

**CITY OF VICTORIA
HERITAGE ADVISORY PANEL
MEETING MINUTES
DECEMBER 11, 2019**

Present: Pamela Madoff, Chair
Steve Barber
Doug Campbell
Katie Cummer
Hal Kalman
Shari Khadem
Lisa MacIntosh
Connie Quaedvlieg

Absent: Julie Br  h  ret, Graham Walker

Staff: John O'Reilly, Senior Heritage Planner
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 November 12th and 26th Meetings

Moved

Seconded

Carried (unanimous)

2. Business Arising from the Minutes

- The review of the changes to the Downtown Core Area Plan will continue at today's meeting.

3. Announcements

John O'Reilly:

- A new plaque recognizing Old Town is now mounted on a granite plinth outside the Tourism Information Centre at the corner of Government and Wharf Streets.
- As yet, there is no Committee of the Whole meeting date for the Northern Junk application.

**4. 1302 Finlayson Street
Request for addition to the Heritage Register (HAF 00095)**

Attendees: Adrian Brett (Adrian Brett & Associates)

John O'Reilly provided a brief introduction. Adrian Brett presented.

Panel Questions and Comments

- Will the 1976 addition remain and be renovated? John O'Reilly: It will remain with some changes, including a glass balustrade. (The archival photograph on the Statement of Significance is from 1959.)
- Why not designate the building? Adrian Brett: There is no request to designate as the owner wants to retain flexibility regarding the commercial use of the building. Since it was built in the mid-1920s, the property has been used as commercial. If, for example, a coffee shop wanted to use the space, it may want to open up the front façade. If placed on the Register, the building's heritage is recognized, but changes will not require a heritage alteration permit.
- Will the existing building be rehabilitated? Adrian Brett: Yes, in the future the owner wants to improve the façade. Panel: The words "improve the façade" suggest that designation may be appropriate so that the changes would be reviewed by the Panel.
- The applicant is receiving public benefit through a rezoning with variances, including increased density. Traditionally, the City has requested designation of properties with heritage significance. The owner has not committed to rehabilitating the building. Given the benefits being conferred on the property by the rezoning and the granting of variances, it would be more appropriate to recommend heritage designation.
- The statutory right-of-way is probably the strongest incentive for preservation because if the building is demolished, the non-conforming use would no longer be allowed, resulting in a smaller floor plate.
- Small changes to the building may be allowed through the delegated heritage alteration permit process versus the heritage alteration permit process.
- Heritage registration is very limiting, even with the discussions that staff can have with the owner in the future.

Moved

Seconded

That the Heritage Advisory Panel recommend that Council approve the heritage designation of the property located at 1302 Finlayson Street, pursuant to Section 611 of the *Local Government Act*, as a Municipal Heritage Site in lieu of the financial benefits to the applicant and the greater protection of heritage resources provided by heritage designation.

Carried (unanimous)

4. **1306 - 1330 Broad Street / 615 - 625 Johnson Street / parts of 622 and 630 Yates Street (Duck's Block)
Heritage Alteration Permit with Variances Application No. 00018**

The following motion was made at the November 28, 2019 Council Meeting:
Refer the item back to COTW and invite the person who chaired the Heritage Advisory Committee the day this was presented to share thoughts on behalf of the committee with COTW...

Attendees: David Chard (Chard Development Ltd.)

John O'Reilly provided a brief introduction.

Panel Questions and Comments

- Katie Cummer, Acting Chair, will attend a Committee of the Whole meeting to share the perspective of the Panel and what was discussed during its review of the Duck's Block development on August 13, 2019.
- The Panel does not want to set a precedent wherein their decisions are not trusted.
- There is no established procedure for this request from Council. Traditionally, the Chair is not the Panel's spokesperson; the Panel speaks as a collective.
- Council could be told what was discussed and what was not discussed at the Panel meeting. The minutes do not address what was not discussed. Councillor Thornton-Joe attended the meeting and took her own notes which have been read by other councillors. Council is looking for the "flavour" of the meeting.
- It is unfair to ask the Chair to condense the depth and variety of opinions that led to the motion. The Panel could suggest an alternative, i.e. invite councillors to a Panel meeting for discussion of the issue to listen to the range of opinions. The Panel already formed a recommendation and the proper process should be followed. We would need ALL members of Council to attend the Panel meeting or the process would be fractured.
- The members of the Panel who were present at the August 13th meeting could attend the COTW meeting to provide support, but only the Chair would speak. Katie could indicate that members are present and Council could choose to ask questions of them. The members will be informed of the COTW date when it is set.

