



COMMUNITY HERITAGE COMMISSION

MINUTES

Wednesday, December 7, 2022, 6:00 p.m.

Meeting held electronically and open to public attendance

Council Chamber, City Hall

PRESENT:

Councillor Jaimie McEvoy*	Chair
John Davies*	Alternate Chair/Community Member
Samuel Boisvert*	Community Member
Jennifer Crews*	NWHPS Representative
Bozana Djuric*	Community Member
Virginia McMahon*	Community Member

REGRETS:

Councillor Daniel Fontaine	Council Representative
Lindsay Macintosh	Community Member
Iulia Sincaian	Community Member

GUESTS:

Julia Schueck*	Schueck Heritage Consulting
----------------	-----------------------------

STAFF PRESENT:

Rob McCullough*	Manager, Museums and Heritage Services, Office of the CAO
Judith Mosley	Senior Heritage Planner, Climate Action, Planning and Development
Kathleen Stevens*	Heritage Planning Analyst, Climate Action, Planning and Development
Dilys Huang	Development Planner, Climate Action, Planning and Development
Lisa Wambaa	Planning Assistant, Climate Action, Planning and Development
Carilyn Cook	Committee Clerk, Legislative Services

*Denotes electronic attendance

1. CALL TO ORDER AND LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Councillor McEvoy opened the meeting at 6:00 p.m. and recognized with respect that New Westminster is on the unceded and unsurrendered land of the Halkomelem speaking peoples. He acknowledged that colonialism has made invisible their histories and connections to the land. He recognized that, as a City, we are learning and building relationships with the people whose lands we are on.

2. INTRODUCTIONS

None.

3. CHANGES TO THE AGENDA

None.

4. ADOPTION OF MINUTES FROM PREVIOUS MEETINGS

4.1 September 7, 2022

MOVED and SECONDED

THAT the minutes of the September 7, 2022 Community Heritage Commission meeting be adopted with the following amendment:

- Page 3, last bullet point should state “structurally sound” as opposed to “architecturally sound.”

Carried.

All Commission members present voted in favour of the motion.

5. REPORTS AND PRESENTATIONS

5.1 Heritage Designation Application: 109 Third Avenue

Kathleen Stevens, Heritage Planning Analyst, reviewed the report dated December 7, 2022 and advised that the owners of 109 Third Avenue are proposing to increase the protection of the 1911 house through a Heritage Designation, which is the strongest form of heritage protection. She noted that the heritage value of the property has already been recognized through its inclusion on the Heritage Inventory and in the Queen’s Park Heritage Conservation Area.

Discussion ensued and Commission members provided the following comments:

- The home is stunning and richly detailed, and it is great to see interior character-defining elements included in this Heritage Designation; and,
- The Commission is grateful to the owners of this home, who have long been advocates of heritage in the community, and all owners who maintain their

heritage resources and pursue voluntary Heritage Designations of their properties.

In response to a question from the Commission, Julie Schueck, Principal, Schueck Heritage Consulting, advised that sleeping porches were popular in California as a way to keep cool during the heat of the summer.

MOVED and SECONDED

THAT the Community Heritage Commission recommend that Council support protecting 109 Third Avenue through a Heritage Designation Bylaw and its inclusion on the City's Heritage Register.

Carried.

All Commission members present voted in favour of the motion.

5.2 Heritage Revitalization Agreement Application: 441 Fader Street

Kathleen Stevens, Heritage Planning Analyst, reviewed the December 7, 2022 report regarding a Heritage Revitalization Agreement application for 441 Fader Street which would include the retention of a 1930 heritage house and the construction of a new infill house with a secondary rental suite.

Julie Schueck shared a PowerPoint presentation which outlined the following:

- The project and its heritage value, including character-defining elements;
- The heritage house conservation plan; and,
- The proposal for the construction of a new infill house.

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

- Consultation with the neighbours will begin soon;
- The infill house will be stratified;
- The plan is to keep the new house in the family; however, that could change in the future;
- Generally, there is less of a desire to use all authentic supplies on new homes, especially with cost of wood; and,
- Hardie board siding would only be used on the new build.

