SPECIAL REGULAR MEETING OF 
CITY COUNCIL

Notice is hereby given of the following Special Regular Meeting of Council:
May 14, 2018 at 9:30 a.m.
Council Chamber, City Hall

AGENDA

Call to order.

Call to order.

RECEIVED FOR ACTION

1. Queen’s Park Heritage Conservation Area Incentive Program: Proposed Implementation Framework, Acting Director of Development Services
   a. Staff Report (Tabled May 7, 2018)
   ai. Incentive Framework for Protected Properties in the Queen’s Park Heritage Conservation Area (On Table)
   aii. (PowerPoint) Queen’s Park Heritage Conservation Area Proposed Incentives Program Implementation Framework (On Table)

CONSENT AGENDA

2. Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure: Outstanding Referral for Street Closure Bylaw No. 7935, 2017, Director of Engineering Services
ITEMS REMOVED FROM THE CONSENT AGENDA

BYLAWS

3. REGARDING Wood-Boyne Street Road Closure Bylaw No. 7935, 2017:

THAT Adoption of Bylaw No. 7935, 2017 be RESCINDED

EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC

4. 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 Section 90(1)(f) of the Community Charter:

(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;

Purpose of the meeting:
Law enforcement matters

ADJOURNMENT

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

THAT Council endorse the Incentive Framework as outlined in this report, and direct staff to proceed with the necessary steps for implementation.

PURPOSE

The purpose of this report is to summarize the results of the final round of consultation for the Queen’s Park Heritage Conservation Area Incentives program and request Council endorsement of the incentive options and implementation framework described in this report.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The consultation and research phases of the Incentives Program for the Queen’s Park Heritage Conservation Area are complete. This report summarizes the results of the latest round of consultation, held in April, and presents an Implementation Framework for the Incentives Program. The Implementation Framework is summarised in Image 1.
### Categories of Incentives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Increase in Density</td>
<td>• Increase principal dwelling FSR&lt;br&gt;• More achievable laneway house density</td>
<td>• Larger laneway house</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Relaxation of Regulations</td>
<td>• Relax laneway house guidelines&lt;br&gt;• Relax Building Code</td>
<td>• Heritage Development Variance Permit Policy</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Change of Tenure</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Stratify Laneway House and Principal Dwelling&lt;br&gt;• Multiple Unit Conversion (Rental)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Process and Other Changes</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Expedite related city permits.&lt;br&gt;• Add services for owners doing renovations&lt;br&gt;• Refine Evaluation Checklist&lt;br&gt;• Develop additional design guidelines</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Citywide Incentives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Citywide Incentives</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Sewer separation relaxations</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Interpretive Sign Program&lt;br&gt;• Heritage Home Grant Program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### POLICY AND REGULATIONS

**Queen’s Park Heritage Conservation Area**

A Heritage Conservation Area is a distinct neighbourhood, characterized by its historic value, which is identified in a City’s Official Community Plan (OCP) for heritage conservation purposes. The Queen’s Park Heritage Conservation Area is an area management tool, which includes both heritage protection for the exterior of pre-1941...
buildings, and design control for new construction. Properties in the neighbourhood are either protected (Advanced Category, pre-1941) or non-protected (Limited Category, post-1941). A temporary third category (Special Limited) exists for the duration of a study which is scheduled to be complete in 2019. Further information on the Heritage Conservation Area policies and regulations, and a comparison of the different levels of heritage protection, is included in Attachment 2.

BACKGROUND

During the process of creating the Queen’s Park Heritage Conservation Area, concerns were raised by property owners about potential impacts of the policy. In response to these concerns, and consistent with the Neighbourhood Heritage Study Working Group’s recommendations, Council directed staff to explore incentives for protected properties. An Incentives Program was included in the Implementation Work Program for the Heritage Conservation Area, which was endorsed by Council in October 2017.

In response to feedback received from delegations to Council and during the first round of consultation for the Incentives Program (held in December 2017), the City expanded the exploration of approaches to mitigating potential impacts on property owners. A report was presented to Council on March 5, 2018, which provided an update on the progress that had been made since the scope of the Program was expanded. At this meeting, Council endorsed the principle that a broad range of incentives be made available, which would allow property owners to choose which one(s) would best suit their needs.

As part of the research into incentives, a Discussion Paper was prepared by consultants and presented to Council on March 12, 2018. The Discussion Paper overviewed how incentives have been used in other residential Heritage Conservation Areas in British Columbia and presented a wide range of possible incentives for protected properties in Queen’s Park. Based on the findings of the Discussion Paper, staff recommended a broad list of incentives for community consultation and two approaches to implementing those incentives: outright or conditional. Council endorsed staff presenting the range of incentives and implementation options to the community for their review and feedback. This final consultation round was held in early April, 2018.

Also as part of the research, the City retained Coriolis Consulting to complete an economic analysis. This work explored the potential financial impact of the adoption of the Heritage Conservation Area, and the potential financial benefit of zoning incentives being considered. The results of this analysis were presented to Council on April 16, 2018.
CONSULTATION SUMMARY

Overview

The purpose of the most recent consultation was to:

- Understand the level of support for each of the proposed incentives, and the reasoning behind the support/lack of support;
- Understand the level of support for each implementation option (e.g. outright or with conditions) and the reasoning behind each person’s preference; and
- Provide an update to community and committee members who have been actively involved in the Queen’s Park Heritage Conservation Area process to date, while also seeking feedback from Queen’s Park residents who have not yet been active in the process.

The consultation included:

- two public open houses,
- an online survey,
- City committee consultation,
- continued targeted stakeholder consultation, and
- one-on-one meetings, emails, phone calls, and other discussions held with community members.

Both public open houses were held at City Hall. The first was held on Thursday, April 5, 2018 from 5:00pm to 7:30pm. The second was held Saturday, April 7, 2018 from 9:30am to 12:00pm. Participants were provided with a worksheet that they filled out privately with their feedback, rather than having to add their comments using post it notes, which the other participants could review and comment on. Participants also had the opportunity to take their worksheet home and return it to City Hall once completed. A survey with the same background material and questions as the open house worksheets was available through the City’s website from March 20 to April 10, 2018.

Similarly, the incentives proposed to the community through the open houses and survey were presented to the City’s Community Heritage Commission and Advisory Planning Commission for review and comment.

The materials provided to all groups summarized the background and policy context, the possible incentive options, options for the implementation approach, and next steps. The open house presentation boards were prepared in advance of the open houses and the opening of the survey, and were posted online along with the Discussion Paper and staff report. A similar package was circulated to the City committees. This approach was taken to maximize the time participants had to read and review the large quantity of information being presented, before providing their comments and recommendations.
Summary of Community Participation

Overall, the public consultation was considered to have been a success. Community members took time to go through the large amount of information being presented, and provided meaningful feedback. Approximately 80 people attended the open houses and 126 people provided feedback through the online survey.

It is expected that people completed both an open house worksheet and the online survey. Staff did review the IP addresses of the online survey respondents and found 34 responses (or 27% of total online responses) associated with 14 duplicate IP addresses. Based on an analysis of the duplicate responses, staff concludes that they are likely associated with different individuals (e.g. owners and renters or multiple family members living at same address; people using a library or other common computer) and do not compromise the validity of the results.

Event participants and survey respondents were asked to share information about themselves. Providing information was voluntary and was not given by all participants, but the information collected did provide an idea of who participated. The results from demographic questions were compared to the data from the 2016 Census. Key findings include:

- Older adults (between 50 and 64) and seniors (over 65) were over represented (46% and 24% of participants, respectively).
- Young adults (between 25 and 35) and young people (under 25) were under represented (9% and 1% of participants, respectively).
- The majority of participants were property owners (95%).
- The majority of participants lived in the Queen’s Park neighbourhood (89%).
- The majority of participants owned a protected property (74%).
- The majority of participants had previously been involved in the Heritage Conservation Area consultation process (75%).

General Community Feedback

Image 1 provides an overview of the responses received from the community. A comprehensive summary of the feedback received regarding each incentive is provided in Attachment 1. The raw notes from the online survey and open house worksheets are available in Attachment 4.
Image 2: Summary of Level of Support for Each Incentive from Community Consultation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offer Outright</th>
<th>Offer with Conditions</th>
<th>Do Not Offer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Increased FSR for Principal Dwelling</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Existing Basement Floor Space Exclusion</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Existing Attic Floor Space Exclusion</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 More Achievable Laneway or Carriage House Density</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Larger Laneway or Carriage House</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Policy to Support Non-conforming Additions</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Relaxations for Laneway or Carriage House Guidelines</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Sewer Separation Relaxations for Laneway/Carriage Houses</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 Building Code Relaxations</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Stratified Laneway or Carriage House</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Stratified Principal Dwelling</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Multiple Unit Conversion (Rental)</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 Small Lot Subdivision</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Heritage Home Grant Program</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Interpretive Sign Program</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 Expedited Approval Process</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Below are common themes that arose from the comments:

- Concern was expressed about the amount of density being proposed and the associated impact on greenspace, privacy, character, infrastructure, traffic, and demand for parking.
- Some participants expressed concerns that taking advantage of the incentives could require a substantial investment that owners may not be able to achieve.
- Participants also expressed concerns that the incentives would erode the intent of the Heritage Conservation Area by allowing too much change to the character of protected houses.
- Many comments about the overall approach reflected themes of equity and fairness. These were especially reflective of a perceived lack of equity between properties in the neighbourhood, and also a lack of city-wide equity between heritage properties in Queen's Park, compared with heritage properties in other neighbourhoods.
- Concern was expressed that the additional, especially zoning-related, incentives would draw developers to the neighbourhood. Some participants expressed feeling that the incentives are targeted at the development community, rather than owners or families.
- There was continued frustration related to the Heritage Conservation Area’s implementation.
• A number of participants emphasized the need for clear, simple, and transparent regulation. Some favour either outright incentives or none at all in order to reduce confusion.

• There was some confusion between the Heritage Conservation Area’s incentives and the citywide Heritage Revitalization Agreements process.

Stakeholder Feedback

BC Assessment

Discussions with BC Assessment indicated that the majority of single detached dwelling properties in the City of New Westminster had a change in their 2018 assessed value compared to 2017: between -5% to +15%. The change in assessed values in the Queen’s Park neighbourhood was consistent with the general market change for single detached dwelling properties in the rest of the city. BC Assessment indicated that there is no market evidence that isolates a change in value due to the creation of the Queen’s Park Heritage Conservation Area.

Six property owners appealed this year’s assessment, which BC Assessment indicated is a typical number for a neighbourhood. The appeals requested a deduction in value based on the adoption of the Heritage Conservation Area. Based on the lack of evidence of a market change, BC Assessment staff recommended the position of confirming the assessed value. However, the Property Assessment Review Panel agreed to a reduction of 10% of the value for each of the six properties.

Local Financial Institution and Appraiser

Staff interviewed both a financial institution and an appraiser. Generally, when making lending decisions, financial institutions will rely on the appraised value (as opposed to the assessed value), so both perspectives were important.

The financial institution expressed the importance of City policies and regulations being easy to find and understand. This information is considered by the appraiser and by the financial institution when making lending decisions. The financial institution also expressed that the faster they can access the information and gain a clear understanding of property entitlements, the better. The discussion also covered the challenges associated with insurance when homes do not conform to current zoning, particularly when a homeowner would not be permitted to rebuild with the same entitlements after a major fire or other incident.

The appraiser indicated that their assessment would consider the opportunities for a protected property relative to a non-protected property. The main consideration would be whether the property could still reach full development potential. Generally, they interpret any additional regulations as an encumbrance on the property, which reduces value. They did note that there
would be little concern if the house were over density and in good condition. The Heritage Conservation Area design guidelines for non-protected properties were not seen to have an impact on the value of these properties.

**City Committee Feedback**

The incentives being considered, and implementation approaches, were presented to the Community Heritage Commission and the Advisory Planning Commission for their feedback. Their comments are summarized below, and an excerpt of the draft minutes from both committees is included in Attachment 3.

**Community Heritage Commission (CHC)**

The incentives and implementation approach options were presented to the CHC for review and feedback at their meeting on April 4, 2018. In summary, the CHC generally supported the incentives, but expressed concerns about the level of impact on the character of the neighbourhood and its greenspace. There were concerns about the density of development that may be permitted through the incentives and the potential damage to the heritage character of a house when too many renovations or changes occur. There were also some concerns regarding citywide equity of the incentive programs, and a call for similar incentives to be provided to heritage houses across the city, which may encourage more retention of older homes.

**Advisory Planning Commission (APC)**

The incentives and implementation approach options were presented to the APC for review and feedback at their meeting on March 27, 2018. In summary, the APC felt that the program was on the right track, but worried about the level of impact the incentives would have on the character of the neighbourhood and the amount of greenspace. There were also concerns about the loss of control over the amount of development, given the incentives could be offered outright. There was further concern about the level of consistency and fairness, both within the neighbourhood and citywide. Overall, there was general support for each of the incentives, but questions were raised regarding how they would work together and the impact of allowing more than one on each property.

**DISCUSSION**

**Implementation Approach**

Based on the recommendations of the Discussion Paper, staff gathered feedback on the following implementation options:
1. Outright Entitlements – Incentives could be implemented as an outright entitlement for all protected properties. This means that property owners could take advantage of an incentive without any additional approval process (e.g. no public hearing).

2. Conditional Entitlements – In exchange for meeting the additional conditions, further incentives with a more significant benefit could be offered to the owner of a protected property. The conditions could include:
   - requiring restoration of the house, and/or
   - requiring work done to the house to meet a higher standard of conservation than required by the Heritage Conservation Area design guidelines, and/or
   - requiring Heritage Designation (a higher level of heritage protection than the Heritage Conservation Area).

Regardless of the implementation approach, Heritage Revitalization Agreements would continue to be available for protected property owners in the Heritage Conservation Area.

The consultation asked whether all incentives should be offered as outright entitlements or whether some incentives should be offered with conditions. For each incentive participants could indicate whether it should be offered outright or with conditions. There was a mix of community feedback regarding this implementation approach, with some people in favour of only having outright incentives, and others in favour of both outright and conditional incentives. There was also some confusion about what the conditions would be and how they would be implemented.

Staff recommends that any incentives selected be implemented as outright entitlements. Providing a range of outright incentives would be the best approach to address the majority of property scenarios. Most importantly, implementing incentives as outright entitlements provides greater clarity and certainty for property owners.

Staff also recommends that, as part of a future work plan, staff update the citywide Heritage Revitalization Agreement program with the objective of creating a more enticing and less onerous process in order to further encourage the retention of heritage buildings. As part of this work plan, staff would develop an approach specific to the unique context of the Queen’s Park Heritage Conservation Area.

Potential Incentives

There were sixteen incentive options being explored during the final phases of consultation and research. As outlined in Image 2, this report organizes incentives into the following four categories: 1) Increase in Density, 2) Relaxation of Regulations, 3) Change in Tenure, and 4) Process and Other Changes.
As summarized in Image 2, staff has provided a recommendation regarding the implementation of each incentive based on the research conducted and feedback received during consultation. For each incentive staff has also recommended one of the following:

- Yes, implement in the short term (before the summer).
- Yes, implement in the medium term (by winter 2018/2019, unless otherwise specified).
- Implement citywide, rather than as an incentive for the Queen’s Park Heritage Conservation Area.
- No, do not implement.

The following section outlines staff recommendations in details. Staff recommendations on the final implementation framework are also summarized in the “Summary of Recommendations” subsection below. A comprehensive summary of the feedback for each incentive is provided in Attachment 1.

**Image 3: Incentive Framework for Protected Properties in the Queen’s Park Heritage Conservation Area**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Incentive</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0 Increase in Density</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Increased Floor Space Ratio (FSR) for the Principal Dwelling</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>Increase the FSR by 0.20 for all protected properties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Existing Basement Floor Space Exclusion</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Offer a larger increase in FSR instead of this incentive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Existing Attic Floor Space Exclusion</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Offer a larger increase in FSR instead of this incentive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 More Achievable Laneway or Carriage House Density</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>Allow a larger density transfer to enable a laneway or carriage house of up to 958 square feet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Larger Laneway House or Carriage House</td>
<td>Yes, for some</td>
<td>Medium Term</td>
<td>Allow only for large properties with houses that are already over density.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2.0 Relaxation of Regulations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.1</th>
<th>Policy to Support Additions to Buildings that do not Conform with the Zoning Bylaw</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Medium Term</th>
<th>Existing policy for Development Variance Permits would be reviewed and a guide created</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Relaxations for Laneway and Carriage House Regulations and Guidelines</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>Minor relaxations to guidelines will be supported, when appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Relaxation of Sewer Separation Requirements for Laneway and Carriage Houses</td>
<td>Citywide</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Citywide relaxations when the principal dwelling is being retained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Building Code Relaxations</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>As requested, starting in the short term</td>
<td>Opportunities for owners will be identified when they apply to renovate.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.0 Change of Tenure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.1</th>
<th>Stratified Laneway or Carriage House</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Medium Term</th>
<th>Allow for all protected properties.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Stratified Principal Dwelling</td>
<td>Yes, for some</td>
<td>Medium Term</td>
<td>Allow only for large properties with houses that are already over density.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Multiple Unit Conversion (Rental)</td>
<td>Yes, for some</td>
<td>Medium Term</td>
<td>Allow only for large properties with houses that are already over density.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>Small Lot Subdivision</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Only allow through a Heritage Revitalization Agreement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.0 Process and Other Changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4.1</th>
<th>Heritage Home Grant Program</th>
<th>Citywide</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>Explore expansion of the program citywide.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Interpretive Sign Program</td>
<td>Citywide</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Incorporate into an existing citywide work plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>Expedited Approval Process</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Medium Term</td>
<td>Explore ways to expedite other related city permits. Explore additional services to assist owners when they apply to renovate. Refine the Evaluation Checklist. Provide more direction by adding additional design guidelines during Heritage Conservation Area review.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.0 Increase in Density

1.1 Increased Floor Space Ratio (FSR) for the Principal Dwelling

This incentive proposed increasing the permitted density from 0.5 Floor Space Ratio (FSR) to 0.6 FSR. There are two implementation options for this incentive. One option would be for the increase in density to be implemented as an alternative to a laneway or carriage house. This approach would mean that property owners who do not have the opportunity to build a laneway house could still access the additional density without increasing the overall density on each property. The other option would be for the increase in density to be implemented in addition to a laneway or carriage house, increasing the overall density permitted on the site.

The majority of participants supported this incentive being offered outright (55%), 32% supported this incentive being offered with conditions, and 13% felt the incentive should not be offered.

*Staff recommends implementing a larger Floor Space Ratio bonus than proposed, instead of also implementing the basement or attic exclusions. Staff recommends this incentive be implemented in the short term.* Staff proposes a bonus of 0.20 FSR, which is larger than the average basement size in Queen’s Park. This increase would be in addition to that permitted for a laneway or carriage house, instead of an accessory dwelling.
Many community members indicated that they were supportive of attic space exclusion, basement space exclusion, and an FSR bonus, but clarified in their comments that they only wanted one of the three to be implemented. Of the three floor space related incentives, a general increase in FSR received the highest community support, and lowest opposition. Staff feels that the most flexible approach would be to offer a larger FSR bonus than originally proposed, which would achieve the intent of each of the three incentives considered. As a result, this approach means the greatest number of properties would qualify for the incentive, despite the large variety of existing conditions.

The economic analysis proposed both an increase in FSR and the exemption of basement floor space. However, the above approach is more in keeping with the feedback received from the community, related to density. Many consultation participants expressed the importance of additional density being balanced with neighbourhood character. Concerns were expressed that allowing too much of a bonus would result in substantial additions to homes, which many see as compromising the heritage character of the home and the neighbourhood. Another frequent concern was the loss of greenspace and trees caused by such large additions. Based on this feedback, staff feels that the proposed approach is appropriate, and that the remaining economic impacts can be addressed through other incentives.

Staff also believes that the proposed approach is appropriate since the alternative approach of offering both a floor space ratio bonus and exempting basement space may not be a viable option for many properties, given the challenge of accommodating such a large increase in floor space under existing property constraints and constraints created from retaining the existing building.

An increase in floor space ratio would also be the best approach for providing clarity. There would be no confusion about what each owner would be entitled to, unlike the other two incentives. In addition, this approach avoids the risk of having an unintended consequence of grade manipulation, which could happen in order to enable some basements to qualify for exemptions.

1.2 Existing Basement Floor Space Exclusion

Exempting basement space would effectively reduce the total Floor Space Ratio (FSR) of a house, which could allow an owner to build an addition. The amount of floor space that could be added to the house would depend on factors such as the size of the existing basement, but could allow a substantial addition (e.g. an average addition of 0.16 FSR, and in some cases, an addition of 0.36 FSR).

The majority of participants supported this incentive being offered outright (53%), 33% supported this incentive being offered with conditions, and 14% felt the incentive should not be offered.
Staff recommends not implementing this incentive and instead implementing a larger Floor Space Ratio bonus as outlined above. Owners would still have the opportunity to add an addition above ground equivalent to the average basement, even if the house is currently at the maximum density. Owners would also have the opportunity to raise their home to make the basement space more functional.

1.3 Existing Attic Floor Space Exclusion

For houses where the attic is currently counted as floor space, this incentive would allow addition of the equivalent floor space to the house. This incentive could also allow property owners to renovate to use attic space that currently is not utilized; however, doing so may be costly due to BC Building Code requirements.

The majority of participants supported this incentive being offered outright (51%), 35% supported this incentive being offered with conditions, and 14% felt the incentive should not be offered.

Staff recommends not implementing this incentive and instead implementing a larger Floor Space Ratio bonus as outlined above. Owners would have the opportunity to add an addition larger that the size of their attic or to take advantage of underutilized attic space, even if the house is currently at the maximum density.

1.4 More Achievable Laneway or Carriage House Density

The current program allows for unused density from the principal dwelling to be transferred to the laneway or carriage house. The amount of density that can be transferred is limited to five percent of the site area, even in cases where this would result in a smaller than permitted laneway of carriage house. This incentive would remove this limit and allow additional unused density to be transferred up to the maximum permitted size of 958 square feet. This change would make it easier for laneway and carriage houses to be built at the maximum size without increasing the overall density entitlements on the site.

The majority of participants supported this incentive being offered outright (55%), 18% supported this incentive being offered with conditions, and 26% felt the incentive should not be offered.

Staff recommends implementing this incentive in the short term. The proposed incentive of an increase in the floor space ratio would mean that most owners (who are able to build a laneway or carriage house) would have the option to build a maximum size laneway house. The development permit guidelines, including those related to building massing and privacy, would still apply to laneway and carriage houses.
1.5 Larger Laneway or Carriage House

This incentive would allow a larger laneway or carriage house. This could be achieved in two different ways. The first would be to increase the total size of the laneway or carriage house from 958 square feet to 1,200 square feet. The second would be to exclude cellars from the floor space calculation. This would allow people to add below grade storage space in a way that does not increase the size of the building above ground.

A total of 41% participants supported this incentive being offered outright, 24% supported this incentive being offered with conditions, and 35% felt the incentive should not be offered.

Given that community feedback regarding this incentive was mixed, **staff recommends exploring this as an incentive specifically for large properties with homes that are already over density, in the medium term.** This incentive would be tailored to work for homes that, due to their size, would not receive a benefit through an increase in floor space ratio.

There was some support for the option of exempting cellar space from the density calculation for laneway houses, if the space could not be used as floor space. **Staff recommends exploring this option during the review of the laneway and carriage house program and, if appropriate, implementing the incentive citywide.**

2.0 Relaxations to Regulations

2.1 Policy to Support Additions to Buildings that do not Conform with the Zoning Bylaw

This incentive would result in a policy identifying conditions under which a Development Variance Permit would be reasonable in order to vary Zoning Bylaw regulations for an addition that is consistent with the existing building but not the current zoning regulations. A total of 46% participants supported this incentive being offered outright, 39% supported this incentive being offered with conditions, and 14% felt the incentive should not be offered.

**Staff recommends implementing this incentive in the medium term.** The City already has a policy for evaluating Development Variance Permits, including for additions to existing non-conforming buildings, which could be used for any applications in the short term. In the medium term, staff would explore ways to refine the existing policy to further support additions to protected properties, create a guide for owners about the policy, and explore ways to streamline the approval process. Council would still be required to consider the issuance of the Development Variance Permit, which cannot be delegated to staff.

There was some interest from the community in making outright changes to regulations such as site coverage and rear yard setback, which are most likely to be prohibitive to owners
wanting to add an addition. However, as many community members noted, these changes would have an impact on green space, stormwater management and tree protection. Instead of granting relaxations outright, staff proposes starting with requiring Development Variance Permits, and monitoring implementation to assess whether a variance is being consistently approved. The results of the monitoring program could help inform future decisions about making an outright change to the regulations.

2.2 Relaxations for Laneway and Carriage House Regulations and Guidelines

The City’s current approach to laneway and carriage house development permits is generally permissive and streamlined. Additional flexibility for the Heritage Conservation Area could be established by amending the development permit guidelines. Even further flexibility could be achieved through reductions to related Zoning Bylaw regulations (e.g. parking, height), which currently requires a Development Variance Permit approved by Council. Being more permissive with the guidelines and regulations may increase the number of owners able to build a laneway or carriage house; however, these guidelines and regulations were established recently through extensive public consultation.

