

The Corporation of the City of North Vancouver  
**Regular Meeting of the Heritage Advisory Commission**  
City Hall, 141 West 14<sup>th</sup> Street, North Vancouver  
Conference Room A  
Tuesday, December 13, 2022 at 6:00 p.m.

---

---

**MINUTES**

---

---

**PRESENT:**

Chris Wilkinson, Chair  
Michaela Balkova, Architect  
Chris Carnovale  
Ali Nayeri

**STAFF:**

Bram van der Heijden, Planner 1  
Emma Chow, Planner 2  
Christa Bulman, Committee and Records Clerk  
Tanis Huckell, Committee Clerk

**REGRETS:**

Christine Wilson  
Kate O'Donnell

**GUESTS:**

Lucio Picciano, Architect AIBC CPHD, dlp  
Architecture Inc.  
Meredith Mitchell, Landscape Architect

---

---

The meeting was called to order at 6:02pm.

**1. ADOPTION OF MINUTES**

The minutes of November 8, 2022 were adopted as circulated.

**2. HERITAGE REVITALIZATION AGREEMENT WITH DELEGATION**

311 West 14<sup>th</sup> Street (Follis Residence)

The City has received a Heritage Revitalization Agreement (HRA) application from Lucio Picciano of dlp Architecture Inc., to raise the home two feet and remove the existing structure at the rear of the property, including the garage and deck. The proposed duplex is 5.6 m from the heritage home, with the top story being setback an additional 3.3 m to create more separation at this height. The top of the proposed roof is 1.13 m higher than the heritage home itself. The bonus density for this property brings the maximum density from 0.50 FSR to 0.67 FSR. Staff would like to get feedback on the revitalization and raising of the heritage home with any considerations, such as vulnerable elements of the heritage building.

L. Picciano introduced the application to the Commission for review, noting the following:

- The building will not move laterally, the proposed plan is to raise the structure 30 inches.
- Benefits to raising the structure 30 inches included:
  - Gives dominance to the heritage house frontage.
  - Available to provide a more adaptable basement suite, which will make it at-grade entry level.
  - Closer proximity to the sidewalk grade, which will reduce the amount of steps.

- Eliminated front steps down, level entry ramp to 4 new risers allowing bridge to be a ramp with an acceptable slope and also retain prominent front entry stair. All 4 steps go up and will be visible.
- Side elevation siteline right to the door.
- Reconstruction of the basement once the residence has been lifted, allowing for a self contained secondary suite with energy updates.
- Keep the prominent chimney towards the frontage and remove the secondary chimney near the rear of the building.
- Decommission rear chimney and both fireplaces externally but keep them in tact internally.
- Energy upgrades to existing heritage house will be kept minimal with the exception of decommissioning the chimneys/gas services and replacing it with a heatpump.
- Duplex will have a minimalist look in comparison to the heritage house while maintaining correlation in terms of proportion, height and form factor.
- Passive house certified to allow for high energy and air quality performance. Exceeding step 5 of the BC Step-Code.
- The house will retain its colour and existing materials, including window frames and roof. The new duplex will have silver metallic flat metal panels and light stained wood on lower sections, only 2 materials for duplex and subtle to allow the structure to blend in.
- Speaking to the Heritage Conservation Plan, the intent is to keep the current cladding matching the basement and whatever is adjacent to it. The wood paneling will match what's currently in the basement, which is a vertical wood (3 inch tongue and groove). Keeping original approach to cladding while removing the garage and deck rear addition. There is support from the heritage consultant to remove the rear chimney but keep the front one. Apart from raising the house 30 inches, proposed new picket railing on the porch and the windows will be retained as much as possible.

M. Mitchell discussed the landscape layout to the Commission for review, noting the following:

- There are pre-existing deciduous trees that are visible from the street frontage view, two in which will be relocated. There are also individual walkways that come from the street frontage to the porch existing with the sloped landscape. There is a grade difference from the rear and front yards. There will be bike racks added to the garage and yard space for the new duplex as well as a trellis system on the backside of the building to provide green space with an individual stair entry to the back. Patio space will also incorporate a concrete slab to provide a minimalistic approach while the front will highlight greenery.

