

**THE CORPORATION OF THE DISTRICT OF WEST VANCOUVER
HERITAGE ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
ELECTRONIC MEETING
WEDNESDAY, APRIL 28, 2021**

Committee Members: P. Grossman; P. Hundal; M. Geller; H. Nesbitt,; J. Mawson, L. Anderson
Absent: D. Parr; J. McDougall; B. Clark; Councillor S.Thompson

Council Liaison: S. Thompson

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

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 4:34 p.m.

RECOMMENDATION

WHEREAS the March 24, 2021 Order of the Provincial Health Officer on Gatherings and Events ("order") prohibits members of the public from attending committee meetings in-person until the order is rescinded or replaced;

WHEREAS the District of West Vancouver is required to prohibit in-person attendance at committee meetings pursuant to the order; and

WHEREAS the District of West Vancouver has enabled public participation at committee meetings via electronic means to ensure openness, transparency, accessibility and accountability, including via the use of live streaming (video and audio) for public viewing, and electronic communication facilities (video-conferencing software) for public participation;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the APRIL 28, 2021 meeting be held without in-person public attendance.

CARRIED

Request to members: Please update your availability when Cindy sends out the invite for Committee meetings.

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT the April 28, 2021 Heritage Advisory Committee meeting agenda be approved with the following amendment:

Add Item #5: Appointing a HAC member to the Lower Caulfield Advisory Committee.

CARRIED

3. ADOPTION OF MEETING MINUTES

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT the March 31, 2021 minutes be adopted.

CARRIED

4. NAVY JACK HOUSE OPTIONS MARK CHAN, DEPUTY CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER / DIRECTOR OF CORPORATE SERVICES UPDATE & DON LUXTON, DONALD LUXTON & ASSOCIATES

Mark Chan introduced Don Luxton and reviewed the three potential scenarios for the Navy Jack House.

As directed by Council the District is proceeding with feasibility analysis (considering factors such as size, siting, access, integration with John Lawson Park and the Spirit Trail, cost, funding sources, rent revenue and commercial interest) based on a full time commercial use (food and beverage establishment) for the House, for two scenarios:

1. a smaller ground floor footprint based generally on the original form (approx. 800 to 1,000 sq. ft.); and
2. a larger ground floor footprint based on the original form plus an approximate 1,400 sq. ft. addition;

and a third scenario suggested by the citizen group of a coffee shop and gift shop area (approx. 800 sq. ft.) that could also be used for multi-use purposes (including: heritage exhibit space, local art/craft sales, education, concerts, etc.), with a 1,000 sq. ft. annex building to the south connected by a breezeway of approx. 400 sq. ft.

Don Luxton reviewed his report from January 2021 and went on to summarize the key findings. It was pretty clear that what we expected of the house was buried inside the later additions. We didn't know exactly what we would find until the walls and wall coverings were removed. The demolition was done very carefully. Nothing got removed that should have been retained. We uncovered a very fragile building, which we would expect given its age (circa 1872). We found a large amount of original material in the upper floor and original siding. The roof framing was not altered as well as the shingles. This was fantastic evidence. We struggled in terms of recommendations with respect to the 2nd floor as it would be almost impossible to use the second floor if standard building code upgrades were applied. We don't want to destroy that evidence. Given that the ground level is not intact as all the original walls were taken out, there is opportunity for it to be rebuilt and made into a functional space. The ground floor can be rebuilt in a way that's functional and usable and even up to code. The intent would be for the front and side façades to be restored to original. We have physical and documentary evidence to achieve that. The opportunity for expansion of the interior space is at the rear of the building, it does not have historic value and can be rebuilt. My advice is for an addition to the rear of the building that would be contemporary in its design and distinguishable from the original. In terms of the specific preferred option consideration needs to be given for the long term preservation and maintenance. A commercial use will generate more

income for maintenance of the building than a public use, and allow the public to come into the building, be up close and see it. If the commercial use option is chosen an addition is needed to have enough space for a functional commercial use. This can be added to the back of the building. A food and beverage use will need a loading bay, commercial kitchen, but it's all doable like the Boothroyd House and is done regularly. You also see community uses done regularly but don't expect them to generate their keep because revenue potential is too loose.

The committee went on to question the presenter and staff, with the presenter and staffs comments in *italics*.

Appreciate the overview of the work, incredibly exciting. This is a building that has been cocooned and preserved. You mention the upper floor and how generally intact it is. In the scenario where we leave the upper floor intact and focus on main floor, are you suggesting the two front and back gable extensions be removed?

