

**THE CORPORATION OF THE DISTRICT OF WEST VANCOUVER
HERITAGE ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
VIA ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATION FACILITIES
WEDNESDAY, MARCH 30, 2022**

Committee Members: P. Grossman (Co-Chair), B. Clark (Co-Chair), S. Abri, L. Anderson, M. Geller, A. Hatch, P. Hundal, J. Mawson; and Councillor S. Thompson attended the meeting via electronic communication facilities.

Staff: E. Syvokas, Community Planner (Staff Liaison) and J. Suggitt, Executive Assistant (Committee Clerk) attended the meeting via electronic communications facilities.

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 4:29 p.m.

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT the March 30, 2022 Heritage Advisory Committee meeting agenda be approved as circulated.

CARRIED

3. ADOPTION OF MINUTES

Committee Comments:

- Concerns were raised that the minutes from the last Committee meeting were too extensive and too much to read.
- Some Committee members found the notes comprehensive and appreciated the ability to go back to previous meeting minutes in detail.
- It was suggested there may be an advantage to having the Committee meeting recorded and potentially keeping the video on the District of West Vancouver website for the public to watch for those who cannot attend the meeting. Some Committee members expressed concerns with confidentiality, not being able to speak freely if meetings are recorded and documented in a high level of detail, despite the meeting being open to the public and concerns were raised that this may diminish the quality of the Committee's discussion and ability to give input.

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT the February 22, 2022 Heritage Advisory Committee meeting minutes be adopted as circulated.

CARRIED

REPORTS / ITEMS

4. Preliminary Heritage Revitalization Agreement Proposal for 1591 Haywood Avenue

Project Overview: E. Syvokas provided a brief introductory presentation describing the property location and context, the existing buildings on the site including the “Clegg House”, and the proposed redevelopment of the site. Staff requested the Committee’s comments on issues related to site development (including, setbacks, density, tree retention, vehicle access and parking), compatibility of the architectural design with the Clegg House, appropriateness of the proposal in relation to character defining elements of the Clegg House, and the fit of the proposed developments within the established neighbourhood character, and within the site and relationship to the Clegg House.

Project Presentation: Meghan and Darrin DeCosta (Property Owners), Colin Hogan, of Focus Architecture and André Lessard of Dewhirst Lessard Consulting further described the proposal including the heritage value of the Clegg House and the architectural approach to the design of the project as follows:

- The Clegg House was identified as a heritage support building and the primary value of the house is in the style, age and contribution to the neighbourhood and its development and relationship to the Clegg family.
- There are several elements defining the style of the house: Craftsman style with roof brackets, the original windows and cladding, and massing of the house. The conservation plan goes through the elements one by one and most are proposed to be preserved. As the house is to be moved, certain elements such as the front porch and back porch will be altered and restored. Windows will have to be removed but the wood frames will be retained and most of the sashes restored, and all material/cladding will be preserved and salvaged. One element missing on the drawing set are the knee brackets which will be reinstated. The foundation can be improved with seismic mitigation and the house will be on a much better foundation. The owners have agreed to reinstate the original divisions of the windows and will reinstate the exterior shaft of the chimney, which is an important feature of the Craftsman style and will be preserved. The back porch will also be altered. Rehabilitation of the damaged pieces will be replaced by matching material which will bring back the original style and value of the house.
- Displayed the proposed site plan with reorganization of the site; relocating the Clegg House to the south, not changing orientation with the front door continuing to face 16th Street. Proposal to subdivide the lot with a new infill dwelling and garage on the northern lot and the Clegg House and new garage with suite above on the southern lot. An overall FAR of 0.38 is proposed.
- Displayed site sections showing that 16th Street slopes from north to south. The current basement ceiling is very low (6 ft.) and as such is not liveable. The proposal gives a taller basement without changing the relationship to grade; not lifting the house up, basement is being pushed further down into the ground.
- Displayed coloured streetscape plans showing the relationship of the proposed 3 buildings on 16th Street which shows existing height of Clegg House and showing it being moved down the hill and giving space between it the garage and the new house.

