

**4. 1314-1318 and 1324 Wharf Street
Heritage Alteration Permit No. 00136**

Attendees: Jon Stovell and Juan Pereira, Reliance Properties Ltd. (owner); Adrian Politano, Dialog Design (architect); Donald Luxton, Donald Luxton and Associates Ltd. (heritage consultant)

Merinda Conley, Senior Heritage Planner, provided a brief summary of the application.

Adrian Politano, Jon Stovell and Donald Luxton provided a presentation about the application.

Panel Comments and Questions

- Will there be a glass bubble to link the two heritage buildings as was shown in previous plans? Architect: Yes, the buildings will be linked by a vertical and horizontal walkway to connect the two buildings so that they operate as one.
- Which walls will be removed and which will be retained? Architect: Basically from the northern curve (the parking entrance ramp), everything to the south of that corner on the lowest level will be new; everything above that to the right and left will be preserved park. The entrance ramp disturbs the heritage buildings more due to the ridged ramp which must be curved to maintain grade. The parking ramp was at the street line, but has been pushed back. Owner: The lower level of the south building has a very low ceiling level.
- Has any attention been paid to the possible heritage value at the water line (for example, mooring rings)? Heritage Consultant: The conservation plan was not done to the waterline; however, these things should be examined. The shape and configuration of the waterline has changed dramatically over the years. In the past there were a series of wharves, buildings and other warehouses built out from the existing warehouse buildings. If there are key features remaining, they will be identified.
- The Panel did not receive the Conservation Plan for 1318 Wharf Street; therefore, the plan cannot be recommended by the Panel. The existing conditions of the buildings are very poor as the buildings have not been maintained for at least five years despite complaints to the City bylaw office. The brick work at the rear of the Fraser Warehouse is collapsing; there is graffiti and plant growth deteriorating the stonework on both buildings; at the front of the buildings, the sandstone under the stucco is from Salt Spring Island and must be conserved. How high are the buildings above the water? Architect: They are 107 feet above the water (16 feet less than the Janion).
- Have city services been removed from the city-owned property? Owner: The city services have all been bypassed. There is a hydro vault remaining that may be relocated.
- The terrace on the pavilion building is a good idea; however, it will need protection from the wind (often screens are used which add height). How will the wind issue be resolved? Architect: Glass could be added; this will be planned in advance of construction.
- What is the setback at the fifth floor on the Johnson Street façade? Architect: The setback varies from 8 feet to 15 feet.
- This is a challenging and complex project. The Old Town Design Guidelines, which apply to this property, indicate that new construction must be strongly contextual. Of the new building, the pavilion and the heritage-designated buildings, the new building

dominates the site. The project is weighted towards Johnson Street and the four buildings do not hold together. The new building's massing and height do not relate to its immediate neighbours (for example, it is 16 feet higher than the Janion). The materials are not strongly contextual with those of the surrounding buildings; the materials were chosen to oppose the red brick of those buildings. There is a tension between the context of the proposed development, the new bridge and heritage-designated buildings and park. The project requires more homogeneity, a closer relationship with its neighbourhood; and needs to pay more attention to itself rather than being a mediator between the old and new.

- Concern was expressed about the lack of information about the heritage-designated buildings and the height of the new building.
- Why is the pavilion needed? It blocks the heritage-designated buildings. Heritage Consultant: Historically, the heritage buildings were on one side of a two-sided street. The plan is to recreate the sense of a street to recapture the historic context. Leaving the heritage buildings in a plaza without anything else did not seem appropriate. Owner: Reeson Park and the bridgehead plaza already provide a lot of open space. Architect: Narrow streets/alleys are a character-defining element of the area.
- The site is quite remarkable in that there is an opportunity to create a new building on a very open space. The area is being "done over" with the new bridge, the Janion, and a new building proposed for beside the Janion. Many concepts have been worked and reworked in the overall approach to the site and many questions have been answered well. However, the overwhelming issue is the new building. It is too massive and too high. It is not a satisfactory proposal for such a landmark building.
- A four to five storey building is recommended for the site.

