

**CITY OF VICTORIA
HERITAGE ADVISORY PANEL
MEETING MINUTES
NOVEMBER 10, 2020**

Present: Avery Bonner
Doug Campbell
Helen Edwards
James Kerr
Kirby Delaney
Pamela Madoff, Chair
Steve Barber

Presenters/Guests: Erica Sangster
Donald Luxton
Greg Damant
Bianca Bodley
Hallmark Office
Josh Harvey
Karen Ayers
Kristine Liu
Laura Ralph
Luke Mari
Peter Nadler
Sara Huynh
Robert Fung

Absent: Shari Khadem
Graham Walker
Aaron Usatch

Staff: John O'Reilly, Senior Heritage Planner
Alec Johnston, Senior Planner
Andrea Walker Collins, Planning Secretary

The Chair called the meeting to order at 12:09pm.

1. Adoption of the Agenda

Moved by Avery Bonner

Seconded by Doug Campbell

Carried (unanimous)

2. Adoption of the Minutes of the October 13, 2020 Meeting

Moved by Avery Bonner

Seconded by Doug Campbell

Carried (unanimous)

3. Business Arising from Minutes

- a. Six consultant offers for Bank Street School have been received. City staff will likely retain a consultant next week.

4. 902 Foul Bay Road – Heritage Alteration Permit with Variances Application No. 00022

Introduction by John O'Reilly

Presentation by Erica Sangster & Bianca Bodley

Panel Questions

- Doug Campbell: why is the bicycle in the south/east corner rather than with the planned parking? Erica Sangster: vehicle parking and bike parking were separated to maximize each.
- Avery Bonner: why was a modern gate design chosen, rather than restoring or referencing? Erica Sangster: we are not trying to recreate something that isn't heritage, but are open to other ideas.
- Pamela Madoff: what was the reason to remove the Copper Beech trees? Erica Sangster: this is a challenging part of the site. We tried to keep one of the Copper beeches, but it was not in the best health. We had to choose which had to be removed. Ultimately both would need to be removed.

Panel Discussion

- Pamela Madoff noted the matters staff requested HAPL's comments on, including alterations to the stone wall, the salvage strategy for the stone wall, and eligibility of the site for continued heritage designation. As the site is a designated heritage landscape, the Panel needs to decide if this is an appropriate approach to a designated landscape. The building and landscape can be considered as being of equal importance, the house to its setting and the landscape as it relates to the house.
- Doug Campbell: the use of the stone for reusing for a new stone wall is very well done. Preference for the open form gate. Efforts to preserve trees and other vegetation is commendable. The approach to present the built form as two clusters makes a gesture towards traditional architecture. The proposal demonstrates a good use of materials for this neighbourhood. Having individual units offset responds well to the houses in the area, and to the curve in the road. The proposal is a nice addition to this neighbourhood.
- Avery Bonner: the spirit of maintaining the landscaping is well done. Prefers the open gate.
- Steve Barber: preference for the open gate. Designation of the landscape was completed with the previous building on the site. There is no longer reason to continue the designation of the landscaping, except for the sake of the stone wall.
- Doug Campbell: the bicycle enclosure structure in the prominent south-east corner could be a beautifully landscaped space instead. Encourage the applicants to locate the bicycle enclosure elsewhere.
- Pamela Madoff: the building form is driving the landscape rather than the landscape driving form of the building. Would have preferred a more balanced approach.

Motion:

That the Heritage Advisory Panel recommend to Council that Heritage Alteration Permit with Variances Application No. 00022 for 902 Foul Bay Road be approved with the following changes:

The heritage designation bylaw be revised with the exception of the stone wall.

MOVED by Avery Bonner

SECONDED by Doug Campbell

Carried (5 in favour, 1 opposed)

5. 1244 Wharf Street – Heritage Alteration Permit with Variances Application No. 00023

