

**Queen's Park Heritage Conservation Area Review  
Final Working Group Meeting**

**July 13, 2017**

**6:00pm**

**Council Chambers**

**AGENDA**

**1.0 Working Group Meeting Notes of May 2, 2017**

**2.0 Implementation and Next Steps**

**3.0 Incentives Brainstorm**

**4.0 Debrief and Lessons Learned in the Process**

**5.0 Wrap up**

*Please RSVP to Britney Quail at  
[bquail@newwestcity.ca](mailto:bquail@newwestcity.ca)  
or at 604.527.4621*

# Queen's Park Heritage Conservation Area Review Working Group Meeting Notes of March 29, 2017

## PRESENT:

Councillor Jaimie McEvoy, Chair  
David Brett, Vice-Chair  
Deane Gurney (QPRA)  
Dave Vallee  
Bruce Cheng  
Maureen Arvanitidis (NWHPS)  
Rebecca Bateman  
Steve North (NWHPS)  
Jim Hutson (QPRA)  
Jennifer Wolowic

## CITY STAFF:

Britney Quail, Planning Analyst

## REGRETS:

Tom Bellamy  
Robert Toth  
Gary Holisko

## GUESTS:

Kathleen Langstroth  
Steve Norman

---

### **1.0 Working Group Meeting Notes of March 29, 2017.**

Staff confirmed the wording of the motions from the previous meeting with Working Group members. A full copy of the Working Group notes of March 29, 2017 will be provided for the Group's approval at the next regularly scheduled meeting on June 6, 2017.

### **2.0 Conservation Area Administrative Policy**

Ms. Quail, Heritage Planning Analyst provided an overview of the provisions of the proposed Heritage Conservation Area administrative policies which were endorsed by Council on May 1, 2017. Staff explained that the provisions of these policies would be incorporated into to the appropriate heritage related procedures bylaws, which were already in place the City.

Ms. Quail then detailed the decision-making authority, guidelines, application requirements, process, and fees for the following types of applications, which would be required should a Conservation Area be implemented:

- 1) Applications for exterior renovations on a protected house;
- 2) Applications for demolition of a protected house;
- 3) Applications for new building construction, which would apply to all lots in the neighbourhood;
- 4) Applications to move between protection levels.

Staff provided copies of the May 1, 2017 Council report to members of the Working Group, as the administrative policies presented are further detailed in that report. Ms. Quail also answered questions relating to the processing of applications, per the administrative policy discussed.

### **3.0 Heritage Criteria Review**

Ms. Quail explained that per the legislative requirements of the Local Government Act, the Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw, which would bring the Heritage Conservation Area into effect, is required to include guidelines for the approval or withholding of a permit. Design Guidelines have been developed, which the Working Group has contributed to through presentations and workshops. However, additional guidelines are required for demolition and lot subdivision.

Based on the previous work of the Group through the Neighbourhood Heritage Study, and the Working Group's Summary of Historic Values for the Queen's Park Neighbourhood, evaluation guidelines were developed by staff. Staff reviewed the guidelines, which include a weighted combination of three elements:

- 1) Heritage Character and Merit of the Existing House  
*Intent: Retain buildings in the neighbourhood with heritage merit in order to retain the historic character of the neighbourhood.*
- 2) Development Potential of the Lot  
*Intent: A property owner retains their entitlement to build to the full potential of their lot under the existing Zoning Bylaw.*
- 3) Condition of the Lot and House  
*Intent: Condition of the house, integrity of its historic elements, and the work required to achieve heritage retention in addition to development potential is considered.*

Staff further explained that these guidelines are similar to those used throughout the Heritage Control Period by the Technical Review Panel. Members of the Working Group who also sit on the Technical Review Panel confirmed this and recommended the three element review to other members of the Group.

Staff confirmed that, per the proposed Conservation Area administrative policy, applicants would be required to submit historic information as part of an application package (such as a Heritage Assessment, conducted by a certified Heritage Professional) for the purposes of completing this evaluation.

Copies of the evaluation tool were provided in the agenda package for the meeting, and additional copies were provided at the meeting. Staff took questions relating to the application of the evaluation tool. However, due to a lack of time in the meeting, staff requested that Working Group members review the document in the following days and submit any comments to Ms. Quail by email no later than Tuesday May 9, 2017.

Note: no comments relating to this document were received from Working Group members by the May 9<sup>th</sup> deadline.

