

**DISTRICT OF NORTH VANCOUVER
PUBLIC HEARING**

REPORT of the Public Hearing held in the Council Chambers of the Municipal Hall, 355 West Queens Road, North Vancouver, B.C. on Tuesday, June 21, 2016 commencing at 7:00 p.m.

Present: Mayor R. Walton
Councillor M. Bond
Councillor J. Hanson
Councillor R. Hicks
Councillor L. Muri

Absent: Councillor R. Bassam
Councillor D. MacKay-Dunn

Staff: Mr. D. Milburn, Acting General Manager – Planning, Properties & Permits
Mr. J. Gordon, Municipal Clerk
Ms. J. Paton, Manager – Development Planning
Ms. L. Brick, Deputy Municipal Clerk
Ms. S. Dale, Confidential Council Clerk
Ms. K. Larsen, Planner

Heritage Revitalization Authorization Agreement Bylaw 8180 – Thomson House

Purpose of Bylaw:

Bylaw 8180 authorizes entry into a Heritage Revitalization Agreement which will secure the permanent protection of Thomson House and permit subdivision into two lots which do not meet the minimum lot width or area of the Residential Single-Family Queensdale (RSQ) Zone.

Heritage Designation Bylaw 8181 – 360 East Windsor Road, Bylaw 8181, 2016

Purpose of Bylaw:

Bylaw 8181 proposes to designate Thomson House as a protected heritage property.

1. OPENING BY THE MAYOR

Mayor Walton welcomed everyone and advised that the purpose of the Public Hearing was to receive input from the community and staff on the proposed bylaws as outlined in the Notice of Public Hearing.

In Mayor Walton's preamble he addressed the following:

- All persons who believe that their interest in property is affected by the proposed bylaws will be afforded a reasonable opportunity to be heard and to present written submissions;
- Use the established speakers list. At the end of the speakers list, the Chair may call on speakers from the audience;
- You will have five minutes to address Council for a first time. Begin your remarks to Council by stating your name and address;

- After everyone who wishes to speak has spoken once, speakers will then be allowed one additional five minute presentation;
- Any additional presentations will only be allowed at the discretion of the Chair;
- All members of the audience are asked to refrain from applause or other expressions of emotion. Council wishes to hear everyone's views in an open and impartial forum;
- Council is here to listen to the public, not to debate the merits of the bylaws; and,
- At the conclusion of the public input Council may request further information from staff which may or may not require an extension of the hearing, or Council may close the hearing after which Council should not receive further new information from the public.

Mr. James Gordon, Municipal Clerk stated that:

- The binder containing documents and submissions related to these bylaws is available on the side table to be viewed;
- Everyone at the Hearing will be provided an opportunity to speak. If necessary, the Hearing will continue on a second night; and,
- The Public Hearing is being streamed live over the internet and recorded in accordance with the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act.

2. INTRODUCTION OF BYLAWS BY CLERK

Mr. James Gordon, Municipal Clerk, introduced the proposed bylaws stating that:

Bylaw 8180 authorizes entry into a Heritage Revitalization Agreement which will secure the permanent protection of Thomson House and permit subdivision into two lots which do not meet the minimum lot width or area of the Residential Single-Family Queensdale (RSQ) Zone.

Bylaw 8181 proposes to designate Thomson House as a protected heritage property.

3. PRESENTATION BY STAFF

Ms. Kathleen Larsen, Planner, provided an overview of the proposal elaborating on the Clerk's introduction.

Ms. Larsen advised that:

- The Thomson House is a craftsman style house constructed in 1913 and is on the District's Heritage Register;
- A Heritage Revitalization Agreement is a formal voluntary agreement negotiated between a municipality and the owners of a heritage property requiring approval from Council. Through this type of agreement, the *Local Government Act* establishes a number of ways that a municipality can protect its heritage resources using a variety of temporary and permanent protection measures including Heritage Revitalization Agreements such as is proposed for the Thomson House;
- A Heritage Register allows a local government to document the buildings or structures of heritage value to the community;

