

**CITY OF VICTORIA
JOINT ADVISORY DESIGN / HERITAGE ADVISORY PANEL
MEETING MINUTES
February 1, 2017**

Present: Christopher Rowe, Chair
Justin Gammon
Jesse Garlick
Patricia Graham
Cynthia Hildebrand
Erica Sangster
Keri Briggs
Chloe Fox Miller
Rick Goodacre
Ken Johnson
Hal Kalman
Stuart Stark

Guest: Councillor Pamela Madoff

Staff: Charlotte Wain, Senior Planner - Urban Design
Merinda Conley, Senior Heritage Planner
Adrian Brett, Heritage Planner
Lauren Martin, Secretary

The Chair called the meeting to order at 11:30 am.

1. Adoption of the Minutes of the December 3, 2014 Meeting

Page 6, add as third bullet:

"It was pointed out that boxcars were not part of the historic context of the Roundhouse which was used exclusively for train locomotives."

Moved

Seconded

That the minutes be adopted as amended

Carried

2. Rezoning Application No. 00466 and Heritage Alteration Permit Application No. 00214 for 913-929 Burdett Avenue and 914-924 McClure Street

Attendees:

- Larry Cecco, John Keay, Danny Ziegler, Nicole Parker, and Shari Khadem, Keay Cecco Architecture Ltd.
- Carole Rossell, Small and Rossell Landscape Architects
- Donald Luxton, Donald Luxton & Associates Inc.
- Melissa Brunner and Chris Isherwood, The Norwood Group
- George Churcher, 999 Burdett Avenue

Charlotte Wain provided a brief overview of the project:

- The proposal is for construction of a six storey senior's residence consisting of 132 units; FSR of 1.98:1 and maximum height of 20.53m
- One level of underground parking with 43 stalls with access on McClure Street and surface parking for three stalls and one loading stall on Burdett Avenue are included.
- The applications were referred to the Heritage Advisory Panel on July 12, 2016 and the Advisory Design Panel on July 27, 2016.
- A summary of the changes made since those meetings is on page 2 of the staff report.
- On January 12, 2017, the Committee of the Whole referred the applications to the Joint Panel to provide comments on six items as documented in the motion.

Larry Cecco provided a presentation of the overall proposal.

John Keay and Donald Luxton addressed the changes to the heritage buildings.

Panel

- The rendering shows rectilinear dormers on the roof, but in the 1865 photo the dormers look gothic. John Keay: The rendering is incorrect. The dormer beside the tower will be removed; the dormers on the west elevation and the oriel windows will be retained.
- Donald Luxton: To clarify the dates in the Conservation Plan, the front of the building was designed in 1865 and opened in 1866; the rear addition was built in 1876.
- What is the rationale for the horizontal jogging on the McClure Street elevation? Larry Cecco: This was done to provide relief on the west elevation.
- The categorization of the heritage properties as primary, secondary and tertiary by the applicant indicates a value judgement. Heritage designated properties are all equally important from a legal perspective.

Item 1: The relationship between the scale of the proposed development and the OCP policy that supports new additions that conserve and enhance heritage property.

- Charlotte Wain: The OCP Urban Place Designation for the property is Urban Residential which supports buildings up to six storeys. The project is consistent with its Urban Place Designation and is within its density range.
- The OCP states that Victoria's heritage resources are protected and celebrated. Landmark buildings such as Christ Church Cathedral are identified in the OCP. The Cathedral's landmark radius is 90 m which encompasses two buildings (Mount St. Angela College and Catreffe) in the application. The contextual relationship of the site has not been referenced in the application. Charlotte Wain: View studies were provided by the applicant which show how the views of Christ Church Cathedral will be impacted.
- Does the scale/massing negatively affect the Cathedral context? The heritage designation of the buildings predate the application for this project. In terms of the relationship between the scale of the proposed development and the intent of the designation of the three existing buildings, the scale of the new construction is overwhelming and out of scale with the heritage buildings, i.e. the height and massing are not appropriate.
- It would be valuable to distinguish between the visual impact of the new development on the perception of the heritage aspects and possible irreparable harm to be done

versus the overall plan scale. Heritage value is measured in terms of aesthetics, visuals, history, and the broader context.

