

ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

**Tuesday, January 16, 2018 at 6:30 p.m.
Council Chambers**

MINUTES

VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT:

Peter Hall	- Chair, Community Member
Christa MacArthur	- Vice-Chair, Community Member
Darlene Carty	- Community Member
Laura Cornish	- Community Member
Margaret Fairweather	- Community Member
Andrew Hull	- Community Member
Tobi May	- Community Member
Alex Swezey	- Community Member

GUESTS:

Vandy Britton	- Property Owner
Phil Cookson	- Property Owner
Kirsten Sutton	- D3 Dimension Drafting and Design Inc.

STAFF:

Britney Quail	- Heritage Policy Planner
Heather Corbett	- Committee Clerk

The meeting was called to order at 6:32 p.m.

1.0 ADDITIONS TO AGENDA

1.1 There were no additions.

2.0 ADOPTION OF MINUTES

2.1 Adoption of the minutes of Tuesday, December 5, 2017

MOVED AND SECONDED

THAT the minutes of the December 5, 2017 Advisory Planning Commission meeting be adopted.

CARRIED.

All members of the Commission present voted in favour of the motion.

3.0 INFORMATION PRESENTATIONS

3.1 There were no items.

4.0 REZONING

4.1 224 Sixth Avenue – Heritage Revitalization Agreement and Heritage Designation Bylaw

Ms. Britney Quail, Heritage Policy Planner, summarized the report dated January 16, 2018, regarding a Heritage Revitalization Agreement (HRA) and Heritage Designation for a heritage home at 224 Sixth Avenue. The proposal is to retain, restore and protect the original 1937 house, in exchange for subdividing the property and constructing a new house, with a larger floor space ratio than normally permitted, on the newly created lot. The subdivision would move the existing house over and forward on the lot, to better align the house with others on the block.

In response to questions from the Commission, Ms. Quail provided the following information:

- Once the heritage house has moved to its new position on the lot, it will still comply with the setbacks consistent with the RS-1 zoning bylaw;
- The setback of the proposed new house is also consistent with the RS-1 zoning bylaw, which is a 19 ft. front yard setback;
- Front yard setbacks used to be 25 ft., however when the OCP was approved, the front setback was reduced to 19 ft;
- The existing heritage house is currently set back relative to other houses on the block, therefore this proposal will bring it in line with the neighbouring houses;
- If this property was developed as a single lot with no subdivision, a 4.9 ft. side setback would be required;
- The owners are awaiting a window study to clearly identify the amount of overlap with the neighbouring house, however the aim is for as minimal overlap as possible;
- The proposal meets all parking requirements and no street parking will be lost as the proposal does not include the addition of an additional driveway;
- The relaxation in FSR is proposed in exchange for the conservation and protection of the existing heritage house – the goal is to encourage and incentivize the retention of the house;
- The potential lane at the rear of the house would not likely be built for 150 years as it is part of the Master Transportation Plan;
- The right of way for the lane would come jointly out of this property and the property behind; and,

- Every HRA application is different and it is not always the case with lot separation that additional density is provided to the new lot. Generally, it depends on the style of development being proposed and is often dependent upon where the owner wants to live, although it is not the case in this application.

Ms. Quail added to her introduction of the application, noting that it is proposed that both properties include secondary suites, although no laneway house would be permitted, unless proposed in future.

The owners of the property, Mr. Phil Cookson and Ms. Vandy Britton, along with Ms. Kirsten Sutton of D3 Dimension Drafting and Design Inc., made a presentation to the Commission, reviewing the intent of continued ownership, the history and design of the heritage house, including its character defining elements, and the planned changes and restoration objectives. They also discussed the new infill house, including its site on the lot, proposed design and their sustainability objectives. The owners further expressed that the subdivision of the lot would help to finance the ongoing maintenance of the heritage home and their enthusiasm for the use of infill houses in Queen's Park as a method of providing density.

In response to questions from the Commission, Mr. Cookson, Ms. Britton and Ms. Sutton provided the following information:

- In consultation with the Queen's Park Resident's association, the proposed glass and metal railing on the porch of the new house were changed to the traditional wooden spindle rail;
- The rationale behind the size and floor space of the infill house is that the owner's believe it to be a size that a young family would be able to afford, with a mortgage helper in the basement; and,
- There is no alignment of windows with the neighbouring property planned.

In response to further questions from the Commission, Ms. Quail provided the following information:

- The Heritage Designation will be solely for the heritage house, but the Heritage Revitalization Agreement will be on title for both properties; and,
- The designs of both the heritage house (in its restored state) and the future infill house have been evaluated against the Queen's Park Heritage Conservation Area (HCA) design guidelines and both houses fit into the recommended guidelines for the HCA as well as the Standard Guidelines for Historic Places.

The Chair called for any speakers from the public.

Ms. Lucille Nelson, Resident, commented that Ms. Quail had not included the comments that were made at the public consultation for the property in her report.

In response to the comment raised by the speaker, Ms. Quail responded that the public consultation comments were included in the Staff report supplied to the Advisory Planning Commission prior to the meeting, and also posted online.

Mr. Larry Church, Resident, made a number of comments on the proposed HRA:

- The introduction of a lane at the back of the house would adversely affect the whole neighbourhood and some very old trees;
- It would be important to take into consideration the preservation of the Queen's Park grid system and the current urban forest management strategy; and,
- The proposed dormer on the new house would create shade on the adjacent house.

