

MINUTES OF THE
JOINT ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL/HERITAGE ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
HELD WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER, 2014, 12 P.M.

1. THE CHAIR CALLED THE MEETING TO ORDER AT 12:03 P.M.

Panel Members Present: Stuart Stark (Chair); Mark Byram; Barry Cosgrave; John Dam; Ken Johnson; Mike Miller (for Mickey Lam); Ann Katherine Murphy; Rod Windjack

Absent: Richard Linzey

Staff Present: Mike Wilson – Senior Planner-Urban Design;
Jim Handy - Senior Planner-Development Agreements;
Murray Miller – Senior Heritage Planner;
Charlotte Wain – Senior Planner- Urban Design

2. MINUTES

2.1 Minutes from the Meeting held May 1, 2013

Action:

MOVED / SECONDED

It was moved by Mr. Cosgrave, seconded by Mr. Windjack, that the Minutes of the Joint Advisory Design Panel and Heritage Advisory Committee held May 1, 2013, be approved subject to an amendment of Mr. Cosgrave's misspelled name under the "Present" portion of the minutes. "Cosgrave", Cosgrave.

Discussion on the Motion:

- some members felt they were put in an uncomfortable situation by being asked to approve minutes from a meeting they did not attend.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

3. APPLICATIONS

3.1 Development Permit #000356 and Heritage Alteration Permit #00180 for 251-259 Esquimalt Road and 200 E&N Rail Line

The application is to restore the rail turntable; renovate the four existing Heritage-Buildings and construct three new one-storey buildings. Outdoor areas include surface parking, public open space and cultural interpretation.

Applicant Meeting attendees: Ms. Jennifer Kay, Landeca A Consultancy
Mr. Norman Hotson, Dialog Design
Ms. Nastaran Moradinejad, PFS Studio
Mr. George Kallergis, Focus Equities
Mr. David Fullbrook, Focus Equities
Mr. Jonathan Yardley, Jonathan Yardley Architect

Mr. Handy provided the Panel with a brief introduction of the Application and the areas of the project that Council was seeking advice on, including the following:

- exterior rehabilitation of the Heritage-Designated structures;
- roundhouse doors;
- addition of the glass Atrium and adjacent connected building.

Mr. Handy also elaborated that in some instances the proposed design solutions are not consistent with the *Roundhouse Design Guidelines* and invited the Panel to provide advice to Staff on the following areas:

- design and appearance of the new buildings and the proposed use of finishing materials;
- design solutions to contribute to a better streetscape adjacent to Esquimalt Road;
- reconfiguration and proposed final design solution for the Heritage-Designated turntable and proposed plaza.

Mr. Miller then provided the Panel with a brief introduction of the Application's heritage significance and invited the Panel to provide feedback to Staff on the following areas of the Proposal that may compromise character defining elements and to recommend any changes that could minimize this impact:

- proposed affixation of signage to the exterior brick walls;
- lack of information provided regarding testing of the existing mortar and masonry units to determine a proper recipe for any new mortar to be used in the repair of historic masonry;
- proposed treatment of the train bay doors;
- proposed door for the existing arch doorway;
- proposed positioning of the mezzanine at the back shop.

Mr. Miller also requested that the Panel consider the Proposals reversibility for any future changes.

Ms. Kay then provided the Panel with a brief introduction of the presentation and addressed some of the introductory comments made by Staff where the Proposal has been deemed inconsistent with the Guidelines.

Mr. Hotson provided a detailed presentation of the Proposal to the Panel including the Proposals heritage value to Canada and the proposed phases of development.

Ms. Kay then provided the Panel with a brief overview of the key topics for review.

Mr. Hotson then elaborated on these key topics and invited the Panel to provide feedback.

Panel Members discussed:

Roundhouse Main Doors-

- Concerns that the character of the building will be impacted by retail tenant's modifications to the doors.
- The possibilities of leaving the doors open and placing glass entrances behind.
- Solid wood doors are an important character defining element and some members do not want glazing used on the doors.
- The preference for the original doors.
- Weather proofing measures behind the doors.
- Concerns that signage will be placed on the doors impacting the character of the building.
- Consideration of the performance of the doors as a building envelope.

Action:

MOVED / SECONDED

It was moved by Mr. Byram, seconded by Ms. Murphy, that the Joint Advisory Design Panel and Heritage Advisory Committee recommend to Council that all of the wood doors be restored to the original construction in front of the entrance bays and that glazing be permitted in front of the restored bay doors shown on drawing RH A501.

Discussion on the Motion:

- The fact the doors will not always be opened.
- How the doors will be secured in an open position.
- The wind concerns for open doors.
- The difficulty with opening and closing large heavy doors and the logistics of doing this.
- Concerns of compromising the heritage values.
- Preference to make the doors as original looking as possible.
- Reconstruction concerns of the original doors.

For: Mr. Cosgrave, Mr. Dam, Mr. Johnson, Ms. Murphy

Against: Mr. Stark (Chair), Mr. Byram, Mr. Windjack, Mr. Miller

MOTION FAILS

Action:

MOVED / SECONDED

It was moved by Mr. Windjack, seconded by Mr. Johnson, that the Joint Advisory Design Panel and Heritage Advisory Committee recommend to Council that the doors be restored back to their original state which is a solid door, that the doors all be operable so they can open and that each of the ten portals have a glazed storefront infill, some with access doors and some without.

