

**CITY OF VICTORIA
HERITAGE ADVISORY PANEL
MEETING MINUTES
SEPTEMBER 10, 2019**

Present: Pamela Madoff, Chair
Doug Campbell
Katie Cummer
Shari Khadem
Lisa MacIntosh

Absent: Julie Br  h  ret, Hal Kalman, Connie Quaedvlieg, Graham Walker

Staff: John O'Reilly, Senior Heritage Planner
Steve Barber, Heritage Planner
Lauren Martin, Heritage Secretary

The Chair called the meeting to order at noon.

1. Adoption of the Minutes of the August 13 and 20, 2019 Meetings

Moved

Seconded

Carried

2. Announcements

- Steve Barber has completed his temporary, part-time term with the City. He intends to reapply for membership on the Panel.

**3. 1314 & 1318 Wharf Street (Northern Junk)
Heritage Alteration Permit Application No. 00236**

Attendees: Alan Boniface (Dialog Design), Juan Pereira (Reliance (Crosstown) Properties Ltd.) and Donald Luxton (Donald Luxton and Associates Inc.)

John O'Reilly provided a brief introduction. Alan Boniface, Juan Pereira, Donald Luxton presented.

Panel Questions and Comments

- A typical response to development of a heritage building is to step back the upper wall, but the applicant states that this is not financially feasible; however, the Panel is not privy to financial information. Rather than stepping the building back at both front and rear, could another approach be considered? For example, the plans indicate that on the harbour side of the Fraser building there will be balconies that extend beyond the building.
- Brick has been chosen for the new storeys on the larger building which would result in masonry on top of masonry. Has the applicant considered using a lighter material for more distinction between the ground floor and the upper floors? Alan Boniface: Yes,

- that has been considered, but it was determined that brick was the most sympathetic. However, the applicant is open to the Panel's thoughts on materiality.
- Since the laneway will be accessible to the public, why have gates at the entrances? Alan Boniface: This is a common practice in Victoria in response to CPTED. Juan Pereira: The laneway will be dedicated as a statutory right-of-way with specific opening hours.
 - Which lot is City property and which is 1300 Wharf Street? Has the purchase of a part of these lots been discussed with the City? Alan Boniface: The City owns both the north lot by the bridge and Reeson Park (1300 Wharf Street). Juan Pereira: The purchase of the north lot has been discussed with the City and not accepted as the OCP envisions another use for the land.
 - Would the large mural shown on the Fraser Warehouse in the renderings a permanent art piece? Alan Boniface: Yes, it would be permanent; however, the design will be City-driven. Juan Pereira: This is similar to other side walls in Old Town that are adorned with art work or painted signage.
 - Besides residential and a restaurant, what will be the uses for the buildings? Juan Pereira: Possible other uses are commercial, museum or gallery.
 - Will the current "Northern Junk" signage be retained? Juan Pereira: The proper warehouse names will be used on each building with possibly a sign over the alley referring to "Northern Junk". This will be discussed with the City. Donald Luxton: The two buildings were known as "Victoria Junk" in 1917. After active use, the buildings were used for scrap metal storage. The current Northern Junk sign will not be retained, but perhaps interpretation that addresses the buildings' layers of history would be appropriate.
 - Do you have visualizations showing set back options? Alan Boniface: Slides were shown.
 - Regarding the atrium from the south, the architectural approach was taken so that the Caire & Grancini Warehouse will appear as an artefact. Why is there not a gap that delineates the roofline and allows the entire pediment to be retained so that it reads as an entire unit? Alan Boniface: The aim was to be sensitive to the overall height of the project and to establish a different feel for this elevation. Juan Pereira: There could be a more generous vertical gap. However, the new wood frame construction is limited to 18m from the lowest level.
 - Could the walls of the laneway be opened up more to the interior of the buildings? Donald Luxton: The intent is to create a laneway that does not currently exist, with display cases, windows and doorways to the interior. It would be similar to Theatre Alley. Alan Boniface: The waterfront will be at the end of the alley and the stamped metal ceiling will provide reflectivity. Juan Pereira: The alley will be double height with lighting on the walls and small glass blocks along its base.
 - The setbacks and materiality do not allow distinguishability between the old and the new. The warehouses are two distinct buildings, but tend to disappear in the current design. The ratio of solid to void is similar between the old and the new. A larger setback and the use of glass, rather than brick, would provide more distinguishability.
 - The massing of the new construction is too great, i.e. the hat is too big for the head.
 - The guideline about new construction being subordinate and heritage being distinct has not been met. There are other ways to approach this site.
 - The scale of Old Town is three to six storeys. The scale of Wharf Street decreases to zero to one storey which opens it up to the harbour. The main characteristic of the city is its relationship to the harbour. A five-storey building along Wharf Street will set a negative precedent and impact the future of Old Town.