One of the things that is quite apparent as you see in my report on page 12 - The original shingling, the front dormer was on top, 1872 building was a side gabled structure very similar to page 7 of my report. We anticipate the dormer was not original, we have documentary evidence that it was there. If we want to restore to the timeframe when the photos were taken (1910/1912) we would put dormer back. The rear gable we are not as clear on. Whether or not there was a dormer? On page 12 of report the original roof line is cut at the back, there was an 8 ft. addition that appears to be original, probably no dormer. The cooking part of the house would have been in the back. If we could see the house in 1872 we would see a side with no dormers, 2 windows, probably a stairway up, sleeping area finished with tongue and groove plank.

Support the work to date and recommendations. Could we avoid the upgrade to the code if the 2nd floor was used as office space?

The 2nd floor won't be usable if we preserve the building. You would need accessibility like an elevator. If you look at roof slope and amount of headroom, there's not much useable square footage. Anything you do to insulate it to bring it to a reasonable envelope will not allow us to preserve the top floor. Our envelope consultants won't let us do that. The value is really on the ground level, and we're not constrained there so it's a great opportunity. The 2nd floor preserved as is. The ground floor can bring the value, so you just slide in this layer of use and allow for the "heritage hat" to be maintained.

If there will be a new roof, are you saying the 2nd storey would stay "as is", and how could that 2nd storey area not be upgraded?

It can stay "as is" by not using the upper level floor space (for occupancy). You can rebuild and replicate the roof and stabilize the walls. The issue is if you try and upgrade the 2nd storey you would pull the siding off and you will lose 50% of the original heritage material. It will not be the same building.

What is the difference between the 2 first options?

With the first option the implication of not having an addition would limit the usability. You would only get 800 sq. ft. for a commercial use. That's a very small footprint for any kind of use. After installing accessible washrooms there is very little space left. The rear of the building is suited to have an addition and it then leaves the front of the house available for restoring. The rear was generally functional anyway. We often say go to the rear of the building for restorations, don't try to go to top or side. In this case, it could be either a breezeway or an extrusion but a breezeway is less functional. The addition could be contemporary, very simple, it could be wood frame, heavy timber coming off the back of the house. 1400 sf doesn't sound unreasonable if designed properly. The design to meet the Standards & Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada would require the addition to be subordinate, compatible and distinct to the heritage building which can be accommodated with a single storey addition at 1400 sq. ft. using timber construction.

Did you have any requirements/recommendations for storytelling about the history and architecture of the site and building?

Our report was a physical investigation, however, the story is awesome. The intersection of European and First Nation history. The work that the citizen's group did was very impressive to research the history of the building. The story is very important and should be considered when developing the project scope.

The Navy Jack citizen group completed thorough research. West Vancouver Historic Society has continued to research the story of the house. As Don said the story of the people who lived at the house is significant in terms of the intersection with European and First Nations history. Other families lived in the house as well who made contributions to West Vancouver which is also important.

The architecture of the house Don spoke to in its earlier forms tells us about the house and history. The citizen group anticipated whatever the use would be that some exhibit space would be an opportunity to display the history of the house. The opportunity for public use is that it could be used for story telling. This house was in a local environment as part of the foreshore that had been a part of First Nations life. The Streamkeepers have an important adjacent project for the creek. The intersection of the built and natural environment are an important consideration for the overall site.

There are other opportunities in the landscape for the overall potential restoration. The key is to rescue the building right now, however, the context is extraordinary. The landscaping will be critical.

This is a significant opportunity and we want to share and tell the story and engage with First Nations. Council is still investigating this now and doing a feasibility analysis. Once the feasibility study is completed Council will review and decide on the selected option to proceed with which would allow for further work and development of the project to be initiated.

One major issue is that it is generally for heritage projects it is easier to get capital money for restoration (and ribbon cutting ceremonies) than it is to have revenue for ongoing operating costs and maintenance. So we often see white elephants that people raise money for but then can't be sustained. You don't want to go through all this work, then have to shut down because you can't keep it open. Secondly, if the building isn't used, it won't be heated, lit and maintained. So you have to have an active use. A community museum would be very challenging for financial sustainability. A commercial use can generate a tenant, an interest, and keep the building sustained. With the significant effort and funding necessary to initially deliver these projects consideration for long term maintenance is critical to ensure that the facility is protected in perpetuity. Revenue to sustain the long term maintenance is important.

