Notice is hereby given of the following Regular Meeting of Council:
September 18, 2017 at 12:00 p.m.
With immediate adjournment to Closed Meeting
Regular Council reconvenes at 5:45 p.m.

Council Chamber
City Hall

AGENDA
For On-Table additions see item 20a.

Call to order.

REMOVAL OF ITEMS FROM THE CONSENT AGENDA

1. **MOTION** to remove items from the Consent Agenda.

EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC

2. **MOTION:**

   THAT pursuant to Section 90 of the Community Charter, members of the public be excluded from the Closed Meeting of Council immediately following the Regular Meeting of Council on the basis that the subject matter of all agenda items to be considered relate to matters listed under Sections 90(1)(a), 90(1)(e), 90(1)(f), 90(1)(g), 90(1)(i), 90(1)(k), and 90(2)(b) of the Community Charter:
(a) personal information about an identifiable individual who holds or is being considered for a position as an officer, employee or agent of the municipality or another position appointed by the municipality;

(e) the acquisition, disposition or expropriation of land or improvements, if the council considers that disclosure could reasonably be expected to harm the interests of the municipality;

(f) law enforcement, if the council considers that disclosure could reasonably be expected to harm the conduct of an investigation under or enforcement of an enactment;

(g) litigation or potential litigation affecting the municipality;

(i) the receipt of advice that is subject to solicitor-client privilege, including communications necessary for that purpose;

(k) negotiations and related discussions respecting the proposed provision of a municipal service that are at their preliminary stages and that, in the view of the council, could reasonably be expected to harm the interests of the municipality if they were held in public;

90(2)

(b) the consideration of information received and held in confidence relating to negotiations between the municipality and a provincial government or the federal government or both, or between a provincial government or the federal government or both and a third party;

Purpose of the meeting:
Personal, property, legal and negotiations matters

ADJOURNMENT

3. MOTION to adjourn the Council Meeting in open session and proceed to Closed Session.

RECONVENE TO REGULAR COUNCIL

4. MOTION to reconvene to the Regular Meeting of Council at 5:45 p.m. in the Council Chamber.
REVIEW AND ADOPTION OF CONSENT AGENDA

5. The Consent Agenda - Council members may adopt in one motion all recommendations appearing on the Consent Agenda or, prior to the vote, request an item be removed from the Consent Agenda for debate or discussion, voting in opposition to a recommendation, or declaring a conflict of interest with an item.

**REVIEW** of items previously removed from the Consent Agenda.

**REQUEST** for any additional items to be removed from the Consent Agenda.

**MOTION** to remove additional items from the Consent Agenda (if applicable).

**MOTION** to approve the recommendations for items remaining in the Consent Agenda.

ADJOURNMENT

6. **MOTION** to adjourn the Regular Council Meeting at 6:00 p.m. and proceed to the Public Hearing in the Council Chamber.

RECONVENE TO REGULAR COUNCIL

7. **MOTION** to reconvene to the Regular Council Meeting immediately following the Public Hearing in the Council Chamber.

ADDITIONS TO THE AGENDA
Urgent/time sensitive matters only

8. **MOTION** to Add or Delete Items from the Agenda.

**MOTION** to receive all On Table material as presented to Council.

BYLAWS CONSIDERED AT THE PUBLIC HEARING

9. Zoning Amendment (43 Hastings Street Affordable Housing Project)
   Bylaw No. 7923, 2017

   **THIRD READING**
10. Official Community Plan Adoption Bylaw No. 7925, 2017  
   **THIRD READING**

11. Zoning Amendment Bylaw (Infill Housing) No. 7936, 2017  
   **THIRD READING**

**OPPORTUNITY TO BE HEARD AND ISSUANCE OF DEVELOPMENT VARIANCE PERMITS**

12. Development Variance Permit No. DVP00634 to vary Sign Bylaw requirements at 610 Sixth Street (Royal City Centre)

Required notification has been completed.

**Attachments:**

i. Copy of Development Variance Permit notice

ii. Acting Director of Development Services’ report dated August 28, 2017

a. **Motion** to receive the following correspondence concerning this application:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Written Submissions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None to date.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. Statement concerning the number of written submissions received (Acting City Clerk)

c. Invitation to those present to address the application

d. **Motion** to approve/reject issuance of Development Variance Permit No. 00634.

**UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

13. **No Items**
CONSENT AGENDA

Acting City Clerk

14. Recruitment 2017 Committee Appointments

Acting Director of Development Services and Director of Engineering Services

15. Fire Escape Stairs at 642 Columbia Street – Review of Alternative Options and Appearance Mitigation Approaches

Director of Engineering Services

16. Sale of Tanaka Court Properties

Director of Engineering Services and General Manager of Electrical Operations

17. BCIT Smart Microgrid Applied Research Project for Street Level Electric Vehicle Charging in New Westminster

Director of Finance and Information Technology

18. Investment Report to August 31, 2017

ITEMS REMOVED FROM THE CONSENT AGENDA

BYLAWS

19. Bylaw for adoption:

   a. Local Area Service Bylaw No. 7942, 2017

   ADOPTION

COMMUNITY ANNOUNCEMENTS / ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM COUNCIL

NEW BUSINESS

20. a. 647 Ewen Avenue Temporary Protection Order
**NEXT MEETING**

**October 2, 2017**

A Regular Council meeting will convene at 2:00 p.m. and immediately adjourn to a Closed meeting, and then the Regular meeting will reconvene at 6:00 p.m. Both meetings will be held in the Council Chamber on the 2nd Floor at City Hall.

**ADJOURNMENT**
There is no Report with this Item.
Please see Attachment(s).
OPPORTUNITY TO BE HEARD

6:00 pm on September 18th, 2017
in Council Chamber
City Hall, 511 Royal Avenue, New Westminster
Development Variance Permit DVP00634
A Development Variance Permit to Vary Sign Bylaw No. 7867, 2017

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:
A Development Variance Permit (DVP) application has been made by Wensley Architecture (representing Winners) to vary the requirements of Sign Bylaw No. 7867, 2017 at 610 Sixth Street – Royal City Centre Mall. The applicant proposes one fascia sign on the northeast building elevation fronting Sixth Street for which Winners does not have street frontage, a requirement of the Sign Bylaw. A second fascia sign is proposed (18.55m² / 222sqft) on Sixth Avenue which exceeds the maximum sign area requirement of 14 square metres. The proposed signs are generally in keeping with the intent of the Sign Bylaw and similar sign DVPs have been issued by Council for other major retailers in Royal City Centre Mall.

WHAT IS DEVELOPMENT VARIANCE PERMIT DVP00634?
The proposed sign requires the following sections of Sign Bylaw No. 7867, 2017 to be varied:

- Section 10.4.1 – ... not more than one fascia sign shall be permitted for each street fronting wall of a building or business unit...
- Section 9.1 – ...The maximum sign area of any combination of awning signs, canopy signs and fascia signs shall not exceed .... a maximum sign area of 14.0 square metres...

HOW DO I GET MORE INFORMATION?
The permit application and all pertinent material are available for viewing in the Planning Division at City Hall ten (10) business days prior to the Opportunity to be Heard, September 1, 2017 to September 18, 2017. City Hall hours are Monday between 8:00am and 7:00pm, and Tuesday through Friday between 8:00am and 5:00pm (except statutory holidays).

HOW CAN I BE HEARD?
The public is welcome to attend the Opportunity to be Heard on September 18, 2017 at 6:00pm, or send a written submission addressed to Mayor and Council prior to the closing of the Opportunity to be Heard.

QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS?
All submitted comments will be distributed to Council and posted on the City’s website. For more information regarding this proposal, please call the Planning Division at 604-527-4532.

Attend:
City Hall Council Chamber
511 Royal Avenue,
New Westminster BC V3L 1H9

Post:
Legislative Services Department
511 Royal Avenue
New Westminster BC V3L 1H9

Email:
clerks@newwestcity.ca

Questions? Phone:
604-527-4523

Jan Gibson
City Clerk
REPORT
Development Services

To: Mayor Coté and Members of Council Date: 8/28/2017
From: Jackie Teed File: DVP00634
Acting Director of Development Item #: 348/2017
Services

Subject: 610 Sixth Street: Development Variance Permit to Vary Sign Bylaw No. 7867, 2017 to Permit the Installation of Two Signs - Notice of Opportunity to be Heard

RECOMMENDATION

THAT Council issue notice that it will consider a resolution to issue Development Variance Permit DVP00634 to vary Sign Bylaw requirements at 610 Sixth Street (Royal City Centre) to allow for the installation of two fascia signs following an Opportunity to be Heard on September 18, 2017.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A Sign Permit application has been submitted for Winners at 610 Sixth Street – ‘Royal City Centre.’ The application proposes two fascia signs which do not conform to Sign Bylaw 7867, 2017 and requires a Development Variance Permit.

