

**THE CORPORATION OF THE DISTRICT OF WEST VANCOUVER
HERITAGE ADVISORY COMMITTEE
RAVEN ROOM, MUNICIPAL HALL
TUESDAY MARCH 5, 2019**

Members Present: Paula Grossman, Paul Hundal, Michael Geller, Laura Anderson, Dana Parr, John Mawson, Brenda Clark, Liane McKenna

Council Liaison: Nora Gambioli

Staff Present: Michelle McGuire (Manager of Current Planning & Urban Design)
Stephen Mikicich (Manager of Economic Development)
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 3:07 p.m.

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

It was Moved and Seconded:

- THAT the Tuesday January 10, 2019 Heritage Advisory Committee meeting agenda be approved as circulated.

CARRIED

3. ADOPTION OF MINUTES

It was moved and seconded:

THAT the January 10, 2019 Heritage Advisory Committee Meeting minutes be amended as follows:

- Page 5 – 2nd bullet should read “south” not “north”.
- Page 6 after the word “encumbrance” add “is the proper way to fund restoration”.

CARRIED

4. APPLICATIONS FOR CONSIDERATION

4.1 3321 RADCLIFFE AVENUE (HEWITT HOUSE)

Staff Presentation

Erik Wilhelm (Senior Community Planner) introduced the proposal and described:

- The site location
- The subject property
- Things to consider

Applicant Presentation

Kate Lade, the owner, attended the meeting and provided an overview of the proposal:

- The owner and her husband purchased the property over a year ago with the intention of restoring and preserving the house.
- The reason for requesting the subdivision on the property is for the owner's parents to live there 6 months of the year to help care for their son.
- They have met with the neighbours and have worked on designing a home that compliments the neighbourhood and is respectful to their neighbours.
- There is an old tennis court pad presently on the property where the infill house is proposed to be built.
- Staff requested that the committee comment on whether they would recommend that the Design Review Committee (DRC) also review the proposal noting that the DRC appoints two members to the HAC.

Committee Questions:

The Committee posed questions to staff and the applicant, with the applicant's and staff responses in *italics*:

- You have identified 6600 sq. ft. for the total site area. What is the permitted site minimum under zoning? *The zoning is RS4. The proposal would create a smaller lot than what is permitted under zoning.*
- What is the total square footage of the proposed parcels and the houses including the existing house and the infill house? Will there be separate owners? *The larger lot is 4400 sq. ft. and the new lot is 2168 sq. ft. My parents would be the owners of the smaller parcel. The HRA would run with both sites.*
- What are the parking requirements for this zone? Is there anything comparable currently on Marine Drive? *There is nothing comparable on Marine Drive. Parking is very constricted on the block and adjacent sites do not have Marine Drive vehicle access. Adjacent sites have landscaping and fencing installed on District boulevard property. If off street parking were proposed along Radcliffe significant mature landscaping would need to be removed detracting from the streetscape and character of the Hewitt house setting. Adjacent owners on Radcliffe have resident "reserved" street parking available.*
- If the lot is sold there is no right of way for residents of the Hewitt house to access the proposed parking. Could an easement be required that would allow for access? *Yes.*
- Are there other options on Marine Drive for providing parking (e.g. street parking with or without resident only parking signage)? *Parking couldn't be dedicated for the owners. The proposal is to improve the existing Marine Drive driveway situation by providing a 2 bay parallel pull out.*
- If the north setback was increased would it be possible to add two off street parking stalls, then owners could back in? *The site topography and depth would make it challenging to provide off street parking.*
- Is there a possibility that the owner and district can work to get reserved parking along Marine Drive? *Staff will look in to that possibility.*
- You have indicated that three families will live on the site? *Yes, there are tenants living in the basement suite. The parking for the suite is street parking.*