Discussion ensued and Commission members provided the following comments:

- The colour scheme is striking and works with house across the street;

- Appreciate seeing an HRA for a house of this size and era in the Sapperton area;
- Clarification is needed regarding the rehabilitation of the windows as both the Conservation Plan and the staff report note the replacement of the current vinyl windows with wood-frame windows; however, window frames and window sashes are different elements of window assembly;
- The appropriate intervention for an HRA would be to preserve and rehabilitate existing wood frames in order to support wood window sashes, with no use of wood veneer or faux wood products;
- While sliding windows are not historically appropriate and hung windows should be used instead, it is understood that the south elevation sliding window is to provide egress;
- If not received already, detailed, measured drawings of the existing condition of the heritage building should be provided to the City; and,
- While the densification is difficult to accept, it is appreciated that the infill house respects the architecture of the existing house and neighbourhood.

MOVED and SECONDED

THAT the Community Heritage Commission recommend that Council support the Heritage Revitalization Agreement for 441 Fader Street and its inclusion on the City's Heritage Register.

Carried.

All Commission members present voted in favour of the motion.

5.3 Pre-Application Review: 63 Merivale Street & 250 Agnes Street

Dilys Huang, Development Planner, outlined the December 7, 2022 report regarding a Pre-Application Review for 63 Merivale Street and 250 Agnes Street which would include the retention and on-site relocation of the 1916 building, along with the addition of a residential component to the heritage house. During a PowerPoint presentation, Ms. Huang outlined the pre-application review process, the site context, the proposal, elevations, and renderings of the site.

In response to questions from the Commission, Ms. Huang provided the following comments:

- If there is no Heritage Revitalization Agreement in place, based on the existing zoning of the properties, 250 Agnes Street which is currently zoned RM-2 would allow for a low-rise apartment building, and at 63 Merivale Street, which is zoned as RS-2, a single detached dwelling would be permitted;

- The site's land use designation in the Official Community Plan includes low-rise apartments as a permitted building form;
- Records show that there should be eight apartment units in the existing low-rise apartment building;
- The current proposal includes a mix of strata and rental units and the City's Tenant Relocation Policy would be considered during any development review, along with the Rental Replacement Policy that would also be applicable;
- Based on the Rental Replacement Policy, secure market rentals would be required and of that, at least 10% would need to be below market rental units; and,
- If the proposal moves forward as an HRA, a Heritage Conservation Plan would be required to be submitted as part of the application and would include details regarding the relocation of the heritage house.

Discussion ensued and Commission members provided the following comments:

- As the project moves forward, no demolition permit for 250 Agnes should be considered until measures are in place to protect the heritage building from vandalism, keep it in use and restore it;
- It would be great to have some of the original fabric, especially from the fireplace, bricks from the chimney stack, and timber framing from the 1910 building reinstated and interpreted in the proposed multi-unit building;
- The condition of the building at 63 Merivale Street is disappointing, and it is hoped that the applicant and owner have taken precautions to halt further damage and deterioration of it;
- The proposal for the new structure to encase a quarter of the historical building and protrude from the roof is unsightly and disregards Standards 11 and 12 of the Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada;
- Though not preferable, if a physical connection between the buildings is required it should be restricted to a small passage at the back, have minimal impact on the historical building and be no higher than its eaves;
- Construction of a retaining wall at the corner of Merivale and Dickenson Streets may adversely impact conservation of the original scale of the building; and,
- Once relocated, the sloped grade front elevation of the historical dwelling and the partial above-ground basement exposure of the existing fenestration along Dickenson, should continue to be featured.

5.4 Heritage Review (Demolition): 309 Lawrence Street

Lisa Wambaa, Planning Assistant, reviewed the December 7, 2022 report regarding a Heritage Review (Demolition) for the 1922 house located at 309 Lawrence Street which is not protected by bylaw and has not been listed on the City's Heritage Register but is listed on the 2010 Queensborough Residential Heritage Inventory and is identified as the Ellis Residence.