Discussion on the Motion:

- Concerns with having the doors open as only glazing will be seen.
- Some members feel the proposal is supportable as proposed.

For: Mr. Stark (Chair), Mr. Dam, Mr. Johnson, Mr. Windjack

Against: Mr. Byram, Mr. Cosgrave, Mr. Miller, Ms. Murphy

MOTION FAILS

Action:

MOVED / SECONDED

It was moved by Mr. Byram, seconded by Mr. Miller, that the Joint Advisory Design Panel and Heritage Advisory Committee recommend to Council that the Roundhouse doors be approved as presented.

For: Mr. Byram, Mr. Cosgrave, Mr. Johnson, Mr. Miller, Ms. Murphy

Against: Mr. Stark (Chair), Mr. Dam, Mr. Windjack

CARRIED

Panel Members discussed:

Proposed Service Door – North Elevation of Back Shop-

- Significance of the original door at the back shop.
- The appropriateness of the design proposed for the service door in response to the heritage building.
- Possibility of incorporating an arch opening in the door frame with a recessed entry door.
- Concerns of removing the original doors on the heritage buildings.

Proposed Retail Door – South Elevation of Stores Building-

- The need for more transparency near the buildings retail space. This could be done with glass on all three retail doors.
- Concerns of removing the original doors on the heritage buildings.
- Distinguishing the original openings from the new openings.

Action:

MOVED / SECONDED

It was moved by Mr. Johnson, seconded by Mr. Windjack, that the Joint Advisory Design Panel/Heritage Advisory Committee recommend to Council that the new dock, canopy and door shown on drawing BS A502 is not recommended for approval and that the applicant return to the Senior Heritage Planner with something more in keeping and sympathetic with the original building design.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Action:

MOVED / SECONDED

It was moved by Mr. Byram, seconded by Mr. Miller, that the Joint Advisory Design Panel/Heritage Advisory Committee recommend to Council that the stores building on drawing ST A502 be kept as the original door.

For: Mr. Stark (Chair), Mr. Byram, Mr. Miller, Mr. Dam, Mr. Windjack

Against: Mr. Cosgrave, Mr. Johnson, Ms. Murphy

CARRIED

Panel Members discussed:

Proposed Glass Atrium-

- Some members expressed that the design of Atrium had been sensitively handled.
- Some members stated that the connection between heritage and new buildings was commonly handled in this way.
- Concerns on the transparency of the Atrium and how the mechanical systems may take away from the transparent look.
- Concerns of eliminating the original windows in the Roundhouse and the effect it will have on the exterior of the building.
- Some members stated that the introduction of interior structural pillars as an opening to the new addition to the Roundhouse was an interesting and inviting way to connect the two buildings.
- Possibility of a green roof treatment on the building adjacent to the Roundhouse.

Action:

MOVED / SECONDED

It was moved by Mr. Windjack, seconded by Mr. Miller, that the Joint Advisory Design Panel and Heritage Advisory Committee recommend to Council that the Atrium be accepted as presented with consideration of the following:

- Elimination of one of the openings from the Roundhouse building into the Atrium and retention of one original window.
- Consideration of a green roof treatment over the new building adjacent to the Atrium.
- Particular attention to the detailing of building mechanical systems proposed for this area.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Panel Members discussed:

New Buildings and Materials-

- The preference of old growth material to be used on the ceiling of the Roundhouse rather than wood laminate.
- Members suggested the use of Corten steel as an alternative to Corrugated Metal, if viable.

Streetscapes, Boxcars and Sand tower-

- The water tower addition could be misconceiving to the public as there was no water tower on the original site.
- Members discussed whether or not an original water tower could be sourced or an exact replica could be constructed.
- The space needs to consider how it will be animated year round.
- A greater sense of arrival at the two key entrances. The Roundhouse Mews to Esquimalt Road as well as the Lime Bay Mews between the proposed retail buildings.
- Exploration of a pedestrian link from Esquimalt Road near the current position of the boxcars.
- Concerns that modifications made to the boxcars to accommodate new uses could render them unrecognizable. The boxcars are one of the few representations of past use on the site and some members feel these are important additions.
- The need to reflect the industrial history of this area.
- The bumper car seating is not ideal as it does not appear to be a comfortable place to sit.
- Lack of connection between new and old uses.

Turntable & Treatment-

- The turntables rarity and historic significance.
- Some members feel that the double concrete map on the turntable is confusing and that only one map is preferable.
- Some members would like to see an engine on the turntable as a focal point.
- That the applicant be commended for proposing to rehabilitate the turntable such that it is functional.

Action:

MOVED / SECONDED

It was moved by Mr. Johnson, seconded by Mr. Miller, that the Advisory Design Panel and Heritage Advisory Committee - Joint Panel recommend to Council that Development Permit with Variance #000356 and Heritage Alteration Permit #00180 for 251-259 Esquimalt Road be approved with the consideration of the comments made by the Joint Panel.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

4. ADJOURNMENT

The Joint Advisory Design Panel/Heritage Advisory Committee meeting of December 3, 2014 adjourned at 2:55 P.M.

Stuart Stark, Chair