PURPOSE

The purpose of this report is to advise Council of the application and to request that Council provide staff with direction in processing the proposed variance requests.
POLICY AND REGULATIONS

Sign Bylaw No. 7867, 2017
Signs are regulated under Sign Bylaw No. 7867, 2017. The purpose of this Bylaw is to regulate signs in a manner that promotes public safety; provides sufficient opportunities for a range of signs to advertise goods, services and businesses; and protects and enhances the character and aesthetic standards of the city and the vitality of its commercial districts.

Official Community Plan 2011 - Uptown Development Permit Area
The subject site is within the #2 Uptown Development Permit Area. There are no references to signage in the Development Permit Guidelines. An excerpt from the Uptown DPA is available in Attachment 1.

Draft Official Community Plan 2017- Mixed Use Nodes 4.1 Uptown
The subject site is within the Mixed Use Nodes #4.1 Uptown Development Permit Area of the draft 2017 Official Community Plan. The intent of the signage design guidelines is to provide signage that is clear and visible without being visually obtrusive. The signage exert from the draft plan is available in Attachment 1.

Economic Development
The City encourages efforts to both attract and retain businesses. Through these efforts, the city’s economy can continue to thrive and grow, creating jobs and further establishing New Westminster as a great place to live, work, play and invest.

SITE CONTEXT AND PROPERTY INFORMATION

610 Sixth Street (Royal City Centre) is situated in the Uptown neighbourhood and contains multiple commercial retail businesses. To the north, northeast and southeast are commercially zoned properties and commercial establishments. To the west is Moody Park. To the northwest are residential multi-family buildings. A location map is shown in Attachment 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Wensley Architecture Ltd.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Zoning</td>
<td>Community Commercial Districts (High Rise) (C-3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCP Land Use Designation</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCP Development Permit Area</td>
<td>#2 Uptown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Frontage</td>
<td>80.47 metres (264.01 feet)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Depth</td>
<td>299.18 metres (981.56 feet)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area</td>
<td>24,074 square metres (259,129 square feet)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROPOSED VARIANCES

Wensley Architecture has submitted a Sign Permit application on behalf of Winners for signage at 610 Sixth Street - ‘Royal City Centre’. The project plans are available in Attachment 3. The application requires a Development Variance Permit to vary the following sections of Sign Bylaw 7867, 2017 in order to permit two fascia signs. The Sign Permit review checklist is available in Attachment 4.

Section 10.4.1:
... not more than one fascia sign shall be permitted for each street fronting wall of a building or business unit...

Sign #1 is a fascia sign proposed on the northeast building elevation facing Sixth Street. The commercial retail unit occupied by Winners does not have street frontage on Sixth Street.

Section 9.1:
...The maximum sign area of any combination of awning signs, canopy signs and fascia signs shall not exceed .... a maximum sign area of 14.0 square metres...

Sign #2 is a fascia sign proposed on Sixth Ave with a sign area of 18.55m² (200sqft).

BACKGROUND

There are three previous Development Variance Permits (DVPs) approved for signage at 610 Sixth Street:

- DVP00587 was approved April 28, 2015 to allow two multi-tenant freestanding pylon signs,
- DVP00575 was approved September 16, 2014, to allow Walmart two larger fascia signs of 26.76 m² (288 sq ft), more than one fascia sign on a street frontage, and a sign on a wall that is not part of their unit premise,
- DVP00514 was approved October 10, 2010, to allow Safeway three fascia signs on Sixth Ave, one with a sign area of 26.47 m² (285 sq ft) and two with copy area greater than 50%.

In addition, three variances have been approved for building features such as parking, loading bays and front yard setbacks.

EVALUATION

The following is an evaluation of the variances based on the Policy Approach to Considering Requests for Variances adopted on January 28, 2008.
Information Question

Q. What is the intent of the bylaws which the applicant is seeking to have varied?

A. The purpose of Sign Bylaw No. 7867, 2017 is to regulate signs in a manner that promotes public safety, provides sufficient opportunities for a range of signs to advertise goods, services and businesses, and protects and enhances the character and aesthetic standards of the city and the vitality of its commercial districts.

Assessment Questions

1. Is there a community benefit to the granting of the variance; beyond that received by the owner or occupant of the property?
   No.

2. Is there a hardship involved in adhering to the pertinent bylaw? A hardship must relate to the location, size, geometry or natural attributes (e.g. slope, floodplain, rock formation, natural vegetation) of the site and not the personal or business circumstances of the applicant
   No.

3. If the answer to question #1 is ‘No’, but the answer to question #2 is ‘Yes,’ can it still be demonstrated that the proposal still meets the intent of the bylaw?
   N/A

4. Is this the most appropriate mechanism (i.e. Development Variance Permit or Board of Variance) for achieving the end result of the proposed variance?
   Yes, as the Board of Variance does not have jurisdiction to consider variances regarding the Sign Bylaw.

5. Are the proposed variances relatively minor?
   Yes, given the size of the building in which the signage in question will be located and given the comparable size of other signage on the building associated with major tenants.

For this application, of the five answers, two are “Yes”, two are “No”, and one is N/A.
DISCUSSION

Wensley Architecture has submitted a Sign Permit application for signs at Winners at 610 Sixth Street – ‘Royal City Centre’. The application includes two fascia signs and two additions on both existing multi-tenant freestanding signs. The additions proposed for the freestanding signs are not the subject of this DVP application. The applicant has submitted a variance request letter in support of their application for fascia signs that do not meet the Sign Bylaw requirements, which is available in Attachment 5.

Sign #1 is a fascia sign proposed on the northeast building elevation. Although the commercial retail unit occupied by Winners does not have street frontage on Sixth Street, this area forms one of the main entrances to the shopping center. The proposed sign would be in line with, and smaller in size than, the existing Walmart sign on the same wall that was authorized by DVP00575.

Sign #2 is a fascia sign proposed on the south building elevation fronting Sixth Street. The proposed sign area is 18.55 square metres (199.67 square feet) which exceeds the maximum size requirements of 14.0 square metres (150.7 square feet). The proposed sign would be in line with, and similar in size to, the Shoppers Drug Mart sign on Sixth Ave. Given the size of the building wall fronting Sixth Ave. and the existence of other large signs such as Walmart, the proposed Winners sign would not dominate the streetscape or detract from the architectural elements of the building.

The proposed signs are generally in keeping with the intent of the Sign Bylaw and similar sign DVPs issued by Council for other large retailers in Royal City Center.

INTERDEPARTMENT LIASON

Development Services and Economic Development staff have liaised on this application.

OPTIONS

There are three options of Council’s consideration:

1. THAT Council issue notice that it will consider a resolution to issue Development Variance Permit DVP00634 to vary Sign Bylaw requirements at 610 Sixth Street (Royal City Centre) to allow for the installation of two fascia signs following an Opportunity to be Heard on September 18, 2017

2. THAT Council reject DVP00634
3. **THAT** Council provide staff with other direction.

Staff recommends option 1.

**ATTACHMENTS**

Attachment 1: Official Community Plan Designation  
Attachment 2: Location Map  
Attachment 3: Project Plans  
Attachment 4: Analysis of Proposed Variances and Sign Bylaw Checklist  
Attachment 5: Variance Request Letter

This report has been prepared by:  
Nick Hardy, Planning Assistant

This report was reviewed by:  
John Stark, Acting Manager of Planning

Approved for Presentation to Council

For:  
Jackie Teed  
Acting Director of Development Services

Lisa Spitale  
Chief Administrative Officer
Attachment 1

Official Community Plan Designation
Commercial and Mixed Use Development Permit Areas

#2 Uptown

The Uptown area, identified as Development Permit Area #2 [see Map D1], is designated in order to provide a focus for mixed use development in this area and a framework for its evolution. This Development Permit Area provides objectives and guidelines for the form and character of high, medium and low rise residential and commercial uses, as well as retail.

[Discussion of this area is contained in sections 2.1: Population and Growth Management, 2.3: Housing and 2.7: Commercial Revitalization and the Economy.]

Objectives

The objectives of this designation are to:

• Promote the Uptown as the professional centre of New Westminster.

• Provide opportunities for a range of pedestrian-Oriented commercial uses.

• Promote residential use on the upper floors.

Guidelines

Development permits issued in this area shall be in accordance with the following guidelines:

• Architecture, including scale and massing of buildings, shall be in keeping with the context of the area.

• Architecture, including scale and massing of buildings, should be complementary with the historic character of adjacent neighbourhoods, such as Queen’s Park.