- The reality of this project is that heritage resources are embedded in a property that an applicant wants to develop. Ideally, the applicant would drive the project from a conservation perspective. However, applicants drive projects from a number of perspectives, particularly finances. The applicant has done a very good job in responding to concerns; however, heritage proponents will always find this type of development large. Heritage is always challenged due to economics.
- What can be changed so that the new construction is not overwhelming in relation to the heritage buildings? Standard 11 was noted.
- The majority of the Panel agreed that this item had been addressed satisfactorily.

Item 2: Does the proposal appropriately respond to Standard 1 of the National Standards and Guidelines in respect to the removal of heritage designated elements/additions and the relocation of the Cartreff and Temple buildings.

- A Heritage Advisory Panel member provided an overview of the Standards and Guidelines. "Preservation" means leave it the way you found it; "Rehabilitation" means make changes so that it works well for the present and future and retain heritage character-defining elements; "Restoration" means put it back to a specific date/time. The heritage consultant indicated that the approach for this project is preservation and the architect indicated that it is restoration which is contradictory.
- Donald Luxton: The primary intent of the project is preservation. Mount St. Angela College includes preservation of the exterior and removal of the 1912 porte cochere and dormers (i.e. restoration). It is preservation because 95% of the fabric of the building will be retained. Panel: This is not true preservation; it is actually rehabilitation.
- It was noted that many projects involve all three terms. This project is primarily rehabilitation along with new construction.
- Is the Mount Saint Angela building being preserved to 1865 or to the way it exists now? Donald Luxton: The primary intent is preservation, but restoration to 1865 with the removal of the porte cochere as it is not original (1912) and not attached to the building. The porch will be retained.
- One member expressed concern about the removal of the 1912 hotel wing. This does not meet Standard 2. The three-storey addition and porte cochere have acquired historical significance as they have been in existence longer than the original Mount Saint Angela building and are included in the designation as character-defining elements. The rest of the Panel did not object to the removal of the addition.
- The majority of the Panel agreed with the removal of the porte cochere. One member indicated that the porte cochere helped define the existing character of the building and is worth saving.

Item 3: Does the proposal respond appropriately to Standard 11 of the National Standards and Guidelines in terms of new construction being physically and visually compatible with, subordinate to, yet distinguishable from, the historic place.

- "Subordinate to" does not necessarily mean smaller; it may mean less competitive.
- Infill is an appropriate strategy; the facades have been treated satisfactorily and complement the Cartreff building.

- Are reproduction or neutrality best? The setting needs to be considered.
- The project will significantly impact sunlight. There will be permanent shade to the north on Burdett Street. Were shadow studies provided?
- Standard 11 is used to justify modern additions. Glass and reflection will dominate the small, solid heritage buildings; the scale, massing and shininess will diminish the heritage character.
- The applicant has done a great job on the Burdett Street elevation in respecting the two heritage-designated buildings; i.e. they stand out from the new construction.
- Why will the building addition of 1876 be demolished? Donald Luxton: The addition was completely altered in 1912. The building will be stripped back to its 1876 fabric and that will be preserved. Large areas of glass could be removed in the future, but the heritage-designated buildings will still be there. (Standard 12)
- The glass on the Burdett Avenue elevation is set back and does not challenge the Cartreff and Mount Saint Angela buildings. It will provide lots of diffused light.
- The gambrel roof is imitative of the roof of the Cartreff house; it should be different. John Keay: The new construction will be sympathetic to the Cartreff house, but the materials used will enable it to be read as a different building.
- On the McClure Street elevation, there is unnecessary horizontal articulation (overhang) beginning at the third floor.
- The Temple house will be moved 66 feet east. Does the rendering accurately show the proposed front stairs/wall/gate? This design has no relation to how it looks now. It is recommended that the existing remain. Larry Cecco: The rendering is incorrect. The heritage elements will be maintained as in A2.0. The Conservation Plan is accurate.
- The wall in the rendering is not how it appears now. Will it look like that in the final iteration? Is the wall moving? Larry Cecco: If there is a mid-block walkway, the rock outcrop and wall will be retained.
- The majority of the Panel ~~believe~~ believe that modifications to the addition of the Cartreff house should be something less imitative, with particular attention to the roofline.

