

Minutes Extract – Heritage Revitalization Agreement (108-118 Royal Avenue and 74-82 First Street) Bylaw No. 8339, 2022, Heritage Designation (82 First Street) Bylaw No. 8340, 2022 and Road Closure Bylaw and Land Disposition (Windsor Street) Bylaw No. 8350, 2022

R-2 Preliminary Report to Council – February 8, 2021

18. 108-118 Royal Avenue and 74-82 First Street: Heritage Revitalization Agreement and Special Development Permit Applications – Preliminary Report

In response to Council questions, Emilie Adin, Director of Development Services, and Mike Watson, Senior Planner, Development Services, provided the following information:

- This application uses a Heritage Revitalization Agreement (HRA) to preserve the 1890 home on the site and a contribution from the applicant to move the 1930 home from the site to another location;
- An HRA and a rezoning are two different tools to exercise the same authority; the same outcome could be achieved with a rezoning and a Section 219 Covenant, however using an HRA makes enforceability easier;
- There will be a smaller contribution from the developer as the preservation of heritage is considered part of the contribution; and
- This is a preliminary report; numbers regarding parking will be adjusted in the future.

MOVED and SECONDED

THAT Council direct staff to process the Heritage Revitalization Agreement and Special Development Permit applications at 108-118 Royal Avenue and 74-82 First Street as outlined in the March 1, 2021 report entitled “108-118 Royal Avenue and 74-82 First Street: Heritage Revitalization Agreement and Special Development Permit Applications – Preliminary Report.”

Carried.

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

R-3 Report to Community Heritage Commission – April 7, 2021

5.2 82 First Street & 112 Royal Avenue: Heritage Revitalization Agreement & Applicant Presentation

Athena Von Hausen, Planner, reviewed the April 7, 2021 staff report regarding a proposed Heritage Revitalization Agreement (HRA) at 82 First Street and 112 Royal Ave, which proposes to relocate, restore and legally protect the 1890 house (Woods House) on site, and relocate the 1930 Henderson House off site, providing it for another third-party HRA. The remainder of the site would be redeveloped to include a two-phase midrise residential building.

Ms. Von Hausen requested the Commission provide feedback on the heritage value of the 1890 and 1930 buildings, the appropriateness of the proposed new building in relation to the heritage house, and to provide Council with a recommendation of support or non-support of the HRA.

Adel Bellemlih, Applicant, and Elana Zysblat, Heritage Consultant, provided a PowerPoint presentation in regards to the project, highlighting the following information:

- Location, history and character-defining elements of the heritage houses;
- Objectives of the HRA and the advantages of relocating the Woods House to its proposed location on the site; and,
- Details of the proposed residential apartment buildings and the design elements making them compatible, distinguishable and subordinate to the heritage house.

In response to questions from the Commission, Mr. Bellemlih, Ms. Zysblat, Ms. Von Hausen and Britney Dack, Senior Heritage Planner, provided the following information:

- If the relocation of the heritage house is approved to its proposed location on First Street, it would be located next to a designated heritage house that is currently in place, and another designated heritage house around the corner, on Agnes Street, creating a streetscape and a grouping of turn of the century homes at First and Agnes Streets;

- It is not yet confirmed whether the chimney would need to be deconstructed for the relocation of the heritage house;
- The interior layout of the ground floor includes a fireplace; however this is not yet finalized, as the aim of the HRA is to protect the exterior of the house;
- The project team is interested in keeping as many of the interior features of the heritage house as possible, because they are excellent period examples;
- The roof of the heritage house was changed several times; therefore it is not known whether there was cresting on the roof originally, and it is not proposed in the HRA restoration work;
- The relocation of the 112 Royal Avenue house to its new Cumberland Street location would occur once confirmation is received from Council related to this project proposal;
- The northern portion of the foundation of the 82 First Street house is natural rock and the remainder of the foundation is poured concrete;
- In April 2016, the CHC considered three of the properties on the site and determined that 82 First Street (Woods House) had the most heritage value for retention;
- The project was expanded to consider 112, 114, and 118 Royal Avenue, of which staff identified that 112 Royal Avenue had the most heritage value for retention;
- In order to accommodate the proposed mid-rise residential building development on the site, all four of the other houses on the site, which have less heritage significance, would be demolished;
- Two of the other houses on the site are mid-century buildings, and would require demolition permits; however, there is no requirement to retain them;
- The designation of the site within the Official Community Plan is for higher density in the form of low to mid-rise apartments; and,
- The CHC's support for the HRA would express support for the proposed level of retention and demolition of the other houses on the site; however, the Commission could choose to encourage the sustainable deconstruction or relocation of the other homes.

