



MINUTES
OAK BAY HERITAGE COMMISSION
THURSDAY, APRIL 6, 2017 AT 10:00 AM
COUNCIL CHAMBEERS, MUNICIPAL HALL, 2167 OAK BAY AVENUE

MEMBERS PRESENT

Marion Cumming
Jane M. Hall
Joan Heagle
Susan Ross

Cora Smith
Bronwyn Taylor
Robert Taylor

MEMBERS ABSENT

Heather Cochran
Cairine Green
Margaret Palmer

Councillor Kevin Murdoch
Monica Walter

STAFF PRESENT

Deborah Jensen, Manager of Planning
Roy Thomassen, Director of Building and Planning

Krista Mitchell, Building / Planning Clerk

OTHERS PRESENT

Members of the Public: 3

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 10:05 am.

2. Approval of Agenda and Late Items

The agenda was approved as presented.

3. New Business

- a) DVP00058 – 3125 Uplands Road
To consider interior renovations undertaken to the existing home.

D. Jensen gave a brief overview of the application. Some of the comments were:

- A development variance permit was previously approved for renovations to the home and construction of two accessory buildings, and the new owner has now applied for another development variance permit for an addition to one side of the home and construction of a new detached garage.
- Council issued a 60 day protection order for the heritage registered home, which means no work is to be done until the order is lifted; however, staff discovered that significant work has already taken place, including alterations or removal of some of the character defining elements outlined in the statement of significance.

R. Thomassen noted staff had not been made aware of the extent of the interior work that had been undertaken, where the contractor had essentially stripped the interior of the home, and the statement of significance may need to be amended.

Commission Comments

Commission members inquired as to what materials had been removed, and whether the contractors had salvaged any of those materials.

M. Jardine, contractor, apologized for how the work had unfolded, noting they pride themselves on their integrity, and the state of the home is beyond what they would normally do. He advised that the entrance way, staircase, floors, hardware and some trim had been saved, that there was only one marble fireplace as the other two fireplaces had been modified with dated tile from a previous renovation, and that a new wall system is being introduced for rain screening.

R. Collins, applicant, commented the owner wants to restore the home similar to its original state, and that they would like to complete the renovations as soon as possible.

Commission members commented that the home is not designated and that the floor plan is more or less intact, noting that previous renovations were not sympathetic or in keeping with the heritage value. They also suggested that, while some character defining elements outlined in the statement of significance are gone, the statement should remain as is so a future owner is aware and may wish to restore those elements.

Commission members noted it is very important that heritage be a success, and removal of the interior features where the home is not designated is irrelevant since the streetscape has not changed. A Commission member further noted that the problem is the breach of the 60 day waiting period.

A Commission member commented the photographs of the work submitted by the contractor are not a true reflection of the home as the online photographs from a realtor website show the home with the character elements.

M. Jardine, contractor, clarified the photographs were meant to show the renovations done in the 1980s and there was no intent to mislead anyone, noting the intent of the owner is to make a beautiful home indicative of the age and styling of the home.

R. Collins, applicant, confirmed the fireplace, living room, staircase, and entryway are all staying in the same location.

D. Jensen advised the staircase, flooring, door frames, and fireplace structures are still in place.

Commission members suggested the owners are trying to adapt the home to the 21st century while restoring it to be gracious again and advised the owners consider heritage designation, yet noting the designation should not be forced as it may deter people from heritage altogether.

R. Collins, applicant, commented the owners would like to complete the renovation and then consider heritage designation.

Commission members suggested it would be nice to retain some of the character defining elements of the home, such as the staircase, since this home is one of the original 12 homes built in the Uplands. A Commission member also commented that the interior of

the home was not viewed by the Commission, and it is dangerous to the process for the Commission to interfere with a heritage registered, not designated, home.

R. Goodman, contractor, noted that the owners have previously renovated heritage homes in Vancouver.

It was moved and seconded to recommend that Council support the ongoing interior renovations as presented.

The motion was carried.
S. Ross, C. Smith and J. Hall opposed.

J. Heagle departed the meeting at 10:50 am.

It was moved to recommend that Council support the ongoing interior renovation with the preservation of the staircase and the floors.

The motion failed.

It was moved and seconded that the Heritage Commission recommend that Council consider future heritage designation of the heritage home.

The motion failed.

4. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 11:05 am.