

HERITAGE ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MINUTES

October 23, 2013

PRESENT

Mr. Stephen Terauds, Chair
Mr. Nelson Brison
Ms. Deborah Larter
Ms. Janet Morris
Ms. Emma Sampson
Mr. Richard White
Councillor David Hendsbee

REGRETS:

Mr. David Houlihan
Ms. Monica MacDonald, Vice Chair
Ms. Sarah Levy
Mr. Marcel Parsons (absent)

STAFF:

Mr. Seamus McGreal, Heritage Planner
Ms. Sheilagh Edmonds, Legislative Assistant
Mr. Lachlan Barber, Legislative Support

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	CALL TO ORDER.....	3
2.	APPROVAL OF MINUTES	3
3.	APPROVAL OF THE ORDER OF BUSINESS AND APPROVAL OF ADDITIONS AND DELETIONS.....	3
4.	BUSINESS ARISING OUT OF THE MINUTES: None	4
4.1	Business Arising – None.....	4
5.	CONSIDERATION OF DEFERRED BUSINESS – None	4
6.	CORRESPONDENCE, PETITIONS & DELEGATIONS	4
6.1	Correspondence	4
6.1.1	Correspondence dated September 18, 2013 and September 23, 2013 from The Heritage Trust	4
6.2	Petitions – None	4
6.3	Presentation – None	4
6.4	Updates from HAC Members - HRM Committees /HAC Sub-committees .	4
7.	REPORTS	4
7.1	Staff	4
7.1.1	Case H00383: Heritage Incentives – Barrington Street Heritage Conservation District 2013-14.....	4
7.1.2	RP+5: Draft Revised Regional Municipal Planning Strategy Report	8
7.1.3	Case H00382: Substantial Alteration to 2221 Maitland Street, Halifax – St. George’s Parish Hall	7
7.2	Committee Members	10
7.2.1	Meeting Time (Chair)	10
9.	NEXT MEETING DATE – November 27, 2013.....	10
10.	ADJOURNMENT	10

1. CALL TO ORDER

The Chair called the meeting to order at 3:08 p.m. without quorum in Halifax Hall, City Hall, 1841 Argyle Street, Halifax.

The Chair noted Councillor Hendsbee was expected shortly and once he was in attendance, there would be quorum. The Chair noted that the Committee had previously agreed to hear a presentation by Mr. Phil Pacey, Heritage Trust and suggested, therefore beginning the discussion of 7.1.2, by inviting Mr. Phil Pacey to provide his remarks at this time, to which the Committee agreed.

7.1.2 RP+5: Draft Revised Regional Municipal Planning Strategy Report

Two letters in regard to the RP+5 Draft Plan were submitted by the Heritage Trust of Nova Scotia and received by the Committee. The first was dated September 18th, 2013 and the second was dated September 23rd, 2013.

Mr. Pacey of the Heritage Trust of Nova Scotia commented on the points made by the Heritage Trust. He highlighted the following points related to the 3rd draft of the revised Regional Plan.

- The Heritage Trust believes that the treatment of heritage in the Regional Plan should reflect the best practices that existed prior to amalgamation and that all heritage properties in HRM should be treated equally and subject to the same policies.
- It is the view of the Heritage Trust that the Regional Plan does not provide adequate protection to heritage properties in the regional centre due to the secondary plans for these areas being rescinded as part of the regional planning process.
- The Heritage Trust feels that a general set of heritage policies should be provided in the RP and that policies treating specific areas could be presented in secondary planning strategies.

At 3:20 p.m. Councillor Hendsbee entered the meeting and quorum was achieved.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOVED by Ms. Sampson, seconded by Councillor Hendsbee, that the minutes of August 27, 2013 be approved. MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

3. APPROVAL OF THE ORDER OF BUSINESS AND APPROVAL OF ADDITIONS AND DELETIONS

The Chair shared with the Committee that the timeline for item 7.1.2 has been extended and that a recommendation will not be possible before December or January. He

indicated that although the item would have to be deferred, there was a possibility of discussing the draft at the current time. The Chair also suggested moving the item to the end of the meeting to allow time for discussion. The committee members expressed agreement to both discussing the draft and moving the item to the end of the meeting.

