



**CITY OF VICTORIA
HERITAGE ADVISORY PANEL MEETING MINUTES
JANUARY 13, 2026**

**HYBRID MEETING VIA MICROSOFT TEAMS & Xwsepsum Nations ROOM
1 CENTENNIAL SQUARE**

The City of Victoria is located on the homelands of the Songhees Nation and Xwsepsum Nation

PANEL MEMBERS PRESENT: Alissa Wrean (Chair), Ben Clinton-Baker, Jana Stefan, Valerie Lindholm, Katie McEvoy, Nathalie Picard, Rosemary Sleigh, Veronika (Nikki) Strong-Boag, Liberty Brears

ABSENT: Steve Barber

STAFF PRESENT: Kristal Stevenot – Senior Heritage Planner
Laura Saretsky – Heritage Planner
Kamryn Allen – Recording Secretary

APPLICANT ATTENDEES: **Heritage Designation Application No.000218 for 1527 Redfern Street.**
Rus Collins (Applicant from Zebra Design & Interior Groups), Benjamin Kiiskila (Client for new ADU and son of applicant), Debbie Campbell (Property owner), Katie Cummer (Heritage Consultant from Cummer Heritage Consulting)

1. Call to Order

The Chair called the meeting to order at 12:01 p.m.

Panel Members and staff provided introductions.

2. Approval of Agenda

Moved By: B. Clinton-Baker

Seconded By: V. Lindholm

That the January 13, 2026, Advisory Design Panel Agenda be approved as circulated.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

3. Minutes

Minutes from the meeting held:

December 9, 2025

Moved By: N. Strong-Boag

Seconded By: J. Stefan

That the Minutes from the meeting held December 9, 2025, be approved as circulated.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

4. Applications

Heritage Designation Application No.000218 for 1527 Redfern Street.

Kristal Stevenot Senior Planner, provided an overview of the application and highlighted the areas that staff are seeking feedback on the proposed Heritage Designation Application

The Panel asked the following questions of clarification:

- Is the architecture of the proposed secondary building going to be in keeping with the existing building?
 - Our focus today should be in the designation and not on the delegated development permit application.
 - We've attempted to keep the building in the rear, simple and subtle and complementary in colours, but we are not trying to copy the front house. The back house will have different textures on it, different siding panelling and there is some fluted woodwork on the very front of the house. It's trying to be interesting, but at the same time not conflicting at all with the heritage house in the front.
- The lower entrance is visually prominent and highlights that the house has been elevated from its original site. Is there an opportunity to relocate or redesign the entry so it is less of a focal point and does not diminish the visual importance of the porch?
 - Part of the challenges with this heritage building, is we wanted to try and be cognisant of budget but also recognizing the changes through time that have happened to the building. It was converted quite some time ago now, 50 years or so, so wanting to be respectful of the fact that it has had this form for almost as long as it was in the other form is ultimately why we kept it as is, while acknowledging that it has undergone these changes.
 - It became a duplex so long ago, making it part of its social value and we really did see the fact that it has provided so much housing to multiple families over so many generations. So, we wanted to respect that and celebrate that. No thought went into closing or removing that entrance or lowering it back down. To recognize the changes to the place over time, is Standard 2 which encourages us to do that.
- What is Standard 2?
 - From the Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada: "Conserve changes to an historic place that over time have become character defining elements in their own right."

- Question about the timeline and chronology, is it not known exactly when the house was built, it seemed like there was quite a wide range, between the 20s to 60s?
 - The 1920-60s was for the extension off the back, however the original building was built in 1921. On the historical permit cards, the duplex came along in the 80s.

Panel members discussed:

- The matter of the secondary suite and the lower level of the house was raised. It serves as a good example of a common historical modification to a popular architectural style found throughout the Lower Mainland and southern Vancouver Island, and it tells you how people had to modify their houses in order to continue to afford to live in what became an increasingly expensive area so I don't have a problem with that kind of historic modification because it is an historic modification that needs to be remembered when we are thinking about popular housing.
- It is interesting that there was a time when the City previously explored designating a number of properties in the area, then it never happened. Given the current increase in development, this may be an appropriate time to reconsider that opportunity
- The property's association with the construction of the hospital, and some major events in the city's history is important. Also, that it is an example of a slower development in the community. I tend to support the application and to encourage people to do this kind of heritage infill.
- The property has had too many changes, and they continue to propose more changes that don't fit with the historical profile of the building itself. The heritage report does not appear to adequately acknowledge the original structure. The modification to the front façade, specifically the partial removal of the porch to create an apartment entrance, does not fit with the historic character. Although the provision of additional housing is supported, the building does not retain sufficient heritage value to warrant designation.
- The heritage value described in the Statement of Significance supports reasons for designation, given that the building has retained much of its original character as demonstrated in the photographs.
- Despite the alterations, the character-defining elements remain intact and legible.

Motion: That the Heritage Advisory Panel recommends to Council that Heritage Designation Application No. 000218 for 1527 Redfern Street be approved as presented.

Moved By: K. McEvoy

Seconded By: V. Strong-Boag

Opposed V. Lindholm

CARRIED

5. Adjournment

The January 13, 2026, Advisory Design Panel meeting was adjourned at 12:27 p.m.