



CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF NEW WESTMINSTER

PUBLIC HEARING/OPPORTUNITY TO BE HEARD

April 21, 2008 7:31 p.m.
Council Chamber
City Hall

NOTES

PRESENT:

Mayor Wayne Wright
Councillor Jonathan Cote
Councillor Calvin Donnelly
Councillor Bill Harper
Councillor Bob Osterman
Councillor Betty McIntosh
Councillor Lorrie Williams

STAFF:

Mr. Paul Daminato	- City Administrator
Mr. Rick Page	- Corporate Officer/Director of Legislative Services
Ms. Lisa Spitale	- Director of Development Services
Mr. Jim Lowrie	- Director of Engineering Services
Mr. Gary Holowatiuk	- Director of Finance and Information Technology
Ms. Judi Turner	- Assistant Corporate Officer

Mayor Wright read a statement regarding the conduct of the Hearing.

BUSINESS

- 1(a) [Zoning Amendment Bylaw No. 7227, 2008 \[a bylaw to rezone 419 and 423 Eighth Street from Single Detached Dwelling Districts \(RS-2\) to Multiple Dwelling Districts \(Low Rise\) \(RM-2\)\]](#)
- 1(b) [Development Permit 013 \(BH\) with variances: Height; Front Yard; Rear Yard; Side Yard which does not adjoin a street – Northerly lot line; Side Yard which does not adjoin a street – Southerly lot line; Site Coverage](#)

- a. Explanation of bylaw, development permit with variances and proposed development of the lands (Director of Development Services)
- b. Statement concerning the number of written submissions received and their distribution (Corporate Officer) – there were none
- c. Motion to receive submissions
- d. Invitation to those present to address the bylaw and development permit with variances

Elena Oanta of Denis Turco Architect, representing the proponent, rose to make a presentation regarding the project for two buildings of 16 units which will replace the existing dwelling units. The project consists of a friendly design that complements the architecture of neighbouring development, an interior court yard, and landscaping to complement the area.

Robert Jost of 401, 320 Royal Avenue rose to indicate he is not opposed to the development but is opposed to demolition of the existing 97 year old heritage home. He suggested it be preserved within the proposal as has been done in other areas of the Lower Mainland. It might be preserved and developed into 3 units itself.

- e. Motion to refer to Council

MOVED and SECONDED

THAT the following be referred to Council for consideration:

- *Zoning Amendment Bylaw No. 7227, 2008, and*
- *Development Permit 013 (BH) with variances.*

CARRIED.

All members of Council voted in favour of the motion.

2. [Heritage Revitalization Agreement \(340 Fifth Street\) Bylaw No. 7174, 2007 \[a bylaw to enter into a Heritage Revitalization Agreement with the Owner of Heritage Property\]](#)

- a. Explanation of bylaw and proposed development of the lands (Director of Development Services)
- b. Statement concerning the number of written submissions received and their distribution (Corporate Officer)

- c. Motion to receive submissions

MOVED and SECONDED

THAT the following correspondence be received:

In Support:

- *Email from Janet Brine, 217 Third Avenue, expressing support*
- *Email from Neil Gibbard, 125 Peele Street, supporting proposal*
- *Email from Barbara Duggan/Ken Cawkell, 315 fifth Street, supporting proposal*
- *Email from Tim Ruane, 411 Fifth Street*
- *Email from Roland Kaulfuss, 222 Anthony Court*
- *Email from Caroline & Dharmesh Patel, 322 Sixth Avenue*
- *Email from Angela & Ken Emsley, 411 Fourth Avenue*
- *Email from Rashid Ahmed, 102 Agnes Street*
- *Email from Trevor & Diane Muir, 108 Oakland Street*
- *Email from Eric Smith, 210 Clinton Place*
- *Email from Robert Chesterman/Karima Budhwani, 337 Second Street*

Opposing:

- *Email from Ethel Field, 127 Queens Avenue*
- *Email from Lorna Campbell, 407 St. George Street*
-

CARRIED.

All members of Council voted in favour of the motion.

- d. Invitation to those present to address the bylaw

Eric Pattison, Architect for the project, rose to make a presentation regarding a development proposal for the Colin Howay Cottage. He reviewed previous renovations to the home, design features, heritage values, and the current proposal to relocate the home to 340 Fifth. He also reviewed the Armitage House. Mr. Pattison reviewed the site plan with existing and relocated home, garage, the addition to the heritage house, floor plans, elevations, the public consultation process. He noted variances which are required for the proposal.

Marvin Lemke, President of Queens Park Residents Association, 501 Fifth Street, rose and commented on the resurrection of the local residents association. At a meeting of the association, those present voiced opposition to the development and this position was communicated to the City. Their concern was the possibility of other similar subdivisions in the area and in the city which will drive in fill development. They felt that HRA should be about heritage and not densification. The Executive convened a meeting where 70 persons attended and the architect made a

presentation and City staff were present. The Executive met again where a vote on the application produced 36 votes against and 20 in favour. This ratio is felt to reflect others in the area.