In discussion, the Commission made the following comments:

- Appreciation was shown for the retention of the Woods House, as it an important heritage house in the City;
- Appreciation was shown for the overall project design and for the proposed park areas on the project site;

- Appreciation was shown for the simplicity of the new building and its relationship to the heritage house;
- In the proposed new location, the rear of the Woods House would be very close to the new apartment building;
- The interiors of houses designed by architect Samuel Maclure were as important to him as the exteriors; therefore, it is reassuring to learn that the interior of the Woods House would be retained to some degree;
- It may be an improvement for the concrete wall to be in line with the heritage house, rather than abutting; and,
- The restoration and relocation of the heritage houses are appreciated; however, more information about the rest of the houses on the site would be appropriate in order to evaluate the project as a whole.

MOVED and SECONDED

That the Community Heritage Commission recommend that Council support the overall Heritage Revitalization Agreement, and the Heritage Designation of 82 First Street and its inclusion on the City's Heritage Register.

CARRIED.

Rosanne Hood voted in opposition to the motion.

Report to New Westminster Design Panel – April 27, 2021

5.1 108 – 118 Royal Avenue and 74 – 82 First Street

Athena Von Hausen, Planner, reviewed the April 27, 2021 staff report regarding a proposed Heritage Revitalization Agreement (HRA) and Development Permit application at 108-118 Royal Avenue and 74-82 First Street to allow the development of a six to eight storey multi-unit residential building and, to relocate, restore and legally protect the 1890 house (Woods House) on site, and relocate the 1930 Henderson House off site.

Ms. Von Hausen also noted the proposed development of a Multi-Use Pathway (MUP) that would be located adjacent to the development, and reviewed the questions that the Design Panel was asked to consider in relation to the proposal.

In response to questions from the Panel, Ms. Von Hausen provided the following information:

- If the application is successful, the heritage house would be stratified and contain two units; and,
- The proposed increase in density is in line with the Official Community Plan (OCP) designation for the site.

Peter Hildebrand, Iredale Architecture, Daryl Tyacke, ETA Landscape Architecture, and Adel Bellemlih, Applicant, provided a PowerPoint presentation regarding the application, highlighting the following information:

- Site plan, context images, design rationale and precedent images showing the design and materiality of the proposed buildings;
- Elevations and renderings, showing setbacks and entrances of the buildings from all directions, and in relation to the heritage house and MUP;
- Shadow studies showing the shadows of the six-storey building
- Landscape plans of all landscaped levels of the buildings, including precedent images of the materials;
- An off-site landscape plan of all pathways and landscape plans for the MUP and patios; and,
- Images of the existing heritage houses on First Street, and the proposed location of the Wood House, creating a “heritage cluster”.

In response to questions from the Panel, Ms. Von Hausen, Mr. Bellemlih, Mr. Hildebrand and Mr. Tyacke provided the following information:

- There is no play area for children planned within the development as there is a school playground approximately 300 feet from the proposed site, at Qayqayt elementary school;
- A traffic study completed for the proposal concluded that the existing local traffic infrastructure would be compatible with the proposal’s transportation needs;
- Access to the building’s parking would be at the rear of the building, off Windsor Street, and therefore quite discrete;
- The soil depth of the roof amenity planters is planned as 2.5 feet;

- The City's Engineering Services department's recommendation was that the MUP should be maintained by the strata; therefore, any potential irrigation required for the MUP would be maintained by the strata;
- The green wall on the side of the Royal 1 building would be composed of planting on top of steel cables going up the building;
- Suitable plants would be used on the green wall to ensure that it is successful;
- The heritage house would be situated 15 feet from the property line;
- Multiple designs have been examined to manage the slope of the MUP, which is intended for both cyclists and pedestrians;
- What appears as stairs in the drawing on the MUP are rumble strips; and,
- The roof deck has been limited in size due to code limitations, in order to reduce the need for a second exit, and to be cognizant of the noise on the wood frame structure.