- A listing on a Heritage Register documents heritage significance but permanent methods of protection are required to ensure that the building is not demolished;
- A Heritage Revitalization Agreement will ensure that the integrity of the heritage house is not compromised and can be maintained over an extended period of time. Under the Heritage Designation bylaw any future change to the heritage house will require a Heritage Alteration Permit approved by the District's General Manager – Planning, Properties and Permits;
- The property is located in the Queensdale neighbourhood, is designated as Single-Family Residential Level 2 in the Official Community Plan and is zoned Residential Single-Family Queensdale;
- The Residential Single-Family Queensdale Zone does not provide for subdivision of this lot without an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw or a Heritage Revitalization Agreement;
- The property is 13,154 sq. ft. in area, 100 ft. in width and 132 ft. in depth. Under the RSQ Zone the lot would allow for the construction of a house that is 5,919 sq. ft. excluding basement area;
- The owner of the property has applied for a Heritage Revitalization Agreement that proposes the subdivision of the property into two lots and the designation (legal protection) of the heritage house on the west lot;
- Under the proposed Heritage Revitalization Agreement the applicant proposes to retain the Thomson House and conserve and rehabilitate its prominent features including:
 - The one and one half storey height, projecting bays and bellcast side-gabled roof with shed-roof dormers;
 - The wood frame construction with rubble foundation;
 - The craftsman architectural details;
 - The original window and door assemblies; and
 - A reconstructed external brick chimney.
- A Statement of Significance and Maintenance and Conservation Plan completed by the project heritage consultant has been submitted in support of the Heritage Designation and the Heritage Revitalization Agreement proposal;
- The proposed subdivision of the property into two lots each approximately 50 ft in width will allow for the retention of the Thomson House on the west lot and the construction of a new house on the east lot;
- Each proposed lot has a driveway leading to a detached two-car garage at the rear of the property with a parking pad for a third vehicle beside the garage on the west lot;
- Prior to application for the Heritage Revitalization Agreement, staff discussed a variety of options for redevelopment of the site that would preserve the heritage value and character while also remaining sensitive to the single-family character of the neighbourhood. Various combinations of single-family homes, secondary suites and coach houses were discussed;
- The owner of the property chose to proceed with a subdivision through a Heritage Revitalization Agreement application to allow for the conservation of the heritage home as a viable option;
- Under the Heritage Revitalization Agreement the new house on the east lot is proposed to be:
 - A maximum of 3,192 sq. ft. in size and built to comply with all the requirements of the Residential Single-Family Queensdale Zone;

- With the renovated Thomson House at 2402 sq. ft., the total residential square footage on the property at 5594 sq. ft. will be less than what would be permitted for one large new house on the existing lot;
- Constructed 38 ft. from the front property line, set back from the Thomson House, to help highlight the restored heritage house on the street frontage;
- Constructed in accordance with the plans attached to the Heritage Revitalization Agreement;
- Designed to comply with green building standards of Energuide 86;
- Accompanied by a letter of support from a qualified heritage consultant to ensure the heritage house retained on the west lot will predominate the street frontage and the new construction will be sympathetic to the architectural style of the heritage house; and,
- Prohibited from having a secondary suite or coach house.

Ms. Larsen responded to the following questions provided to staff prior to the Public Hearing:

How many homes in the Queensdale zone have been voluntarily protected with a Heritage Revitalization Agreement?

There have been no homes in the Queensdale area voluntarily protected with a Heritage Revitalization Agreement. There are two properties at 145 East Windsor Road and 390 Kings Road that have been voluntarily protected by a Heritage Designation Bylaw.

What is the average value of a large lot in Queensdale on a 100 ft. lot with a new house compared to an older home?

There were two sales of older homes on 100 ft. lots in the Queensdale neighborhood in 2016. Sales indicate their value between \$2.2 and \$2.6 million. Newer homes on smaller 33 ft. lots sold for approximately \$1.7 million during the same time period. There were no comparable house sales for new houses on large lots in 2016.

It should be noted however that most of the homes have been substantially renovated to like-new condition in the past five years.

It does appear that the larger lots do attract a higher purchase price. Due to the variability in age and condition of homes it seems that the larger lots are desirable and appeal to a specific segment of the market who wish to own a large lot and not necessarily for future potential subdivision.