• Buildings should be sited to provide a visual and acoustical barrier to the traffic corridor.
Mixed Use Nodes
4.1 Uptown

4.1.26 SIGNAGE
Intent: Provide signage that is clear and visible without being visually obtrusive.
• A comprehensive sign plan should be provided for all new developments.
• Signs should be designed to be consistent with the architectural style, scale and materials of the development and its surrounding context.
• Signs should be integrated into the detailing of the building, but subordinate to the overall building composition.
• Signs should be visible from the street without being visually obtrusive. Signs should be designed so that the size, location and information is oriented to pedestrians.
• Signs should be appropriately lit and visible at all times. To achieve this, use of indirect lighting from fixtures integrated into the design of the building is encouraged.
• Signs should add to the interest of the building and respect the historic character of the area, and not create visual clutter.
Attachment 2

Location Map
Attachment 3

Project Plans
SOUTH ELEVATION - 6th AVENUE

TOTAL SIGN AREA: 18.58m²

SCALE: 3/32" = 1' - 0"

CENTRE WITH DOOR

CENTRE WITH EXISTING SIGN

ENTIRE WALL LENGHT

65.38m

7.26m

TO THE GROUND

PROPOSED
PROPOSED

EAST ELEVATION - 6TH STREET

TOTAL SIGN AREA: 3.42m²

SCALE: 3/32" = 1' - 0"
SIGN DIMENSIONS APPROX. 12' - 0" [3658] X 8' - 0" [2438]
SURVEY TO CONFIRM
Attachment 4

Analysis of Proposed Variances to Sign Bylaw Requirements and Sign Bylaw Checklist
## Analysis of Variances to Sign Bylaw Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement be Varied</th>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section 9.14:</strong> Sign Area</td>
<td>Maximum area: 14m² (150.7 sqft)</td>
<td>Maximum area: 18.55m² (300 sqft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section 10.4.1:</strong> Fascia Signs</td>
<td>Not more than one fascia sign shall be permitted for each street fronting wall of a building or business unit</td>
<td>One fascia sign for a business unit with no street frontage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Sign Bylaw 7867, 2017 Review Checklist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>610 Sixth Street</th>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Winners / Strathallen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zone</td>
<td>C-3</td>
<td>Permit #</td>
<td>BP011370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewed by</td>
<td>Nicholas Hardy</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>August 14, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direction</td>
<td>NorthEast</td>
<td>Street facing</td>
<td>Sixth Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Signs</td>
<td>1 of 2</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>DVP Required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sign #1

**Fascia Sign**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provided</th>
<th>☑</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of signs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>• Max 2 of awning sign, canopy sign, fascia sign, under-awning sign, under-canopy sign, projecting sign or freestanding sign, per street fronting wall of a building or business unit in C- or M-zones 7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Max 1 Fascia sign for each street fronting wall of a building or business unit. VARIANCE REQUIRED 10.4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Interrupted by columns or other architectural features permitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign Area</td>
<td>3.40 m²</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>• 1.0 m² sign area for each 1.0 linear meter of building wall to a maximum sign area of 14.0m² 7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Interrupted by columns or other architectural features permitted, column area included in max sign area calculation 10.4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wall Length</td>
<td>9.14 m</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>• Identification signs: building/business max 0.65m², place of worship max 2.0m², multifamily residential max 1.0m² 8.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Drive Throughs: 2m² per sign face 10.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Channel letters</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>• 50% of the maximum permitted sign area maximum of 7.0 m² 7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign Clearance</td>
<td>8.22 m</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>• 2.5m for signs over a street or sidewalk 7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 4.5m for signs over a parking area of driveway 7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• No clearance requirement for sign less than 0.1m projection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illuminated</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>• Permitted 7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Does not impact adjacent property, lane or street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital Electronic</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>• Max 50% of total sign area (except Drive-Troughs: 100%) 7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Permitted only in P-1, P-2 and P-3 Zoning Districts, Commercial Service, Commercial Parking and Industrial Zoning Districts; 7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 6 seconds display change rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projection</td>
<td>0.17 m</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>• Max 0.3 m from the face of the building 10.4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
<td>• not extend horizontally beyond the limits of the building face 10.4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• two signs may extend to meet at the corner 10.4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• not extend above the limit of the roofline of a building 10.4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compatible</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
<td>• multiple signs are consistent and compatible in height, character and design, and architecturally coordinated with the building 10.4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Districts</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>• located between the 1st &amp; 2nd floor or on the bulkhead 12.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Max vertical dimension of 0.6m 12.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Max length of 90% of the width of the building 12.2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Columbia St only - not digital electronic 12.2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• No Florescent backlit signs or exposed florescent tubing App A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Doc#1029160
## Sign #2: Fascia Sign

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Max 2 of awning sign, canopy sign, fascia sign, under-awning sign, under-canopy sign, projecting sign or freestanding sign, per street fronting wall of a building or business unit in C- or M-zones</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max 1 Fascia sign for each street fronting wall of a building or business unit.</td>
<td>10.4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interrupted by columns or other architectural features permitted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0 m² sign area for each 1.0 linear meter of building wall to a maximum sign area of 14.0 m² \text{VARIANCE REQUIRED}</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interrupted by columns or other architectural features permitted, column area included in max sign area calculation</td>
<td>10.4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification signs: building/business max 0.65 m², place of worship max 2.0 m², multifamily residential max 1.0 m²</td>
<td>8.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive Throughs: 2 m² per sign face</td>
<td>10.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50% of the maximum permitted sign area maximum of 7.0 m²</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 m for signs over a street or sidewalk</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5 m for signs over a parking area of driveway</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No clearance requirement for sign less than 0.1 m projection</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permitted</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not impact adjacent property, lane or street</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max 50% of total sign area (except Drive-Troughs: 100%)</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permitted only in P-1, P-2 and P-3 Zoning Districts, Commercial Service, Commercial Parking and Industrial Zoning Districts;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 seconds display change rate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max 0.3 m from the face of the building</td>
<td>10.4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not extend horizontally beyond the limits of the building face</td>
<td>10.4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>two signs may extend to meet at the corner</td>
<td>10.4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not extend above the limit of the roofline of a building</td>
<td>10.4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>multiple signs are consistent and compatible in height, character and design, and architecturally coordinated with the building</td>
<td>10.4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>located between the 1st &amp; 2nd floor or on the bulkhead</td>
<td>12.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max vertical dimension of 0.6 m</td>
<td>12.2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max length of 90% of the width of the building</td>
<td>App A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia St only - not digital electronic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Florescent backlit signs or exposed florescent tubing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of signs</strong></td>
<td>Provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Sign Area</strong></th>
<th>Provided</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th><strong>Description</strong></th>
<th>Ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.06 m²</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Industrial &amp; Commercial Service Zones: max 15m² per sign face</td>
<td>10.6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Commercial and Public institutional Zones: max 2m² per sign face</td>
<td>10.6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>May be on 2 sign faces</td>
<td>10.6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Identification signs: building/business max 0.65m², place of worship max 2.0m², multifamily residential max 1.0m²</td>
<td>8.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Drive Throughs: 2m² per sign face</td>
<td>10.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Channel letters</strong></th>
<th>Provided</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th><strong>Description</strong></th>
<th>Ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>50% of the maximum permitted sign area, maximum of 7.0 m²</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Sign Clearance</strong></th>
<th>Provided</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th><strong>Description</strong></th>
<th>Ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.5 m</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Min 2.5m for signs over a street or sidewalk</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Min 4.5m for signs over a parking area of driveway</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Located entirely in landscaping, no minimum clearance</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Monument signs - no minimum clearance</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Illuminated</strong></th>
<th>Provided</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th><strong>Description</strong></th>
<th>Ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Permitted</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Does not impact adjacent property, lane or street</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Digital Electronic</strong></th>
<th>Provided</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th><strong>Description</strong></th>
<th>Ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Max 50% of total sign area (except Drive-Troughs: 100%)</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Permitted only in P-1, P-2 and P-3 Zoning Districts, Commercial Service, Commercial Parking and Industrial Zoning Districts;</td>
<td>8.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Display change maximum once every 6 seconds</td>
<td>8.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Permitted for places of worship</td>
<td>8.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Location</strong></th>
<th>Provided</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th><strong>Description</strong></th>
<th>Ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Entirely within the parcel</td>
<td>10.6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not within 1.5m of a building</td>
<td>10.6.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Height</strong></th>
<th>Provided</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th><strong>Description</strong></th>
<th>Ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A m</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Industrial &amp; Comm Service Zones: Less of building height or 6.0m</td>
<td>10.6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Commercial and Public institutional Zones: Max 2.2m</td>
<td>10.6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Drive Throughs: 2.2m</td>
<td>10.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Identification signs: place of worship max 2.2m, multifamily residential max 1.5m</td>
<td>8.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Frontage</strong></th>
<th>Provided</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th><strong>Description</strong></th>
<th>Ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A m</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>For more than 1 freestanding sign only</td>
<td>10.6.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Distance btwn signs</strong></th>
<th>Provided</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th><strong>Description</strong></th>
<th>Ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A m</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Additional freestanding signs for street frontages over 50m, freestanding signs at least 25 m apart</td>
<td>10.6.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Distance to Street</strong></th>
<th>Provided</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th><strong>Description</strong></th>
<th>Ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A m</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Digital electronic signs larger than 5.0m² not closer than 20m to a street</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Landscaping</strong></th>
<th>Provided</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th><strong>Description</strong></th>
<th>Ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A m²</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>landscaping planter at the base for freestanding signs above 2.2 m in height, at least the size of the sign area</td>
<td>10.6.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Compatible</strong></th>
<th>Provided</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th><strong>Description</strong></th>
<th>Ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>multiple signs are consistent and compatible in height, character and design, and architecturally coordinated with the building</td>
<td>10.6.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Heritage Districts</strong></th>
<th>Provided</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th><strong>Description</strong></th>
<th>Ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Columbia Street – Not permitted</td>
<td>12.2.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Sign Bylaw 7867, 2017 Review Checklist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>610 Sixth Street</th>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Winners / Strathallen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zone</td>
<td>C-3</td>
<td>Permit #</td>
<td>BP011370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewed by</td>
<td>Nicholas Hardy</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>August 14, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direction</td>
<td>SouthWest</td>
<td>Street facing</td>
<td>Eighth Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Signs</td>
<td>4 of 4</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Freestanding Sign

