



## **COMMUNITY HERITAGE COMMISSION**

**Wednesday, April 10, 2019, 6:00 p.m.  
Committee Room #2, City Hall**

### **MINUTES**

#### **VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Councillor Jaimie McEvoy	- Chair
Maureen Arvanitidis	- Community Member
John Davies	- Vice-Chair, Community Member
Jenelle Davies	- Community Member
Deane Gurney	- Community Member
Troy Hunter	- Community Member (Arrived at 6:09)
David Sarraf	- Community Member (Arrived at 6:11)

#### **REGRETS:**

Rosanne Hood	- NWHPS Representative
--------------	------------------------

#### **STAFF:**

Cameron Barker	- Planning Assistant
Dilys Huang	- Planning Technician
Rob McCullough	- Manager, Museums & Heritage Services
Britney Quail	- Heritage Planner
Heather Corbett	- Committee Clerk

The meeting was called to order at 6:00 p.m.

### **1.0 ADDITIONS TO AGENDA**

There were no additions.

### **2.0 ADOPTION OF MINUTES**

#### **2.1 Adoption of the Minutes of February 6, 2019**

##### **MOVED and SECONDED**

*THAT the minutes of the February 6, 2019 Community Heritage Commission meeting be adopted.*

**CARRIED.**

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

### **3.0 PRESENTATIONS**

**Procedural Note:** Item 3.1 was addressed after Item 3.2 and prior to Item 5.4.

#### **3.1 632 Second Street – Heritage Revitalization Agreement**

Dilys Huang, Planning Technician, summarized the staff report dated April 10, 2019 regarding a Heritage Revitalization Agreement (HRA) proposed for subdivision of the property at 632 Second Street into two parcels, as well as the construction of an infill house, and relaxation of zoning provisions, in exchange for restoration and protection of the 1937 Pugh Residence.

Julie Schueck, Heritage Consultant, provided the Commission with a PowerPoint presentation covering the following information:

- The history of the Pugh Residence and amendments made to the building over time;
- Details of the proposed restorations and rehabilitations on each elevation of the house; and,
- The importance of retention and protection of the house.

In response to questions from the Commission, Ms. Schueck and Jaspal Randhawa, Owner, provided the following information:

- Some of the current siding on the existing house has been removed in order for the builder to inspect the original stucco, and it appeared to be in good condition;
- The intent would be to restore any damaged stucco to match the original, regardless of how difficult it may be to source the materials;
- The detached garage for the infill house, shown on the current plans, would convert to a detached workshop, and an additional parking space would be provided as a parking pad alongside the others;
- The plans show two parking spots on each proposed lot, as required by the City for single detached dwellings with suites;
- The conditions of the windows on the existing house have not yet been assessed;
- An independent assessment of the chimney masonry was not provided in the package;
- A historically appropriate paint colour has not yet been selected for the existing house, though it would replace the non-characteristic colour currently in place and shown on the drawings;
- If the original soffits are not present under the aluminum soffits on the existing house, new painted wood soffits would be installed;
- The inclusion of an accessible secondary suite in the infill building is in response to a recognized need by the City for more of these types of suites, to benefit the community;

- An alternative to fiber-cementitious plank siding (such as Hardie Board) could be considered for the infill house, however it is widely recognized as a sustainable product within Metro Vancouver, and its use is permitted for new buildings in the city and in the HRA context ;
- The existing house is not currently on the City’s Heritage Register;
- The proposed HRA would designate the house. As such, any future changes to the building would require a Heritage Alteration Permit;
- An open house was held in regards to the application, as well as consultation with the local Residents’ Association, and there were neighbours who have shown support for the proposed increase in density and for retaining the heritage house; and,
- The direct neighbours have demonstrated concern about parking in the neighbourhood and a loss of sunlight to their property.

The Commission made the following comments:

- More detail in the Heritage Conservation Plan and report about the conditions of the existing house would be useful in order to ensure that expectations are known from the outset of the project;
- More certainty related to proposed conservation work would be helpful for the Commission to make recommendations;
- As the alternative to this proposal would be to build a new larger house, the proposed measures to provide density, and restore and maintain the house are positive;
- The effort to provide an accessible suite is commendable; and,
- The proposed design of the infill house is sympathetic to traditional heritage character for turn of the century houses.

**MOVED and SECONDED**

*THAT the Community Heritage Commission recommend that Council support the Heritage Revitalization Agreement for 632 Second Street;*

**CARRIED.**

Maureen Arvanitidis and Deane Gurney voted in opposition.

