

ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

Tuesday, May 9, 2017 at 6:30 pm
Council Chambers

AGENDA

Item	Name	PAGE
1.0	ADDITIONS TO AGENDA	
1.1		
2.0	ADOPTION OF MINUTES	
2.1	Adoption of the minutes of Tuesday, April 18, 2017	2
3.0	INFORMATION PRESENTATIONS	
3.1		
4.0	REZONING	
4.1		
5.0	NEW BUSINESS	
5.1	Invitation to a free forum on Citizen Advisory Bodies and Urban Policy co-hosted by the SFU Urban Studies Program and the Vancouver City Planning Commission	9
6.0	REPORTS AND INFORMATION	
6.1	Queen's Park Heritage Conservation Area: Draft Conservation Area and Administrative Policy	11
7.0	CORRESPONDENCE	
7.1	Correspondence re: Queen's Park Heritage Conservation Area	22
8.0	NEXT MEETING	
	Tuesday, May 16, 2017	
9.0	ADJOURNMENT	

ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

Tuesday, April 18, 2017 at 6:30 pm
Council Chambers

MINUTES

VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT:

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

STAFF:

Rupinder Basi	- Senior Planner
David Guiney	- Senior Planning Analyst
Jim Hurst	- Development Planner
Heather Corbett	- Committee Clerk

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

1.0 ADDITIONS TO AGENDA

There were no additions.

2.0 ADOPTION OF MINUTES

2.1 Adoption of the minutes of Tuesday, March 21, 2017

MOVED AND SECONDED

THAT the March 21, 2017 Advisory Planning Commission minutes be amended as follows:

- In section 6.1, the following comment be added: The Heritage Conservation Area could have implications for buildings outside the Queens Park area.

THAT the minutes be adopted as amended

CARRIED.

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

3.0 INFORMATION PRESENTATIONS

3.1 Planning Policy Orientation

Rupinder Basi, Senior Planner, provided a PowerPoint presentation summarizing the role and functions of the Advisory Planning Commission (APC), including slides covering information on:

- The establishment and history of the APC;
- The role of the APC in the development review process;
- The scope of the APC and the difference between the Design Panel and the APC;
- The APC meeting formats;
- Key city policy documents; and,
- Staff roles and interactions with APC.

In response to a request from the Commission, Mr. Basi indicated that a copy of the presentation would be made available to the Commission and included in the minutes.

Procedural note: The Chair noted for the interest of the audience in attendance that discussion on the Queen's Park Heritage Conservation Area had been removed from the meeting agenda.

4.0 REZONING

4.1 229 Eleventh Street

David Guiney, Senior Planning Analyst, summarized the report dated April 18, 2017, regarding a rezoning application that has been received for 229 Eleventh St to rezone from Single Detached Dwelling Districts to a Comprehensive Development District (CD zone) to build a two-storey, side-by-side duplex at the front of the property and a laneway house at the rear of the property facing onto Shaw Street.

In response to questions from the Commission, Mr. Guiney provided the following information:

- This project has been brought forward with the understanding that the dwellings will be stratified;
- The City is not setting a precedent in allowing this laneway house to be stratified, as the nature of the project is more akin to a triplex than to a duplex with a laneway house;
- The developer is working with a landscape architect to ensure that the landscaping will be attractive from the street;
- A proposal for trees to be added to the street has not been received with this application but it is within the mandate of the APC to include a provision for this;
- There is one parking space for each of the three dwelling units; and,
- This application was reviewed with the draft laneway house design guidelines in mind and it complies with most of those guidelines.

Heather Davidson of Heather Davidson Design provided a PowerPoint presentation outlining details and drawings of the project and the associated landscaping.

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

- Relations between neighbours have been planned for in that the passageways from front to back and for access to waste containers have been made purposely wider;
- Focus was placed on green space at the back for the laneway house, but it could be possible to increase the green space available by extending the landscaping at the front (at letter F on plans shown to the Commission);
- The future owners of the laneway house could turn the garage into living space, providing they do not prevent the ability to park in the space; and,
- The rooms that are located next to the parking spaces on the side of the laneway house are the living space and the garage.

Rick Vugteveen, Resident and member of Yes in New West, spoke in favour of the proposal and the design that has been incorporated, yet expressed concerns regarding the laneway house, noting that there is potential for greater FSR within this design, allowing for a larger space for a single-family dwelling at lower cost.

Bibiana Lomperd, Resident, expressed concern about the proximity of the waste and recycling containers to the location of the laneway house.

In response to questions and comments from Mr. Vugteveen and Ms. Lomperd, and the Commission, Mr. Guiney provided the following information:

- The truncated roof design on the laneway house is due to the building envelope regulations for laneway house;
- The reason that the laneway house is located in the centre of the rear of the property is to give more convenient, equal, and direct access to the entrances of the duplex.
- The layout of the houses on the property comes from the need to address the challenges of fitting in all the buildings, the landscaping and adequate parking.

The Commission acknowledged the concerns from the public and noted the following comments:

- The Commission commended the architects and the City for the design;
- The proposal appears to address the City's Family Friendly housing policy;
- Appreciation was expressed for the City and Developer's efforts in having the first Laneway project move forward in the City of New Westminster, however the livable space of the laneway house in this development appears to be very limited;
- Appreciation was expressed for development of this property, which has been vacant for so many years;
- It may be appropriate to allow the laneway house to have more floor space; and,
- The Eleventh Street streetscape could be improved upon with an increase of trees

and improvements could be made to the streetscape on Shaw Street.

MOVED and SECONDED

THAT the following on-table correspondence regarding 229 Eleventh Street be received for information:

- *Email from Rick Vugteveen, dated April 18th*

THAT the application for the Rezoning at 229 Eleventh Street be accepted but, in this specific case, encourage the City to work with the Developer to:

- *increase the size of the laneway house; and*
- *seek ways to apply a more relaxed use of the existing draft laneway house guidelines*

CARRIED.

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

4.2 630 Ewen Avenue

Jim Hurst, Development Planner, summarized the report dated April 18, 2017, regarding an application to amend the Official Community Plan land use designation of 630 Ewen Avenue, to rezone the property from Queensborough Residential Dwelling Districts (RQ-1) to Comprehensive Development Districts (CD-70) and to obtain a Development Permit for a five-unit residential development on the property.

Mr. Hurst explained that as this site is owned by the City, a Memorandum of Understanding has been developed to lease this property to Women in Need Gaining Strength (WINGS) for 60 years, with the option to renew in future. The agreement will set out the details of the affordability, operational and administrative requirements for the property. WINGS is the applicant, for all of the applications.

