

THE CORPORATION OF THE DISTRICT OF WEST VANCOUVER

HERITAGE ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING AGENDA

WEDNESDAY, JULY 27, 2022

4:30 PM IN THE RAVEN ROOM, MUNICIPAL HALL

(In-person attendance only)

Note: Council Committee meetings are conducted in accordance with Council Committee Procedure Bylaw No. 5020, 2019 (as amended), subject to the discretion of the Chair.

CALL TO ORDER

1. Call to Order

Note: Chair will confirm that the meeting is being conducted in-person, pursuant to Council Committee Procedure Bylaw No. 5020, 2019 (as amended).

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

2. Approval of Committee Meeting Agenda

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the July 27, 2022 Heritage Advisory Committee meeting agenda be approved as circulated.

ADOPTION OF MINUTES

3. Adoption of Committee Meeting Minutes

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the June 29, 2022 Heritage Advisory Committee meeting minutes be adopted as circulated.

REPORTS / ITEMS

4. Heritage Revitalization Agreement Proposal for 1591 Haywood Avenue

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the presentation regarding Heritage Revitalization Agreement Proposal for 1591 Haywood Avenue be received for information.

5. Heritage Project Updates

RECOMMENDATION:

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

PUBLIC QUESTIONS

6. Public Questions

NEXT MEETING

7. Next Meeting

The next Heritage Advisory Committee meeting is scheduled for September 28, 2022 at 4:30 p.m. via electronic communication facilities.

ADJOURNMENT

8. Adjournment of Committee Meeting

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the July 27, 2022 Heritage Advisory Committee meeting be adjourned.

**THE CORPORATION OF THE DISTRICT OF WEST VANCOUVER
HERITAGE ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
VIA ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATION FACILITIES
WEDNESDAY, JUNE 29, 2022**

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

Staff: E. Syvokas, Community Planner (Staff Liaison); A. Banks, Senior Manager of Parks; C. Ambor, Parks Stewardship Manager; M. McGuire, Senior Manager of Current Planning and Urban Design; and C. Mayne, Executive Assistant to the Director of Planning & Development Services (Committee Clerk) attended the meeting via electronic communication facilities.

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 4:35 p.m.

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT the June 29, 2022 Heritage Advisory Committee meeting agenda be amended by:

- Adding Item 4.1 - Navy Jack House Update;

AND THAT the agenda be approved as amended.

CARRIED

3. ADOPTION OF MINUTES

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT the April 27, 2022 Heritage Advisory Committee meeting minutes be amended by:

- Changing the spelling of Gellar to Geller;

AND THAT the minutes be adopted as amended.

CARRIED

REPORTS / ITEMS

4. Heritage Workshop

E. Syvokas introduced the Heritage Workshop which was organized in response to two issues that the committee had been discussing that staff felt could use the guidance of a heritage expert:

- 1) Current HAC asset inventory including trails, points of interest, plaques, benches, commemorative trees, and parks, etc. in context of what constitutes heritage; and

- 2) Application of the Standards and Guidelines and accepted practices for the review of development proposals.

Staff from the Parks Department, Andrew Banks and Corinne Ambor, were invited to attend the meeting to answer questions with respect to assets on District property which are managed by the Parks Department.

Presentation: Donald Luxton, heritage consultant, provided a presentation that included an overview of conservation principles, heritage conservation jurisdictions (world, national, provincial, and municipal), the Federal *Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places*, and Heritage Conservation tools.

Committee Questions:

The Committee went on to question the presenter, with Don Luxton's and staff responses in *italics*:

The issue that we are grappling with is interpreting Standard 11 regarding any new work being physically and visually compatible with, subordinate to and distinguishable from the historic place. It has been interpreted by some members that an addition/infill should not look like a character home from the 1930's. Other members support additions and infill that look compatible to the period. This is especially clear when looking at the Lower Caulfield Heritage Conservation Area, where the purpose of the HCA is to maintain the character of the 1920's village. If additions or infill dwellings are contemporary, it would change the whole character of the area. How do you interpret Standard 11?

The Standards and Guidelines are principles and guidelines and provide practical advice to guide decision making. There is no right or wrong answer. The heritage world is a world where we must debate, understand, and defend. There are different ways of doing things and different situations. We don't build things the same way as in the past, so new construction wouldn't be the same. Generally, it is advised that additions/infill do not copy or mimic. New additions should be identifiable but respect the heritage building by sitting back, not being too flashy, and not drawing attention.

Is it ok to say that an addition/infill should be the same style (i.e., 1930s character per the example)?

That is up for interpretation. It is a balancing act. It should be distinguishable, should look new but not stick out like a sore thumb. It should be deferential. In successful projects, the addition or infill always look like they are part of the same family as the heritage building. Should it be a 1930s house, no; it should be a 1930s inspired house using a common vocabulary, without copying. If you are going to build in historic guidelines you need to follow the standards.