- Displayed the existing floorplan showing a typical 3 bedroom layout into and a single bath in the upstairs level. The proposal is to modernize the floorplan by adding a master bath.
- Displayed proposed floor plans with the addition of an ensuite bathroom by adding two dormers to the house. On the main floor, reorganizing the back end of the house with a mudroom space, kitchen and dining room to make it more conducive to modern living. The proposal has a new foundation to modernize the layout and gain ceiling height in the basement.
- Displayed proposed elevations of the Clegg House. The colours of the house shown with white siding with blue trim are not original colours. The heritage consultant provided a palette of colours that are proposed to be appropriate. The west elevation will remain as-is with the exception of replacing windows in keeping with traditional vertically oriented Craftsman style windows. The south elevation shows a new element above the living room window on the left, the proposed dormer in the master bedroom allows more space in the attic for the ensuite.
- Displayed detached garage plans showing the garage set back from the Clegg House to not compete with its position on the site. The design is sympathetic but not a copy of the house with a similar pattern of Clegg House windows but with less ornamentation, and slightly muted colour scheme. A small studio suite is proposed on top of the garage.
- Displayed view from 16th Street with Clegg House relocated still in a prominent location on the site, new garage pushed back, the existing hedge will be revised to provide driveway access and aligned with a new walkway location.
- Displayed view from Haywood Avenue showing the new dormer and trees along Vinson Creek.
- The most visible addition is the south elevation dormer which is quite compatible on the house. The Clegg house will not have the same commanding position that it currently has but it will have a similar position with respect to the corner which is the most important aspect of the house. The relationship with the creek is very important and the relocated house doesn't have the same directness to the creek but still has the view and it's compatible with the environment.

Committee Questions and Comments:

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

- A committee member commented that they are supportive of the proposal. What changes were made in response to neighbourhood concerns? *Response: Concerns raised regarding the original proposal were related to the density proposed, insufficient parking (although exceeded minimum requirement by the District), the provision of street parking on 16th Street (impacts to emergency vehicle access), the impact of a commercial bed and breakfast use on traffic and neighbourhood character, and potential view impacts. The proposal was revised to address these concerns by reducing the density of the project by removing a dwelling unit (a coach house was proposed to be where the parking pad is now proposed off of Haywood Avenue), adding additional off-street parking,*

removing the request for a bed and breakfast use, and moving the proposed location of the existing house to protect view lines.

- **Will all the trees be saved?** *Response: We are waiting for the results of an arborist report. There are two trees of concern, an unhealthy Dogwood and a Cedar that is close to the house. The Cedar may be used for siding and material for the house as it is large enough that there is sufficient timber to be used for siding and flower boxes.*
- **What would a typical FAR increase be for heritage projects? 10%?** *Staff response: Of the 6 Heritage Revitalization Agreement projects approved, they range from 0.3 to 0.67 but this depends on specific site context and neighbouring context and type of proposal.*
- **Is the proposed cladding of the Clegg House to remain in situ?** *Response: Generally the preference is to keep as much of the original material as possible.*
- **What evidence is there of the options for the colour palette shown in the conservation plan being available in Vancouver during this time period, particularly the blue and purple colours?** *Response: The colour palette proposed is that from the building's construction period (1929). The conservation plan describes evidence of the original colours of the house.*
- **Supportive of the proposal; the neighbourhood has heritage character and this proposal would fit right in.**
- **Vinson Creek, what is the nature of the bank?** *Response: The bank has had some retaining wall work, has a beach entry, large stones and rocks in the flood plain. The proposal includes removal of the existing garage within 5 metres of top of bank of the watercourse, as well as removal of hardscaping within 15 metres of top of bank of the watercourse. The benefit to the riparian zone is 7 square metres of net habitat gain. There are a lot of invasive plants, which will be removed and replanted with native species. Is there sun exposure?*
Response: some sun at the creek edge, the northern bank not as much as the southern bank.
- **How will someone differentiate between the new buildings and the heritage building in the future?** *Response: The proposed infill buildings are compatible with the Clegg House. The design of the new buildings can be simplified or modified further to differentiate from the Clegg House. The challenge is to balance to how close we can come to that style but not replicate it.*
- **Respect the neighbourhood's concerns but don't compromise too much as the project needs to be financial viable. The designer and architect have done a good job. The Committee has been talking about the bed and breakfast idea to encourage people to conserve heritage properties.**
- **Supportive of the proposal; would help families age in place. Interested to see the landscaping plan to see if it is compatible with the proposed density.**
- **The proposed location of the Clegg House closer to the street and corner in combination with the proposed colour palette may be too overpowering on the streetscape. A lighter colour palette might be helpful. Agree with the comment**

that you don't want to compromise too much and make the project unviable from a business case perspective.