Moved

Seconded

That the Heritage Advisory Panel recommend to Council that Heritage Alteration Permit Application No. 00136 for 1314-1318 and 1324 Wharf Street does not sufficiently meet the applicable design guidelines and policies and should be declined and that the key areas that should be revised to include:

- lower the height of the new building
- fully address the heritage conservation of the historic buildings
- proposed materials to respond to the immediate context of the neighbourhood.

Carried (unanimous)

3. **1314 and 1316-1318 Wharf Street (Caire & Grancini and Fraser Warehouses)
Review of the Conservation Plans**

Attendees: Adrian Politano and Juan Pereira, Dialog; Sydney Schwartz, MCM Partnership; Chelsea Dunk, Donald Luxton & Associates

Merinda Conley outlined the reason for the applicant's return to the Panel.

Panel Questions and Comments

- Is there any intention to use the "Northern Junk" name in signage and marketing? Juan Pereira: The name will be included in building signage.
- On the west side of the building at 1314 Wharf Street, one window and one entrance will be removed and replaced with three large windows and another entrance. What is the reason for so much intervention on that façade? Adrian Politano: The ground level slopes up and will have to be taken down slightly to allow for headroom and connection to the waterfront elevation. This results in elongation/enlargement of the doorway. The new openings will match the three openings above to create a more porous frontage for the walkway and patio. Some of the openings were not original. Panel: The opening on the left looks original. The necessity of the door is understandable due to the change in grade, but it is not clear why the three large windows are needed. The existing opening should be retained. Adrian Politano: That is a possibility.
- The glass atrium between the two buildings is good; however, the plans show large openings through the walls resulting in the removal of a lot of brick. Adrian Politano: The openings may not be as large depending on the final structure. The openings will mimic the openings between the two CRUs in 1316-1318 Wharf Street and allow access through the atrium to the commercial spaces.
- Will the atrium serve as a corridor or as a commercial space? Adrian Politano: It will serve as a commercial space.
- The proposal's conservation approach is inconsistent. It is indicated that the chosen approach is preservation and rehabilitation. However, returning the appearance of the façades to the 1860s is restoration. Enlarging the windows is rehabilitation and will transform the dark warehouses by bringing in light. Rehabilitation is a positive approach. It is suggested that the applicant work with their heritage consultant to develop a consistent approach.
- One of the character-defining elements of the building at 1314 Wharf Street is form and massing; however, a portion of the lower floor by the ramp will be removed. Will this impact the form and massing? Acting Chair: Since the corner for removal is below grade, it is not clear whether the intervention will impact the form and massing.
- It is good to have these two buildings retained and adapted for a new use. In relation to the details, it should be made clear what is original and what is an intervention.
- In a complex project like this, all conservation approaches will be used as many interventions will be required. The overall effect is what matters. Requesting that the applicant identify the conservation approaches is not useful.
- Will the new materials be in keeping with the original? Adrian Politano: That is the intention once the existing materials are removed.

Moved

Seconded

That the revised conservation plans have been received and reviewed and that the Heritage Advisory Panel has made comments and trust that the applicant will recognize the long-standing name of "Northern Junk."

Carried (unanimous)

**CITY OF VICTORIA
HERITAGE ADVISORY PANEL
MEETING MINUTES
MAY 8, 2018**

Present: Rick Goodacre, Acting Chair
Keri Briggs
Ken Johnson
Hal Kalman
Shari Khadem
Theo Riecken

Absent: Doug Campbell, Richard Linzey, John O'Reilly

Guest: Councillor Pamela Madoff; Councillor Charlayne Thornton-Joe

Staff: Merinda Conley, Senior Heritage Planner
Alison Meyer, Assistant Director, Development Services
Jonathan Tinney, Director, Sustainable Planning and Community Development
Lauren Martin, Heritage Secretary

The Chair called the meeting to order at noon.