A total of 42% participants supported this incentive being offered outright, 24% supported this incentive being offered with conditions, and 34% felt the incentive should not be offered.

Given that community feedback regarding this incentive was mixed, staff recommends implementing some minor relaxations to the development permit guidelines, when appropriate, while still maintaining the intent of the guidelines in the short term. This is a similar approach already taken for energy efficient units and accessible single story units. The Director of Development Services already has this authority when considering the approval of the Development Permit. These relaxations could be implemented in practice and monitored, and then formalized when the Laneway and Carriage House Development Permit Area is updated after the completion of the infill housing monitoring program.

Staff does not propose implementing any changes to regulations (e.g. parking, height) at this time. Discussions with owners indicated that a reduction of the parking requirement may make a laneway or carriage house a viable opportunity. However, a large number of concerns were raised by the community about parking. Staff recommends that reductions to parking continue to be implemented through a Development Variance Permit, rather than as an outright reduction, to maintain the ability for site specific consideration.

2.3 Relaxation of Sewer Separation Requirements for Laneway and Carriage Houses

This incentive would waive the current requirement so that a laneway or carriage house being built in combination with a protected home would not require sewer separation. This could be an advantage given the cost of the work.
A total of 45% participants supported this incentive being offered outright, 18% supported this incentive being offered with conditions, and 37% felt the incentive should not be offered.

*Staff proposes implementing this approach citywide.* Based on discussion with the Engineering Department, it was determined that a citywide approach would be more appropriate. Relaxations to the sewer separation requirements will be granted for the principal dwelling, when the principal dwelling is being retained. Other upgrades will still be required (e.g. to the service connection) to ensure that the servicing needs for the property are still met.

### 2.4 Building Code Relaxations

Houses that are listed on the Heritage Register are eligible for Building Code relaxations. This incentive would add the protected properties to the Heritage Register so that they would be eligible for the relaxations. The scope of these relaxations is relatively limited and often requires the building to be sprinklered. However, the relaxations can be useful when renovating an existing building since they may allow a property owner to keep elements that do not comply with the current code such as a narrow staircase or below height railing.

The majority of participants supported this incentive being offered outright (69%), 17% supported this incentive being offered with conditions, and 14% felt the incentive should not be offered.

*Staff recommends moving forward with this incentive on a site specific basis, when requested by an owner.* Staff would explore the usefulness of the incentive with owners when they apply to renovate their house.

### 3.0 Change of Tenure

#### 3.1 Stratified Laneway or Carriage House

The City’s current program requires that a laneway or carriage house be a rental unit. Through this incentive the unit could be stratified, which would allow for separate sale. This incentive would not allow the secondary suite within the principal house to be stratified.

A total of 42% participants supported this incentive being offered outright, 16% supported this incentive being offered with conditions, and 43% felt the incentive should not be offered.

*Staff recommends implementing this incentive in the medium term.* The implementation of this incentive was recommended by the economic analysis due to the increased value created through stratification. By only changing the permitted tenure, this incentive can provide
benefit without having impact on the housing form or density permitted. This incentive also supports the City objective of increasing housing choice.

3.2 Stratified Principal Dwelling

This incentive would allow the principal dwelling to be divided into multiple units that could be stratified and sold separately. This incentive would not allow for a stratified laneway or carriage house. BC Building Code requirements would be significant as this would be considered a multiple unit dwelling, which could make this incentive so financially restrictive that this option may not be viable except to a very few properties.

A total of 31% participants supported this incentive being offered outright, 29% supported this incentive being offered with conditions, and 40% felt the incentive should not be offered.

Staff recommends exploring this as an incentive specifically for large properties that have homes that are already over density, in the medium term. This incentive would be tailored to work for homes that, due to their current size, would not receive a benefit through an increase in floor space ratio. This incentive would also be used to provide opportunity to those homes that cannot build a laneway or carriage house. Additional details related to what properties qualify, and additional requirements related to open space and parking, would be determined before implementation.

3.3 Multiple Unit Conversion Dwellings (Rental)

This incentive would allow a house to have two secondary suites. This would be offered as an alternative to a laneway house or a carriage house (i.e. there would still be one principal unit and two rental units). It would offer an opportunity for people to add a third dwelling unit even if they cannot or do not have interest in building a laneway or carriage house. This incentive would also allow owners to better utilize larger houses. This approach would likely be costly given BC Building Code requirements as the building would be considered a multiple unit dwelling, and may outweigh the benefits in most situations.

A total of 42% participants supported this incentive being offered outright, 27% supported this incentive being offered with conditions, and 30% felt the incentive should not be offered.

Staff recommends exploring this as an incentive specifically for large properties that have homes that are already over density, in the medium term. Offering this incentive in addition to stratification would provide additional flexibility for owners. Similar to the stratification of a principal dwelling, this incentive would be tailored to work for homes that, due to their current size, would not receive a benefit through an increase in floor space ratio. This incentive would also be used to provide opportunity to those homes that cannot build a
laneway or carriage house. Additional details related to what properties qualify, and additional requirements related to open space and parking, would be determined before implementation.

3.4 Small Lot Subdivision

This incentive would reduce the minimum lot size from 6,000 square feet to 4,000 square feet, which would be the same as the minimum lot size permitted under the RS-5 (small lots) zoning district. This could allow properties over 8,000 square feet to subdivide without a rezoning process. It still may not be possible for a number of homeowners to subdivide due to the size of the existing house or the placement of the house on the lot. It is likely that this incentive would work best for small houses on a large lot.

A total of 39% participants supported this incentive being offered outright, 29% supported this incentive being offered with conditions, and 32% felt the incentive should not be offered.

Staff recommends not moving forward with this incentive. Instead staff recommends maintaining this as an incentive that could be offered through a Heritage Revitalization Agreement (HRA). The power of an HRA as a tool allows for additional relaxation to be granted (e.g. minimum lot size, site coverage, floor space ratio) which makes subdivision viable. Without these additional relaxations, only a very small number of properties may be eligible to use this incentive.

4.0 Process and Other Changes

4.1 Heritage Home Grant Program

The New Westminster Heritage Foundation has a grant program that is partially funded by the City. This incentive would expand this program so that protected properties would be eligible. This would require changes to the administration of the program and for the City to contribute a greater amount to the fund.

A total of 45% participants supported this incentive being offered outright, 26% supported this incentive being offered with conditions, and 30% felt the incentive should not be offered.

Staff recommends that the expansion of the grant program be incorporated into the citywide update of the Heritage Revitalization Agreement program. The citywide program would have the objective of further encouraging the retention of heritage buildings. As part of this work plan, staff would consider the unique context of the Queen’s Park Heritage Conservation Area.
4.2 Interpretive Sign Program

This incentive would offer a sign program that identifies the importance of the neighbourhood. This could include interpretive signs located throughout the neighbourhood that tell the stories and history of Queen’s Park.

The majority of participants supported this incentive being offered outright (58%), 4% supported this incentive being offered with conditions, and 37% felt the incentive should not be offered.

*Staff recommends expanding the interpretative sign program being implemented by New Westminster’s Museum and Archives to include signs for Queen’s Park. Signs for Queen’s Park could be included as a tier two project, which would be implemented in the next five years, using existing funding.*

4.3 Expedited Approval Processes

Council endorsed an expedited approval process with the adoption of the Queen’s Park Heritage Conservation Area. Most notably, this approach included delegating approval authority to the Director of Development Services. This means that Heritage Alteration Permits, including applications to demolish a protected house, do not require Council approval. This approach reduces review time. The only exception is applications to remove protection, which cannot be delegated and must be approved by Council. The City has adopted a streamlined review process for these applications. Staff would identify whether any other approval processes associated with the incentive program could be similarly streamlined.

The majority of participants supported this incentive being offered outright (52%), 22% supported this incentive being offered with conditions, and 26% felt the incentive should not be offered.

Based on the feedback received, staff has four recommendations to improve the Heritage Alteration Permit application process:

- *Find additional ways to expedite the approval process by exploring ways to expedite related City permit processes* (e.g. tree permits, building permits) in the medium term. The objective of this review would be to find ways to make the permit process shorter than what is typical, despite the additional review required by the Heritage Conservation Area.
• *Explore, in the medium term, additional services that could be provided to protected property owners when they make a Heritage Alteration Permit application.* In the short term this would start with offering one-on-one pre-application review meetings. This would be similar to the approach taken for Laneway and Carriage House Development Permit application process, which uses the meetings as an opportunity for staff to discuss the application process and identify site specific considerations with the owner before they hire any professionals (or spends any money on the process). In other cases these meetings are held with professionals, hired by the owner, to provide information about the program and the City’s expectations before the professional spends substantial time on a design. Additional opportunities to provide extra services to owners of protected properties would be explored in the medium term.

• *Make refinements to the Evaluation Checklist in the medium term.* Feedback has indicated the need for more clarity around the Evaluation Checklist used to evaluate demolitions applications and applications to have protection removed. As a result, staff has requested a review of the Heritage Merit criteria by the heritage professionals retained to conduct the Special Limited Study assessment. Staff has also requested a review of the Development Potential criteria by the consultant retained to conduct the economic analysis of the incentive program. Staff would continue to explore case studies to ensure that the criteria are working as intended, and to identify any additional refinements needed. In addition, staff would develop an accompanying guide that outlines the intent of the checklist, how it will be used, and how decisions will be made.

• *Draft additional design guidelines during the Heritage Conservation Area review.* Specifically, the design guidelines for protected buildings include a section on additions that could be expanded to provide more direction and clarity about City expectations for different types of additions. For example, this could include guidelines related to an addition to the side of the house. Additional photos or architectural sketches could be provided to add more clarity. The Heritage Conservation Area policy review, scheduled for the spring of 2019, already anticipates a review of the design guidelines. Staff would continue to monitor the implementation process to identify other refinements required to the design guidelines.

**Summary of Recommendations: Incentive Framework**

At this time staff is seeking support for the following:

A. Direct staff that the implementation approach not include conditional incentives.
B. Direct staff to implement the following incentives in the short term:
   i. Amend the zoning to allow protected properties in the Queen’s Park Heritage Conservation Area to have a bonus Floor Space Ratio of 0.20.
   ii. Amend the zoning to allow protected properties in the Queen’s Park Heritage Conservation Area to transfer unused Floor Space Ratio to allow a laneway or carriage house of up to 958 square feet.
   iii. Support some minor relaxations to the laneway and carriage house development permit guidelines, when appropriate, while still maintaining the intent of the guidelines.
   iv. Facilitate relaxations to the Building Code by adding homes to the Heritage Register, on a site specific basis, when requested by an owner.

C. Direct staff to implement the following incentives in the medium term:
   i. Revise the policy for Development Variance Permits to further support additions to buildings that do not conform with the Zoning Bylaw.
   ii. Allow stratified laneway and carriage houses.
   iii. Allow larger laneway and carriage houses for large properties with a house that is already over density.
   iv. Allow stratified principal dwellings for large properties with a house that is already over density.
   v. Allow multiple unit conversion (rental) for large properties with a house that is already over density.
   vi. Find additional ways to expedite the approval process by exploring ways to expedite related City permit processes.
   vii. Explore additional services that could be provided to protected property owners when they make a Heritage Alteration Permit application.
   viii. Make refinements to the Evaluation Checklist.
   ix. Develop additional design guidelines during the Heritage Conservation Area review.

D. Direct staff to implement the following incentives citywide:
   i. Relax sewer separation requirements for the principal dwelling, when the principal dwelling is being retained.
   ii. Explore expansion of the grant program through a citywide update of the Heritage Revitalization Agreement program.
iii. Incorporate signs for Queen’s Park in the citywide interpretative sign program
developed by New Westminster’s Museum and Archives.

E. Direct staff not to implement the following incentives:
   i. Existing basement floor space exclusion.
   ii. Existing attic floor space exclusion.
   iii. Small lot subdivision.

NEXT STEPS

Based on Council’s direction on the Implementation Framework, staff would begin
implementation. The Zoning Bylaw amendment required for the implementation of
incentives identified for the short term would be brought forward for Council’s consideration
later this spring. A Public Hearing would be scheduled so that the incentives could be
considered for adoption before summer.

Additional work towards implementation of medium term incentives would take place over
the remainder of the year. Additional amendment bylaws would be presented to Council for
their consideration once this work is complete.

INTERDEPARTMENTAL LIAISON

Staff from other Departments are being updated and consulted throughout the process.

OPTIONS

The following options are provided for Council’s consideration:

1. That Council endorse the Incentive Framework as outlined in this report, and direct
   staff to proceed with the necessary steps for implementation;

2. That Council direct staff to proceed with the necessary steps to implement the
   Incentive Framework, as amended by Council at the Regular Meeting of May 7, 2018.

3. That Council provide alternative direction.

Staff recommends Option 1.
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Summary of Feedback and Recommendations
IMPLEMENTATION APPROACH

The following implantation options were explored during the community consultation:

1. **Outright Entitlements** – Incentives could be implemented as an outright entitlement for all protected properties. This means that property owners could take advantage of an incentive without any additional approval process (e.g. no public hearing).

2. **Conditional Entitlements** – In exchange for meeting the additional conditions, further incentives with a more significant benefit could be offered to the owner of a protected property. The conditions could include requiring restoration of the house, and/or; requiring work done to the house to meet a higher standard of conservation than required by the Heritage Conservation Area design guidelines, and/or; requiring Heritage Designation (a higher level of heritage protection than the Heritage Conservation Area).

Regardless of the implementation approach, Heritage Revitalization Agreements would continue to be available for protected property owners in the Heritage Conservation Area.

**Community Feedback**

- Many of those that supported all incentives being offered outright felt that this would be more understandable and the most fair way to provide benefit to all owners.
- Many who opposed conditions did not want to see adding bureaucracy added to the approval process.
- Some of those that felt that there should be a mix of outright and conditional incentives felt that this approach would be a good way of managing the amount of change associated with some incentives (e.g. through the additional staff review), while others felt that this was a good way to support increased heritage protection or restoration.
- Though some expressed support for conditions, they also noted their concerns that this approach would reduce the appeal of Heritage Revitalization Agreements, which they feel should be maintained as an important tool used in Queen’s Park.

**Community Heritage Commission Feedback**

The Commission was in agreement that the incentives should be implemented with some conditions.

**Advisory Planning Commission Feedback**

The approach of offering conditional incentives adds confusion and reduces the appeal of a Heritage Revitalization Agreement.

**Discussion Paper Recommendation**

Offer those incentives with more significant benefit with conditions including: 1) a Heritage Conservation Covenant 2) “Recommended” standards of the Heritage Conservation Area Design Guidelines apply; 3) Heritage Building restoration.

**Staff Recommendation**

Staff recommends that any incentives selected be implemented as outright entitlements.
1.1 INCREASED FLOOR SPACE RATIO (FSR) FOR THE PRINCIPAL DWELLING

This incentive proposed increasing the permitted density from 0.5 Floor Space Ratio (FSR) to 0.6 FSR. There are two implementation options for this incentive. One option would be for the increase in density to be implemented as an alternative to a laneway or carriage house. This approach would mean that property owners who do not have the opportunity to build a laneway house could still access the additional density without increasing the overall density on each property. The other option would be for the increase in density to be implemented in addition to a laneway or carriage house, increasing the overall density permitted on the site.

Summary of Feedback from the Community

- Several participants expressed that 0.6 FSR should be the maximum FSR permitted. A number of participants explained that they support the incentive only if it is offered as an alternative to laneway or carriage houses. “See this as being an advantage to homeowners but should be kept as an alternative to laneway not in addition to”.
- Some saw this as an appropriate way to provide extra density to owners that have sub-par basements or attics.
- Other participants thought this should be offered in addition to other density related incentives to allow a total FSR of up to 0.7, 0.75 or 0.8.
- Few explanations for opposition were provided by participants, but these include concerns about the how large houses would be, green space, impact on neighbours, parking and the cost of accessing the incentive.

Summary of Feedback from the Community Heritage Commission

The Commission was generally not supportive of this incentive, particularly if the incentives relating to FSR exclusion of basements and attics are implemented.

Discussion Paper Recommendation

Implement a 0.1 FSR bonus with the conditions proposed plus a condition that the density only be available for those properties without a laneway or carriage house.

Economic Analysis Recommendation

Implement this incentive to offset the impact of the cost premium associated with heritage renovations.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends implementing a larger Floor Space Ratio bonus than proposed, instead of also implementing the basement or attic exclusions. Staff recommends this incentive be implemented in the short term. Staff proposes a bonus of 0.20 FSR.
1.2 EXISTING BASEMENT FLOOR SPACE EXCLUSION

Exempting basement space would effectively reduce the total Floor Space Ratio (FSR) of a house, which could allow an owner to build an addition. The amount of floor space that could be added to the house would depend on factors such as the size of the existing basement, but could allow a substantial addition (e.g. an average addition of 0.16 FSR, and in some cases, an addition of 0.36 FSR).

Summary of Feedback from the Community

- “This is the easiest and most straightforward to implement. It allows all properties with the room to expand their house and those without a basement to add one regardless of their present FSR.”
- “Good incentive but I have some concerns about the amount of square footage that could be added to an already large home.” Some people suggest offering only one of the basement exemption, the attic exemption or FSR bonus to any given homeowner. Others suggested that an overall density limit should be in place, to prevent monster homes, for example. Some felt the FSR bonus may be a better tool since it could also free up basement and attic space.
- Some felt the space should be excluded due to the quality of basements (e.g. below height)
- “Raising up houses to increase basement space or add an additional floor destroys in most cases the design, balance, and 'look' of a house. This is not, in my opinion, how we preserve heritage houses.” Others were concerned about the impact of the additional floor space on greenspace and trees.

Summary of Feedback from the Community Heritage Commission

There was support for this incentive. Basements are ideal for turning into living space.

Discussion Paper Recommendation

Implement as an outright entitlement.

Economic Analysis Recommendation

Implement this incentive to offset the impact of having a basement, which may be subpar and are not as valuable as above ground floor space.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends not implementing this incentive and instead implement a larger Floor Space Ratio bonus.
1.3 EXISTING ATTIC FLOOR SPACE EXCLUSION

For houses where the attic is currently counted as floor space, this incentive would allow addition of the equivalent floor space to the house. This incentive could also allow property owners to renovate to use attic space that currently is not utilized; however, doing so may be costly due to BC Building Code requirements.

Summary of Feedback from the Community

- “Owners should be able to use space in their existing attic, but any work that affects the exterior of the house should follow guidelines that are sympathetic to the original design of the house.” A number of people raised concerns about the impact on the character of the home through required changes to the roofline, including the addition of dormers.
- Some people suggest offering only one of the basement exemption, the attic exemption or FSR bonus to any given homeowner. Some suggested that an overall density limit should be in place. Others supported the development of attic space, but not the opportunity to build an addition to the house.
- Some were concerned about the usability of the space and the cost of renovations. “I don't believe this is an incentive due to high cost with small benefit.”
- Some were concerned about the impact of the additional floor space on greenspace and trees.

Summary of Feedback from the Community Heritage Commission

- The Commission was hesitant about this incentive.
- This incentive may encourage “scope creep” and the addition of dormers, although perhaps this could be mitigated in the language of the zoning bylaw;

Discussion Paper Recommendation

Implement as an outright entitlement.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends not implementing this incentive and instead implement a larger Floor Space Ratio bonus.
1.4 MORE ACHIEVABLE LANEWAY OR CARRIAGE HOUSE DENSITY

The current program allows for unused density from the principal dwelling to be transferred to the laneway or carriage house. The amount of density that can be transferred is limited to five percent of the site area, even in cases where this would result in a smaller than permitted laneway of carriage house. This incentive would remove this limit and allow additional unused density to be transferred up to the maximum permitted size of 958 square feet. This change would make it easier for laneway and carriage houses to be built at the maximum size without increasing the overall density entitlements on the site.

Summary of Feedback from the Community

- “As long as it doesn't exceed the 958 max.” Other responses expressed support as long as the total site FSR is not exceeded.
- “Laneway and carriage houses should not dominate back yards and be invasive to neighbouring properties.” Other concerns raised include impact on neighbourhood character and loss of greenspace.
- Some participants expressed concern about laneway and carriage houses being permitted.

Summary of Feedback from the Community Heritage Commission

- The Commission was generally not supportive of this incentive.
- Increased densification may take away from greenspace.

Discussion Paper Recommendation

Implement as an outright entitlement.

Summary of Economic Analysis

The Economic Analysis recommended that owners have the flexibility to use bonus floor space for either the principal dwelling, or the laneway or carriage house.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends implementing this incentive in the short term.
1.5 LARGER LANEWAY OR CARRIAGE HOUSE

This incentive would allow a larger laneway or carriage house. This could be achieved in two different ways. The first would be to increase the total size of the laneway or carriage house from 958 square feet to 1,200 square feet. The second would be to exclude cellars from the floor space calculation. This would allow people to add below grade storage space in a way that does not increase the size of the building above ground.

Summary of Feedback from the Community

- “958 sqft is big enough.”
- Some concerns were raised regarding the potential negative impact on neighbours, loss of neighbourhood character, and loss of greenspace.
- “YES! Huge thumbs up on this, especially considering that 1200sqft allows for small families.” Others felt that a larger laneway house should only be permitted through a Heritage Revitalization Agreement.
- Some participants were supportive of excluding the cellar floor area but opposed the larger laneway or carriage house size. “Excluding cellar floor space and keeping the building otherwise to the 958 sq ft limit would be preferable to having an overall larger building.”

Summary of Feedback from the Community Heritage Commission

- The Commission was generally not supportive of this incentive.

Discussion Paper Recommendation

Implement with the conditions proposed.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends exploring this as an incentive specifically for large properties that have homes that are already over density, in the medium term.
2.1 POLICY TO SUPPORT ADDITIONS TO BUILDINGS THAT DO NOT CONFORM WITH THE ZONING BYLAW

This incentive would result in a policy identifying conditions under which a Development Variance Permit would be reasonable in order to vary Zoning Bylaw regulations for an addition that is consistent with the existing building but not the current zoning regulations. The policy would identify those variances that would be considered reasonable. This incentive could also be expended to include reductions to Zoning Bylaw regulations (e.g. height, setbacks) with the purpose of allowing additions that are consistent (or more consistent) with existing buildings. This approach would be less flexible but would mean that no Council approval would be required.

Summary of Feedback from the Community

- “Based on the number of non-conforming houses in QP, this makes a lot of sense and would produce more consistent-looking additions.” Some specified that the design of the addition needed to be in keeping with the existing house.
- “Would always want this to require approval. Can see this one getting out of hand and losing the whole point of the HCA.” Many specified supported of the Development Variance Permit process not outright relaxations to the Zoning Bylaw. Some suggested that the process for getting a Development Variance Permit should be streamlined and cheaper.
- Few but various rationales were offered for opposing the incentive, including concerns about height variances, impact on neighbours, impact of views, loss of greenspace and the potential scope of the policy changes.
- Some felt that more information was needed about the incentive.

Summary of Feedback from the Community Heritage Commission

The Commission was generally supportive of this incentive, however commented that it would depend on the parameters and existing property lines for each property.

Discussion Paper Recommendation

Implement as an outright entitlement.

Economic Analysis Recommendation

The Economic Analysis recommended implementing this incentive to assist in accommodating floor space.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends implementing this incentive in the medium term.
2.2 RELAXATIONS FOR LANEWAY AND CARRIAGE HOUSE REGULATIONS AND GUIDELINES

The City’s current approach to laneway and carriage house development permits is generally permissive and streamlined. Additional flexibility for the Heritage Conservation Area could be established by amending the development permit guidelines. Even further flexibility could be achieved through reductions to related Zoning Bylaw regulations (e.g. parking, height), which currently requires a Development Variance Permit approved by Council. Being more permissive with the guidelines and regulations may increase the number of owners able to build a laneway or carriage house; however, these guidelines and regulations were established recently through extensive public consultation.

Summary of Feedback from the Community

- “Since these guidelines and regulations were established recently through extensive public consultation, we should not change or revisit them for several years, until we have some experience with the new guidelines.” Others point out that variances would be better accomplished through an HCA. Some wanted the ability to build a laneway or carriage house above a garage.
- “Relaxations should be situational and not causing a problem to adjacent homeowners.” Participants also expressed concerns about size, site coverage and parking.
- Some supported this incentive since they felt that the current regulations are too restrictive. Others supported the initiative since they felt it would allow them to build a laneway or carriage house.
- Some participants expressed concern about laneway and carriage houses being permitted.

Summary of Feedback from the Community Heritage Commission

- The Commission was generally not supportive of this incentive.
- This incentive could cause resentment in other areas of the City and detract from the character of the neighbourhood.

Discussion Paper Recommendation

Implement sideyard location (when suitable), other sitting relaxations, and parking relaxations as outright entitlement.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends implementing some minor relaxations to the development permit guidelines, when appropriate, while still maintaining the intent of the guidelines in the short term.
2.3 RELAXATION OF SEWER SEPARATION REQUIREMENTS FOR LANEWAY AND CARRIAGE HOUSES

This incentive would waive the current requirement so that a laneway or carriage house being built in combination with a protected home would not require sewer separation. This could be an advantage given the cost of the work.