- There is no plan for the interior of the house, how much of the original interiors of the house are proposed to be kept? *Approximately 90% of the layout is original, the main living area is wood panel, and the sun room was the original outside deck which has been enclosed. The windows and doors are original, the floors have been restored. The kitchen is old and needs updating.*
- Under a HRA what renovations would be allowed? The stairs are challenging. *We have fixed, the stairs, they were carpeted and dangerous, we have removed the carpet and restored the floor.*
- *Staff commented that HRA's typically protect building exteriors. Interior protections are rarer and more challenging. It is challenging for the municipality to enforce. We will review the conservation plan, statement of significance and the committee's comments in determining recommended elements for protection.*
- The owners may want to alter the outside, can they do that? *Staff commented that an HRA is enabled through a bylaw it is very specific and the exterior would be legally protected. A Heritage Alteration Permit would be required to consider and permit any exterior changes once an HRA were in place.*
- Can the parking be varied further to allow zero parking? *The district directed the applicant to consider the lay-by option. Staff could review other options.*
- The house is extremely close to the western lot line? *There is an existing tennis court already there and along with the location of the accessory building on the adjacent lot it made the most sense to locate the infill house for siting and privacy reasons.*
- In reviewing the plans many of the existing trees are proposed to be removed according to the Arborist report. Some of the trees slated for removal are large and mature. Could the proposal be altered to save more site trees? *The trees slated for removal are located within the building envelop and one of the trees is dead. Staff commented that there are three permit sized trees; one being 79cm in diameter, 89cm and 104cm.*
- If the infill house can be proposed in a different location to save trees it should be considered as there will be concerns regarding loss of mature trees.
- Has there been conversation with neighbours regarding the trees? *The neighbours are supportive of the trees coming down, positive and supportive.*

Heritage Advisory Committee (HAC) Comments

The Committee went on to provide comments, with the applicant's and staff responses in *italics*:

- Concern was expressed about the level of heritage protection proposed. Support for consideration of protection of interior heritage features. The incentive to allow subdivision is significant and as much as possible should be protected in return. Concerned that a future owner would not maintain/protect interior features and that they could be lost or that a future owner would seek additional compensation/incentive for interior protection. Supported the Vinson House proposal where interior features were protected. Some interior upgrades will need to be made and would be fine (e.g. bathrooms). It is a small lot, however, the densification is supported based on the neighbourhood context. Don't see the the trees as a character defining element of the site. *The owner indicated strong commitment to the protection of the house as well, we would like to upgrade the kitchen and bathroom but we are looking to keep the character of the home.*

- The issue of parking is important in terms of the neighbourhood, Use of an easement should be secured for the main house residents for providing parking access. This should be provided for as circumstances change in the future. Recommend working with the engineering department to come up with a solution. A solution needs to be found to provide minimum required parking. Very unfortunate the architect is not here. The two houses should mimic each other in design. *The exterior colours haven't been decided on. We asked the district if we should mimic the Hewitt house for the infill house design and the District's advice was to be sympathetic. We are open to advice on the external colors.*
- The Architect should have attended the meeting. There is a lot of missing information on the drawings and the package does not seem to be coordinated or show the overall site planning. An overview from the architect and a comprehensive design package would help with the discussion and comments.
- It's a commendable effort to maintain the house, curious if you can tell us about the retaining walls? *There was some excavation for the tennis court, there is a flat piece of land there.*
- The massing of the new building is generally attractive, if it didn't have an open ended gable. The massing would be more neighbourly, if the gable was deleted and a porch could be added that would be south facing and would improve the roof line and improve the transition to the Hewitt house. Overlook of infill house to Hewitt house needs review and design development. Design development to reduce the extent of the deck wrapping around the infill house, for privacy consideration could delete/reduce south deck.
- In the future there may be 2 different owners that are not related. There is a complete exposed overlook from one house to the other. Design development is needed to improve privacy and overlook. Landscape elements could be employed e.g. adding a pergola for screening.
- Zero lot line on the north is concerning with site planning and code issues. Planting should be provided on the property at the north edge to soften the interface with Marine Drive, not just boulevard planting.
- Fencing – seems very wall like. Needs design development. Landscape elements should be included in the HRA as it is a fundamental part of the site.
- The concept of subdivision is tricky given that we have reviewed another proposal with subdivision and not supported it. Agree with parking comments, a viable solution is necessary. As well it is unfortunate that there is no landscape buffer at the north to provide a pleasant way to enter the building. *As the owners we have taken privacy considerations seriously. With the Hewitt House we took time to orientate the site lines between the two houses to avoid a fishbowl effect. We have a lot of proposed hedging, box and laurel, which will extend between the two properties. With the existing retaining wall location and siting challenges landscaping on the Marine Drive property along the north edge is constricted. The fence line sits right on the boulevard.*
- Generally a good proposal although there are some details that need to be worked out. The through lot presents a good opportunity for subdivision. Support having some interior features be protected as part of the HRA recognizing that this is challenging for the municipality to enforce. The Statement of Significance is silent on this aspect. Consideration of including landscape features as character defining elements of the overall HRA. There is some nice hedging that adds character to the new house design. The size and building massing are well done.

