

**CITY OF VICTORIA
HERITAGE ADVISORY PANEL
MEETING MINUTES
MAY 14, 2024**

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

Regrets: John Boehme

Guests: **Heritage Alteration Permit Application No. 000251 for 674, 676, and 678 Battery Street, 675 and 685 Niagara Street, and 50 Douglas Street**
Rob Whetter and Eduardo de Santis (dHKarchitects); Milliken Real Estate Corporation Representatives; and Amica Senior Lifestyles Representatives

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

The Chair called the meeting to order at 12:03 p.m.

Alissa Wrean and Liberty Brears were not present at the time the meeting convened.

1. Adoption of the Agenda

Moved: Deniz Unsal

Seconded: Valerie Lindholm

Motion: That the May 14, 2024 Heritage Advisory Panel meeting Agenda be approved.

Carried Unanimously

2. Adoption of the Minutes of the April 9, 2024 Meeting

Moved: Veronica (Nikki) Strong-Boag

Seconded: Jim Kerr

Motion: That the April 9, 2024 Heritage Advisory Panel meeting Minutes be approved as circulated.

Carried Unanimously

Alissa Wrean joined the meeting at 12:05 p.m.

Liberty Brears joined the meeting at 12:05 p.m.

3. **Business Arising from the Minutes**

- Victoria's Centennial Square Fountain

Jim Kerr introduced the item providing background as discussed at the previous April 9, 2024 Heritage Advisory Panel meeting.

Moved: Jim Kerr

Seconded: Veronica (Nikki) Strong-Boag

Motion: In light of potential alterations or removal of the existing fountain as part of the current Centennial Square revitalization project, and given its historic importance as the central focus of the Square and an exemplary piece of mid-20th century public art, the Heritage Advisory Panel respectfully requests Council to refer the issue of the fountain to the Panel for comment on its significance and conservation at this time. It should be noted that Council has not re-appointed the Art in Public Places Committee since their last term expired in 2023 and, in its absence, it would be appropriate for the issue to be referred to HAPL.

Carried Unanimously

Moved: Jim Kerr

Seconded: Valerie Lindholm

Motion: That the Heritage Advisory Panel prepare a letter to Council detailing the motion approved above as follows: *In light of potential alterations or removal of the existing fountain as part of the current Centennial Square revitalization project, and given its historic importance as the central focus of the Square and an exemplary piece of mid-20th century public art, the Heritage Advisory Panel respectfully requests Council to refer the issue of the fountain to the Panel for comment on its significance and conservation at this time. It should be noted that Council has not re-appointed the Art in Public Places Committee since their last term expired in 2023 and, in its absence, it would be appropriate for the issue to be referred to HAPL.*

Carried Unanimously

4. **Announcements**

None.

5. **Heritage Alteration Permit Application No. 00251 for 674, 676, and 678 Battery Street, 675 and 685 Niagara Street, and 50 Douglas Street**

Staff provided a brief presentation introducing the application.

Rob Whetter, *dHKarchitects*, presented a PowerPoint presentation regarding the application and was accompanied by project partners Milliken Real Estate Corporation and Amica Senior Lifestyles.

Panel Questions and Comments

- Paint colour selection, highlighting a question as to whether Benjamin Moore paint colours were truly matches for Victoria's heritage and a desire for assurances that the proposal's team will research the original paint for a best match.

