

**THE CORPORATION OF THE DISTRICT OF WEST VANCOUVER
HERITAGE ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
MAIN FLOOR CONFERENCE ROOM
THURSDAY JUNE 25, 2020**

Committee Members: P. Grossman; L. Anderson; P. Hundal; D. Parr, A. Van Hoek, J. Mawson; M. Geller; and B. Clark. Absent: L. McKenna

Council Liaison: N. Gambioli.

Staff: M. McGuire, Staff Liaison; C. Mayne, Committee Clerk.

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 4:10 p.m.

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT the June 25, 2020 Heritage Advisory Committee meeting agenda be amended by:

- Adding Heritage site updates
- HAC Workplan
- Klee Wyck

AND THAT the agenda be approved as amended.

CARRIED

3. NAVY JACK - SUMMARY OF COMMUNITY CONSULTATION AND PROPOSED NEXT STEPS

Anne Mooi, Director of Parks, Culture and Community Services, and Donna Powers, Director of Community Relations and Communications, provided a power point presentation regarding the Navy Jack Nature Centre and community consultation results.

Committee Questions:

The committee directed questions to the presenters, with staff responses in *italics*.

Why was the committee not consulted prior to the decision to demolish the house and why was the decision made in a closed Council meeting?

Council received the same information as the Committee regarding the public engagement process and the results were generally not supportive of funding the Nature House proposal. Council made the decision in closed Council under section 90 of the Community Charter because the site is District-owned. The next steps are to determine potential commemoration initiatives for the site and location in

2020/01/21

collaboration with members of the committee and Tsleil-Waututh, Musqueam and Squamish First Nations.

Was a heritage report completed for the house and site? Can you please resend this to the committee? I think the word deconstruct is interesting and provides an opportunity.

Yes, Don Luxton completed a report in 2017 and this was provided to the committee last year.

If there was funding available would Council's decision be different?

It would cost 2.3 million dollars to refurbish the house and move it, and that was a question on the survey. It would cost 1.7 million to replicate the house. All the options in terms of funding were generally not supported when we heard from the public.

Is there a possibility to have someone else take possession of it and restore it?

The house is in poor condition; it has been renovated so many times that it is likely not possible to move it to another site.

The District will use a heritage expert to see if anything from the house can be repurposed. Would like to engage the committee with other partners to determine what we can do to reuse any salvageable items.

ACTION ITEM: Staff to recirculate the Don Luxton report to the group.

What was the response regarding potential commemoration from First Nations and Streamkeepers? I am surprised this question was not already asked. Concerned that Council did not have all the relevant information prior to making a decision. The District's track record for maintaining and managing District owned heritage assets is very poor. Many examples: the lack of maintenance of Klee Wyck, the ferry building rotting out, etc. It is unfortunate and poor public relations. How can the District, through its heritage policies and with the Committee request that private citizens maintain and protect their heritage assets when the municipality has not. The District should be taking a leadership role.

Staff will consult with both First Nations and Streamkeepers representatives regarding potential commemoration of the house and site following the upcoming Council report on July 20, 2020 summarizing the public consultation results.

The house itself is one of the oldest structures in the Lower Mainland and has such historical significance. More should be done to consider protection.

The first survey was confusing as to where the funding was coming from. Was that addressed in the recent consultation?

The first survey was limited to budget considerations. The Navy Jack proposal was relatively high in terms of necessary finding compared to the other initiatives that the survey asked about. Generally the results favoured lower priced options. The subsequent Navy Jack consultation just focussed on the options for the Nature House proposal and provided robust information regarding the options and funding source.

Can the committee see results of the survey?

Yes, we will be reporting out fully in terms of engagement, they will be available July 9.

Can we have a tour of the house?

Facilities staff previously indicated that due to the building condition a tour is not possible. Staff will follow up with Facilities staff to confirm. Perhaps someone can go in and take photos.

Who will be involved in determining potential commemoration initiatives?

Representatives from the Public Art Committee, Heritage Advisory Committee and First Nations communities. There are grants available, if doing something jointly and honoring the site. Staff will bring together the representatives to form a group that will determine a commemoration approach.

Surprised that the decision was already made. Thought there would be more discussion prior to such a significant decision being made. With such a low response rate for the consultation feel the results are not really representative of the West Vancouver public. Generally speaking consultation regarding funding for these types of initiatives is not going to be supported. Disappointed in the decision.

This is a loss to the District. Based on the previous staff presentation and the Luxton report the building is not in good shape. The Luxton report indicated that there were hardly any original features left. Understandable that there would be huge costs needed to bring it up to standards and continue to maintain. Share the disappointment of the Committee, however, these budgetary decisions are difficult especially during current times of reduced budgets. It is a good lesson that one of the reasons that this building was so expensive to upgrade as it is in such disrepair. We need to identify current or future heritage resources and consider a program so that we don't get into this state with other buildings.