1. Adoption of the Minutes of the April 10, 2018 Meeting

Moved

Seconded

That the minutes be adopted as distributed

Carried (unanimous)

2. Announcements

- Merinda Conley: Council will consider the appointment of a new Panel member at their meeting on May 10.
- Merinda Conley: Follow up from the April 10 Panel meeting regarding 1731 Rockland Avenue. The property is not heritage registered or designated and there was no evidence of a carport on the approved Building Permit of January 2016.
- Anna Babicz, Urban Designer: Request for one to two members of the Panel to volunteer for the Centennial Square Action Plan working group. The working group will identify the priorities in design and improvements for the Square and the short and long term development options. The working group will first meet on June 5. There will also be follow up meetings with the entire Panel.
- Ken Johnson: The South Vancouver Island Heritage Fair for students in grades four to six will take place on Friday, May 11, 9:00 am to 2:00 pm at the Royal BC Museum.

3. **1622-1628 Store Street
Development Permit with Variance Application No. 00068**

Attendees: Franc D'Ambrosio and Erica Sangstra, D'Ambrosio Architecture and Urbanism (architect); Jim Tait, Triad Holdings Inc. (owner)

Merinda Conley, Senior Heritage Planner, provided a brief summary of the application.

Franc D'Ambrosio and Erica Sangstra provided a presentation about the application.

Panel Comments and Questions

- What was the result of the Advisory Design Panel's review of the application?
Merinda Conley: The application was supported as presented.
- Is this property included in the Downtown Core Area Plan (DCAP)? Merinda Conley: Yes, it is. It is also located in DPA9 (HC), Inner Harbour.
- Will an archeological assessment be done on the site? Architect: A consultant has been retained. Owner: The applicant applied to the Province and has an agreed process.
- How many feet above the water line is the proposed building and how does this compare to the Janion and Mermaid Wharf? The DCAP states that the harbour front is viewed as an amphitheatre to the city with lower buildings along the water and gradually higher buildings beyond the harbour towards Douglas and Blanshard Streets. The buildings seem to be getting higher along Wharf Street. Architect: We do not have the height information available at this time. The site is on the edge of the downtown core. The architectural height that will occur beyond the site is lower as it is adjacent to Old Town; therefore, the amphitheatre idea defers to the peer building relationship in this location.
- What is the reflectivity of the prefinished steel shingles? Architect: The shingles have a dull lustre without shine. The bays and colour are meant as an echo of the traditional bays on the Janion.
- What is the expected service life of the steel shingles? Architect: We will obtain that information for the Panel.
- Will there be any access to water, i.e. a place to launch a kayak? Architect: There is no water access on the site as the grades are not conducive to this. The site will have kayak storage and join to the walkway that leads to water access on the Ocean River property.
- Will the bay windows project into the public realm? Architect: No.
- What is the specific relationship between the height of the block on the water and the height of the two adjacent buildings and what is the allowable height as per the Zoning Bylaw? Chair: The proposed height is 18m, the zone standard is 15m.
- What is the meaning of "interior floor area access"? Architect: It denotes the size of the lobby.
- It is difficult to conform to all requirements on this site. It is most important to note that the site is in DPA9. Height requirements have been created for a reason; however, each proposal tends to request a height variance to maximize development potential. The site is in a height sensitive area. The request for additional height is not supportable, but the proposed building is strong contextually.
- Is the proposed building 3m higher than the adjacent Janion at the water? Architect: The building is within a metre of height of the Janion at the water. The proposed height and massing increase the liveability for the building residents and respects the

existing residents in the adjacent buildings. The deviation from the allowable height is appropriate due to the narrowness of the building and its robust materials and composition of forms. The aim was to have a building that is contextually appropriate overall, i.e. it fits in with the adjacent buildings.