Typically the large lot provides extra privacy and the designation of owning an executive/estate type property lifestyle. It also allows for the potential of constructing a larger home in the future.

The average sale price per sq. ft. (of land) is \$269.

What would the impact of entering into a Heritage Revitalization Agreement have on lot value?

A Heritage Revitalization Agreement usually works to maximize development potential and the ultimate value of a property in return for protection of the heritage house on the site. Furthermore protected houses tend to be well maintained, helping them to retain their value. However, a protected heritage property appeals to a smaller specialty niche purchaser.

How has the population in the Queensdale area changed over the past 5, 10, 15, 20 years?

The population in the Queensdale area has remained extremely stable remaining at about 3.9 persons per household over the past 20 years. In 1996 the population was 1,129 growing to an estimated 1,159 by June 2016.

How did the process proceed with the lot development to date?

Lot development to date includes the following:

- A Building and Demolition Permit application was received in August 2015;
- Tree permits were issued October 6, 2015;
- Tree removal ensued soon after;
- The Thomson House was raised in preparation for new work;
- A Stop Work Permit was issued for the raising of the house on October 27, 2015;
- Staff worked with the applicant during the following months; and,
- A Heritage Revitalization Agreement application was made on February 2, 2016.

Are there tax incentives that Council could offer to encourage heritage retention?

The *Community Charter* provides a local government with the ability to provide tax incentives to the owners of protected heritage buildings; however, this tool has not been widely used in BC as it provides a limited incentive and generally not enough to make a heritage project work successfully. Most tax programs have been found to work better for commercial situations. There is no existing tax incentive program in the District of North Vancouver.

What other incentives (other than subdivision) can be provided to encourage heritage retention?

The following is a preliminary list of incentive options which could be brought forward:

- Stratification of single-family heritage homes into two unit dwellings;
- Permit a coach house with a basement;
- Stratification of a coach house accessory to a single-family heritage home;
- Increase the permitted uses such as permitting a bed and breakfast in a coach house;
- Vehicle parking reductions;
- Density bonus for dedication and restoration of heritage buildings; and,
- Consideration of incentives for homes relocated within the District.

If the heritage house was to be retained as a coach house on the property would it require a variance or new Heritage Revitalization Agreement?

A Heritage Revitalization Agreement will be required whether the house is retained on a new subdivided parcel or is retained as a coach house on the parent parcel.

What would be involved if the owner wanted to give the house to the District to move it rather than paying the cost of demolition?

A preliminary review of the property indicates that the house would be difficult to move through the tree lined streets of East Windsor and would require cutting back of overhanging branches. Once to Lonsdale the move would be more straightforward.

Nikkel Brothers moving offers a website that offers character and heritage houses for sale. Moving costs are paid by the recipient of the house. A typical move to a Vancouver suburb lying along the river could cost approximately \$115,000.

There are no potential sites in the Queensdale area. Should there be interest in moving the house to a District site staff would need to review potential or viable properties.

4. PRESENTATION BY APPLICANT

Mr. Donato D'Amici, Owner:

- Spoke in support of the proposed bylaws;
- Noted that historical features have been incorporated in the design of the proposed new home;
- Commented that the proposed development is in keeping with the smaller homes located in surrounding areas;
- Noted that they have worked with the District to address density concerns; and,
- Spoke to the proposed landscape plan.

5. REPRESENTATIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

5.1. Mr. Peter Miller, North Shore Heritage Society: IN FAVOUR

- Spoke as the President of the North Shore Heritage Preservation Society;
- Spoke in support of preserving the Thomson House;
- Expressed concerns that the new residence would dominate the heritage house; and,
- Recommended that detailed guidelines be provided to homeowners renovating heritage homes.

5.2. Mr. Bill Hall, 500 Block East Queens Road: OPPOSED

- Opined that the Thomson House does not comply with current day safety standards.

