

**THE CORPORATION OF THE DISTRICT OF WEST VANCOUVER
HERITAGE ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MAIN FLOOR CONFERENCE ROOM
WEDNESDAY, MAY 15, 2019**

Members Present: Paula Grossman, John Mawson, Michael Geller, Brenda Clark, Annerieke van Hoek, Laura Anderson, Paul Hundal

Members Absent: Liane McKenna, Dana Parr

Council Liaison: Nora Gambioli

Staff Present: Michelle McGuire (Manager of Current Planning & Urban Design)
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 4:08 p.m.

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT the May 15, 2019 Heritage Advisory Committee meeting agenda be approved as circulated.

A member requested to add a standing item to all agendas for public outreach. The group discussed and decided this will be covered in the draft framework council report.

CARRIED

3. ADOPTION OF MINUTES

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT the April 16, 2019 Heritage Advisory Committee Meeting minutes be adopted as circulated.

CARRIED

4. APPLICATIONS FOR CONSIDERATION

4.1 3321 Radcliffe Avenue (Hewitt House)

Staff Presentation:

Erik Wilhelm, Senior Community Planner, introduced the proposal.

Applicant Presentation:

The applicant team presented and described the application.

Elana Zysblat, Heritage Consultant, noted that interior protection is not recommended in this case. This approach is only typically done when a significant heritage interior is at risk or where there is public or semi-public use in a building; neither of which is the case for the Hewitt House. It was noted that it is extraordinarily rare to see interior elements protected within a private dwelling. Consultation with heritage colleagues in other municipalities confirmed that it is very rare in single family homes that do not include public use. In the last 10 years, out of 142 buildings designated in the City of Vancouver only 5 included protection of interior elements. A serious concern is that if interior protection is routinely required or expected in West Vancouver that it could be a significant deterrent for projects and home owners. With the limited number of heritage projects in West Vancouver this issue should be carefully considered by the Heritage Advisory Committee to not discourage heritage projects from coming forward.

Committee Questions:

The committee directed questions to the presenters, with the applicants' and staff responses in *italics*:

- Are there any other houses along Marine Drive that are in such a close proximity to the property line? *There are existing garages that are located as close to Marine Drive. There are a fair amount of similar setbacks in the area.*
- How would a person get to the Hewitt House from Marine Drive? *They would come through the yard. It is a permeable surface. The proposal is trying to not touch the rock wall.*
- Previously it appeared as if there was no setback from Marine Drive and the current plans show a 1.0 ft. setback. Why not increase it to 2.0 ft.? *Keeping the infill house closer to Marine Drive enables an increased yard between the Hewitt House and the infill house and allows for the infill house to be constructed on the existing foundation located at the rear of the property thereby facilitating less site disturbance and soil removal.*
- Please describe how the house was relocated and situated. *It previously straddled the current site and the neighbouring property to the east. The house faced the same direction as it currently does and it was moved a few feet in order to subdivide the eastern parcel. The downstairs was created as a basement. A trellis and deck was added.*
- The original house includes a basement suite, so three families would live on the property if the proposal was approved. Is the expectation that Hewitt House residents will park on Marine Drive or use Radcliffe? *The main unit in the Hewitt House uses Marine Drive for parking and the tenants use Radcliffe.*
- What is the increase in land value for the property? *The project overall represents more of a financial loss with construction costs, etc. As for future value it is unknowable as the market changes. There must be value associated with the extra lot created.*
- How deep is the boulevard? *20 ft. Pavers could be added to create a walkway to Marine Drive. It should be on the drawings.*
- The overlook between the buildings, how is this being treated, what about the upper levels? *The porch and gardens are designed to draw your eye towards the southeast. People will use*

the deck and with the position this could create overlook issues. *The deck is wider on the east side. Overlook is not an issue as there is a 40 ft. space between buildings. Sheet A8.1 provides renderings of the projected views demonstrating that the view from the infill house is of the landscape (i.e. not the Hewitt House windows and outdoor area). As well, outlook and privacy issues were addressed with the removal of the gable end of the infill house.*

- Anticipating Council questions, next to the new cottage on the east side, will there be significant rock blasting? *There is no blasting needed.*
- Could you repurpose the trees? Is that a requirement to replace trees if they are removed? *The applicant indicated that they will repurpose as much of the trees as is viable. Replacement trees will be planted.*

Committee Comments:

The committee directed questions to the presenters, with the applicants' and staff responses in *italics*:

