

**CITY OF VICTORIA
HERITAGE ADVISORY PANEL
MEETING MINUTES
May 11, 2021**

Present: Aaron Usatch
Avery Bonner
Doug Campbell
Graham Walker
Helen Edwards
Jim Kerr
Kirby Delaney
Pamela Madoff, Chair
Shari Khadem
Steve Barber

Guests: Karen Bergen
Meghan Bannon
PJ L'Heureux
Chad Magas
Landon Anholt
David Vera
Keith Barbon
Earl Large
Kimberly Colpman
Martin Winston
Caroline Moore
Wendy Bowkett
Ken Johnson
Councillor Geoff Young
Councillor Charlayne Thornton-Joe

Staff: John O'Reilly, Senior Heritage Planner
Justine Wendland, Heritage Secretary

The Chair called the meeting to order at noon.

1. Adoption of the Agenda

Moved by Avery Bonner

Seconded by Shari Khadem

Carried (unanimous)

2. Adoption of the Minutes of the April 13, 2021 Meeting

Moved by Helen Edwards

Seconded by Doug Campbell

Carried (unanimous)

3. Business Arising from the Minutes

None raised.

4. Announcements

- Roundhouse site visit on May 18th and Special HAPL on May 25th, 2021
- New Heritage Planner
- Northern Junk went to Committee of the Whole and advanced to public hearing which is not yet scheduled.

5. 450 Swift Street– Heritage Alteration Permit with Variance Application No. 00030

John O'Reilly provided a brief introduction and applicant provided follow-up comments.

Panel Questions and Comments

Why change the windows? For movement and function of the patio as an extension of the interior. There is an indoor/outdoor bar serviced from both sides. From a service point of view, it allows one staff bartender to staff the bar. The thought was to have the patio in use for ¾ of the seasons a year. The vinyl screens will be only used in colder months. Is there any ramp or accessibility access on the new patio? No ramp is integrated with the new patio, but patrons could enter through main entrance. Accessibility is addressed through adding a lift in the building as patrons must enter the establishment through the front door. Were alternatives considered to the vinyl panels? Yes, other options were considered, such as glazing but that limited the height and added more visual clutter, mesh provided wind block but when its closed it creates a black wall and a visual block. Why is the lower brick to be painted white? This is to create a taproom atmosphere and a different feel for that corner, to draw attention there. Any intention to enclose the patio? No, the patio will be completely open

Regarding the window alterations, consistency of the multi-pane windows original to the buildings and the Panel voiced support for retaining multi-light windows but also supported modifying windows. The detailing of newer windows was consistent with the original design of the windows. We cannot confirm if specific windows are original, but the design is authentic to the design of the time. Are there statements of the statement of significance for the building? No official statement of significance.

Regarding the patio design, the Panel is looking for more transparency other than the vinyl barriers for wind reduction. Supportive of a permanent addition as such a greenhouse-type structure which might be more successful than the vinyl visually as well as reducing wind for patrons. This structure should be considered as an addition to the building versus a patio installation. What materials would be used for a greenhouse? Typically, greenhouses are glass and steel. The Empress's conservatory is a good example that inspired the design of the greenhouse design for the conference centre.

Regarding the quality of the signage, it was unclear from the applicants' renderings of the building and placement of signage if all signs are illuminated. Is the CRAFT sign illuminating and identifying the entrance to the building? What the role of that sign is? Craft sign is by a service window. The size of the signage could be reduced and appears unnecessary large.

Regarding the masonry painting, the Panel indicated that the brick should remain unpainted to match the rest of the building. The metal canopy is closed at the one end and becomes a solid entity as it is closed on one side versus floating canopy. The closed folded canopy also blocks the main entrance. The Panel indicated they would like to see options for transparency on the canopy, and that the size of canopy feels large for the area.

Regarding the lighting of the building, the applicant is not proposing new lighting for the heritage building, although this may benefit the visibility and prominence of the building at night. Is the lighting in rendering existing or new and proposed? It looks like there is potential glare from the highly mounted lights that shine downwards. If they do cause glare, could they be dimmed? Flood lights are already mounted on the building, a few lights were added at the entry and smaller ones on the corner, the upper lights are existing. Could those highly positioned lights be removed? The current lights amplify the building, they are currently a soft light and none glaring. For security you would like to keep that lighting, as they are quite dim. Would there be new lighting under the new canopy at the entrance by the outdoor dining area by the white brick? A wall sconce will be located by both, but minimal light fixtures will be added. Was an alternative to the steel structure proposed, why not use a timber structure? The plan was to keep the structure as slim as possible, and the timber appeared heavier against the building. The Chintz and Company building was inspirational and the metal coming off the old brick building. Is there still a connection from Herald Street to Swift street? Yes, where there was an existing stairwell that would be made level.

Motion:

Option Three That the Heritage Advisory Panel recommend to Council that Heritage Alteration Permit with Variances Application No. 00030 for 450 Swift Street does not sufficiently meet the applicable design guidelines and polices and should be declined (and that the key areas that should be revised include): as listed by the Panel, if there is further advice they would like to provide on how the Application could be improved.

Moved by Steve Barber

Seconded by Jim Kerr

List of Considerations:

1. Retain multi-light windows overlooking covered patio.
2. Reconsider approach to covered patio more consistent with heritage building that is lighter and more transparent. 1:27)
3. Reconsideration of size and number of signs
4. Ground storey should not be painted and reconsideration of closed end of the canopy at the north end of the patio
5. Any change in exterior lighting should be in compliance with Guidelines to the satisfaction of the Senior Heritage Planner.
6. Confirmation of the materials of doors and window replacement.

Carried (9 in favor, 1 opposed)

6. **1737 Rockland Avenue – Heritage Designation No. 000195**

John O'Reilly provided a brief introduction.

Steve Barber excused himself from this/left meeting at 1:23pm and returned a few minutes later.

Panel Questions and Comments

Is the floorplan the extent to the designation request, was the construction done previous without permit are those changes included? It could be excluded from the designation to just encircle the original envelope of the building and exclude the patio structure.

Motion:

Moved by Doug Campbell

Seconded by Jim Kerr

Recommendation to put forward to Council for approval. Heritage designation is to not include the addition of the patio cover but be specific to only the original footprint of the house.

Carried (unanimous)

7. **255 Government Street– Delegated Heritage Alteration Permit No. 00169**

John O'Reilly provided a brief introduction.

No formal minutes were transcribed.

8. **1009 Southgate Street– Delegated Heritage Alteration Permit No. 00168**

John O'Reilly provided a brief introduction.

No formal minutes were transcribed.

Motion to adjourn: Jim Kerr

Seconded: Doug Campbell

Adjournment: (Unanimous)

Adjourned at 1:40 pm