- Commend the applicant for maintaining the allowable FSR. Changing the shape of the building is a reasonable solution.
- The proposal is a reasonable response in relation to the existing buildings and the massing and addition of height is appropriate. More development will likely occur on the waterfront and it is hoped that the current plan for the waterfront anticipates development that will result in a well-articulated waterfront.

Moved

Seconded

That the Heritage Advisory Panel recommend to Council that Development Permit with Variances Application No. 00068 for 1622-1628 Store Street be approved as presented.

Carried (unanimous)

**4. 1314-1318 and 1324 Wharf Street
Heritage Alteration Permit No. 00136**

Attendees: Jon Stovell and Juan Pereira, Reliance Properties Ltd. (owner); Adrian Politano, Dialog Design (architect); Donald Luxton, Donald Luxton and Associates Ltd. (heritage consultant)

Merinda Conley, Senior Heritage Planner, provided a brief summary of the application.

Adrian Politano, Jon Stovell and Donald Luxton provided a presentation about the application.

Panel Comments and Questions

- Will there be a glass bubble to link the two heritage buildings as was shown in previous plans? Architect: Yes, the buildings will be linked by a vertical and horizontal walkway to connect the two buildings so that they operate as one.
- Which walls will be removed and which will be retained? Architect: Basically from the northern curve (the parking entrance ramp), everything to the south of that corner on the lowest level will be new; everything above that to the right and left will be preserved park. The entrance ramp disturbs the heritage buildings more due to the ridged ramp which must be curved to maintain grade. The parking ramp was at the street line, but has been pushed back. Owner: The lower level of the south building has a very low ceiling level.
- Has any attention been paid to the possible heritage value at the water line (for example, mooring rings)? Heritage Consultant: The conservation plan was not done to the waterline; however, these things should be examined. The shape and configuration of the waterline has changed dramatically over the years. In the past there were a series of wharves, buildings and other warehouses built out from the existing warehouse buildings. If there are key features remaining, they will be identified.

- The Panel did not receive the Conservation Plan for 1318 Wharf Street; therefore, the plan cannot be recommended by the Panel. The existing conditions of the buildings are very poor as the buildings have not been maintained for at least five years despite complaints to the City bylaw office. The brick work at the rear of the Fraser Warehouse is collapsing; there is graffiti and plant growth deteriorating the stonework on both buildings; at the front of the buildings, the sandstone under the stucco is from Salt Spring Island and must be conserved. How high are the buildings above the water? Architect: They are 107 feet above the water (16 feet less than the Janion).
- Have city services been removed from the city-owned property? Owner: The city services have all been bypassed. There is a hydro vault remaining that may be relocated.
- The terrace on the pavilion building is a good idea; however, it will need protection from the wind (often screens are used which add height). How will the wind issue be resolved? Architect: Glass could be added; this will be planned in advance of construction.
- What is the setback at the fifth floor on the Johnson Street façade? Architect: The setback varies from 8 feet to 15 feet.
- This is a challenging and complex project. The Old Town Design Guidelines, which apply to this property, indicate that new construction must be strongly contextual. Of the new building, the pavilion and the heritage-designated buildings, the new building dominates the site. The project is weighted towards Johnson Street and the four buildings do not hold together. The new building's massing and height do not relate to its immediate neighbours (for example, it is 16 feet higher than the Janion). The materials are not strongly contextual with those of the surrounding buildings; the materials were chosen to oppose the red brick of those buildings. There is a tension between the context of the proposed development, the new bridge and heritage-designated buildings and park. The project requires more homogeneity, a closer relationship with its neighbourhood; and needs to pay more attention to itself rather than being a mediator between the old and new.
- Concern was expressed about the lack of information about the heritage-designated buildings and the height of the new building.
- Why is the pavilion needed? It blocks the heritage-designated buildings. Heritage Consultant: Historically, the heritage buildings were on one side of a two-sided street. The plan is to recreate the sense of a street to recapture the historic context. Leaving the heritage buildings in a plaza without anything else did not seem appropriate. Owner: Reeson Park and the bridgehead plaza already provide a lot of open space. Architect: Narrow streets/alleys are a character-defining element of the area.
- The site is quite remarkable in that there is an opportunity to create a new building on a very open space. The area is being "done over" with the new bridge, the Janion, and a new building proposed for beside the Janion. Many concepts have been worked and reworked in the overall approach to the site and many questions have been answered well. However, the overwhelming issue is the new building. It is too massive and too high. It is not a satisfactory proposal for such a landmark building.
- A four to five storey building is recommended for the site.

