



ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

Tuesday, May 17, 2016 at 6:30 pm
Committee Rm #2

MINUTES

VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT:

Brian Shigetomi	- Chair, Community Member
Laura Cornish	- Community Member
Andrew Hull	- Community Member
Margaret Fairweather	- Community Member
Peter Goodwin	- Community Member
Christa MacArthur	- Community Member
Alex Swezey	- Community Member

REGRETS:

Richard Carswell	- Community Member
Peter Hall	- Community Member

GUESTS:

Rob Johnson	- Architect
-------------	-------------

STAFF:

Julie Schueck	- Heritage Planner
Lauren Blake	- Committee Clerk

The meeting was called to order at 6:31 p.m.

1.0 ADDITIONS TO AGENDA

There were no additions.

2.0 ADOPTION OF MINUTES

2.1 Adoption of the minutes of April 19, 2016

MOVED and SECONDED

THAT the minutes of the April 19, 2016 Advisory Planning Commission meeting be adopted.

CARRIED.

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

3.0 INFORMATION PRESENTATIONS

3.1 There were no items.

4.0 REZONING

4.1 1031 Sixth Ave

HER00563

Julie Schueck, Heritage Planner, summarized the report dated May 17, 2016 regarding an application that has been received for a Heritage Revitalization Agreement (HRA) for 1031 Sixth Avenue in order to construct a new house on the front of the parcel and relocate the 1891 heritage house to the rear of the parcel. There would be no subdivision. The Floor Space Ratio would be a total of 0.80 (allowed 0.50). The above grade for the two houses would be 0.695 (allowed 0.40). The total site coverage would be 36.6% (allowed 35%). In return, the applicants would agree to retain and restore the exterior of the 1891 McLaughlin house and place long-term legal protection on it through a Heritage Designation Bylaw.

Ms. Schueck advised that notification was sent to the following:

- the surrounding neighbourhood within 100 metres (578 notices);
- All Residents' Associations;
- the Board of School Trustees;
- Superintendent of Schools; and,
- the New Westminster Heritage Preservation Society

Rob Johnson, Architect, provided an on-table PowerPoint summarizing details of the project, noting the following information:

- The initial building permit application proposed to excavate the crawl space to provide a full height basement;
- The presence of hardpan underneath the house did not allow the applicant to move forward with excavating the site;
- The first HRA application proposed to implement a new laneway house; however, this application was pulled by the applicant;
- The applicant applied for a demolition permit and proposed to build a new home in an Edwardian style;
- The City issued a delay for the demolition permit; and,
- The second and current HRA application proposed to retain the heritage home as a "house on the lane" at the rear of the property, with a new home built at the front of the lot.

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

- The City has not considered a prohibition on strata or air parcel titles or a sales covenant for the property;
- The City does not currently have a policy regarding laneway housing; however, laneway homes are generally 800 – 1000 square feet, are one or one and a half storeys, and maintain an architectural presence on the lane;
- While the house is listed on the heritage register, there is no formal protection for the home at this time;
- Parking relaxations are often sought as part of an HRA;
- The HRA Bylaw would outline the timeline for the completion of the heritage restoration, as well as the required protection for the house;
- A bond could be implemented for additional assurance that the heritage home is restored; and,
- Interior restoration requirements are generally not specified as part of an HRA, as an applicant may require flexibility to ensure the interior of the house meets their needs.

With respect to the City's options for retaining the heritage home, Ms. Schueck advised that Council can place a heritage designation on the house with or without an owner's consent, which would allow the City to deny the demolition of the house; however, if an owner's consent is not obtained, the City could be held liable. Ms. Schueck noted that Council has not placed a heritage designation on a property without an owner's consent.

In response to questions from the Commission, Mr. Johnson and Steven Long, Applicant, provided the following information:

- If implemented at the rear of the property, the heritage home would be set into the incline of the property, with the main floor approximately 14 inches off of the grade;
- The vertical wall of the heritage home would be approximately the same height as the peak of the existing garage at the rear of the property;
- Temporarily relocating the heritage home to allow for the excavation of the basement could impact the cost of the project;
- The iron work that was removed from the heritage home has been retained;
- Some of the windows were deemed to be unsalvageable by the project's heritage consultant;
- The heritage home and proposed new house would be approximately the same height;

- It was suggested that the heritage home in its currently proposed location could cause more shadowing on the neighbouring property due to sun patterns; and,
- The provision of tandem parking would require an additional relaxation from the City.

Gail Keary, 1018 Nanaimo Street, questioned the proposed cost savings of building a new house and relocating the heritage home to the back of the lot, rather than temporarily moving the heritage home to excavate the site to provide a full height basement, while retaining the heritage home at the front of the lot. It was noted that the applicant would be excavating the site regardless to implement a basement for the new house.

Jacque Park, 1027 Sixth Avenue, expressed concerns regarding the potential loss of sunlight in her backyard if the heritage home is relocated to the back lane, as well as for the lack of backyard that the proposal would provide. Ms. Park noted that implementing two homes on the lot is too aggressive and would not suite the neighbourhood. Ms. Park suggested that the heritage home should remain in its current location.

