

**THE CORPORATION OF THE DISTRICT OF WEST VANCOUVER
HERITAGE ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
RAVEN ROOM
TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 26, 2019**

Committee Members Committee Members: P. Grossman; L. Anderson; P. Hundal; J. Mawson; A. van Hoek; M. Geller; B. Clark; L. McKenna, and Councillor N. Gambioli.
Absent: D. Parr

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

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 4:31 p.m.

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT the November 26, 2019 Heritage Advisory Committee meeting agenda be amended by:

- Adding Update on Heritage Planner as 5.2
- Adding Update on Binning & Hewitt House to 5.3

AND THAT the agenda be approved as amended.

CARRIED

3. ADOPTION OF MINUTES

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT the September 17, 2019 Heritage Advisory Committee Meeting minutes be adopted as circulated.

CARRIED

4. APPLICATION FOR CONSIDERATION

4441 Piccadilly North (Gentles Cottage)

Staff Presentation:

Michelle McGuire, Manager of Current Planning & Urban Design

- Subject property site and location
- Background and Overview
 - Proposed FAR is 0.64
- The proposal will also be reviewed by the DRC.

Applicant Presentation:

The applicant team presented and described the application.

- Project Overview – proposal would protect a significant heritage building and responds to directions in the new OCP to deliver missing middle housing options.
 - Retain and restore existing Gentles Cottage to 1951 era and convert to 5 secure rental units with one unit proposed as short term rental accommodation allowing semi-public access to the rehabilitated heritage building
 - Add the Gentles Cottage to the Community Heritage Register and designate
 - Retain and protect gazebo structure as common amenity area for residents of the site
 - Redevelopment of the balance of the site with 8 additional market units in three buildings , two duplexes and 4 townhouses
- Project Background
- Statement of Significance – reviewed the history of the house and the family that built and lived there.
- Context of site
- Project overview – viewed the flyover
- Use of natural stone throughout the site

Committee Questions:

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

- Would like to know specifics about the expression of materials
Windows will be double-glazed; infill is stone and natural cedar. West Coast modern expression for infill.
- What are the changes to the heritage house?
On the second floor, there is an existing suite. Currently the only access to that is through the great room. The proposal would have the whole second floor becomes as a suite with a new stair added to allow access. Minimal new openings to be added to accommodate new units, removal of sleeping porch. The master room on the main floor will be a suite. The main room will be rental to help address the lack of rental. Short-term rental for one of the suites which would allow semi-public access to the building, Proposed to program it so that anyone who lives in the complex could use it as well as the public. For the cottage two different openings are proposed to be added, very subtle and would be done in keeping with the 1951 renovations.
- What will the color of the building be and what modifications are proposed?
The house is currently blue and red. We interviewed previous families and grandchildren who owned or lived in the building. Based on this research we chose a paint colour to represent the previous unpainted cedar finish. That is how it was until the latest homeowners painted. Proposal is to bring back the natural cedar color with cream windows. Removing the paint would put the

original siding at risk so the proposal is to sand it down and paint it to a color that imitates cedar. The color scheme will be grey. Proposed to restore the cedar shake roof.

- Wildness of original site, do you have a plan that shows which trees will be taken down and has anyone looked at state of trees?
There is a Covenant on title whereby most of the existing trees have been topped to allow for views from the property to the north. It is important to retain the landscaped edges of the site. Walked the site with an arborist, one tree at the entry to the drive isle is proposed to be retained. As well, an existing mature Rhododendron close to the gazebo will be retained. Proposed landscape approach is to remove invasive species and reintroduce native planting across the site wherever possible.
- For the infill, the plans do not show the distance between the two duplexes.
8 ft.
- Survey A03, current site. You referenced steep slope, natural features such as ponds and the built form, the step terraced work and retaining walls. The presentation suggested that the existing three pools would be converted to structured water features. Of the existing rock, water and terraced landscape features, how much is retained?
There is an upper deck and down a few steps is a lower deck. The lower deck is not accessible. There is a 15 ft. easement that we are not using. The proposal is to push the existing wall in about 3 ft. and rebuild it. We will be using the greenspace in the back for the gathering spot.
- The SOS speaks to the importance of the original cottage and its addition in 1951; however, the proposed interior work would remove / renovate all of the 1951 interiors?
Past owners have changed renovated most of the 1951 interiors. The main room could be renovated while protecting elements that have value like the fireplaces.
- For the HRA, are any of the interior elements proposed to be protected?
We would be open to protecting the gazebo and the fireplace and open to recommendations from the committee. With the proposed rental tenure and specifically the short-term rental use this would allow for semi-public access to the interior of the Cottage so that the short term rental unit could be rented and accessed for heritage events. That living room was where all the parties happened.
- Will the site be subdivided so that the house is on a separate property than the townhouse?
The Cottage would be owned by one owner and the duplexes and townhouses could be separate strata. If the Cottage itself is under one ownership, heritage maintenance is much easier to accomplish. Trying to avoid issues that have

come up in the past with stratas with mixed ownership that included a heritage resource (e.g. heritage maintenance costs).

