

**CITY OF VICTORIA
HERITAGE ADVISORY PANEL
MEETING MINUTES
APRIL 9, 2019**

Present: Katie Cummer, Acting Chair
Steve Barber
Julie Br  h  ret
Doug Campbell
Hal Kalman
Shari Khadem
Graham Walker

Absent: Lisa MacIntosh, Pamela Madoff, Connie Quaedvlieg

Staff: Merinda Conley, Senior Heritage Planner
John O'Reilly, Heritage Planner
Moir   Wilson, Senior Planner - Urban Design
Alison Meyer, Assistant Director, Development Services
Lauren Martin, Heritage Secretary

The Chair called the meeting to order at noon.

1. Adoption of the Minutes of the March 12, 2019 Meeting

Moved

Seconded

Carried

2. Business Arising from the Minutes

- An observation from the minutes: The focus of heritage conservation has shifted to buildings from the immediate post-war period. This makes sense as traditionally, the focus is on buildings of 75+ years of age. Buildings from the late 19th century and early 20th century to the 1920s have already been managed.
- Follow up from a past meeting item: The Panel reviewed an application for improvement to the paving and landscaping of the Inner Harbour's Lower Causeway. Is there an update? Merinda Conley: The applicant chose not to move forward. They are undertaking additional studies for a more inclusive approach to rehabilitation of the causeway. To date, a new application has not been received.

3. Announcements

- John O'Reilly: The *Old Town Design Guidelines* were presented to Council on March 14th for 1st and 2nd readings of the Official Community Plan (OCP) Amendment Bylaw followed by a Public Hearing on March 28th. The bylaw was adopted and the relevant sections of the OCP have been updated.

- John O'Reilly: The Provincial Roundtables on Heritage report, *The State of Heritage*, was presented at a group meeting in Victoria on April 2nd. The draft report concludes that heritage professionals are redirecting their attention from historic places and the built environment to tangible heritage and social history. Most of the discussion was about rural sites which do not have many historic places or buildings. During the peer review, John suggested the addition of language about the importance of ongoing management and stewardship of historic places and the built environment. The report will be presented at the Heritage BC Conference in May.
- Merinda Conley: 1402-1404 Douglas Street, Heritage Alteration Permit No. 00231 update: At the March 12th meeting, the Panel recommended that Council decline the HAP application and that the applicant be encouraged to explore alternatives that allow light transmission, but do not allow the cannabis products to be visible from outside the building and to consider the impact on the following:
 - the exterior appearance of the heritage-designated building
 - active land uses
 - the pedestrian environment
 - the vitality of the street
 - the natural surveillance of the exterior and interior environment
 - alternative screening options that could minimize visual impact on the heritage character of the building and the pedestrian environment.

The owner/applicant had Cannabis Retail Inspectors tour the space to consider other acceptable options that would meet the Liquor Cannabis Regulation Branch (LCRB) regulation. A screening solution was then proposed, consisting of Plexiglas panels with applied film set slightly away from the inside face of the storefront windows. Staff encouraged the applicant to consider archival images of the interior of mercantile stores from the early 1900s in Victoria and the applicant agreed. Since the interior of the building is not designated, a HAP is no longer required. However, the applicant has agreed to sign a covenant stating that the screening will be removed immediately once the LCRB regulations change.

- Merinda Conley: The annual Hallmark Heritage Awards Night is on Tuesday, May 7th at 7:30 pm at St. Ann's Academy Auditorium.

4. **1209 Yukon Street Heritage Designation Application No. 000183**

John O'Reilly provided a brief introduction.

Panel Questions and Comments

- Would it be appropriate for the Panel to address the proposed alterations now? Alison Meyer: The alterations will require Delegated Heritage Alteration Permits which will be reviewed by the Panel as per Council's direction.

Moved

Seconded

That the Heritage Advisory Panel recommend that Council approve the designation of the heritage-registered property located at 1209 Yukon Street, pursuant to Section 611 of the *Local Government Act*, as a Municipal Heritage Site.

Carried (unanimous)

**5. 952 Johnson Street & 1400 Vancouver Street
Heritage Designation Application No. 000184**

Attendees: Dan Cox, Cox Developments Ltd.

Merinda Conley provided a brief introduction.