Introduction by John O'Reilly

Presentation by Greg Damant, Donald Luxton & Robert Fung

Panel Questions

- Steve Barber: the renderings have an inconsistency with the proposed new doors. Some doors appear to have divided windows, while the materials provided have simple glazed doors. What is proposed exactly? Greg Damant: the design has evolved. The presentation indicates the proposed doors. The all-glass doors are in keeping with the window elements. After considering the function of the doors, it was decided to recall the original configuration of the doors as they looked previously.
- James Kerr: commends the applicants for the well thought out presentation and design, with a balance of preservation and rehabilitation. Behind the present mural there is a masonry wall with proposed changes. How is the plan for new windows possible with a masonry wall? Can the mass of the walls be preserved? Greg Damant: the walls can be preserved with the lower windows, but it would not be consistent in the upper windows. Some openings could be pushed in instead of out.
- Pamela Madoff: are the openings on the main floor original openings? Greg Damant: some are reopening original openings in the south elevation.
- Pamela Madoff: the large horizontal window is antithetical to the original building design. Greg Damant: the applications would like to take the opportunity to create a unique approach that favours the interior functionality.
- Pamela Madoff: will the patio structure be covered with a canopy during the winter? Greg Damant: the structure is designed for four seasons with the ability to add enclosures.
- James Kerr: the mural is faded and past its prime. Is it a liability? Greg Damant: this has been investigated, and unfortunately stucco was applied directly to the brick. Removing the stucco will damage the brick. The wall could be cladded, but it would be a risk to remove the stucco.

Panel Discussion

- Doug Campbell: it is unusual to receive such a great example of conservation work with no addition to the building.
- Steve Barber: appreciation for the overall rehabilitation and preservation of the features of the building. The rear patio is light and well-designed, and does not have any serious impacts on the public realm. However the use of Corten steel sleeves for the windows and doors is inappropriate. Guideline 20 of the *Standards and Guidelines* recommends “designing and installing new windows, doors or storefronts required by a new use on

non-character-defining elevations in a manner that is compatible with the building's style, era and character." Windows on both the north and south elevations should be inset. Concern for the impact on the masonry wall, and its consistency with the *Standards and Guidelines*.

- Helen Edwards: the mural is unfortunately unattractive due to the lack of maintenance.
- Pamela Madoff: the mural was not installed correctly.

Motion:

That the Heritage Advisory Panel recommend to Council that Heritage Alteration Permit with a Variance Application No. 00023 for 1244 Wharf Street be approved with the following changes:

- revisit the window treatment on north and south elevation with punched window openings.
- reconsider use of the detailing of the new entrances with regards to the Corten steel on the sides of the brick.
- reconsideration of the large horizontal window on the north elevation.
- mural is deleterious to the masonry wall and precludes the opening of new windows. Not a contributing element to the building or a character defining element in the statement of significance.
- more details regarding the pediments at a larger scale.

Moved by Avery Bonner

Seconded by Steve Barber

Carried (unanimous)

6. 2536 Richmond Road – Heritage Designation Application No. 00193

Introduction by John O'Reilly
Presentation by Sheena (owner)

Recommendation:

That the Heritage Advisory Panel recommend that Council approve the designation of the heritage-registered property located at 2536 Richmond Road, pursuant to Section 611 of the Local Government Act, as a Municipal Heritage Site.

Moved by Helen Edwards

Seconded by Doug Campbell

Carried (unanimous)

7. 1125 Fort Street – Heritage Designation No. 00193

Introduction by John O'Reilly
Presentation by Nicole Parker

Panel Questions

- Avery Bonner: is the Zen building taller than the subject property? Nicole Parker: yes, it is taller.

- Avery Bonner: is the back street available for parking? Is underground parking included? Nicole Parker: ground level parking is available.
- Steve Barber: what is the zoning entitlement for the site? John O'Reilly: the floor space ratio permitted under the zoning is 1.2 times the lot area, and proposed is 1.93 times the lot area.
- Avery Bonner: will the chimneys be retained? Nicole Parker: for seismic purposes, one of the chimneys will need to be removed.
- James Kerr: do the windows on the property line remain? Nicole Parker: that they remain with a protective glass.

Panel Discussion

- Doug Campbell: the application is supportable given the likelihood of demolition without designation.
- Pamela Madoff: this architectural approach would not be supportable if the building were heritage-designated.
- James Kerr: every effort should be made to distinguish the larger building from the heritage so that the heritage house is distinct.

Recommendation:

That the Heritage Advisory Panel recommend that Council approve the designation of the property located at 1125 Fort Street, consistent with architectural plans dated September 9, 2020, pursuant to Section 611 of the Local Government Act, as a Municipal Heritage Site.

Comments for consideration:

- Create as much visual separation and subordination to the building at 1125 Fort Street.

Moved by Avery Bonner

Seconded by James Kerr

Carried (unanimous)

Adjournment of the meeting: 2:51 pm