#### **4.0 Next Steps**

Staff informed the Working Group that at the Monday May 1<sup>st</sup> Council meeting, Council had endorsed the administrative policies for the purposes of drafting a bylaw to implement a Heritage Conservation Area. At that Council meeting, Council also directed staff to provide a policy alternative which could address community concerns related to lots that may experience a decrease in market interest due to a combination of the heritage protection provisions and site constraints, which could ultimately restrict the ability of some properties to achieve their full potential (including density entitlements, and any new incentives). Staff indicated to the Group that they are in touch with Coriolis Consulting, whom some of the Group members were familiar with, to work on this policy alternative. Staff estimated that the report would be presented to Council within the next two Council meetings.

#### **5.0 Summer Meeting Dates**

Staff brought to the member's attention that the Working Group had not established meeting dates for the final two meetings of the Group in July and August 2017. The Working Group confirmed that those meetings should proceed, with the possibility of the final meeting being a social, rather than a business meeting; to include additional catering or pot-luck style offerings.

Staff confirmed with the Working Group that the first Tuesday of the month would be appropriate for these meetings (barring holidays) and indicated that the dates for those meetings would be brought to the Group at the next regularly scheduled meeting on June 6.

## **5.0 New Business: Letters and Delegations of Support**

Mr. Steve North brought forward an item as new business at the end of the meeting. Mr. North expressed that he felt it was critically important for members of the Working Group to be providing their written support of this policy proposal to Council members. He highlighted that the members of the Working Group were individual residents of the community, as well as members of the Working Group collective. Mr. North additionally encouraged Working Group members who had not yet made a delegation to Council to do so at the upcoming May 15<sup>th</sup> Council meeting.

**The next meeting of the Working Group is scheduled for:**  
Tuesday June 6, 2017 @ 6:00pm in Council Chambers

## Queen's Park Heritage Conservation Area Review Working Group Meeting Notes of March 29, 2017

### PRESENT:

Councillor Jaimie McEvoy, Chair  
David Brett, Vice-Chair  
Deane Gurney (QPRA)  
Robert Toth  
Dave Vallee  
Bruce Cheng  
Gary Holisko  
Maureen Arvanitidis (NWHPS)  
Rebecca Bateman  
Steve North (NWHPS)  
Jim Hutson (QPRA)

### CITY STAFF:

Britney Quail, Planning Analyst

### REGRETS:

Tom Bellamy  
Jennifer Wolowic

### GUESTS:

Kathleen Langstroth  
Bev McLellan  
Steve Norman

---

### **1.0 Working Group Meeting Notes of February 7, 2017.**

No corrections were required. The notes were accepted as circulated.

### **2.0 Working Group Meeting Notes of March 7, 2017.**

No corrections were required. The notes were accepted as circulated.

### **3.0 Round 2 Public Consultation -- Report back on Results**

Britney Quail, Heritage Planning Analyst, presented on the consultation results from the second round of public engagement, including an overview of each the public open houses, online survey, and targeted stakeholder events. The second round of consultation engaged community members, heritage stakeholders, the Working Group, City committees and commissions, design professionals, local realtors, and Regional stakeholders.

The second round of consultation sought feedback from the community on the following key topics:

- What level of protection (Advanced, Standard or Limited) should be applied to each of the identified housing eras?
- Should properties already zoned commercial, institutional, townhouse and low-rise residential be included in the Heritage Conservation Area?
- Five low-rise apartments in the neighbourhood are on RS-1 zoned properties and would not be entitled to build to a greater density without rezoning. Should these properties be subject to the Heritage Conservation Area policy?; and
- Are the draft design guidelines for new buildings, based on the “traditional New Westminster architectural character”, and for protected building renovations and landscape design, appropriate to the neighbourhood?

Staff noted that a copy of Dialog Design’s (the consultation consultant) summary, which contains detailed information related to the consultation results would be made public through a report to Council on April 10, 2017 and copies would be brought to the next Working Group meeting for members, should they be interested in reading the full report.

Staff highlighted that this round of outreach demonstrated a high rate of new participants. On average, approximately 40% of respondents at the open houses and from the online survey indicated they had not previously participated in any of the Queen’s Park Heritage Conservation Area engagement activities. However, analysis of responses from those identifying as being first-time participants versus those of respondents who had previously participated, indicate similar results from each group.

Staff also noted that in this round of consultation, an average of 60% of open house respondents indicated that some form of protection is appropriate, as compared to Round 1 where approximately 75% of open house respondents indicated overall support for a Heritage Conservation Area policy. As such, the new results demonstrate more than a 15% decrease in support for the proposal.

Overall, in the online survey and public open house comments, there were three themes of concern which emerged, and were summarized for the Working Group by Ms. Quail:

- 1) Heritage Protection and Property Value;
- 2) Heritage Protection and Property Rights; and
- 3) Shifting assessment Responsibility and Cost to Owner.