Moved

Seconded

That the Heritage Advisory Panel recommend to Council that Heritage Alteration Permit Application No. 00136 for 1314-1318 and 1324 Wharf Street does not sufficiently meet the applicable design guidelines and policies and should be declined and that the key areas that should be revised to include:

- lower the height of the new building
- fully address the heritage conservation of the historic buildings
- proposed materials to respond to the immediate context of the neighbourhood.

Carried (unanimous)

5. Relevance of Age to Heritage Significance

Hal Kalman

- Typically buildings that are at least 50 years old are considered for heritage registration and designation in Victoria, however, there is no policy that indicates this.
- A review of the policies of other municipalities and organizations was done (see handout). It was concluded that the minimum age is usually less than 50 years; however, in many cases there is no minimum age.
- It is recommended that the Panel discuss this issue and formalize a local policy at a future meeting.

6. City Hall Paint Removal and Repointing

Merinda Conley and Donald Luxton provided an overview of the City Hall paint removal process.

Donald Luxton

- The work is based on the *City Hall Restoration Study* (1990-1991) by Bawlf Cooper and Associates and Marshall Goldworthy and Associates.
- The following were created in 2008: the Statement of Significance for the municipal level of heritage value; an envelope conservation management plan; and a City Hall finishes study.
- There is moisture under the current paint which is causing a lot of peeling.
- No more paint is to be added to the exterior of City Hall at this time.
- The current paint contains lead and will need to be remediated.
- In 2009-2010, test stripping was done, but it was not very successful. Since then, the technology has improved.
- The questions are: What is the best approach to take with the painted brick? Can it be successfully stripped and if so, what would be the cost and procedure involved?
- A chemical and hot water treatment was used on the current test strip. This process removes the paint, but also removes the soft mortar; therefore, the building will need repointing.
- If the building is repainted, stripped and repainted again, what are the long term maintenance issues?

- The building was constructed in multiple stages and so the stripping may not be consistent.
- There are no pencil joints on the north side of the building, but they may be present in other parts of the building.
- The stripping is part of an extensive program that also includes a new roof, repairs to windows and the replacement of the crestring and urns on the roof.

Panel Comments and Questions

- When was the building first painted and why? Donald Luxton: The building was probably painted in 1878 for aesthetic reasons. "Striping" of buildings was a trend at the time. There is no proof that the painting was due to early damage.
- The bricks on the south side are better quality than those on the north. There is a lot of variation in the bricks so the building may not look very good totally stripped.

Some Panel members attended a site visit immediately after adjournment.

7. Adjournment - 2:30 pm

Attendees present at on-site review:

- Ken Johnson
- Rick Goodacre
- Councillor Pamela Madoff
- Don Luxton
- Merinda Conley

Panel Member On-Site Review of Paint Removal Test Patch on the North Wall of City Hall

