

**MINUTES OF THE
ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MEETING
HELD WEDNESDAY AUGUST 28, 2019**

1. THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER AT 12:05 PM

Present: Elizabeth Balderston, Pamela Madoff, Jessi-Anne Reeves, Carl-Jan Rupp, Karen Sander, Stefan Schulson

Absent for a Portion of the Meeting: Brad Forth, Roger Tinney

Absent: Sorin Birliga, Jason Niles, Marilyn Palmer

Staff Present: Miko Betanzo – Senior Planner, Urban Design
Jim Handy – Senior Planner – Development Agreements
Katie Lauriston – Secretary

2. MINUTES

Minutes from the Meeting held July 24, 2019

Motion:

It was moved by Roger Tinney, seconded by Jessi-Anne Reeves, that the minutes from the meeting held July 24, 2019 be adopted.

Carried Unanimously

3. APPLICATIONS

3.1 Development Permit Application No. 000549 for 202 Harbour Road

The City is considering a Development Permit to construct a six-storey commercial building on a vacant site at the corner of Harbour Road and Esquimalt Road.

Applicant meeting attendees:

JAMES IRWIN	JAMES E. IRWIN ARCHITECT INC.
TOM BAXTER	JAMES E. IRWIN ARCHITECT INC.
TAMARA BONNEMAISON	MURDOCH DE GREEF INC.

Jim Handy provided the Panel with a brief introduction of the application and the areas that Council is seeking advice on, including the following:

- the design and location of building entrances on Harbour Road
- the rear of the building and the interface with the future plaza / pedestrian pathway.

James Irwin provided the Panel with a detailed presentation of the site and context of the proposal and Tamara Bonnemaïson provided details of the landscape design.

The Panel asked the following questions of clarification:

- where are the building entrances located on Harbour Road?
 - there is an entrance at the lobby, two along Harbour Road and one at the south facing the plaza
- is a fence proposed to separate the southern corner of the lot from the public plaza?
 - temporary fencing is proposed, which would be removed subject to the future plaza design
- is the location of the parkade entrance on the adjacent site to the north confirmed?
 - based on zoning documents for the adjacent sites, this is its assumed location for the parkade entrance for five towers along Dockside
- what is the proposed garbage disposal route?
 - all garbage/recycling would be stored in two areas in the parkade, and brought out to the north end of the property along Harbour Road for pickup
- was screening the temporary garbage pickup location considered?
 - if the garbage area were screened, trucks would not have access for pickup
 - there is additional landscaping and parkade exhaust fanning located at that point, a little further from Harbour Road
- is there any proposed screening for the hydro kiosk?
 - no, this is a very tight site due to the required statutory right-of-way (SRW), which leaves no further space for landscaping
- is the SRW for a future sewer line?
 - the SRW is for Harbour Road itself, although some utilities are also run within the SRW
- is there any conflict between the utilities running along the SRW and the proposed tree plantings?
 - this has been assessed and the tree placement will work as proposed
- what landscaping, if any, is proposed on the roofs?
 - landscaping is proposed only for the second storey roof
 - the fourth and sixth floors may have walkout decks
 - no green roofs are proposed as the building's height is restricted
 - the sixth floor roof is being kept clear for the future location of solar panels, and highly reflective materials are proposed on this roof
- the lobby has two entrances, with one downsized as an emergency exit. Given the future importance of a gateway at the south end, was increasing the prominence of this entrance explored?
 - yes, the location of this entrance ensures future circulation from the plaza to Harbour Road
- was the future connection of the second level to the adjacent building considered?
 - this was explored; however, the timeline for the adjacent building makes it difficult to determine the design of the adjacent building at this stage
- will there be a one-storey difference in grade to the adjacent site at the southwest corner?
 - there could be, but it is not yet determined
 - the intention would be to make a connection to the adjacent sites, which is why the parkade entrance is located as proposed
 - the main focus is to create a connection to the corner plaza
- what materials are proposed for the uppermost roof?
 - white aluminum composite (ACM) panels are proposed, which would be very slim in profile with no flashing cap

