

**COMMUNITY HERITAGE COMMISSION**

**MINUTES**

**Wednesday, November 3, 2021**

**Meeting held electronically and open to public attendance  
in Council Chamber, City Hall**

**PRESENT:**

Councillor Jaimie McEvoy\*

Ms. Maureen Arvanitidis	Community Member
Mr. Samuel Boisvert	Community Member*
Mr. John Davies	Community Member/Alternate Chair*
Ms. Jill Davy	NWHPS Representative*
Ms. Lindsay Macintosh	Community Member
Mr. David Sarraf	Community Member*

**ABSENT:**

Mr. Robert Petrusa	Community Member
--------------------	------------------

**STAFF PRESENT:**

Ms. Britney Dack	Senior Heritage Planner, Climate Action, Planning and Development
Mr. Rob McCullough	Manager, Museums and Heritage Services Office of the CAO*
Ms. Kathleen Stevens	Heritage Planning Analyst, Climate Action, Planning and Development*
Mr. Hardev Gill	Planning Technician, Climate Action, Planning and Development
Ms. Carilyn Cook	Committee Clerk, Legislative Services

**GUESTS:**

Ms. Kirsten Sutton	D3 Design*
Ms. Elana Zysblat	Heritage Consultant*
Mr. James Garbutt	Applicant, 328 Second Street*
Ms. Gail Ancill	Applicant, 125 Third Street*
Ms. Bernita Boersma	Applicant, 349 Cumberland Street
Ms. Heather Boersma	Applicant, 349 Cumberland Street
Mr. Bal Gill	Applicant, 133 Debeck Street*

\*Denotes electronic attendance

**1. WELCOME AND LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

Councillor McEvoy opened the meeting at 6:00 p.m. and recognized that New Westminster is on the unceded and unsurrendered land of the Halkomelem speaking peoples and 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. CHANGES TO THE AGENDA**

*MOVED and SECONDED*

*THAT the agenda of the November 3, 2021 Community Heritage Commission meeting be adopted with the addition of New Business Item 7.1 Condolences for Julie Schueck, Schueck Consulting, on the passing of her father, by John Davies, Community Member.*

**Carried.**

All Commission members present voted in favour of the motion.

**3. ADOPTION OF MINUTES FROM PREVIOUS MEETINGS**

**3.1 October 6, 2021**

*MOVED and SECONDED*

*THAT the minutes of the October 6, 2021 Community Heritage Commission meeting be adopted.*

**Carried.**

All Commission members present voted in favour of the motion.

**4. REPORTS AND PRESENTATIONS**

**4.1 Heritage Revitalization Agreement Application: 328 Second Street**

Hardev Gill, Planning Technician, reviewed the staff report dated November 3, 2021 regarding an application for a Heritage Revitalization Agreement (HRA) at 328 Second Street, a protected property in the Queen's Park Heritage Conservation Area. It is noted that the application is not subject to the temporary hold the Council has placed on these types of applications as it was received before June 2021.

James Garbutt, Owner/Applicant of 328 Second Street, shared a brief history of his ownership of the property and his family's future plans for the property.

Kirsten Sutton, D3 Design, and Elana Zysblat, Design Consultant, provided a PowerPoint presentation which outlined the history, current state, and proposed restoration and rehabilitation of the house located at 328 Second Street.

In response to questions from the Commission, Ms. Sutton, Ms. Zysblat, and Mr. Garbutt provided the following comments:

- If restoration aspects of the house are irreplaceable, they will be replaced in kind and, when possible, original aspects will be kept;
- With respect to outdoor space, the play area for children will be oriented towards the front of the property and the nearby park can also be utilized for outdoor enjoyment;
- The proposed infill house will be three stories, compliant for setbacks in every direction, and with a footprint below the maximum allowable for a laneway house;
- Restoration of an unmaintained heritage house such as this is a big expense which the infill house needs to compensated for;
- Good conservation includes sustainable living in a comfortable sized dwelling; and,
- Resources for restorations are not always available to meet the Standards and Guidelines, which are the best case scenarios.

The Commission provided the following comments:

- Considering the challenges that come with restoration, the proposal is elegant, will fit nicely in the neighbourhood, and will see the property realize its heritage potential;
- It is appreciated that the owner plans to restore the house as opposed to demolition;
- The proposed infill house is too large with respect to the size of the lot and will take away from the look of the heritage house. A laneway house should be considered instead to improve the appearance overall and fit in better with the neighbourhood; and,
- There is the potential to have three households residing on the property without sufficient outdoor space for enjoyment.

MOVED and SECONDED

*THAT the Community Heritage Commission recommend that Council support the Heritage Revitalization Agreement for 328 Second Street and its inclusion on the City's Heritage Register.*

**Carried.**

Maureen Arvanitidis voted in opposition of the motion.