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provided</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of signs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>• <strong>Max 2</strong> of awning sign, canopy sign, fascia sign, under-awning sign, under-canopy sign, projecting sign or freestanding sign, per street fronting wall of a building or business unit in C- or M-zones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>Max 1 freestanding</strong> sign for each street frontage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign Area</td>
<td>N/A m²</td>
<td>• Industrial &amp; Commercial Service Zones: <strong>max 15m² per sign face</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Commercial and Public institutional Zones: <strong>max 2m² per sign face</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• May be on 2 sign faces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Identification signs: building/business max 0.65m², place of worship max 2.0m², multifamily residential max 1.0m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Drive Throughs: 2m² per sign face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Channel letters</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>• 50% of the maximum permitted sign area, maximum of 7.0 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign Clearance</td>
<td>2.5 m</td>
<td>• <strong>Min 2.5m</strong> for signs over a street or sidewalk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>Min 4.5m</strong> for signs over a parking area of driveway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Located entirely in landscaping, no minimum clearance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Monument signs - no minimum clearance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illuminated</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>• Permitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Does not impact adjacent property, lane or street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital Electronic</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>• <strong>Max 50%</strong> of total sign area (except Drive-Troughs: 100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Permitted only in P-1, P-2 and P-3 Zoning Districts, Commercial Service, Commercial Parking and Industrial Zoning Districts;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Display change maximum once every <strong>6 seconds</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Permitted for places of worship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>• Entirely within the parcel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Not within 1.5m of a building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height</td>
<td>N/A m</td>
<td>• Industrial &amp; Comm Service Zones: Less of building height or 6.0m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Commercial and Public institutional Zones: Max 2.2m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Drive Throughs: 2.2m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Identification signs: place of worship max 2.2m, multifamily residential max 1.5m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frontage</td>
<td>N/A m</td>
<td>• <strong>For more than 1 freestanding sign only</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance btwn signs</td>
<td>N/A m</td>
<td>• Additional freestanding signs for street frontages over 50m, freestanding signs at least 25 m apart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance to Street</td>
<td>N/A m</td>
<td>• Digital electronic signs larger than 5.0m² not closer than <strong>20m</strong> to a street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscaping</td>
<td>N/A m²</td>
<td>• landscaping planter at the base for freestanding signs above 2.2 m in height, at least the size of the sign area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compatible</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>• multiple signs are consistent and compatible in height, character and design, and architecturally coordinated with the building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Districts</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachment 5

Variance request letter
July 31, 2017

DESIGN RATIONALE
NEW ANCHOR TENANT - SIGN VARIANCE
610 SIXTH STREET, NEW WESTMINSTER BC
ROYAL CITY CENTRE SHOPPING CENTRE

1. FASCIA SIGNAGE
   - Given the size of the new Tenant, it is in comparison to the other 4 major Tenants within the Mall (White Spot, Wal-Mart, Save on Foods & Shoppers Drug Mart) and requires similar exterior signage in order to accommodate accordingly.
   - The new Tenant signage along both Sixth Avenue and Sixth Street size and locations, keeps with the overall mall exterior look from an Architectural look.
   - The size and location of these new signs provides the public opportunity to view without talking away from the overall mall exterior.
   - Internally lit letters with a non-externally lit background sign are consistent with the other major Tenants.

2. FREE STANDING PYLON SIGNAGE
   - The newly added pylon circular signs, both at the corners of Sixth Avenue/6th Street & Sixth Avenue/6th Street are consistent with the other major Tenants.

In conclusion, the new Tenant signage will add to the life of the neighbouring older buildings, and will create a new exciting atmosphere at this important location in the City of New Westminster.
REPORT
Legislative Services

To: Mayor Coté and Members of Council Date: 9/18/2017

From: Jacqueline Killawee
Acting City Clerk

File: 05.1035.10
Item #: 387/2017

Subject: Recruitment 2017 Committee Appointments

RECOMMENDATION

THAT Council appoint Gavin Palmer as the Queensborough Resident’s Association Representative to the Neighbourhood Traffic Advisory Committee (NTAC) for the term ending January 31, 2018; and,

THAT Council appoint Sukhdeep Jassar, MPH as the Fraser Health Representative to the Community and Social Issues Committee (CSI) for the term ending January 31, 2018.

PURPOSE

The purpose of this report is to:

- Request the appointment of Gavin Palmer as the Queensborough Resident’s Association Representative to the Neighbourhood Traffic Advisory Committee (NTAC) for the term ending January 31, 2018; and
- Request the appointment of Sukhdeep Jassar, MPH as the Fraser Health Representative to the Community and Social Issues Committee (CSI) for the term ending January 31, 2018.
BACKGROUND

During the initial recruitment process, some committee positions that are filled by outside organizations were left vacant, due to the fact that no nominations were received from the organizations. Since the initial recruitment process, Legislative Services have received two nomination applications to fill the vacancies, as follows:

On May 17, 2017, Legislative Services received an application from Gavin Palmer to serve as the Queensborough Resident’s Association representative to the Neighbourhood Traffic Advisory Committee.

On July 6, 2017, Legislative Services received an application from Sukhdeep Jassar, MPH to serve as the Fraser Health representative to the Community and Social Issues Committee.

OPTIONS

Option 1: THAT Council appoint Gavin Palmer as the Queensborough Resident’s Association Representative to the Neighbourhood Traffic Advisory Committee (NTAC) for the term ending January 31, 2018; and,

Option 2: THAT Council appoint Sukhdeep Jassar, MPH as the Fraser Health Representative to the Community and Social Issues Committee (CSI) for the term ending January 31, 2018; and,

Option 3: Please provide staff with other direction.

Staff recommends Options 1 and 2.

CONCLUSION

Appointments to Advisory Committees, Boards and Commissions must be authorized by a Council resolution.

This report has been prepared by
Heather Corbett, Committee Clerk
This report was reviewed by:

Jacqueline Killawee  
Acting City Clerk

Lisa Spitale  
Chief Administrative Officer

Approved for Presentation to Council
RECOMMENDATION

THAT the fire escape stairs at 642 Columbia Street be enhanced through a combination of design/public art interventions as described in this report.

PURPOSE

The purpose of this report is to present the results of a review of alternative fire escape options for the heritage building at 642 Columbia Street and potential aesthetic enhancement concepts consistent with the design intent of the Front Street Mews.

BACKGROUND

The demolition of the western portion of the Front Street parkade required removal of the existing ramps/stairs linking two buildings (600 and 642 Columbia Street) to the parkade structure. After removal of the old connections, new fire egress stairways were required to be installed for these buildings. The replacement stairway for 600 Columbia Street is completed and the stairway for 642 Columbia Street is the subject of this report.
The heritage building on 642 Columbia Street located at the northwest corner of Front Street and McKenzie Street has three levels. The first level is at-grade on Front Street. The second or middle level has an at-grade front entrance on Columbia Street. The third level is one floor above Columbia Street on the north half of the building (see Figure 1). The rear of the second and the third/roof levels had fire escape connections to Decks A and B of the now-demolished west parkade respectively (see Figure 2).

