

THE CORPORATION OF THE DISTRICT OF WEST VANCOUVER

**HERITAGE ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING AGENDA
TUESDAY APRIL 16, 2019
3:00 PM IN THE RAVEN ROOM**

Members Present: Paula Grossman, Paul Hundal, Michael Geller, Brenda Clark, Dana Parr, Liane McKenna, Laura Anderson, Annerieke Van Hoek

Members Absent: John Mawson

Council Liaison: Nora Gambioli

Staff Present: Michelle McGuire (Manager of Current Planning & Urban Design)
Erik Wilhelm (Senior Community Planner)
Cindy Mayne (Executive Assistant to the Director of Planning & Development Services)

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 3:06 p.m.

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

A member requested that Committee correspondence be added to agendas. Staff will review and report back to the committee.

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT the Tuesday April 16, 2019 Heritage Advisory Committee meeting agenda be approved as circulated.

CARRIED

3. ADOPTION OF MINUTES

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT the Tuesday March 5, 2019 Heritage Advisory Committee Meeting minutes be adopted as circulated.

CARRIED

4. OTHER ITEMS**4.1 Navy Jack (20 minutes)****Introduction:**

- Staff summarized the memo that had been circulated to the Committee describing the Nature House proposal for the Navy Jack building and the budget survey update. Based on the relatively low support level indicated with the budget survey results, the Nature House proposal is not proceeding at this time. Further consultation and planning work will be conducted by Parks and Facilities staff to determine next steps and potential options for the building. Further, it was noted that the Nature House proposal was based on a heritage conservation assessment and that this document was also forwarded to the Committee for their review.
- Given the time available for discussion on this item Parks and Facilities staff were not in attendance. However, any questions that the Committee raised would be forwarded for response and a staff representative could attend a future meeting for further discussion.
- A member had previously tabled a motion requesting that a heritage assessment and conservation plan be prepared prior to the building being repurposed as the Navy Jack Nature House. Based on the information provided in the staff memo the member withdrew the tabled motion.

Committee Comments:

- A heritage assessment has been done. This is not a full conservation plan. We need to be clear what the features are that need to be protected.
- Councillor Gambioli commented that this is a very important time for this asset, the Navy Jack building has significant heritage value and very few community members are aware of it. Staff have estimated to fix this up as a standard for the public to be able to use it there are significant costs due to accessibility and sea level rise accommodation/requirements. The building needs to be relocated and the total budget will be approximately 2 million dollars to complete the required work. This item was generally not supported in the budget. There was significant work put into develop the nature house proposal and the nature groups involved have worked on this project for six years. The nature groups are generally ok with a using new building and are not tied specifically to the existing house. If this building is going to be saved, there will have to be a significant community interest/advocacy to support this effort.
- The 50.9% is not statistically significant as only 161 people took part in the survey. As well, the survey was difficult to navigate.
- We need to conduct community outreach and communication and let the public know about this heritage building. It is one of the oldest buildings in the lower mainland and we need to educate people about its importance. Developing a conservation plan is premature as this is all up in the air.

Committee Questions:

The committee asked questions and staff responses in *italics* (questions that staff do not have an answer for will be sent to Parks and Facilities staff for response):

- What's the assessed value? *\$2.87 million and the building is \$88,800.*
- Were there other less expensive options that could be considered?
- What maintenance is being done on the house in the meantime? *The agreement the District had with the former resident was he could live there as long as he is alive. The District is not putting money in to it right now.*
- Has parks considered an artisan residence program? An artist could live upstairs and could donate paintings over time. Then you would have continued occupancy, while maintaining the residential use. Emily Carr, would have more information on this.
- Would be helpful for Parks and Facilities staff to discuss the building with the Committee.
- It would be useful to schedule a tour of the house with staff. It has likely been altered over time and it has to be raised due to the flood construction level (FCL), which will alter it again. It would be useful to see the building and how much could be retained, what potential implications seismic upgrading might have and a sense of what the heritage retention option could look like. Without plans showing the restoration plan still have concerns regarding the potential proposal. *There are no specific architectural/building plans as of yet for the potential restoration, based on Donald Luxton's report item 6.2. The rehabilitation strategy option is high level, it includes a second floor, however, the current plan is only for the ground level not to include an upper level.*
- If it is used as an artist's residence, would we have to alter the plans? *Yes, any public use of the building would kick in any of the FCL requirements as well as accessibility requirements. We don't know of the state of the house.*
- The nature groups are disappointed with the budget survey result and the current status of the nature house plan as there has been significant work put into developing the plan to use the building.
- The report says that the building is quite deteriorated and that it has been significantly altered. Staff should protect the building from further deterioration. Give the state of the house need to consider what the actual value of keeping it is? A very small part of the heritage assessment speaks to the heritage significance of the building, the SOS speaks more of the importance of the site. The site for its location is almost more important than the structure itself. It should be reviewed comprehensively for heritage significance to determine the best way to celebrate its history. It is difficult to make houses accessible and this requirement could destroy the character of the house.