- Supportive of the proposal. Have watched the property evolve over the years, aware of its original context which has not been lost. The house is worthy of protection and am grateful that the proposal has come forward. Will not specifically comment on the design. While I have walked the street I have never been inside the boundary of the property. Will there be an opportunity to tour the property? What is the timeframe for review? I am conscious of asking for more information, all of these requests add cost and time, and I don't wish for the committee to hold up the process. Is there anything that can be done to expedite this project? *Staff commented that HRAs are expedited to the extent possible noting that there are legal and statutory requirements that have to be satisfied.*
- Before this goes before Council the architect should clarify the project details including FAR. Design development is needed to resolve site planning, privacy and overlook issues, parking, etc. One specific design detail that should be reviewed is the window placement in the infill house. Need to be careful about consideration of interior protection. Is tricky to execute and enforce.
- Have concerns about the impacts that result from a subdivision proposal for the site including tree removal. On the other hand, the benefit of retaining the heritage building is supported, with the house maintaining its character in context. The intent is supported. This would represent a significant change in the neighbourhood. Feel that the committee should refer design development to staff.

The chair summarized comments from the Committee noting that comments were generally supportive with specific points raised as follows:

- Parking is an issue. There needs to be an improved parking solution, should consider an easement and/or reserving spots.
- A comprehensive landscape plan is needed showing how the two houses work together. There is concern regarding tree removal.
- Setbacks need to be carefully considered, very minimal setback at north and south edge of infill house. Code issues should be considered. Design development needed for the roofline of the infill house.
- There is concern that the plans are not clear. They need to show all project details including FAR.
- Some concerns regarding building massing and overlook. There are some specific subdivision issues raised (e.g. proximity to lot lines, etc.), however, generally there was support for subdivision.
- The building massing of the new house seems high, reads as more than 1500 sq. ft. in size.
- There is a division on the committee in regards to the interior work with some members feeling that some interior elements should be protected e.g. the fireplace is a unique element.
- The Committee felt that the architect should have been present for describing the proposal and for the discussion and questions.

It was moved and seconded:

THAT The Heritage Advisory Committee supports the proposal and requests that staff work with the applicant and the building department on changes and clarifications responding to the following comments/issues:

- Parking issue with possibility of easement and spots reserved for the site;
- Landscaping to be integrated and more comprehensive, identifying all trees that need to be removed and including the entire site with the Hewitt House;
- Provide comprehensible plans with easily readable information;
- Resolution of concerns about overlook and potential issues that can arise;
- Potential for identifying some unique elements of the interior with the idea to preserve these elements;

- Design development to address the height issue for the south elevation. Review the building massing;
- Review setbacks for code issues and site planning considerations; and
- Before going to council have the building department review the drawings to determine any key code issues.

CARRIED

- Staff indicated that they could provide the updated plans to the Committee via e-mail once received.
- Staff and Councillor Gambioli updated the Committee on Council discussion arising from consideration of a temporary protection for the Chin Residence at 1840 Orchard Way.
- Staff updated the committee on the Temporary Protection Order for the Chin residence and that it is slated for demolition. The temporary protection was approved by Council for a 60-day stay on the demolition permit.
- Councillor Gambioli updated the committee on council's discussion indicating the need to get in front of these temporary protection orders. Council has asked the committee to report back at the end of June on the following:
 - Develop a framework and what other tools can we use, research other municipalities and what they do?
 - Which specific heritage things can we protect and how far do we go? What do we recommend for budget?
- One committee member commented that public education and awareness should be considered as part of the report back to Council. The Hewitt House proposal would be a perfect example of a successful heritage project that is being brought forward by an interested home owner.
- Councillor Gambioli commented that West Vancouver got zero nominations for municipal heritage awards. The committee could also consider how to encourage nominations going forward.