MOVED by Mr. White, seconded by Mr. Brison that the agenda, as amended, be approved. MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

4. BUSINESS ARISING OUT OF THE MINUTES: None

5. CONSIDERATION OF DEFERRED BUSINESS – None

6. CORRESPONDENCE, PETITIONS & DELEGATIONS

6.1 Correspondence

- An e-mail correspondence dated October 19, 2013, in regard to the RP+5 Draft Plan was submitted from HAC Vice Chair, Ms. Monica MacDonald.
- Correspondence dated September 18, 2013 and September 23, 2013 from The Heritage Trust in regard to the RP+5 draft plan

6.2 Petitions – None

6.3 Presentation – None

6.4 Updates from HAC Members - HRM Committees /HAC Sub-committees - None

7. REPORTS

7.1 Staff

7.1.1 Case H00383: Heritage Incentives – Barrington Street Heritage Conservation District 2013-14

The Chair invited Mr. McGreal to report on the Barrington Street Heritage Incentive programme.

Mr. McGreal's presentation highlighted the following points:

- This is the final year of the five year programme, begun in 2009.
- Interior and exterior renovations are eligible. The conditions stipulate that a building may not be demolished for twenty years if it receives funding.
- This year there were three proposals: Mary McAlpine building, Cabot building, NFB building. Each includes grants and tax credits.

- Mary McAlpine building work included a number of elements in the interior surfaces, exterior of the building. The work is nearing completion. The value of the work is \$65,209. The requested grant and tax credit is valued at \$25,361.
- Cabot building work included repairs and the installation of new materials and building systems (HVAC and hot water heating). The ground floor space is now vacant. The total project value is \$23,121. The requested grant and tax credit is valued at \$4,446.
- NFB building grants include façade stabilization, construction of a new 4th floor, construction of a new building behind the façade, basic building costs, professional fees. The financial package from HRM is valued at over 800,000 dollars. This is a substantial alteration to a heritage property recommended by HAC and approved by Council. The total project value is \$3,703,955. The grant and tax credit value is \$655,400.

Mr. McGreal noted the staff recommendation before the Committee.

Following the presentation the Chair invited questions from committee members.

The Chair asked for clarification as to whether the work on the McAlpine building was new or from cost overruns from the previous year. Mr. White pointed out that the report indicates that these are new works. It was clarified that the earlier work was for the construction of the iron work. The grant before the committee is for the coating and installation which was carried out in the current fiscal year.

The Chair asked about if there is a possibility to extend the programme. Mr. McGreal replied that there is not currently a mechanism to extend the life of the programme.

Mr. White asked if the iron work is original to the building. Mr. McGreal replied that there used to be a parapet, but the new iron work is an interpretation that departs from the original design.

MOVED by Councillor Hendsbee, seconded by Mr. White, that the Heritage Advisory Committee recommend that Halifax Regional Council approve grants and tax credits for the McAlpine Building, the Cabot building, and the NFB building in the Barrington Street Heritage Conservation District as outlined in the staff report.

A discussion ensued in which the following points were highlighted:

- In regards to the NFB building, the Chair pointed out that the agreement for the stabilization grant should be contingent on new construction. Mr. McGreal indicated that a friendly amendment to item number 4 in the recommendation would be possible. Mr. McGreal pointed out that the recommendation indicates "forgiveness in the 2014-15 budget". He proposed to change this to "repayment

forgiveness in the operating budget in the fiscal year subsequent to the project's completion." **The committee agreed to the change.**

- The committee expressed a desire to learn about whether the programme was successful in meeting the intended outcomes. Mr. McGreal noted that a report on the programme will come forward. He noted also that the programme was challenging from an administrative point of view.

With the friendly amendment to the recommendation the Chair called for the question on the motion which now reads, in its entirety as follow:

MOVED by Councillor Hendsbee, seconded by Mr. White, that the Heritage Advisory Committee recommend that Halifax Regional Council approve grants and tax credits for the McAlpine Building, the Cabot building, and the NFB building in the Barrington Street Heritage Conservation District as outlined in the staff report.