#### **4.2 Heritage Review (Demolition): 349 Cumberland Street**

Kathleen Stevens, Heritage Planning Analyst, reviewed the staff report dated November 3, 2021 regarding the duplex located at 349 Cumberland Street, which is not legally protected by bylaw nor on the City's Heritage Register, although is

included on the City's Heritage Resource Inventory. Commission members are asked to review the heritage value of the building prior to the Demolition Permit process.

Heather Boersma, on behalf of Bernita Boersma, owner of 349 Cumberland Street, provided a presentation which outlined the rationale behind the demolition application, the engineering/inspection report and other overall findings, and future plans for the property which includes a proposal for a new home with a one bedroom secondary suite, as well as a laneway house which is allowed in the neighbourhood.

In response to questions from Commission members, Ms. Boersma and Ms. Boersma advised that the property, which has great street appeal, was for sale last summer but did not sell. The applicant noted that she had followed Heritage Revitalization Agreements over the years and was not interested in pursuing one for this property.

The Commission provided the following comments:

- As demolition of this unique build would be a loss for the neighbourhood, an alternate plan to retain the building should be sought out;
- It appears that most the problems associated with the house presently are in relation to the foundation and, if that were fixed, cracks in the stucco and windows, etc., could be corrected; however, that would be an expensive undertaking and it is unknown what the cost would be to raise the house and fix the foundation;
- The energy efficiency that would come with a new build would not offset the carbon emissions of a demolition and rebuild;
- The proposed new house does not have an historical look to it but is similar to other contemporary houses in the neighbourhood;
- The applicant is urged to enter into a Heritage Revitalization Agreement to avoid what would be a significant loss for the community;
- Members agreed that, in addition to further exploration of retention options for the building be conducted, a temporary protection order should be placed on the property.

MOVED and SECONDED

*THAT the Community Heritage Commission recommend the Director of Development Services direct staff to further explore retention options for the house at 349 Cumberland Street and to place a temporary protection order on the property.*

**Carried.**

All Commission members present voted in favour of the motion.

#### **4.3 Heritage Review (Demolition): 133 Debeck Street**

Britney Dack, Senior Heritage Planner, reviewed the staff report dated November 3, 2021 regarding 133 Debeck Street, a modest, single-storey cottage, noting that most of the original materials have been changed over time with additions and renovations. The house is not legally protected, nor is it listed on the City's Heritage Register or Inventory. Commission members are asked to review the heritage value of the building prior to the Demolition Permit process.

The Commission acknowledged that the building was not visually appealing nor did it have heritage value and that moving forward with demolition was appropriate.

MOVED and SECONDED

*THAT the Community Heritage Commission recommend the Director of Development Services issue the Demolition Permit for 133 Debeck Street, and that the applicant consider deconstruction as an alternative to demolition waste.*

**Carried.**

All Commission members present voted in favour of the motion.

#### **4.4 Heritage Designation Application: 125 Third Street**

Kathleen Stevens, Heritage Planning Analyst, reviewed the staff report dated November 3, 2021 regarding 125 Third Street for which an application has been received to protect the building through one of the strongest forms of heritage protection, a Heritage Designation Bylaw. Ms. Stevens noted that the recommendations in the report incorrectly includes the word "Avenue" as opposed to "Street."

Commission members commended Gail Ancill, the owner of 125 Third Street, for her work in preserving the house.

Ms. Ancill shared that she purchased the house in 1989 and noted that it was in such disrepair in the 1980's that it was a surprise that it was not demolished at that time. She shared that the owner, Ms. Johnson, received a promise from the new owners that they would not tear it down. Ms. Ancill stated that it has been a pleasure to restore and preserve the memory of J.J. Johnson and his family.

MOVED and SECONDED

*THAT the Community Heritage Commission recommend that Council support protecting 125 Third Street through a Heritage Designation Bylaw.*

**Carried.**

All Commission members present voted in favour of the motion.

## **5. UNFINISHED BUSINESS FROM PREVIOUS MEETINGS**

### **5.1 Heritage Revitalization Agreement Refresh: Timeline and Work Plan**

Britney Dack, Senior Heritage Planner, advised that the October 6, 2021, agenda report titled, “Heritage Revitalization Agreement Refresh: Timeline and Work Plan,” which was deferred from the October meeting, was supplemented by a secondary report titled, “HRA Refresh: Queen’s Park Heritage Conservation Area Post-Implementation Evaluation and Report Back on Final Incentives” which was circulated to Commission members earlier today. She noted that both reports provided updates for the Commission who have been very involved in the development of the Queen’s Park Heritage Conservation Area, the related incentives program, and the implementation plan. She shared that as that process is now complete, the Heritage Revitalization Agreement Refresh project would now begin.