Is it up to the designer to look at the heritage building and consider the context and demonstrate how they are adhering to the Standards and Guidelines?

All heritage work should be subject to knowledgeable criticism. There is always a necessity for open and public review of projects, especially when incentives are being offered. The applicant should demonstrate how they are meeting the

Standards and Guidelines and HAC needs to assess the project against those principles. That is HAC's role.

What is heritage value?

In the past the focus was on old houses, then expanded to newer houses, and then further to include landscapes. A values-based criteria is used to determine what has heritage value. This is an ongoing process, as some things age, things will accrue more value. The Heritage Register is a tool for tangible heritage (i.e., physical sites). There are not tools in the Local Government Act manage intangible heritage (i.e., cultural value such as events, traditions, culture). There may be other better ways to manage broader heritage. Buildings are easy because we have the Standards and Guidelines to follow.

Community participation for identifying heritage assets / landmarks is great.

It is a surprisingly complex field when getting into cultural heritage. I am so glad in this country we have a national system, and all use the one language. It is important to be precise in terminology. It used to be so difficult because we didn't speak the same language. It is important that those presenting projects comment on the specifics of the Standards and Guidelines.

Can you provide any comment on whether tribute trees and benches have heritage value?

The Local Government Act is specifically targeted at land and property The Heritage Register is used as a tool to monitor proposed changes to real property through municipal flagging and the permit process. If you overload the Heritage Register, it becomes a management issue. For instance, the Heritage Register is not a good way to manage trees as they have lifespans and then it becomes an issue if they die. Further, commemorative items such as trees and benches contribute community history but adding a commemorative bench or tree to the Heritage Register won't make any difference to their management, as they also have a short timespan (renewed every 10 years). If it isn't 20 years old should not be on Heritage Register.

What about trails and landscapes?

There are certain trails that have ended up on heritage registers for very specific reasons, such as the Semiahmoo Trail recognizing an important historic pioneer trail/wagon transportation route. However, trails change over time and need to be managed which makes it tricky.

Response from A. Banks: The District has a tribute tree and bench program. It is quite an involved program, with over 300 benches. We renew them every 10 to 15 years; therefore, they are evolving, not static. In terms of trees, the issue is that they fail or die. They have a lifespan and to manage this is quite challenging. They often can't be replaced in the same location or with the same species. For example, there was an issue with Hemlock moths attacking Hemlock trees so wouldn't make sense to replace the trees that died with the same species. In terms of trails, many are established but they do change due to erosion, landslides, usage etc. A heritage trail

is one where you can see the history trail i.e., a mill or flume. That is the aspect to focus and encourage through interpretive signage.

The presentation was very helpful. The committee has been working on building an inventory of assets that may have heritage merit which is divided in to four streams. This is the fist in determining the assets the District has. Until we all the information we can't decide if they have heritage merit. The inventory of assets is a tool which will help frame our discussion on which assets should be considered for the Heritage Register. For instance, it is helpful to have a list of commemorative plaques and where they are located. This will allow us to understand, if there are some that may be worthy of preparing a Statement of Significance for potentially adding to the Heritage Register.

You can never have too much information, however, the key is determining where to focus energy. An informal list has no status under heritage legislation and can be confusing for the public. Commemorative plaques have not been set up to be permanent, therefore they may be an issue in terms of management if added to the Heritage Register. One of the key things is to compare to other similar sites, objects, and values and against the District's established evaluation criteria.

Does an asset have to be attached to land?

Things that move cannot be added to the register. It is a legal definition, and the Municipality must follow those rules. Can list and designate things like cemeteries. They have their own management plans and are very specific. If it is attached to real land it can go on the Heritage Register.

Skid roads: we have a series of them across Hollyburn Mountain. Parks staff have been very helpful in protecting them but the advantage of adding them to the Heritage Register is preserving corporate memory.

A skid road would be considered a cultural landscape under the Standards and Guidelines. There is nothing preventing a skid row (should be the best example of one) from being added to the Heritage Register but it must be built into the Parks Management Strategy to ensure protection and management.

The key is to not overload the Heritage Register and make the list difficult for staff to manage.

How are we working on these new potential additions, who is working on it and when will they be reviewed?

Staff response: We have the list of suggestions from the public. We have been talking about other additions to the asset inventory. We have not determined the next steps forward for those suggestions. Currently collecting and discussing. Once a list of significant assets has been determined, would need to review each asset against the criteria for additions to the Heritage Register and a Statement of Significance would need to be prepared for Council to consider for each nomination. At this point it is a work in progress. Determining where the committee wants to focus energies and next steps. This will need to be discussed at a future meeting.