- It was noted that seven applications of efs 2500 were required to remove the paint from the brick and mortar joints, which is highly labour intensive. Ken Johnson stated that one of the most biodegradable paint strippers is based with hydrogen peroxide, and the use of a hydrogen peroxide paint stripper is estimated to save a considerable amount of labour by comparison, as well as disposal costs.
- Ken Johnson explained that a Proscoproduct called Sure Klean Weather Seal Siloxane PD is a long-lasting, pre-diluted water repellent for concrete and most masonry and stucco surfaces. It is a breathable masonry coating (BMC). Approximately 98% of moisture is extracted from the masonry, and the product works very well in Victoria's climate.
- Pressure washer should be equipped with a gauge and only a light pressure should be used.
- A natural hydraulic lime mortar should be used and is locally stocked. This type of mortar was used on the Union, and possibly on the Fairfield Block.
- More investigation is needed, especially in determining the chemical base of the paint stripper to be used and the reaction between the stripper and the masonry.
- Merinda Conley briefly met with Doug Campbell on a separate occasion to review the test patch. Doug Campbell had concerns with the paint removal. He stated that it is obvious that the brick surface was always painted, and that the poor condition of the brick surface and uneven width of mortar joints was a good indicator that the building was always meant to be painted. He also stated that it was evident that initial surface preparation from the paint was not done properly, thus another indication that the inconsistent brick surface was meant to be painted.

**CITY OF VICTORIA
HERITAGE ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES
JUNE 12, 2018**

Present: Rick Goodacre, Acting Chair
Keri Briggs
Doug Campbell
Ken Johnson
Hal Kalman
Shari Khadem
Theo Riecken

Absent: Kelly Black

Guest: Pamela Madoff, Charlayne Thornton-Joe

Staff: Merinda Conley, Senior Heritage Planner
Alison Meyer, Assistant Director, Development Services
John O'Reilly, Heritage Planner
Lauren Martin, Heritage Secretary

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

1. Adoption of Minutes of May 8, 2018 Meeting

Amendment: Page 5, second bullet from the bottom - change "remortaring" to "repointing"

Moved

Seconded

That the minutes be adopted as amended.

Carried (unanimous)

2. **Announcements**

- Merinda Conley introduced the new Heritage Planner, John O'Reilly.

3. **1314 and 1316-1318 Wharf Street (Caire & Grancini and Fraser Warehouses)
Review of the Conservation Plans**

Attendees: Adrian Politano and Juan Pereira, Dialog; Sydney Schwartz, MCM Partnership; Chelsea Dunk, Donald Luxton & Associates

Merinda Conley outlined the reason for the applicant's return to the Panel.

Panel Questions and Comments

- Is there any intention to use the "Northern Junk" name in signage and marketing?
Juan Pereira: The name will be included in building signage.

- On the west side of the building at 1314 Wharf Street, one window and one entrance will be removed and replaced with three large windows and another entrance. What is the reason for so much intervention on that façade? Adrian Politano: The ground level slopes up and will have to be taken down slightly to allow for headroom and connection to the waterfront elevation. This results in elongation/enlargement of the doorway. The new openings will match the three openings above to create a more porous frontage for the walkway and patio. Some of the openings were not original. Panel: The opening on the left looks original. The necessity of the door is understandable due to the change in grade, but it is not clear why the three large windows are needed. The existing opening should be retained. Adrian Politano: That is a possibility.
- The glass atrium between the two buildings is good; however, the plans show large openings through the walls resulting in the removal of a lot of brick. Adrian Politano: The openings may not be as large depending on the final structure. The openings will mimic the openings between the two CRUs in 1316-1318 Wharf Street and allow access through the atrium to the commercial spaces.
- Will the atrium serve as a corridor or as a commercial space? Adrian Politano: It will serve as a commercial space.
- The proposal's conservation approach is inconsistent. It is indicated that the chosen approach is preservation and rehabilitation. However, returning the appearance of the façades to the 1860s is restoration. Enlarging the windows is rehabilitation and will transform the dark warehouses by bringing in light. Rehabilitation is a positive approach. It is suggested that the applicant work with their heritage consultant to develop a consistent approach.
- One of the character-defining elements of the building at 1314 Wharf Street is form and massing; however, a portion of the lower floor by the ramp will be removed. Will this impact the form and massing? Acting Chair: Since the corner for removal is below grade, it is not clear whether the intervention will impact the form and massing.
- It is good to have these two buildings retained and adapted for a new use. In relation to the details, it should be made clear what is original and what is an intervention.
- In a complex project like this, all conservation approaches will be used as many interventions will be required. The overall effect is what matters. Requesting that the applicant identify the conservation approaches is not useful.
- Will the new materials be in keeping with the original? Adrian Politano: That is the intention once the existing materials are removed.