Summary of Feedback from the Community

- “A good idea if feasible. Would save the homeowner a lot of money.”
- “I really don’t know. I think this is an engineering question, but if adding more density, it may be important to ensure sewer separation meets or exceeds the increased demand of increased use.”
- “Proper engineering should not and can not be negotiated as a trade off for appearance. Infrastructure has to be sized accordingly.” Other participants raised concerns about equity considerations, including that infrastructure costs should be borne equally by all New Westminster residents, or that all residents should be able to access this incentive equally.

Summary of Feedback from the Community Heritage Commission

- The Commission was not supportive of this incentive.
- This may create an environmental issue and could cause resentment in other areas of the City.

Discussion Paper Recommendation

Implement with the conditions proposed.

Staff Recommendation

Staff proposes implementing this incentive citywide.
2.4 BUILDING CODE RELAXATIONS

Houses that are listed on the Heritage Register are eligible for Building Code relaxations. This incentive would add the protected properties to the Heritage Register so that they would be eligible for the relaxations. The scope of these relaxations is relatively limited and often requires the building to be sprinklered. However, the relaxations can be useful when renovating an existing building since they may allow a property owner to keep elements that do not comply with the current code such as a narrow staircase or below height railing.

Summary of Feedback from the Community

- “Safety should never be compromised. Building codes exist for safety!”
- “Definitely this is a positive effort to retain original heritage features.”

Summary of Feedback from the Community Heritage Commission

- The Commission was supportive of this incentive, providing that safety would not be affected.

Economic Analysis Recommendations

The Economic Analysis recommended implementing this incentive in recognition of the challenges associated with renovations.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends moving forward with this incentive on a site specific basis, when requested by an owner.
3.1 STRATIFIED LANEWAY OR CARRIAGE HOUSE

The City’s current program requires that a laneway or carriage house be a rental unit. Through this incentive the unit could be stratified, which would allow for separate sale. This incentive would not allow the secondary suite within the principal house to be stratified.

Summary of Feedback from the Community

- “#1 option. This would allow many people to retire into a smaller unit on their own property while freeing up some capital for their retirement. Or young people to buy their first smaller home.” Other comments also point to increasing housing choice and affordability, and allowing homeowners to recover the costs of maintaining a heritage home.
- “Only under very limited conditions - homeowners receiving this bonus would need to ensure their main house is restored as part of agreement.” Some participants are wary of the financial windfall that could accrue to homeowners.
- “Get an HRA if this is what you want to do. If offered it must be city wide. It should not be part of an HCA.”
- Others express concern about adjusting the laneway and carriage house policy that was recently established through the OCP process.

Summary of Feedback from the Community Heritage Commission

The Commission was generally not supportive of this incentive, as there was concern that it would encourage lot splitting.

Discussion Paper Recommendation

Implement with the conditions proposed.

Economic Analysis Recommendation

The Economic Analysis recommended implementing this incentive.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends implementing this incentive in the medium term.
3.2 STRATIFIED PRINCIPAL DWELLING

This incentive would allow the principal dwelling to be divided into multiple units that could be stratified and sold separately. This incentive would not allow for a stratified laneway or carriage house. BC Building Code requirements would be significant as this would be considered a multiple unit dwelling, which could make this incentive so financially restrictive that this option may not be viable except to a very few properties.

Summary of Feedback from the Community

- Many people felt that requirements should be put in place such as parking, minimum unit size, minimum property size and minimum house size. Other comments suggest that a Heritage Revitalisation Agreement should be required.
- Some felt that impacts needed to be assessed first (e.g. the impact on infrastructure).
- “NO. I do not want principal dwellings in Queen's Park to turn into condos!!” People also raised concerns about traffic, parking and impact on neighbourhood character.
- “It provides for affordable housing options. It also allows densification without increasing the building portion of the lot, thus keeping green spaces.”
- Concerns were raised that people with small houses would not be able to take advantage of this incentive. Concerns were also raised about the cost of renovations being too high to make this viable.
- Some felt that this option appeals to developers not owners.

Summary of Feedback from the Community Heritage Commission

- The Commission was generally supportive of this incentive, however commented that it may only work best for houses of a certain size, e.g. greater than 5000 sq. ft.
- Stratification of principal dwellings does exist in other areas of the region, which may be looked upon as examples.

Discussion Paper Recommendation

Implement with the conditions proposed.

Economic Analysis Recommendation

Implement this incentive but with a limit of two units.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends exploring this as an incentive specifically for large properties that have homes that are already over density, in the medium term.
3.3 MULTIPLE UNIT CONVERSION DWELLINGS (RENTAL)

This incentive would allow a house to have two secondary suites. This would be offered as an alternative to a laneway house or a carriage house (i.e. there would still be one principal unit and two rental units). It would offer an opportunity for people to add a third dwelling unit even if they cannot or do not have interest in building a laneway or carriage house. This incentive would also allow owners to better utilize larger houses. This approach would likely be costly given BC Building Code requirements as the building would be considered a multiple unit dwelling, and may outweigh the benefits in most situations.

Summary of Feedback from the Community

- “This will increase density at the expense of livability.” Numerous people expressed concerns about the number of units created, parking, traffic, pressure on infrastructure, impact on the character of the house (e.g. by adding two front doors), and impact on the character of the neighbourhood.
- Some noted that this would not be an option for people with small houses. Others noted that the cost of construction would mean this would not be a viable option.
- “Suites should be at least 800 square feet and off street parking should be provided.”
- “Good idea, will provide more rental stock and allow friends or multigenerational of families to live together.”

Summary of Feedback from the Community Heritage Commission

- The Commission was generally supportive of this incentive, however commented that it may only work best for houses of a certain size.

Discussion Paper Recommendation

Implement as an outright entitlement.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends exploring this as an incentive specifically for large properties that have homes that are already over density, in the medium term.
### 3.4 SMALL LOT SUBDIVISION

This incentive would reduce the minimum lot size from 6,000 square feet to 4,000 square feet, which would be the same as the minimum lot size permitted under the RS-5 (small lots) zoning district. This could allow properties over 8,000 square feet to subdivide without a rezoning process. It still may not be possible for a number of homeowners to subdivide due to the size of the existing house or the placement of the house on the lot. It is likely that this incentive would work best for small houses on a large lot.

**Summary of Feedback from the Community**

- “No small lot subdivision within the HCA.”
- Concerns were raised about densification, change in neighbourhood character, and that it would only benefit a small number of properties. “Meaningless for homes with small lots (of which there are MANY under 8000 sq ft).”
- Most of those that were supportive felt that Council approval should still be required, either through a rezoning or a Heritage Revitalization Agreement.

**Summary of Feedback from the Community Heritage Commission**

- The Commission was not supportive of this incentive.
- Subdivision may take away from greenspace.

**Discussion Paper Recommendation**

Implement with the conditions proposed.

**Economic Analysis Recommendation**

The Economic Analysis recommended supporting rezoning applications to allow a small lot subdivision in cases where owners can make a compelling case that the other changes so not work or are insufficient to offset impact.

**Staff Recommendation**

Staff recommends not moving forward with this incentive.
4.1 HERITAGE HOME GRANT PROGRAM

The New Westminster Heritage Foundation has a grant program that is partially funded by the City. This incentive would expand this program so that protected properties would be eligible. This would require changes to the administration of the program and for the City to contribute a greater amount to the fund.

Summary of Feedback from the Community

- Some participants express reservations until more information is provided about how the grants would be administered.
- Most of those in support expressed the importance of it being a citywide program.
- Others express concern with the financial and political sustainability of an expanded program.
- Others suggest that homeowners should be responsible for maintenance of their own properties, that tax revenues should not be put into this program, or that tax revenues would be better spent on other civic priorities.

Summary of Feedback from the Community Heritage Commission

- The Commission was supportive of this incentive given more details become available.

Discussion Paper Recommendation

Implement as a general benefit for all protected properties.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends that the expansion of the grant program be incorporated into the citywide update of the Heritage Revitalization Agreement program.
4.2 INTERPRETIVE SIGN PROGRAM

This incentive would offer a sign program that identifies the importance of the neighbourhood. This could include interpretive signs located throughout the neighbourhood that tell the stories and history of Queen’s Park.

Summary of Feedback from the Community

- “This and other initiatives to promote awareness of the HCA will generate economic wins for our City.”
- “Who is this incentive for? I don't believe residents want a sign in front of their homes or on their street corner.” Other reasons for opposing the incentive include the cost and aesthetic concerns. Some people express that the City should instead promote the existing New Westminster Heritage Preservation Society. Other felt the money would be better spent on neighbourhood infrastructure.

Summary of Feedback from the Community Heritage Commission

- The Commission was generally supportive of this incentive.

Discussion Paper Recommendation

Implement as a general neighbourhood benefit.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends expanding the interpretative sign program being implemented by New Westminster’s Museum and Archives to include signs for Queen’s Park.
4.3 EXPEDITED APPROVAL PROCESSES

Council endorsed an expedited approval process with the adoption of the Queen’s Park Heritage Conservation Area. Most notably, this approach included delegating approval authority to the Director of Development Services. This means that Heritage Alteration Permits, including applications to demolish a protected house, do not require Council approval. This approach reduces review time. The only exception is applications to remove protection, which cannot be delegated and must be approved by Council. The City has adopted a streamlined review process for these applications. Staff would identify whether any other approval processes associated with the incentive program could be similarly streamlined.

Summary of Feedback from the Community

- “Make things as easy as possible and get rid of as much red tape as you can.”
- Other were supportive of removing decision-making influence from special-interest groups and reducing the costs associated with long approvals processes.
- Some only support the incentive for “simple” renovations.
- “Fast is OK but not at the expense of a quality product.”
- Most participants opposing the incentive are concerned about expedited demolition approvals.

Feedback from the Community Heritage Commission

- The Commission was generally supportive of this incentive in principle but indicated that in practicality it may be difficult to administer.
- This incentive could be useful for property owners wishing to downgrade the protection of their house, but possibly problematic when applied to applications for demolitions.

Economic Analysis Recommendation

The City should provide assistance to property as they make their way through the process.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends: 1) Finding additional ways to expedite the approval process by exploring ways to expedite related City permit processes (e.g. tree permits, building permits) in the medium term; 2) Exploring, in the medium term, additional services that could be provided to protected property owners when they make a Heritage Alteration Permit application; 3) Making refinements to the Evaluation Checklist in the medium term; 4) Drafting additional design guidelines during the Heritage Conservation Area review.
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Summary of Relevant Policy and Regulations
SUMMARY OF RELEVANT POLICY AND REGULATIONS

Queen’s Park Heritage Conservation Area

A Heritage Conservation Area is a distinct neighbourhood, characterized by its historic value, which is identified in a City’s Official Community Plan (OCP) for heritage conservation purposes. The Queen’s Park Heritage Conservation Area includes properties south of Sixth Avenue, north of Royal Avenue, west of Sixth Street and east of Queen’s Park. The Queen’s Park Heritage Conservation Area applies primarily to single detached dwellings in the neighbourhood.

The Queen’s Park Heritage Conservation Area is a lower level of heritage-related protection than a Heritage Designation which is applied to an individual property (and is a requirement of a Heritage Revitalization Agreement). Rather, the Queen’s Park Heritage Conservation Area is an area management tool, which includes both low-level heritage protection for the exterior of existing buildings, and design control for new construction. The goal of a Heritage Conservation Area is to allow change, but ensure the change is respectful of existing heritage character. Heritage Alteration Permits are used for managing the change. Figure 1, included at the end of this section, provides additional explanation of the difference between the levels of heritage protection associated with the Heritage Conservation Area and Heritage Designation.

Levels of Heritage Conservation Area Protection

**Advanced Category (Protected Properties)**

Buildings constructed in the Queen’s Park neighbourhood in 1940 or earlier, and those listed on the Heritage Register are protected through the Heritage Conservation Area (“Advanced” category). Protection requires that the owner obtain a Heritage Alteration Permit (HAP) from the City for construction activities on the front, sides or visible roof of the existing principal building. No HAP is required if the exterior alteration does not affect one of these elements (e.g. for construction in the rear of the building). The purpose of these HAPs is to provide the City the opportunity to review the proposed building alterations with the intent of ensuring that the alterations respect the history of the house and enhances the heritage character of the neighbourhood. These permits are issued by the Director of Development Services and do not require the approval of the Council.

A HAP is also required to allow demolition of an existing protected building. An application for demolition would be reviewed against criteria organized into three different categories: 1) Heritage Character and Merit, 2) Development Potential, and 3) Condition. The HAP would either be approved or denied by the Director of Development Services based on the evaluation of these criteria.
Owners of a protected property can also apply to have their house moved to the Limited category. These applications would also be reviewed against the criteria in the three categories: 1) Heritage Character and Merit, 2) Development Potential, and 3) Condition. The application would either be approved or denied by Council based on the evaluation of the criteria. If approved, the change would be implemented through an Official Community Plan Amendment.

Special Limited Category (Study)

There are approximately 80 properties which would be protected through the Heritage Conservation Area, but have been identified through the policy development process as having characteristics which may negatively impact the owner, should the house be required to be retained. Those properties form a “Special Limited” study category, which has a lower level of heritage protection until further study has been completed. This study will evaluate whether each house in this category should be moved to the Advanced category or to the Limited category based on the site specific context.

Limited Category

The remaining buildings in the neighbourhood are not protected (“Limited” category). The construction of new residential buildings on these properties, including detached accessory dwellings (laneway or carriage houses), requires a HAP. These HAPs provide the Director of Development Services the opportunity to review the design of new buildings with the intent of ensuring all the new development, including infill, is consistent with the existing heritage buildings and enhances the heritage character of the neighbourhood.

Development Entitlement

The Heritage Conservation Area provides a layer of regulation in addition to the Zoning Bylaw, which applies to all properties in the Area. All properties, protected or not, continue to have the same density entitlement as other properties in the same zoning district. If a Heritage Alteration Permit (HAP) is required for construction activity, that permit governs design of the construction, not the density, number of units, height, setbacks or other elements detailed in the Zoning Bylaw.

Comparison of Heritage Protection Levels

There are generally two levels of heritage protection in the City:

1) The Heritage Conservation Area, which applies in the Queen’s Park Neighbourhood; and
2) A Heritage Revitalization Agreement (HRA), which may be applied to an individual property anywhere in the city. The HRA is the strongest kind of protection, as it generally only allows changes for conservation purposes.

The table below provides a comparison between the provisions of the categories in the Heritage Conservation Area and those typical to an HRA.

**Figure 1: Summary of the levels of protection achieved through the HCA and through Heritage Designation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HCA: Limited Protection</th>
<th>HCA: Advanced Protection</th>
<th>Heritage Designation (HRA Requirement)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is demolition allowed?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>It would be considered: the approval of demolition would be conditional based on an evaluation of three factors: 1) heritage value, 2) development potential, and 3) condition.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could additional floor space be added to the building?</td>
<td>Yes, anywhere, up to the zoning maximum.</td>
<td>Yes, with permit for design review, up to the zoning maximum.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there design review for the construction of a new building?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What design guidelines must be met?</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td>Should meet the guidelines included in the “acceptable” or “recommended” categories of the HCA Design Guidelines.</td>
<td>Must meet guidelines equivalent to the “recommended” category of the HCA Design Guidelines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is full restoration of the building required?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could a laneway or carriage house be built on the lot?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>It would be considered, and could require rezoning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could a secondary suite be added to the house?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>It would be considered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is a Heritage Alteration Permit required for changes to the exterior of the building?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes, for changes to the front, sides, or visible roofline. Not required for the back.</td>
<td>Yes, for all changes anywhere on the building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is a permit required for regular maintenance like re-roofing, re-painting, or replacing rotted deck boards?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Are there restrictions on a building’s exterior paint colour?</strong></td>
<td>HCA: Limited Protection</td>
<td>HCA: Advanced Protection</td>
<td>Heritage Designation (HRA Requirement)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Could the windows and doors be replaced?** | Yes | Yes, with a permit for design review for those windows/doors on the front or sides of the building. | Only if they are beyond repair, and they would have to be replaced with replicas. |
| **Could a porch or deck be added to the building?** | Yes | Yes, with a permit for design review for a porch/deck added to the front or sides of the building. | No |
| **Is a Heritage Alteration Permit required for interior changes?** | No | No | Sometimes |
| **Is a Heritage Alteration Permit required for changes to landscaping?** | No | No | Sometimes |
| **Who issues the Heritage Alteration Permit?** | Director of Development Services | Director of Development Services | Council |
| **Do permit applications require community review?** | No | No | Yes, in most cases |
| **Do permit applications require review by City committees?** | No | No | Yes |
| **Does the property have access to zoning incentives?** | No | Coming soon | Only if full heritage conservation (restoration) work is undertaken. |
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City Committee Consultation – Minute Extracts
6.1 Queen’s Park Heritage Conservation Area – Incentives Program

Margaret Fairweather recused herself from consideration of this item, as she is a homeowner in Queens Park She departed the meeting at 7:10 p.m.

Rebecca Bateman disclosed that she is a resident in Queens Park, and a member of the Queens Park Heritage Study Working Group. The Commission determined that it was not necessary for Ms. Bateman to recuse herself.

Lynn Roxburgh provided a PowerPoint presentation summarizing details of the Queen’s Park Heritage Conservation Area (HCA) Area Incentive Program consultation on possible incentives and implementation approach, as outlined in the report dated March 27, 2018.

In response to questions from the Commission, Ms. Roxburgh offered the following:

- It has yet to be determined whether there will be a limit on the number of incentives that an owner can utilize;
- If the City implement incentives as outright entitlements there would be no opportunity to prevent owners from implementing;
- There is potential to limit the number of incentives that can be implemented;
- The City is looking at this based on community feedback indicating an interest in having more options;
- The City is open to hearing feedback about whether to do something differently;
- In most cases, the HRA is just the exterior;
- Research indicates that once the City deals with the regulations being transparent and consistent the property values improve;
- The focus has been on adding incentives to encourage retention of any protected heritage house and to maintain and renovate the house to its maximum potential;
- The cost of renovating a heritage house is more than the cost of building a house, and there is interest to provide a benefit to offset that cost; and,
There are a group of residents concerned about property values and the City hopes that these incentives could be of assistance.

The Commission noted the following comments:

- Concern about incentives that involve relaxation of sewer separation and/or are tied to stratification of laneway;
- Concern that if multiple side-by-side homes took advantage of multiple incentives it could negatively impact the character of the neighbourhood;
- Concern that the City will lose control of development and its ability to protect the integrity of this heritage neighbourhood;
- It is a lot for the public to grasp in the outreach;
- Offering all incentives as outright entitlements is a concern when some of the incentives are very significant;
- Appreciation that the City is considering some innovative options;
- Suggestion to begin the process by approving only a select a few incentives outright;
- Appreciation that the Working Group recommendations have been considered;
- Working Group community engagement on HCAs, which found that owners were concerned about transparency, consistency and fairness of the process;
- Support for the specific entitlements;
- Concern that it is very political to give one neighbourhood more entitlements;
- Incentives should be tied to whether it is a heritage designation;
- Concern about multiple incentives being implemented at once;
- Support for the idea of diversity in incentives, which responds to the engagement feedback received;
- Interest in ensuring that any density added to Queen’s Park preserves the character of the neighbourhood while still creating opportunities for others to move into the neighbourhood; and,
- Concern that many owners will max out the list of development options and that the neighbourhood cannot take the burden of increased people, parking, waste removal, and loss of greenspace.

MOVED and SECONDED

*THAT the Advisory Planning Commission receive the report for information*

CARRIED.

All members of the Commission present voted in favour of the motion.
3.1 Queen’s Park Heritage Conservation Area: Incentives Program Consultation

Britney Quail, Heritage Policy Planner, provided a PowerPoint presentation summarizing details of the Queen’s Park Heritage Conservation Area (HCA) Incentives Program consultation, including details on possible incentives and implementation approaches, as outlined in the staff report dated April 4, 2018. Ms. Quail asked the Commission for feedback on the list of proposed incentives and how the incentives should be implemented, and provided the following information in response to questions:

- The HCA Design Guidelines outline permitted accessibility measures for heritage homes;
- An example of the difference between outright and conditional entitlements would be the following: with an outright entitlement, all HCA property owners would be provided additional floor space, whereas with a conditional entitlement, if a bonus restoration was agreed to, a stratification of the property may be possible; and,
- The basement floor space exclusion, if implemented, would only apply to the principal house on a property.

Upon discussion, the Commission made the following comments on the proposed incentives:

Existing Basement Floor Space Exclusion
- The Commission was generally in favour of this incentive;
- Basements are ideal for turning into living areas;

Existing Attic Floor Space Exclusion
- The Commission was hesitant about this incentive;
- This incentive may encourage “scope creep” and the addition of dormers, although perhaps this could be mitigated in the language of the zoning bylaw;
Policy to Support Additions to Buildings That Do Not Conform with the Zoning Bylaw

- The Commission was generally supportive of this incentive, however commented that it would depend on the parameters and existing property lines for each property;

Relaxations for Laneway and Carriage House Regulations and Guidelines

- The Commission was generally not supportive of this incentive;
- This incentive could cause resentment in other areas of the City and detract from the character of the neighbourhood;

More Achievable Laneway or Carriage House Density

- The Commission was generally not supportive of this incentive;
- Increased densification may take away from greenspace;

Multiple Conversation Dwellings (Rental)

- The Commission was generally supportive of this incentive, however commented that it may only work best for houses of a certain size;

Increased Floor Space Ratio for the Principal Dwelling

- The Commission was generally not supportive of this incentive, particularly if the incentives relating to FSR exclusion of basements and attics are implemented;

Larger Laneway or Carriage House

- The Commission was generally not supportive of this incentive;

Relaxation of Sewer Separation Requirements for Laneway and Carriage Houses

- The Commission was not supportive of this incentive;
- This may create an environmental issue and could cause resentment in other areas of the City;

Stratified Laneway or Carriage House

- The Commission was generally not supportive of this incentive, as there was concern that it would encourage lot splitting;

Stratified Principal Dwelling

- The Commission was generally supportive of this incentive, however commented that it may only work best for houses of a certain size, e.g. greater than 5000 sq. ft.
- Stratification of principal dwellings does exist in other areas of the region, which may be looked upon as examples;
Building Code Relaxations
- The Commission was supportive of this incentive, providing that safety would not be affected;

Small Lot Subdivision
- The Commission was not supportive of this incentive;
- Subdivision may take away from greenspace;

Heritage Home Grant Program
- The Commission was supportive of this incentive given more details become available;

Interpretive Sign Program
- The Commission was generally supportive of this incentive;

Expedited Approval Processes
- The Commission was generally supportive of this incentive in principle but indicated that in practicality it may be difficult to administer; and,
- This incentive could be useful for property owners wishing to downgrade the protection of their house, but possibly problematic when applied to applications for demolitions.

The Commission was in agreement that the incentives should be implemented with some conditions. The Commission also suggested that, in order to provide clarity, it may be useful to begin with implementation of the most popular incentives, study how successful they are, and then progress with the implementation of other, more detailed incentives.
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Raw Notes from Online Survey and Open House Worksheets
RAW NOTES FROM ONLINE SURVEY AND OPEN HOUSE WORKSHEETS

The following contains the raw comments provided by open house participants (via a printed worksheet) and online survey respondents during the second round of consultation for the Queen’s Park HCA Incentives Program.

Implementation Approach

How should incentives be implemented? Should all incentives be outright entitlements or should some incentives be offered with conditions?

- Incentives should have been offered and decided prior to this implementation of the HCA, it should be outright entitlement you have screwed us already does the City really want to screw us twice!!!
- I trust the consultants expertise on these issue and support their recommendations.
- I think you are missing the mark completely. Incentives offered with conditions or as outright entitlements will only benefit those who are planning major renovations or complete reconstruction of their "Heritage" home. All you will gain in offering incentives of this nature will be to attract developers who are interested in taking advantage of the opportunity to cash in on the desire to increase the density of this once historic area. Heritage is far more than houses and structures to some of us. What you are proposing will change the nature and feel of this wonderful neighborhood. You will "keep" some of the look that people think of as Heritage but will take away the liveability which is the most desirable aspect of living in this neighborhood.
- First choice would be for all incentives to be outright entitlements with no conditions. Any deviation from that however and first choice would then be for no incentives at all. Black and white no grey areas, easy to understand and administer.
- FOR SURE all incentives should be outright entitlements regardless of the condition of the home and WITHOUT the consent of council or a public hearing.
- First of all the incentives do not suit all home owners. Therefore the only way to make this viable is to allow an outright entitlement. Each resident should indicate what they wish, not a committee, or hired consultant should be offered with conditions
- I am perfectly fine with the idea of a tier system of outright vs. conditional entitlements. I've heard some of the worries about complexity but I think if explained clearly in a short, well written pamphlet most would quickly come to understand. I don't think that conditional entitlements should require heritage designation. Please leave that for full HRAs. Limit options such as subdivision and stratification for this highest level of protection, which also comes with the most flexibility. Something like allowing additional floorspace or a larger laneway home would be well suited for conditional entitlements that require restoration to the Recommended level (which is still below designation and HRA). I'd see the conditional entitlements being along
similar lines to "no brainer", low controversy HRAs with well established patterns. Get those out of the heavy process of the HRA. Designation itself is also a deterrent.