In regards to the proposed policy provisions, staff discussed the consultation results with the group, which overall indicated the following in relation to the previous proposal, and questions listed above:

- 1) Support to exclude non-residential properties;
- 2) Support to include RS-1 Zoned apartment buildings;
- 3) Continued strong support for mandatory design guidelines for new construction;
- 4) Continued support for the protection of older houses (Pre-1900 to 1929);
- 5) Continued support for the protection of newer houses (1976-today) from heritage protection; and
- 6) Continued varied support for protection or exemption of mid-era (1930-1975) houses.

#### **4.0 Proposed Changes to the Heritage Conservation Area Policy**

The Working Group recessed for approximately 10 minutes while staff set up the following activity.

The Chair introduced an activity through which the Working Group members, having considered all the information related to the consultation results, could vote on their preferred policy structure for the proposed Heritage Conservation Area. Six options for the policy structure were affixed to the walls of the Chambers:

##### A) Very High Protection: three tiered

Advanced	Standard	Limited
Colonial (Pre-1900)	Post Modern (1950-1975)	Contemporary (1976-today)
Boom (1900-1929)		
Wartime (1930-1949)		

B) High Protection: two tiered

Advanced	Limited
Colonial (Pre-1900)	Post Modern (1950-1975)
Boom (1900-1929)	Contemporary (1976-today)
Wartime (1930-1949)	

C) Moderate Protection: three tiered

Advanced	Standard	Limited
Colonial (Pre-1900)	Wartime (1930-1949)	Post Modern (1950-1975)
Boom (1900-1929)		Contemporary (1976-today)

D) Low Protection: two tiered

Advanced	Limited
Colonial (Pre-1900)	Wartime (1930-1949)
Boom (1900-1929)	Post Modern (1950-1975)
	Contemporary (1976-today)

Ms. Quail provided a refresher for Working Group members related to the implications of each protection category (Advanced, Standard and Limited), which had been discussed at previous Working Group meetings. Ms. Quail explained that various combinations of the protection categories could be used to make up the policy structure, though an Advanced was always required. Ms. Quail highlighted that the Standard and Limited protection level would not always be required legally, however that these options were favoured by the community for newer houses. Staff then provided a brief summary of each policy structure option on the wall-posters.

Working Group members were provided with two coloured 'hot dots': yellow and green for voting purposes. The Working Group members were instructed by the Chair to place their green dots on the wall-poster with their preferred policy, in

their role of community members and advocates. The Working Group members were then instructed by the Chair to place their yellow dots on the wall-poster with their preferred policy structure, in the role of a Working Group member, making a recommendation to Council.

Photographs of the posters, including dot votes, are attached and form part of these meeting notes.

The results of the vote were as follows:

- A) 4 green dots; 0 yellow dots
- B) 5 green dots; 5 yellow dots
- C) 1 green dot; 3 yellow dots
- D) 0 green dots; 2 yellow dots

Working Group members were asked by the Chair to indicate where they had placed both their green and yellow dots, and provide an explanation of their choices to the Group. Following this, further discussion ensued between members relating to the merits of each policy structure.

The Working Group moved to:

*Recommend to Council the two tiered Option B: High Protection, which would include Colonial, Boom and Wartime era houses in the Advanced Protection category, as the policy structure for the Proposed Queen's Park Heritage Conservation Area.*

The motion was carried. Though, two members present voted in opposition to that motion.

Further discussion ensued between members. Many members expressed concern regarding a potential loss of properties in the Queen's Park neighbourhood with heritage value as it relates to the 1950-1960 decade, which would not be protected through the Option B proposal. It was suggested that the two category dates be amended, in order to provide an opportunity for protection of that decade. Some members expressed concern with changing the dates the public had been consulted on, and that the Group had been working with for many months.

The Working Group moved to:

*Recommend to Council the two tiered Option B: High Protection, though with the dates of the Wartime and Post-Modern eras amended so that houses built in 1959 or earlier would fall in the Advanced protection category.*

This motion was defeated with six members present voting in opposition to the motion.

## **5.0 Next Steps**

Ms. Quail reported that a staff report to Council was in the process of preparation, which would provide Council with a number of options for the protection structure of the proposed Heritage Conservation Area. Ms. Quail indicated that, as the report to Council is still in draft form, the options provided may not be exactly as laid out for the Working Group, but would be based on the same principles.

Ms. Quail noted that the recommendations of the Working Group and the Community Heritage Commission would be included in the report to Council, along with the community consultation results.

Ms. Quail also advised that, should Council determine a direction for the policy structure at the April 10, 2017 meeting, staff would prepare an administrative process for Council's endorsement at the April 24, 2017 meeting of Council.

**The next meeting of the Working Group is scheduled for:**

Tuesday May 2, 2017 @ 6:00pm in Council Chambers