- the staff report notes that the rooftop is designed to allow for solar panels in the future; why not integrate solar at outset?
 - there are significant costs associated with solar
 - the panels will have to protrude significantly from the slope of the roof; the proposed building height leaves room within the allowable height for panels to be added in the future
- wouldn't solar panels be considered mechanical equipment, thus allowing for the increased height within the zoning?
 - yes, however the portion of the rooftop that can be used for mechanical is limited
- what is the proposed roofing material?
 - the roof surfaces are a highly reflective white SBS material
 - other roof surfaces would likely be pavers, but this is yet to be determined
- would the mechanical equipment be contained within the penthouse?
 - most equipment would be contained within building, although heat pumps would be located on the fifth floor roof and a small mechanical area is proposed for the sixth floor
- what are the materials of the proposed black box on the top level?
 - the elevated box surrounds mechanical equipment, and would be perforated aluminum
- is the roof access for service only?
 - yes
- is there a materials board for the proposal?
 - no
- what is the proposed black siding material?
 - dark grey ACM panel
- would the stair guards be made of standard perforated material?
 - yes
- how does the proposed rain garden near the main entrance function?
 - the rain garden would have an underdrain and an overflow drain, with a rainwater leader feeding into the concrete planter box
 - water will slowly sink into the growing medium, and a perforated pipe to the sewer system is proposed to avoid any sitting water
- is the rain garden located over the parking slab?
 - yes
- what is the proposed fencing material adjacent to the plaza?
 - two materials are proposed; the permanent fence further from the plaza would be wooden, while a wire mesh (or the like) adjacent to the future plaza is designed be removed.

The Panel discussed:

- appreciation for the overall building massing
- need to screen the temporary garbage area along Harbour Road to comply with the design guidelines
- opportunity to move the hydro kiosk further towards parking stall no.14, allowing more room for landscaping and screening of the garbage area
- concern for unprogrammed spaces (e.g. the level two roof deck)
- the need for landscaping and confirmation on materials on the roof decks
- the need for the back entry feature into the site circulation
- need for a stronger entry design from Harbour Road

- desire for a pedestrian connection to the rear of the site and further into Dockside Green
- need to consider that the pathway at the rear could be quite busy
- opportunity for a short-term vehicle lay-by along Harbour Road
- opportunity to signal the importance of the main building entrance through landscaping design
- questioning the functionality of the small rain garden planter on top of the parkade slab
- appreciation for the proposed rain garden on Harbour Road
- concern that the proposed dark grey building material would show bird feces given the number of seagulls in the area
- opportunity for further development of the simple glass façades, especially the north façade
- need for something to animate and signify the building entrances along Harbour Road, such as glass awnings
- desire for more logic and detail to the façade design to better fit with Dockside Green
- the need for a high level of design given the prominent location of the site, as a gateway to Dockside and Vic West
- opportunity for the materials to be more unique to the site
- the need for a materials board for clarification on the proposed materials
- concern that the temporary fencing adjacent to the future plaza would not be removed

Roger Tinney left the meeting at 1:04pm.

- room to improve the pedestrian realm and future pathway along the south side
- appreciation for the openness to the future plaza area
- opportunity for more interesting fencing solutions (e.g. public art piece)
- need to add prominence to the building entryways, especially those at the northeast side
- appreciation for the articulation of the floorplates
- support for the general form and scale of the building
- need for a pronounced main lobby to help offset the lack of building entrance for the stratified main level
- concern for tinting or reflectivity of the glass on the main level for energy efficiency
- need for further clarity on which roof decks might be occupied
- opportunity for green roofs
- desire to see the revised project return to the Panel for review.

Motion:

It was moved by Pamela Madoff, seconded by Carl-Jan Rupp, that the Advisory Design Panel recommend to Council that Development Permit Application No. 000549 for 202 Harbour Road does not sufficiently meet the applicable design guidelines and policies and should be declined, and the key areas that should be revised include:

- a) Refine the architecture to reflect the significant gateway position of the building and to be more consistent with the design quality at Dockside Green

- b) Revisit the materiality and detailing to be more consistent with Dockside Green and to address long term maintenance, and provide a materials board and renderings that more accurately reflect the proposal's materiality
- c) Provide building details and strong landscape connections to emphasize the location of building entrances
- d) Revisit and strengthen the pedestrian connections to the other Dockside Green buildings through the future plaza
- e) Reconsider the raingarden design at the north property boundary to include rooftop runoff and/or improve its functionality
- f) Include landscape elements, rooftop materials and details to ensure a high-quality roof-scape
- g) Consider a lay-by for short term parking along Harbour Road
- h) Screen the hydro kiosk and waste and recycling storage from the street view.