- The incentives offered will have a great impact on the outright vs conditional issue. Some incentives may allow for an outright approval because they are easy to understand and implement and will have a small or no impact on other members of the HCA. Whereas, some incentives may provoke several questions regarding impact on the whole HCA and the level restoration required and the over sight of the City.

- Keep it simple and easy to understand. A smaller number of worthwhile and relevant incentives that are useful to any property owner to implement will work the best. It keeps the playing field level for all. Do not get carried away thinking we need to offer everything to everyone. Even before the HCA there were properties that were "maxed out" or did not have options for further development and the same will be true for some properties with an HCA.

If some greater/higher level incentives are offered with conditions those conditions should come with a requirement of higher protection but I think that this is covered in the OCP and not HCA.

I like the HCA, even without the incentives it is protecting our neighbourhood from demolition and speculation.

We must be careful that over densifying does not become the end goal of the incentives.

- if there is to be any conditions they cannot be so limiting and restrictive that the ability to meet them. This will create undue expense and stress to the home/land owner. If there is to be outright entitlement, then the guidelines to development and/or restoration, should have clear and established criteria at the planning departments level. Have policies before the door open to renovation /development. Put the horse before the cart.

- We are long term residents of Queens Park and strongly support the Heritage Conservation Area in our neighbourhood. We actively took part in the process to create protections for this area. We do not believe that any incentives are needed, other than what is already in place in most communities. The push for incentives has been and continues to be promoted by a very small and vocal minority in the Queen's Park Area. Our heritage guidelines are extremely reasonable and there is no reason to bring in incentives to satisfy a small group.

- The incentives should be implemented to promote homeowners' desire to restore houses as opposed to demolishing and rebuilding. These incentives would encourage homeowners to continue to come to Queen's Park without having to compromise for space while maintaining the Heritage Preservation within the area as well. Limiting the incentives provides a unique opportunity to expand yet preserve the property according to the HCA.

- What I know of the incentives is that they are counter intuitive, they support putting more people in a neighbourhood which has been enjoyed for peace and quiet. Seems we are promoting fewer trees and more structures.
• I think incentives should be offered with clearly spelled out conditions, as recommended by the Discussion Paper.
• I generally prefer we attach conditions rather than general entitlements. The homeowner is often getting a significant increase in property values.
• The City has inflicted a "heritage" sentence on many QP homeowners without the City Staff conducting a heritage study of the individual properties before applying the "heritage" label. Purely the age of a property and it's streetscape (by encapsulating front & sides of house) is not true heritage and indeed owners may gut out the heritage from homes. This has caused many homes to have substantial property value losses and properties decreased by BCAssessment. Therefore, all incentives and grants should be outright incentives without any conditions.
  All pre-1941 homes should be in the "limited" category unless the homeowners have chosen to designate their home as a heritage property.
• I believe that if everyone get the incentives no one will keep the houses. The point of these incentives is to encourage individuals to keep the heritage of the house. If an incentive is given to everyone, this is no longer an incentive. We must reward those for maintaining the original look of the house with these incentives. I believe that these incentives should be offered with the condition that they maintain the heritage look of their house.
• outright entitlements
• Outright Entitlements as default. Maybe some specific Conditional Entitlements but only in very rare cases.
• all incentives should be outright entitlements
• I think conditional incentives create more confusion than there already is... More importantly, where is the option to move down to Limited protection? Many homes can't use any of the incentives that have been floated around so how am I supposed to vote on any kind of incentives plan? The biggest incentive for me is to be moved to Limited ASAP so I can restore my homeowner rights and lost value. Also, why are we almost a year into this HCA without an incentives plan??? Why would council vote to put something this disruptive in place without a clear and concise incentives package to offer residents? Absolute madness!
• Anyone who cannot use these incentives (whether they are outright or conditional) should be moved down to the Limited category. There are many smaller homes and lots in this neighbourhood, so why aren't those homes getting any kind of consideration? Saddling all of these properties with lots of of restrictions and giving them 0% of the benefits will put these families at financial risk. Where is the city's empathy?
• Financial incentives for considerable heritage restoration on a graduated scale means basis. Allow laneway or carriage house within limits on a priority basis
• Personally, not a fan of limiting the number of entitlements in any case. So while in principle I would like to have outright entitlements because it will be easier, I believe
that even now, the entitlements in the conditional area only have a benefit to land owner if they are considering future development. What entitlements to home owners get if they don't want to develop their property? None. The system now is excessively hard to manage for a home owner that has limited funds and experience.

- I believe that some incentives should be offered with conditions. Each property is unique and should be assessed on an individual basis.
- Incentives like zoning relaxations and an expanded heritage grant programs should be offered in the advance category.
- Conditions

  - Preference for outright entitlements as long as guidelines are clearly established. There will always be a need for some flexibility to deal with exceptional circumstances.
  - outright incentives
  - Are incentives to be money or are they to do with zoning issues? One can not just throw money at houses. If maintenance is a concern, then a criteria could easily be established.
  - Why do we need incentives?

- I am opposed to conditions. Each property that is protected is protected, in part, because it is unique - and old. The reality is that conditions will unfairly penalize some properties further as they seek to access incentives. For example, a property that has an addition from the 1970s with aluminum windows may need the windows upgraded in order to add an HCA-appropriate addition to another (perhaps more visible?) part of the house.

Also, conditions implies that although my house is considered worthy of preservation it is inadequately worthy without expensive restoration or a more restrictive level of protection. Conditions, especially if they are more difficult to understand and implement are likely to continue the alienation of realtors and the continuing loss of equity in our homes.

- Surely depends upon the incentives.
- Incentives offered with conditions to save heritage structures.
- All incentives must be Outright Entitlements. The conservation area designation is not voluntary or done on the home by home basis, consequently entitlements need to be outright.
- All incentives must include conditions, this will reduce the abuse of city incentives for heritage properties.
- My reading of this is a 2 tiered approach
  1- outright entitlements for all. this would hopefully ease the fears of people who believe the HCA has a negative impact on their property values / development rights. This would bring everything up to an even playing field FOR ALL.
2- conditional entitlements for those who wish to improve the existing heritage fabric and be awarded for doing so. This incentives heritage preservation FOR SOME, namely those wishing to do so.
Good approach!

- Prior to the HCA, property owners could access various incentives in exchange for the highest level of protection, designation. The incentive policy should retain elements that encourage movement from the advanced or other categories to a higher category. These conditional benefits might actually motivate "borderline" homes that are currently exempt to "cross over" into protected status. However, I agree that basket of "across the board" incentives such as basement and attic exclusions should be applied as outright entitlements. Otherwise, I foresee a "process" issue whereby applications for the incentives could create market "does it or doesn't it" uncertainty. Best to simplify and include "blanket policies" as well as conditional incentives.

- Outright entitlements. The simpler the better.

- One incentive that ALL those in protected homes would’ve FSR bonusing to basements and attics, and even allowing side additions. This could be extended to anyone in New West that is a home older than 1940, so that not just Queens Park residents get special treatment. [A lot of] the other options really fall under OCP umbrella

- All incentives should be implemented as outright entitlements for all owners of protected properties.
This would allow current owners and/or future buyers to use the incentives as they wish, in an effort to recover lost value caused by the policy. And, also allows the owner some different rights, as the policy took away rights, whether the owner agreed or not. The city has enriched property owners in the Glenbrooke North neighbourhood where no protections exist, as well as Limited owners in Queen's Park, as an unintended consequence. Giving protected owners access to all incentives as an outright entitlement will re-level the playing field, and put things back to the order they were in, before the City meddled in free market property rights.

- Conditional Entitlements.
- Mostly outright with some conditional.
- Out right entitlements - are good for incentives that are strongly popular and agreeable by the majority. (see below)! (BUT as long as the incentives […]
The incentives should be easy to understand and manageable to implement and administer.
BOTTOM LINE - incentives should uphold the original purpose of the HCA which is intended to preserve the character and greenspace of the neighborhood!!!!!!!!! Already I see some erosion to this original purpose to satisfy a very few that weren't in agreement with the HCA in the first place.

- Incentives should be easy to understand and for administration BUT some done with rezoning and public hearings as a minimum
• Perhaps a bit of both! The HCA and the Incentives should be easy to understand and manageable to implement and administer while maintaining the standards of restoration that is the hallmark of an HCA.
• outright incentives with no conditions
• Outright incentives are preferable- easier to understand and administer.
• Outright entitlements
• As long as it's equitable for homeowners- eg not preferable treatment. (Eg other regions- Brow on the Hill) I'd like these conditions to extend to homeowners living in the Brow on the Hill area. Otherwise, not sure if I be Eligible for these incentives? My home doesn't have a heritage designation.
• All incentives need to have conditions! And should be open to homeowners all across the City. I don't appreciate the name "Queen's Park Heritage Conservation Area" - it is not inclusive in any sense. The City needs to come up with a name that encompasses all of the beautiful heritage of the entire City. I put a great deal of time, effort and money into maintaining my heritage home but some of my neighbours do not. Just because you own a heritage home does not mean that you are entitled to anything. My home was under an HRA, which we implemented and completed years ago. My neighbour had an HRA but has done only half of the work and not to the quality that is expected by the Agreement. No one has checked the work and no one has checked that the HRA has even been completed. We all want to feel proud of our neighbourhoods and of our heritage buildings so incentives should be open to all so that we have equitable opportunity to access incentives to keep our homes and properties maintained."
• yes, some further conditions might be useful. a money incentive would speak to many people
• Requiring Heritage Designation is a deal breaker - many insurance companies will decline your coverage or make you much higher rates. Further some of the implications of designation are not economically rational (e.g. wood only window frames vs. a wood hybrid) and would not be easily adjustable to modern technologies (e.g. solar windows) I would like to see discussion around heritage rezoning incentives - e.g. turning larger heritage homes into more than 2 dwellings thereby saving the building while mitigating the housing crisis. Incentives are good as it is expensive to keep a heritage home in a state of good repair however restoration can not have impossible timelines or specifications that are not realistic. I wish I had a better answer but incentives, yes - conditions, yes but reasonable.
• Allow across the board entitlements with accepting some tailor made incentives with additional conditions.
• A combination of outright and conditional, as determined by the heritage committee in consultation with the homeowners, and administered by the heritage foundation.
Rezoning hearings and additional approval processes add significant costs and further reduce affordability. Outright entitlements are preferable and should be available to all existing properties regardless of status including beyond Queens Park.

Outright entitlements with all incentives

Some incentives should be offered with conditions.

How about trying to save more than the 'famous' houses in Queen's Park? There are still a few older homes sprinkled through the rest of New Westminster.

I live in the West End, and it makes me sick to see the older homes fall one after another, only to be replaced by ugly monster homes. We moved here 25 years ago because it had a nice old-fashioned Vancouver neighbourhood feel, and it is fast disappearing.

We have 8 new houses on our Dublin Street block, and that doesn't make us comfortable for the future of the remaining houses. Not all of the houses on the block are old, but the majority were built before and after the 2nd World War. If they are not saved, then that time in history is going to be lost. So, why is it that only the oldest houses are being protected?

incentives are not needed

Some incentives should be offered with conditions.

Some incentives -- including those with more benefits -- should be implemented with conditions.

easy access and education for DIY projects.

I oppose the HCA outright and the idea of the governing body imposing this firstly, and then offers incentives to something that was always the Homeowner's right previously. Queens Park has this eclectic assortment of houses because there was no restrictive covenant at the time, and now it risks becoming a cookie cutter assortment of gingerbread replicas.

No conditions

I don’t want to see any more protection being added to homes. We’ve already given up a lot of our rights, why should we even have to decide whether more protection is good? We should be getting all the incentives necessary, end of story.

It is difficult to answer this question, as none of these options are available to me and many of my neighbours. This plan appears to only be concerned with compensating those people fortunate enough to own very big houses.

Some incentives should be offered with conditions.

I think a 'low bar' conditional program makes sense. Not too stringent but not wide open.

I think the best way would be outright entitlements. The area is currently under mandatory design guidelines as a result of the HCA so the less barriers the better. Since that was the one of the main initial drivers for the HCA, we should make every effort to reduce the barrier to entry to take advantage of the incentives. People are already saddled with a major restriction on what can or can not be done with the property.
Incentives should be offered with conditions such as overall restriction on FSR and design guidelines to avoid the creation of monster homes. Also, if you use an the house cannot be moves Advanced Category at a later date. Simple conditions, nothing cumbersome. Try to avoid additional processing by being very clear about what is allowed and then following through with inspections or "walk throughs". Let's be honest - some owners/developers will try to do things to their own benefit.

All these “incentives” should be outright entitlements

All incentives should be offered as outright entitlements. The main purpose of incentives is to offset the considerable decline in property values caused by implementation of the HCA ......The notion that any homeowner needs to add further restrictions or expenses to their to gain access to higher value incentives is absurd and unacceptable.

I feel like this is adding complexity to an already complex issue. I don't recall ever hearing about a tiered incentive approach until now. I think they should all be outright and on the table because many of these incentives are what was promised to us by supporters of this bylaw.

"I think there should be a set, clear, completely transparent process for what anyone could negotiate for and receive.

The city is creating a black box of negotiated incentives. Furthermore, the incentives (e.g. more square footage, bigger laneway house, higher roof, etc...) are often completely at odds with the Heritage Conservation area. I don't care that a house is restored to look more like a Heritage house, if it is cramped between 2 laneway houses, has had it's setback reduced and is now 4 feet from the house next door. It is absolutely ludicrous to incentivize heritage with incentives that minimize the pleasant streetscape that "'heritage'' creates."

All should be given outright

I think most of the incentives should be outright entitlements but if property owner want above that then there should be conditions or HCA

This assumes that everyone is equal and that all can afford to implement recommended incentives to add density to the housing stock in New West. Renovations and building new structures costs a lot of money and time; two things not everyone is privy to. If these are not possible for homeowners and the price of their homes is not equivalent to market forces outside of the HCA then some people may not move or be able to move to live elsewhere.

Everything should be outright entitlements, no conditions attached.

I can not name a single benefit I have received by this HCA there are only negatives. Given that changes to the bylaw were planned right from the beginning, at your first opportunity, reverse the HCA. Think of all the tax dollars that could be saved, in the long run this will amount to many millions. Enhance the already very successful HRA program so that more homes citywide take advantage of it and the stronger legal protection requisite therein. Many marginal homes have been caught in the crossfire and none of the so called "incentives" may work or be relevant to them. Council says
it may move some of these homes to the unprotected category but there are no guarantees this will happen. Even more disturbing would be for Council to automatically include more homes into the protected category once they pass a certain age or to move a home from unprotected to protected at the behest of a few citizens in a small local preservation society, group or committee. How long before all 1950's homes are captured by the heritage net. The only incentive necessary is to give ALL home owners the option to be either in or out of the heritage conservation area. Your attempt to fix something that was never broken has been miserable for many and glee for only a select few.

- No incentives or any more tax dollars spent on heritage. The past will always be there, focus should be on improving the future.
- Incentives should only be offered with conditions
- Offer most incentives with conditions so that there is continuous oversight and control
- Allow stratification if principal residence restored
  - Basement floor space exclusion anything below 4' of grade
  - Complete attic floor space exclusion - dormers max 6' or 50% of eave length
  - Relaxation for laneway house or carriage if original house restored to certain level
  - 15% of laneway or carriage house FSR
  - 100% tie into existing sewer system for laneway
  - HUGE ENGINEERING BLOCK ON ALL LANEWAYS!!

- I would like to see conditions placed on the incentives being considered.
- Some conditional
- Tiered - where some incentives are offered with conditions. The complexity this creates is not a true challenge to implementation as long as an effective communication tool outlining the incentives (as has already been achieved through these 'boards' is accessible.
- I think that some incentives should be offered with conditions. I would like to see a higher level of heritage restoration required for some of the larger incentives such as stratification and laneway homes. This seems fair. If some are benefiting to a larger extent with incentives than others, their gain should be in turn of historical benefit to the neighbourhood as a whole. I would like to see that these homeowners be required to for instance install/replace vinyl/aluminum windows with wood windows and doors that look heritage as well as using original looking exterior materials and have original looking porches, etc.
- Some incentives should be offered with conditions, however not knowing exactly what the conditions will be make it difficult.
- Some incentives with some conditions
- With conditions
- I think a mixture of outright entitlements (for simpler administration and less uncertainty for the homeowner) and some conditional entitlements (with greater benefits) would make sense.
• Incentives should be offered with conditions. If you get AN incentive the others are not available to the property. If you utilize an incentive the property must stay in the advanced category forever.

• All incentives should be offered for the benefit of the area (HCA). It is not appropriate to give the homeowner an advantage that does not help the City/residents.

• Yes, they should all be outright entitlements! Point #3 above [smaller number of incentives] sounds like a bit of a threat. #4 [all incentives outweigh impacts of HCA] - No property will be able to implement all of them. And what is the problem if benefits of some outweigh the HCA impact? We are already negatively impacted by the HCA. My dictionary defines an incentive as a "thing that urges a person on". These are concessions, not incentives!

• I think some should come with conditions
• Conditional entitlements would appear to provide some safeguards by ensuring any monies would be properly applied.

• Incentives should be offered with conditions.
• Anything that involves setbacks and heights is tricky - if they conform to existing house, ok to do outright, if [not], it needs review with conditions similar to current variance process.
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• Some should be offered with conditions, say for bigger projects
• Keep the incentives simple and easy to understand. Perhaps a flowchart might be helpful. Use the HRA for more complex conditions as it can be used for the entire City and not just one neighbourhood.

• First of all, stop calling them "incentives". What you are proposing is NOT incentives...they are measures to mitigate the loss of property values for homeowners in the affected area. To provide an incentive infers that one can opt in or out of the HCA. Something we all know is not possible unless there is a change in civic government in October.

I think the strategy should be to implement enough mitigation measures as to ensure that someone who does not have the money to invest in the expansion of their home will have recovered the lost value due to HCA. People shouldn't have to spend more money they don't have to recover the several hundred thousand dollar loss they are facing due to the HCA.

• I am fully opposed to any incentives plan that does not allow owners who cannot use them to move down to the limited protection category. All of these incentives vastly favour owners of large homes/properties with lots of money. What about the owners of small properties and those without vast savings? This is very unfair, as it will drive down the value of the homes in this latter group - they will have 100% of the restrictions with 0% of the benefit. This is a glaring problem that has been pointed out to the city numerous times by residents.
• I prefer conditional entitlements. I don't think that council owes something to every home owner.
• All incentives should be outright entitlements.
• I am in favour of an option that keeps things simple. All changes being proposed by the home-owner should be vetted by the City, and rewarded according to their benefit to the street-scape.
Those who deviate from what they have promised the City (and by extension, the neighbourhood), should be forced to un-do their work and comply with what they agreed to. This is different from what has frequently happened recently in New Westminster (e.g. 200 block of Fourth St.) where an owner has dramatically deviated from what was planned and agreed to by City and neighbourhood. The result in this (and similar situations) is one where the City 're-negotiates' with the non-complying owner, and makes concessions which are frequently less-than-sympathetic to the street-scape of the neighbourhood, while additionally causing relational strife. And it bears mentioning that friendly relationships are the TRUE, and protection-worthy, 'street-scape' of the Queen's Park neighbourhood.
• Not sure about outright entitlements. The big incentive is living in an HCA. Small houses on small or big lots will benefit from the heritage retention. Adding conditions might increase workload though. I think outright entitlements if they are the chosen incentives should be reserved for the Advance category. We need to make it attractive to be in that category.
• For incentives to protect the intent of the HCA they should be conditional. There may be some cases where an incentive need not to have strings attached but I think these would be rare.
• I believe that to provide the greatest benefit to present and future homeowners as well as stronger protection for houses which might be at risk that there should be a combination of outright entitlements as well as conditional incentives based on the needs of the homeowner, property and the neighbourhood as a whole.
• There should be conditions imposed on the incentives.
• I support a combination of both outright & conditional incentives. Simplicity of process combined with homeowners required to participate in a way to support heritage restoration and protection.
• I support a combination of Outright & Conditional Entitlements. Process should be streamlined & simple while homeowners should be required to restore their property in an appropriate heritage manner
• There should be MANY outright entitlements that are easy to understand. The HCA has impacted affected homes and their assessed values (and by extension the entire neighborhood) deeply. I believe the city has a lot to make up for - incentives should be extremely easy to understand, extremely applicable to all homes impacted, and have virtually no barriers in place for home owners to access or take advantage of them.
• I would like to see outright incentives across the board to keep things simple. I would support accepting some more custom made incentives with conditional added requirements.
• Outright
• This proposal does not take properties that are small and/or primarily have land value-only into account. There are many residents who feel excluded by these incentives, which will only work for owners with large plots who are willing and able to spend a lot of money. Unless the city is going to move people who are shut out from these ideas down to a lower level of protection, how can this plan be considered fair? It will only create further inequity.

**Potential Incentives**

**Increased Floor Space Ratio for the Principal Dwelling**

• This concession should also be available generally to owners of existing properties in New Westminster. Specifically owners who have already built large garages that do not meet the new zoning set-back or floor-space rules applicable to laneway houses but which are otherwise suitable to be reclassified as laneway houses should be allowed to convert them to laneway houses as long as no additional infringing construction is included.
• I fully support this incentive
• See this as being an advantage to homeowners but should be kept as an alternative to laneway not in addition to
• If a detached accessory building or LWH is not possible then this should be allowed PLUS the basement and attic exclusions, up to a maximum FSR in the range of .7 - .8. Also note that there should be some limits on larger properties to protect against monster homes. Base all of these bonuses on an average 6000sqft lot.
• How are residents supposed to increase FSR with exterior restrictions? I don’t have any land behind my property so the only way I can do this is by tearing down half my house and extending it out sideways. Also, I was told this was going to be 0.7FSR, what happens to that? Another thing I would consider.. many of the homes here are valued very low (some buildings assessed as low as $50K). Adding heavy land restriction and then allowing those low value buildings to add 10% doesn’t seem like that much of a value. Especially because for some homes it will cost and arm and a leg to do it.
• This seems to be a fair way to provide property owners who cannot or do not want to build a laneway or carriage house with a more or less equivalent opportunity to increase their living space. I do think, however, that there should be some oversight on the types of addictions people choose for their properties to ensure that they maintain their heritage value and remain consistent with the other houses in their neighbourhood.
• If the additional density results in a suite - then off street parking must be provided.
allows extra density for homes without attics or low basements.
If this option is considered then the property must be able to support off street parking for primary residence along with any potential rental suite or secondary accommodation allowed with the additional square footage.
Same comment as in the previous question.
Make it 15%
Our street is already congested with parked cars on both sides. Trucks cannot get down the street and cars have to take turns to go one way. If people would use their existing garages for cars instead of storage traffic flow would be better.
Green space is important. If a property is covered with buildings - and this happens throughout the neighbourhood - the neighbourhood will be diminished.
If it doesn't impact have a huge impact on the existing yard and neighbors - especially if it is a small lot that greatly changes it - like eliminating the garden and having the home fill the property - then yes. But only up to .6 only.
I agree with this but only allow the increase in FSR without changing minimum setbacks etc.
Up to .6 only. This will help some with no option for an laneway house. However, the size of additions may have to be capped.
This needs to be looked at closely by a committee that can ensure the addition will not greatly affect the overall heritage look of the house and neighbourhood.
But bring in even more strict guidelines for keeping New West's urban forest; most important in these these times of global warming and the possibility of extreme heat and other challenges.
Prefer incentive that would increase the permitted density from .5 FSR to .6 FSR over laneway or carriage house additions.
NOT TOO LARGE please!
Again, green space needs to be preserved so this should be controlled. Also design guidelines for additions would need to be in place.
All zoning code requirements should not be compromised.
I'm almost at .5 FSR as it stands right now so adding 10% not necessarily a huge boost. But I suppose it could work for others. I thought this FSR increase was going to be proposed to be 0.7, why did it go down to .6?
...only to .6 FSR
only up to .6 FSR
...only up to .6 FSR
What happened to 0.7 FSR that was touted all throughout this process? I heard that repeatedly from supporters of this initiative as a likely offering. Now we're down to 0.6... I honestly don't think this makes much of a difference for people and I don't think a potential buyer could care less about 10% more FSR when they have total restrictions on a house's exterior. Also, some homes are in positions that makes it hard to increase FSR without costly renovations. Furthermore why should I have to renovate and increase FSR at all?? This incentive is an acknowledgement that families
(or potential future buyers) will have to renovate to achieve parity in their home value.