In response to questions from the Commission, Mr. Hurst provided the following information:

- There are only two parking spaces planned for the development because the housing is proposed for low-income families and the site is near transit and commercial amenities;
 - As per section 3.1 of the report, to address the promotion of best practices for water and energy conservation, the applicant is engaging with Energy Save New West to ensure there are energy savings within the building, and CNW Engineering has looked at the development from a water efficiency aspect;
 - Although the design panel suggested more engaging entrance pathways, the development has been planned with one multi-use pathway;
 - The Developer has yet to decide on the type of play area in the space planned for this use. If in future, the play space ceases to be viable, the applicant may convert it to non-habitable space;
 - Acoustic treatment of the covered play area is yet to be finalized, but it will be treated so that it does not echo;
 - Bicycle storage is allowed in the development and has been designated in the plans;
-

and,

- Due to flood plain requirements in the Queensborough community the habitable floors for all townhouse units are elevated up to 5 and 6 feet above grade and are not disabled accessible.

Lorrie Wasyliw, Executive Director of WINGS, spoke about the organization and the project, and noted the following information:

- WINGS is a non-profit charitable society that currently manages two residences in New Westminster for women and children seeking to begin new lives after experiencing domestic violence. The aim of this project is to integrate women and children into the Queensborough community and to create a community within the development itself;
- Having the one gate on the property will provide an element of safety to the residents;
- The Community and Social Issues Committee has reviewed this proposal and expressed appreciation for WINGS and the City developing the operating agreement to include rent controls;
- WINGS is very comfortable with only two parking spots and gave an example of another residence where there are seven units but there have never been more than 2 vehicles; and,
- The owner of the property that is closest to the proposed building came to the Residents Association meeting and was very supportive of the proposal.

Bibiana Lomperd and Carol Clarke, Residents of Boyne Street, expressed support for the project, but also expressed concern with the pre-loading that occurs with developments in Queensborough and the resulting flooding problems and standing water that are experienced by residents nearby.

In response to comments made by Ms. Lomperd and Ms. Clarke, Mr. Hurst provided the following information:

- Pre-loading and filling occurs in the Queensborough community to stabilize soils and to elevate sites and enable flood plain requirements to be satisfied, to protecting property owners and the community, should flooding occur. Standing water in Queensborough properties is certainly a concern, and can be a result of bringing urban standards to an area that has rural drainage standards;
- Last fall during the exceptionally high rains all, pre-loading was stopped for all properties as the placement of the pre-load and fill material could not be controlled due to high water content.
- Pre-loading has already occurred on the 630 Ewen Avenue property;
- A drain has been installed on the south property line of the site to deal with any potential water issues; and,
- The City responds to calls as they are received on drainage issues in the Queensborough community.

The Commission acknowledged the concerns from the public and noted the following

comments:

- The Commission commended the City and WINGS for the strategy used in the development of this project, in terms of the partnership with a non-profit organization and incorporation of the City’s Affordable Housing Strategy;
- The proposal is well considered, well-sited with regards to proximity to transit, provides plenty of amenity space, and will likely provide plenty of space for the community to gather.
- It may be appropriate to emulate the reduction of parking requirements and incorporation of green space as seen in this project in more developments within the City;
- The Commission understands the concerns in regards to pre-loading and resulting pooling of water and appreciates that the situation could worsen with further development in Queensborough. It would be desirable to see the City takes steps to mitigate the effects of pre-loading and piling;

MOVED and SECONDED

THAT the Commission support the proposed Official Community Plan Amendment and Rezoning for 630 Ewen Avenue.

CARRIED

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

MOVED and SECONDED

THAT the Commission receive a presentation from Staff at a future meeting for discussion on issues raised relating to pre-loading and associated matters.

CARRIED

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

5.0 NEW BUSINESS

There were no items.

6.0 REPORTS AND INFORMATION

There were no items.

7.0 CORRESPONDENCE

There were no items.

8.0 NEXT MEETING

Tuesday, May 16, 2017

9.0 ADJOURNMENT

ON MOTION, the meeting adjourned at 8:47 p.m.

Certified Correct,

Peter Hall, Chair

Heather Corbett, Committee Clerk

From: [Gillian Day](#)
To: [Samantha Bohmert](#)
Subject: APC invitation
Date: Monday, May 01, 2017 9:16:03 AM
Attachments: [image003.jpg](#)

Hi Samantha,

Please find following an invitation for the Advisory Planning Commission to send a citizen representative to a free forum on the topic of Citizen Advisory Bodies and Urban Policy co-hosted by the SFU Urban Studies Program and the Vancouver City Planning Commission. Perhaps you can add this to the agenda of your next meeting.

The organizers noted that elected officials will also be invited in a separate invitation.

Thank you,

Gillian

Dear citizen advisory body chair or member,

I am writing to invite you to send a (one) citizen representative of your group to attend Rethinking the Region - a free forum on the topic of citizen advisory bodies and urban policy on Saturday, June 17th. Rethinking the Region is an annual event organized by the SFU Urban Studies Program, with a different theme or focus each year. This year, we are co-hosting the event with the Vancouver City Planning Commission. The details of this event, including the keynote speaker and panellists, can be found at the link below. I think you will find the content very relevant to your volunteer work as a member of a citizen advisory body. Please note that due to limited space, this event is by invitation only, so we ask you not to share this invitation beyond your committee. Registration is on a first-come, first-served basis.

Registration deadline: May 15

Here's where you can learn more about the event. Please note that you will need to enter the password RTR2017 to view the registration page.

<https://www.sfu.ca/urban/rethinking-the-region-2017.html>

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me.

best,

Karen Sawatzky

kasawatz@sfu.ca

Event coordinator

Rethinking the Region 2017

Gillian Day | Agenda Secretary
T 604.527.4612 | E gday@newwestcity.ca

City of New Westminster | Legislative Services
511 Royal Avenue, New Westminster, BC V3L 1H9
www.newwestcity.ca

This message including attachments, transmitted herein is confidential and may contain privileged information. It is intended solely for the person or entity to which it is addressed. Any review, retransmission, dissemination, taking of any action in reliance upon, or other use of this information by persons or entities other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you received this in error, please notify the sender and delete or destroy all copies.

entitlements associated with zoning. All properties, protected or not, would continue to be able to build to the density and other requirements listed in the property's zoning, though the manner in which properties could be altered would be subject to the City's approval. Design control over entirely new construction could apply for any property in the area, if the level of heritage protection assigned to that property allowed the owner to replace an existing building.

The inclusion of a property within a Heritage Conservation Area does not require the permission of the property owner. The usual notification requirements apply to the Public Hearing that is required for the Bylaw that establishes the Heritage Conservation Area. Upon the implementation of a Heritage Conservation Area, there is no requirement for compensation to a property owner by the City.

BACKGROUND

Previous Council Direction

On April 10, 2017, staff reported back to Council on the results of community consultation on the proposed Heritage Conservation Area for the Queen's Park neighbourhood. Council received a large number of delegations related to the proposal and directed staff to provide additional information and analysis.

On April 24, 2017, Council hosted a workshop to discuss the potential impacts of a Heritage Conservation Area on property values, potential future incentives for houses protected in a Heritage Conservation Area, the general process for seeking a demolition permit in the Heritage Conservation Area, and options for structuring the Heritage Conservation Area policy.