- Confirmed their commitment to work with consultant Donald Luxton for the best heritage colour restoration.
- Ensuring the building's original colours and design are kept authentic rather than blending into the surrounding neighbourhood.
- Preference for a black sash rather than a black wood window trim.
 - Agreeance to improving the treatment of the sash while highlighting that any changes to the design detail in the plans is not an intended heritage characteristic deviation but rather a modeling or drawing difference, further advising that they plan for a true heritage restoration.
- Proposed treatment for the new elevator and rear addition?
 - Plans to remove the existing addition and replace it with a smaller addition, reinstate a traditional wood cladding, and treat the elevator area with a mix of an opaque wall and a glassy window wall, including colours that are similar to the main building.
 - Highlighted ADP comments about the proposed wood panel treatment on the elevator area windows and their preference for a more subtle treatment consistent with main building.
- Proposed treatment of the window wall system?
 - Currently proposed to be a powder aluminum window wall system but recent consideration has been made for a black window wall system to be consistent with rest of building.
- Whether the proposed roof and soffit placement would be extended over the elevator area portion of the building?
 - No, proposal to install a lower flat roof over the elevator area, piston elevator in the ground allows to keep the elevator overrun low.
- The proposed wood siding for the addition?
 - A larger panel product for differentiation from the main building in the same colour.
- Rationale for the proposed design and material choice, particularly the stone look of the cement fibre panels and the wood, including its alignment with the Heritage Conservation Area 1 design and policy guidelines as well as the James Bay Neighbourhood Plan.
 - Many iterations of the building have been done in collaboration with the Planning Department and its' Heritage Team including various material considerations. Wood cladding has been seen as a consistent material used in the neighbourhood as well as brick and stone on various surrounding heritage buildings.
 - Concerns of using brick in this location due to a lack of compatibility and fit within the neighbourhood, however the materials chosen are of high quality and a good fit within the surrounding neighbourhood.
 - Believes the proposed combination of the high quality materials fits with a number of the design guidelines.
- Concerns about the material, massing, and scale of the proposal and its' fit within the neighbourhood.
- Whether the Advisory Design Panel's feedback on the proposal is available for review, and highlighted a desire for better linkages between Panels, encouraging the reinstatement of cross-panel liaisons.
- Whether there is a DPA or HCA on the Niagara Street properties?

- A portion of Niagara Street is located in the HCA.
- Whether the portion of the property not in DPA or HCA, will have the same zoning and design guidelines applied?
 - This proposal is being considered against the Urban Residential Urban Place Designation under the OCP as a guideline of a comparative zone but more strictly being compared to design guidelines for the area as well as the heritage policies.
- How does the proposal transition down to the Heritage Conservation Area on Battery Street?
 - The building steps down from 5 ½ stories to about 3 ½ stories and the setbacks were increased on that side.
 - Various design elements are also proposed to increase the visual massing transition.
- Clarification on the distance between the addition and the main building.
 - Approximately 10meters.
- Concerns about the west wing transition to the neighbourhood and the impact on adjacent properties.
- Appreciation for the care and attention to the current Rutland House, the proposed increased setbacks, and the improvements to the landscaping.

A guest attendee made a comment. Kristal Stevenot, Senior Heritage Planner, reminded the attendees that guests are not permitted to participate even by using the chat for comments. The guest attendee was provided with directions on how to direct their comments to Council for consideration.

Deniz Unsal left the meeting at 12:55 p.m.

Panel Comments Continued

- Appreciation for the thoughtful approach to the existing heritage properties in the neighbourhood and improvements to the existing building on the property.
- Consideration of the building's height and ensuring sensitive transitions to its' surroundings, minimizing impacts.
- The need for senior living facilities in the community.

Moved: Liberty Brears

Seconded: Alissa Wrean

Rutland House

Motion: That the Heritage Advisory Panel recommend to Council that Heritage Alteration Permit Application No.000251 for 674, 676, and 678 Battery Street, 675 and 685 Niagara Street, and 50 Douglas Street be approved with the following changes:

- Confirmation of the colour scheme with the consultants to confirm the black needs to be applied to the sash, not the trim.

Carried Unanimously

Moved: Jim Kerr

Seconded: Veronica (Nikki) Strong-Boag

New Building

Motion: That the Heritage Advisory Panel recommend to Council that Heritage Alteration Permit Application No.000251 for 674, 676, and 678 Battery Street, 675 and 685 Niagara Street, and 50 Douglas Street be approved with the following changes:

- Proposed height and massing of the Niagara Street west wing be reduced to better achieve an appropriate scale transition adjacent to the Heritage Conservation Area.

Carried Unanimously

6. **Adjournment**

Moved: Veronica (Nikki) Strong-Boag **Seconded:** Jim Kerr

Motion: That the May 14, 2024 Heritage Advisory Panel meeting Agenda be adjourned at 1:11 p.m.

Carried Unanimously