As concerns have been expressed regarding the appearance of the replacement fire exit stairs (Figure 3), staff explored potential interior changes to 642 Columbia Street, such as secondary egress, that could allow for the exterior fire escape stairs to be removed; and alternatively, potential mitigation methods for enhancing the appearance of the exterior fire escape stairs.

**EXISTING POLICY/PRACTICE**

All new buildings are designed with a secondary means of egress in addition to the main entrance in accordance with B.C. Building Code requirements. Due to the unique nature of historic buildings, code consultants are engaged to provide advice on the specifics of each building and location.
DISCUSSION

Alternate Fire Egress Options for 642 Columbia Street

A building code consultant with heritage expertise (McGinn Engineering and Preservation Services) was retained to explore interior fire egress alternatives and to provide preliminary cost estimates.

McGinn Engineering developed an option that involved improving the fire rating of the top floor and exit doorway, and constructing either an internal or external egress stairway from the middle floor to Front St. If an internal stair were to be constructed, the preferred location would be inside the south building wall within the existing electrical meter room; however this would necessitate establishing a new corridor configuration on the main floor and relocation of the main electrical circuit panel and meter. This solution was reviewed with the building owner but considered too disruptive to the building tenants.

The consultant also examined alternative configurations of exterior fire escape concepts attached to the building. These concepts would provide egress connection from the second floor to the sidewalk and also include access to and from the third floor. Each concept would require a new fire alarm panel and additional fire detection on each floor, and installation of sprinkler heads in all window areas that would be adjacent to the stairs. In addition, these concepts require new external structural steel works and relocation/repurposing of the current fire escape stairs. The cost estimates of these options are discussed in the Financial Impact section.

Repurposing of the Current Stair Structure

If an alternative interior or exterior fire escape solution for the building at 642 Columbia St. is implemented in the foreseeable future, it is possible that the existing stairs could be repurposed for use at another location. The remaining portion of the Front Street Parkade has two sets of aging stairs that will eventually require replacement, likely within the next 10 years. One is located on the Frontage Road east of the Westley Military Surplus Store. The other is located at the back of 430 Columbia Street and east of the Army & Navy Store. A cursory review suggests that the stairs at 642 Columbia Street could be repurposed for use in the replacement of the parkade stairs near Westley Military Surplus store although some modifications and sidewalk widening would be required. The existing stairway at the back of 430 Columbia Street and east of the Army & Navy Store has limited right-of-way and would require structural integration to an elaborate two level walkway structure connecting each level of the parkade to Columbia St. and Front St. Given the complexity and restricted right-of-way, this site is not considered a practical location for repurposing the 642 Columbia Street stairs (cost would likely exceed $1.0 M).
Potential Aesthetic Enhancements to Existing Fire Exit Stairs

The fire exit stairs, as they currently exist, are shown in Figure 3. Final connection of the stairway to the building at 642 Columbia St. is awaiting removal of existing overhead electrical and telecommunication cables. This work is expected to occur in October, and once removed, the stairway may be connected to the building.

Staff are currently exploring preliminary options for a design and/or public art intervention that would help transform the stature of the stairway into a design feature along the existing streetscape (refer to Figure 4). The high level concepts being explored include:

1. Decorative, perforated metal screens: Metal mesh or perforated panels may be added to the triangular openings on either side of the structure. The perforations may be designed to play with light and shadow reflections during the daytime and may be a lit feature at nighttime (refer to Figure 5).

2. Artistic projections: An artistic image(s) may be projected on the stairs at nighttime. The projections may be a rotating exhibit or coinciding with special/seasonal events on Front Street. The projection may also be interactive, providing the opportunity for the public to participate in the installation and create ongoing programming. (refer to Figure 6).

3. Projected gobo lighting: A pattern of light and colour may be projected on to the stairs at nighttime, colours and patterns may change with special/seasonal events (refer to Figure 7).
The Public Arts Advisory Committee has expressed support for allocating public arts funding to enhance the aesthetics of the fire escape stairs if the City chooses to retain it at the current location at the Mews.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

A summary of the alternative solutions considered in this report is outlined in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Additional Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternate Exterior Fire Egress Options for 642 Columbia Street</td>
<td>$252,000 to $380,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relocate and repurpose the current fire escape staircase at 642 Columbia Street to Parkade near Westley Military Surplus Store (west side of Army &amp; Navy Store)</td>
<td>$190,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetic Enhancements to Existing Fire Egress Staircase at 642 Columbia St.</td>
<td>$25,000 - $100,000¹</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**INTERDEPARTMENTAL LIAISON**

This report was prepared collaboratively between the Development Services and Engineering Departments.

**OPTIONS**

The following options are presented for Council’s consideration:

1) That the fire escape stairs at 642 Columbia Street be enhanced through a combination of design/public art interventions as described in this report;

¹ Potential funding from the City Public Art reserves.
2) That an alternate external stair system at 642 Columbia Street and repurposing of the existing stairs to the Front St. parkade be further pursued;

3) That Council provide alternative direction to staff.

Given that interior fire escape modifications are considered too disruptive to the tenants of 642 Columbia Street and the high cost of a new exterior solution providing only moderate aesthetic improvement, staff recommends that Council approve Option 1.

CONCLUSION

Demolition of the western portion of the Front Street parkade required the replacement of the previous fire escape for the heritage building at 642 Columbia Street with a free-standing stairway on Front Street Mews. A review of alternate fire escape options including internal building modifications and external systems was undertaken by a code consultant specialized in heritage buildings. Internal building modifications are not supported by the property owner at this time. As the costs of the alternate fire escape options including repurposing/relocating the current stairs are significant, staff explored methods of enhancing the appearance of the existing stairs. Examples of aesthetic enhancement concepts are included in this report for consideration.

This report has been prepared by:
Catalin Dobrescu, P.Eng., Utilities and Special Projects Engineer
Christy Mereigh, Manager of Building Inspections
Erika Mashig, Parks and Open Public Space Planner

This report was reviewed by:
Eugene Wat, P.Eng., PTOE., Manager of Infrastructure Planning

Approved for Presentation to Council

Jackie Teed, Acting Director of Development Services

Lisa Spitale, Chief Administrative Officer

For Jim Lowrie, Eng. L., MBA
Director of Engineering Services

Agenda Item 383/2017
REPORT
Engineering Services

To: Mayor Coté and Members of Council Date: 9/18/2017

From: Jim Lowrie File: 02.0535.20-01
Director of Engineering Services

Item #: 386/2017

Subject: Sale of Tanaka Court Properties

RECOMMENDATION

THAT Council receive this report for information.

PURPOSE

The purpose of the report is to provide Council with information on the sale of the property at 1130 Boyd Street and surplus road allowance on Tanaka Court.

BACKGROUND

Staff has concluded the negotiation on the terms and conditions of the Purchase and Sales Agreement acceptable to the City and the Purchaser, 103566 B.C. Ltd. for the subject properties.

EXISTING POLICY

The subject properties have been evaluated using the Policy Framework for the Disposition of City Owned Land and has met the criteria for disposition. An assessment of the City’s evaluation criteria for disposition of the subject property can be found in Attachment #1.
ANALYSIS

Staff continued negotiations with the Purchaser on terms and conditions satisfactory to both parties. The negotiations were recently concluded and the key terms of the Purchase and Sale Agreement are as follows:

Purchase Price - $1.29 million subject to rezoning
Deposit - $64,500
Conditions - Purchaser to be responsible for tree survey, arborist report and cost of removal of trees on the subject properties.
Completion Date - 30 days after waiver of conditions precedent.
Due Diligence - Subject to environmental review

INTERDEPARTMENTAL LIAISON

This report has been prepared in consultation with the Finance and IT Department. The City solicitor assisted in the preparation of the lease document.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 - Evaluation Criteria for Disposition

This report has been prepared by:
Terry Atherton, P. Eng., Manager of Civic Buildings & Properties