Moved

Seconded

That the revised conservation plans have been received and reviewed and that the Heritage Advisory Panel has made comments and trust that the applicant will recognize the long-standing name of "Northern Junk."

Carried (unanimous)

4. **502-508 Discovery Street / 505-509 Pembroke Street / 2031-2051 Store Street**
Heritage Alteration Permit Application No. 00228
Heritage Designation Application No. 000173

Attendees: Matthew Phillips, 502 Discovery Holdings; Michael Moody, MJM Architect Inc.

Merinda Conley provided a brief summary of the application.

Panel Questions and Comments

- Regarding the roof structure, will the original roof rafters be retained as part of the post and beam for the interior working space? Matthew Phillips: Yes, except for the modification of one rafter beneath the trapezoidal structure.
- Can you look up into the trusses? Matthew Phillips: The trusses will be visible from the ground floor through the stairwell opening of the new floor.
- What materials will be used for the ceiling? Matthew Phillips: Drywall.
- Will the wood timber trusses require more support? Matt: The trusses will need to be strengthened in the northeast corner to increase the bearing capacity.
- The glass roof in the centre is a nice feature. Has an opening in the second floor been considered to bring light through to the ground floor? Michael Moody: A pyramidal skylight will bring light into the lobby adjacent to Store Street.
- Reference was made to the Salt Building in Vancouver in which the trusses are visible from the ground floor. Could a similar design be considered for this building?
- The brick needs work. Will a conservation plan be prepared? Matthew Phillips: Repointing is part of the project.
- It is commendable that the entire building rather than only the façade will be retained; however, conservation and maintenance plans are recommended.

Moved

Seconded

That the Heritage Advisory Panel recommend to Council that Heritage Alteration Permit Application No. 00228 for 502-508 Discovery Street / 505-509 Pembroke Street / 2031-2051 Store Street be approved as presented.

Carried (unanimous)

Moved

Seconded

That the Heritage Advisory Panel recommend that Council approve the designation of the heritage-registered property located at 502-508 Discovery Street / 505-509 Pembroke Street / 2031-2051 Store Street, pursuant to Section 611 of the *Local Government Act*, as a Municipal Heritage Site.

Carried (unanimous)

5. **727 Yates Street**
Heritage Alteration Permit with Variances Application No. 00008

Attendees: Jim Wong; Studio One Architecture Inc.; Daniel Belanger, Pacific Cove Property Management

Merinda Conley provided a brief summary of the application.

Panel Questions and Comments

- Privacy and livability: The project is a practical response to a very narrow lot.
- Impact on the context of the Heritage Conservation Area: DPA 2 (HC) has more density and height than Old Town and is a mixed character area. The step back complements the adjacent building and the proposal makes use of the existing building. More changes to the building would be risky and not advantageous. The building will provide liveable rental units downtown.
- Proposal's success in considering the heritage value and characteristics of the Yates Street Heritage Corridor: The Panel supports the restoration of the storefront. The recreated heritage façade will increase the building's profile on the streetscape.
- Proposed conservation strategies: The office building next door is set back so the eastern façade of this building is visible. It is a nice indentation that provides some relief on the street. Jim Wong: Any exposed brick will be refurbished.
- Quality and durability of materials for the addition: The proposed metal cladding has also been used on the adjacent building. Has it weathered well? Jim Wong: Yes, it is weathering well after five years.

Moved

Seconded

That the Heritage Advisory Panel recommend to Council that Heritage Alteration Permit with Variances Application No. 00008 for 727 Yates Street be approved as presented.