Felicity Rudolph of 340 Fifth Street rose to support the project and described other restoration projects they have been involved with. They requested Council support for the project.

Kathleen Langstroth, Vice President of the New Westminster Heritage Preservation Society, which is not opposed in principle to heritage revitalization agreements as they apply to unique properties and situations. The group is however opposed to HRA use to facilitate subdivision of properties. They are concerned about how the policy is applied and suggest that a site must warrant significant heritage conservation. She asked whether both subject properties have significant heritage value. She felt that the relocation will cause the house to lose its heritage characteristics. Her other concern is the necessity to subdivide a property and move a house which will require significant changes to a new lot.

Martin Merkli of 118 First Street rose and read and submitted his written submission and asked that it be published in the minutes in full as written (the submission will be added to these minutes as an attachment). NOT per RP

Daniel Fontaine of 308 Regina Street was present to support the proposal which he views as the right thing to do for the environment and for our young families as affordable housing alternatives. There is no new land left in New Westminster so use of existing land is the wise choice and more environmentally sound as it saves forest and farm lands from development. If no new housing is developed Queens Park will not be available to young families. This proposal will retain the character of the neighbourhood and should be supported.

Catherine Hutson of 435 Third Street rose and noted that the family friendly tone of New Westminster must be retained. She asked whether the Armitage House will not be retained if this project is not supported. Alterations for this house may make it more livable but it will also make it more marketable. Ms. Hutson questioned the heritage merit of the house to be relocated and its history. It will be moved from its home base, renovated and added on to. This will save a shell of a house and not represent a heritage restoration. She voiced concern that this project will set a precedent. If it is worth it, it should be saved in its own neighbourhood in its own context.

Kathleen Langstroth, Vice President of the New Westminster Heritage Preservation Society, rose to respond to a question from a member as to the position of the Society and noted that their issues relate to the proper use of an HRA and the end result of moving a heritage house with the purpose of restoration rather than renovation or remodelling.

Mark Fox of 113 Oakland Street rose to speak in favour of the proposal as it:

- Is a creative approach dealing with pressure on housing on the city
 - It preserves an existing heritage home which enhances heritage values to the city overall
 - It enhances the current street scape
 - It enhances the city's tax base
 - It makes it possible for other people to live affordably in the community.
- It is the investment of families and people who make a contribution not just heritage.

Sheila Harris of 118 St. Patrick Street rose and noted that the dormers and the addition will make the renovated house look different. She supported the proposal because:

- Neighbours support it
- It will allow the rescue of a heritage home
- It could stand as an example of a successful in fill development which creates more living space near city centres, transportation, services, and parks
- It will save forest and agriculture land
- Being pro densification is not being anti heritage
- These homes are an alternative to condo living
- Creative ways to add density to the neighbourhood is necessary to allow varied occupancy.

Tom Adair of 1405 Nanaimo Street rose to support the proposal. He resides in an 1893 house and noted that many houses in the city are not listed on the heritage inventory. Heritage restoration is an evolutionary process as it allows working with the community. He commended the city on the process and encourage a similar process more around design in the West End where splitting lots is occurring. HRA's allow the city to hold the homeowner accountable in the process in order to maintain heritage value. It respects the heritage values of the buildings and the neighbourhood.

Tim Holekenyon of 218 Third Avenue was present to oppose the proposal. He suggested the city needs a policy that goes beyond HRA's so that HRA's are designed and used for what they are created for. This project goes beyond what HRA's are designed for.

Lorraine Brett of 502 First Street rose to oppose the proposal. She spoke of intangible values that made New Westminster the community it has been. These values are slipping away. This project will drop the City in status as a livable city. She spoke of the impact of densification and its effect on green space and its landscape. It will increase the hard surfaces and will create more run off into city sewers. She asked that the proposal not be approved.

Susan Irwin of 231 Queens Avenue rose to support the proposal. Increased density, if well planned, is a reality that must be faced including in Queens Park. This is a creative way of increasing the density of our community and the result is attractive. We need a flexible approach and we must use the tools we have. This is how communities grow and change. She asked for support for the application.

Jaimie McEvoy of 340 Ginger Drive rose and cited statements on the Statement of Significance for this house. In the Brow of the Hill, every house that has some character is worthy of being saved. He voiced concern with moving a heritage house from its context. The heritage content of all neighbourhoods in the city must be preserved, not just in one community. He asked if the additions to the house will be small scale in terms of impact on the existing house. Densification should not result in loss of all back yard green space. He urged that these other policy issues be examined and established for use in future projects.

Tim Ruang of 411 Fifth Street rose to support the proposal. Debating the heritage value of the home is as difficult as debating art. It has heritage character. He noted the house will be moved to the land fill or to this location. We should preserve a building that has some heritage value. The new lot is a gateway to the area and the restored and renovated home will add to the impact of the gateway. Any project requires both restoration and renovation. He likes how things are done in Queens Park and in New Westminster.