- None of the above. What about all of the owners that cannot use this?
- Simple to understand and implement.
- This would be useful and helpful to all property owners but the building guidelines need to be followed. It is important that the additions blend with the house and do not look distinct from it. This is repeatedly stated as very important by residents of the neighbourhood.
- Must have a firm limit on FSR
- If you don't build a laneway, you could do this but only if you actually make a suite in your house. If the premise is laneways are to increase density than i would only allow larger houses with the aim of increasing density. Furthermore this expansion should not be allowed to encroach on side yard or setbacks (e.g. you can't just keep building to the edge of your yard and, like laneways, should have neighbourhood, consultation)
- Only with the proviso that the home be restored in concert with the renovations.
- I don't have a back lane like a number of the streets in QP
- Many of the larger homes, some owned by NW Heritage Directors, are already 0.7FSR so this incentive must be implement and consideration to increase to 0.7FSR.
- This would be important for us. Without a lane behind us our option would be a carriage house - but years ago one of the owners joined the former garage to the house using a variance to get a 2 foot side yard. It means there isn't reasonable access on both sides of the house to accommodate a family in the current house plus ease of access to a carriage house in the back. Much more reasonable would be widening the existing house, raising it, and adding a full height basement.
- 0.5 SFR is very low compared with neighboring Vancouver, it should be increased more like 0.65 to add density.
- If conditions are attached then I change my answer to No, don't offer this incentive.
- QP FSR should be similar to other areas of New West.
- Again, this sounds like another incentive for additions, which still do not benefit my property due to the small size of the land and positioning of the existing home. However I don't object to others benefiting from it.
- This incentive is potentially huge and I would recommend retaining it as a "carrot" for designation. The attic and basement incentives if implemented across he board are a de facto FSR bonus, so the folks, like myself, who would not have much room for a laneway house are not really being "left out." If the up-zoning is seen as critical, the folks that believe it is can access it with the conditions.
- Again the new 10% should be consistent with the current style of the house. We all ready have terrible examples of houses and the story is, owners could not be turned down if it met building regulation. We don't need 10% ugly. Design guidelines need to be in place.
• Under the right circumstances this incentive would make sense as homeowners would not need to compensate by building a laneway house rather they would be allowed to expand the existing home.
• This should only be given to those who maintain the original front of their heritage homes.
• But perhaps there should be a maximum that is enforced - max 0.6 FSR
• With a maximum FSR
• As long as it's an alternative, not on top of laneway or carriage
• As an alternative to laneway or carriage house only.
• Most homes in Queens Park are already over FSR 0.60 but some owners would benefit
• Limits on house/bonus size
• Same as previous [upper limit to bonus]
• There must be a limit on maximum size that is non-negotiable.
• Green space is important to the whole neighbourhood. This measure will be not environmentally friendly, against Canadian value
• Very expensive for small additional space
• again, more cost to the homeowner, so no!
• The FSR in New Westminster is too low compared with other municipalities.
• Possible conditions - case by case
• Not beneficial to most
• Only if it is applied to the original dwelling, never to laneway or carriage houses.
• Not high enough for SMALL lots. Have at +0.1 FSR of existing instead. We are already near 0.6 FSR on our 4300 sqft lot already. So for us it would be 0.7 FSR. It would not be a monster house due to our smaller lot size.
• This is a reasonable incentive.
• 10% larger is reasonable, more than 10% could result in an unattractive and crowded lot
• Site coverage also needs to be increased from 35% to 40-45% in order to realize the benefit of this incentive
• Allow 0.6 FSR as long as site coverage respected re: yards.
• Outright but only without LWH. Otherwise also allow more floor space but through basement or attic.
• increase needs to suit existing building
• As long as the proposed FSR is not exceeded
• Yes! This alone would negate any perceived negative impact of the HCA. BUT it can only apply to existing heritage properties - incentivizing restoration/renovation/addition - it CANNOT apply to new builds.
• The main concern needs to be houses with a small FSR to be able to meet their full potential
This incentive seems to be one that would have a smaller amount of administrative challenges attached to it.
Each one should be evaluated, so that they maintain the character of the neighbourhood from the street and lane. It can be done with some sensitivity.
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If you are going to implement this property loss mitigation strategy, then apply it to all homeowners negatively impacted by the HCA. However, I should note this is encouraging the construction of larger homes that consume even more energy. How "eco-friendly" is that?
As long as it is in lieu of a carriage house I have no difficulty.
I support additional FSR if it does not impact the overall setbacks & garden space. IE, if an additional 10% means loss of garden space (less than currently permitted) then a condition should apply. IE, only get 5% to retain appropriate setbacks & gardens.
Support this incentive providing that it does not impact yard space (front, back or side) & site coverage of lot area.
This is easy to offer, but very, very hard for residents to implement. Also, what happened to .7?

Existing Basement Floor Space Exclusion
This concession should also be available more generally to owners of existing properties in new Westminster
Only offer this incentive if the addition doesn't negatively impact the neighbours (ie. overlooking their yards, shading their homes or gardens) and fits aesthetically with the rest of the homes on the street. The addition should work within the character of the existing house.
Concerned about the size of the addition
Seems like there is a potential for a huge increase in the size of some homes. Not particularly in favour of that and also it should be limited to basement or attic, but not both. The .1 increase in FSR should be the limit
This is a significant incentive that I'm very much in favor of. I do think there should be some restrictions, such as an overall FSR cap. Imagine a foursquare house with three equally sized floors, one of which is the basement. One would be allowed to hit .75 FSR (.5 plus .25 exempt) plus also build a laneway home. Maybe cap the FSR of excluded basements and attics at .2 FSR for a total FSR of .7.
Note that in these situations I do believe excess above ground density should be transferable to a laneway home, even if the home itself hits .5+ FSR due to the basement exclusion.
If people can use it, make it available. I don’t have a basement so this doesn’t apply to me.
- A key feature of our community is beautifully landscaped homes situated on properties where there is green space between homes. This is a major reason why we came here over 30 years ago, and it is a major attraction for new home buyers. This back door method for significantly increasing floor space COMPLETELY defeats the purpose of heritage conservation.
- Raising up houses to increase basement space or add an additional floor destroys in most cases the design, balance, and 'look' of a house. This is not, in my opinion, how we preserve heritage houses.
- As long as the addition meets the requirements of the HCA
- great idea
- didn't know that basements were included in fsr
- Offer this if you need to appease people who aren’t happy.
- Why are proposed incentives so strongly focused on additions to existing homes? I'm not aware of such a strong desire to add on to all the Heritage Homes in the area. Is there something I'm missing in the desire to declare this area an HCA to allow additions onto existing structures?
- Bad incentive idea, most properties are already restricted for size. Not all lots are the same in QP
- Unfortunately this incentive will not work for our house. We are not interested in additional floor space. The problem is an environmental one - the house has no insulation and the windows leak warm air. Bigger is not better.
- Definitely this is a very useful incentive. The cost of adding a basement could be costly - but that is the nature of renovations and the homeowner would need to discuss what is best for him/her. Not having to go through an HRA to shore up a crumbling foundation - this would make it very reasonable.
- I'm in agreement to excluding the basement from the FSR, as long as there is still some kind of overall maximum to the allowable FSR dependent on the size of the lot. No one wants a huge monstrosity next to them built to the borders of the property. This is also a good incentive in that many basements on heritage houses can be damp or have low ceiling and not usable.
- Allow but with a maximum FSR
- There should be a maximum re: FSR. We do not want monster additions impacting our neighbours and shading gardens.
- I am very concerned that Queen's Park will lose too much green space and trees. I am not in favour of homeowners being able to increase the footprint of their homes by the equivalent square footage of their basements. I myself and considering putting an addition onto our first floor, but I would only consider increasing the footprint of my home by about 30% because I want to maintain a good sized yard. I would hope that the incentive of a 40% increase is spread out over 2 or 3 floors, and the size of the yard will still provide privacy for neighbours. I would not want the footprint Queen's Park property to substantially reduce green space or privacy. Some properties with large homes and small lots should not be able to increase the size of their footprints.
I also feel that any additions must be of the same architectural style and materials as the original structure.

- This is a great incentive, particularly for smaller homes wanting to have more floor space. It should be offered to most as it does not affect the exterior of the home.
- The risk of allowing too high of a percentage of the lot to be covered by buildings is the potential decrease in "urban forest". The city has already recognized the importance of green space, and we need to ensure that our lots here not over developed.
- The phrase "protected property owners" implies that everyone in New Westminster wanted the HCA. This is not the case; there were many people who were opposed or who did not understand what the HCA was or what the implications of the HCA were. As the HCA was imposed upon all residents of Queens Park then all should benefit (if they can) from any incentives. Just to give you some insider information as to how some neighbours feel about the HCA. One neighbour refers to the boundary zone as checkpoint charlie

- Prefer adding new basement to existing house to a max .6 FSR. Do not like the option to increase above ground additions equivalent to Basement size
- This could be offered to all. It would be up to the homeowner if they could afford it because I don’t think the city should bear any costs
- Agree but should not also allow FSR Exclusion for Attic. Either Basement or Attic should be allowed but not both at the same time. Additionally yard space code requirements should not be compromised.
- This has always been poor policy and shouldn't be there in the first place. This should be not considered an incentive at all and allowed immediately on all homes. There are two infills across the street from us will no basements which would have allowed them extra living space in an era where extra living space is important. If a basement had been allowed, there would be no impact on neighbours or the city. This should not be in the category of an incentive.
- How can I vote on conditions if we don't know what they are yet? I can't make an educated decision without having all the information. However, I think introducing conditions on any of these is not in good faith. I had a sign on my lawn and had other residents telling me I would get all sorts of great incentives. I feel misled.

- .....no more than .6 FSR
- only up to .6 FSR
- ....only up to .6 FSR
- Many homes can't use this because they don't have basements (my house included)... It's insane that you are now fishing to get even higher protection on people's homes. We were promised this HCA was NOT full designation of homes. Now you want to start to peel back the incentives offered and try to get homeowners to agree to having potentially full designation a conditional requirement. Many residents were PROMISED incentives that work for everyone by city staff and HCA supporters. This
is total back-peddling. It's not that I don't want this incentive available, but I realize many homes can't realistically use it so it just won't work for a lot of residents.

- None of the above. What about the homes that do not have basements?
- This is a simple incentive to understand and to implement.
- This is the easiest and most straight forward to implement. It allows all properties with the room to expand their house and those without a basement to to add one regardless of their present FSR. With or without an HCA any home addition comes with a cost that is affordable or not to the homeowner.
- Must be used with common sense - no "monster" homes created from bonusing basements. Put a cap on FSR
- There should be some conditions of restoration for this, but not to the extent that the house has to be given official heritage designation.
- This added square footage is a big bonus, and should only be offered with the conditions of some restoration work being done.
- This is ridiculous. This will essentially allow you to create a taller house, a laneway house (that becomes a very large home), or a house that has no yard. I don't see how you can say this is increasing Heritage. This is directly killing what makes Queen's park unique within the city.
- These incentives should only be offered with the proviso that the home be restored.
- one comment on existing basements is that the ceiling height in a lot of early homes was only 6 feet max before any plumbing or heat ducting was added, pretty much useless for anything else. Basically a crawl space. Also they used inside perimeter drainage and in my case it is only half a basement, the rest is dirt which contributes to a lot of dust and dirt along with some interesting smells
- Many of the protected smaller homes do not have full or finished basements and many have height restrictions leading to storage or crawlspace. The flooring is usually thin set concrete with the structure wooden posts in the dirt so older homes have poor structure in basements. The cost to undertake a basement project in older home is considerable.
- We are on piers and beams. Our house is one and a half storeys high. The dirt floor crawlspace is about 3 feet high. Under previous zoning bylaws we could dig a basement but it would have to be mostly underground (which we don't like, don't believe we will use) and add to our FSR. With this incentive, we may be able to build a basement substantially above ground, making our house half a storey above ground level, plus one main floor level, plus the current top floor half storey. We would use this. It would increase the comfort of our draughty house, decrease the dirt crawlspace smell that we currently manage with bi-annual spray and $700 air purifiers on each floor, and allow for a third bedroom and family room that isn't in a dark basement. For our small 2 bedroom house this would be a significant step toward making our home sellable to a family - and without losing the private-feeling yard with mature landscaping.
- Calculation of existing low height basement area is not correct and generous, as they are not quality living space for residents. It should be excluded.
- Not in favour of any possible additional conditions attached. Otherwise I choose No, don't offer this incentive.
- Offer instead to all properties in the HCA, all have been/will be impacted in some fashion.
- I don't object to implementing this incentive for others, however it would offer no benefit to us. Our property has a basement, but the size of our land as well as the positioning of our house make any addition impossible.
- Low ceiling height, poor light, and other considerations does indeed often create a tremendously sharp contrast between upper floors and basements for many advanced category homes. Presumably the incentive would be an "as is" plan that would discourage costly house raising and/or floor lowering that is sometimes considered. My point being that if basements are bemused, homeowners should not be expecting to get a variance to raise their house a foot or two.
- Any additions to a house would need to be in character with the house and not look "like an addition".
- These incentives are akin to chopping ones arm off and then offering a choice of which finger to give back
- Limiting this incentive would promote the value of houses and offset the gap between land value and home value. Increasing liveable space when living spaces are limited is a valuable resources to attract future homeowners and at the same time preserve the integrity of the HCA.
- As stated in the previous message, I think that there should be conditions with the incentive. This conditions should be that the person is maintaining the heritage of the house.
- With the current cost of living and housing crisis, if people want to add basement space so that they can stay in their smaller homes in New West rather than move out of the City or if it allows people to offer a rental, I'm all for this incentive!
- Maximum 0.6 FSR
- Good incentive but I have some concerns about the amount of square footage that could be added to an already large home.
- I like this incentive but I'm concerned about the size of the addition to an already large QP house.
- Definition of basement. Anything below basement area that is 4'0" below grade should be excluded.
- Limits on overall house size/bonus
- Should be an upper limit to how much "bonus" a home can receive - bigger homes will benefit the most!
- Must be used rationally - should not create a monster home. A reasonable limit on FSR.
- This will lead to big giant houses that disrupt beauty of neighbourhood and invade other people's privacy
- This should be available for all protected properties. The "exemption" would likely negate the need for some HRAs.
- Ensure added density does not unduly impact landscaping and greenspace on property
- This could allow for homes that are too large for lot and be very expensive to utilize.
- not sufficient enough. too much cost to the homeowner
- Should be offered to ALL of New West older homes
- Agree, many basements are low height and not supported to be healthy environment for living purpose, it should be waived from calculation.
- No benefit
- [supports together with attic FSR exclusion]
- There should be a max FSR so the structure does not end up as a monster home.
- Many basements of protected [properties] are very low and have few windows/are dirty. Exclusion benefit many properties.
- This incentive makes a lot of sense. A huge benefit
- Add exemption to new basements.
- Do not allow both basement or attic FSR exclusion. Agree with one or the other, not both. Respect zoning re: site coverage as first priority, i.e. do not sacrifice yards for this.
- As long as it is still in line with current FSR. But do not allow bsmt AND attic exclusion.
- How would this even work; how often could FSR increase by 40% but still be within height, setback and site coverage allowances?
- And no more regulations you have so much burocrocy in place already!!!
- I think this is excessive. We will end up with monster houses on small lots.
- Houses with basements don't typically need a FSR increase
- Should be some conditions. Eg, unconditionally for smaller lots. Conditionally on larger lots (i.e. only if carriage/laneway house being built)
- This incentive should be offered on a case by case basis.
- But this question is no different than the last, DO not implement until the development/planning department has given clear guidelines to the Home/land owners, in order to have clear rules to follow. Not open to interpretation and /or manipulation.
- I'm wondering if this has the potential to create some pretty huge additions? If I think about where I live, we could end up with a 1500 square foot addition if I'm interpreting this incentive correctly. Not sure how the city would be able to maintain the street scape which is the main focus of bringing in an HCA in the first place.
- Keep the original houses intact, and allow lane-way houses.
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- Above ground additions should be minimized in order to maintain the integrity of the homes. If this incentive were to be offered, it should definitely be with conditions.
- This might be the easiest to implement.
- Once again...this is not an incentive. I would have to spend tens of thousands of dollars on renovations to realize this so-called benefit. But if you insist on writing the survey in this biased way, then yes, provide the "incentive" to all protected property owners.
- I think if you do this you will end up with a lot of homes that are too big for their lots. Visually it would be awful.
- There should be some restoration to the front aspect if the house is raised to accommodate the basement.
- The more I think about this --offer benefits to be IN the advanced category. Bonusing basement is a good idea if homeowners need density.
- Lot and current building sizes should be taken into consideration.
- Offer to all protected properties, but with consideration / coordination with other exclusions. IE, if the basement is an exclusion then the attic should not also be an exclusion (or vice versa). Also in consideration with maintaining reasonable setups & gardens, the property should not be filled with buildings.
- Support this incentive without also allowing an attic FSR exclusion. IE, one or the other, not both.
- This is a good incentive but extremely expensive for home owners to actually take advantage of. The market value of their home is reduced and adding a huge Reno is expensive and probably will not yield a return that makes up for the loss caused by the hca.
- Many homes are excluded from this.

Existing Attic Floor Space Exclusion

- This concession should also be available more generally to owners of existing properties in New Westminster.
- Owners should be able to use space in their existing attic, but any work that affects the exterior of the house should follow guidelines that are sympathetic to the original design of the house.
- Either the attic or the basement exclusion not both.
- We have an attic space that was partially developed when we moved into our QP home so we understand the advantages of this but stil, should be eithe the attic or the basement for exclusion, but not both.
- Same comments as per basement. Overall cap at .7 FSR for home (.2 of which is basement or attic exclusions) + .1 FSR for LWH.
- Same as previous. I have a crawl space, but no livable attic space so it doesn’t apply to me. I don’t want to ask that anyone lose anything, but I’m worried there are lots of incentives being offered that I just can’t use.
- See prior comment on basement exclusion
- Yes - if renovations fit criteria for HCA
- another great idea
- didn't know that attics were included in fsr
- It makes no sense to calculate unusable floor space.
- This additional space may cause the roof line to be dramatically altered which would have a considerable impact on the HCA.
- See previous question comment. The house must be able to accomodate this type of plan , my house does not
- Again we are not interested in additional floor space. Attic on second floor i.e., bedroom floor, and already usable.
- Yes, this is a very good option but the addition of dormers needs to be sympathetic to the house.
- I'm in agreement to excluding attics from the FSR too, as long as there is still some kind of overall maximum to the allowable FSR dependent on the size of the lot. No one wants a huge monstrosity next to them built to the borders of the property. I've also been in the predicament of wanting to utilize an attic that was only utilized for storage and the BC Building codes and the city told me that I would need steel structures on the outside of the house. When I contracted a structural engineer (two different ones), both told me it wasn't needed and would be cost prohibitive. At the time they estimated a cost that was almost what we bought the house for. So the attic wasn't utilized!
- Do one or the other - either the attic or the basement
- One or the other. Same as basement answer. No huge additions. Limit to size. One or the other.
- Without compromising the aesthetics and balance of the exterior
- My comments on the previous question apply here as well. I am against some homes with small yards being able to increase their footprints. I am also against any enlargements of home footprints to be more that about 30% depending on the size of the remaining green space and privacy for neighbours.
- This is a great incentive as well and should be offered to all. Again it gives more floor space and does not affect the exterior of the home.
- As long as appropriate fire and safety concerns are addressed.
- What fire, and safety procedures would be followed in this case?
- Like the incentive to allow homeowners to renovate existing attic space to maximize use but do not like building an above ground addition equivalent to the size of the attic. As per consultants recommendations may need to add definition of attic to zoning bylaw.
- This will help homeowners who don't have a basement.
• Same response as previous answer re:basement.
• Agree but should not also allow FSR Exclusion for Basement. Either Basement or Attic should be allowed but not both at the same time. Additionally yard space code requirements should not be compromised.
• This also should not be considered an incentive and should be immediately allowed on all properties within the city. This is utterly infuriating to have the city punish people for trying to densify within their own homes. Offer immediately and give the residents of Queen's Park something that truly represents an incentive; not things they should have already.
• Again, what are the conditions? This HCA is turning into a big bait and switch.
• ...only with .6 FSR and dormers need to be suitable to the character of the house
• only up to .6 FSR
• ...only up to .6 FSR
• Same as the previous question... Many homes don't have attics and can't just add one on (logistically and legally it just doesn't work for many homeowners). I'm either voting to give something only some homeowners can get or voting that nobody gets anything. This is not a fair position to be in unless homes are able to opt out of Advanced and move down to Limited altogether! If moving to Limited was an available incentive for homes that can't use the ones being entertained then I would be more obliged to advocate their usage. If a homeowner wants to stay in Advanced and lose rights/value, they should have access to incentives definitely.
• None of the above. What about the homes that do not have attics?
• As before, the simpler to understand and implement, the better.
• If you can't go down why not go up. Developed attic space can be very useful.
• Guidelines for dormers would be useful and the use of wood windows.
• Yes, but not if the basement is also excluded from the overall FSR.
• Again, adding square footage to a house is a very nice incentive to ... doing some restoration work! I don't know who will decide what kind and how much, but there should be a trade-off. Even if just to make the neighbours happy.
• I'm less adverse to this vs. the basement incentive, but i still dislike it.
• Structural updates would be required in nearly all attics. It would be a mess to allow this and then enforce the building code.
• My attic space has been accessed but you can only walk in it with your sideways as it is has very limited height.
• Bedrooms in the attic space are quirky and small. The stairs leading up to the attic are often narrow and many homeowners have to remove parts of the house just to get modern day beds and mattresses and furniture into these rooms. Renovating or enlarging attic space may require structural improvements and is very costly to undertake.
• We have an interest in adding a dormer. With HCA restrictions it is unlikely that we could do so in our front bedroom - as much as we would appreciate the greater headroom. However, the bathroom that currently can't accommodate a shower (only a
bathtub) would really benefit from a dormer and is less visible from the road. Because of the slope of the ceiling/roof we have very little attic and it is unusable. However, we have neighbours with a small home that is protected and the attic was once livable space and it would be a real help if they could open it up again.

- Not in favour of any possible additional conditions attached. Otherwise I choose No, don't offer this incentive.
- Offer to all properties in the HCA. Dormers are fine.
- I don't object to implementing this incentive for others, however it would offer no benefit to us. Our property has an attic, but the size of our land as well as the positioning of our house make any addition impossible.
- As a homeowner with a large but unfinished attic space, having the potential to develop it without conditions would be a significant benefit. We have looked into finishing the space in the past, and based on our findings, creating "livable" space is not necessarily achievable, depending on the structural supports for a floor where only a ceiling was planed for. My point is that I don't think people will be suddenly finishing their attics in a great rush, as cost and structural constraints remain a consideration. But certainly enabling the possibility would be positive.
- Tour the neighbourhood now and view the many ugly dormers. Use them as examples of what not to do.
- Study the current period of the house in question and determine something that would add space that the owner wants but enhance the appearance of the house and its period. That would add value and it appears to be all about money. Be sure the assessment authority added the additional value to house.
- Although I disagree the HCA, this would go against historically unpermitted uses for attics, be very costly, and most likely change the exterior historical features if adding dormers.
- Allowing heritage homes to expand into the attic would allow for even more space. Although it may be costly, the cost versus demolishing the house to allot for that space would be offset by this incentive.
- I believe that this should be offered on the condition that they maintain the heritage and era of the house.
- Again, if this allows people to stay in their smaller homes in New West instead of the leaving to find a bigger home in the Valley, give people this opportunity. I do, however, think that design has to play into this incentive.

- Maximum 0.6 FSR
- Only one - attic or basement, NOT BOTH.
- Either attic or basement not both.
- Max. dormer of 50% of eave length
- Limits on overall house size/bonus
- Same as above [upper limit to bonus]
- Same as above [reasonable limits]
• Only if the neighbour privacy is protected. For example, only next to house of equal height
• But people must meet design guidelines re: dormers, etc.
• I don't believe this is an incentive due to high cost with small benefit
• same as above [too costly]
• No benefit
• [supports together with basement FSR exclusion]
• There needs to be design guidelines... otherwise roofs could be over dormered.
• Will really help smaller homes like ours. This is the incentive we would love to take as we have a high ceiling attic but our house on small lot is at >0.5 FSR already.
• This incentive should only be allowed if the proposed addition looks good and does not jeopardize the heritage value and appeal.
• In case of excessive attic square footage, allow with a percentage reduction in square footage.
• See above comments re. basement FSR exclusions [not both]
• As long as remains in line with current FSR, roof height not impacted. But do not allow attic AND basement exclusion.
• This should only be used if any changes to the roofline are in line with height of surrounding properties
• No more regs please ,
• Yes if it doesn't detract from the character of the house
• As with basement. Some conditions. No conditions for smaller lots; some with larger lots (ie in conjunction with building carriage/laneway house)
• Also case by case. The addition would need to meet design guidelines to maintain the heritage character of the home.
• as per previous comments.
• Similarly to the previous suggested incentive, this has some potential to greatly increase the size of some homes, especially if you were permitted to do both basement exclusion as well as attic exclusion. Would it be that one could seek to do both? Perhaps would make more sense to be permitted to do only one of these two incentives.
• Again, lane way houses. Keep the original house intact (which should be big enough for any one family!), and allow basement suites and lane way houses to increase density.

**Online Surveys Not Submitted**
• Basements no, but attics will be smaller, so with conditions
• Same as last comment. This is NOT an incentive.
• Only if the addition does not detract from the look of the existing house.
• My main concern is that if this incentive is used there be no height variances required as part of the addition if the added height does not fit in with the neighbouring homes.
Offer to all protected properties, but with consideration / coordination with other exclusions. IE, if the attic is an exclusion then the basement should not also be an exclusion (or vice versa). Also in consideration with maintaining reasonable setups & gardens, so that the property is not be filled with buildings.

Support this incentive without also allowing a basement FSR exclusion. IE, one or the other, not both.

Again, an expensive incentive to take advantage of. Most homeowners probably could not afford it, but it should be made available.

Many homes are excluded from this.