Mr. Dean Chittock, 300 Block East Windsor Road: OPPOSED

- Suggested that the proposed Heritage Revitalization Agreement process is flawed;
- Opined that the proposal contradicts the District's Official Community Plan; and,

- Opined that the proposed Heritage Revitalization Agreement will set a dangerous precedence if passed.
- 5.3. Mr. Conan Holizk, 900 Block Frederick Place: IN FAVOUR**
- Spoke to the character of the neighbourhood; and,
 - Urged Council to preserve the heritage of the Queensdale area.
- 5.4. Mr. Glen Robitaille, 300 Block East Windsor Road: OPPOSED**
- Spoke in opposition to the proposed subdivision of 360 East Windsor Road; and,
 - Stated that a building can be replaced but a community is more fragile and longer lasting.
- 5.5. Mr. Stan Feingold, 300 Block East St. James Road: OPPOSED**
- Spoke in opposition to the proposed subdivision;
 - Commented that the proposed development will alter the character of the neighbourhood; and,
 - Opined that the proposed Heritage Revitalization Agreement process is flawed.
- 5.6. Mr. Ryan Lenarduzzi, 1200 Block Richards Street, Vancouver: IN FAVOUR**
- Commented that the proposal will allow the preservation of the existing heritage house and character of the surrounding area.
- 5.7. Ms. Heather Headley, 1500 Block Draycott Road: OPPOSED**
- Read a letter on behalf of Carol Wightman;
 - Opined that the lot sizes of the Queensdale area provides unique neighbourhood character;
 - Expressed concerns that the application will set a precedent for future subdivisions; and,
 - Suggested that the park-like charm of the neighbourhood may be lost.
- 5.8. Ms. Barb Lawrie, 200 Block East Kings Road: OPPOSED**
- Commented that the neighbourhood is struggling with the Heritage Revitalization Agreement process;
 - Spoke in opposition to the proposed subdivision; and,
 - Opined that the removal of trees has reduced the heritage value of the property.
- 5.9. Ms. Kyla Gardner, 200 Block West 6th Street: IN FAVOUR**
- Spoke in support of the proposed Heritage Revitalization Agreement for the Thomson House;
 - Commented that the proposed development is a win-win for the community as it will preserve the heritage home and provide a new residence;
 - Opined that the proposal will preserve the unique character of the neighbourhood;
 - Spoke in support of heritage preservation;
 - Urged Council to consider the positive impacts the proposal will have on the community; and,
 - Opined that a Heritage Revitalization Agreement will not set a precedent.

- 5.10. Mr. Darryl Nelson, 300 Block East Windsor Road: OPPOSED**
- Opined that the proposed Heritage Revitalization Agreement process is flawed;
 - Commented that the proposed subdivision will alter the character of the neighbourhood; and,
 - Noted that the Queensdale area is not slated for infill.
- 5.11. Mr. Reimar Kroecher, 500 Block East Kings Road: OPPOSED**
- Spoke in opposition to the Heritage Revitalization Agreement process;
 - Urged Council to preserve heritage homes; and,
 - Expressed concerns with regards to the Thomson House being demolished.
- 5.12. Ms. Mariana D'Amici, 300 Block East Windsor Road: IN FAVOUR**
- Read a letter on behalf of Chrislana and John Gregory;
 - Spoke in support of the proposed Heritage Revitalization Agreement for the Thomson House;
 - Opined that the proposal is in keeping with the neighbourhood;
 - Commented that the proposed development is a win-win for the community as it will preserve the heritage home and provide a new residence; and,
 - Commented that the proposed new residence is aesthetically pleasing.
- 5.13. Mr. Shah Gul, 300 Block East Queens Road: OPPOSED**
- Spoke in opposition to subdivision;
 - Opined that the proposal will have negative impacts on the neighbourhood;
 - Expressed concerns that the application will set a precedent for future subdivisions;
 - Suggested that the park-like charm of the neighbourhood may be lost;
 - Noted that the neighbourhood does not have resources to support increased density; and,
 - Urged Council to not proceed with the proposal.
- 5.14. Ms. Karen Baker, 3000 Block St. Kilda Avenue: OPPOSED**
- Spoke regarding the unique character of the Upper Lonsdale area.
- 5.15. Mr. Tim Dean, 400 Block East Windsor Road: IN FAVOUR**
- Spoke in support of heritage restoration; and,
 - Opined that the proposal is the best solution to preserve the Thomson House.
- 5.16. Ms. Donna Oseen, 400 Block East Windsor Road: OPPOSED**
- Read a letter on behalf of Yvonne Schmidt;
 - Urged Council to defeat the proposed bylaws; and,
 - Opined that this application is not in keeping with the neighbourhood character.
- 5.17. Mr. Alborz Jaberolonsor, 400 Block West Keith Road: IN FAVOUR**
- Spoke in support of the Thomson House.