Approved for Presentation to Council

For Jim Lowrie, ENG. L., MBA
Director of Engineering Services

Lisa Spitale
Chief Administrative Officer
Attachment 1

Evaluation Criteria for Disposition
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Determining Factor</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Park land or a community / recreational facility</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Protection of environmentally sensitive areas or mitigation of natural hazards</td>
<td>Trees on site,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Waterfront property</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Civic facilities, such as City Hall, libraries, museums, police and fire department buildings</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Civic operational facilities, such as engineering operations yard, tow yard and the animal shelter</td>
<td>Possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Civic infrastructure, such as utilities</td>
<td>It has been investigated for an electrical substation but it is too far from the desired location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Vehicular, pedestrian, cycling and other modes of transportation, parking facilities.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Retention for use by other government bodies, such as Fraser Health, Metro Vancouver parks</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Retention for use by private agencies, such as leases to non-profit organizations</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Furthering objectives of Council adopted policies, including community plans and economic development or environmental or social objectives</td>
<td>It furthers the land use designations in the Queensborough Community Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Fulfilling an historical obligation attached to the property i.e. the property was gifted for a particular purpose</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>The protection of significant historical or cultural resources</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Fulfilling DCC commitments</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRITERIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td>Does the sale of the property support or hinder the realization of Council adopted policies, such as community plans, the Livable City Strategy and other economic development, social or environmental objectives?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td>Does the sale of the property have an economic benefit to the City? Is the location of the property and the proposed land use resulting from the sale a positive benefit to the liveability and economic development of the City?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td>In the case of a proposed purchase for a specific purpose, does the location of the property maximize economic benefits to the City (i.e. synergies with the private sector and leveraging economic development opportunities with private and public partners).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td>Is the retention of the property financially supportable in the short term, in terms of operating costs and other financial costs to the City?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td>Is the sale of the property supportable in terms of optimizing the potential long term financial return? Considerations include: 1) Are there anticipated changes within the area, such as adjacent development or servicing which would increase the financial return? 2) Would potential lot assemblies or partnership with adjacent land owners maximize the financial return on the property? 3) What is the current market for this type of property and land use? 4) Can the property be sold for its appraised market value?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td>Is there an overall community / social good to be gained through the retention of the property? If there is a community / social good, how much is the opportunity cost in terms of lost revenue and amount of potential subsidy required by the City to attain or retain the social good?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td>Can the property be considered for the development of affordable housing either in consolidation with other properties or by itself?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Queensborough Plan Designates this area for casino, commercial and light industrial uses. The property will be consolidated with a hard to develop private site to yield a good development site.

Yes - it is surplus road and a hard to develop City site and hard to develop private site that will be consolidated and used for commercial purposes providing employment and taxation.

Yes - it is surplus road and a hard to develop City site and hard to develop private site that will be consolidated and used for commercial purposes providing employment and taxation.

Some maintenance is required but there are few costs associated with the property.

The City is not selling the entire portion of the roadway that is being closed. Another portion of the roadway can be combined with a private property to provide a site for development.

na

na

The Queensborough OCP designates this area for commercial, industrial and the casino.
RECOMMENDATION

THAT Council accept as information this report on a BCIT research project that would include installation of up to 12, Level 2 public electric vehicle charging stations in New Westminster.

PURPOSE

The purpose of this report is to provide Council with notification on a demonstration project led by the BCIT Smart Microgrid Applied Research Team in partnership with City of New Westminster. The objective of this pilot initiative is to understand and evaluate the technical and operational aspects of integrating curbside electric vehicle charging points tied into the City’s streetlight infrastructure.

BACKGROUND

In August 2017, a research team from BCIT’s Smart Microgrid Applied Research Team met with Mayor Coté and staff from the Electrical Utility and Engineering Services regarding a research and demonstration initiative that would entail potential installation of up to 12, ground-level Level 2 electric vehicle (EV) charging stations in New Westminster. This Federally funded pilot initiative includes identification of potential EV charging locations based upon technical screening of LED streetlight infrastructure that could feasibly support
an integrated Level 2 charging unit. These locations would also be evaluated on suitability for curbside charging and consideration of site-specific transportation and street use criteria, with the objective of having the recommended locations identified over the next several weeks.

Once a shortlist of EV sites has been identified and approved, the project will enter a design phase, with development of civil and electrical engineering specifications, as well as preliminary costing for each location. This would be followed by installation of the electrical infrastructure and Level 2 charging unit(s) at each site. Concurrent with the design and installation phases, BCIT would coordinate and consolidate analysis on these sites, as well as summarize technical conclusions and pragmatic considerations arising from the project. Federal requirements on this BCIT-led project require that all charging sites are installed and operational well before March 31, 2018.

**EXISTING POLICY/PRACTICE**

**Utility Commission Strategic Plan**

The Electrical Utility Commission Strategic Plan has an objective to embrace clean energy and the green economy through distributed renewable energy systems, micro-grid and neighbourhood-scale projects, as well as pursuing opportunities for grid modernization and fibre-optic digital infrastructure in New Westminster. As LED based street lighting becomes the norm in New Westminster, this potentially frees up electrical power at the streetlight that could be utilized for EV charging. Furthermore, as electric vehicles become more popular and widespread, understanding the policy implications and technical integration aspects of this transition become increasingly important for electrical utilities.

**Community Energy and Emissions Plan**

New Westminster’s *Community Energy & Emissions Plan (CEEP)* identifies actions and strategies to improve energy efficiency and reduce greenhouse gas emissions to meet the community-wide targets expressed in the Official Community Plan. Section 6.4 of the CEEP lays out a strategy for low-carbon mobility in New Westminster as part of enhancing sustainable transportation options within the community. This includes opportunities to support more efficient vehicle travel through programs targeted at: (a) reducing single-occupancy vehicle trips (particularly for commuting); (b) influencing the purchase of smaller, cleaner vehicles and supporting infrastructure; and (c) reducing commercial vehicle fuel use through ‘greener’ fleets (i.e., electrification, clean fuels) and improved trip planning for goods movement.

**DISCUSSION**

Electric vehicle infrastructure is a critical component in shifting light-duty vehicles away from fossil fuels, as well as adequately preparing for increased market uptake of electric
vehicles by local residents and businesses. Currently, one of the greatest barriers to widespread adoption of electric vehicles is lack of convenient access to EV charging. Unlike traditional gasoline and diesel refuelling stations, which are common and widely distributed, electric vehicle charging infrastructure is currently at the early adoption stage. However, charging of electric vehicles can potentially occur wherever sufficient electrical power and connection equipment is available, for example, at home or at a parking stall at work (where owners have installed the necessary equipment), or at a commercial site or public location (e.g., community centres, parking lots, on-street charging). At present, the number of public charging points, while growing across the Metro Vancouver region, is still limited.

This BCIT-led and Federally funded EV infrastructure demonstration project provides an opportunity for the City to participate in technical screening, design analysis and installation of limited number of publicly accessible Level 2 charging stations in New Westminster. Potential sites include street level EV charging points adjacent to parallel or angled parking stalls, with some EV charging potentially situated within public parking lots. For purposes of this research project, these charging stations would be integrated into nearby streetlight infrastructure that meet the electrical standards necessary to support Level 2 charging. This scope of work is the basis for the technical research being conducted on this project.

The learning and experiences gathered from this seven-month BCIT pilot project will also inform City staff as they develop a comprehensive Electric Vehicle Strategy for New Westminster, during that time period. The development of the EV Strategy would be a cross-departmental planning and policy effort, and is proposed to get underway later this fall, and will be the subject of a subsequent Council Report.

SUSTAINABILITY IMPLICATIONS

In addition to supporting the strategies and actions from New Westminster’s Community Energy and Emissions Plan (CEEP) and Utility Commission Strategic Plan, specific objectives on low-carbon mobility are included within New Westminster’s Official Community Plan 2017. OCP policy #4.1: Reduce transportation energy use and related greenhouse gas emissions recognizes that providing a wider range of low-carbon travel options decreases vehicle use, reduces transportation-related GHG emissions, improves air quality, and is beneficial to local residents and businesses. Options include clean energy vehicles such as electric cars and electric bicycles that the City can support by investing in public charging stations and supporting similar initiatives on private property. Car-sharing options are also encouraged, to provide local residents with quick, on-demand access to a car or truck without the cost of owning a vehicle. As battery power and drivetrain technologies improve, providers such as EVO, Car2Go, Modo and ZipCar may increasingly supplement their hybrid-powered fleets with plug-in vehicles over time.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

This pilot demonstration project is being led by a team from British Columbia Institute of Technology’s Smart Grid Microgrid Applied Research Team, with technical analysis and
review, research and reporting, as well as direct funding for civil design and installation of Level 2 chargers providing by the Federal Government.

INTERDEPARTMENTAL LIAISON

Staff from the Electrical Utility and Engineering Services department will be involved throughout the 7-month pilot project, working with the BCIT research team to screen and select EV charging locations, and assist BCIT in developing the civil and electrical specifications for installation of the distributed Level 2 charging points.

OPTIONS

The following options are presented for Council’s consideration:

1. THAT Council accept this report on a Federally funded BCIT research project for installation of up to 12, Level 2 public electric vehicle charging stations in New Westminster as information; or,

2. THAT Council provide staff with alternative direction.

Staff recommends option 1.