The infill house debate was a big one. Is it ok for infill houses to be inspired by heritage houses and not get bogged down that it must be modern?

As discussed previously, it is about having a common vocabulary between old and new. The infill should be inspired by the heritage building but not replicate. Look at every proportion and every line and how it relates to the heritage building. Try to make things that are new speak to things that are old. It is about proportion, materiality, colour etc.

Do HRA's in other municipalities get reviewed by the DRC and HAC?

The way it is usually handled is that staff determine which committees should review a project based on the scale, complexity etc. The HAC review all heritage projects and the DRC typically also review multi-family and commercial projects.

The HAC is an advisory committee of Council and make recommendations whether to support a proposal. Staff take the comments received and then work with the applicant to revise their project to address the comments before bringing the application forward for Council's consideration.

How does the Urban Forest Management Plan relate to heritage?

Response from A. Banks: The goal of that plan is to protect, enhance and maintain the health of West Vancouver's urban forest. West Vancouver is lucky to have such a large tree canopy which is an important part of the character of West Vancouver. The UFMP is looking at the different areas of the District, such as the Altamont area which is very treed compared to the Ambleside area. The plan will develop a strategy that will maximize the benefits and minimize the risks of our urban forest over the next 15 years.

The 2006 Heritage Strategic plan has expired. Where are we at with meeting the plan's objectives? Would like to see what has not been achieved.

Most of the objectives of the plan have been implemented. The committee could review the plan of a strategic plan update and determine what objectives have yet to be completed.

Talking about looking at the Heritage Strategic Plan, can we focus on this? Do we need to engage a consultant to update this? This would have to be added to the work plan as we might need resources to complete this work.

Reviewing the plan would give a good idea of where you are. I am a big believer in having a strategic plan, periodically it needs to be reviewed.

The Chair thanked Don Luxton for the informative presentation, as well as Parks staff for attending the meeting.

C. Ambor and A. Banks left the meeting at 6:18 p.m. and did not return.

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT the discussion regarding Heritage Workshop be received for information.

CARRIED

L. Anderson left the meeting at 6:20 p.m. and did not return.

4.1 Navy Jack House Update

E. Syvokas provided an update on the Navy Jack House:

Front yard clean up has commenced and is anticipated to be completed within the next week. Shortly thereafter, mulch will be blown into the area to complete this work.

Staff have been in contact regularly with representatives of the Navy Jack House Citizen Group and are working on the following:

- Creating signage that will be posted on the chain link fence on the south perimeter. This is close to completion.
- A fund will soon be setup through the West Vancouver Foundation for the group to collect donations.
- Staff are liaising with the Navy Jack House Citizen Group about the Navy Jack House Citizen Group setting up a tent/booth at Harmony Arts Festival to raise awareness and facilitate fundraising.

J. Mawson provided the following additional information from the Navy Jack House Citizen Group:

The information boards will hopefully provide the public with information. The other component is determining if there is anything else that can be done to the house that will help inform the public or make the site a little more attractive. To see that the place is a little more loved and cared for would be helpful. This will give the public a sense of what is coming down the line in terms of its restoration. The Navy Jack House Citizen Group has been in touch with the Public Art Advisory Committee and has made some suggestions about window decorations, murals etc. The group will have a booth at the Harmony Arts Festival.

There is a possibility that a private donor might step forward and make a significant contribution to the public fundraising or take on the whole restoration themselves. This private funding approach is being discussed with the individual and staff. This person has been involved in restoration before and has a construction company that can restore. It would go in front of Council and would be huge for our committee to weigh in at that stage. If they do come forward with something in writing, it would be helpful to have support from our committee. It will take quite a while to unfold so in the meantime the Navy Jack House Citizen Group must be committed to fundraise and leave the parallel private situation to unfold as it will.

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT the verbal report regarding Navy Jack House Update be received for information.

CARRIED

L. Anderson absent at vote

PUBLIC QUESTIONS

5. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

C. Reynolds commented on the following:

- There are five categories of heritage. Please consider these.
- Suggested some incentives, will send along.
- Very exciting thinking about Harmony Arts Festival. Looks positive and it will be great.

M. Fidler, representing a co-housing collective for the “Horseshoe Bay Cottages” on Nelson Avenue introduced himself and indicated that he would like to open the dialogue and be part of the heritage conversation.

Staff are working with Mr. Fidler and are at the preliminary stages.

J. Mawson left the meeting at 6:34 p.m. and did not return.

As quorum was lost, the meeting was adjourned at 6:34 p.m.

Staff confirmed that the next Heritage Advisory Committee meeting is scheduled for July 27, 2022 at 4:30 p.m. and will be held in-person in the Raven Room.

Certified Correct:

Chair

Staff Liaison