Mr. Gurney of 101 Queens rose to suggest that the city change its notices to make it distinct what is being proposed in revitalization plans. He opposed the application as the HRA is being used to circumvent the rules. He suggested that more of these will be seen on First Street as it faces the park. He felt that our forefathers did not anticipate such

development. He did not see a heritage win in this situation – there are other houses which will be demolished that might be more suitable for this treatment. Residents of the area like to walk in the community and see trees and heritage. More public input and policy is needed before this is approved.

David Brett of 401 First Street and Vice President of Queens Park Residents Association rose to ask if this is a vote in favour of density. If so, he suggested rezoning the entire neighbourhood or changing the guidelines for rezoning RS 1 lots. Although it appears to be about heritage, it is about densification and debate should reflect that. He asked what further consultation process is suggested by staff. He advised that 64% of the Residents Association oppose the proposal. If their majority is not taken into serious consideration, then what is the role of a Residents Association. He felt that this vote will reflect the larger community. Residents are not in favour of subdivision to allow another house to be located. There was consensus that this house does not have overwhelming heritage merit. As well, Mr. Brett felt this proposal will create a precedent.

Robert Jost of 401, 320 Royal Avenue, rose to state he loves the neighbourhood the way it is however he supports the proposal in question. He called for a high degree of preservation in Queens Park. He supported the proposal because: it is done by a long time Queens Park residents (Mr. Pattison) who values his community, it borders higher density with bus service, the neighbours support the project. He opposed projects that will ruin the character of the neighbourhood which should be preserved. The city needs higher density and executive homes.

MOVED and SECONDED

THAT the Public Hearing recess.

CARRIED.

All members of Council voted in favour of the motion.

The Public Hearing recessed at 9:24 p.m. and reconvened at 9:33 p.m. with all members of Council present.

Kathleen Langstroth, Vice President of the New Westminster Heritage Preservation Society, rose again and advised she and her husband have restored two heritage homes. She was opposed to seeing a single family home moved from the Brow of the Hill when it would be best served to be kept in the Brow of the Hill. A HRA was developed to serve the purpose of heritage gain for a home or a lot or a neighbourhood. We should not call an HRA for this site as it is for the purpose of

densification. We also need to retain green space which is important throughout the city. She asked where the city will get the funds and facilities necessary to maintain a growth in population resulting from subdivisions. She asked that Council consider that impact of the use of an HRA to subdivide this lot on the entire city.

Catherine Hutson of 435 Third Street, rose again to speak of a house on Watson built in the 1800's which is worth saving and is located on a wide lot. If the Howay house were relocated to this property, it would save the house and provide cash for the renovation of the existing 1800 house. This would represent a heritage win.

John Vector of 123 Queens Avenue rose and advised he moved into Queens Park for its green space and heritage which is unique to Queens Park. If we think of changing the character and the space of the area, it will be difficult to keep the historical neighbourhood. There are few areas in the region that still have historical neighbourhoods. He opposed the proposal.

Martin Merkli of 118 First Street rose again and commented that his submission has solutions that would be of use. However, he supported densification and supports the subject project.

Robert Jost of 401, 320 Royal Avenue, rose again to speak of 401 and 403 St. George Street where an infill house was built 10 years ago and which was the original precedent. He suggested tools to protect the Queens Park neighbourhood: declare the home as a heritage site, register a covenant on the land declaring it as a historic neighbourhood. He urged Council to approve this project and to issue a moratorium on demolition. He also urged that the character of this neighbourhood not be impacted.

Jaimie McEvoy of 340 Ginger Drive rose again to note that the Howay house is worth preserving. If it is not moved, he is not aware of plans that it will be demolished. The heritage of our city is not unique to one neighbourhood and should be preserved in all neighbourhoods. This proposal is not a heritage restoration but if it were left in its present site, it might also receive restoration.

Marvin Lemke, President of Queens Park Residents Association, 501 Fifth Street, rose again to suggest that the city improve its signage for these applications.

Eric Pattison, Architect, rose to provide more information on the issues that were raised. There is not the intention of the proponents to demolish their house. Restoration will take place to the exterior of the house and dormers will be replaced and the addition is at the rear and will be subservient to the original house. The Statement of Significance was written by himself and reviewed by staff. Houses move to all areas of the city. 100% of the returned forms from neighbours were in support of the project. There were 16 letters of support sent to Council.

Catherine Hutson of 435 Third Street rose again to ask how long the house was left vacant and whether there is a current engineering survey to ensure the house remains suitable and will survive the relocation. Mr. Pattison confirmed the house is sound to be relocated.

- e. Motion to refer to Council

MOVED and SECONDED

THAT the following be referred to Council for consideration:

- *Heritage Revitalization Agreement (340 Fifth Street) Bylaw No. 7174, 2007.*

CARRIED.

All members of Council voted in favour of the motion.

ADJOURNMENT

The Public Hearing concluded at 10:03 p.m.

Certified as being a fair and accurate report of the Public Hearing.

Richard L. Page – City Clerk