On April 24, 2017, Council endorsed a draft policy which would protect houses built in 1940 and earlier, including demolition review and renovation design review. The policy would also require all new construction on any property in the neighbourhood to comply with mandatory design guidelines. Properties with buildings built after 1940 would not be protected under the proposed Heritage Conservation Area.

On May 1, 2017, Council endorsed Proposed Conservation Area Policy Provisions, and Proposed Administration Policy Provisions.

On May 8, 2017, Council will review the Draft Queen's Park Heritage Conservation Area Design Guidelines.

PROPOSED POLICY PROVISIONS

There are three policy areas for which staff is seeking APC endorsement for the Queen's Park Heritage Conservation Area, as follows and detailed below:

- A. Proposed Conservation Area Policy Provisions
- B. Draft Queen's Park Heritage Conservation Area Design Guidelines
- C. Proposed Administration Policy Provisions

A. Proposed Conservation Area Policy Provisions

There are approximately 700 residential properties (zoned RS-1, RS-2, RS-5, or RS-6) which would form part of the Heritage Conservation Area. Approximately 500 of those properties would be protected, and require Heritage Alteration Permits for changes to the existing building (including demolition). The provisions of the policy which would be used to create the required bylaws would be as follows:

- The Heritage Conservation Area would apply to the Queen's Park neighbourhood, bounded on the north by Sixth Avenue, on the south by Royal Avenue, on the west by Sixth Street, and on the east by the 75.5 acre Queen's Park.
- All single detached dwelling buildings constructed in 1940 or earlier, currently listed on the Heritage Register, or Designated would be in the Advanced (Protected) category of the Conservation Area. For these properties, the following activities would require that the owner obtain a Heritage Alteration Permit from the City prior to obtaining other required City permits:
 - Construction activities on the front, sides or visible roof of the existing principal building;
 - Demolition of the existing principal building;
 - Construction of a new principal building or new accessory buildings, and associated landscaping; and
 - Subdivision or consolidation of the lot.
- All single detached dwelling buildings constructed in 1941 or later would be in the Limited (Non-Protected) category of the Conservation Area. For these properties, the following activities would require that the owner obtain a Heritage Alteration Permit from the City prior to obtaining other required City permits:
 - Construction of new principal building or accessory buildings, and associated landscaping; and
 - Subdivision or consolidation of the lot.

- Multiple-unit residential buildings which are on property zoned under a Single Detached Dwelling district would form part of the Heritage Conservation Area and would be subject to the provisions according to their year of construction.
- Properties within the Queen’s Park neighbourhood zoned for Commercial (C), Institutional (P), Mid-rise multiple-dwellings (RM), and Townhouse/ multiple-unit-residential (RT) would not form part of the Heritage Conservation Area, and as such would not be subject to the provisions.
- No Schedule of Protected Properties would be established within the Heritage Conservation Area. Properties currently on the Heritage Register or Designated would remain as such, as well as be added to the Advanced (Protected) category.
- For Advanced (Protected) category houses, some work that may not otherwise require a Building Permit may require an HAP, including:
 - Alterations to the location, dimension or framing of any door or window on the front façade or side elevations of a protected building;
 - Alterations to the design or material composition of any verandah or porch (including railing) on the front façade or side elevations of a protected building;
 - Addition of skylights and solar panels to roofs, if visible from the street;
 - Alteration of the design or material of significant architectural details.
- For Advanced (Protected) category houses, the following work would not require an HAP:
 - Interior renovations, changes to the back of the building, and changes to the non-visible rear roof, including additions of skylights and solar panels to these areas;
 - Changes to an existing non-residential accessory building;
 - Regular maintenance and repairs to the building, which would include reroofing with similar material, painting, or replacing worn siding or porch boards with in-kind materials. Regular maintenance would not include removal or replacement of heritage elements or a change in design, material or general appearance;
 - Changes to existing landscaping and/or landscape maintenance including weeding, mowing, annual or seasonal planting, dirt bed planting, and pruning of shrubs; and
 - Removal of trees (unless a Designated Heritage Tree), which would instead remain subject to the City’s Tree Protection and Regulation Bylaw 7799, 2016.

- The Heritage Conservation Area would include mandatory design guidelines for existing Advanced (Protected) category houses, and all new building construction and their associated landscapes. Laneway or carriage house construction would be required to meet both the Heritage Conservation Area design guidelines and the laneway/carriage house design guidelines, should Council approve that housing form.
- Advanced (Protected) category houses would not be required to retroactively upgrade their building to the standards of the design guidelines. Only new construction would be required to meet these standards. Furthermore, new construction on one portion of the property would not trigger required upgrades on other areas of the property.
- For Limited (Non-Protected) houses, an HAP is not required for changes to the existing principal building unless the structure is substantially altered (70% or more of the house is dismantled or removed, as identified in current Building Permit regulations) at which point the design guidelines for new construction would apply and an HAP would be required.
- The Official Community Plan and the Zoning Bylaw would continue to apply to the properties in the Heritage Conservation Area along with other city-wide policies and bylaws.

B. Draft Queen’s Park Residential Building Design Guidelines

The Heritage Conservation Area would include mandatory design guidelines for renovations to Advanced (Protected) category houses, and all new construction (including associated landscaping). The design guidelines are proposed to contain three sections: 1) New Residential Buildings; 2) Alterations to Heritage Buildings; 3) Landscape Design. They would be an additional layer of regulation above the zoning: the existing single detached dwelling zoning regulations would continue to apply, though variances could be sought to accommodate compliance with the design guidelines and the principles of heritage best practices.

A final draft of the Queen’s Park Heritage Conservation Area Design Guidelines, as prepared by Donald Luxton and Associates, is included in this report as Attachment 1. The design guidelines would be finalized regarding layout and further illustrations of the concepts described in the design guidelines prior to Council consideration of First and Second Reading of the necessary bylaws.

The design guidelines include the following general provisions:

- 1) The design guidelines for new house construction are based on the best practices of “fitting in” with existing heritage structures on surrounding properties along the streetscape, and applying New Westminster’s traditional architectural character elements - referred to in the design guidelines as “Traditional Style”. This means that, in contrast to the current Queen’s Park Historic District Residential Design Guidelines (1999), the new building Design Guidelines are not based on any specific historic style (e.g. Craftsman, Edwardian, or Arts and Crafts). Best practice in architectural design for heritage areas is not to copy existing styles.
- 2) The design guidelines for protected houses are primarily based on the Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada. This document is a nationally applied best practice manual for heritage conservation projects, and was adopted by Council in 2008. The goal of the guidelines are to ensure changes or additions to existing heritage structures are compatible with and do not detract from the heritage character of the building.
- 3) Landscape design guidelines are included which are mandatory for all new building construction, and would be voluntary for existing buildings regardless of their level of protection. These guidelines were created based on best practices in landscape architecture including enhancing the pedestrian experience, increasing biodiversity and the use of naturalized plant species. The design of the landscape was identified as a key component of the heritage character of the neighbourhood requiring protection.