Dan Gray, 1034 Nanaimo Street, suggested that the heritage home should remain in its current location. Mr. Grey expressed concerns regarding the lack of community consultation during the HRA process.

In response to questions from Mr. Gray, Ms. Schueck advised that community consultation is part of the HRA process, and has included:

- A sign outlining the application was posted on the property;
- Staff presented the application at a Residents' Association meeting;
- The application was presented to the Community Heritage Commission;
- Notification for the Advisory Planning Commission meeting where the application will be presented is sent to neighbours within 100 metres of the property; and,
- Should Council move the application forward, a Public Hearing would be scheduled, where residents would be provided an opportunity to address Council directly.

Ms. Schueck advised that Council would receive feedback from the Community Heritage Commission and Advisory Planning Commission, including the public's comments. Ms. Schueck noted that Council has expressed an interest in continuing with the HRA process in order to retain the house.

Leslie Gray, 1034 Nanaimo Street, suggested that the house in its current state is unsalvageable.

In response to questions from Ms. Gray, Ms. Schueck provided the following information:

- The heritage value of the property has been identified in the Statement of Significance, which was prepared by a heritage professional;
- Heritage value can be tangible, such as the materials of the home, or intangible, such as the stories or people connected with the house;
- Cities generally prefer home owners to request heritage protection or retention, rather than the City designating protection or retention; and,
- Heritage homes that are in poor condition can be restored.

Gail Faure, 1032 Nanaimo Street, expressed concerns regarding the potential number of families that could be living on the site, as well as the shade impact that the proposal could have on her property.

Brian Jackhart, 1030 Nanaimo Street, expressed concerns regarding the implementation of two large homes on one lot. Mr. Jackhart suggested that the HRA may not provide a heritage gain for the neighbourhood.

In response to questions from Mr. Jackhart, Ms. Schueck advised that there are no financial incentives, such as grants, provided to HRA applicants.

Lizz Kelly, 1028 Nanaimo Street, expressed concerns regarding the lack of neighbourhood support for the application.

In response to questions from Ms. Kelly, Ms. Schueck provided the following information:

- There are no financial incentives, such as grants, provided to HRA applicants in exchange for the retention of heritage homes;
- Non-financial incentives are provided as part of a HRA, and may include the relaxation of zoning requirements;
- The HRA Bylaw usually provides between two to three years for the restoration of a heritage home; however, the amount of time can be negotiated;
- As per the Local Government Act, a HRA does not set a legal precedent for any community; and,
- All HRAs are unique and have different requirements.

Allison Golosky, 1112 Nanaimo Street, expressed concerns regarding the parking requirements of the proposal.

Chris Bell, 1006 Nanaimo Street, suggested that the second HRA proposal, which would maintain the heritage home in its current location, as well as implement a laneway house, could be reconsidered. Mr. Bell expressed concern with respect to the length of time that the heritage home would be unattended to.

In response to comments and questions from Mr. Bell, Ms. Schueck advised that the HRA would only allow the applicant to rebuild a replicate of the house in the event of an accident, such as an earthquake or fire.

Lynn Leadbettar, 1027 Sixth Avenue, suggested that the earlier HRA proposal could be reconsidered, as the current proposal does not provide a heritage gain for the neighbourhood.

In response to questions from the public, Ms. Schueck advised that the majority of HRAs address exterior features of the house.

Dan Gray, 1034 Nanaimo Street, provided an on table petition of Moody Park residents expressing opposition to the HRA proposal. Mr. Gray expressed concerns regarding the potential number of people that could be living on the property.

Discussion ensued, and the Commission expressed concerns for the lack of community support for the proposal, the proposed basement suite and the length of time that the heritage home could remain unrestored. In addition, the Commission noted the following comments:

- The current proposal is too dense for the site;
- The floor space ratio is too high for the site;
- The two proposed homes are too big for the lot size;
- Retaining the heritage home at the back of the property diminishes its heritage value and should not be considered a heritage gain for the neighbourhood;
- It was suggested that if the proposal moves forward, the applicant be required to restore the heritage home prior to building a new home;
- The proposal does not provide adequate parking;
- It was suggested that if the proposal moves forward, permit parking could be implemented on the street;
- It was suggested that the proposed parking pad could be elongated in order to provide a tandem parking space; and,
- The proposal would not complement the streetscape.

The Commission suggested that either of the first two proposals, which would maintain the heritage home at the front of the site, could be better solutions for the retention of the heritage home, as well as for the density of the site.

MOVED and SECONDED

THAT the application for the Heritage Revitalization Agreement for 1031 Sixth Avenue not be supported.

CARRIED.

Peter Goodwin voted in opposition to the motion.

MOVED and SECONDED

THAT the on-table correspondence be received for information.

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

7.1 Correspondence received from Jacquie Park, dated May 05, 2016

The correspondence was received as part of the on-table package.

8.0 NEXT MEETING

June 21, 2016 (in Committee Room #2)

9.0 ADJOURNMENT

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

Certified Correct,

Brian Shigetomi
Chair

Lauren Blake
Committee Clerk