Carried Unanimously

4. ADJOURNMENT

The Advisory Design Panel meeting of August 28, 2019 was adjourned at 1:25pm.

Stefan Schulson, Chair

**MINUTES OF THE
ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MEETING
HELD WEDNESDAY DECEMBER 18, 2019**

4.2 Development Permit Application No. 000549 for 202 Harbour Road

The City is considering a Development Permit Application for a 6-storey strata office building.

Applicant meeting attendees:

JAMES IRWIN	JAMES IRWIN ARCHITECTURE
SCOTT MURDOCH	MURDOCH DE GREEFF INC
TOM BAXTER	JAMES IRWIN ARCHITECTURE
BRENT BROWNSSELL	SUPERB CONTRUCTION LTD

Michael Angrove provided the Panel with a brief introduction of the application.

James Irwin provided the Panel with a detailed presentation of the site and context of the proposal, and Scott Murdoch provided the Panel with details of the proposed landscape plan.

The Panel asked the following questions of clarification:

- what is the triangle in the front access on the main floor plan?
 - those are columns that hold up the canopy
- where is the intended public access to the building?
 - the main entrance
- is the occupancy intended mostly for commercial use?
 - the occupancy is all commercial, it is a public building
- what is the intended pavement and surfaces?
 - the bulk of the site is pavers, the sidewalk on Harbour Road will be natural pavers and parking will be two tone
- what material is the south plaza?
 - The south plaza will also be pavers in charcoal and natural tones
- what is the intent of the south plaza?
 - it is a spill over space from the ground floor, public seating space and future connection space
- what is the intent for the space behind the south plaza?
 - It's use has not yet been determined
- is the property to the west a park?
 - no, that is the last piece of the Bosa development
- what is happening with the structure and materials on the top of the roof?
 - the 6th floor is a light steel structure. The interior of the roofscape is steel. we are insulating on top and have narrowed the roof
- are there thermal breaks on the decks?
 - yes, the concrete desk on the west side are all thermally broken
- how are the thermal breaks being accomplished?
 - there is a standard composition the applicant has brought that allows that
- was the sleek design of the roof considered, or how you could introduce that elsewhere on the building to tie everything together?

- The architect looked at transitions and depth, but from a horizontal view were looking at larger bands and the roof was the floating piece that tied it all back together. The roof is supposed to be the signature piece of this building
- was a lighter entrance and canopy feature considered to clearly signal the main entrance?
 - Yes, but the architect wanted that transparency
- does parking stall 15 need to be where it is currently located?
 - it could be turned into a non-accessible spot, but the developer would like to have it as close as possible. All those parking spots are needed. This is the most efficient configuration
- were other light expressions for the canopy considered?
 - yes, but there is a fine line between weight and design
- is there a necessity for the notch out on the roof?
 - The architect went with that because the building steps back, the architect wanted to narrow it out. Otherwise it would have a large overhang and then it would have to have a column to support it
- what is the reason for the strong contrast in the white and black banding?
 - solar was talked about, it's not required. So, the money was put into other aspects. The applicant could revisit the black banding and fine tune things
- are the bands different colours?
 - they are slightly different shades of black.

Panel members discussed:

- setting good parameters on the south side
- how the building volume and articulation creates a good point to anchor the corner
- how the upper band diminishes the building's elegance
- opportunity to bringing in the sleekness of the roof scape to the front of the building
- the challenges of integration with surrounding context while not yet having neighbours
- appreciation for the sustainability aspects
- opportunity to eliminate the notch on the roofline
- making the entrance more delicate and inviting
- relocating the front entrance parking stall.

Motion:

It was moved by Sorin Birliga, seconded by Jessi-Anne Reeves, that the Advisory Design Panel recommend to Council that Development Permit Application No. 000549 for 202 Harbour Road be approved with the following changes:

- revise, strengthen and simplify the main entrance, emphasize location and execution
- relocation of parking stall at front entrance
- reduce the visual competition of the fifth-floor parapet.

For: Sorin Birliga, Stefan Schulson, Jessi-Anne Reeves

Opposed: Pamela Madoff, Carl-Jan Rupp

Carried 3-2