C. Proposed Administration Policy Provisions

The Heritage Conservation Area Administration Policy would outline the requirements and process for demolition and renovation of Advanced (Protected) category buildings, new building construction, and requesting removal from the Advanced (Protected) category of the Heritage Conservation Area. Attachment 2 includes a diagram illustrating the general steps for demolition and renovation applications.

The following provisions are proposed for each application type:

Applications for Exterior Renovations

- Renovation applications would require submission of photographs of the existing house, a design rationale, and proposed site plan and elevations, including proposed list of materials.

- Applications would be evaluated by staff against the design guidelines (Attachment 1). In cases where interpretation of the design guidelines requires further analysis, the Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada, adopted by Council in 2008 as a best-practice manual for the evaluation of heritage projects in the City, would be the guide. Staff would work with applicants to address any aspects of the proposal that did not meet the intent of the design guidelines.
- The City would have the authority to deny an HAP until the proposed changes were deemed to be consistent with the design guidelines.
- Council has delegated the authority for approval of renovation HAPs to the Director of Development Services.
- Applicants would have the option to appeal to Council should they disagree with the decision of Council's delegate.
- No fee would be charged for renovation permits.
- Once an HAP has been issued, the applicant would be able to apply for other required City permits.

Applications for Demolition

- Demolition application would require submission of a heritage assessment prepared by a heritage professional with membership in the Canadian Association of Heritage Professionals (CAHP). Applicants could choose to also provide other information in support of their application, such as conditions assessment, restoration quotes, etc. The preparation of all submission materials would be at the cost of the applicant.
- Applications would be evaluated by staff using an evaluation check-list to ensure transparency and consistency. To complete the checklist (Attachment 3), staff would evaluate the application against guidelines (Attachment 1) which were informed by the neighbourhood's Statement of Significance (2017), a Neighbourhood Context Statement (2008), and the work of the Queen's Park Working Group (2015). The evaluation would take into consideration:
 - potential to achieve density entitlements without eliminating heritage value;
 - heritage merit of the building; and,
 - condition of the building, including the degree to which heritage elements remain.

- The checklist would provide a “score”, with applications achieving below a certain baseline score being considered reasonable for demolition. The City would have the authority to deny an HAP for applications achieving a score equal to or above the baseline score.
- Council has delegated the authority for approval of demolition HAPs to the Director of Development Services.
- Applicants would have the option to appeal to Council should they disagree with the decision of Council’s delegate.
- Should the demolition HAP be rejected, the owner would be able to apply for a renovation HAP which would be reviewed according to that process. The City would work with the applicant to identify how the existing entitlements could be achieved through renovation to the existing building, in compliance with the design guidelines.
- Should the demolition HAP be approved, the applicant would be able to apply for a demolition permit.
- Demolition HAPs would have an expiry date of three years from issuance, which would allow owners to plan ahead.
- A fee of \$1,430.00 would be charged for demolition HAPs. This fee represents the estimated cost recovery for Development Services staff review (\$930.00) and a cost recovery charge for Legislative Services notification (\$500.00) where required.
- In addition, an applicant would be required to pay in the order of \$1,500.00 as a consultant fee for their heritage assessment. This would mean a total cost for the HAP application of about \$2,930.00. This would not include fees associated with the Building or Demolition Permit, should the application be approved

Applications for New Building Construction

- New building construction applications would require submission of proposed site plan and elevations, including proposed list of materials, and a street context rendering.
- Applications would be evaluated by staff against the design guidelines (Attachment 1). This would include an analysis by staff of the characteristics of the streetscape and buildings on both sides of the subject property’s block to determine the key aspects

within which the new building must seek to “fit in”. Applicants would be encouraged to apply for their HAP permit and receive this evaluation prior to finalizing the design of their new house.

- The City would have the authority to deny an HAP until the proposed building were deemed to be consistent with the design guidelines and “fit” with the streetscape context.
- Council has delegated the authority for approval of new building HAPs to the Director of Development Services.
- Applicants would have the option to appeal to Council should they disagree with the decision of Council’s delegate.
- A fee of \$930.00 would be charged for HAPs for new construction. This fee represents the estimated cost recovery for Development Services staff review.
- Once an HAP has been issued, the applicant would be able to apply for other required City permits.

Applications to Move Between Protection Levels

- The owner of a property in the Limited (Non-Protected) category could apply to the City to have their property protected. The owner of a property in the Advanced (Protected) category could also apply to have their property protected more strongly. Such applications would be made via the following:
 - Voluntary application to list the house on the Heritage Register or to Designate. This application would follow the current City process for such applications. No fee is currently associated with these applications.
 - Application for a Heritage Revitalization Agreement. Though the City would explore incentives for the Queen’s Park Heritage Conservation Area as a next step should the Heritage Conservation Area be approved, there would remain the opportunity for property owners to negotiate additional incentives in exchange for full restoration and Designation of the house.
- The intent of the Heritage Conservation Area is to protect buildings from 1940 and older, and to ensure the design of new buildings “fits” with neighbourhood character. The demolition HAP application process provides the appropriate means for owners to have their property evaluated to determine if it may be removed from protection through demolition. As such, it is unlikely that staff would support applications to

move from the Advance category into the Limited category. However, an owner could apply to the City to do so, regardless of the building's construction date, through an Official Community Plan (OCP) amendment, as follows:

- Given that this would effectively permit the building to be demolished or renovated without the requirement for City review, such an application would be evaluated using the same submission requirements and evaluation criteria as the demolition HAP application process.
- Applications would be processed under the City's typical OCP application process for heritage-related land use applications, including review by the Community Heritage Commission and Advisory Planning Commission, and would be considered for adoption by Council.
- A fee of \$1,860.00 would be charged for these applications. This fee represents the estimated cost recovery for Development Services staff review (\$930.00) and a cost recovery charge for the mandated Public Hearing (\$930.00).
- In addition, an applicant would be required to pay in the order of \$1,500.00 as a consultant fee for their heritage assessment. This would mean a total cost for the HAP application of about \$3,360.00. This would not include fees associated with the Building or Demolition Permit, should the application be approved.

DISCUSSION

Role of Consultation

Public, committee, heritage advocate, and working group consultation has been the source of the options used to shape the proposed policy provisions for the conservation area which would be used to guide decision-making on conservation area applications. The City has also received feedback that property owners believe the City, not citizens, should make decisions regarding individual applications under the conservation area policy. As such, public consultation and review by the Community Heritage Commission would not be included as part of the evaluation of HAP applications under the conservation area, other than amendments to the Official Community Plan.

The Queen's Park Working Group and the Technical Review Panel, established through the Heritage Control Period, are proposed to be dissolved by August 2017.

Implications of Not Establishing a Schedule

Without a Schedule of Protected Properties, Advanced (Protected) category properties would be able to apply for demolition through the Heritage Alteration Permit Process, whereas if a Schedule was established, an OCP amendment would be required.