Carried (6 in support, 1 abstention)

6. **819-823, 825 and 827 Fort Street**
Heritage Alteration Permit with Variances Application No. 00009
Heritage Designation Application No. 000176

Attendees: Sydney Schwartz, MCM Partnership; Kristine Liu and Robert Fung, The Salient Group; Chelsea Dunk, Donald Luxton & Associates; Will King, Waymark Architecture; Bruce Johnson, RJC Engineers

Merinda Conley provided a brief summary of the application.

Panel Questions and Comments

- Are the units for rental or purchase? Sydney Schwartz: Rental.
- What will be the depth of the retail space? Robert Fung: The retail space will be 60 ft deep. Only the façades will be retained.
- There are a number of interior bedrooms without windows. Sydney Schwartz: Yes, on the podium level there are two bedroom suites in which the rear bedrooms do not have windows. These suites have higher ceilings and attention will be given to material

treatments and lightness to maximize light into these deeper spaces. Robert Fung: There are units on the second and third levels that have internal bedrooms. These bedrooms could have sliding glass doors or transom windows to provide light. Panel: Are windowless bedrooms allowed under the building code?

- Have shadow studies been done? The building, on the south side of Fort Street, would cast a long shadow across the street. The concern is in the shoulder seasons (spring and fall). Sydney Schwartz: The spring equinox shadow touches the buildings across the street at noon (shadow study chart was shown).
- Is 827 Fort Street included in the heritage designation? Merinda Conley: No, it was determined at the time of designation (2008) that the building was not worthy of designation due to the number of alterations over time. The Council minutes and motions from 2008 were reviewed and discussed with the City Solicitor. The building was not identified in the Statement of Significance. Panel: Who was the architect of 827 Fort Street and the year built? This building was built in the 1950s and could have significance.
- The height of the building will dominant the block and set a precedent. The proposed setbacks are not adequate. A lower building and more setback would mitigate the shadowing issue.
- The project straddles two zones: one allows 43m and the other 15.5m in height. The proposal is requesting 35.2m in height. That is a substantial variance for the height. Robert Fung: Information was provided regarding the allowable heights for this site in the existing zones and in the Downtown Core Area Plan.
- Does the proposal meet the guidelines for the DPA 7B (HC): Corridors Heritage? Merinda Conley: The guidelines support the proposal. Panel: Does the additional height encourage human-scaled urban design? If it does not, it deviates from policy.
- Architecturally, there is too much consistency in materials between the lower and upper floors. It would be preferable if the upper floors had more glass rather than brick. The scale of detail on the brick part of the building is less than that of other buildings on Fort Street.
- The windows on the base, body and cap are well done.
- The proposal says nothing about the robustness of the Fort Street Heritage Corridor. The podium of the building needs greater detail to increase the integration of the design. There is no harmony between the new building and the older buildings on the corridor. The new construction on the streetscape reflects the tower, not the existing buildings.
- It is unfortunate that only the two façades are being conserved and not the buildings.
- The Panel would like to hear the Advisory Design Panel's motion for this project. Alison Meyer: Council looks for independent consideration by the Panels. The draft ADP motion was read aloud.
- The retention of the heritage building façades maintains the pedestrian rhythm on the street. The podium maintains the height along the street.

Moved

Seconded

That the Heritage Advisory Panel recommend to Council that Heritage Alteration Permit with Variances Application No. 00009 for 819-823, 825 and 827 Fort Street be approved with the following changes:

- increase in height beyond the maximum allowable of 30m not be allowed
- Increase the setback of the tower from the streetwall subject to the zone
- confirmation of heritage designation of 827 Fort Street.

Carried (4 in favour; 2 opposed)

Moved

Seconded

That the Heritage Advisory Panel recommend that Council approve the designation of the heritage-registered property located at 819-823 Fort Street, pursuant to Section 611 of the *Local Government Act*, as a Municipal Heritage Site.

Carried (unanimous)

7. Adjournment - 3:03 pm