Alison Meyer left the meeting at 12:50 pm

5. Downtown Core Area Plan - Urban Design Workshop

Presenters: Robert Batallas, Senior Planner and Joaquin Karakas, Senior Urban Designer

Panel Questions and Comments

- Steve Barber volunteered to serve on the Technical Working Group.
- What is defined as the Inner Harbour Causeway Area? Is it only the granite causeway and pedestrian walkway below? Does it need a set of design guidelines? First, the area needs to be clearly defined. There are very few development opportunities in the area. Public realm aspects related to the Heritage Conservation Area (HCA) are covered by the Downtown Public Realm Plan. However, design guidance is lacking for changes to private property that interfaces with the Harbour (e.g. fences, railings, hotel additions and recladding, redevelopment of the Belleville Terminal). Specific guidelines are needed so that there is consistency in form, scale and materials.
- Will the reference to façades in section 7.22 be changed or removed? Robert Batallas: This will be discussed by the Technical Working Group.
- The Inner Harbour Causeway Area has multiple gateways, i.e. Coho, Clipper, airport bus, traffic from Wharf Street. Each entry point should have a visual landmark. What is the difference between a gateway and a landmark? What message do these terms impart to a developer?
- Detailed guidelines are needed regarding the transition (tiering) of buildings from the Harbour to Downtown, particularly along Wharf Street as that is where Old Town meets the Harbour. There is pressure to add large additions to one-storey buildings, e.g. Northern Junk. Guidelines are also needed regarding scale, view corridors,

- public walkways with amenities (restaurants, parks) from Ship Point to the Johnson Street Bridge.
- Be clear about the tiering of buildings from the Harbour. Buildings should move “up and away” from the water, between Wharf and Blanshard Streets. This is not lot specific. Language in the guidelines should clarify that buildings on waterfront lots should move “up and away” as well.
 - The heritage section indicates that a balance should be achieved between new development and heritage conservation. Strong language is required to send the message that within an HCA, heritage needs to be at the top of the list.
 - In reference to Section 7.21, as well as a Heritage Conservation Plan, the heritage consultant should sign off on additions to heritage buildings. Robert Batallas: A process to support that would need to be developed.
 - Regarding Section 7.21, it would be helpful to explain under what circumstances a heritage impact assessment is relevant. John O’Reilly: The OCP indicates which application types require which studies. The OCP could be referenced in 7.21.
 - Within the boundaries of Old Town, there is protection due to the HCA and control and guidance through the Old Town Design Guidelines. However, in the areas to the north, such as Pembroke and Store Streets, and to the east of Blanshard Street, there are individual registered and designated buildings that could be impacted by adjacent high rise buildings. There is a real need for policy direction regarding these issues; for example, new development should modify massing at the same level as adjacent lower scale heritage buildings.
 - Some proposals for new developments are requesting 12 to 15 storey rooftop additions. This is not good contemporary architecture or good preservation. If the property is not within an HCA, the conversation is very limited. John O’Reilly: The DCAP could specify the standard and extent of conservation required to attain the bonus density offered in the OCP.
 - “Rooftop addition” is a misnomer for increased height. The term should indicate a one-storey addition or rooftop mechanical boxes only.
 - Steve and Pamela may update the Panel during the review period. Robert and Joaquin will return to the Panel when the first draft is completed and eventually will require a letter of support from the Panel for Council.

Adjournment: 1:15 pm