

**CITY OF VICTORIA
HERITAGE ADVISORY PANEL
MEETING MINUTES
June 11th, 2024**

Present: Alissa Wrean
Deniz Unsal
Imogen Goldie
Jim Kerr (Chair)
John Boehme
Liberty Brears
Lorenda Calvert
Valerie Lindholm
Veronica (Nikki) Strong-Boag

Regrets: Genevieve Hill

Guests: **Heritage Alteration Permit No. 00263 for 350 Douglas Street**
Kyle Bradshaw (Metafor Studio), Chris Windjack (LADR), Jennifer Kaufman (Town-Square), David Woo (Starlight Invest), Justin Filuk (Starlight Invest), Kelsey Tyerman (Starlight Invest), Mike Woodland (Metafor Studio), Mat McLash (McLash Development Ltd.)

Heritage Alteration Permit with Variances No. 00036 and Rezoning Application No. 00869 for 1244 Wharf Street

Robert Fung (The Salient Group), Charlotte Rogers (The Salient Group), Sara Huynh (Cascadia Architects), Greg Damant (Cascadia Architects)

Heritage Designation Application No. 000209 for 1885 Government Street
Nathan Ma (Nicola Wealth), Sara Huynh (Cascadia Architects), Greg Damant (Cascadia Architects)

Staff: Kristal Stevenot, Senior Heritage Planner
Rob Bateman, Senior Planner
Miko Betanzo, Urban Design
Laura Saretsky, Heritage Planner
Kamryn Allen, Heritage Secretary
Alicia Ferguson, Recording Secretary

The Chair called the meeting to order at 12:02 p.m.

John Boehme and Imogen Goldie were not present at the time the meeting convened.

1. Adoption of the Agenda

Moved: Deniz Unsal

Seconded: Alissa Wrean

Motion: That the June 11th, 2024, Heritage Advisory Panel Meeting Agenda be approved.
Carried Unanimously

2. Adoption of the Minutes of the May 14th, 2024, Meeting

Moved: Jim Kerr

Seconded: Liberty Brears

Motion: That the May 14th, 2024, Heritage Advisory Panel Meeting Minutes be approved as amended to correct the motions on page 4 & 5 to read as two separate motions, the first motion for the Rutland House and the second pertaining to the new building.

Carried Unanimously

Veronica (Nikki) Strong-Boag encouraged striking agenda items due to concerns of time constraints. The Chair encouraged the Panel to proceed with the agenda as effectively as possible until any quorum issues arise.

Imogen Goldie joined the meeting at 12:08 p.m.

3. **Business Arising from the Minutes**

None.

4. **Announcements**

None.

5. **Heritage Alteration Permit No. 00263 for 350 Douglas Street**

Staff provided a brief introduction to the Panel with a presentation.

Jennifer Kay (Town-Square), Kyle Bradshaw (Metafor Studio), and Matt McLash (McLash Developments) presented their application to the Panel.

John Boehme joined the meeting at 12:14 p.m.

Panel Question comments

- Regarding the new surface parking lot along Huntington Place, are there any future plans for additional development beyond surface parking? Perhaps another phase of work?
 - There was significant community feedback, opposed to development along Huntington so there is no plan for future development.
- Strip of covered parking on the Huntington side, is it being retained?
 - No, the car park is being removed.
- Why are the proposed plans showing only a four-story building?
 - Four story design is a result of an overlook issue and details the transition/ scale from community, stepping down into Single Family area.
- It's suggested that the underground parking will be wired for electric vehicles. Will the surface parking also be prewired?
 - Existing towers not explored with this application.
 - Yes, will include both for EV chargers.
- Has there been any consideration of redesigning the two towers on Government Street to resemble the new project on Toronto Street?
 - We have not investigated this.
- They've done a sensitive job of bringing the building to scale in terms of heritage aspects which will be a nice addition to the James Bay neighborhood.
- Are there residential terraces facing Huntington Place on the ground floor units?