Without a Schedule, the properties in the Advanced category will not have a high enough level of protection to be eligible to use BC Building Code alternate compliance methods. These methods acknowledge that applying Building Code requirements to existing buildings is, in many cases, impractical and may compromise historic appearance or the historic authenticity of the building.

However, property owners would still be able to become eligible through voluntarily placing their building on the City's Heritage Register, or Designating.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

Based on past applications (since 2012), the City should receive the following number of Heritage Alteration Permit applications under the Heritage Conservation Area:

- Renovation: six to ten per year
- Demolition: two to three per year. It is anticipated that the number of demolition applications may increase in the short term, but would settle back to a three-a-year average.

OPTIONS

The following options are available for consideration by the Advisory Planning Commission:

1. That the Advisory Planning Commission endorse the proposed provisions of the Queen's Park Heritage Conservation Area.
2. That the Advisory Planning Commission endorse the draft Queen's Park Heritage Conservation Area Design Guidelines for inclusion in the Heritage Conservation Area policy.
3. That the Advisory Planning Commission endorse the proposed provisions of the Queen's Park Heritage Conservation Area Administration Policy.
4. That the Advisory Planning Commission provide staff with alternative direction.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1: Draft Design Guidelines

Attachment 2: Heritage Alteration Permit Process Diagram

Attachment 3: Draft Evaluation Criteria for Heritage Assessment

From: [Lorne Hill](#)
To: [External-Post Master - Pln](#)
Subject: Advisory Planning Commission - request to make a submission
Date: Thursday, March 30, 2017 12:22:52 PM
Attachments: [HCA letter.pdf](#)

Hello,

We received the Notice of Advisory Planning Commission Meeting in the mail.

We would like to make in-person presentation to the Commission. Is this possible? How does that work?

Please find attached our recent communication with the Mayor and Councillors.

Thank you,

Lorne and Doreen Hill
215 Second St.

March 20, 2017

To:

From: Lorne and Doreen Hill
215 Second St, New Westminster
[REDACTED]
Lorne.hill@telus.net

Re: Heritage Conservation Area (HCA) concerns

We are writing to you today to share some concerns we have with the proposed HCA policy that is under development. We support the HCA but have concerns about some areas. Understanding that the administrative policy details are still under development, we wanted to share our high-level concerns. As our elected representative, we would like to know where you stand on these important issues.

Some context will help frame the discussion. We are committed to the success of New Westminster. We have raised our kids here, own a business in town, and volunteer on local non-profit boards. We have lived in Queen's Park since 2001 and love the neighbourhood. We really enjoy the heritage feel of the neighbourhood and support the general idea of a policy to protect the heritage character. We especially support restrictions on the design of new developments.

Our home was built in 1891 but has since gone through many alterations to both the interior and the exterior. While some heritage features remain the overall heritage appeal is low. While we have no immediate plans to make major changes to our home, we have been advised that if we listed our property today the highest market value would be as a "tear down". Many of our neighbours have homes whose heritage appeal, and related heritage protections, add value to their property – ours is not one of them.

In this context, I would like your feedback on the following concerns. Our understanding of the proposed policy is based on discussions with city staff as well as reading a document entitled "Public Meeting CityCouncil OpenWorkshop OW 2.2017_QPHCA".

1. Extreme Involuntary Restrictions as default – our home would be placed in the Advanced Protection category solely based on its age. No assessment of heritage value would be made before that categorization. It would be incumbent on the home owner to prove that the property has lower heritage value, and therefore less restrictions. Do you agree with this approach?
2. Heritage Assessment Expense – our understanding is that a request to reduce heritage protection would require the home owner to pay for a Heritage Assessment. This heritage assessment may cost as much as \$2,000. Do you agree the homeowner should bear this cost?

3. Subjective Criteria for Protection Reduction – the detailed criteria for heritage value assessment is still under development but the general principles seem very subjective. The above referenced document refers to an assessment measuring “cultural, spiritual, social, scientific or historical value” in a property. This criterion seems very subjective – meaning that the denial of a reduction in heritage protection could be made on any number of grounds up to and including who may have lived in the house. Do you support the subjective nature of this this criterion?
4. No compensation mechanism – in speaking to city staff we understand that there is no compensation mechanism envisioned for homeowners whose property values are materially affected by heritage restrictions. Civil litigation is always possible but does not really provide a reasonable avenue for a home owner to receive compensation. Do you agree there should be no compensation mechanism for these cases?

We love the Queen’s Park neighbourhood and it is easy to get sentimental about the heritage nature of the area. Our concern is that this sentiment may outweigh the practical considerations related to specific homes and their value. Advanced Protection on our home may mean a reduction in its value in the range of hundreds of thousands of dollars. Let’s make sure that sentiment does not end up costing home owners – as our family’s future is at stake.

We look forward to an opportunity to discuss our concerns with you. Please get back to us to arrange a meeting.

Yours Sincerely,

Lorne and Doreen Hill

From: [Joanne Matson](#)
To: [External-Post Master - Pln](#)
Subject: Fwd: Queen's Park Advisory Planning Commission
Date: Sunday, April 02, 2017 9:44:13 PM

Hello!

Could I please have the opportunity to speak before the Advisory Planning Commission on April 18th? My name is Joanne Matson and I live at 436 Second St. Thank you!

Kind regards,
Joanne

From: [Samantha Bohmert](#)
To: ["Valerie Garbutt"](#)
Bcc: [Britney Quail](#)
Subject: RE: Queens Park Heritage Conservation Area Policy
Date: Monday, April 03, 2017 2:25:44 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Good morning Valerie,

Thank you for your feedback. I have sent it to the project planner for their reference. A copy of your email will also be presented to the APC members.

Best,

Samantha Bohmert | T 604.515.3791
Planning Assistant | City of New Westminster

From: Valerie Garbutt [mailto:valerie_garbutt@hotmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, April 02, 2017 11:56 PM
To: External-Post Master - Pln
Subject: Re: Queens Park Heritage Conservation Area Policy

Attn: Advisory Planning Commission

This note is in response to the Notice we received regarding the proposal to consider designation of the homes in Queens Park for Heritage Conservation. As you know real estate prices in the Greater Vancouver area are accelerating at an unbelievable pace. An individual's home is without doubt the largest investment he/we make in our lifetime.

I emphatically vote "down" the proposal as it is far too restrictive and would without a doubt devalue my/our homes.

When a Committee has the power to establish such strict building regulations/guidelines, which will be in fact be mandatory building and renovation guidelines it is in my opinion "shocking". I agree with establishing certain guidelines as to the building for new construction in Queens Park to be of heritage style, (front of the main house, only); but to get so detailed in terms of garage location, etc. that is far to restrictive.

The proposed guidelines would give far too much control, by a Committee, over the single largest investment in a person's lifetime. I feel it would immediately devalue property in the area as only the small percentage of individuals who are so intent/interested in living in a heritage home/area would be interested in purchasing in the Queens Park Area.

Thus, eliminating the majority of "potential" buyers in the Greater Vancouver area when they have such strict limitations as to what they can build and/or renovate.