The Panel noted the following comments in relation to the staff questions asked in the above-noted staff report:

Question 1) Comments from the panel would be appreciated on how successful the proposed massing is at fitting into the neighbourhood context, especially in regards to:

- *does the proposed architectural style enhance the character of the existing neighbourhood;*
 - *appropriateness of the architectural expression;*
 - *overall massing and contextual fit;*
 - *location of ground-oriented units and interface with edges of site;*
 - *transitions to the existing neighbouring single-family dwellings to the south;*
 - *impact on privacy and overlook from decks and south/west façade;*
 - *appropriateness of the articulation and materiality of the development*
 - *does the materiality of the building help to reinforce New Westminster as a historic place; and*
 - *overall design of the parkade entry.*
-
- Given the OCP designation and that Royal Avenue is a key corridor, the massing is well handled, and the density is supportable;
 - The increase in density works well with the multi-unit buildings located to the West on Royal Avenue;

- The transition from the heritage house to the multi-unit building is suitable and the house does not appear engulfed;
- The position of the heritage building on the site works well, and enhances the neighbourhood, particularly with the cluster of heritage houses at the base of First Street; and,
- At the east elevation, the deck element could be replicated and brought to the entry of the building.

Question 2: Comments from the panel would be appreciated on how successful the proposal is at integrating the heritage house, especially in regards to:

- *Does the current design provide an appropriate buffer and massing transition between the heritage house and the residential mid-rise building;*
 - *Does the current design highlight and respect the heritage building; and*
 - *Are the design elements (character) of the new mid-rise building compatible with and respectful of the heritage house's character.*
-
- The heritage house is located very close to the podium-level of the mid-rise residential building. More space could be included between the heritage house and the building.

Question 3: Comments from the panel would be appreciated on the streetscape, especially in regards to:

- *success of the development in responding to the pedestrian scale;*
 - *quality of visual interest at the pedestrian level at the building entrance on First Street; and*
 - *activation of adjacent streets and public spaces.*
-
- The streetscapes of Royal Avenue and Windsor Street work well;
 - On the south side next to the heritage home, consider use of the red brick in that location, as it would complement the heritage home;
 - The slope of the MUP has challenges and may need further consideration;
 - The zigzags on the MUP would likely be an issue for cyclists and accessibility, and may be avoided or cut through by pedestrians; and,
 - If maintenance of the MUP is to be the responsibility of the strata, consider the use of drought tolerant planting, so it is not overly arduous for the strata.

- The east elevation along First Street uses a 'Y' element in the building entry. Can this element be replicated in other areas of the building entrances for the project?

Question 4: Comments from the panel regarding the building and landscaping interface with the lane on the lane (south) side of the property would be appreciated.

- The loading area and interface with the lane could be softened with the additions of trellises.

Question 5: Comments from the panel would be appreciated on the proposed open spaces, particularly:

- *how successful the proposal is at using semi-private space to transition from private residential areas to public streets; and*
 - *the selection of hard and soft landscaping materials, including input on the planting species selected.*
-
- Appreciation was shown for the provision of multi-level outdoor amenity spaces;
 - On First Street, it may be better to choose more standard height street trees than Japanese maples;
 - The soil volumes indicated for the planters may not be sufficient for the intended trees, and it may be more appropriate to plant shrubs in planters with less than seven cubic metres;
 - Where agriculture plots are planned on the rooftop, it would be recommended to provide compost bins, planter tables, and storage areas to help residents better use the plots;
 - The roof amenity may be too small given the number of intended residents, and it may be appropriate to design for a larger space from the beginning;
 - If the rooftop amenity space is increased, there may be methods to avoid the construction of a second exit, such as posting an occupancy limit; and,
 - It may be beneficial to include a small space for toddlers or preschool age children to play rather than relying on the elementary school playground.

- Streetscape quality along the MUP could be improved to better integrate the residential units into the pathway design.

Question 6: Comments are appreciated from the panel in regards to the building shadow impacts on adjacent properties.

- No impacts to adjacent properties were identified with the shadow study, particularly given the urban setting.

Question 7: Comments from the panel regarding the proposed materials, texture of the materials, material colours, and the material detailing would be appreciated.

- Appreciation was shown for the restrained language, palette and material choices of the building, and the use of material in conjunction with the heritage building;
- It would be important to resolve the issue within the drawings of two different railings at the entry corner;
- The textures of the materials, particularly the grey in the middle, could be further developed;
- The language of the vertical wood elements could be extended or mirrored between both buildings; and,
- Appreciation was shown for the use of brick, in terms of its placement at the edges of the buildings, and it could be used even more.

The Panel provided the following general comments about the proposal:

- Appreciation was shown for the project and its design in general;
- The mix and size of the proposed units and family-friendly layouts were appreciated by the Panel, particularly with proximity to the elementary school;
- Consideration of a larger indoor amenity space may be appropriate, as the proposed space seems small for the number of proposed units;
- The parking space seems reasonable for the building, especially in terms of storage;

- If the strata will be responsible for maintaining the heritage home, ensure that the costs are considered and clearly disclosed in agreements; and,
- Appreciation was shown for the quality of the drawings package.

