

- Final Report from Don Luxton and Associates Inc. Heritage Assessment Report

Regarding the Menzies Residence dated: April 20 2016

Pitt Meadows File No. : 3360-20-2014-04

Civic Address: 19963 Mc Neil Rd., Pitt Meadows

2nd reading Submission Date: March 03 2017



Wednesday, April 20, 2016

Alycia Hayes
c/o Davenport Design Group Ltd.

Dear Ms. Hayes;

Heritage Assessment: The Menzies Residence, 19963 McNeil Road, Pitt Meadows

As outlined, this report provides a heritage assessment on the condition of the Menzies Residence, and its suitability for conservation. This site is listed on the City of Pitt Meadows Heritage Register, and this assessment provides a further review of its heritage values, current situation, overall condition and options for conservation.



Menzies Residence
19963 McNeil Road
Circa 1910
Listed on the Pitt Meadows Community Heritage Register

SITE HISTORY

Raised areas, such as Menzies Island, were some of the first lands to be pre-empted in Pitt Meadows when the area was opened for settlement in the 1860s and 1870s. It was property with access to higher ground that was most sought after in these early years. This “half-and-half” land (part highland, part lowland) allowed homes, barns, and outbuildings to be built beyond the reach of floods, while providing grazing land for livestock for most of the year.

The W.H. Menzies family settled in the Number 2 Dyking District. They first went in by rowboat and the lumber for the buildings on their farm was also brought in by boat. This house was constructed for William Henry Menzies (1855-1947) and his first wife, Mary (1849-1924) Menzies. After Mary’s death due to influenza in 1924, William was remarried to Anna Brott (1862-1949). William Menzies worked as a farmer and carpenter, and lived in the house until the 1940s.

INTEGRITY

The Menzies Residence is currently located on a large property, set well back from McNeil Road, which reflects its original use as a farmhouse. The building is set at an angle on the lot; for the purposes of this report the front façade is assumed to face south.

Over time, large additions have been added to the east and west sides of the house, at the ground floor and basement levels. The original part of the house was built circa 1910, and displays a dual pitched roof, which extends over the front verandah, and a shed roof dormer with multi-assembly windows. The front door and the three part front casement window, with double transoms, appear to be original. The bevelled wooden siding and trim in the entry area is original, and appears to have also been matched on the additions. It is unknown if the front dormer is original, or has been extended.

The addition to the west extends the original rooflines, and returns them in a hipped roof, which alters the form and scale of the original house. Similarly, the addition to the east extends the roof form and alters the scale of the house. It appears that the original east and west walls of the house have been substantially altered or removed.

Overall the house in its current configuration lacks a great deal of its original integrity. In addition to the changes to form, scale and massing, there are also other alterations to windows, doors, stairs and balustrades. These alterations are not considered to have heritage significance, and detract from the original appearance and character of the house.



CONDITION OF MATERIAL

The house has been open to the elements, apparently for a period of several years. Windows are open and have allowed water infiltration. The roof shingles are failing. There is some structural sagging evident in the rooflines, and some internal structural failure. Overall, the construction materials are compromised, and appear to be in poor condition.

Throughout the exterior siding and the interior features, it appears that mould has become established, and is evident on most surfaces. The extent to which this has compromised the materials is unknown.



OPTIONS FOR CONSERVATION

In its current condition, the house lacks substantial integrity and appears to be in poor condition.

The options for conservation include:

- Retention of existing form;
- Partial retention (restoration of circa 1910 form), which could also include relocation;
- Documentation and demolition;
- Salvage;
- Commemoration.

If there is a decision to conserve all or part of the house, the following general considerations would apply.

- **Location:** Depending on structural condition, the house could be maintained at its current location, moved onsite, or relocated off site, if structurally feasible.
- **Form:** The additions to the east and west detract from the historical integrity and could be removed. This would allow a conjectural restoration of the 1910 form of the house.
- **Materials:** It is assumed that many of the materials have been compromised, and in any proposed conservation, the house would have to be virtually dismantled, in order to

provide a structurally stable shell and a functional envelope. This would further compromise the historical integrity of the site through potential loss of original material.

This would include:

- Salvage of as much original siding and trim as possible, once the extent of deterioration and biological growth is determined.
- Salvage of original windows and doors.
- Rebuilding of the structural shell of the building.
- Salvage of any interior features such as stairs.

Overall, a conservation of the circa 1910 house could be considered, but the current situation and condition indicate that little original material would remain through this process. The house would need to be substantially rebuilt, would lack integrity, and much of the restoration would be conjectural. Such a restoration would lack integrity, and would not properly represent heritage value. The Menzies Residence, in its current condition, does not appear to be a good candidate for the conservation process.

If full or partial conservation is considered, the condition of materials would need to be fully assessed to fully understand how much of the building structure and materials could be conserved.

EXCLUSIONS

This Review does not provide a structural assessment, which would need to be provided by a qualified structural engineer, nor does it assess the existence of any hazardous materials.

Please let me know if you have any further questions, or would like to discuss this review. Many thanks in advance.

Sincerely,



Donald Luxton, FRAIC
Principal, Donald Luxton & Associates Inc.