More Achievable Laneway or Carriage House Density

This concession should also be available generally to owners of existing properties in New Westminster. Specifically owners who have already built large garages that do not meet the new zoning set-back or floor-space rules applicable to laneway houses but which are otherwise suitable to be reclassified as laneway houses should be allowed to convert them to laneway houses as long as no additional infringing construction is included.

Wouldn't like the laneway house dwarf the main house

Size of laneway should not exceed the 958 whichever way it’s done.

This should be an outright incentive. It is allowing more flexibility so that heritage properties have access to the same entitlements as any new build.

I think New West has a density issue as it stands. Not enough living space! So I think this should be eased for ALL New west residents. Many of us can’t use this either so we would appreciate an incentive that works for us, too.

See prior comment - relaxing the rules for lane way homes will completely erode the neighborhood. Why bother having a conservation area at all if you allow densification of every green space.

I understand this incentive means that a property owner will be able to transfer more than the current limit of 0.05 FSR up to 958 square feet ONLY AS LONG AS THEY DO NOT EXCEED THEIR TOTAL FSR LIMIT.

the restrictions with having to put 2 parking spaces on your property don't make having a carriage/laneway house very attractive. It will also greatly reduce GREEN space!!! Allow people to build a proper carriage house above a garage. Also allow carriage houses to park tandem.

To all of New Westminster or none

First I am NOT a fan of ANY laneway or Carriage house. The concept degrades the nature and feel of the neighborhood. That being said, IF they are to be allowed then allowing unused density to be transferred from the main house would be the only option that would be acceptable.

Allowing more structure than the FSR calls for only further chips away at what makes this area a desirable place to live. The larger yards, the bigger setbacks, the wide side-
yards all make up the definition of Heritage and changes to this simply erode the reasons why protection of this area as a HCA was undertaken

- yes but must work with existing home
- This incentive could have significant impact on neighbours and the crowded look of the addition.
- See previous comment. If i get a lane possibly
- Isn't this an OCP issue. Build what you can with the existing space.
- Don't muddy the waters with the HCA vs the OCP! Build to what you can with existing space. My head hurts. So much to think about it. Personally I would like to ensure we retain SOME green space. I fear structures being built to only inches between each other. And lots of concrete and one shrub..
- the lane way house might then dwarf the existing house, if I understand this correctly
- I don't want Queen's Park to become a high density area like East Vancouver.
- Yes, another great idea.
- Keep the urban forest in mind under all scenarios
- Not keen on this incentive as I don't like increasing density through laneway or carriage houses and the impact on the neighbourhood. However for special cases where the impact is minimal I understand the need to allow for maximum permitted living space of 958 sf.
- As per my previous reply. Also, I think all these incentives should apply to anyone in New West that has a home older than 1940
- I absolutely support increased Laneway or Carriage House Density. In fact, I don't think the permitted size of 958 square feet goes far enough. As the housing affordability crisis continues to worsen, people are going to be raising families in these carriage houses. Increase the allowable floor space to at least 1200 square feet!
- N/A
- Same as last question... If homes that can't use this are allowed to move down to Limited then I don't see why others who want to keep their home in Advanced protection shouldn't be able to use this.
- None of the above. What about all of the owners who cannot use this?
- Simple to understand a and implement and consistent with New West affordable housing strategy
- If this was offered theoretically you could end up with a laneway or carriage house larger than the original house. Leave it to the OCP.
- NO! I do not want my neighbours Laneway or carriage house dominating or shadowing my backyard.
- I don't see the logic of this. 1st, it would have been nice to know what the current max permitted square footage would be (so one could compare to 958) and second, the recent consultation regarding laneways was highly controversial and now you want to expand how big a laneway house can be - this seems more like a suggestion from developers vs. residents.
- Expand the permitted transfer to allow laneway homes as large as 1600 sq. ft. to facilitate smallish 3 bedroom housing units that can accommodate a smallish family
- Why 958 sq ft? At least 1200-1400 should be allowed for an additional structure.
- The City has already allowed a home to have a 1650SF laneway home in the past year. So why is there a 958SF limit?
- Not only do I wholeheartedly endorse this - if other aspects of the regulations are maintained - but I would like the maximum size be 1200 square feel. If a carriage or laneway house is viably a downsizing for the owner who might move grown children and their families into the main house, it will need to be big enough. If I had 1200 square feet for a carriage house I would build and move onto our son's property here in Queen's Park.
- It is fair to transfer more or all of the unused density to the secondary new unit.
- Offer this to all residents and not just a select few.
- Keep laneway carriage houses small.
- This incentive would not benefit my property as it is far too small for a laneway house. I don't object to others benefiting from this though.
- I am of the view that laneway and carriage guidelines should not be enhanced for the QPN over other New Westminster neighbourhoods, except with higher protection. We do not want the HCA to result in the QPN being further seen as overloaded with perks. Also, the complications could be tremendous, bogging us down.
- For many years 958 sq. feet was a pleasant two or three bedroom bungalow and neighbourhoods were built to this size. Where would the green space be in such a perposal? If 958 sq. feet were to be achieved, then it should be on two levels and on site parking provided.
- In many cases though, this wouldn't even come close to being enough than what would normally be permitted.
- It doesn't add restorative qualities to the house and is purely meant to increase mass. Homeowners would not be incentivized to actually live in the house.
- This should only be given to those who maintain the original front of their heritage homes.
- No to more building on single family lots
- As I said previously - we are already congested in QP and parking is limited. Sewer, garbage?
- As long as it doesn't exceed the 958 max.
- OK as long as no more than 958 sqft.
- 958 SF laneway can make a home livable for couple w/ one kid.
- Nothing extra should be offered beyond current OCP
- Same as above [same bonuses as rest of NW]
- No, no, no it only benefits developers and speculators.
- Crowding/spacing could be significant problem
- We do not need more "buildings" covering more "green space"
Attachment 4 – Raw Notes from Online Survey and Open House Worksheets

- "... maximum permitted size of 958 square feet"] or more
- Laneway and carriage houses should not dominate back yards and be invasive to neighbouring properties.
- Prefer next incentive though [larger laneway or carriage house]
- as long as the maximum permitted size is enforced.
- again - design guidelines needed - No!! alcan boxes
- How do you transfer density from a house already over FSR?
- I worry that you will pack too much density into small spaces.
- Yes, allowing laneway houses as much space as possible makes them more livable.
- 1000 square feet is a much more long term livable space than a 600 square foot space and in all honesty the size of the dwelling won't be that dramatically different.
- Our house is apparently within 200 sq ft of its maximum; which, if you look at the house, just doesn't make sense.
  I think that means that we couldn't have a lane way house, according to current rules.
  We have a large (2.5 car) garage that could easily be split into two garages, and have a nice apartment built over top.
  We have a small bachelor suite in the basement we use for a guest room. Another owner would likely use it as a mother-in-law or nanny suite, or even rent it out like we did when we first bought the house.
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- If you are going to implement this property loss mitigation strategy, then apply it to all homeowners negatively impacted by the HCA. Once again, this is inappropriately being referred to as an incentive - which it is not.
- A good idea.
- Perfect solution to unused space in large homes.
- I support this incentive if the additional density does not impact setbacks and garden space.
- Support this incentive providing that it does not impact yard space (front, back or side) & site coverage of lot area.
- This will only be possible for large properties (once again, many owners are excluded).

Larger Laneway or Carriage House
- This concession is especially relevant to people who have built large garages that could be converted but which have too much floor space. The current rules would require such existing buildings built at a cost of $80,000 and up to be demolished and replaced with ones that have a smaller floor area, a huge waste of money when the existing building is otherwise quite suitable for conversion. This concession should be given to all existing buildings in New Westminster in areas zoned for laneway homes.
- Laneway houses should be proportional to the land available and not negatively impact adjacent neighbours (i.e., significant lack of privacy due to overlooking windows or yards or shading windows and gardens).
- Nope don't like it
- Keep the maximum where it is at 958
- YES! Huge thumbs up on this, especially considering that 1200 sq ft allows for small families. I’d even go a little bit further on larger lots to allow 3 bedrooms (assuming an overall FSR cap that works. Given that this is an additional incentive vs. simply more flexibility on an existing entitlement I believe it is fair to require Recommended guideline compliance.
- Same as last question.. what about someone like me with small property?
- See prior comments
- I DO NOT want to offer the incentive to increase the permitted size of the laneway or carriage house from 958 square feet to 1,200 square feet.
- I DO want to offer the incentive to allow people to add below grade floor space in a way that does not increase the size of the building above ground, but increases storage space, but I want the condition to be that the below ground space is for storage only and is NOT additional living space. This needs to be monitored carefully both before and after modifications are completed.
- does this mean 1200 sq ft plus 1200 sq ft in cellar?
- All of New Westminster or none
- NO
- The below grade suggestion is the one that could have some usefulness.
- No
- Absolutely not!
- I’d worry about this being abused - I think a size limit should be set or everyone will pander to something else just to see if they can get it. Like the example on 5th St. ??? The city didn't even negotiate for any heritage concessions - what was received by the city in return for the 1,600 square feet that the applicant got? Yes 145k is a lot for wood windows, but 145k is NOT a large concession for receiving 1,600 square feet of extra living space!!! This isn't the fault of the applicant, but what did they agree to - the house was renovated by a previous owner and they mentioned that they have "maintained it" - which is true and very well, but isn’t that the base standard - to maintain your home?
- Yes if the above ground size does not change. I live near the Second Street and Royal Avenue, Queens Avenue square huge house which looms over the neighbouring homes.
- I think either option sounds great. I am all for maximizing floor space in whatever way is needed to encourage homeowners to preserve the heritage characteristics of their homes.
- Keep the urban forest in mind in all scenarios
• Much prefer the second option of excluding the seller space from the size limit. As per comment in previous question, I understand the need to increase permitted size for certain circumstances to 1200 sf to allow enough space for smaller families.
• 958 is enough for an infill.
• I’m okay with the second option, but not the first
• As in my previous comments, I emphatically support the increase in size of a laneway or carriage house to at least 1,200 square feet.
• The second option described is somewhat confusing. Does this mean that a 958 square foot home (presumably built on one level) could then have an additional 958 sqft basement for a total of over 1,960 sq ft? Or is it presumed that the 958 sqft would be built on two levels, with a basement adding another approximately 425 sqft? If this space may only be used for storage, I do not support this option. The temptation to later (illegally) convert storage space to living space is high and leads to substandard housing.
• N/A
• Same as last question... If homes that can't use this are allowed to move down to Limited then I don't see why others who want to keep their home in Advanced protection shouldn't be able to use this.
• None of the above. What about all of the owners who cannot use this?
• No, No NO!
• NO, NO, NO!!! Too big! This would alter the character and significantly reduce the green space that is so valued in the QP neighborhood and the city. If someone wants this do it through the OCP and the apply for an HRA requiring a public hearing.
• Excluding cellar floor space and keeping the building otherwise to the 958 sq ft limit would be preferable to having an overall larger building.
• Using cellar floor space to achieve the maximum should be the only way a laneway or carriage house should be allowed to be over the 958 sq ft.
• I thought in the last question, currently even 958 wasn't allowed and now we are jumping to 1200. 1200 is not a laneway. I am ok with a cellar space (only if <5 ft high and <200 square feet area) not counting toward total square footage IF, and it is a big IF, it doesn't make the building taller/wider.
• 1600 sq feet would be better for accommodating smallish families of 3 or 4 people.
• never could understand why basements were considered to be part of the limit in the first place
• City has already allowed a QP home 1650SF so why is a limit imposed?
• Ha! This fits perfectly with my previous comment. I would like to see the permitted size increased to 1200 square feet - but would appreciate enough below grade storage. The storage does not need to be full-height, however; 4 feet high is sufficient for convenient storage.
• Offer this to all residents and not just a select few.
• Keep laneway carriage houses small. Ok to not count cellar in fsr.
• This incentive would not benefit my property as it is far too small for a laneway house. I don't object to others benefiting from this though.
• This is gratuitous and unnecessary.
• Suddenly two new parking spaces need to be mandatory. Again, new construction should be very complimentary to existing house.
• If the reason is to allow a similar equivalence of FSR, it would most likely be that the principal dwelling is severely undersized and by allowing larger laneways, the laneways themselves will be larger than the principal dwelling, and possibly detract from the streetscape. Or it is never intended to work in practicality.
• Laneway houses are not a part of the home and would not incentivize owners to actually restore their homes. Increasing the density does not add any perks.
• This should only be given to those who maintain the original front of their heritage homes.
• I think not!
• NO
• Max. should remain at 958
• 958 sqft is big enough
• * Cellar should be allowed regardless as the size of building does not increase.
• Theme here. The HCA is NOT to become the "playground" for developers. Infill houses as per OCP.
• could result in increased density and reduction in green space
• The HCA is to protect streetscapes and the character of the QP neighbourhood. This would only lead to its demise!!!
• [No, don't offer to increase the permitted size but OK to exclude cellar floor space] if it's storage, not a suite
• Decreased green space and very environmentally unfriendly
• [YES re: exclude cellar floor space but NO re: larger laneway or carriage house]
• Definitely not! This option is now talking more about "infill houses"
• only to larger lots
• More cost effective and usable
• Concerned about site coverage and footprint. Don't want bulky dwellings. Maybe reduce FSR on top floor (R10 in Burnaby)
• Allow both
• WAY TOO BIG!
• below grade is fine for main house. 958 sqft is max!
• Condition being you can exclude cellar floor space, BUT DO NOT INCREASE SQUARE FOOTAGE.
• The only condition is that the increased floor space above 958 be from the basement
• This really depends on the size of the lot. I suppose I would prefer the 2nd of the two options. The size of the laneway house should be proportionate to the size of the lot
• Only if added space is basement
• Need to ensure that the owners do not convert the basement space to a suite.
• Laneway and carriage houses should remain at a maximum of 958 square feet.
• Again, if it is done sensitively, and retains the original feel of the neighbourhood.
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• Again offer it through a HRA to all of New Westminster.
• For the larger lots
• 1200 square feet is a usable size for a family.
• The size of a laneway/carriage house should confirm to the OCP
• Do not agree with providing this incentive just to Queen's Park, should be the same guidelines & restrictions for all homeowners in New West. Align to the OCP consistently.
• This will only work for large property owners (once again, many owners are excluded).

Policy to Support Additions to Buildings that Do Not Conform with the Zoning Bylaw
• This concession should also be available more generally to owners of existing properties in New Westminster. In particular owners who have already built large garages that do not meet the new zoning set-back or floor-space rules applicable to laneway houses but which are otherwise suitable to be reclassified as laneway houses should be allowed to convert them to laneway houses as long as no additional infringing construction is included.
• Yes, as long as there is no negative impact on the neighbours.
• I like the additions to have a similar look to the existing buildings but I'm a little concerned about decisions not having council approval
• Would always want this to require approval. Can see this one getting out of hand and losing the whole point of the HCA
• This is an excellent incentive! A complete no-brainer.
• My dwelling straddles property lines so I don’t think easing of setbacks helps me very much. Same with height variances. This incentive is a little unclear as to how it applies to me.
• This incentive can enhance a property and maintain or improve its heritage value, but it can also be 'abused' and make a property less attractive, especially from a heritage and a neighbourhood perspective, so I think it is important to maintain oversight and control here.
• brilliant
• this is too confusing to comment on
• My house has been renovated many times over the years and I would assume the setbacks and height are not conforming.
• Offer this to ALL old houses in New Westminster
• No zoning or bylaw regulations should be relaxed
• The additions to houses that are outside existing zoning regulations must have public oversight up to and including Council discussion. The proposal could have significant impact on neighbours and over all appearance of the house. The heritage value of the house could be significantly impacted and I note that there are several houses currently existing within the HCA that reflect this issue.
• Dumb idea. Now the home owner would need an expensive engineer to approve build changes, costing not worth it
• We would not want neighbouring properties towering over ours. However, in our case the neighbouring properties have already been torn down and beautiful new heritage homes built.
• More likely in agreement if it is to restore the home back to its historical state. Heritage charm should be retained at all cost.
• Roof line. Side additions. Whatever. As long as it does not annoy the surrounding neighbours. The heritage charm should be retained at all costs.
• I am not familiar with the current Zoning Bylaw. I may be able to support this incentive, but not if it will result in massive homes. For example, I would not want my neighbours to be able to add another one or two floors above their current second-floor deck, because that would result in a much more massive structure only 3 feet from my property, which would result in a huge loss of sunlight and privacy.
• Yes this is a great incentive as it will allow for any additions to look like they fit in with the home. Again I feel strongly that to give this incentive should require a trade-off such as installing wood windows and doors.
• Pity the smaller house owners who may lose views, light and a sense of space.
• Agree with incentive to grandfather existing nonconforming houses for renovations only. Any additions would be conditional and a policy needs to be developed that identifies when a development variance permit should be supported so that additions are consistent with existing design guidelines and neighbourhood character.
• Sometimes common sense solutions that don't necessarily meet code are the way to go.
• I wouldn’t want this incentive to cause a reduction in green space, so if relaxed setbacks and other variances would cause excessive mature trees, shrubs or greenspaces to be reduced, I would not be in favour, so this incentive would need to be controlled.
• To be considered on a one by one basis, developing a policy that identifies when a Development Variance Permit should be supported.
• I support additions that are consistent with an existing building of heritage value. For instance, as homeowners of a 1910 home that sits approximately 6” too close to the property line, we needed to apply to the Board of Variance for a relaxation of the side set back requirement. This was necessary for our proposed rear addition to align properly with the existing house. While we were appreciative of the Board's approval, the application fee cost us over $500 and a delay of 10 weeks. I would like a more
streamlined (and less expensive!) process that incentivizes homeowners who seek to create sensitive expansions to heritage homes.

- This feels like a minimum acceptable considering nothing in this neighbourhood conforms as it stands now.
- ...only up to .6 FSR
- only up to .6 FSR
- ....only up to .6 FSR
- I don't feel like this is really much of an incentive. It's a promise that zoning bylaws *may* be relaxed. These relaxations may work in my favour, they may not. Some houses are already not compliant and push the boundaries on bylaw allowances. Many are close to the road and straddle property lines on both sides (i.e. no land behind the house to build). This won't help those homes.
- None of the above. What about the owners that cannot use this?
- A reasonable approach to deal with reality on the ground.
- This would be useful for some houses but conditions should apply that ensure that the finished home is cohesive in style and does not interfere with the neighbouring houses on either side of it. ie sightline, setback side yards to the detriment of the neighbouring houses. Too many variances can make the end product very cumbersome and extremely overbuilt which I do not believe is the intention of this incentive.
- The 2nd and 3rd paragraphs are very worthwhile but the design guidelines must be used. Must be reasonable with setbacks so the building does not over shadow its neighbours.
- Not in favor. We went through a whole Heritage Conservation consultation period where the community said streetscape, boulevards, set backs and trees were important and as soon as the consultation is over the city is trying to reduce all of these things. If your existing roof is already non-conforming why should you get a second free pass when you add to your house? Your neighbour (whose house conforms) will not be able to add a higher roof to his/her home to match the ever expanding roof you are creating.
- These homes must be restored to qualify.
- Almost have this now with current heritage guidelines. As the case with my neighbour was aloud to overbuild the property for heritage considerations. Unfortunately the city didn't document or follow up and all the heritage aspects were removed during the renovation process. In my case I have a nonconforming side by side duplex that was built with permits. Not sure why it was permitted w/o rezoning but it was.
- The more streamlined the process of development can be the better. Only if we were allowed to build a mostly above-ground basement would roof height matter to our house, but it would be wonderful to put an addition over the kitchen so that the 2 bedrooms upstairs could become three - and the roof height would need to be appropriate for making a ceiling that is full height inside rather than the current 4 foot
side walls. Not sure we would use it but there are many for whom this is necessary if they are going to add any square footage.

- Depend on individual cases.
- Too many unknowns. This incentive could also include developing a policy ..., could also be expanded to include reductions to Zoning Bylaw ..., what else might it also include? How many years will this process go on for?
- This incentive wouldn't benefit us as we have no space to add an incentive, but I think it definitely makes sense to allow homeowners to make any additions more closely match the existing home. Since the whole purpose of the HCA is to enforce the heritage look and feel of the neighbourhood, it would be strange to allow new additions that then don't appear to conform with the existing home.
- If the current house exceeds current building code conditions that were created without proper permits then don't offer additions under that situation. It doesn't matter who looks at it, planning department or council.
- The Zoning Bylaw exists for many reasons. One of them is to ensure the approval process is not left to one person at the Governing body or a select few.
- The HCA is only concerned with the facade and as long as the addition is conforming to the facade regulations, there should be minimal regulations to provide more incentives.
- I believe that this should only be given as an incentive to those who maintain the era and heritage facade of the front of their homes.
- Particularly paragraph (a). Reducing setbacks SHOULD NOT overshadow existing residences.
- Sounds like it could be a free-for-all if not required to seek approval. Still need to maintain the purpose of the HCA with streetscape.
- I feel that Council still should have their say on these matters.
- Anything that will match existing design of original home should be considered.
- Based on the number of non-conforming houses in QP, this makes a lot of sense and would produce more consistent-looking additions
- Must enforce paragraph 2 and 3.
- ["This incentive could also include developing a policy that identifies when a Development Variance Permit should be supported..."] By all means.
- Invasion of privacy
- No height variances. These infringe on the views of others and negatively impact streetscape
- Maybe helpful to some but I would not like to see increases in heights
- property must have off street parking
- ? Not reply on this issue as not sure what those "grandfathered" houses' nature or condition.
- Possible conditions - case by case
- As per paragraph 2 and 3
- Variance process is very onerous. Anything to reduce this burden I support. Also include tree protection in this policy and setbacks.
- Existing zoning re: setbacks should be respected for any addition.
- Why not city wide?
- needs to favor existing building
- I would still require the variance but waive the fee for the development permit. Council should encourage the Variance committee to be sympathetic to this kind of alteration
- A policy that can be implemented without council input is preferred and practical.
- This could be difficult to keep from getting out of control if there was no approval required.
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- Offer this with a HRA
- If you are going to implement this property loss mitigation strategy, then apply it to all homeowners negatively impacted by the HCA.
- Only if they are compatible with the look of the existing property. Perhaps development variances should be free.
- To include more families and modern 21st century life in Queen's Park, additions should be allowed that conform to the design of the original home.
- Additions should be allowed that match the architecture of the house regardless of current bylaws unless they impact on neighbours (views and light).
- Most home owners could not afford to take advantage of the incentive but a future buyer might be able to. Allow it.
- This is too vague to be meaningful. All incentives should be clearly defined.

Relaxations for Laneway and Carriage House Regulations and Guidelines
- This concession should also be available generally to owners of existing properties in New Westminster. Specifically owners who have already built large garages that do not meet the new zoning set-back or floor-space rules applicable to laneway houses but which are otherwise suitable to be reclassified as laneway houses should be allowed to convert them to laneway houses as long as no additional infringing construction is included.
- Don't like this......could be taken advantage of!
- Consultation has been done, shouldn’t be reopened
- This makes sense as an outright incentive as it allows heritage properties to access existing entitlements that they might not otherwise be able to utilize. This is an example of where a property might be at a significant disadvantage due to heritage. More flexibility would be greatly appreciated. I'd directly benefit from coachhouses being allowed on a large sideyard. Big thumbs up there, especially considering existing precedents in the neighbourhood.
• Seeing as this is already available to all New West residents, what relaxations would there be? My personal opinion on this type of incentive is that with New West densification an inevitable outcome, anything QP residents get everyone else in New West will eventually get as well. Besides that my lot is small so I don’t get this benefit anyway. Won’t that make larger lots even more valuable compared to mine?
• Allowing lane way or carriage houses of any kind is quite ridiculous in a heritage conservation area. There are many ways to increase density in New Westminster and there is no reason to do so in this small concentrated area of heritage homes.
• Since these guidelines and regulations were established recently through extensive public consultation, we should not change or revisit them for several years, until we have some experience with the new guidelines.
• great idea, maybe carriage home should match style of existing home
• For all of New Westminster or NONE
• Offering any relaxations to accommodate laneway or carriage houses will have a negative effect on the desirability of the neighborhood.
• Give me a lane so i can benefit, otherwise nobody should be allowed
• See previous comments.
• There are already set guidelines in the OCP
• We already have set guidelines in the OCP. Have to think about neighbouring properties, parking, etc
• Isn't this an OCP issue?
• no, years of work and meetings decided this
• The intent of the Conservation Area must be kept in mind. There are many more neighbourhoods where homeowners and investors can maximize their return on investment.
• This is a great idea and again I think we need to focus on making sure we give these incentives to those most interested in making their homes as "heritage" as possible. I feel strongly about certain requirements such as heritage looking windows, doors, siding and roofing materials.
• Zoning relaxations should be the same citywide. No special treatment for the HCA.
• There is great fear that the laneways and/or carriage houses will be too large. I think they need to stick to the allotted 950 sq feet and be subservient to the principle home. Also, ensuring green space is persevered
• I absolutely support the relaxation of regulations for Laneway and Carriage Houses. As well as protecting our valuable resource of heritage homes, it allows owners to offset the cost of maintaining large homes AND contribute to the goal of sustainable housing.
• What if I don't have enough land to build a laneway or carriage house?
• Small lots can't use this. It's a disproportionate incentive that I think should be available to homes who can use it and want to stay in Advanced protection. For the many homes that can't use it they should be allowed to move down to Limited.
• None of the above. What about all of the owners who cannot use this?
A laneway or carriage house is designed to be a smaller addition to the property maxing out at 950 fsr. This would soon lead to houses that would overpower the property and have a detrimental impact on the neighbouring properties.