Support the comments and advice provided. A gift shop will likely not generate significant revenue year round. Whereas a food and beverage facility would be very popular in this prime location. It would be an appropriate accessory use of the park. A gift shop would not work. Share the concerns about scenario 3. It was concerning that one of the Councillors said the capital costs/investment should be considered on the basis of generating a return. The building has significant value to the community beyond strict monetary value.

For a potential operator it would likely not work to require them to pay for the restoration in exchange for use of the facility. There are other sources of funding for the initial capital work required for restoration.

For comparison, will the proposed arts centre cover its own costs?

The District will likely use CACs or a loan for that project although it is still very much a work in progress. The way I would interpret the comment from one of Council regarding funding is that if the District puts in 2 million (for example) would we be able to recoup this investment over the long term. This would be evaluated through the feasibility study. Right now as part of feasibility work, I am speaking to the restaurant industry. We have a phenomenal location with a great story. The ground floor is a blank canvas and with an addition you could have a great opportunity. An idea for how the business case could be structured would be to lease with a specific restaurant operator for a long period (e.g. 25 years) with the operator putting up all or most of the capital cost. The rent could be then set over the contract period to allow for revenue sharing for the District to offset the capital cost over time.

The costs for the overall project can be kept down with a simple addition. Wood frame construction without the need for elevators. If the costs are reasonable it is like building a shell building and getting the tenant to move in. It should not be an overly complex addition or restoration. The relative simplicity works in its favor.

Members discussed the motion and agreed on the following:

THAT HAC fully support the direction that staff is taking on the work for the Navy Jack House under the continued guidance of Donald Luxton.

THAT HAC generally supports a full time food and beverage operation as an appropriate use for the site along with an addition of approximately 1400 sq.ft. to the rear as it represents the most viable long term option for restoration of the Navy Jack House.

CARRIED

5. HERITAGE ADVISORY REPRESENTATIVE ON THE LOWER CAULFEILD ADVISORY COMMITTEE (LCAC)

The Terms of Reference were updated for the LCAC to include a HAC member on the committee. There is not a large time commitment with this committee.

P. Hundal would be interested in joining the committee as the HAC representative.

The Committee discussed and requested that the call out be sent to the whole group and give everyone absent an opportunity to volunteer.

6. HERITAGE PROJECT UPDATES

Michelle provided two updates to the Committee:

- The Dawson House was subdivided and has been sold separately. The District has received a demolition permit for the house.
- Council approved the temporary 60 day protection of 466 Hillcrest and that is currently in place.

The Dawson House is such a fabulous house. Can they relocate it? Is there a similar lot somewhere?

The owner had indicated that they have looked at options and that it would be extremely difficult if not impossible to relocate.

7. WORKPLAN UPDATE

Staff are pleased to announce that we have hired Erika Syvokas into the Community Planner position that will be dedicated to heritage work for 50% of the position. Erika has significant planning experience in West Vancouver having worked on a variety of development, heritage and policy projects over her time with the department. We are working to backfill Erika's previous position so there will be a transition period before Erika can be 50% dedicated to the heritage portfolio. Erika will join us at our next meeting.

Staff have updated the last version of the workplan that everyone reviewed at the previous meeting to make changes based on the comments and emails received from members. The Committee discussed and it was agreed to hold off on a more fulsome discussion of the workplan until Erika can attend.

One member asked about how to add items to the workplan. One idea was related the creation of an inventory of cairns, plaques, signs, water fountains, pocket parks and gardens for adding to the landscape and cultural identified resources list. Recently at Point Atkinson there has been a rash of vandalism and there is a lot of concern from people in the area. Could consider having a discussion at a future Committee meeting about the long terms plans for Point Atkinson.

The workplan item regarding an inventory of cairns, plaques, signs, etc. has been added. At some point we will present our workplan to Council who will then consider it for approval. Until that time the document is living and things can be added keeping in mind the Committee's mandate as set out in the Terms of Reference.

8. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

C. Reynolds discussed the wording of the motion for Navy Jack and wanted confirmation that the support for food and beverage operation was stated as "general". We shouldn't shut the door to being open on other suggestions.

9. NEXT MEETING

Thursday, May 27, 2021

If all the members could please reply with availability when the meeting invite is sent so we can make sure we have quorum.

10. ADJOURNMENT

Adjourned at 6:20 pm.



Paula Grossman, CHAIR



Michelle McGuire, STAFF LIAISON