- Proposed subdivision plan was not included?
The Land Surveyor is still working through some aspects of the driveway. Subdivision plan would be submitted at a later date.
- Are we expecting to see the HRA come back?
Consistent with standard practise for all HRAs the committee wouldn't review the specific HRA document prior to Council consideration. It would be reviewed by the District solicitors and staff and would be attached to the council report.

Committee Comments:

- The site and cottage are of significant heritage value and deserve to be added to the Community Heritage Register. The site and cottage are architecturally and historically significant. Using the 1951 era renovation as the benchmark is supportable. The overall concept is handsome, however, some are going to question if the rental infill units are too much for the site. The concept of using west coast modern architecture rather than mimicking the heritage cottage is supportable, support interior protection as proposed by the applicant team. The proposed FAR 0.64 is consistent with other lower density housing and heritage infill projects. Concern about design of stair addition could be improved to be more compatible.
- The Caulfeild area is significant. Caulfeild Cove has a unique character. I saw that character on the property. The problem is this project eliminates the character, the landscape and view. The character will be completely erased with the proposed development. The house has very little heritage significance other than interior. I do not see a heritage house being left although I do support aspects of the interior being saved. Really appreciated the flyover, when you get to the end of the driveway it looks like a walk-up motel. I think it has character right now, if you treat this as an HRA, I do not see any significant heritage features left. What is being preserved here is so limited, not enough to justify this scale of development.
- Thank you for the presentation. I appreciate there is an interest to returning the Cottage to its 1951 era. Some of the changes that are being proposed will assist in that. Support including the gazebo and brick fireplace as protected heritage elements. They tell the story of the site. Would like to see an HRA that gets more specific on what will be retained. Some of the proposed landscape features will have value but are not the same as what is there now. Cannot replace the existing features (e.g. ponds). Interest in retaining the key landscape features of the plan so that these are secured as a part of the approval.

- Generally support protection of the Cottage and the approach to planning the site. The infill development is appropriate. West Vancouver OCP supports adding housing variety and diversity to evolve. The proposed housing would be accessible to a variety of people including the family friendly units. The variety of housing units would support aging in place in the site. Support the approach to restoring the Cottage to its 1951 era, however, the modern additional design elements of the Cottage should be reconsidered (e.g. aluminum and glass railings, modern garage doors). Support restoring the heritage Cottage with a subdued look. The proposed landscape plan responds appropriately to the site features with its existing ponds and walkways. The overall landscape plan serves to make the site accessible for residents. Support protection of the gazebo, as a unique feature on the site.
- Generally support preserving the existing Cottage. Having the heritage house in the foreground of the site as seen from Piccadilly North is beneficial for the overall proposal. Concerned with the amount of paving around the house, especially the long retaining walls. Consider additional planting for the landscape plan to reduce paving and study the retaining walls, specifically the one beside the driveway. Currently the character of the stonework has the look of a resort. Be mindful of too much paving when trying to achieve a west coast modern design. It is somewhat difficult to read the plans (e.g. not dimensioned). The buildings are close to the edge of the site along the west and south. Those building forms will be very exposed. Consider design development for setbacks and building massing along these edges to reduce building bulk and proximity.
- Appreciated the fly through and written material. Won't limit comments strictly to responding to staff questions. Heritage isn't only about built form; it's about landscape and people. A cornerstone of the heritage significance for this site is linked to the founding fathers of Caulfeild and their vision for the area. The SOS is too narrow in scope and doesn't respond to the Caulfeild heritage and character defining elements. This should be what anchors the purpose of the SOS and significance of the site. This area above Marine Drive has significant connection to Lower Caulfeild and was envisioned and planned with similar character and elements. Reviewed the work and extensive community consultation that produced the Lower Caulfeild conservation plan in 2012. Even though this site is outside the area, the sites below and above Marine Drive are linked. Neighbourhood character and the community consultation made it clear that the landscape is more important than built form in terms of the heritage significance. The SOS needs work to bring in more of Lower Caulfeild elements that then draws out why the site is important. It is not just about the building, it is about the people, the landscape and Caulfeild and Stone's vision. Question of whether the infill development is appropriate in relation to the proposal being primarily driven by heritage should be taken offline with staff for discussion. The scale of this development needs to fit in with the whole context of the heritage of the area and not just the business case. Realize that our task here is to focus on the heritage elements, not other aspects of the municipal agenda responding to climate action and

housing needs. This proposal responds to many council agenda items, however, it should be tied to neighbourhood character and the significance of the Caulfeild area. Caulfeild envisioned walkability, community sites and shared sites. The proposal could be improved to emphasize these key characteristics. Concerned that where the heritage structure is it is not easily visible to the public. Caulfeild envisioned laneways and early subdivision plan had roughed in driveways. Needs to respond to the Caulfeild vision with country laneways, to connect east west from the road to the other side of the property. The public would then be able to see the benefits. I would be prepared to support this in principle, still some work that needs to be done in terms of scale and character defining character in SoS. More work is needed in terms of community engagement and how the public might access the site. Would like to see it come back as a second discussion with changes responding to comments of the Committee.