In response to questions from the Commission, Ms. Dack advised that staff will work on the draft policy, following the standard policy development process, and that foundational principles are anticipated to go to Council in November. Ms. Dack shared that this item will come back to the Commission for further discussion related to infill and density implications, etc., in order to inform a draft policy for Council’s consideration and, possibly go out to the community for input on the final policy for Council’s endorsement. The intention is to have the policy finished before the summer of 2022.

Commission members noted that they are looking forward to having the policy complete and acknowledged that the community will have a lot of input to contribute to the creation of it, including what values we want to attach to Heritage Revitalization Agreements.

### **5.2 Feasibility Study for 302 Royal Avenue (Museum & Archives Annex Building)**

Rob McCullough, Manager, Museums and Heritage Services provided an overview of the October 6, 2021 report which was deferred from the October 6, 2021 meeting, regarding the feasibility study for 302 Royal Avenue, the Museum and Archives Annex Building, in order to inform potential redevelopment of the building which is adjacent to Irving House.

In response to questions and suggestions from the Commission, Mr. McCullough provided the following comments:

- The washrooms in Irving House will be available if the Archives Annex building is no longer usable;

- The old museum building contains the site utilities and will be something to consider through the study. A small building may be required to house utilities, as Irving House cannot;
- The collections are already either at the Anvil Centre or in the process to be moved over to the Anvil Centre and currently being reviewed as they currently have no stories to go with them;
- A heritage garden located behind Irving House has been created in partnership with students from École Qayqayt Elementary School and it would be nice to incorporate orchard trees in the garden along with the other food that is being grown and donated to the Union Gospel Mission's food program;
- The building is seismically unsafe and either needs to come down or receive significant upgrades;
- Duplicate items go to the Museum Advisory Board and Council prior to removal from the collection and could then be used for hands on teaching, transfer to other museums, return to the original donor or sale through city auction;
- When the Statement of Significance (SOS) is updated, the role and importance of the Native Sons and Daughters in seeing that the Irving House was saved, could be included in the Statement.
  - Information to update the SOS could be found in the records of a study group for the Native Sons and Daughters which is now available to staff;
- An endowment from the Native Sons came to the City to be passed onto the Irving house and not to be used for general city purposes; and,
- Irving House is currently being fully booked on a regular basis on weekends since reopening after the COVID-19 lockdown.

The Commission provided the following comments:

- Implementation of a tea house would encourage people to stay at the museum for longer visits; and,
- The Hastings Mill Museum in Vancouver has a fantastic Native art collection and may have a lot of useful information for updating the Statement of Significance.

## **6. STANDING REPORTS AND UPDATES**

### **6.1 General Inquiries from the Commission**

A discussion ensued regarding the heritage review policy for properties on the Heritage Inventory List.

In response to questions from the Commission, Britney Dack, Senior Heritage Planner, and Kathleen Stevens, Heritage Planning Analyst, provide the following comments:

- As part of the heritage review process, buildings over 50 years of age are reviewed by staff but if a property is listed on the Heritage Inventory, it typically is brought forward to the Commission for feedback; however, there is no requirement that a Heritage Assessment be provided unless a building is 100 years and older; and,
- Staff have the opportunity through the redevelopment process to require a Heritage Assessment be submitted for properties that are part of a redevelopment application beyond the site's existing entitlement.

The Commission provided the following comments:

- It is surprising that the City does not have a heritage review policy for places included on the Heritage Inventory List and 349 Cumberland is a good example of where such a policy would be appropriate;
- Heritage assessments should be required regardless of the age of the building;
- It would be beneficial to receive input on this issue from the community to gain a sense of how the community values a property. This may be helpful in avoiding unnecessary conflict in the community and, while it may take a long time to compile the feedback, it would be a good place to start; and,
- Consideration should also be made with respect to same-style homes in close proximity to one another and preserving them all as houses lend to the importance of one another.

MOVED and SECONDED

*THAT the Community Heritage Commission recommend that Council apply the same heritage assessment requirements included in the 100 Years or Older Policy to properties included on the City's Heritage Inventory List.*

**Carried.**

All Commission members present voted in favour of the motion.

## **7. NEW BUSINESS**

John Davies, Community Member, advised that Julie Schueck's father passed away recently and that given her frequent work with the Community Heritage Commission, it would be appropriate for the Commission to offer condolences to Ms. Schueck.

MOVED and SECONDED

*THAT the Community Heritage Commission send its condolences to Julie Schueck with respect to the passing of her father.*

**Carried.**

All Commission members present voted in favour of the motion.



Ms. Britney Dack, Senior Heritage Planner, and Ms. Kathleen Stevens, Heritage Planning Analyst, offered to send condolences to Ms. Schueck on behalf of the Commission.

8. **END OF MEETING**

The meeting ended at 7:30 p.m.

9. **UPCOMING MEETINGS**

December 1, 2021