ACTION ITEMS: Staff to see if a tour can be set up with parks staff that could include Nature House organization representatives.

4.2 Draft Heritage Framework (45 minutes)

- Staff are proposing to bring forward a council report outlining a heritage framework including the key items listed in the agenda.

- Staff reviewed the resolution from the February 19, 2019 Council meeting regarding additions to the Community Heritage Register and confirmed that the decision to add inventory resources to the register is already decided. The proposed clarification to add the secondary and primary resources as a batch to the register would be brought forward as part of the framework to implement this previous decision.
- Staff are seeking feedback on the key items listed for including on the heritage framework. Are we missing any key items? Any feedback on prioritizing the specific items?

Committee Comments/Questions (staff answers shown in *italics*):

- What would the timeline be for this report and what would the cost be? *The Council report timing is tentatively scheduled for a June Council date. The report would include a budget ask that staff would propose. Staff will provide a draft report to the Committee for review prior to Council consideration.*
- From the Tri Municipal meeting one key strategy from City of North Vancouver was to have an informal review system in place for homeowners to be able to approach city hall with preliminary proposals to help facilitate heritage proposals. *Staff confirmed that the planning department already does have this system for preliminary proposal review. Promoting this review process for heritage projects could be included as part of the outreach program.*
- There are a lot of potential owners that would like to participate in heritage protection. Would advocate community outreach as a priority.
- One member suggested a reordering of the priorities as follows:
 - 4.2.1
 - 4.2.6
 - 4.2.2
 - 4.2.4
 - 4.2.3
- The Committee generally supported this revised priority list.
- Is signage included in the overall program e.g. The welcome to West Vancouver sign? What about cultural heritage, what about stories and memories? *Cultural heritage is included in the overall framework.*
- Having an SOS done on any “at risk” property, could the onus be put on the owner? *There is no ability for staff to legislate that.*
- On Westmap, can you just see support buildings? *Yes.*

Moved and Seconded:

Committee supports a draft heritage framework to be prepared by the planning department outlining costs and staffing to present to Council.

CARRIED

4.3 HRA submission checklist / requirements (10 minutes)

- This list was created in response to discussion at the previous last meeting. Staff want each applicant to prepare a complete package so the committee has what is

needed to make recommendations. This list is similar to what the Design Review Committee uses. Staff are looking for the group to give endorsement on the list.

- A member recommended that the requirements include that the landscape architect be in attendance. Revised wording was suggested to reflect the potential significance of site landscaping. The Committee generally supported the revised wording.

Moved and Seconded:

The committee supports the Heritage Advisory Committee Submission Checklist with the following changes:

The Presentation: add to the second sentence of the presentation bullet on page 1. "It is highly desirable for the projects"

CARRIED

5. APPLICATIONS FOR CONSIDERATION

5.1 Boyd House HRA (60 mins)

Staff Presentation

Erik Wilhelm (Senior Community Planner) introduced the policy, site context and proposal.

Applicant presentation

N. Howell (Heritage consultant), T. Johnson (architect) and B. Harrison (Landscape Architect) further described the proposal including the heritage significance of the house, and the architectural and landscape approach to the design of the project.