Council recessed at 8:39 pm and reconvened at 8:46 pm.

- 5.18. Mr. Al Sutton, 300 Block East St. James Paul: OPPOSED**
- Spoke in opposition to the proposed Heritage Revitalization Agreement; and,

- Suggested that the District look at other ways of preserving the Thomson House.
- 5.19. Mr. Donald Luxton, 1300 Block Hornby Street, Vancouver: COMMENTING**
- Stated that a Heritage Revitalization Agreement will not set a precedent;
 - Commented that the Thomson House is an important part of the character of the neighbourhood;
 - Commented that the proposed Heritage Revitalization Agreement reflects the *Local Government Act*; and,
 - Opined that the proposal is modest.
- 5.20. Ms. Christina Paul, 400 Block St. James Road: OPPOSED**
- Spoke to the unique character of the community; and,
 - Urged Council to defeat the proposed bylaws.
- 5.21. Mr. John Rainy, 300 Block East Windsor Road: OPPOSED**
- Spoke to the unique character of the community; and,
 - Urged Council to defeat the proposed subdivision.
- 5.22. Ms. Christina Kroeher, 500 Block East Queens Road: OPPOSED**
- Urged Council to provide incentives for homeowners to restore heritage homes; and,
 - Spoke in opposition to demolition.
- 5.23. Ms. Molly Lawler, 100 Block East Kings Road: OPPOSED**
- Spoke to the history of the Queensdale neighbourhood;
 - Noted that there is not a clear process for heritage homeowners;
 - Opined that the Heritage Revitalization Agreement process is flawed; and,
 - Expressed concerns that the lot has been cleared and the house is sitting on stilts.
- 5.24. Mr. Donoto D'Amici, 300 Block East Windsor Road: SPEAKING A SECOND TIME**
- Commented that trees were removed from the site and will be re-planted if they can be accommodated.
- 5.25. Mr. Stan Feingold, 300 Block East St. James Road: SPEAKING A SECOND TIME**
- Spoke in opposition to demolition; and,
 - Expressed concerns that the application will set a precedent for future subdivisions.
- 5.26. Mr. Darryl Nelson, 300 Block East Windsor Road: SPEAKING A SECOND TIME**
- Submitted a petition in opposition to the proposed subdivision; and,
 - Stated that the majority of the community is in opposition to the proposal.
- 5.27. Mr. Donoto D'Amici, 200 Block East Windsor Road: SPEAKING A THIRD TIME**
- Noted that information pamphlets were provided to neighbours.

6. QUESTIONS FROM COUNCIL

Council requested that Donald Luxton's report dated October 16, 2015 be included in the public records. In response to this request, staff summarized Mr. Luxton's report.

Council requested that staff report back on the following:

- When the heritage consultant was hired;
- Why a stop work permit was issued;
- Suitable District owned lots appropriate for relocating the Thomson House to;
- Tax incentives for moving the Thomson House; and,
- The cost of moving the Thomson House.

Council questioned if the leaflets provided at the Public Meeting were included in the Public Hearing binder. Staff commented that the submissions from the Public Information Meeting is included in the binder but the leaflets circulated in the neighbourhood relating to petitions had not been received for inclusion in the Public Hearing binder.

7. COUNCIL RESOLUTION

MOVED by Councillor MURI

SECONDED by Councillor HANSON

THAT the June 21, 2016 Public Hearing be closed;

AND THAT "Heritage Revitalization Authorization Agreement Bylaw 8180 – Thomson House" and "Heritage Designation Bylaw 8181 – 360 East Windsor Road, Bylaw 8181, 2016" be returned to Council for further consideration.

CARRIED
(9:34 p.m.)

CERTIFIED CORRECT:



Confidential Council Clerk