- Concern about the amount of hardscaping. The proposed infill development doesn't really represent mid century modern design, which should fit in with the local landscape. With the proposed conservation plan, the Cottage seems to disappear and ends up having a resort-like character. Do not see elements of the home as what was intended for the Caulfeild area.
- Agree that there is too much paving. Reduce it and consider design development to retain the character of Caulfeild, notwithstanding the proposed additional development. Reconsider introduction of the newer modern elements for the Cottage. It should feel like a 1951 building.
- Concerned that there is too much building on the site. Design development needed to reduce building massing at the edges of the site.

It was Moved and Seconded:

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

- General support for the renovation and rehabilitation with design development to eliminate some or all of the modern material and design interventions for the Cottage
- Seek heritage protection for the gazebo and fireplaces within the Cottage.
- The Project SoS more clearly articulate the heritage values and character-defining elements of this "place" (not just the "house" as adapted over time), drawing a broader connection to Lower Caulfeild and the heritage values articulated in that SoS."
- Design development to consider the scale and positioning of the infill development, including its proximity to adjacent property line and the distance between the duplexes. The scale of the development should fit into the area.
- Design development to reduce excessive amount of paving and hardscaping. Consider increased retention of existing landscape features.

THAT the revised package along with a revised SOS should be recirculated to the committee for review (after DRC review and any changes resulting from that review). This may not require a subsequent applicant presentation and full HAC review.

OPPOSED: Paul Hundal

CARRIED

5. Updates

- 5.1 Update on coordination work related to outreach and education and best practises review (Laura Anderson and John Mawson)

Laura and John reviewed the materials that were forwarded to the Committee describing their work to date with Laura working on outreach and education and John initiating a best practises review.

There was discussion about a "Retreat" to debate a concrete "Public Information and Education Strategy" based on the circulated draft; most expressed a preference to do this over one or more evenings rather than a weekend day.

Action item: Identify potential dates for a discussion.

- 5.2 Update on Heritage Planner – Staff submitted the business case; no update on this other than it is underway. The budget doesn't get approved until next year.

- 5.3 HRA and Heritage project updates

Binning – Current work is not being reviewed under a Heritage Alteration Permit but is maintenance work that is required as per the Heritage Designation and Heritage Maintenance By-laws. Some work (e.g. structural repairs to foundation) will require building permits, etc. Staff have been on site to do inspections and are actively engaging with the owner. Ongoing, we are going to send a letter with deadlines and items. Staff are reviewing, not a public document. Happy to provide updates as I have them.

Hewitt House –The application was not supported by Council. If the applicant would like to resubmit the same proposal they would have to wait one year from the Council decision (based on the provisions in the Development Procedures By-law). Staff have met with the applicant and provided information on options.

Boyd House – First reading scheduled for Council on December 2, 2019.

Action Item: The committee requested an update regarding consultation on the Navy Jack house

6. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

- Does the Committee consider environmental aspects of proposals? The proposed infill development smothers the proposal and eradicates the existing landscape. As well the amount of blasting necessary for the proposal is unsustainable.
- There was talk about heritage and how it is overlapping with the Neighbourhood Character Working Group mandate.
- The Natural Assets work that West Vancouver is conducting is very forward thinking.
- Is this committee guided by the Heritage Strategic Plan? If so the proposal should be considered based on the policies that relate to community and the importance of neighbourhood character.
Heritage strategic plan is a foundational document for the Committee.
- There should be a requirement for heritage reports and presentations from applicants to have realistic plans and renderings. Feel the presentation materials are not accurate. Is there a consideration of FAR comparable to the area and all of West Vancouver? Walkway on the west is not usable as it begins on a dead end street and the north end dead-ends at the railroad. As well, to turn in into a walkway would require to removal of existing trees.
- For Committee procedures, it should be permitted for members of the public to speak up and make points of clarification throughout the meeting (i.e. not just at the end during the public questions period). Heritage week is the 3rd week in February. HAC should consider opportunities to promote the Committee's work. There are five categories of heritage that need to be considered. Support the District's efforts to hire a Heritage planner.
- Confused about what heritage the committee is endorsing in supporting this proposal. Is someone looking at this site supposed to see a 1934 cottage or an example of a mid century modern house? Trying to understand what heritage is being endorsed here.

7. NEXT MEETINGS

The proposed 2020 Meeting Schedule is as follows:

Date	Time	Room Location
January 21, 2020	4:30pm	Raven Room
March 10, 2020	4:30 pm	Raven Room
May 19, 2020	4:30pm	Raven Room
July 21, 2020	4:30 pm	Raven Room
September 22, 2020	4:30 pm	Raven Room
November 17, 2020	4:30 pm	Raven Room

8. ADJOURNMENT

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT the November 26, 2019 Heritage Advisory Committee Meeting (open session) be adjourned.

CARRIED

The meeting adjourned at 7:36 p.m.

Certified Correct:

Paula Grossman
Chair

M. H.
Committee Clerk