This report has been prepared by:
Norm Connolly, Community Energy Manager

Approved for Presentation to Council

Rod Carle
General Manager, Electrical Utility

Lisa Spitale
Chief Administrative Officer

For Jim Lowrie, Eng. L., MBA
Director, Engineering Services

Agenda Item 384/2017
RECOMMENDATION

THAT Council receives this report on the status of the City's investment portfolio for information.

SUMMARY

The City’s investment portfolio has a balance of $160 million (market value $158 million) as at August 31, 2017. The portfolio balance is $10 million higher than it was at August 31, 2016 which is primarily due to payments received from DAC. The City also holds a vendor-take-back (VTB) mortgage on the Anvil Office Tower in the amount of $25.3 million due December 30th, 2017 with an interest rate of 1.92% compounding semi-annually.

The City has earned $2.1 million in income on its investments for the year to date period achieving approximately 83% of its annual revenue budget of $2.6 million. Year to date unrealized market losses are $1.4 million.¹

Current yields in the bond market are low and in some cases negative due to the recent increase in interest rates. It is expected that there will be recovery over the longer term and the City is currently holding its investment position in longer term investments and funding

¹ Unrealized market losses do not impact the City's annualized Return on Investment unless investments in the MFA’s Intermediate and Bond Funds are liquidated and the losses become “realized”.

cash requirements from the intermediate fund as required. The current investment portfolio has $146 million in MFA intermediate and bond funds.

**BALANCES**

On August 31, 2017 the City's investment balances were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Carrying Value</th>
<th>Market Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scotia Bank</td>
<td>$8,211,377</td>
<td>$8,211,377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Finance Authority (MFA) Pooled Investment Funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money Market Fund</td>
<td>5,628,892</td>
<td>5,628,892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate Fund</td>
<td>58,535,622</td>
<td>57,834,237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond Fund</td>
<td>87,945,771</td>
<td>86,733,998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total MFA</td>
<td>$152,110,285</td>
<td>$150,197,127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Investments</td>
<td>$160,321,662</td>
<td>$158,408,504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIB Mortgage</td>
<td>$25,250,000</td>
<td>$25,250,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Schedule “A” provides additional information on the above investments.

**MUNICIPAL FINANCE AUTHORITY (‘MFA’) POOLED INVESTMENT FUNDS**

The MFA investment program offers pooled investment options in the Money Market, Intermediate, and Bond Funds. Municipalities may participate in one or all of the funds for competitive rates of return and excellent liquidity in low risk investments.

The MFA is capable of generating competitive returns due to fewer restrictions through legislation than that of municipalities. The funds are well diversified and managed by Phillips, Hager & North in compliance with MFA’s investment policies. The funds are benchmarked against Financial Times Stock Exchange (FTSE) indices and are shown on Schedule “B” attached.

Reported returns are based on the market value of the investments held by the funds on the reporting date. The market values may fluctuate significantly depending on volatility in the market. The actual returns that are experienced in the fund will depend on when the investments are sold or mature.
The annualized rates of return as at July 31, 2017 for MFA funds measured against the FTSE were: Money Market Fund 0.86%; Intermediate Fund 0.71%; and Bond Fund -0.17%; the annualized rates of return of the FTSE benchmarks were 0.37%, -0.03%, and -0.56% respectively (Schedule B). The MFA continues to perform above the benchmark and investment performance has remained at approximately the same level for the last six months for the Money Market Fund and has declined for the Intermediate and Bond Funds.

**MARKET OUTLOOK**

The Bank of Canada’s September 6, 2017 press release states that the bank has increased its overnight rate to 1%. Global economic growth has been stronger than anticipated but current risks and uncertainties about fiscal policies and trade issues have led to a weaker US dollar. Inflation in Canada is below the 2% target.

**ATTACHMENTS**

Attachment #1 - Schedule A & B

---

Attachment #1

Schedule A – Investments Held as at August 31, 2017

Schedule B – Annualized Rates of Return on MFA Funds as at August 31, 2017
## Schedule A

**Investments Held as at August 31, 2017**

### INVESTMENT MIX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investment Type</th>
<th>Investments Balance</th>
<th>% of Group Total</th>
<th>Max Allowable per Investment Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bank Accounts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotia Bank</td>
<td>$ 8,211,377</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short Term Investments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFA Money Market Fund</td>
<td>$ 5,628,892</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Term Investments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFA Intermediate Fund</td>
<td>$ 57,834,237</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFA Bond Fund</td>
<td>$ 86,733,998</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Term Investments Total</td>
<td>144,568,235</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Investments</td>
<td>$ 158,408,504</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** the City holds a vendor-take-back mortgage on the Anvil Office Tower in the amount of $25,250,000. The interest rate is 1.92% compounded semi-annually and the mortgage is due on December 30th, 2017.
Schedule B
Annualized Rates of Return on MFA Funds
As at July 31, 2017 *

MFA Money Market Fund

Year-to-Date %
Non-annualized: -0.51%
One Year %
Annualized: 0.86%
Since Inception %
Annualized: 3.99%

MFA Intermediate Fund

Year-to-Date %
Non-annualized: -0.28%
One Year %
Annualized: 0.71%
Since Inception %
Annualized: 3.61%

MFA Bond Fund

Year-to-Date %
Non-annualized: -0.02%
One Year %
Annualized: -0.17%
Since Inception %
Annualized: 6.09%
There is no Report with this Item. Please see Attachment(s).
A Bylaw to authorize undergrounding of existing overhead utilities on the east side of 200 Block of Howes Street

WHEREAS a petition has been received to underground existing overhead utilities on the east side of 200 Block of Howes Street, Queensborough, excluding the Howes Street frontages of the following properties:

- 921 Salter Street
- 936 Ewen Avenue

and the City Clerk on August 31, 2017 certified that the petition is sufficient;

AND WHEREAS it is expedient to grant the request of the petition in the manner hereinafter provided;

NOW THEREFORE the Municipal Council of the Corporation of the City of New Westminster in open meeting assembled ENACTS AS FOLLOWS:

1. This Bylaw may be cited as LOCAL Area Service BYLAW NO. 7942, 2017.
2. That undergrounding of overhead utilities such as Hydro, Telus and Shaw at above mentioned locations be constructed as a Local Area Service under the provisions of the “Community Charter”.
3. The estimated cost to underground the overhead utilities is $200,400, including 5% GST and 10% contingency for cost overruns.
4. The Corporation’s portion of the cost of the work is 50%. The Property Owners’ portion of the cost is 50%.
5. The Property Owner shall pay its share of actual cost of the work.
6. The Director of Engineering Services does forthwith make such plans, profiles and such specifications and furnish such information as may be necessary for the making of a contract for the execution of the work in coordination with development in the area.
7. The work shall be carried out and executed under the superintendence and according to the directions and orders of such Engineer.
8. The Mayor and Clerk are authorized to cause a contract for the construction of the work to be made and entered into with some person or persons, firm or corporation.
9. The Director of Finance and Information Technology may, subject to the approval of the Council and the Inspector of Municipalities first had and obtained, agree with any
10. The Local Service Tax to recover the property Owners’ portion of the cost to carry out the overhead conversion works is to be determined on the basis of the Frontage – Taxable Meters of the properties on east side of Howes Street abutting the work, from north property line of 255 Howes Street to the south property line of 207 Howes Street.

11. The local Service Tax is to be paid in twenty (20) consecutive annual installments, commencing in the year after completion of the work.

12. The Property Owner may elect to commute the Local Service Tax, by payment of a one-time amount up until May 31, 2018.

13. Any time after June 1, 2018 the Property owner may elect to commute the balance of the local service Tax by payment of a one-time amount equal to the Property Owner’s portion of the remaining principal of the cost of the work, as of the prior year’s tax notice due date, plus interest to the commuted payment date.

GIVEN FIRST READING this 11th day of September, 2017.

GIVEN SECOND READING this 11th day of September, 2017.

GIVEN THIRD READING this 11th day of September, 2017.

ADOPTED and the Seal of the Corporation of the City of New Westminster affixed this    day of    , 2017.

___________________________
MAYOR

___________________________
CITY CLERK
AERIAL MAP OF HOWES ST LAS BENEFITING PROPERTIES - BYLAW NO. 7942, 2017

Aerial Photo of Howes St (benefitting properties)
RECOMMENDATION

WHEREAS the Council considers that property at 647 Ewen Avenue has, or may have, sufficient heritage value or heritage character to justify its conservation;

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the property is subject to temporary protection pursuant to s. 606 of the Local Government Act, for 60 days commencing on the date of this Resolution;

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the prohibitions in s. 609 of the Local Government Act apply to the property without exception during the 60-day period; and

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Director of Development Services or a staff member acting on behalf of the Director be authorized to post one or more notices of temporary heritage protection on the property, in the form attached to this report, and to remove the notice or notices upon the expiry of the 60-day period.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

As per the City’s heritage review policy, the Community Heritage Commission reviewed the demolition application for the 1931 National Slovak Society Building located at 647 Ewen Avenue in Queensborough. The Commission has requested that Council place a 60 day temporary protection order on the property, the purpose of which is to allow time for staff
and the applicant to consider heritage retention options. This demolition application is not covered by the heritage control period bylaw.