- It may be warranted to discuss other incentives such as waiving application fees and streamlining heritage applications so that applicants aren't bearing all of the costs and time before getting final approval.
- I disagree this is an excellent proposal overall but have the following comments: the new infill buildings are creating a false sense of heritage; the infill buildings should be physically and visually compatible, subordinate and distinguishable from the heritage building; support additional density; the front setback for the Clegg House should be increased to at least 20 ft. to help preserve the character; would like to see evidence of the proposed colour palette used in Vancouver. More thought needs to be put in on the colour scheme; and the rear deck on the Clegg House could be a new expression (was not original).
- A further discussion regarding whether replica heritage is better or worse is needed.
- The garage needs to be more subordinate to the house. In favour of incorporating another heritage building on site. Consider a way to differentiate the new from the old; colour can help. Keep the setback from street for main house.

Having reviewed the application and heard the presentation provided by the Applicant:

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT the Heritage Advisory Committee thanks the applicant team for their presentation, generally views favourably the direction being taken, and that the applicant consider the comments raised at this meeting before coming back with a formal application.

CARRIED

A. Hatch voted in the negative

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT a full discussion regarding accepted practices for complementing heritage buildings with new development be scheduled for a future committee meeting.

CARRIED

5. 2021 Annual Committee Evaluation

E. Syvokas provided an update on the 2021 evaluation results as follows:

- The annual committee evaluation survey was circulated to the committee in December 2021. In response to the Committee's request, the evaluation was reopened on February 23, 2022 and remained open until March 11, 2022.
- Based on feedback received, in future, evaluations will take place in November instead of December.
- Two additional evaluations were received for a total of 4 respondents.

- The survey is intended to help inform ongoing meeting planning by identifying strengths and gaps.
- The main concern identified was the difficulty in achieving quorum and the impact that had on the Committee's effectiveness. Responses indicate that Committee members understand and are able to carry out their role effectively, the Committee is functioning well, communication is improving with internal and external stakeholders, the Chair is effective in their role, and meetings are effective and have a clear purpose.
- A few suggestions for more effective meetings include, using a briefing note approach which is circulated as part of the agenda package to provide sufficient background information to facilitate decision-making at meetings and using a Gantt chart approach to breaking down steps, allocating resources and monitoring progress for work plan items.

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT the results regarding 2021 Annual Committee Evaluation be received for information.

CARRIED

6. Public Engagement Initiative to Identify Heritage Resources

E. Syvokas provided an update on the Public Engagement Initiative to Identify Heritage Resources as follows:

- The suggestion form was available for 3 weeks with a deadline for completion on March 15.
- The initiative was well promoted on social media, on posters, on the District's website, WestvancouverITE, and e-west newsletter and promoted by various community groups. It also received media attention with an article in the North Shore News. Staff discussed extending the deadline with Communications staff and was advised extending the deadline would not have an impact.
- There were 35 online submissions, 3 email submissions and one paper form received. Submissions included buildings, structures, landscape features and cultural assets. There were multiple submissions for Ambleside Park and the Clyde McRae monument on Ambleside beach. One interesting submission was for a buried skateboard park. The West Coast Modern League and the North Shore Heritage Preservation Society provided a list of previously unidentified Lewis Construction Company post and beam homes. Finally, a suggestion was made to add a list of coves.

Committee Questions and Comments:

- Does the list of homes submitted become part of the public record that the public can search? The list included all the names of homeowners and there may be privacy concerns if it becomes part of the public record. *Staff response: the list has only been circulated to the Committee. It is up to the Committee to determine what the next steps are for reviewing the suggestions.*
- Pleased to see the excerpt (list of bays, coves, beaches etc.) from the book "Cottages to Community", by The West Vancouver Historical Society. It is one of

the foundations of our heritage landmark inventory that was brought to the Committee.

- At the January meeting, D. Niedermayer (Senior Manager, Cultural Services) had indicated that the Parks Department staff could provide a list of benches and plaques. Is there an update? What is the next step? Can the asset working group compile the lists? Suggest moving this to the next meeting to discuss the various lists to be compiled including the list of houses from West Coast Modern League with the names removed.

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT the results regarding Public Engagement Initiative to Identify Heritage Resources be received for information and that discussion continue at the next committee meeting and that the property owners' names be redacted from the list of Lewis homes.