MOVED and SECONDED

THAT the New Westminster Design Panel support the Heritage Revitalization Agreement and Development Permit applications for 108 – 118 Royal Avenue and 74-82 First Street, and that staff work with the applicant in consideration of the feedback provided.

CARRIED.

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

R-5 Memorandum to Community Heritage Commission – July 7, 2021

4.1 114 & 118 Royal Avenue: Heritage Review for Demolition of 1944 and 1945 Buildings

Athena von Hausen, Development Planner, reviewed the July 7, 2021 memorandum from staff, which provided extra information to the Commission on the demolitions of 114 and 118 Royal Avenue, as part of the overall Heritage Revitalization Agreement (HRA) at 74 and 82 First Street and 108-118 Royal Avenue. Ms. von Hausen noted that no action was requested from the Commission as it was a presentation of information only.

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

- In order to accommodate the proposed mid-rise residential building development on the site, it is planned that both 114 and 118 Royal Avenue, and two other houses on the site with less heritage significance, would be demolished; and

- The Applicant has indicated a willingness to explore the relocation of the houses to other locations.

First and Second Readings by Council – June 13, 2022

5.4 Heritage Revitalization Agreement, Heritage Designation, Road Closure and Land Sale: 108 – 118 Royal Avenue and 74 – 82 First Street – Bylaws for Consideration of Readings

To consider bylaws which would allow for the construction of 189 market strata units in a mid-rise building and within a relocated, protected and restored 1890 Woods House (82 First Street), and the offsite relocation of the 1930 Henderson House (112 Royal Avenue). Includes consideration of land sale and dedication to facilitate the development and a multi-use pathway.

THAT That Council consider Heritage Revitalization Agreement (108 – 118 Royal Avenue and 74 – 82 First Street) Bylaw 8339, 2022, Heritage Designation (82 First Street) Bylaw No. 8340, 2022, and Road Closure Bylaw and Land Disposition (Windsor Street) Bylaw No. 8350, 2022 for First and Second Readings, and forward the Bylaws to a Public Hearing; and

THAT Council authorize the Mayor and Corporate Officer to sign the Road Closure and Land Exchange Agreement which includes the sale of a portion of the Windsor Street right of way adjacent to the proposed development and the dedication of new road (intended to be used for a multi-use pathway) adjacent to Qayqayt Elementary School, should Council adopt Road Closure Bylaw and Land Disposition (Windsor Street) Bylaw No. 8350, 2022.

Adopted on Consent.

7.1 Bylaws for Readings

b. Heritage Revitalization Agreement (108-118 Royal Avenue and 74-82 First Street) Bylaw No. 8339, 2022

This bylaw will enable the development of a six to eight storey multiple unit residential building with 189 stratified residential units

and a density of 3.29 FSR in exchange for the retention, on-site relocation, restoration, and protection of the Woods House (1890) at 82 First Street. This bylaw is on the agenda for **TWO READINGS.**

MOVED and SECONDED

THAT Heritage Revitalization Agreement (108-118 Royal Avenue and 74-82 First Street) Bylaw No. 8339, 2022 be given First Reading.
Carried.

All members present voted in favour of the motion.

MOVED and SECONDED

THAT Heritage Revitalization Agreement (108-118 Royal Avenue and 74-82 First Street) Bylaw No. 8339, 2022 be given Second Reading.
Carried.

All members present voted in favour of the motion.

c. Heritage Designation (82 First Street) Bylaw No. 8340, 2022

This bylaw will legally protect the Woods House (built 1890) at 82 First Street and designate it as protected heritage property. This bylaw is on the agenda for **TWO READINGS.**

MOVED and SECONDED

THAT Heritage Designation (82 First Street) Bylaw No. 8340, 2022 be given First Reading.
Carried.

All members present voted in favour of the motion.

MOVED and SECONDED

THAT Heritage Designation (82 First Street) Bylaw No. 8340, 2022 be given Second Reading.

Carried.

All members present voted in favour of the motion.

d. Road Closure Bylaw and Land Disposition (Windsor Street) Bylaw No. 8350, 2022

This bylaw will authorize the sale and closure of a 404.7 square metres portion of Windsor Street. This bylaw is on the agenda for **TWO READINGS.**

MOVED and SECONDED

THAT Road Closure Bylaw and Land Disposition (Windsor Street) Bylaw No. 8350, 2022 be given First Reading.

Carried.

All members present voted in favour of the motion.

MOVED and SECONDED

THAT Road Closure Bylaw and Land Disposition (Windsor Street) Bylaw No. 8350, 2022 be given Second Reading.

Carried.

All members present voted in favour of the motion.