Regards,
Valerie and Edwin Garbutt
528 Fourth Street, New Westminster

I/we emphatically do not approve of the proposed Queen's Park Heritage Conservation Area Policy, as proposed.

Valerie and Ted Garbutt

From: [Britney Quail](#)
To: [Samantha Bohmert](#)
Subject: FW: Heritage Conservation policy - APC
Date: Saturday, April 08, 2017 12:20:28 PM

For APC

Best,

Britney Quail | Heritage Planning Analyst
T 604.527.4621 | E bquail@newwestcity.ca
City of New Westminster

-----Original Message-----

From: gkasteel@telus.net [<mailto:jan2012@telus.net>]
Sent: Friday, April 07, 2017 3:18 PM
To: Britney Quail
Subject: Heritage Conservation policy

Hello Britney.

I was forwarded (by Roland Kaulfuss) info on the proposed meetings for City Council and the Advisory Planning Commission - the order seems confusing, why does it go to Council before the Advisory Planning meeting?

I have concerns about the proposed heritage conservation area policy. My house was built in 1889, we bought it in 1969, almost 48 years ago. This policy will certainly have an affect on the value of this property as well as many others in the area. I love the feeling of the neighbourhood, and am happy that many of the lovely old homes are being maintained and restored. But not every house in QP has heritage value or needs to be 'saved', and not everyone has pockets deep enough to restore an old house to original. My home was never a grand house, and after 128 years has very little 'original' left.

I fail to see why the house on College court and the one on 5th Ave were denied demo permits (but the one on Arbutus was passed???) , and feel very sorry for the people who purchased them before this 1 year 'not a moratorium' came into effect. There are a number of homes in the area built in the last 10-15 years that add to the streetscape and feeling of QP far more than those 2 houses. Any new construction that follows the proposed design guidelines will not result in a house that resembles either of them. It's interesting as well that 2 homes were demolished about 25 years ago so that 2 other (much larger) houses could be moved into the area.

Surely there is room for common sense and concern for all property owners in Queen's Park.
Thanks you for your attention to this.

Regards, Betty Kasteel

From: [Lorne Hill](#)
To: [Samantha Bohmert](#)
Subject: Re: Advisory Planning Commission - request to make a submission
Date: Wednesday, April 12, 2017 9:19:01 AM

Hi Samantha,

Do you have the details on the agenda and speaking arrangements?

Cheers - Lorne

----- Original Message -----

From: "Samantha Bohmert" <sbohmert@newwestcity.ca>
To: "Lorne Hill" <a6a35574@telus.net>
Sent: Thursday, April 6, 2017 4:32:39 PM
Subject: RE: Advisory Planning Commission - request to make a submission

Hi Lorne,

There are three items on the Agenda. The Queen's Park Heritage Conservation Area Policy will most likely generate the most discussion and will be presented third. I will follow up early next week regarding speaking procedures and time available.

Best,

Samantha Bohmert | T 604.515.3791
Planning Assistant | City of New Westminster

-----Original Message-----

From: Lorne Hill [<mailto:a6a35574@telus.net>]
Sent: Thursday, April 06, 2017 8:30 AM
To: Samantha Bohmert
Subject: Re: Advisory Planning Commission - request to make a submission

OK, perfect. Thanks for getting back to me. Do you know where that will be on the agenda? How much time am I allotted?

Cheers - Lorne

----- Original Message -----

From: "Samantha Bohmert" <sbohmert@newwestcity.ca>
To: "Lorne Hill" <a6a35574@telus.net>
Sent: Thursday, April 6, 2017 8:12:58 AM
Subject: RE: Advisory Planning Commission - request to make a submission

Hi Lorne,

I thought you had been replied to, so thank you for your patience and for following up. You are welcome to speak to the APC on the meeting on the 18th.

Best,

Samantha Bohmert | T 604.515.3791
Planning Assistant | City of New Westminster

-----Original Message-----

From: Lorne Hill [<mailto:a6a35574@telus.net>]
Sent: Thursday, April 06, 2017 7:08 AM

To: Samantha Bohmert
Cc: Lauren Blake
Subject: Re: Advisory Planning Commission - request to make a submission

Hi Lauren,

Can you provide any feedback on this?

Thank you,

Lorne

----- Original Message -----

From: "Samantha Bohmert" <sbohmert@newwestcity.ca>
To: "Lorne Hill" <a6a35574@telus.net>
Cc: "Lauren Blake" <lblake@newwestcity.ca>
Sent: Friday, March 31, 2017 2:56:50 PM
Subject: RE: Advisory Planning Commission - request to make a submission

Hi Lorne,

Thank you for your comments. I have forwarded them to the project planner. I have asked Lauren Blake, the Legislative Services staff who knows about APC meeting procedure, to respond to your inquiry.

Best,

Samantha Bohmert | T 604.515.3791
Planning Assistant | City of New Westminster

-----Original Message-----

From: Lorne Hill [<mailto:a6a35574@telus.net>]
Sent: Thursday, March 30, 2017 12:23 PM
To: External-Post Master - Pln
Subject: Advisory Planning Commission - request to make a submission

Hello,

We received the Notice of Advisory Planning Commission Meeting in the mail.

We would like to make in-person presentation to the Commission. Is this possible? How does that work?

Please find attached our recent communication with the Mayor and Councillors.

Thank you,

Lorne and Doreen Hill
215 Second St.

From: [Britney Quail](#)
To: "Bill Bryan"
Cc: [Samantha Bohmert](#)
Subject: RE: queens park heritage conservation commission meeting apr.18/17
Date: Thursday, April 13, 2017 10:17:40 AM
Attachments: [image001.jpg](#)

Hello Mr. Bryan,

I am writing to advise you that the item related to the proposed Heritage Conservation Area for the Queen's Park neighbourhood has been withdrawn from this month's Advisory Planning Commission agenda. There will continue to be opportunities for public comment on the proposal in the following months. The next public meeting relating to this topic is an Open Council Workshop, scheduled for Monday April 24th.

Thank you for your comments, and your interest in participating in the meeting. Should you like to contribute your thoughts to the official record, you are welcome to send a letter to Mayor and Council at Clerks@newwestcity.ca or by post to 511 Royal Ave.

Best,

Britney Quail | Heritage Planning Analyst
T 604.527.4621 | E bquail@newwestcity.ca
City of New Westminster

From: Bill Bryan [<mailto:billbr58@telus.net>]
Sent: Wednesday, April 05, 2017 10:30 PM
To: Britney Quail
Subject: queens park heritage conservation commission meeting apr.18/17

Britney:

Raised in new west lived in the same residence for 27 yrs in the queens park area. Done tons of stuff, been all over, business man gone broke come back again. Contributed to our way of life and what we have to-day etc etc.

Give your collective heads a shake. Doing us a favour by preserving the 'queens pk' area. Big deal! What about the rest of the city. Cherry picking what should stay and what should go. There is not a house in the heritage designated area which should be torn down. Do you think a new house built to look old or historic on the site of an old torn down unit is appropriate. Hardly. Even the smallest bungalow of old has class, character and some wonderful history.

