



28<sup>th</sup> November 2019

File: 19003

Planning Department,  
City of Kelowna,  
City Hall,  
1435 Water Street,  
Kelowna, B.C.  
V1Y 1J4

Attention: Lauren Sanbrooks, M.A., Planner II

Dear Lauren :

Reference: 409 Park Avenue, Kelowna \_ Removal of Property from the Heritage Register

As I think you're aware, the owners of 409 Park Avenue (Brenda Rusnak & Dave Cullen) retained me to provide structural engineering services for the remodelling of the existing house at this address. The initial task of those services was to perform a structural inspection and evaluation of the building. The evaluation unfortunately revealed that there are significant structural defects in the building with respect to its lack of a competent foundation system, under-capacity structural framing, and a seriously compromised roof structure. Rectification of these defects is neither practical nor fiscally viable.

Consequently the owners have decided that they want to demolish the existing house and rebuild to a design compliant with the conservation area development guidelines, which will of course require re-application for an HAP. In preparation for this, the owners wish to apply to have the property removed from the heritage register.

With my own background in heritage buildings I always consider demolition as a last resort, so in this case I have carried out a quite detailed investigation of the building's heritage attributes, together with its current condition.

During the course of the structural inspection I found that the building had been extensively modified since its original construction. The gable/dormer on the west side of the roof was clearly not part of the original building and is quite crudely constructed. The bay window at main floor level on the west elevation is also not original. The extension of the main floor at the north end is very obviously a later addition. There is a small extended area on the south side which is not original and the entire east wing is clearly a modern addition. So the building that exists today bears no resemblance to the building originally built for F.W. Groves in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century.

In reviewing the SoS I noted several inconsistencies between what is described and what actually exists. The character defining elements include the descriptions:

1. *"....with substantial rectangular side extension creating an overall 'T' shaped plan;"*

Structural review has shown the side extension to be of modern origin and it is understood that the City Building Department's records date this extension at 1995.



2. *"-concrete foundation,"*

The building does not have a concrete foundation.

Also included in the character defining elements are the descriptions:

- *Cross-gabled dormers on the side elevations;*
- *Enclosed rear porch with gabled roof;*
- *Bay window on the Long St elevation.*

From inspection of the building structure it can be seen that all of these elements are additions and modifications to the original early 20<sup>th</sup> century building. It is believed that these elements were added at a remodelling that took place in 1939.

Consequently the SoS is somewhat misleading, it portrays the building as a 1909 construction, but actually describes a building that really only came into existence during an extensive remodelling in 1939, with a small addition to the south in 1948, and a further major addition to the east in 1995. Architecturally, the building style as it currently exists appears to be a combination of Arts & Crafts (Late) and Vernacular Cottage (Early) having characteristics of both but not truly fitting into either style.

At the time this building was added to the heritage register, the evaluation system used to determine eligibility for heritage status was far less objective than the current system and consequently was open to inconsistency.

I felt that an objective way to assess the heritage importance of this house was to rate it again using the current evaluation system. Attached to this letter is the evaluation I carried out, I've included a column for the rationale behind each rating. Although there is still some subjectivity in this evaluation system, I'm experienced enough with it to know that my findings are reasonably representative of an independent assessment of this building. While others may rate slightly differently I think it unlikely that the score would be raised sufficiently to definitively qualify it for inclusion on the register.

Having completed this exercise I have to conclude that this house is not an important heritage asset that must be saved and I feel more comfortable in supporting the application for removal of the house from the heritage register.

Sincerely,

Brian Anderson, P.Eng.

***Datum Consulting Ltd***

*Structural Engineers*

Ph: (250) 575-6136

Email: [be.anderson@telus.net](mailto:be.anderson@telus.net)

**KELOWNA HERITAGE REGISTER EVALUATION CRITERIA**

<b>409 Park Avenue, Kelowna</b>			
<b>CATEGORY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Rationale</b>	<b>Score</b>
<b>A. Architectural History</b>			
1. Style and/or Type	G	As an amalgam of styles resulting from the major 1939 remodelling, it could be considered to be no more than an average example (being neither one style nor the other) but given the history of the building and its early 20th century origins a 'G' rating seems conservatively appropriate	12
2. Design	F/P	Neither the original building nor the remodelled one (i.e. current condition) incorporate any special attributes and the existing building does actually contain a number of design flaws	0
3. Construction	G	The main floor support/foundation system is historically early but typical of the period and commonly found in the HCA	5
4. Designer / Builder	F/P	Unknown	0
Subtotal			17
<b>B. Cultural History</b>			
1. Historical Association	VG	The house is closely connected with F.W. Groves who is recognized as a person of importance	18
2. Historical Pattern	G	In the context of F.W. Groves contribution to the community (irrigation and water system engineering) the building could be considered to be associated with a historical pattern (although not actually what this criteria was intended to mean this is a conservative approach to this item)	10
Subtotal			28
<b>C. Context</b>			
1. Landscape /Site	F/P	Although there is one mature tree on the property there is no intact historical landscape, nor any features of significance	0
2. Neighbourhood	G	This building is non-conforming with respect to style. There are also a variety of styles on this block. Consequently there is no contiguous group of similar style, but it is in an area of compatible use	6
3. Visual / Symbolic Importance	F/P	The building is not a landmark and not of symbolic significance	0
Subtotal			6
<b>D. Integrity &amp; Condition</b>			
1. Integrity & Condition	F/P	The building has a modern extension to the east and is completely remodelled since its original construction in 1909. It is in very poor structural condition, mostly due to the poor quality of construction of the modified roof framing and the lack of a competent foundation system	-15
Total			<b>36</b>
Evaluation Group C - A score of less than 40 indicates that the building does not qualify for inclusion on the register			