- The changes in the proposal are a significant improvement, your efforts are noticed. It is a nice design, very sympathetic to the Hewitt House. It is likely you will have issues with the Marine Drive setback in terms of glazing, etc. A 3.0 ft. setback would improve the situation with some reduction in the yard between the buildings. With more layered landscaping that would filter the view between the infill building and the garden, south of there a grouping of small deciduous trees, you would have room. The landscaping is charming and has a country garden feel, very lush and beautifully planted. For privacy to work make the edges softer, giving a feeling of layers. The character of landscaping along Marine Drive should be considered to plant something that is going to replace the mature trees removed to provide the neighbourhood tree replacement for what is lost. Could be something nicer than what is there. The fencing looks so wall-like, so impenetrable. *Those fences are existing now. Some concern with the color of materials. The approach is to be respectful and fit in and not try and to copy/mimic the Hewitt House. Muted colours were chosen in order to let Hewitt House stand out.*
- The roof line of the infill house has significantly improved.
- A walkway should be included to connect from Marine Drive to the Hewitt House. Currently the walkway would require walking right beside a window.
- With respect to the existing cedar trees, it seems that for many heritage sites there are significant trees that are proposed to be removed in exchange for heritage infill development. It becomes a choice between the trees and retention of the house. In the future the District will likely have stronger policy related to planting trees. Staff are currently reviewing the existing Interim Tree By-law and we should be aware of potential changes that could be relevant for the proposal.
- The infill house fits well on the site. The changes to the roof line are supported. If there was an issue with overlook due to the roof line the change solved it. Don't think the deck will be an overlook issue. A blank wall is not the solution, an animated façade with windows is supported. Agree with the pathway comments to provide a direct link. Support the proposal overall.
- Want to address the interior protection issue. With respect to the importance of the heritage interior, private, semi-public or public use is irrelevant. For those who are interested in purchasing heritage sites comprehensive heritage protection of both interior and exterior is important. Would want the interior to be as authentic as the outside. So many heritage properties exist where the interior is not preserved. With the Hewitt House the interior is significant. *The Heritage Consultant concurred that the interior is significant. However, buildings were not built to stay frozen in time. It is important to understand that heritage conservation concerns the management of heritage sites and resources over time and there needs to be room for evolution. For us to start limiting interior living spaces, in a private home,*

there is a reason it is not practiced, not a normal request. The routine practice to require interior protection would discourage HRAs. A good heritage interior will generally be protected. This shouldn't be left to chance. An example of where the issue was not successfully resolved is the Binning House where the applicant came back for further compensation in exchange for interior protection because it was not secured adequately initially. Would like to see comprehensive protection secured at the onset to avoid situations like the Binning House from occurring. With the significant benefit of subdivision there should be significant heritage protection granted in exchange. The alternative would be to permit the same building with a Coach House.

- The information provided by the heritage consultant is very helpful and Council members would benefit from receiving it.
- The Hewitt House is a charming house, there is a legitimate argument for supporting the Heritage Revitalization Agreement (HRA). Otherwise someone would knock it down. Supportive of the efforts to protect the house. Don't support forcing protection of the heritage interior. A direct pathway from Marine Drive to the Hewitt House should be provided and shown on the plans. Recommend planting for screening purposes including trees for the yard between the houses. Planting should be loose and not rectangular. The setback from Marine Drive should be increased. It is likely that the building department will require an increased setback or reduced glazing. The revised roofline for the infill house is improved from the previous proposal.
- The proposal brings together a number of positive elements including providing family friendly housing options. The heritage statement of significance speaks to character defining interior elements. Don't want us as a committee to shy away from the notion of interior protection simply because it is challenging. Interior elements are important. Would like to gain a better understanding of the pragmatics of the available tools to provide informed advice. There is an educational opportunity for us. Debate around monetary value, contentious as it might be, is important. If we are going to preserve heritage, we have to make proposals mainstream. The business case has to be there with incentives and efficient processing. There is a significant opportunity to celebrate this HRA proposal with a plaque and other promotional materials to educate and highlight this successful example. *The owners feel the same.*
- The proposal presents a great outreach opportunity with a story that would be useful as a case study.

The chair summarized the Committee's comments:

There is general consensus that the revisions have responded to comments from the Heritage Advisory Committee. There are a few things that the applicant should still consider including the proximity to the property line on the Marine Drive edge as it is anticipated that there will be issues with addressing Building Code requirements. General comments regarding landscaping were provided to consider layering the landscape in between the buildings. As well, there was a suggestion to provide more significant tree planting to replace trees that are being removed. The Committee generally agreed that a direct pathway should be provided and shown on the plans from Marine Drive to the Hewitt House. Interior protection and how to handle significant interior elements is an issue that the Committee needs to discuss further at a higher level to determine a consistent approach. As well, subdivision is also a general topic that requires further Committee discussion.

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

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT the Heritage Advisory Committee SUPPORT the application and that the following items be addressed through review with staff:

1. Issues related to the proximity of the infill house to the north setback to Marine Drive;
2. Landscaping between the two buildings and edges related to potential overlook and screening issues;
3. Tree replacement strategy for removal of existing mature cedars with consideration for boulevard tree planting; and
4. Clarify landscape plan showing the path between the sites extending to the Marine Drive sidewalk.

THAT the Heritage Advisory Committee supports voluntary protection, if offered by the applicant, of the wood paneled fireplace room to be included in the HRA.

CARRIED

5. **PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

The Committee listened to comments and responded to questions from the public.

6. **NEXT MEETING**

The Committee agreed that if there is a longer agenda we will start meeting at 4pm otherwise meetings will begin at 4:30 pm.

The next meeting of the Heritage Advisory Committee is scheduled for June 11, 2019.

7. **ADJOURNMENT**

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT the May 15, 2019 Heritage Advisory Committee meeting be adjourned.

CARRIED

The meeting adjourned at 6:05 p.m.



Paula Grossman, CHAIR



Michelle McGuire, STAFF LIAISON