L. Picciano plays a flythrough video for the Commission at 6:33pm.

#### Questions/Comments from the Commission:

- Why are you removing 1 chimney externally and both fireplaces on the inside? **A:** By decommissioning, we are preventing their ability to burn wood for heat, which aligns with our new energy proposals. In addition to it being unhealthy to burn wood inside, we're aiming to make this project as energy efficient as possible through electricity and decarbonisation. Removing the second chimney is mainly to mitigate the possibility of it coming down when we raised the house.
- Is the whole development part of a strata or is it managed separately as dwellings? **A:** It will be stratified. The owner intends to keep the property and rent out the other 5 units.

- You mentioned your decision to establish a bit of contrast infill on the existing heritage building, why do you feel like that's required? Why make contrast in terms of colour and materials? **A:** Primarily for two reasons. Firstly, we are a contemporary firm and mainly do modernist projects so we like to find ways to make layers of interest with the decade we're in. Secondly, if we want to achieve a level of indoor air quality and energy performance, a very simple approach to design is the best. We're adding a lot of budget to allow that envelope to be high performing and by keeping it minimalistic we're putting budget towards that high performance.
- Can you give me more information on the front fence and screening of the garage areas or location of heat pump? Have you talked to heritage advisor with what the strategy is? **A:** Not for the heatpump but we have discussed fencing and screening (bike locations). We plan to use a combination of metal picket (character decision to match architecture). Fencing on 2 sides is a more heritage-style wood so we wanted perforated style on the perimeter to allow green to come through the fence while also keeping it as minimal as possible.
- There appears to be a lot of fence in the front and since it's black it's very prominent, have you considered reducing the fence in the front? **A:** We have fence and gates due to the retaining wall and grade difference so we could look at reducing fence in some areas. The parameter will have fence to separate neighbours/yard spaces. We do not have fencing in between planted areas.
- To confirm, you aren't moving the main heritage house but the setback lines are changing? **A:** Correct, it should be situated exactly where it is. The current house is setback further than what is required by zoning, to ensure it remains that way we would increase the setback of rezoning.
- Regarding the basement energy upgrades and improvements, do you have any detail on the transition between the basement and existing floor above? Right now it looks like the siding is in-line, will the basement be bumped up and what would the transition look like between the two levels? **A:** The basement walls will be destroyed when lifting the building, we will line-up with the existing above and build insulation to the inside.
- With the secondary chimney being removed, because it is not very visible and the prominent chimney will be kept in place, what materials are being used? **A:** We are going for a secondary material wood grain look but with composite material products. It does have wood content and wood grain but it is not pure wood.
- Do you feel the wood is necessary? Heritage buildings are built on honest materials, such that wood is wood. Do you think it's necessary to go with wood? **A:** The grain won't be prominent, it's not meant to be seen as wood. It's meant to contrast the nature of the silver metallic with softer smaller scale material that mirrors wood. It can have same width of board so that the whole structure of duplex is not metal. Will the composted board be in similar fashion as the metal siding? **A:** The metal panel is 12 inches wide and the composite board is also vertical but would be 6 inches and it's not as narrow as the heritage house but still reflects it.
- Is the overhang at the rear created by wood with glass? What is the material? **A:** Wood frame. We have a long canopy and same thing at the front but much narrower. Same idea front and back.
- Regarding the bonus density reference to site nearby, is there a comparable bonus elsewhere? **A:** Across the street, same zone RS1 and R2 in OCP and 19 bonus density. There are a couple other bonus densities that have occurred, excluded density in zone here and there. It's difficult to backtrack exactly what happened, in-line with OCP and the proposed heritage policy.
- To confirm, the separation between the two buildings is 18 ft? **A:** 18.3 ft and top floor additional 11 ft, which brings it to 29.3 ft.