No, the max size of 958 is the maximum size. Anything bigger is done through the HRA as an infill house. And offered citywide.

The ink is not even dry on the recent consultation and already you want to change things? Where could this question possibly be coming from other than from developers and not residents? This is the most ridiculous of all the suggestions so far.

The addition of a laneway or carriage house must be built in a heritage style linked to the architecture of the principal house.

The city's idea of what an "extensive public consultations" are and what reality is... Just like the phrases used in the reports regarding the HCA, the majority of QP residences are NOT represented and the phrase "large or huge support" has never been validated nor explained by any city official when asked.

I think any variation to the newly crafted guidelines and regulations should be only allowed if it is reasonably minor and not infringe on the quiet enjoyment and outlook of neighbouring properties.

Offer this to all residents and not just a select few.

This incentive would not benefit my property as it is far too small for a laneway house. I don't object to others benefitting from this though.

To my way of thinking, a decision to build a laneway home transcends FSR and other code concerns. Demographic considerations such as age, proximity to family and financial capacity play a part. Some people value green space and gardens over a floor space "win." Keep this carrot for the folks that really need and want it and tie it to higher protection class.

Design guidelines and parking issues need to come into play.

This would be counterintuitive as the lots would be split and would not be productive by just increasing the mass. This incentive may not be as it seems as it may not hold something as meaningful for the actual house itself.

This should only be given to those who maintain the original front of their heritage homes.

No - too invasive to the neighbours.

Addressing this is issue through HRAs should be done.

Scope creep!

I'm concerned about the possibility of this incentive being taken advantage of and the result doesn't fit with the streetscape.

Design guidelines created for laneway currently are too, too, too restrictive, hence no permits issued til date?? 15% laneway FSR would make laneway more feasible.

Nothing extra should be offered beyond current OCP.

QP should not have additional bonuses not available to rest of New West.

It benefits developers and speculators.
The house just approved that allowed a 1600 [sqft] house to be built as a (laneway) infill is far too large. This is an HCA not laneway

As discussed. Parking issue

This is an OCP and QP should not be treated differently

Increase affordable housing

Concerned about site coverage.

case by case

The HCA is intended to maintain and protect the character and streetscape of the QP neighbourhood.

Needs some sort of variance/ neighbourhood input depending on what homeowner wants to do.

Relaxations should be situational and not causing a problem to adjacent homeowners.

depending on the individual situation this incentive could be very reasonable.

Align with established guidelines and regulations.

Lane house should not be over 1000 sqft

I am not comfortable with relaxing setback allowances

Let's see what we get now by way of laneway/carriage houses before altering the policy already.

Revenue from Laneway and carriage houses support the maintenance of heritage houses.

It would not be appropriate to set aside the consultation process that has already occurred.

Again, it needs to be done sensitively. Parking needs to be taken into account as well. And, again, not just for the protected houses in Queen's Park.
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Again with a HRA

If you are going to implement this property loss mitigation strategy, then apply it to all homeowners negatively impacted by the HCA. Once again, this is inappropriately being referred to as an incentive - which it is not.

Laneway or carriage house should be in a consistent design to the original home.

Maintain established guidelines and regulations as per OCP

Align with OCP guidelines & regulations. HCA is not relevant.

This will only be possible for large properties (once again, many residents are excluded).
Relaxation of Sewer Separation Requirements for Laneway and Carriage Houses

- What is the "sewer separation requirement" - do you mean separate sanitary and storm, or do you mean separate sewers for laneway and main building? If the total number of fixture units falls within the drain sizing parameters, then who cares? Maximum flexibility is required here.
- If this helps an owner to save a house, save some money and build a laneway or carriage house, and doesn't compromise the sewer system
- Increased density could put strain on the existing sewer systems —- don’t think this is a good idea.
- I don't see how this incentive impacts long term city infrastructure goals or helps the environment. The only exception would be if storm water is being handled via an alternative solution such as a rainwater garden.
- Doesn’t apply to me
- See prior comments - The city needs to realize that relaxing these laneway home requirements is a very slippery slope. We will end up with little houses packed in like sardines in a can. The neighborhood will no longer be attractive to people who value heritage features.
- A property owner building a laneway or carriage house should NOT be exempt from sewage requirements that apply to a property owner undertaking any other type of renovation or property improvement. I do not fully understand Sewerage and Drainage Regulation Bylaw No. 7746, 2015, but it does appear that a property owner will, in some situations, need to separate their sewer system. A property owner building a laneway or carriage house should NOT receive special dispensation with regard to sewer separation requirements.
- fabulous idea
- NO
- Stop trying to flood the neighbourhood with higher densification, otherwise why dont we lobby for single family homes only in QP
- Not if it is not offered to other neighbourhoods.
- This is something that should be answered by the Engineering Dept. I have no knowledge in this area
- Sewer and water should be separate
- ok with this unless Engineering sees future problems which we as lay people do not understand at this time
- If this is possible and safe and effective for all.
- Waiving this requirement could lead to overwhelming the primary residence's sewer capacity - also, if there are changes that permit the sale of the laneway or carriage house to a separate owner, a shared sewer line could be problematic.
- Why did this option not have input from the Engineering Department before offering it as a part of this survey.
• All homeowners need to pay for this cost so why should those living in Queens Park have it waived? These homeowners will receive additional income through the rentals of these laneway and carriage houses which will offset these costs.
• I really don’t know. I think this an engineering question, but if adding more density, it may be important to ensure sewer separation meets or exceeds the increased demand of increased use.
• Yes, I emphatically support this incentive for protected properties. As the owner of a heritage property in Queen's Park, I am faced with laying down a $20,000 deposit for a new sewer/storm water separation in order to add a rear addition to my home. That's a LOT of money for to pay for infrastructure costs that some would argue should rightly be borne by the City. Someday, I hope one of my children may be able to build a carriage home on my property. Price tags like this could put that dream out of reach.
• N/A
• Seriously? .....and how is the rest of the city going to like that proposal?
• Same as last question... If homes that can't use this are allowed to move down to Limited then I don't see why others who want to keep their home in Advanced protection shouldn't be able to use this.
• None of the above. What about all of the owners who cannot use this?
• This is a pragmatic approach that deals with the existing reality of the sewer layout and where it is sited on the lot. Give the cost involved just in taking advantage of these "incentives" the more you can reduce the scope creep of added costs the better.
• There is not enough information about this. What are the implications of this if 6 properties on the same block have laneway and carriage houses? The engineering department has to have the final say on this.
• If offered it must be city wide and do not think that the city can afford to do this for everyone wanting a laneway or carriage house. Best left to the engineering department to answer definitively.
• I cannot comment - i don't have enough information.
• This is not a strong "no". It is a no in the absence of input from the Engineering Department. I am concerned that the systems are able to handle the volume and would think that any sewer connection and piping that has not been recently upgraded would be required to be upgraded - and so that cost would exist either way.
• Offer this to all residents and not just a select few.
• Should be offered to all homes in New West to help keep costs down for new rental units.
• I don't understand enough about the impacts of not requiring sewer separation to comment on this, or to make an educated choice about whether this should be offered or not.
• Again, save some carrots here folks.
• Make sure rainwater does not get into the sani system. Create rock pits to allow slow dispersment which has a benefit to trees.
• Proper engineering should not and can not be negotiated as a trade off for appearance. Infrastructure has to be sized accordingly
• Relaxing under certain conditions where it would be reasonable and a good incentive.
• I believe that this incentive should only be given to those who maintain the original front of their heritage homes.
• City-wide or not at all.
• NO
• I don't fully understand but expect it's important to maintain the integrity of the sewer system
• Financial help is always welcome! as long as the sewer system is not negatively impacted
• Offer to all properties. ENGINEERING NEEDS TO GET ON BOARD!!!! No sense offering this because of this road block
• [also checked "NO"] Don't know enough about this issue. Perhaps a cost-sharing solution. Need more info
• What are the cost implications? City would need to provide more information before I could make an informed opinion.
• No, this is a city wide option or not at all.
• This is shifting burden to other NW residents. NW needs to keep money to improve areas that can benefit more people
• NO! We all need to do our part to keep development as sustainable and eco friendly as possible
• This is an environmental issue and the cost of building in QP needs to be borne by the property owner
• If engineering approves
• sewer water and refuse taxes to be carried by laneway house
• If it is safe and sanitary
• Unless stratified. I don't think there should be additional costs of separate sewer connection.
• case by case
• with engineering approval
• huge burden
• This is for engineering to determine. What are the ramifications of not doing this if there are multiple builds in 1 block.
• Why? If building a new laneway house, easy to separate.
• Not sure, suggest new structure should comply with separation requirements, but existing house should not need to comply. Note - insufficient knowledge re: implications.
• How do you calculate how many people are flushing?
• Serious consideration from the Engineering Department
• A good idea if feasible. Would save the homeowner a lot of money.
• The cost to the homeowner to have the city do this work is incredibly high
• Should not remove this requirement for the sake of increasing density with a lower price tag.
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• AND offer it to all homes in the City built prior to 1940. If the original home comes down at a later date the costs get absorbed by the new build.
• If you are going to implement this property loss mitigation strategy, then apply it to all homeowners negatively impacted by the HCA. Once again, this is inappropriately being referred to as an incentive - which it is not. Our family would have to spend hundreds of thousands of dollars that we don't have in order to benefit from this "incentive".
• If the laneway or carriage house is a rental, it could remain without separate sewer. If subdivided and sold, a separation would be required.
• Cannot comment, do not know the benefits/cons of sewer separation.
• Cannot respond to this question, I do not know the pros/cons of sewer separation other than cost. It is an Engineering infrastructure issue, nor is it specific to Queens Park/the HCA.
• Another incentive that does not apply to most residents.

**Building Code Relaxations**
• This concession should also be available generally to owners of existing properties in New Westminster. Specifically owners who have already built large garages that do not meet the new zoning set-back or floor-space rules applicable to laneway houses but which are otherwise suitable to be reclassified as laneway houses should be allowed to convert them to laneway houses as long as no additional infringing construction is included. Sprinklering shouldn't only be required in cases where walls are closer or windows are bigger than normally allowed by code for fire separation purposes.
• Just a good idea
• Good incentive to help maintain the character homes and what makes them unique.
• I’ve talked with some neighbors on this point exactly. Not sure what the incentive here is... I get relaxed building codes, but as a result I may have to bring aspects of my house up to code?? I was against this HCA from the beginning. I didn’t want to give up control of my exteriors and now I certainly don’t want you inside my house either.
• And all old homes in the city
• If we are to be forced to become caretakers of our homes and maintain them under the HCA then certain modern building code aspects should be relaxed to allow existing features to be kept intact
• Obviously the consultant working on this file should be fired. My residence will not be traded for any designation. “Deal with the devil, city hall NW”
And ... just how do you reconcile complete restoration with non-conforming building code regulations?

Definitely this is a positive effort to retain original heritage features.

Common sense should prevail here. The whole point of owning a heritage home is to have the heritage details and current building code requirements should not be applied if they change these heritage details.

or keeping and adding below height windows

I think safety is important and there needs to be some thought put into this. We have changed two railings on our own home to comply as I personally did not think them safe. We made them look as heritage as possible. You also need to think about insurance coverage if there is an accident. On the other hand insulation requirements that are not a safety risk should be relaxed. I feel heritage homes should be insulated when possible but not necessarily to today's standards.

building codes are there for a reason. Renovations are an opportunity to bring a structure up to code, not continue to live with something that is/could potentially be unsafe.

Introducing conditions could make it prohibitively expensive.

What significance does the heritage register have now that all properties are in the HCA?

Like the fact that eligible properties in the HCA would be protected when added to the Heritage Register. Homeowners should get some benefit when their properties are added to the Heritage Register.

As a homeowner if a heritage home, this would be a welcome incentive as Reno’s are expensive enough already. But it would still need to meet safety standards

In the name of all that is sane, yes. Renovating heritage homes presents huge challenges. Relaxing areas of the code rewards conscientious homeowners and contractors and, by removing the temptation to undertake work without permits, may actually improve safety.

I'd rather not have the inside of my home under scrutiny.

Protected property owners must have the right to say no to the Heritage Register.

Many homes already violate building codes... Are you implying that without this incentive you're going to start enforcing them and fining residents until they comply? It should be a given that heritage conservation REQUIRES relaxed building codes because THESE ARE REALLY OLD HOMES! Stop pretending this is an incentive, this should be standard available as part of the HCA.

Furthermore, why are you even talking about the insides of houses? This HCA is about exterior protection and we were promised the inside of our homes were not subject to any scrutiny. Now you're basically saying that you may relax building codes, but these relaxations may come with scrutiny about the insides of our homes and require improving elements until they comply with code. This is ridiculous.

None of the above. How is this even considered an incentive? Allowing owners to "keep existing elements that do not comply with current code" is a GIVEN
considering the age of these houses. Every single one the homes in the advanced protection category is likely in violation of a dozen or so building codes. What is the alternative to relaxing building codes? Forcing owners to gut their homes?

- this could be a useful tool.
- This is offered provincially and should be part of the HCA for houses that meet the provincial criteria - designation or registered.
- I don't feel informed enough to comment. I think, given previous fires in New West, any relaxation of codes are dangerous.
- Difficult to add sprinklers to heritage structure without ruining its integrity so smoke alarms could be mandatory?
- My house needs these kinds of considerations.
- I don't feel informed enough to comment. I think, given previous fires in New West, any relaxation of codes are dangerous.
- Building code relaxations not only potential save money, they actually enable retention of the heritage we are trying to save. We want to "keep the house the same," not lard them down with mandated new stuff.
- This is already offered in the Building Code regardless of HCA designation or not. It should not be called an incentive.
- These are provincial laws and cannot really be affected. The city inspectors should be given leeway to give their subjective judgements to overcome building code requirements to maintain flexibility for modifications.
- The city inspectors should be given flexibility in order to accommodate heritage buildings in which the code was different than it is today.
- Provincial issue - leave as is
- Only if based on provincial criteria
- It would help with keeping the original house looking "original"
- For common sense relaxations.
- Railings on porch a good example - but not for code requirements affecting safety
- For designated and registered homes as per provincial requirements.
- Currently too many valuable homes are not included. We need to protect these houses of significance.
- This point may be difficult to implement if stratification is allowed and new owners are expected to occupy property after renovation - safety.
- Safety should never be compromised. Building codes exist for safety!
- Strong yes!
- possible conditions
- Code regulations must be followed
- As stated in provincial by-laws. Relaxation of building codes are presently available with higher levels of protection-designation.
- Relaxations should be offered due to potential economic issues limiting preservation.
- Why not city wide?
- Who cares....this is not that great of an incentive
- Yes, this is a practical way to encourage renovation over demolition.
- This appears to be an incentive that would be relatively easy to put in place and would require less 'policing' than some.
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- If you are going to implement this property loss mitigation strategy, then apply it to all homeowners negatively impacted by the HCA. Once again, this is inappropriately being referred to as an incentive - which it is not.
- This is an option that some protected owners may want, however, being on the Heritage Register it a disadvantage when selling. You have lost ownership of your deed.
- We have installed sprinklers retroactively in our 1910 home.
- This is not an incentive.

**Stratified Laneway or Carriage House**
- Unsure about this. If it means that building which are OK with no stratifying are now required to meet today's building code before they can be stratified then it's not going to fly on most cases.
- Rental only
- Maintain as rental units only —- allows more people an opportunity to afford to live in QP.
- This is probably best handled via an HRA given the large financial benefit for the home owner.
- Doesn’t apply to me
- Absolutely no - this is a recipe for disaster
- NO! This incentive will allow property owners to effectively subdivide their properties and create very small house lots, something that I and many other Queen's Park residents have long opposed.
- will provide more alternative and affordable housing, but should have some conditions or HRA
- Only through a HRA and to the entire city
- NO, NO, NO
- Very important and forward thinking
- Lot sizes have been set at minimum sizes for several reasons. This incentive could open up the whole question of minimum lot sizes and have a detrimental impact on the whole City.
- Bad idea. See previous comments
- Too much of a slippery slope.
Stratification - isn't that part of OCP and something that should be New West wide? To me this is more a detriment than an incentive - or positive to Queen's Park. Personally I think one should ONLY be allowed to choose between building a carriage house or laneway OR applying for stratification. Otherwise I can see people just doing both one after the other creating more of an administration.

City council is trying to make New West affordable and address the lack of vacancies but increasing rentals. Allowing them to be stratified goes totally against this.

Citywide OCP issue. Stratification with an HRA.

I support this incentive. It will likely help with housing sales and prices in a heritage conservation area.

Consider letting the lane way or carriage house be owned rather than rented and the primary property to be sold off. This could be a way for older residents to move out of their primary property into a smaller house and still stay in their own neighbourhood and community they have been a part of for many years as well as the gardens/yards they have been working in and on for many years.

the sale of a lane way or carriage house allows the owners to recoup some of the costs of maintaining an older heritage home. Renovating a house is much more expensive than a new build. This is an important incentive to prevent demolition!

Prefer strata over rentals as it means less transition in the neighbourhood and more commitment to building community, fosters responsible citizenship and caring for the neighbourhood.

NOT sure about this one. I thought infill is rental only. HRA could be stratified.

This could lead to an abuse or overuse of densification, based no longer on need (to help children of aging parents) but on greed (to do this solely to make a profit)

I support this incentive as I view it as another tool to provide affordable housing. The cost of building a carriage house far outweighs the amount of revenue it could reasonably expect to generate.

I support this incentive as I view it as another tool to (1) offset the costs of buying and maintaining a heritage home/property and (2) as a means to provide affordable housing.

The current costs of building prohibit the average homeowner from making a reasonable return on a rental unit. Stratification is a good option."

N/A

Absolutely not...get and HRA

Same as last question... If homes that can't use this are allowed to move down to Limited then I don't see why others who want to keep their home in Advanced protection shouldn't be able to use this.

None of the above. What about all of the owners who cannot use this?

Facilitates aging in place. e.g. in our case wouldn't it be wonderful for our kids to migrate into the family home and us to migrate to our own smaller space yet not changing our existing community supports.
• This can be achieved through an HRA to everyone throughout the city. Keep it that way.
• Get an HRA if this is what you want to do. If offered it must be city wide. It should not be part of an HCA.
• Conditions of some restoration to original house, with laneway/carriage house in keeping with character/style of original building.
• I'm not totally against this, but it seems like the City, after a period of lengthy consultation, is trying to change the rules, as soon as the consultation has stopped. It really leaves me wondering whether the city was listening during the consultation.
• Permitting stratification is the only way for homeowner to recover losses incurred as a direct result of the HCA being implemented.
• Stratification is something that I am not in favour of. It will shift the experience of the neighbourhood. The higher density brought about via carriage homes is a shift in itself (and one for which though I personally have reservations I believe many of my neighbours are keen to consider) but stratification sets up another shift on top of that, away from my comfort zone and one that I think brings with it some dissonance.
• Units should not be allowed for separate sale from the main property.
• The principal property must remain intact, no stratification. All laneway or carriage house addition must remain rental.
• Basically this is sub dividing a property just like was done in the 1940's and just as haphazard.
• Again, this is not a firm "no". In my mind part of what we preserve when we preserve heritage includes lot size, and the opportunity for someone in the future to own a large property. I would be more interested in an incentive that allows for co-housing. Similar to stratifying but it keeps the property as a legal unit with some interesting sharing possibilities, including having the senior generation moving into laneway and carriage houses.
• Stratified smaller lots and laneway houses can help housing affordability for buyers.
• Offer this to all residents and not just a select few.
• Offer to all homes in New West.
• This incentive would not benefit my property as it is far too small for a laneway house. I don't object to others benefiting from this though.
• The purpose of the HCA is to preserve heritage, not enable densification. We went through an OCP process that lead us to the laneway/carriage house policy we have now. Let's not monkey with it.
• That is subdividing and we have too many small lots all ready.
• Stratifying laneways is an eventuality in NW. It is already being done in other municipalities.
• This would require lot splitting and should not be offered as it does not increase meaning for the houseowner and the heritage home.
• This should only be given to those who maintain the original front of their heritage homes.
- NO
- As long as original home gets renovated from outside
- [no] At this time. Let's get used to adding infill first!!
- Only under very limited conditions - homeowners receiving this bonus would need to ensure their main house is restored as part of agreement.
- If you want to sell off your carriage house or laneway house get an HRA which is what needs to be done across the city.
- This is just an HCA
- NW is a safe place. Higher turnover means increased risk to elderly and children.
- Definitely!
- #1 option. This would allow many people to retire into a smaller unit on their own property while freeing up some capital for their retirement. Or young people to buy their first smaller home.
- Best option for most properties
- Absolutely! will bring more young people and families to the neighbourhood. Strong yes!
- These stratified units can present as more affordable market housing as houses and the lot sizes are smaller.
- Viable alternative to offset capital loss on property
- only way I could get financing
- It is covered in the OCP. Leave it there.
- Needs variance process, depends on lot configuration.
- The idea of sale of laneway/carriage homes is unsettling because the excess amount of homeowners could take away from our communities character
- the secondary suite and the laneway/carriage house should both be allowed to have separate title. offer this proposed incentive outright.
- MAYBE only with an HRA. Borderline almost too much of an incentive.
- Don't subdivide the neighbourhood to bits
- No problem with that.
- This could be a way of offering affordable home ownership in heritage areas.
- Units should remain as rentals.
- Stratification sounds awesome! Great way to support densifying the neighbourhood and diversity of residents!
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- HRA
- If you are going to implement this property loss mitigation strategy, then apply it to all homeowners negatively impacted by the HCA. Once again, this is inappropriately being referred to as an incentive - which it is not. Our family would have to spend hundreds of thousands of dollars that we don't have in order to benefit from this "incentive". 
• This sounds complicated.
• Align with the OCP, not specific to HCA
• Another incentive that does not apply to most residents.

Stratified Principal Dwelling
• Unsure
• Only offer this if the property includes additional parking for the three units or the street can accommodate the additional parking. The City should assume two cars per unit.
• Not in favour
• Prefer the possibility of renting out portions of the house rather than to stratify
• I fully support but probably should require an HRA.
• Sounds like this one isn’t viable anyway. I can’t use it so I don’t have a strong opinion on it.
• Are you kidding???
• NO. I do not want principal dwellings in Queen's Park to turn into condos!!
• There must be allowance for off-street parking for each unit and each unit should be at least 850 sq ft
• maybe on larger houses, over 3,000 sq ft and with some conditions or HRA
• Only through a HRA and for the entire city
• NO, NO, NO
• There are very few houses that could use this very expensive option.
• Just getting stupid with more density, i thought the idea was to protect the scene of the neighbourhood
• My preference is that we not go down this road- unless it is for very large houses in excess of 5000sq ft.
• Only offer in extreme situations where no one will buy the home and renovate - falling into extreme disrepair. What I saw living in other countries is one a building is stratified it is VERY hard for it to ever become a single family dwelling again - however if it has many suites and one owner - that is doable
• I see this working but only if the exterior of the home is maintained to look like a single family home. That is, no additional exterior doors added that look out of character (eg another front door) and no exterior staircases added to access floors. We need to look at cities in Europe that allow for this where the houses still look like a single family home but in the inside, other suites within the house can be accessed. My grandparents lived in such a a house where everyone came in through the front door and then accessed their unit from within
• Not sure about this. Maybe a duplex like the Edmonds house at 5th and 5th. That is a good example of a possible stratification. Only a few houses would be able to be stratified. But is that what we want?
• In the 1980s I lived in Vancouver and knew people who bought strata units in heritage homes. I can't believe we are only just discussing this now. It will be the only affordable way to go soon enough. Who can afford these larger homes and who wants to buy one that they will not be able to sell later on?

• Very important to maintain and/or restore a big old house. Or as an infill: This would have been a better option to the two small identical houses built on 5th street. All the original houses on the block are lovely old large homes and the two small new houses are a poor fit.

• Need to evaluate impact on the community in terms of traffic parking etc. Also need to try to preserve interior/exterior character and retain existing architectural features and materials were possible.

• It provides for affordable housing options. It also allows densification without increasing the building portion of the lot, thus keeping green spaces.

• I am unclear on this incentive. I support stratification of a principal dwelling. I also support stratified laneway or carriage houses. Why does one preclude the other?

• Seems to work very well in Vancouver City Hall area.

• Great for large homes, bad for small homes... Only if Limited protection is available as incentive should this be made to those choosing to stay in Advanced.

• None of the above. What about all of the owners who cannot use this?

• makes affordable housing strategy manageable. We don't want to turn this area into a gated community but a livable community for ALL.

• This is better addressed as a city wide proposal with strict regulation re: minimum size for stratified units, fire and safety regulations.

• NO! This can be done citywide through the OCP.

• Paying the cost of stratifying should be the homeowner’s decision. Is there any harm in offering this incentive on condition of a certain level of restoration?

• This was not what Heritage Conservation had in mind.

• On larger homes, this may be necessary to do such as they have done in Vancouver with big old heritage homes.