The temporary protection notice form is attached in Appendix A.

**PURPOSE**

The purpose of this report is to request Council to direct that a temporary protection order for 60 days be placed on the property.

**POLICY CONTEXT**

**Existing Heritage Review Policy**

The City’s heritage review policy requires that demolition permits for all buildings and other heritage elements older than 50 years be reviewed by the Planning Division and be referred to the Community Heritage Commission for comment if deemed by the Planning Division to have sufficient heritage significance to warrant additional consideration.

**Temporary Protection Orders**

Council may place a temporary protection order by resolution on a specific property for a period of up to 60 days.

The order may require that no actions or work be carried out on the property. Once the 60 days has passed, if no viable long-term protection options are identified, the applicant may proceed with the existing application. It may be made in relation to a property that is or may be ‘heritage property’, which is defined in the Local Government Act as a property that is considered by Council to have sufficient ‘heritage value’ or ‘heritage character’ to justify its conservation. This may include properties that are not listed on the Heritage Register. The intention of a temporary protection order is to allow for consideration of future long-term protection options for a property and allow time to negotiate an appropriate resolution with the property owner.

**Heritage Designation**

A Heritage Designation Bylaw places long-term protection on the land title of a property and is the primary form of protection that can prohibit demolition. Council has the authority to place heritage designation on a property without the owner’s consent. The owner then has one year in which to prove that the designation caused a reduction in the market value of the property and claim compensation. The amount of compensation is subject to mutual agreement or, if necessary, arbitration.
BACKGROUND

Proposal

An application was made on July 21, 2017 to demolish the 1931 National Slovak Society Building at 647 Ewen Avenue in order to construct two new single detached dwellings on the property.

Property Description

The subject property is situated at the north-east corner of Wood Street and Ewen Avenue, across Wood Street from Sukh Sagar Community Park. Though Ewen was historically a commercial street, today the site and surrounding neighbourhood is now zoned Queensborough Neighbourhood Residential Dwelling Districts (RQ-1) for low-density residential use.

The heritage building straddles an existing lot line. Should the building be demolished, a new single-detached residential dwelling, with secondary suite, could be constructed on each lot. The new residences would be required to conform to the RQ-1 zoning districts. A site location map is found in Appendix B.

Site Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zoning RQ-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frontage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total floor space in Existing Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Floor Space Ratio</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Heritage Significance

The building was constructed for the Royal City National Slovak Society, and was later converted to the Slovak Rest Home, though the site was sold in the 1970s and operated privately as a daycare centre and subsequently a private residence. The building is deemed to have value for its cultural and historic associations, as well as its aesthetics.

The building is false fronted, with a structural gabled roof behind. There is an eyebrow portico at the entranceway, and the second storey of the false front is accentuated by a pediment. Both portico and pediment reference the Mission Revival Style. However, having been built in the Great Depression by a non-profit cultural society, the building is relatively simple, compared to the elaborate Colonial/Mission Revivals popular in the area in the
In the early days of Ewen Avenue’s development, the false-front style was common to the commercial high street. Notably, the Slovak Hall was accompanied by White’s Store on the south side of the street at 646 Ewen Avenue. The properties located at 401 Ewen Avenue and 116 Ewen Avenue were also false fronted community buildings: the Tatra (Czech) Hall and Howes Clothing and Grocery respectively. The false fronted community and commercial buildings are reflective of the early settlement of Queensborough. The subject property 647 Ewen Avenue is the only false front building remaining along Ewen Avenue.

The Slovakian community is one of half-dozen foundational cultural groups in Queensborough, and is named in the community’s Historic Context Statement and in the Queensborough Community Plan’s Context chapter. The building tells the story of the early cultural communities, primarily involved in agricultural production and logging, who settled the area. It is reflective of the diversity of the settling community. Other community groups who built similar community halls include Italian, Czech, Japanese, Scandinavian and South Asian (Sikh).

An archival photograph of the building is found in Appendix C, and the Inventory listing for the property is attached as Appendix D.

**Condition**

From a preliminary visual analysis, foundation work is required, as well as stabilization of the front portico and restoration of the original stucco siding. To assist in evaluating the potential of restoring this house, staff has recommended that the applicant have a conditions assessment carried out on the property.

A photograph of the building in 2016 is found in Appendix E.

**COMMUNITY HERITAGE COMMISSION**

As per the City’s heritage review policy and given the heritage significance of the property the demolition application for 647 Ewen Avenue was brought to the Community Heritage Commission (CHC) for comment. At the September 6th, 2017 meeting, the CHC passed the following recommendation to Council:

> That the Community Heritage Commission forward a request to Council for Temporary Protection on the building at 647 Ewen Avenue, and for Staff to discuss the restoration of the building façade as a component of a new structure with the Applicant.
**DISCUSSION**

**Development Opportunity**

The subject site has two frontages and is over 9,500 ft² (882.5 m²) which result in high potential for the negotiation of a Heritage Revitalization Agreement (HRA). An HRA could include restoration and protection of the 1930s building in exchange for relaxations to the Zoning Bylaw and/or additional density on the site.

**Ongoing Negotiation**

Following the September 6 CHC meeting, staff has continued discussions with the property owner and potential buyer regarding redevelopment options by way of retaining the existing heritage valued home. The temporary protection order would give more time to explore these redevelopment options and the potential benefits to the owner and/or developer.

**OPTIONS**

The following options are presented for Council consideration:

1) **THAT** Council approve the following resolution:

   WHEREAS the Council considers that property at 647 Ewen Avenue has, or may have, sufficient heritage value or heritage character to justify its conservation;

   BE IT RESOLVED THAT the property is subject to temporary protection pursuant to s. 606 of the Local Government Act, for 60 days commencing on the date of this Resolution;

   BE IT RESOLVED THAT the prohibitions in s. 609 of the Local Government Act apply to the property without exception during the 60-day period; and

   BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Director of Development Services or a staff member acting on behalf of the Director be authorized to post one or more notices of temporary heritage protection on the property, in the form attached to this report, and to remove the notice or notices upon the expiry of the 60-day period.

2) That Council direct staff to proceed with processing the demolition application for 647 Ewen Avenue.

3) That Council direct staff to begin the process to place formal protection on the property at 647 Ewen Avenue through a Heritage Designation Bylaw.
4) That Council give staff alternative direction.

Staff recommends option 1.

**ATTACHMENTS**

Attachment A: Protection Notice  
Attachment B: Location Map  
Attachment C: Archival Photograph of Building  
Attachment D: Heritage Inventory Listing  
Attachment E: Photograph of Building in 2016
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This report was reviewed by:  
John Stark, Acting Manager of Planning  

Approved for Presentation to Council

Jackie Teed  
Acting Director of Development Services  
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Chief Administrative Officer
Appendix A

Protection Notice Form
CITY OF NEW WESTMINSTER

NOTICE OF HERITAGE PROTECTION

This property is the subject of a heritage protection order made by the Council of the City of New Westminster on [insert date].

It is an offence under Part 15 of the Local Government Act, punishable by a fine of up to $50,000.00 or imprisonment for up to 2 years, or both, for any person to alter the exterior of any building on the property; make a structural change to any building on the property; move a building on the property; or alter, excavate or build on the property, except as permitted by the terms of the heritage protection order.

Details of the heritage protection order may be obtained from the City’s Heritage Planner at 604 527-4532 or in person at City Hall, Planning Division, 511 Royal Avenue.

It is an offence under Part 15 of the Local Government Act for any person to alter or remove this notice.
Appendix B

Location Map
This map is a user generated static output from an Internet mapping site and is for reference only. Data layers that appear on this map may or may not be accurate, current, or otherwise reliable.
Appendix C

Archival Photograph of

Building
Appendix  D

Heritage Inventory Listing
Slovak Home
647 Ewen Avenue
1939
Mission Revival Style -- Modern Period

Built in 1939 by the Royal City National Slovak Society, the Slovak Rest Home was subsequently converted to a Daycare Centre in 1973. The structure features a gabled roof with a false stepped gable facade. The front entrance is accentuated by an ogee pediment which indicates a secondary influence from the Colonial Revival style. The building has a single gable dormer, intersecting side gable, and stucco siding.
Appendix E

Photograph of Building in 2016