- Yes, one on the corner of the building.
- Was the brick wall is proposed to stretch all the way to Toronto Street?
 - Yes.
- Were the addition of the four-bedroom flats a response to community protest? How is it determined that four units are sufficient, we need more than 3, 4-bedroom units, why was this specific number chosen?
 - Transition and activating the streetscape, aligned the family-oriented housing was on that to that corner, structure of the building on that corner can only fit four.
 - Logical location to put four family-oriented suites in that location on the Huntington- Toronto corner in terms of this design.
- Parking is a lost opportunity.

Moved: John Boehme
Lindholm

Seconded: Valerie

Motion: That the Heritage Advisory Panel recommend to Council that Heritage Alteration Permit Application No. 000263 for 350-360 Douglas Street be approved as presented.

Carried

Opposed: Jim Kerr (Chair) and Veronica (Nikki) Strong-Boag

6. **Heritage Alteration Permit with Variances Application No. 00036 and Rezoning Application No. 00869 for 1244 Wharf Street**

Staff provided a brief introduction to the Panel with a presentation.

Robert Fung (The Salient Group), Greg Damant (Cascadia Architects), and Donald Luxton (Donald Luxton & Associates) presented their application to the Panel.

Panel Questions and comments:

- Proposal to rehabilitate and add two stories to the landmark building by retaining its significant character-defining elements and upgrading its structure components – hotel use.
- Consideration of adding trim to the front windows to provide coordination to the old trim?
 - They are aware of the shaping of the windows however they chose to go with a square shape to respond in a modern way that is responsive but not directly referenced.
 - Wood frame structure with metal cladding, the arch is more of a masonry approach. Square shape with similar roof line has been done but arch did not feel in character with addition. Responsive to detailing in a modern contemporary way.
- Liners, are there liners being used?
 - Yes, the two new windows have a metal sleeve that sits inside the brick that the window sits in to distinguish easily.
- Statement of Significance recognizes the building as the late Victorian architectural aesthetic but I keep hearing the use of industrial aesthetic but that is not the language used in the Statement of significance, where is the industrial word coming from?

- Historically attached to the wharf side as a working building involved with taking goods from the harbour and selling at the storefront, trying to respond via colour palette. They had these lower levels loading right out of the boats, high Victorian architecture on the front facade and the rear is utilitarian.
- Appreciation for the several renditions to finalize an appropriate proposal.
- The slope is extraordinary, reflecting its evolving use over time. It was built to impress, being much larger than the other buildings, with two stories on Wharf Street to create a significant presence as "the showstopper at the end of the street."
- Will the Corten steel will be polished or remain rough?
 - No, not polishing it, keeping it natural to absorb light in a rich way.
- Are there any concerns with the Corten steel with salt water and what it does to the facade?
 - Corten steel doesn't stabilize well when close to the ocean, though it performs better further inland. For this reason, we can't use it structurally. However, we are using it as a surface material without issues. Only concern is water runoff and staining of the existing building. The intention is to work with actual Corten steel, but if concerns arise, we may opt for an alternative like painted aluminum to achieve the same look. Drainage details will be addressed.
- Have there been considerations paid to the whale wall? How is preservation being considered for this feature?
 - The whale wall feature is very important to the representation of the building and the history. The artist is willing to keep it maintained.
 - Reapplication of stucco and base finish will need to be repaired.

Deniz Unsal left the meeting at 1:24 p.m.

- Difficulty with seeing this addition in line with the guidelines, especially Standard 5 and 11 (of *Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places*). It does not look "minimal" nor "subordinate to" and, expressed concerns of the impact to the heritage value of the building.
- Appreciation for the proposed rehabilitation and restoration work. What is the intended purpose of painting the brick rather than restoring it?
 - Each side of the building has different conditions. The east side, which has been painted and is subject to a grant, will be repaired. On the south side, the wall was painted at one point, but the bricks will be repainted there. The west facade has bricks in great shape, and they will be repainted as necessary. The north side has stucco directly applied and removing it would damage the masonry. Therefore, we have four different solutions for each side. Latex paint is not an option as it traps moisture.
- Have they reviewed the proposal with heritage consultants and specialists?
 - Yes, we have.
- For the roof addition, where the building overhangs the façade below, what is the material being used?
 - That would be Corten Steel.
- How does the overhang portion distinguish visually and physically; how do you see the overhang portions co-existing with the design below?
 - Not subordinate in every aspect, comfortable with the architectural approach to the project.
 - Strategy used to help with viability to fit extra space despite the original floorplan and unique layout on Wharf Street.
 - The view down Yate's Street is most important to work with.