Committee Questions:

The Committee asked questions, with the Applicant's team and staff's comments in *italics*:

- Does the FAR 0.93 include basement area? *The 2,800 is the approximate measurement using FAR calculation, it is about 3,500 sq. ft. total with garages excluded.*
- How many square feet would the owner be able to build if they tore the house down? *0.35 FAR about 3200 sq. ft. of net floor area. We are looking at approximately 0.49 FAR in return for protecting the heritage house.*
- When does neighbourhood notification go out? *If council supports the proposal, the neighbourhood would be notified after the council meeting. The applicant has done their own public meeting that the owners hosted prior to submitting the application. Approximately 10 people attended.*
- How tall can coach houses be? *Two stories, much smaller than the existing heritage house, however under existing zoning coach houses have to fit within the maximum 0.35 FAR. There is policy under OCP to consider bonus density for rental coach houses.*
- The recent OCP that was approved - did it consider the area where the subject site is for densification? *There are 3 local area plans anticipated: Taylor Way,*

- *Ambleside and HSB. The site is close to Taylor Way and Ambleside Local Area Plan boundaries but not within either study area. The OCP supported gentle densification strategies for sites across the entire District for gentle densification including small site subdivision and duplex opportunities.*
- *Is there an arborist report? Yes, as part of the application submission. There are 2 large cedars that will have to be removed as they are located within the building footprint. The one that is proposed for saving is about 25 feet in the rear of the yard.*
- *Are there any other trees that are being kept? There are a couple of clusters of trees, shown on sheet A-04. The floating staircase that is going to be built will save some trees.*
- *As it relates to the new garage, you have a flat roof, curious about the view from the north? The application proposes a flat roof partly to maintain views and to be distinct from the Boyd House.*
- *There is a low slope on the existing house, the garage looked fairly boxy, from an entry prospective. Is there an opportunity to have something more architecturally similar to the house for the garage expression? The applicant will review design development to make it fit with the house better.*
- *The roof of the new home, the view that I saw did show the extent of the chimney of that on the roof, this potentially blocks the view, how high up will it be? It will be between 3 and 4 feet above the roof, there will be a section that will be blocked, the view is so wide, we could look at narrowing it down a tad.*
- *Does the Boyd House have sprinklers? You need to read the HRA Bylaw to see damage and destruction. You are obligated to rebuild it, in the event you don't have to rebuild it you have to tear apart the other house. In the event the Heritage house burns down, that is the way it is worded.*
- *With regards to the chimney, how close is it located to the Boyd House and would it be active? There is a fireplace in the living area, mechanical coming from the utility level. This is right at the patio level, wouldn't fumes blow on the patio? The patio exhaust would be located approximately 40 feet to the patio.*
- *Do you know from a code perspective, does it have to be above flute line? It could be located on a wall.*
- *The roof, the planting on the house, how will that look over the long term? The roof planting is provided in mats that perform very well. There are certain mixes we can choose from. Over the winter/fall the plants go relatively dormant and not as green. The height of the planting is approximately 4 inches.*
- *When you were looking at locating the infill house, why was the decision to locate it along the east edge? Did you consider moving the house to the west edge to reduce any view impacts? The grading of the site does not allow for pedestrian access along the east edge of the site.*
- *That chimney is a big piece. It is purposefully in that location, can you look at reducing the chimney? There might be an opportunity to lower it and slightly change the design.*
- *What is the exact distance between the back of the new house and the southerly face of the existing house? It is approximately 12 ft.*
- *In terms of building, why was a zero lot line condition utilized at the rear of the infill house? With no windows proposed at the rear, from a construction prospective, there is no code issue.*

- This slot between the buildings, more of a transition as well as a potential guard rail. Needs to be reviewed further. *We could put a guard rail. With appropriate planting the applicant indicated they felt the transition could work.*
- Are the trees outside the property line being retained? *The applicant is proposing to remove them to deal with a driveway grading issue. District approval is required.*

Committee Comments:

- This is a very handsome scheme, well done. It works because of the topography. Entirely up to the applicant whether you want to keep the chimney. Overall this new house is respectful of the existing house. Design development should be considered for the garage to address comments from the Committee.
- The scheme is very well done, higher density overall if it was a single site, however, due to topography the new house siting and massing works. The presentation did not touch on the small proposed changes to the existing house. The character of the existing house including the open plan is being kept. The changes to the existing house are minimal. I fully support the plan.
- I support the plan, if we didn't provide density, then the heritage house would be torn down. The house would be gone if it went to the open market. I can support the subdivision plan to save this house. I would like to see some internal elements protected, the character defining cinder blocks. I liked the fireplace before the changes. I applaud the owner's upkeep on the house, and I look forward to seeing the plan in place. The fact that it is in a zone where density is supported in the OCP is supportive. Is a supportive way to densify the site by protecting the heritage home.
- For the neighbourhood context you should include some streetscape of both lane and duchess, to show neighbours what this will look like. Most people perspectives from the edges. Very lush now, consider what can be done to give the proposal a soft edge. More study on the garage needed. Should be almost invisible, with more planting. Could consider making it a green wall at the edge. On the south side, be careful of the grading, including stairs outside of the property line. Stairs to street, gives character, if the landscape ties together it will blend in to the neighbourhood. The existing edges are naturalistic, the edges are very important. More views should be reviewed for what the proposal looks like to for a pedestrian. Neighbours might like to see a view of what they will see from the street or the lane.
- The way the plan of the existing yard relates to the roof, it is higher than the garden of the existing house. The house height should drop so it is below the yard. Consider deletion of the slot. The quality of the existing house, should be a natural transition to the infill house. Study the new house, make it smaller, or make it level. I agree with the chimney comments, minimize the roof of the infill house.
- I was a bit surprised by the chimney but I am generally supportive. Should the interior elements be protected? Is it allowed in the HRA?
- This house is a Hollingsworth house, it was dramatically changed in 1977. We are starting off with a house which has been altered. Consider removal of the fireplace addition. We have to be careful to legislate protection of interior elements. Owners will want to make changes. I think it makes sense to allow heritage tours for these houses to be opened to the public where feasible.
- There are not a lot of interior elements that would be considered for protection, the concrete block should remain.

- You hope you do a good job on the design and whoever buys either house will appreciate it.
- To summarize the Committee's comments, everyone generally supports the proposal and thought the applicant did a good job. There were concerns with garage, it should be reviewed. The concrete block element should remain exposed and saved within the interior. There is concern with the transition between the houses. This should be looked at. There was a comment to soften the landscaping edge of the stair to lower and upper elevations. The height of the roof should be lowered to the patio level of the Boyd House.

That the Heritage Advisory Committee support the application subject to further review with staff of the following items:

- Resolve the transition between the Boyd House to infill house,(i.e. The slot);
- Design development to the grade transition from Duchess Avenue to the Boyd House (i.e. The stair);
- Reduce the height of the infill house roof height to be roughly equal to the Boyd House patio;
- Design development to the chimney on infill house to consider view impacts;
- Design development for the architectural design of the garage and to soften the landscape treatment along the lane and consider a sympathetic response to the Boyd House; and
- include protection of the exposed concrete block inside the Boyd House.

It was moved and seconded:

CARRIED

6. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

- The Navy Jack House, more information is that it didn't get survey support because the description of it was it is it would be moved. It wasn't clear that it wasn't going to be coming out of the capital budget, that it was going to be CACs. Several reasons why it didn't get support. Wasn't just John Lawson and Navy Jack that lived there, it was also first nations. Squamish Nation history is also important. The daughter of the chief at the time lived in the house. There is much more to the story and it is quite important. It is the birth place of WV. Whenever you consider heritage do you consider the five categories of heritage? Will pass along the 5 key categories of heritage to the Committee. It would be nice if you can introduce people before they present, e.g. have the applicant introduce themselves and add it to the agenda. Public can speak at end of the items not only at end of topics for Committees. You can add correspondence to your agendas.

7. NEXT MEETINGS

Proposed meeting date of May 7, 2019 to be confirmed by e-mail. The Committee agreed to start meetings at 4pm.

8. ADJOURNMENT

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT the April 16, 2019 Heritage Advisory Committee meeting be adjourned.

CARRIED

The meeting adjourned at 6:22 p.m.



Paula Grossman, CHAIR



Michelle McGuire, STAFF LIAISON