Panel Questions and Comments

- The applicant is commended for undertaking the development of this property. The existing building, designed by John Di Castri, is worthy of designation. When the 1961 addition is removed, will the original west wall remain? Merinda Conley: The original wall of the sawtooth footprint of the west wall of the chapel will remain.
- In the Statement of Significance, omit the reference to the building's association with churches since the chapel was non-denominational. Also be more specific about the roof; describe it as flat and gently sloping rather than geometric.

Moved

Seconded

That the Heritage Advisory Panel recommend that Council approve the designation of the property located at 952 Johnson Street and 1400 Vancouver Street, pursuant to Section 611 of the Local Government Act, as a Municipal Heritage Site.

Carried (unanimous)

**6. 615-617 Government Street
Legislative Precinct Central Heating Plant Replacement Project**

Merinda Conley provided a brief introduction.

Attendees: Michael Masson, Director, Capital Projects; Bernie Gaudet, Director, Corporate Sustainability, BC Real Property Division, Ministry of Citizens' Services

Panel Questions and Comments

- It is obvious that the plant is obsolete and a district energy system is needed. Would the required equipment fit into the current envelope? If it would not fit, how much more space is required? Bernie Gaudet: Currently the dimensions of the required building are unknown. It will be dictated by the size of the equipment and its design. This will not be known until the proposal goes out for procurement. One of the objectives is to retain as much of the existing building as possible without significantly compromising the project.
- It seems like the demolition of the building has already been decided without knowing the energy system. Other heritage buildings have been successfully retrofitted with new equipment, i.e. ground floor heat systems with minimal equipment. Bernie Gaudet: It is not known if the building will be demolished as the type of system has not been determined yet. Ground source heat may be a viable option. The system will serve a group of buildings, not just one. It may not be possible to confine the solution to the size of the existing building's envelope. Michael Masson: The plant will be replaced, but not necessarily the building.

- Have other sites been considered? Michael Masson: Yes, other sites were considered, but the current site is the most viable as a tunnel distribution system is already in place.
- Will various options be costed out? Michael Masson: Yes, all financial and environmental options will be considered.
- The size of the plant will be impacted by the number of energy users. Is the number of users known at this time? Bernie Gaudet: Part of the requirement when doing procurement is the scalability of the energy supply. If the supply is used outside of provincial government facilities, the energy would have to be supplied by a utility provider, not the government. It is in the government's best interest to scale up to reduce cost, liability and greenhouse gas for everyone.
- If a new and much larger building is required, would there be limitations in scale due to its proximity to the Legislative Buildings? Merinda: It is a heritage conservation area so any development would have to go through the heritage alteration permit process and Council. Bernie Gaudet: There is already a district energy system allowed onsite. The aim is to ensure that the system meets provincial regulations for greenhouse gas emissions and the City's regulations. Michael Masson: The business case must show due diligence regarding climate action.
- Has any analysis been done regarding the embodied energy in the existing building? Concrete is one of the most energy intensive materials and most contemporary heritage conservation practices on such buildings always include a life cycle analysis, including the amount of embodied energy in the existing building and how much energy would be expended in its demolition. Bernie Gaudet: This will be included as part of the overall analysis.
- If the west wall of the existing building were removed, its footprint could be doubled by expanding to the west (current location of a parking lot). Michael Masson: The design of the system is currently unknown so these decisions have not been made. Bernie Gaudet: There may be restrictions by lot lines.
- It seems that the province does not want limitations in the development of a new district energy plant. However, the Panel sees heritage value in the existing building. Could the building's value be recognized and acknowledged in the project's terms of reference? Michael Masson: That will be done.
- There is no question that an energy supply is needed. However, there are currently a number of unknowns: the design of the HVAC system, the equipment needed, the envelope required, and if the expansion of the existing building is an option. The Panel appreciates the opportunity to discuss the project at this early stage, but looks forward to seeing the full application in the future.
- The significance of the building must be weighed against the importance of mitigating climate change.
- When will the Panel receive further information about the project? Bernie Gaudet: There should be more information available by the fall. The goal is to have the business case developed by the end of the year and the plant completed by 2021.
- Is seismic upgrading of the Legislative Buildings being considered? Bernie Gaudet: The Legislative Buildings are now considered their own entity; however, the issue of seismic upgrading has been raised by the Real Property Division.

The Secretary left the meeting at 1:40 pm as the remaining agenda items did not require minutes.