**Procedural Note:** Item 3.2 was addressed prior to Item 3.1

**3.2 1002-1004 & 1006-1008 Third Avenue – Heritage Revitalization Agreement**

Britney Quail, Heritage Planner, summarized the staff report dated April 10, 2019 regarding a Heritage Revitalization Agreement (HRA) to allow the conversion of four unoccupied attic spaces into loft bedrooms at the duplexes located at 1002-1004 and 1006-1008 Third Avenue, both built in 1892. Ms. Quail noted the high heritage significance of the duplexes and that the proposed changes to the building are only to the interior.

In response to a question from the Commission, Ms. Quail noted that the Floor Space Ratio (FSR) of the building would increase from 1.27 to 1.51, requiring a relaxation of 1.01.

Elana Zysblat, Ance Building Services and Robert Billard, Billard Architecture provided a PowerPoint presentation covering the following information:

- Heritage value and uniqueness of the duplexes;
- Details of the proposed interventions, including:
  - Preservation of the duplex and its rental use;
  - Restorations to the windows and porches;
  - Rehabilitation of the unfinished attic spaces; and,
- Desired project outcomes, including heritage designation of the buildings.

In response to questions from the Panel, Ms. Zysblat and Mr. Billard provided the following information:

- The nature of the occupancy of the buildings is for single family dwelling, and the proposed renovation would provide additional space for a larger family;
- The buildings would remain under the same ownership as currently;
- No changes are proposed to the framing of the building;
- The proposed changes to the attic space would provide occupied space, which would help maintain the building's ventilation; and,
- No exterior changes are proposed, other than those identified in the report.

#### **MOVED and SECONDED**

*THAT the Community Heritage Commission recommends that City Council support the Heritage Revitalization Agreement application for 1002-1004 and 1006-1008 Third Avenue.*

**CARRIED.**

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

## **4.0 UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

**Procedural Note:** Item 4.1 was addressed after Item 5.4.

### **4.1 Urban Indigenous Engagement around the development of the New Westminster Aquatic and Community Centre – Memo**

Rob McCullough, Manager of Museums & Heritage Services summarized the April 10, 2019 staff memo regarding indigenous engagement in the City and specifically in reference to the new aquatic and community centre.

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

- The full report is due back from the Consultants, Castlemain Group, at the end of the month;
- There have been 81 respondents to the survey and a good turnout has been observed at the open houses and focus groups held thus far;
- Two gymnasiums are planned for the new facility, which would be similar in capacity and square footage to the current building, and big enough to accommodate large events, such as ceremonial gatherings;
- The Arenex replacement building would accommodate the gymnastics programs rather than the new facility (as previously suggested);
- The activities to take place at the new centre are still to be finalized through a public process;

Committee members noted appreciation for the City's engagement with First Nations and consideration for the provision of spaces large enough for sacred ceremonial gatherings.

Councillor McEvoy noted that as the CHC is interested in intangible heritage, it makes sense to remain involved in these types of discussions.

Committee members also discussed the Mayday celebrations, with Committee members noting the following:

- Mayday is of significant importance in New Westminster because of its long history;
- An indigenous perspective could be incorporated and addressed positively within the Mayday traditions;
- Decisions on the relevance of Mayday should be made by the community; and,
- Discussion about Mayday may be relevant for the CHC in terms of intangible heritage in the City.

#### **4.2 Demolition Permit Review Policy – Memo**

Britney Quail, Heritage Planner, summarized the April 10, 2019 staff memo regarding the City's demolition permit review policy, providing details about the legalities, and the City's authority and policies.

In response to a question from the Commission, Ms. Quail noted that, although some municipalities do, the City does not require a new house design to be submitted prior to a building being demolished,

The Committee made the following comments:

- In order to encourage the preservation of buildings that would otherwise be demolished, a request for a schematic idea of what would replace a building could be incorporated into the current building permit submission package requirements;

- A conception drawing requirement could clarify intent and give the City an opportunity to encourage the owner to look at alternatives to a demolition;
- The suggested addition to the submission package could be costly for an owner to provide, when their intention might be to keep the lot vacant for some time;
- One reason to have vacant land could be for land assembly, however this could be shown in a schematic drawing; and,
- It is not general practice to demolish a building unless there is also a plan to erect one in its place.

**MOVED and SECONDED**

*That the CHC recommend that the City consider amending the current demolition permit policy to require that a conception drawing be submitted prior to permitting a demolition order.*

**CARRIED.**

Troy Hunter voted in opposition to the motion.

**5.0 NEW BUSINESS**

**5.1 Fourth Street – Registered Heritage Bricks and Watermain Upgrade**

This item was tabled.

**5.2 220 Second Street – Demolition Application for a Pre-1900, Non-Protected Building in the QPHCA (Britney Quail)**

Britney Quail, Heritage Planner, summarized the April 10 staff report regarding an 1899 building that was removed from protection under the Queen’s Park Heritage Conservation Area, due to a heritage assessment through the special limited study, and subsequent score of 4/9. Ms. Quail noted that the report was for CHC’s information only.