You designate a house as heritage or an area heritage. Thats it! End of story. Goodbye lobby groups for real estate interests. If it was'nt for heritage designation in some areas of Columbia st downtown you would'nt know we have a river there. Lets have a 'queens park' designation for a large area west of 12th st before the dogs of development and their

Friends at city hall authorize the towers to show up.

For what it's worth

Bill (born Vancouver. B.C. mar.17/40

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

From: [Britney Quail](#)
To: ["Lorne Hill"](#)
Cc: [Samantha Bohmert](#)
Subject: RE: Advisory Planning Commission - request to make a submission
Date: Thursday, April 13, 2017 10:14:10 AM

Hello Lorne,

I am writing to advise you that the item related to the proposed Heritage Conservation Area for the Queen's Park neighbourhood has been withdrawn from this month's Advisory Planning Commission agenda. As you know, there will continue to be opportunities for public comment on the proposal in the following months. The next public meeting relating to this topic is an Open Council Workshop, scheduled for Monday April 24th.

Thank you for your comments, and your interest in participating in the meeting.

Best,

Britney Quail | Heritage Planning Analyst
T 604.527.4621 | E bquail@newwestcity.ca
City of New Westminster

-----Original Message-----

From: Lorne Hill [<mailto:a6a35574@telus.net>]
Sent: Thursday, April 06, 2017 8:30 AM
To: Samantha Bohmert
Subject: Re: Advisory Planning Commission - request to make a submission

OK, perfect. Thanks for getting back to me. Do you know where that will be on the agenda? How much time am I allotted?

Cheers - Lorne

----- Original Message -----

From: "Samantha Bohmert" <sbohmert@newwestcity.ca>
To: "Lorne Hill" <a6a35574@telus.net>
Sent: Thursday, April 6, 2017 8:12:58 AM
Subject: RE: Advisory Planning Commission - request to make a submission

Hi Lorne,

I thought you had been replied to, so thank you for your patience and for following up. You are welcome to speak to the APC on the meeting on the 18th.

Best,

Samantha Bohmert | T 604.515.3791
Planning Assistant | City of New Westminster

-----Original Message-----

From: Lorne Hill [<mailto:a6a35574@telus.net>]
Sent: Thursday, April 06, 2017 7:08 AM
To: Samantha Bohmert
Cc: Lauren Blake
Subject: Re: Advisory Planning Commission - request to make a submission

Hi Lauren,

Can you provide any feedback on this?

Thank you,

Lorne

----- Original Message -----

From: "Samantha Bohmert" <sbohmert@newwestcity.ca>

To: "Lorne Hill" <a6a35574@telus.net>

Cc: "Lauren Blake" <lblake@newwestcity.ca>

Sent: Friday, March 31, 2017 2:56:50 PM

Subject: RE: Advisory Planning Commission - request to make a submission

Hi Lorne,

Thank you for your comments. I have forwarded them to the project planner. I have asked Lauren Blake, the Legislative Services staff who knows about APC meeting procedure, to respond to your inquiry.

Best,

Samantha Bohmert | T 604.515.3791
Planning Assistant | City of New Westminster

-----Original Message-----

From: Lorne Hill [<mailto:a6a35574@telus.net>]

Sent: Thursday, March 30, 2017 12:23 PM

To: External-Post Master - Pln

Subject: Advisory Planning Commission - request to make a submission

Hello,

We received the Notice of Advisory Planning Commission Meeting in the mail.

We would like to make in-person presentation to the Commission. Is this possible? How does that work?

Please find attached our recent communication with the Mayor and Councillors.

Thank you,

Lorne and Doreen Hill
215 Second St.

From: [Bruce Cheng](#)
To: [External-Post Master - Pln](#)
Subject: Support for the proposed Queen's Park Heritage Conservation Area Policy
Date: Thursday, May 04, 2017 8:30:57 AM

May 4, 2017.

Dear Members of the Advisory Planning Commission:

I am a member of the Queens Park Heritage Working Group.

In the Spring of 2014, Mayor and Council, acting on Queens Park citizens concerns about loss of heritage, selected a group of diverse individuals to represent the neighbourhood and to arrive at a solution to help preserve heritage in Queen's Park.

We educated ourselves about heritage issues pertaining to property values, property rights, zoning bylaws, design guidelines and many other aspects. We looked at what other jurisdictions were doing and how they achieved their goals. We had guest speakers from BC assessment, the insurance industry, the design community, the city, and from the legal community.

During this process, we shared our findings with the rest of the community through:

An open House Event in March 2015.

A Speak out event in November of 2015.

A second Open House in November/December 2016

A third open House event in March of this year.

Prior to the Speak out event in November of 2015, we personally did a door to door campaign to invite people to our event and to do some face to face engagement.

We set up social media channels and offered our findings on the City of New Westminster website for people to access.

There were also two online questionnaires for people to voice their opinions.

After performing all this work and taking into account the different points of view, we feel we have come up with the best solution for Heritage protection in Queens Park. I am hoping the Advisory Planning Commission will see their way clear to support the work we have done.

Regards,

Bruce Cheng

From: [Britney Quail](#)
To: ["dan@sixdegreesdesign.com"](mailto:dan@sixdegreesdesign.com)
Cc: [Samantha Bohmert](#)
Subject: APC Meeting for Queen's Park HCA
Date: Thursday, May 04, 2017 10:48:42 AM
Attachments: [image002.png](#)

Hello Mr. McCarthy,

A Heritage Conservation Area does not legally Designate property as a "Heritage House". Rather, the Conservation Area would add a permit requirement for the design of major changes to the fronts of pre-1941 buildings.

For more detailed information about the proposal and drafts of the design guidelines, I recommend you visit the City's website [here](#).

Should you like to officially comment on the proposal, I recommend you write to Mayor and Council at clerks@newwestcity.ca.

Best,

Britney Quail | Heritage Planning Analyst
T 604.527.4621 | E bquail@newwestcity.ca

🏡 City of New Westminster | Development Services, Planning
511 Royal Avenue, New Westminster, BC V3L 1H9
www.newwestcity.ca | [f /newwestminster](#) | [@newwestplanning](#)

Please note: my office hours are 9am-5:30pm (Monday-Friday)

This message including attachments, transmitted herein is confidential and may contain privileged information. It is intended solely for the person or entity to which it is addressed. Any review, retransmission, dissemination, taking of any action in reliance upon, or other use of this information by persons or entities other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you received this in error, please notify the sender and delete or destroy all copies.

-----Original Message-----

From: Dan McCarthy [<mailto:dan@sixdegreesdesign.com>]
Sent: Thursday, May 04, 2017 9:41 AM
To: Info
Subject: heritage designation

To whom it may concern;

This is a follow-up e-mail regarding my house at 219 5th Avenue in New Westminster. I am a 50% owner of 219 5th Avenue in New Westminster. I DO NOT WANT MY HOUSE ON YOUR HERITAGE LIST. My name is Daniel T. McCarthy and I want to make it perfectly clear that I do not want my house designated as a heritage house.

