

June 4, 2021

Secretary, Standing Policy Committee on Planning, Development and Community Services

Dear Secretary:

**Re: Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee — Civic Conservatory Renewal Options - Update [File No. CK. 710-70]**

The Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee, at its meeting held on June 2, 2021 considered a report of the General Manager, Community Services Division dated June 2, 2021. The Administration provided a presentation and advised the Committee that due to timing of funding applications and wanting to include MHAC input in the application(s), they required feedback from our Committee directly by a letter sent to the Standing Policy Committee on Planning, Development and community Services. As a result of this requested urgency, the Advisory Committee resolved:

That a letter be forwarded to the Standing Policy Committee on Planning, Development and Community Services providing the Committee's feedback regarding possible impacts to the heritage character-defining elements for the options outlined in the report dated June 2, 2021 of the General Manager, Community Services.

The following is a summary of the feedback provided on the options presented.

Overall, of the options presented, no committee member present expressed wanting to see the removal of the Conservatory. Furthermore, no committee member desires to see the conservatory simply remain as status quo with minor upgrades as it does not align with the future development needs of the community this site serves. The Committee views the conservatory as an important part of the overall heritage expression of the original Mendel Art Gallery building and site.

Of the remaining expansion options, some key issues identified through discussion by the committee included:<sup>1</sup>

- Concern in not wanting to see a covered walkway obscure one whole side of the building.

Option 1 – 'Modular' Expansion – 'The Big Egg'

---

<sup>1</sup> A thank you to Archivist O'Brien for sharing his draft notes taken during the MHAC discussion regarding this item on June 2, 2021.

- The 'Big Egg' option as presented may have the most ability to obscure the building. A thoughtful design may be able to mitigate this.
- The "Big Egg" addition is in direct contrast to the physical character-defining elements that define this building. However, the argument can also be made that one of the character-defining elements of the original building was that it was hyper-modern and pushed beyond contemporary design elements. This option also does that, and in that sense reinforces an important design element of the original building.

Option 2 --"Expand' Expansion

The addition in this option resembles the original building and doesn't obscure the south face of the building to the same extent as No. 1 The second option aligns most with the original character and defining elements of the original site.

Option 3 – Restoration and Repair

This is acceptable but it fails to address the needs of the future city. The conservatory should grow.

Option 4 – Restoration Only

This is somewhat acceptable, but we lose space inside the facility owing to accessibility. Also, we don't address the growing needs of the growing City

Option 5 – Permanent Closure/Demolition

Not recommended.

Option 6 – Status Quo

Not recommended.

The Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee respectfully requests that the recommendation be considered.

Regards,



**Lenore Swystun, Chair**  
Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee

LS:ht

cc: General Manager, Community Services Department  
Director, Planning and Development, Community Services Department  
Planning Project Services Manager, Community Services Department