- What are the roof pitches on the two? **A:** 7 and 12 for duplex and heritage house is 10 and 12.
- Has there been any location specified for the heatpump? **A:** There is a possibility of using the heatpump without an outdoor unit so before having to site one, looking into all the options but we have an extended side yard where we could hide it if necessary.
- Regarding the fencing in the front yard, can you walk us through the height? 42 inch vs. 5 point high fencing? And is the front yard along the side yard also 42 inch? **A:** 42 inch height is required for fall height locations, we are wanting to be unintrusive vs. 5 foot fencing between unit ownership. Wood one standard privacy fence and 1.8 perimeter fence on side. Normally 1.8 wood but would wrap metal around side 6 meters back to have shorter fencing on street but contemplating if would be better to show wood on neighbours side and metal on front but running fence back.
- Looking at Standard 11 of the *Standards & Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada* (Standards & Guidelines), it states “make the new work physically and visually compatible with, subordinate to and distinguishable from the historic place.” It could be argued that from an architectural point of view it might be desirable to make use of modern materials and forms to create visual interest and make the infill “distinguishable”. However, creating high contrast actually goes against the other components of the standard which require the infill to be visually compatible and subordinate to the historic place by drawing attention to addition or infill. The Heritage Conservation Plan also makes reference to the size of the infill and states that its footprint is smaller than the original dwelling, which would make it “subordinate”. However, it seems that that the actual footprint the infill is in fact bigger (153 sq.m. for infill vs. 118 sq.m. for original).
- Regarding the chimney, I can appreciate how hard it is to brace an un-reinforced masonry chimney but since you’re planning on retaining the interior hearth intact, removing an (exterior) element on a heritage building just because it’s hard to conserve/brace it isn’t an appropriate approach. This is especially important since keeping the interior hearth could create confusion when the interior shows a fireplace but there is no trace of it on the exterior. So offering my suggestion to retain this element unless it can be demonstrated that there is an “inherent vice”.
- The density bonus, number of units and overall layout are appropriate contextually. I fully appreciate how you don’t get into a mechanical system but there’s also an opportunity to work with staff as plans develop so not placing heatpump on the side yard locations that impact neighbours and being mindful of neighbours. With respect to colours, there’s an opportunity to look at that more as the contrast is quite significant. The home at 735 East 3<sup>rd</sup> Street is a modern building and has a larger lot built behind Chatman residence, the siding details and simplicity is quite elegant but at same time contrast between red and metallic colours chosen could be too much contrast. With respect to chimney and windows, single chimney prominent to street is most important but visually it is odd to have an element in the building but not having it match outside.
- Only concern is front property screening and fencing, possibility to be more welcoming between the property’s private and public relationship.

It was regularly moved and seconded:

THAT the Heritage Advisory Commission, having reviewed the presentation from Lucio Picciano, dlp Architecture Inc., for the property located at 311 West 14<sup>th</sup> Street (Follis Residence), supports the project subject to the resolution of the following items to the satisfaction of City Staff:

- undertake a review of the interiors and confirm assumptions on the condition of the character defining elements in the Heritage Conservation Plan (operable window, doors and trim);

311 West 14<sup>th</sup> Street – Resolution – Continued

- review the extent and height reduction of proposed fencing at the front yard and simplify the separation of spaces as much as possible;
- further exploration of duplex colour scheme in line with heritage professional;
- further exploration of heat pump and other mechanical equipment be placed in side yards and mindful of potential impacts to neighbours;
- that the Heritage Conservation Plan be shared with the contractor, to ensure recommendations within the plan are adhered to;

AND THAT the Commission thanks the applicant for their presentation and commitment to achieve passive house certification for the new duplex building.”

**Carried Unanimously**

*The delegation for 311 West 14<sup>th</sup> Street left the meeting at 7:56pm.*

**3. TRI-MUNICIPAL MEETING**

E. Chow shared a PowerPoint presentation on the Tri-Municipal HAC Meeting at 7:57pm.

Highlights Included:

- Heritage Conservation Incentives.
- Draft Incentives Policy.
- Draft Incentives Policy: Density, Variance and Subdivision.
- Reflect on past projects and compare them to how they would have been affected by this new policy, being mindful of the complexity and cost.
- The policy was based on what the city has been approving over the years, we have gone back to previous heritage approvals and other municipalities (Coquitlam, New West, DNV, DWV, etc.) and are in-line with what has been happening across the region. We need this policy so we have the same expectations across the board with consistency and best practices.

**4. UPDATES**

- Heritage reserve fund has not been used in quite some time and staff are still working on tracking down the reserve establishment bylaw to share how the funds can be used but upcoming direction is expected to develop an actual heritage grant program.

**5. DATE OF NEXT MEETING – January 17, 2023**

**6. ADJOURN**

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:30pm.

“Chris Wilkinson”

Chair

“February 21, 2023”

Date