- 1. Approve a grant of no more than \$22,236 and a tax credit of no more than \$3,125 for the restoration and renovation of the Mary McAlpine building located at 1569 Barrington Street as describe in the August 14, 2013 staff report and subject to recommendation #5.**
- 2 Approve a grant of no more than \$1,395 and a tax credit of no more than \$3,051 for the restoration and renovation of the Cabot building located at 1725-27 Barrington Street as described in the August 14, 2013 staff report and subject to recommendation #5.**
- 3. Approve a grant of no more than \$100,000 and a tax credit of no more than \$525,593 for the restoration and renovation of the National Film Board building located at 1572 Barrington Street as described in the August 14, 2013 staff report, subject to recommendation #5 and further subject to approval of Heritage Case H00386 by Regional Council in early September 2013.**
- 4. Approve waiving the repayment of \$175,950 the costs HRM incurred to stabilize the façade of the National Film Board building as per the 1997 Heritage Agreement and to budget for this repayment forgiveness in the operating budget in the fiscal year subsequent to the project's completion.**
- 5. Approve payment of the grants and tax credits referenced in recommendations 1 – 3 conditional upon the respective applicant:**
 - a) completing the work set out in the respective application to the satisfaction of the Municipality;**
 - b) providing receipts and invoices, in a format acceptable to the Municipality, to support the total amount approved; and**
 - c) executing and registering at the Registry of Deeds/Land Registration Office and agreement that the owner will not apply to demolish, nor**

will they demolish, the respective property for 20 years from the date of the agreement.

- 6. Approve the transfer of any unused grant funds (at fiscal year-end) from the 2013-14 Barrington Street Heritage Conservation District Incentives Program budget of \$200,000 (\$150,000 from account C310-8004 Planning & Applications and \$50,000 from Q312) to the Cultural Development Reserve (account Q312) for expenditure once the approved projects are completed.**
- 7. Approve extension of any un-issued 2013-14 tax credits referenced in recommendations 1 to 3 above into future fiscal years as may be required to match project timelines.**

MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

During the approval of the order of business, the Committee agreed to deal with this item at this time:

7.1.3 Case H00382: Substantial Alteration to 2221 Maitland Street, Halifax – St. George’s Parish Hall

A staff report dated October, 23, 2013 was submitted.

Mr. McGreal presented an overview of the substantial alteration proposed for the subject property. He began by outlining the heritage value of the Parish Hall. He then reviewed the proposed changes to the property, including an addition that will replace a smaller, earlier addition. He noted that the exterior renovations, including changes to the orientation of the windows and the location of some windows, will introduce a sense of symmetry to the building and will generate a more authentic appearance. The interior renovations will generate more versatile spaces in what has, over time, become a “rabbit warren.” The staff report finds that the addition will be compatible with the older parts of the building and that it does not impact upon the character-defining elements of the structure. The report also finds that it is in keeping with the heritage and architectural character of the building.

Mr. McGreal responded to questions. The committee members asked about the use of vinyl windows. It was explained that the budget, even with potential HRM grants, does not allow for all of the windows to be wooden and that the vinyl windows are used on the addition to differentiate it from the older parts of the building.

Mr. McGreal stated that staff are in support of the proposal and have recommended approval.

MOVED by Councillor Hendsbee, seconded by Ms. Larter, that the Heritage Advisory Committee recommend that Halifax Regional Council approve the

proposed substantial alteration to the St. George's Parish Hall as outlined in Attachments A through D of the staff report.

The Chair invited discussion in which the following comments were expressed:

- Some concern about the use of vinyl windows was expressed, but it was agreed that the proposed window treatment does not impact upon the character defining elements and that the proposed alteration maintains or enhances the heritage value of the property and will be a significant improvement over its current condition.
- The windows, though not original material, reference the original Georgian elements in their form.
- Given the not-for-profit status of the property owner, the committee is sympathetic to the use of vinyl windows as a cost-savings measure which allows possible future replacement with wooden windows.
- The differently shaped windows are an intentional architectural decision but some concern was expressed that there should be a greater level of consistency. Mr. McGreal indicated that the applicant will be held to the drawings provided but that modifications could be discussed during the permitting stage.
- The cost of replacing the cupola would be prohibitive for the owner.

The Chair called the question.

MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

7.1.2 RP+5: Draft Revised Regional Municipal Planning Strategy Report

The Chair invited discussion on the draft RP+5 report.

Comments from Ms. MacDonald, HAC co-Chair, were received and read by the Committee.

The Chair pointed out that Mr. Bill Plaskett, Heritage Planner, has responded to some of the points raised in the letter on the RP+5 draft plan submitted by the HAC. These comments will be forwarded to the committee. The Chair reviewed the correspondence to spark discussion.

- The HAC feels that HRM should exhibit stronger leadership on heritage matters. Mr. Plaskett indicated that it is the opinion of HRM staff and legal that section 7.1 covers this and that the city is presenting a leadership role.
- The HAC desires more definitive policy language. Mr. Plaskett indicated that it is an established practice to use language that balances competing perspectives and priorities.
- The HAC feels that HRM should adopt federal standards and guidelines. Mr. Plaskett indicated that HRM staff feel that this is carried out in section 7.3.5 and policy CH-14.

- The HAC requested a policy requiring character defining elements and statements of value to be included in registrations. Mr. Plaskett indicated that the content of p. 81 of the RP draft responds to this.
- The HAC would like negative language about replication to be replaced with positive language about solutions. Mr. Plaskett indicated that this point is treated in the preamble to policy CH-16.
- The HAC feels that new developments abutting heritage buildings should not create a false sense of historical development. Mr. Plaskett indicated that policy CH-16 clause B incorporates federal standards which respond to this concern.

The Chair invited discussion.

Ms. Morris pointed out the HAC only deals with listed heritage buildings. She asked if a list of non-registered heritage properties is available or if there is a possible middle ground between registration and recognition. The Chair replied that a list was prepared around the time of amalgamation with the intent to assess properties that may be candidates for registration. Ms. Sampson indicated that updating the list is a heritage planning aim. District-level streetscape recognition is another mechanism that partially fulfills this need.

The Chair pointed out that a property may be registered without the owner's consent if it is threatened with demolition.

The committee agreed that the inventory of properties should grow over time, as more properties become historically significant, but that there will be increased competition for limited grant funds. The committee recognized the challenges of understanding heritage as a collective good while not limiting the rights of property owners. Owners of older buildings may not see registration as economically advantageous.

Chair suggested that two issues are at play here: 1) parallel or secondary registration for heritage buildings that are not registered; 2) identifying and registering properties with regards to the Regional Plan.

Ms. Morris suggested that out that demolition is a serious concern and that a policy should deal with this. Ms. Sampson pointed out that policy 7.2.2. could address this concern.

The Chair indicated that there could be more clarity on the role of the RP and the cultural and heritage priorities plan. He proposed further discussion on possibilities that exist outside of the RP and the priorities plan processes.

Ms. Morris indicated she prefers the word adjacent over the word abutting. She also commented that she doesn't think the language around street walls is appropriate because it does not recognize the whole street.

The Chair indicated that the discussion will be continued at the next meeting.

7.2 Committee Members

7.2.1 Meeting Time (Chair)

The Chair raised as a point of discussion the possibility of changing the meeting time to earlier or later in the day to better accommodate the scheduling needs of the Committee members. He pointed out, however, that it will not be possible to accommodate individual scheduling needs.

Mr. White commented that people normally have more energy and enthusiasm in the morning and that morning meetings could prove beneficial in this respect. Mr. Brison agreed with this comment.

Ms. Sampson said any time would be inconvenient for some.

Mr. Brison asked if a meeting could be delayed or rescheduled if an item required attention. The Chair replied that arranging an alternate time to meet on short notice would be complicated.

There was discussion on the point of the number required for quorum. Ms. Edmonds indicated that a quorum of 7 for the HAC is included in the committee by-law and to change it would require an amendment to provincial legislation. The Chair added that the quorum remains at 7 even if there are vacancies on the committee.

Councillor Hendsbee stated that the current meeting time is inconvenient for those who commute because the meeting ends at the peak of rush hour. He suggested that meeting from 4-6 would be better in this regard.

The Chair concluded that in general the current time does not appear to pose major challenges and invited members to continue the conversation over email.

9. NEXT MEETING DATE – November 27, 2013

10. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 5:03 p.m.

Lachlan Barber
Legislative Support