- Is the alignment with the façade below somewhat off?
 - Yes, they are slightly off however they may pull them into the alignment because of considerations around the Corten steel and the potential for staining on the existing building to create a gutter detail for runoff.
- Will the gutter be parallel with the mural?
 - Yes.
- No comments in the building's history relating to the First Nations in the and the lands prior to the buildings existing even in this era of reconciliation.
- Extremely well-considered proposal, level of detail and thoughtfulness.
- Form and character good but further details to be finalized, main points size and scale of addition, work of restoration.
- Highlighted seismic considerations with additions to heritage buildings.
- Need more housing not hotels,
- Having windows in the Mural will need to have bars on them due to high level of crime in that location and eventually detract a negative view on the building. Urge for no windows low down.
- Highlighted the asymmetry approach as common in Old Town.
- Reassurance that seismic issues will be addressed as it is part of the building code.
- Highlighted the placement of the new windows lower down as being for seismic upgrading purposes.
- Excellent approach to building rehabilitation.
- Pursuing other options for the placement of the pediment.
- Preference for no overhang with the top addition but rather align it with the side walls in a parallel manner.

Moved: Imogen Goldie

Seconded: John Boehme

Motion: That the Heritage Advisory Panel recommend to Council that Heritage Alteration Permit with Variances Application No.00036 for 1244 Wharf Street be approved as presented.

Carried

Opposed: Valerie Lindholm

A motion regarding the restoration of the full pediment was proposed but not seconded, noting the Applicants would receive the Panel's comments and suggestions on their proposal.

Allisa Wrean left the meeting at 1:59 p.m.

7. **Heritage Designation Application No. 000209 for 1885 Government Street**

Jim Kerr (Chair) recommended deferring consideration of the next item to the next scheduled meeting. Kristal Stevenot, Senior Heritage Planner, highlighted concerns associated with a delay in consideration. The Panel took a poll for quorum and decided to continue with the agenda.

Staff provided a brief introduction to the Panel with a presentation.

Sara Huynh (Cascadia Archerites), Nathan Ma (Nicola Wealth), Chelsea Dunk (Donald Luxton and Associates) and Chris Windjack (LADR Landscape Architects) presented their application to the Panel.

Panel Questions and comments:

- On the East elevation, the new building against property line, how will the existing windows proposed be infilled? was there intent to retain them due to dealing with special separation challenges via use of sprinklers? Was that option explored?
 - Space planning and functionality did not warrant enough of a gain to pursue approach, landed on an internal side. Programing inside not correlating.
- With the pictures of the patio, noticed the fairy lights but is there a glass ceiling proposed or any consideration to include a glass roof for extended use during winter season?
 - Current approach is to leave it open as there is enough covered space for use, however consideration could be made to a glass roof placement.
- The glass is not attached to the heritage building, it seems like they are using the separation as a focal point of its “uniqueness”.
- Conservation strategies?
 - The seismic work has been completed, RJC Heritage Engineers is handling the file. However, we haven't conducted the brick review yet, as it is still early in the application process, but it will be addressed in due course.
- Seismic, will there be any steel bracing that's visible?
 - Yes, the existing beams on the patio we have located on site, so they are pulled back from the Chatham Street facing side as far as possible.
- Appreciation for the design and fit within the neighbourhood.
- Concerns of a lack of investigation into the brick masonry at this time.

Moved: Veronica (Nikki) Strong-Boag

Seconded: Valerie Lindholm

Motion: That the Heritage Advisory Panel recommend that Council approve Heritage Designation Application No. 000209 for the property located at 1885 Government Street.

Carried Unanimously

8. Adjournment

Moved: Jim Kerr

Seconded: Liberty Brears

Motion: That the June 11th, 2024, Heritage Advisory Panel meeting be adjourned at 2:25 p.m.

Carried Unanimously