Discussion ensued and Commission members provided the following comments:

- In contradiction to the Heritage Value Assessment (HVA), the house retains a lot of historical fabric including window sashes, wood cladding, porch canopy, and brick chimney, and does not appear to be significantly altered as noted in the HVA;
- Other aspects that could be considered heritage values are that previous owners of the home include lumber industry blue collar workers who lived in Queensborough, and that the house represents the interwar suburban growth in the city, in a community that provided affordable land to new property owners;
- The building sits on a corner of a large parcel of land that could allow for subdivision and/or the construction of a more modern dwelling on site while conserving the historical building where it is;
- The applicant may benefit from entering into a Heritage Revitalization Agreement with the City;
- It appears that the evaluation is based on whether or not a property has been raised due to the flood plain resulting in significant alteration and almost half of the houses on the 2010 Queensborough Residential Heritage Inventory list have been significantly altered. There is only one dwelling on Ewen Avenue that is noted as worth saving as it has not been raised;
- The phrase in the HVA's heritage value indication list "significantly altered but retains one unique stained-glass window" does not sum up the building very well; and,
- The house could be protected by moving it as has been done in the past.

MOVED and SECONDED

THAT the Community Heritage Commission recommend the Director of Climate Action, Planning and Development direct staff to further explore retention options (i.e. redevelopment or relocation) for the house at 309 Lawrence Street; and,

THAT consideration be given to placing a temporary protection order, if needed, for the house at 309 Lawrence Street; and,

THAT concerns raised by the Commission with respect to the heritage evaluation be conveyed to the applicant.

Carried.

All Commission members present voted in favour of the motion.

5.5 Heritage Review (Demolition): 413 Rousseau Street

Lisa Wambaa, Planning Assistant, reviewed the December 7, 2022 report for the regarding a Heritage Review (Demolition) for 413 Rousseau Street noting that the 1907 building is not legally protected by bylaw and is not listed on the City's Heritage Register but is listed on the Heritage Inventory.

Discussion ensued and Commission members provided the following comments:

- This dwelling is in a favourable situation for in-situ conservation with space for an infill house or large addition at the rear of the property;
- Staff should continue to work with application towards a Heritage Revitalization Agreement and possibly consider a temporary protection of the dwelling; and;
- The heritage value alone should be enough for the applicant to consider saving the dwelling as requiring a condition assessment to outline synthetic additions to the structure would be an additional cost for the applicant.

Kathleen Stevens, Heritage Planning Analyst, advised that redevelopment options for this property are very limited unless there is a lot consolidation as the current RS-2 zoning does not allow for an infill carriage house or laneway house.

MOVED and SECONDED

THAT the Community Heritage Commission recommend that the Director of Climate Action, Planning and Development direct staff to further explore retention options (i.e. redevelopment or relocation) for the house at 413 Rousseau Street.

Carried.

All Commission members present voted in favour of the motion.

6. UNFINISHED BUSINESS FROM PREVIOUS MEETINGS

6.1 Heritage Values Assessment Update

Judith Mosley, Senior Heritage Planner, reminded Commission members of the discussion that took place at the September 7, 2022 meeting regarding confusion over the requirements for Heritage Assessments.

Ms. Mosley noted that the confusion over the Heritage Values Assessment (HVA) for 933 Fourth Street was a one-off; however, staff have taken several steps, including updating the website and Heritage Review application form, and in staff communications to enquiries to clarify that a HVA should identify the heritage values of the building or site and that the required report is written by a member of the Canadian Association of Heritage Professionals. Given the steps taken, it is anticipated that there will not be confusion with respect to this type of report moving forward.

In response to a question from a Commission member, Ms. Mosley advised that staff can report back to the Commission regarding 809 Carnarvon Street which was issued a demolition permit in August of 2021 and came before the Commission in September 2021. When reporting back, staff will advise if there is still an active demolition permit for the property and if not, if the Commission will be given another opportunity to provide feedback on any future permit application received for this property.

7. NEW BUSINESS

None.

8. END OF MEETING

The meeting ended at 6:58 p.m.

9. UPCOMING MEETINGS

This is the last meeting of the 2022 term.

Certified correct,

Councillor Jaimie McEvoy

Carilyn Cook, Committee Clerk