I did not support the budget necessary for the retention option. Believe that the location on the waterfront will likely add more cost due to the need to plan for flooding and sea level rise. Do wonder if there was the potential to move the house. The decision has been made.

P. Hundal put forward a motion:

THAT the Heritage Advisory Committee express its deep disappointment that the Committee was not consulted prior to Council decision regarding the future of the Navy Jack building.

CARRIED

N. Gambioli – The Committee meeting that occurred last year where staff presented the options for the Nature House was intended to get feedback from the Committee. As well, the intent was that the Committee members and various heritage network

2020/01/21

representatives would participate. I am profoundly disappointed with the results of the consultation and the decision as well. The District has not done a good job of maintaining heritage assets or other District asset. Recent budget decisions have brought in an asset levy which is enabling us to maintain the structures we own, that is only 4 years ago though. For many years before no funding was available for maintenance and taxes were not increased. This goes back decades, we have done a terrible job in the past, and we are now making progress.

The intent of the group of representatives will be to work on commemoration on the site with the goal to bring back options to council with the recommended approach.

Is the commemoration going to include the other past uses of the house or will it be specifically devoted to First Nations history of the site?

It will be everything.

Staff would like volunteers from this committee to join the group to determine an approach to commemoration of the house and site.

Paul Hundal and Brenda Clark volunteered to join the group.

4. Klee Wyck Plant Staging

L. Anderson provided the following summary:

Klee Wyck is an iconic site. There is the potential for using Klee Wyck to stage plant reclamation on the site. The idea came about through the Local Voices program. We spoke to the granddaughter of the original owner she has some wonderful photographs. Proposing that the Committee should write a letter of support for the concept.

A, Mooi - To be included with the staff report a letter should be sent in the next couple of days.

Is there concern for people bringing their personal plants that might be infected with weeds? Is there an example of where it has been done before?

The following motion was proposed:

THAT the committee agrees to write a letter of support for staging plants at Klee Wyck.

CARRIED

5. HAC WORKPLAN

The letter to property owners and residents on the heritage register was sent out that was intended to provide general information about potential incentives available for

2020/01/21

heritage retention and to correct misinformation that was circulating by the anonymous letter that was sent. That was the first step. We need to look through the workplan and prioritize work items.

Staff did receive replies from some residents asking to be removed from the list and others asking what options they might have. We have provided site-specific information to owners who have requested. Unfortunately, with the new budget due to the COVID 19 pandemic, the heritage planner has not been funded.

One key priority is identifying houses which are not yet on the register and do not have SOSs. Once we have that supplementary list a letter could be drafted outlining the potential incentive options available. J. Mawson volunteered to work on identifying houses not on register.

Another key priority is reaching out to real estate agents. For this a different type of information package is needed to help with encouraging how to market houses for renovation or HRA's instead of demolition.

Staff mentioned there is a realtor who specializes in this for mid-century modern homes. Staff will reach out to him to see if he could attend a HAC meeting.

ACTION ITEM: Staff to ask realtor Trent Rodney to attend a meeting and provide a brief presentation to the group.

ACTION ITEM: P. Grossman and M. McGuire volunteered to work on drafting the letter to be sent to realtors.

M. McGuire noted that we have a staff resource issue. If there are members that are willing to take on discreet pieces of the workplan that will be very helpful.

J. Mawson mentioned reaching out to the chair of the Neighbourhood Character Working Group, as he is a realtor and could help us reach out to the broader group.

M. Gellar volunteered to help get names and create a list.

The two key priorities from the workplan are:

1. Create a list of heritage assets not yet identified, not only buildings, consider other heritage assets. Request help from the North Shore Heritage Preservation Society. After the list is compiled it should be presented to Council for consideration to be added to the Community Heritage Register.

2. Work on the letter to real estate agents.

M. Gellar confirmed that he was willing to put together case studies to help realtors and owners.

L. Anderson reported out on the recent Local Voices presentation including the neighbourhood character working group discussion.

6. HERITAGE PROJECT UPDATES

Binning House - Staff sent a letter to the owner informing them of various items that needed to be dealt with to be in compliance with the heritage designation and maintenance bylaws. Building staff and planning staff have been working together to move this forward.

One member observed the site and that one of the terrace walls was being deconstructed.

Staff will request an inspection of the site to confirm all construction activity is in compliance with the relevant bylaws..

4441 Piccadilly North – staff have not received an updated package to bring back to the Committee yet.

Forrest Residence (1143 Eyremount) – negotiations and discussions are ongoing.

7. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

No members of the public were present.

8. NEXT MEETING

We are looking at keeping the July 21, 2020 meeting, waiting to see if the Ferry Building is ready to come to the committee.

9. ADJOURNMENT

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the **June 25, 2020 Heritage Advisory** Committee Meeting (open session) be adjourned at 6:04.

CARRIED

Certified Correct:

Chair

Committee Clerk

2020/01/21