In response to the comments raised by the speaker, Ms. Quail responded that this project is subject to all current City policies such as the urban forest policy, stormwater retention strategy and the Master Transportation plan.

Ms. Janice Holm, Resident, gave a brief overview of her concerns, as included in two submissions to the Commission, including:

- Increased density could contribute to an erosion of heritage value in the neighbourhood;
- Although she is a neighbour to the proposed house, she has not yet been updated on the window assessment project and how it will affect her; and,
- The proposal may cause a significant loss of natural light to the whole side of her house, as well as loss of privacy and view.

Mr. Roger Nelson, Resident, highlighted three items of concern in regards to this project:

- The loss of natural light because of the proposed new house, which would be detrimental for the neighbours;
- The proposed side setbacks of 5ft. seem very small; and,
- Parking on Sixth Avenue could become an issue with the approval of this proposal, as at least four additional cars would need to be parked in order to accommodate the potential new residents.

In response to questions from the Commission, Ms. Quail provided the following information:

- There would be on-site parking for four cars;

- A future laneway is written in to development proposals such as this as a right of way for the City, but is only put into action once a certain percentage of the properties within the block are re-developed; and,
- The proposed parking pads are within the boundary of the property, not including the potential laneway area.

Mr. Matthew Holm, Resident, emphasized that parking on Sixth Avenue is quite unique, in that street parking is only permitted on one side of the street, and therefore is quite limited. In addition, he highlighted that the proposed HRA includes two parking spaces per lot, opposed from each other, whereas usually parking is stacked in the neighbourhood. Mr. Holm further suggested that parking could be stacked in this proposal so that there might be opportunity to park additional cars in future.

In response to a question from the Commission, Mr. Holm responded that the first two to three houses on the North side of Sixth Avenue have a laneway, but it does not extend the entire block.

Ms. Lucille Nelson, Resident, made some further comments on parking in the area and on the effects that the proposal will have on the neighbouring heritage house.

Mr. Larry Church, Resident, reiterated his concerns about the proposed right of way and potential for a future lane in this area. He also asked the Commission to consider the concerns raised by the long term residents in terms of parking in the area.

The Chair called two more times for comments from the public.

In response to a question from the Commission, Ms. Quail provided the following information:

- The property has 82 ft. of frontage, therefore the frontage is adequate to subdivide, however there is not adequate area to do so.

The Chair of the Commission thanked the members of the public for their comments and reiterated that the role of the APC is to comment and advise Council in regards to the City's policies on land use and zoning bylaw, and that the APC has no authority to comment on the Master Transportation plan.

The Commission noted the following comments on the proposed land use:

- It would be important to ensure that the Applicants work within the City's tree bylaw in order to protect relevant trees on the neighbouring property;
- The *Hedera Helix Wornera* (English Ivy) proposed in the landscape plans is an invasive species which is prohibited in New Westminster, and could be replaced by other climbing vines;
- Appreciation was noted for the change in railing materials;
- Concerns were expressed about the size and square footage of the new house on the new lot, as the FSR is significantly higher than allowed;
- Consideration could be given to the height of the house and roof line in comparison to the neighbouring properties;
- In terms of the size and massing of the proposed new house: in comparison to what would have been allowed had this been a new development proposal, this proposal is reasonable and supports higher density;
- The proposed HRA meets all requirements in terms of setbacks, roof height, and parking, and it is in line with the City's heritage policies and goals for Queen's Park;
- Appreciation was expressed for the neighbours' concerns about privacy, however it was noted that the heritage house could have been torn down and replaced with a larger house with smaller setbacks than the proposed with no public input;
- Occasionally, proposals are brought forward which use HRAs that are not in context with the neighbourhood; however considering a bigger house could be built if the original house was torn down, this HRA seems reasonable and an appropriate increase of density;
- In terms of the proposed easement, it is standard practice for municipalities to base FSR calculations on the lot without an easement;
- The lack of availability of parking in the area is not an egregious example and does not appear to be a big enough issue to turn down the proposal;
- If in future, parking becomes increasingly difficult, the owners and neighbours could possibly apply to the City for permitted parking;
- This proposal poses a balanced opportunity to supply family friendly housing and increased density in Queen's Park, while retaining and protecting heritage value; and,
- The Applicants and Staff should respond to Ms. Holm's request for the results of the window analysis.

MOVED and SECONDED

THAT the Advisory Planning Commission recommend that Council support the Heritage Revitalization Agreement and Heritage Designation of 224 Sixth Avenue, as proposed in the January 16, 2018 report.

CARRIED.

All members of the Commission present voted in favour of the motion.



5.0 NEW BUSINESS

- 5.1 The Chair and outgoing Commission members were thanked for their years of service to the Advisory Planning Commission.**

6.0 REPORTS AND INFORMATION

- 6.1 There were no items.**

7.0 CORRESPONDENCE

- 7.1 Correspondence regarding 224 Sixth Avenue**

MOVED and SECONDED

THAT the Advisory Planning Commission receive the correspondence included in the January 16, 2018 agenda package.

CARRIED

All members of the Commission present voted in favour of the motion.

8.0 NEXT MEETING

The next Advisory Planning Commission meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, January 30, 2018 in Council Chamber, City Hall.

9.0 ADJOURNMENT

ON MOTION, the meeting adjourned at 8:03 p.m.

Certified Correct,

ORIGINAL SIGNED

Peter Hall
Chair

ORIGINAL SIGNED

Heather Corbett
Committee Clerk