Item 4: Does the Conservation Plan adequately address the National Standards and Guidelines and provide appropriate detail on how the proposal responds to the Guidelines.

- The interior of the Cartreff house will be gutted, but the Conservation Plan says all is well.
- The Conservation Plan is a statement of the current conditions.
- John Keay: The applicant is unable to see the interior of the Cartreff house as it is currently occupied.

Item 5: Has adequate information been provided by the applicant to support the claim that the level of Burdett Street has been raised over time and that this justifies the moving and raising of the Cartreff house.

- John Keay: The Cartreff house will not be relocated or raised.

Item 6: Does the proposed landscape plan respect and retain historic landscaping appropriate to the 1860s Mt. St. Angela building and the 1905, Samuel McClure designed, Cartreff house, as outlined in the Standards and Guidelines.

- Will the historic landscaping be retained? Carole Rossell: Research did not provide much information about historic landscaping except for a perimeter fence, flowering bushes and trees (1865 photo); the fence was replaced by a hedge and some perennial plantings (1948 photo). Current landscaping on the property consists of perennial and shrub borders and older fruit trees. An English garden style landscaping scheme is proposed to unify the buildings and accommodate different groups of people. The existing fruit trees are in poor shape and will not be retained.
- A letter from the applicant indicated the restoration of the Cartreff residence's herb garden, but there is no proof that one existed. Appropriate landscaping would be a herbaceous border and lawn with existing pathways. It is important to retain individual front gardens for each property.
- The proposed Burdett Street elevation does read as three different sections of landscaping. The walkway with the modern herb garden will tie in with the overall sight. The rationale for the east side walkway/view corridor is not clear except that the City favours a mid-range connector walk; however, a CPTED report indicates that this may be detrimental.
- Will the building at 929 Burdett Street be demolished or moved to a new lot? John Keay: The building is not heritage-designated and has been substantially altered. It will be demolished.

Moved

Seconded

To recommend approval of the Rezoning Application No. 00466 and Heritage Alteration Permit Application No. 00214 for 913-929 Burdett Avenue and 914-924 McClure Street with the following recommendations:

1. The relationship between the scale of the proposed development and the OCP policy that supports new additions that conserve and enhance heritage property.

The majority of the Panel are satisfied that the scale of the proposed development meets the policy and is satisfactory.

2. Does the proposal appropriately respond to Standard 1 of the National Standards and Guidelines in respect to the removal of heritage designated elements/additions and the relocation of the Cartreff and Temple buildings.

The majority of the Panel supports the removal of the hotel addition and the porte cochere.

3. Does the proposal respond appropriately to Standard 11 of the National Standards and Guidelines in terms of new construction being physically and visually compatible with, subordinate to, yet distinguishable from, the historic place.

The majority of the Panel believes that the proposal does respond appropriately to Standard 11. It is recommended that the addition to the Cartreff residence be redesigned to be less imitative with particular attention to the roofline.

4. Does the Conservation Plan adequately address the National Standards and Guidelines and provide appropriate detail on how the proposal responds to the Guidelines.

The Panel recommends that the Conservation Plan and design detail of the Temple residence pay particular attention to sensitive restoration and reconstruction of the staircase, front wall and gate and resolve the discrepancy in the front elevation of the building itself.

5. Has adequate information been provided by the applicant to support the claim that the level of Burdett Street has been raised over time and that this justifies the moving and raising of the Cartreff house.

The moving and lifting of the Cartreff house has now been removed by applicant and is no longer part of the proposal.

6. Does the proposed landscape plan respect and retain historic landscaping appropriate to the 1860s Mt. St. Angela building and the 1905, Samuel McClure designed, Cartreff house as outlines in the Standards and Guidelines.

The Panel is generally satisfied, but recommends that the front garden of the Cartreff residence be reconsidered to bring more in line with an Edwardian bordered garden and distinct from the rest of the frontage. It is also recommended that the applicant consider the use of fruit trees as part of the landscape given their heritage on site.

The Panel recommends that the project be reclassified as a rehabilitation, not as preservation.

Carried (12 in favour, 1 opposed)

3. **Adjourned at 1:45 pm**