CARRIED

P. Grossman left the meeting at 6:22 p.m. and did not return. B. Clark assumed the role of Chair.

7. Heritage Project Updates

E. Syvokas provided an update as follows:

- Four doorknobs salvaged from the Klee Wyck park site are being offered to Dr. Ethlyn Trapp's family. If the family does not want to keep the doorknobs, there is an option for them to be used for the potentially restored gatehouse or used somewhere else on site.
- Gentles Cottage 4441 Piccadilly North: the Committee reviewed a Heritage Revitalization Agreement proposal for the site in 2019. Following lack of support from the neighbourhood, the HRA proposal was abandoned by the developer. The applicant has pursued and received approval for a 3 lot subdivision with variances to the Zoning Bylaw to allow the Gentles Cottage to remain. The good news is that the heritage resource will be retained, although not in perpetuity.
- A demolition permit has been received for 458 Southborough Drive. This is the "Hall Residence" designed by Ron Thom and listed in the District's Heritage Inventory as a support building. Staff will be seeking a 60 day temporary protection order from Council to allow time for staff to contact the owner to discuss alternative options for the property in exchange for legal protection. The report will be considered by Council on April 11.

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT the presentation regarding Heritage Project Updates be received for information.

CARRIED

P. Grossman absent at the vote

Committee Questions and Comments:

- At the February meeting there were comments from the Committee requesting future updates on the public engagement process for the Klee Wyck Park site. What is the process for community engagement? *Staff response: the engagement plan was circulated at the last Heritage Advisory Committee meeting, which included the timing (Spring 2022).*

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT the Senior Manager of Parks present the results of the Klee Wyck Park Site community engagement before the submission is made to Council.

CARRIED

P. Grossman absent at the vote

- There were two items from the last meeting relating to insurance for heritage homes. One was to inform the insurance industry regarding the difference between properties on the Heritage Register vs. designated properties. Secondly, a survey was circulated by Heritage Canada. *Staff response: staff followed up and provided a memo to Schill Insurance clarifying the differences between properties on the Heritage Register and those that are municipally designated. No response received yet, will follow up.*
- From meeting minutes of July 2021, there was a discussion regarding some plaques which were removed from parks due to outdated language. The comment was the District will be working with the West Vancouver Historical Society in developing this signage. The West Vancouver Historical Society has had no contact from the Parks department and there is concern that parks signage will go ahead without their involvement.

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT the Committee have a discussion with the Senior Manager of Parks to discuss the issue of revisionist approaches to signage rather than additionalist approaches.

CARRIED

P. Grossman absent at the vote

- Spring Committee Recruitment

March 31 is the final day to receive applications for new Committee members: have any applications been received for the Heritage Advisory Committee? *Staff response: no applications have been received to date for this committee as part of the spring recruitment.*

How many positions are we filling? *Staff response: there is currently one vacancy. Staff have been in discussions with a member of the Design Review Committee to fill the vacancy which was left by a landscape architect that was appointed from that Committee.*

There are people who are interested and would submit an application. Is it possible to submit an application until the next intake? *Staff response: the application for the spring recruitment closes March 31. However, an application form may be filled out at any time for future vacancies. There is an option on the application form that allows the applicant to be considered for a year from the date of the application. Vacancies can come up anytime.*

PUBLIC QUESTIONS

8. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

C. Reynolds commented the following:

- When asking for nominations for heritage properties, you may want to have a form that has the 5 forms: archaeological, paleontological, culture, landscape and history and people can nominate and put them in a category. There are other things of note to celebrate, not just buildings.
- The minutes were very good and helpful. The public can record the meeting themselves – recording should be done formally. This is a formal municipal committee.
- On the District's website, Dr. Ethlyn Trapp's name was misspelled. *Committee member response: the misspelling has been corrected.*
- Will you get a First Nations member on the Committee? *Committee member response: a Committee member involved in the Navy Jack House project will reach out to their contacts.*

Committee Questions and Comments:

- Can we have updates regarding Navy Jack House? *Staff response: a Council report was sent out to the Committee in early March with the most recent update. Going forward staff can reach out to relevant staff for further updates.*

NEXT MEETING

9. NEXT MEETING

Starting May 1st, Committee meetings may be held in person. Committees must pass a resolution in April to choose to have either in person or electronic meetings for the remainder of 2022. The Committee will need to vote at its next meeting to decide which direction to take. This may have impact on some members and also recruitment of future members. There will be no hybrid meetings, must be either fully in person or fully electronic.

Staff confirmed that the next Heritage Advisory Committee meeting is scheduled for April 27, 2022 at 4:30 p.m.

10. ADJOURNMENT

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT the March 30, 2022 Heritage Advisory Committee meeting be adjourned.

CARRIED

P. Grossman absent at the vote

The meeting adjourned at 6:45 p.m.

Certified Correct:



Chair



Staff Liaison