- A five-storey building along Wharf Street may respond to other parts of Old Town, but it does not respond to the character-defining elements of these two buildings. The proposal does not meet the Standards and Guidelines. It does not meet the guidelines about rooftop additions specified in the *Old Town Design Guidelines*, i.e. rooftop additions should be minimal and not negatively impact the historic buildings. The proposed rooftop additions overwhelm the buildings. The rehabilitation of the Morley Soda Water Factory proved that money can be made by adding only one storey to a historical building.
- According to the *Old Town Design Guidelines*, buildings of this height should not have rooftop additions. If approved, the height would pave the way for other developments. It is not just this site, but how the current heritage standards, guidelines, principles and policies are adjudicated and whether the proposal enhances the prominence and/or viability of the heritage resource.

Moved

Seconded

That the Heritage Advisory Panel recommend to Council that Heritage Alteration Permit Application No. 00236 does not sufficiently meet the applicable design guidelines and policies and should be declined and that the key areas that should be revised include:

- does not comply with the design guidelines for rooftop additions
- lack of distinguishability
- too high for this location
- massing is not subordinate to the existing heritage buildings.

Carried (unanimous)

**4. 2659 Douglas Street (Scott Building)
Heritage Designation Application No. 000180**

Attendees: Angela Dunn and Jordan van Dijk (MGA), Donald Luxton (Donald Luxton and Associates Inc.)

John O'Reilly provided a brief introduction. Angela Dunn, Jordan van Dijk and Donald Luxton presented.

Panel Questions and Comments

- What is the proposed use for the fourth floor addition? Jordan van Dijk: It will be another level of residential. Most of it will sit below the parapet height to create a courtyard that wraps around the suites.
- What are the setbacks for the dark coloured portion of the addition (see drawing A201)? John O'Reilly: The north elevation setback is 17.4 ft (5.3m), the west elevation setback is 12 ft (3.7m), and the top of the addition is only 3 ft above the tallest part of the parapet wall.
- What is being designated? John O'Reilly: The exterior components of the existing building that are not being altered will be designated. The new addition will not be part of the designation.
- The addition is set back to lessen visibility from the street, but why touch the existing building? The additional volume could be incorporated into the new building. The addition wraps over the top of the existing building and appears to be laying claim to

- it. A courtyard has been created between the new building and the existing building and the addition, but why not incorporate all of the new addition into one building and set up a dialogue between the new building and the heritage building. Jordan Dijk: We considered placing most of density on the new building site, but the new building was quite dominant and the separation to create the courtyard was more challenging. A balance was established so that the new building is subservient to the existing building and an active functional courtyard is created. Angela Dunn: The depth of the floor plate of the existing building was challenging for liveability of the suites and by carving out a courtyard, we were able to create more efficient units.
- Why were the particular details and black cladding chosen for the new building? Jordan Dijk: The dark cladding is complementary to the existing building. Angela Dunn: The dark colour frames the existing building, making it more distinct.
 - John O'Reilly: As part of the proposal, the applicant is offering a substantial amount of rehabilitation; the rooftop addition is modest in scale; and the interior of the existing building, not just the façade, is part of the development. The following should be evaluated for heritage designation: the existing building's heritage value, character and the enhancements it will receive.
 - The east elevation is very open on the left and then gradually descends to almost closed on the other end, which creates a contrast with the existing building.
 - One of the character-defining elements of the existing building is its three storey height. Can we caution the applicant about the added storey? Steve Barber: The height of the addition should not be judged by looking at the elevation as it will be seen in perspective. The height will not be noticeable, except at quite a distance.

Moved

Seconded

1. That the Heritage Advisory Panel recommend that Council approve the designation of the property located at 2659 Douglas Street, pursuant to Section 611 of the *Local Government Act*, as a Municipal Heritage Site.
2. That the Heritage Advisory Panel recommend that the applicant consider the following change to the design of the proposed addition to the Scott Building:
 - encourage the applicant to continue to explore the material and colour of the addition.

Carried (unanimous)

The Secretary left the meeting at 2:03 pm as the remaining agenda items did not require minutes.