Thank you,

Daniel T. McCarthy

From: batemanr@telus.net
To: [External-Post Master - Pln](#)
Subject: Letter of support for Queen's Park HCA
Date: Thursday, May 04, 2017 10:17:18 AM
Attachments: [R Bateman HCA letter of support to APC.pdf](#)

Please see attached letter to the Advisory Planning Commission.

Thank you,

Rebecca Bateman

May 4, 2017

To the Members of the Advisory Planning Commission:

I am writing to express my strong support for the Heritage Conservation Area (HCA) proposed for the Queen's Park neighbourhood. I have been a resident here for fifteen years, and live in a 1925-vintage home that would receive the highest level of protection under the HCA as currently drafted.

I have been a member of the Queen's Park Neighbourhood Heritage Study Working Group for three years now, and have a graduate degree in urban planning. Over the course of our years together, Working Group members have been conscientious and dedicated in our efforts to present Council and our neighbours with evidence-based advice on the benefits and any potential drawbacks that an HCA would represent. We are confident that the HCA currently under consideration by Council will have only a beneficial effect on property values in the neighbourhood by providing protection for pre-1941 homes from demolition and insensitive renovations, and by protecting the entire neighbourhood from the construction of new houses that are unsympathetic to the local context.

I urge you to recommend to Council that they approve the HCA for Queen's Park as a benefit not just for those of us who live here, but for the entire City of New Westminster.

Yours very truly,



Rebecca Bateman, Ph.D.
115 St. Patrick Street

From: [Bev McLellan](#)
To: [External-Post Master - Pln](#)
Subject: HCA support...May 9/2017
Date: Thursday, May 04, 2017 12:50:47 PM

> APC

>

> I am writing in support of the HCA and mandatory design guidelines. Council has adopted a simple in or out date of 1940. Please consider offering some support to homes built between 1940-1959. Could we blanket the entire neighbourhood with design guidelines including renovations to avoid confusion.

>

> Thank you

> Bev McLellan

> 220 Queens Ave



>

>

>

> Sent from my iPad

From: [Jennifer Wolowic](#)
To: [External-Post Master - Pln](#)
Subject: Support for Queens Park HCA
Date: Thursday, May 04, 2017 1:21:30 PM

To Whom it may concern,
I have lived in Queens Park for 4 years. I have read through the council reports, the design guidelines, and have read articles related to outcomes of HCA's throughout this process as a member of the Working Group.

I think council has come up with a good compromise with the proposed HCA and it's guidelines. It is a compromise to what the Working group originally and even secondarily proposed. The proposal accurately reflects the neighbourhoods strong interest in mandatory design guidelines for new builds while allowing current owners ability to renovate and apply to change their protection. I believe it will serve the neighbourhood well.

In regard to how the new legislation may affect the neighbourhood it is good to note that homes were sold in Queens Park during the control period, which shows there is strong interest in the buying in the neighbourhood. If people are buying when they don't know what the outcomes or rules might be 6 months from the time of purchase, they will buy once the bylaws are solidified and they know the rules. Also, for the first time, during the control period, a sale large home in Queens Park is being advertised using the phrase "stratification opportunity." The HCA will help preserve the diversity of housing in a walkable area of New Westminster and encourage alternatives to the current frequently tear down/rebuild without increasing density model.

I think the HCA will be good for the neighbourhood as well as the branding New Westminster as a city with unique architecture of the past and innovating for the future.

Thank you for your consideration.

Jennifer Wolowic, PhD
501-101 Royal Ave
New Westminster, BC V3L1H1

From: [Dave Vallee](#)
To: [External-Post Master - Pln](#)
Subject: FW: support for heritage conservation area
Date: Thursday, May 04, 2017 1:45:47 PM

Subject: FW: support for heritage conservation area

To the Advisory Planning commission,

I am in favour of the Heritage Conservation Area, but there may still be more details to work out.

As a resident of Queens Park, I joined the Working Group committee to look at ways to “encourage the retention and enhancement” of the heritage homes in Queens Park. We had several meetings and came up with many ideas such as density bonuses, relaxed enforcement of building code for heritage homes, strata titling, subdividing, easier process and reduced costs for HRA etc. All of these were and still are good ideas, but voluntary, and after more discussions and presentations from BC Assessment Authority, those familiar with Vancouver’s heritage conservation efforts, legal staff and others, the idea of the Heritage Conservation Area began to look as the best option as it would give the city the power to protect valuable heritage homes. Before the current Control Period, there was no protection at all, anyone could come in and get a demolition permit and take down any home. With the HCA the homes will not automatically be given the demolition permit and many that apply will be denied and encouraged to renovate or add on or use the density allowance otherwise. (this dovetails nicely with the 2041 plan proposals for laneway and carriage homes).

Initially, the Working Group thought that each home could be looked at and categorized but we realized that that would be too difficult and expensive, so picking a year built looked like the best alternative though deciding which year is still a tough decision. I think whatever year is picked, there should still be a process for owners who may have a home that is too far gone to save or a house that has little heritage value or is just way too small for the lot where it wouldn’t be practical to add on, where the council can override and grant redevelopment. I believe the proposed 2 or 3 tier levels allows for these adjustments.

There have been many information sessions, meetings with stakeholder groups, consultants and public meetings and surveys etc and most people in the neighbourhood seem to favour the Heritage Conservation Area as also evidenced by the many homes have signs supporting it.

I believe those opposed to the HCA feel that the implementation of the HCA may reduce their properties value. No one can guarantee that there won't be some decline in value temporarily for some properties, while the market adjusts and comes up with creative ways to work with the new HCA guidelines, but I haven't noticed any significant value decline in values since the control period began and since the zoning, density and FSR are not changed, and with the city's 2041 initiative, even more options are available. What has impacted the prices both in Queens Park and all areas of New Westminster, is the 15% foreign buyers tax, but lately the market is coming back from that too. It's quite possible that the HCA could increase values as the wonderful Queens Park Neighbourhood Gem is protected and preserved and even more people desire to live there. Other communities where HCA's have been implemented have seen values rise.

I appreciate all the input from the community, both for and against, and all the hard work from volunteers, city staff and elected representatives. This is a big initiative and a big decision, and a lot of work for many and well worth getting as much input and points of view as possible to come up with the best way to enhance and preserve the Queens Park Neighbourhood, while still respecting and trying to address all relevant concerns.

Regards

Dave Vallee

<image009.jpg>

<image010.jpg>

Dave Vallee – Personal Real Estate Corporation

Team Dave Vallee



Toll Free: 1-800-607-7111

dave@TeamDaveVallee.com

www.TeamDaveVallee.com

<image011.jpg>

RE/MAX Advantage Realty (each office independently owned & operated)

#102 321 6th Street, New Westminster, BC, V3L 3A7