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

- The owners are intending to submit the new design to staff shortly, and a Heritage Alteration Permit is required in order to ensure the design is consistent with the Queen’s Park design guidelines for new construction;
- There has been direction from Council for staff to review the heritage assessment checklist used to make decisions on removal of protection, which, when complete, would be forwarded to CHC for information and comment; and,
- There were a number of houses in the Queen’s Park HCA special limited study that were assessed at 5 out of 9. City staff reached out to these owners to inform them that their house had moderate heritage value and protection would be removed, though encouraged them to leave protection in place.

The Committee made the following comments:

- There are numerous examples in the City where a house may have been preserved if the heritage scoring had included different criteria and a lower minimum was in place; and,
- A re-evaluation of the criteria may be worthwhile.

**MOVED and SECONDED**

*That the CHC recommend that Council review and amend the heritage assessment scoring to reflect a majority score minimum from 60 to 55%.*

**CARRIED.**

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

**5.3 631 Second Street – Pre-Application Review for a Heritage Revitalization Agreement**

Britney Quail, Heritage Planner, summarized the April 10 staff report regarding a pre-application review (PAR) for a proposed Heritage Revitalization Agreement (HRA) at 631 Second Street and asked for the Commission's comments on the property's heritage value.

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

- The intention of the HRA would be to lift the original house and finish the basement;
- There is no requirement for the design of the infill house to be included within a PAR;
- The intention of the HRA proposal is to provide two units in the heritage house and a fee simple lot with one family dwelling on the other lot; and,
- Council supported in principle the HRA for subdivision of the property.

The Committee made the following comments:

- The house in question is in better condition than the house across the street (also put forward for an HRA), as it was fully remodeled in the mid-2000s, and the materials do not have heritage value;
- If this were to be a true HRA, the house should be restored to its original state; and,
- This appears to be an application using heritage as a method to subdivide the property, rather than heritage retention.

**Procedural Note:** Item 5.4 was addressed after Item 3.1

## 5.4 616 Columbia Street – Sign Permit Application for a Heritage Register Building

Cameron Barker, Planning Assistant, summarized the report dated April 10, 2019, regarding a proposed sign permit application for the Cunningham Block building, a heritage registered property, at 616 Columbia Street. Mr. Barker asked the Commission for feedback on the proposed new sign for the building.

In response to a question from the Commission, Mr. Barker noted that the proposed signage letters would be freestanding, made of plastic, non-illuminated, and pinned individually to the wall.

The Commission noted appreciation for the proposal of individual letters.

### **MOVED and SECONDED**

*That the CHC recommend that the signage proposed for 616 Columbia Street proceed as suggested.*

**CARRIED.**

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

## **6.0 REPORTS AND INFORMATION**

### **6.1 General Inquiries from the Commission (Standing Item)**

#### **a) Columbia Street**

In response to a question from the Commission, Britney Quail, Heritage Planner noted that the most recently adopted Official Community Plan (OCP) covers all of New Westminster, other than the Downtown area and Queensborough. Ms. Quail also noted that the current zoning for Columbia Street allows for a building to be 12 storeys in height, although additional height may be considered through the use of an HRA.

#### **b) Follow-up on CHC's Motion re Landfill and Salvage Material**

Britney Quail, Heritage Planner, advised that the report is still with Legislative Services for analysis, and staff would report back to the Commission.

### **6.2 Demolition Permit Applications Issued January 24, 2019 to March 8, 2019:**

<b>ADDRESS</b>	<b>YEAR BUILT</b>	<b>NEIGHBOURHOOD</b>
338 BOYNE ST	1946	QUEENSBOROUGH
930 FOURTH ST	1947	GLENBROOKE NORTH
2309 DUBLIN ST	1944	CONNAUGHT HEIGHTS
724 FIFTH ST	1910	GLENBROOKE NORTH
310 NINTH AVE	1946	GLENBROOKE NORTH

**7.0 CORRESPONDENCE**

**7.1 New Westminster Historical Society Newsletter (March 2019)**

**MOVED and SECONDED**

*THAT the correspondence items be received for information.*

**CARRIED.**

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

**8.0 NEXT MEETING**

Wednesday, May 1, 2019 at 6:00 p.m.in Committee Room #2, City Hall, or at the call of the Chair.

**9.0 ADJOURNMENT**

**ON MOTION**, the meeting was adjourned at 7:56 p.m.

Certified correct,

**ORIGINAL SIGNED**

**Councillor Jaimie McEvoy  
Chair**

**ORIGINAL SIGNED**

**Heather Corbett  
Committee Clerk**