5. OTHER ITEMS

5.1 Community Heritage Register

- a. Additions – Primary and secondary heritage resources
- b. Support resources
- c. Temporary Orders of Protection
- d. New potential incentives (short term vacation rentals)

- Staff provided an overview of the heritage register, there are currently 51 that are on the Community Heritage Register and approximately 100 left to be added.
- As part of the Economic Development Plan there are plans to secure a boutique hotel and add short term vacation rentals. The plan encouraged consideration for a protection incentive if heritage homes could be used as vacation rentals.
- A Committee member comments that this incentive should be considered for the Radcliffe House. As well, these types of incentives would be good to include in public education efforts.
- Staff asked if the committee would consider a motion, adding the primary and secondary buildings to the register – approx. 100 buildings.

- The committee discussed concerns about recommending to immediately add these properties to the register without informing the property owners.
- Councillor Gambioli commented that Council already thinks that these properties were added to the register and there is the outstanding Council resolution that has not been addressed.
- It was decided to discuss this further and to bring it up at the Tri-municipal heritage meeting to find out how other municipalities are handling this issue/opportunity.

ACTION ITEM – Add short term vacation rentals to a future agenda

6. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

- A member of the public asked, what is the rationale to moving the 100 properties to the register? Education first and targeting? *Staff commented that it is to have the properties on the official Community Heritage Register rather than on an informal inventory.*
- I wasn't clear on if this application was going to Council without this committee seeing it again, I recommend you see it again. I was on the NS Heritage Commission, very valuable to review projects with comments resolved.
- Can members can attend the March 12 tri municipal meeting? *Yes.*
- There are advantages and disadvantages of having houses added. Incentives should be considered including tax breaks.
- Navy Jack House, it didn't get the budget survey support because it appeared that it was going to be paid for with taxes rather than CAC's. Secondly if you read what is proposed it is not supportable from a heritage perspective.
- Binning House – I am a member of friends of binning, if you want information, please join.
- Squamish Nation would like to be involved in Navy Jack.
- Heritage designation, talking about exterior vs interior, modernizing a bathroom or kitchen, have a process when you evaluate a heritage house you identify what is important.
- Chin residence didn't come to this committee, it happened too fast.

7. NEXT MEETING

- The format for the March 12 Tri Municipal Heritage Advisory Committees is each municipality will have 20 minutes to present, we could use our time to pose questions.
- Staff will find meeting dates for April and May
- A member requested we give a Binning House update at the Tri Municipal Meeting, however, subsequent discussion resolved that the Committee would rather pose specific questions about managing their heritage register and regarding education and awareness for property owners to avoid heritage demolitions.

The Committee outlined future Items for discussion:

- Transfer of density idea –Hugh Mclean from City of Vancouver to give a presentation at a future meeting
- Navy Jack House
- Ownership model discussion - subdivision vs bare land vs strata
- Report back to Council for a framework to develop tools, including research from other municipalities
- Short Term Vacation Rentals
- Interior vs. exterior heritage protection

One committee member suggested that staff schedule Stephen Mikicich to return to provide an overview to the Committee on the Heritage Strategic Plan with an overview of what has been accomplished and what is outstanding as a starting point for discussion on future policy and education and awareness initiatives.

The Committee discussed procedural questions/comments including:

- Future meeting timeframe and how often to meet, generally felt that for now we need to meet monthly
- Consideration to alternate policy and project items on the meeting rotation to streamline discussion
- The committee requested input in to what is submitted with each HRA proposal. We could borrow from DRC and their submission requirements.
- As well, should require heritage consultants and architects to attend for project review.

The Committee then discussed the Hewitt House proposal with concerns raised that the proposal should return for review with the heritage consultant and architect present.

It was moved and seconded:

THAT the Hewitt House return to the committee for further review.

CARRIED

8. **ADJOURNMENT**

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT the March 5, 2019 Heritage Advisory Committee meeting be adjourned.

CARRIED

The meeting adjourned at 5:57p.m.


Paula Grossman, CHAIR


Michelle McGuire, STAFF LIAISON