• This would only really work for the very large houses and they aren't the ones being penalized, it us in the smaller houses on large lots.

• I'm okay with a large dwelling containing 3 suites and contributing to the rental market or housing families together comfortably but I don't prefer the idea of stratifying the heritage homes that may not be able to efficiently meet the requirements of a strata in the areas of parking, property management, building and garden maintenance, security, and so on.

• Offer this to all residents and not just a select few.

• Probably few could use this but some properties are of a scale where it might make sense.

• This incentive would not benefit my property as it is far too small to be divided into separate units (only one floor is full height). Again I don't object to others benefiting though.
• Only with extreme conditions.
• Nothing says Queens Park Heritage like 3 front doors on a single family home
• By increasing the versatility of very large houses, to allow for future interest and restoration of the houses, it would be a viable incentive to apply.
• I believe that this incentive should reward those who have maintained the original front of their heritage homes.
• Absolutely not
• Seriously, no!
• Rental units are preferable
• Rental suites are much more preferred
• Complete renovation on exterior
• Developers, builders and realtors would all love this but is THIS what the HCA was to become? "condoville?"
• Perhaps only for houses of significant size - not available to everyone.
• A developers and speculators dream.
• would be available to very few and is very expensive
• Same * overcrowding street cars and parking
• Only to larger 5000 sqft+ building
• Only if the house is big enough - e.g. over 5000 sqft
• Apply to larger homes (e.g. > 4000 sqft)
• Costly and safety would be a concern with do-it-yourselfers
• Safety concerns
• Absolutely!
• Too expensive
• stratifying the larger houses is a good idea
• Too dense - remember QP used to be full of rooming houses and multi-suited homes. Creates parking and traffic problems.
• Yes density!!! More affordable.
• Again, turning a home into an apartment complex will take away from our communities character.
• [This incentive] should [allow for a stratified laneway or carriage house.] What is the rationale for only 3 units? There are some very large properties in QP that could be stratified into 5+ units.
• Offer it if requested as part of permit. Not a blanket, outright offer.
• Only with HRA
• Only if lot is present duplex size
• Yes, but not if a laneway house is on the property
• We have no idea how this would work
• This turns a house into a small condo building. It offers affordable home ownership but may put too great a density strain on the neighbourhood.
• suitable for large homes
• Rental units would be more appropriate
• These will be a great way to save the large mansions that are becoming really expensive to upkeep
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• If you are going to implement this property loss mitigation strategy, then apply it to all homeowners negatively impacted by the HCA. Once again, this is inappropriately being referred to as an incentive - which it is not. Our family would have to spend hundreds of thousands of dollars that we don't have in order to benefit from this "incentive".
• As is common in many large homes in the Vancouver area of City Hall, there are stratified dwellings that function very well, and are sought after alternatives to single family.
• Conditions to consider size of principle dwelling & the size of each units (ie min size), & to extend of all areas of New West, not just Queens Park.
• Suggested conditions include ; 1) min size of principle dwelling that can be divided & 2) min size of each unit within the principle dwelling.
• Another incentive that does not apply to most residents.

**Multiple Conversion Dwellings (Rental)**
• Unsure about this one
• Only allow this if off street parking is planned into the design or if the street can accommodate the extra parking required. The City should plan for two parking spaces per unit.
• Could be a saviour for really big houses
• Adding rental units would be fantastic alternative to laneway but does need to be kept as rental units
• Due to building code requirements this is likely best only as a conditional entitlement or as part of an HRA. Large estates (10,000sqft+ lots) should be allowed even more suites but that might be best via an HRA.
• Not sure how much value this has.. my home can’t really be converted this way. Not sure I want rental dwellings all over the place as well.
• We already have too much density in this area - there are already a large number of illegal suites that have a negative impact on homeowners in this area.
• I think it is important that all sites are a minimum size (e.g., 650 sq. ft.) and that there must be at least one parking space for each unit.
• Suites should be at least 800 square feet and off street parking should be provided
• good idea, will provide more rental stock and allow friends or multigenerational of families to live together
• If this is considered as an incentive then the property must be able to support off street parking for Both rental suites along with the primary residence
• It would be difficult to use and expensive, but larger houses may use this incentive.
• QP overcapacity already with illegal suites, lack of parking, and non RS1 houses
• I do not support turning Queens Park away from a basic single family neighbourhood. Secondary suites, in the basement are OK and possibly if a house is in excess of 5000sq ft it may be acceptable to subdivide a house - but we don't want QP to start having 2 front doors etc.
• I could see this being something we might consider - we have a very large home, but do not have the driving access to a large backyard (so no laneway could be built). We could easily have two rental properties within the property. In fact I've been told at one time it had 3 or 4. It is currently a single family home with 7 - 8 bedrooms, and now that our children are away at university there are just the two of us. I have built studio offices in it for my own use (and I see this also being popular in the future as commuting becomes less desirable, and more people work online). In the past, I have also taken in students as Douglas has no residence. In the future I hope to offer bed and breakfast - I think more people with larger homes have to consider other revenue options than stratifying. With the cost of housing/rental I see more people with any size of home trying to accommodate adult children or even parents aging in place by adding suites - putting in suites to rent to family - should be an outright incentive.
• I agree in principal with this to save a heritage home but no stratification and no changes to the exterior of the existing home (eg adding another door to the front)
• Don't like the stressors on infrastructure. Have to think about this. Maybe a duplex with a basement suite. But not multiple rental suites. Who knows? Is this the beginning of returning QP to a number of rooming houses?
• This will increase density at the expense of livability.
• Yes this is a great incentive, especially for larger homes that have cost the homeowner a large amount of money and time to restore. It makes the process more affordable and will help homeowners who as you say may not need all the floor space in their homes. It also helps with our ever increasing housing density problem. Providing rental space is a fantastic idea. I think some of the building codes need to be relaxed or realistic. While we don't want tenants living in unsafe conditions we need it to be affordable for both homeowners and prospective tenants.
• Note though that we must ensure that there is sufficient number of properties for families.
• This incentive needs to consider different family structure scenarios to keep an array of options open.
• A good use of very large older homes
• Need to evaluate the impact on the neighbourhood on a case-by-case basis including parking, traffic circulation etc. Prefer the better utilization of larger houses over adding a laneway or carriage house.
• One secondary suite. OR an infill.
• Conditions might be ensuring variances are within reason, fire and safety regulations are monitored and met and enough off street parking would be required
• Conditions to include minimum size for primary and secondary suites.
• In the interest of creating affordable housing, I absolutely support the incentive to allow multiple suites in one dwelling.
• My house isn't big, don't think it could be divided to have secondary suites. So doesn't so much benefit me, but I suppose others could use this. My honest opinion is that lots of homes do this already, without permits, so not sure how much of a difference having it sanctioned officially would make.
• This is likely a mute point as "cost may out weigh benefits".
• Not an incentive... Many small homes can't convert to multiple dwellings (for 2 or 3 bedroom houses this is totally unrealistic). Even if a homeowner could do this why would they want to live with renters (many of us bought homes to not have strangers living so close to us)? Many homes have small lots and can't build carriage/laneway houses either. I saw a house recently sell that is under Advanced protection and was split into rental units and it still went for under assessed value. So obviously rental units were not much of a selling feature for that house.
• None of the above. What about all to the owners who cannot use this?
• Affordable housing people!
• You can offer this under the OCP. Besides this does nothing to deal with parking issues that already exist on streets, especially where there is parking on one side only.
• Can be hand.led through an HRA in the OCP this is a city wide option
• Start with one suite or laneway. Give that at least 5 years before this proposal. If the City can't get the density you want from that change then maybe the neighbourhood doesn't want density.
• like me not everyone has a lane or can build in the rear yard
• I say yes, with reservations. I don't wish conditions, as such, but I think there have to be minimum house and property size (square footage) to accommodate this many dwellings. I am also extremely concerned about parking - and the unsightliness of insisting that parking exist on the property rather than the roadway. If it must exist on the property, this might easily destroy the beauty of the heritage 'scape that is being protected. On the other hand, we have 3 sets of neighbours with 3, or more vehicles for one address. Our street is almost impossible to navigate and guests have a difficult time parking.
• Would we use this incentive? No. One suite, maybe. I would appreciate being able to build an appropriately heritage style gazebo or trellis or arbor forward of my front porch over my driveway. I don't have space to build a carport and I certainly don't want an unsightly garage in my front yard but I think it would be possible to come up with a design that would enhance the heritage look of the house and mature landscaping while protecting my vehicle.
• If conditions are attached then I change my answer to No, don't offer this incentive.
• This incentive would not benefit our property as our home is too small to incorporate another suite (with only one full height floor), but I don't object to other homes converting to multiple dwellings.
• This policy is very extreme and could radically affect the character of the
eighbourhood by dramatically increasing density. However, there are certain very
large homes where I could envisage the policy being beneficial, as they would
represent effectively "commercial scale" overhauls. I would recommend refining the
conditions to limit stratification to a small handful of properties. Otherwise I fear a
kind of "condoization" of the QPN, kind of like the Vancouver City Hall area, which I
do not find appealing. Let's not copycat Vancouver here.
• There should not be more than one legal suite in a principle dwelling. It happens that I
own a very large house and this comment is to enhance the neighbourhood and some
realtors may think I am lessening my potential resale value. We don't have enough
time in life to even discuss parking issues with this topic!
• I'm sure the neighbours will be excited to have potential boarding houses next to
them, but it would be my opinion that the process would be so restrictive that it would
only look good on paper and not practical in application.
• Allowing this would incentivize homeowners to take advantage of the previous
expansion incentives as even if they were not able to use it as a primary dwelling
space, the additional space allotted could be converted into an additional dwelling.
• This should only be given to those who maintain the original front of their heritage
homes.
• ["This approach would likely be costly... may outweigh the benefits."] This sentence
speaks volumes - however, we are already dealing with traffic and parking issues.
• We are congested enough in the QP neighbourhood.
• As long as the units are rentals
• Only rental units though.
• Vancouver has many conversion that look like single family. Duplex conversion
strongly recommended but as long as home looks like SFD from street.
• No it plays into the hands of developers.
• [BC Building Code requirements] This could be very expensive.
• More dwelling means more cars. Unless less requires the house to have additional
parking space built in the property. Otherwise, it takes advantage of single dwelling
owner, which is not fair.
• But only for larger houses 5000 sqft plus and must be done sensibly, i.e. a 5000 sqft
house could be divided into 2 or 3 units.
• The house has to be of sufficient size - e.g. BIG
• Should be based on combo of sq footage and FSR
• Several factors e.g. sprinkler systems firewalls etc. may increase risks of fires etc. for
neighbouring buildings.
• onerous and expensive
• safety issues
• allow people to move homes to limited category instead of these "frivolous"
incentives that result in more cost to the homeowner.
• I see this is Burnaby often. Results in too many cars and not enough greenspace. Access points for basement suites result in too much concrete.
• expensive cost to homeowner
• This will reduce green space that is very important to the neighbourhood. Not to mention parking problems on already crowded streets.
• Density is great. But make sure it is a long term rental, not short term.
• The idea of homes turning into a long term apartment building until the owner sells or dies is very unappealing.
• A home turning into an apartment complex could take away from the character of the community.
• Set guideline for min. house to qualify (i.e. 1000 sf house is not appropriate) and guideline for secondary suites. Consider size, makeup (i.e. bachelor vs. 1 bdrm, other).
• So where is everyone going to park?
• with tax incentive to help mitigate the housing crisis
• Wouldn't this bring Queens Park back in a full circle to a time when it was largely boarding houses?
• We have these houses in my neighbourhood Moody Park. I don't like them. One suite or laneway house is enough. Otherwise it is essentially an apartment building.
• Suitable for very large homes, eg: 4500+ sf
• Increasing the number of available rentals in Queen's Park is a great way to promote living in such a great neighbourhood without having to make an incredible investment in an outright purchase.
• Most of the existing older homes in my neighbourhood have suites, which could be made legal. But, to allow 2 suites in basements means that houses have to be larger. And, that means knocking down perfectly good houses, increasing the volume of landfill garbage unnecessarily, and destroying the neighbourhoods that people chose to live in.
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• If you are going to implement this property loss mitigation strategy, then apply it to all homeowners negatively impacted by the HCA. Once again, this is inappropriately labelled as an incentive.
• The large homes in QP are perfect to be renovated to accommodate multi family living, which is the future normal.
• Large houses should be able to have more than 1 secondary suite if the suites do not impact the look of the house. IE, maintain the exterior facade, no additional doors.
• I support this as long as the exterior facade is maintained, ie no additional doors or other changes that indicate rental units. Also require sufficient off street parking is provided.
• This will only be possible for very large homes (i.e. once again, small and average homes are excluded).
Small Lot Subdivision

- Unsure about the desirability of this
- Only allow this if the existing heritage home is retained at the front of the property and the new-build home is built in an architecturally sympathetic manner and does not dwarf the smaller home.
- I don't like the small lots in QP now
- The homes that have been built in Queen’s Park on small lots do not enhance the neighbourhood and they look extremely out of place. Wouldn’t want to see any more of them.
- Probably should require an HRA.
- Doesn’t apply to me
- Absolutely not - this focus on increasing density in a heritage area is completely inconsistent with the notion of preserving heritage.
- some conditions or HRA for this
- seems to me that this is already being done anyhow. There are already at least 2, probably more, lots that are around 25' wide! And they're certainly not 160 deep.
- Only with HRA and again the entire city
- I believe that allowing subdivision of existing lots is what started the public uproar over losing "Heritage". Much care and attention should be given to ANY request for subdivision as this is the area that the City has affected the preservation or loss of Heritage. As you drive around the neighborhood some of what could be considered "eye sore" properties are the results of the City's idea of acceptable subdivision. (18 foot wide lots)
- A rezoning process is necessary when going outside usual lot sizes
- Changing the dynamics of the neighbourhood, very 180 from all the HCA work that has taken place
- We have a large square lot with no lane access and a small sitting in a back corner. No possibility of this incentive helping us. The present house needs to be torn down.
- Personally I think this an OCP issue, but I worry that it will cause people with large lots to want to demolish to be able to do this? Why is this a HCA issue? I can't see an issue in the case of a very large lot with a very small home that is off to one side - what is not attractive is if the lot size become extremely irregular.
- Only for small houses on large lots and where the original heritage home will be moved and retained, or better yet restored if needed. The second home must be built with heritage in the design to keep in character with the neighbourhood
- Refer to the OCP. Whatever pertains to that should pertain to the HCA.
- i feel strongly that we should support homeowners with smaller heritage homes in whatever way we can. As long as we are putting heritage looking homes on these small lots I am all for it. We have some good examples of how to do this in our neighbourhood as well as some really bad!
• Maybe you could bring in an incentive to help home owners move their house on their lot?
• Ensuring medium sized trees are protected & other vegetation are left in tact
• Not keen on this incentive as the developers misuse this option and increase density in the neighbourhood. However in certain circumstances I can see the value of subdividing properties over 8000 sf without a rezoning process.
• Again, this would have to be done with design guidelines, preservation of mature trees and green space.Any new construction should not encroach on neighbours in a negative way. Off street parking for both residences would be important too
• I am generally in support of small lot subdivisions but feel a clear set of conditions must come with this incentive. I would like to see substantive green space/landscaping requirements to avoid entire properties "paved over" to accommodate pathways, parking, etc.
• Feels like something that should be done city-wide (if it's not already planned to be).
• This one for sure NO!
• Meaningless for homes with small lots (of which there are MANY under 8000 sq ft).
• None of the above. What about all of the owners who cannot use this?
• It may be helpful for the few owners of such properties but the new build must meet appropriate criteria and the design guidelines to make it appropriate to the site.
• Offered through the OCP, not the QP HCA.
• Again, this seems add odds with the process. If heritage is important, than negotiating to permit 2 new "Heritage style" houses squished into small lots is silly. They won't look "Heritage" no matter how they are built. I'd rather a Heritage house with a laneway than 2 small homes.
• No small lot subdivision within the HCA.
• As mentioned earlier, not a new idea was done in the 1940 and earlier which is why there are a number of 33 ft lots side by side as they used to be a 66 foot lot. and not everyone wants a 66 ft lot
• QP already has a lot of small homes on small lots below 4000SF so this incentive should be implemented.
• Or, maybe yes. I think that the explanation is correct that it would work best for small houses on large lots. In some cases that may make sense - but I fear that people will try to find ways around the limitations of this incentive - like moving and potentially destroying protected homes. It means that neighbours who bought, in part, because they enjoyed the extra side yard spacing will now have a small/skinny house right up against the easement. This truly changes the nature of the neighbourhood. If I must have an HCA then I don't want to see the percentage of heritage homes dwindled in the face of increased density development through subdivision - especially when approval is given to build 2 almost identical pseudo-Craftsman homes side-by-side.
• Offer this to all residents and not just a select few.
• If subdividing, follow same process everyone one else has to.
• Our lot is too small to benefit from this incentive, but I don't object to others benefiting.
• This is theoretically possible with an HRA already, so don't hand over this perk without upsizing the protection.
• There is already a process to do this. It is called a rezoning and requires Council approval. It is not an incentive.
• This allows for more flexibility for homeowners in these complicated cases.
• This should only be given to those who maintain the original front of their heritage homes.
• Too dense
• NO - How many people can you fit in this neighbourhood!
• The "new" small houses that have been built in QP are not in keeping with the neighbourhood.
• The small lot houses in QP now don't fit in with the rest of the neighbourhood.
• No lots available to move or relocate homes that are being demolished. Subdivide but allow only heritage home to be moved to lot. Principal residence has to remain on lot or have heritage home moved to a small lot.
• Still thinking about this one. There is a theme here. Ugh.
• s/b only applicable to small homes on large lots
• This only helps and encourages developers and speculators.
• This only benefits the wealthy NW residents. It invites builder to destroy our neighbourhood.
• Totally causes lots to be chopped up with narrow lots - looks awful.
• Great option for those with large lots and smaller houses.
• Increase density
• smaller lot makes Queens Park more affordable
• A good option for the very few who have placement availability
• Keep it in the OCP where it belongs.
• We live on a 4300 sqft lot, great size. 4000 close.
• This situation could cause some dishonourable builders to produce horrible projects.
• As long as the existing home meets existing setbacks. No encroachments!
• Perhaps with restoration requirements.
• But does not this option as well as laneway house construction have a significant effect on the character of Queen’s Park area? And wasn’t that the the reason for the HCA, to maintain its character?
• It should be subject to the existing density of the neighbourhood and have adequate parking available,
• Every time a lot is carved up into smaller pieces, green space disappears and that is one of the main and most appreciated features of the neighbourhood. As well, what has been built to date in these smaller homes does not fit in with the rest of the neighbourhood.
Online Surveys Not Submitted

- This should be an option for any home owner, especially those with smaller home in the middle of a large lot.
- As long as there are no encroachment and all setbacks are maintained I am OK with this.
- Not specific to Queens Park / HCA. Align to OCP.
- This incentive does not apply to most residents.

Heritage Home Grant Program

- I would like to see an expanded grant program for all of New West
- Would be nice if the grant program could be broadened right across the city rather than just in QP
- If the grant program is available for homes in Queens Park that are NOT designated then the grants should also be expanded to homes city wide as long as they are listed on the register. This would be a great way to get more homes voluntarily added to the register.
- How much would the grant be? Would I be able to do renovations with it? Would there be a set amount for each house?
- Restoring homes to proper standards can be expensive, but very worthwhile.
- too much chance that it wouldn't be awarded fairly
- Don't understand the provisions of this program
- The cost to homeowners are extreme. We need help
- The programme currently works well. Expansion would require significant money to be added to the programme due to the large number of homes in play which could have significant upset with other taxpayers.
- Why does my residence need to be protected to get the grant? I like my house old and don’t need the city to dictate how I should maintain it
- The HCA is costing everyone that wants to sell a designated property in lost property values. No one wants a house they can not make energy efficient or modernize.
- I'm sure this would lead to tax increases, but at least would be of more practical use to me. Better than a 1% levy for an Aquatics Centre.
- Good idea but applicants but I don't think it would be well received by people outside of the hood.
- SHouldn't be specific to the QPHCA
- Not fair to other homeowners in New West if their house is not in the HCA. I see this working if other pre-1940 homes in New West, but not in Queens Park, we’re protected as well. But since they’re not, I don’t see this as fair
- Offer this to formally protected heritage homes citywide. OR maybe. Perhaps an expanded program for houses on the register. Anything should be citywide. NOT specific to the QPHCA.
- I think that heritage conservation benefits the city of New Westminster as a whole (tourism, business, development, etc.) and that it makes sense to have the City support it. It is costly for homeowners to restore and they should be helped.
- An expanded program would likely require more administration and those costs to the City. Coupled with higher expectations on the part of applicants, the NWHF grant program may not be sustainable in the long term.
- Who is paying for this grant program? If it is all taxpayers in New Westminster then this is an embarrassment to think others should pay for the upkeep of HCA protected properties. How will the costs of the HCA and its incentives be measured?
- All eligible properties should be able to apply for this grant and the number of awards would be limited by the size of the budget and the capacity to do the administration. Consider building the fund with from revenues from the film industry to subsidize this grant over using additional taxpayer dollars.
- Should be available citywide to all protect properties and possibly all those on the Register.
- This money should be available for any heritage homeowner in New Westminster, not just in Queens Park
- This seems inline with reducing the cost of maintaining a HCA house but there is no detail about who’s eligible for grants and why.
- Do we have any details on how much this would be? Is there any kind of quota per house that is guaranteed per year? What sorts of house work would be eligible?
- I imagine the amount would be very insignificant though, and restoring a house is extremely expensive.
- Leave it as it is presently set up for designated houses....funding from the film industry should be considered
- Again...how is the rest of the city going to react to this proposal?
- You may consider using money from the film industry however, I do not think the rest of the city would take kindly to this idea.
- Heritage Foundation needs to expand its outlook. Currently very insular and exclusive.
- A grant program is valuable only if it is meaningful.. What this can't be is a token gesture that doesn't give any real compensation for homeowners looking to do improvements. Some of us have lost 6 figures so far so having a grant fund that amounts to a few hundred bucks per year is meaningless. I would also argue that there are fanatics in this neighbourhood that will jump all over this grant and suck it dry before the rest of us have a chance. The grant program would have to be (a) meaningful in the amount of $$ allocated and (b) have a set amount available to EVERY homeowner per year so that it doesn't get unevenly distributed.
- None of the above. Taking six figures off of residents' home values and giving them a little cheque is NOT an incentive.
- This is one way to provide compensation for the current real loss in asset value of our properties
• Keep it as it is - for formally designated properties only.
• As it is now offered for designated properties only across the city. The money to fund the grant should come from the filming companies that use the city so frequently. I do not want New West residents from other neighbourhoods of the city having their tax dollars fund this... that is just wrong.
• I support this in principle. Obviously depends on the final cost.
• This grant should only fund restorations, not renovations.
• scrap it. Basically all the taxpayers in the city are paying to benefit a few
• Don't want more of my tax dollars going to this program.
• Not sure how this happens without conditions - but as far as is possible having it available to all properties without requiring restoration of areas of the home not under consideration.
• DO NOT change the administration if this means the NWHPS has more control or a bigger role or if it means additional staff are required. I have to say NO to additional funds until you reveal what the amount is. If we are to use the supporting documents and the City's latest budget as an indication of the potential heritage funding, then we are talking hundreds of thousands of dollars every year, and it never ends.
• Hard to answer for sure one way or another without more info.
• Dont give any more money or control to heritage people. Only a few benefit. Focus instead on fixing the important things in new west.
• Out of all the incentives offered, this would be my top choice, as it is one of the only incentives that would potentially benefit small houses on small properties. The other proposed benefits so far all disproportionately benefit larger homes and/or larger properties. This benefit would more universally benefit all homeowners in the neighborhood.
• My vision for the HCA is that it will serve as a possible template for other NW neighbourhoods. Let's not saddle taxpayers with more bills to pay. That's not going to help the cause of reservation.
• It just happens that I am very familiar with the grants program. Each application needs serious review and is best to apply to exterior maintenance issues and not in increasing the building size.
• So now we are giving Homeowners money to fix up their houses? Not sure how much tax payer money is already being spent on this Queens Park area already.
• This would be a great incentive but sourcing money may be a difficulty. Applications can be made for exterior maintenance to incentivize homeowners to use.
• This is a great incentive. This should be for those to retain the original facade of the houses, and should help those in real need of help.
• Restoration (e.g. structural integrity, foundations) should be the priority of all grants with all beautification or maintenance to be secondary. Purchasing a heritage home comes with a very large price tag for restoring it's integrity, having incentives and assistance to complete this work is helpful.
• Leave as is presently set up. Revenue from film industry?
• Leave as is for designated houses citywide. Money from filming?
• Don't think the rest of the residents of New West would support QP increase in the grant program.
• I believe the heritage home grant program should be expanded throughout the New West area, not just QP protected properties
• Leave program as is as funding will lead to everybody applying for grant. Maybe pick 3-4 homes a year to fund based on income and assessment.
• To keep this simple - ALL city properties who formally protect (designate) should all be eligible.
• This would incent/encourage homes to be restored - nothing currently available to help homeowners who can't afford restoration
• The programme as it is presently established in the city for designated homes across the city works. Tax payers and their dollars from other neighbourhoods should not pay for QPHCA grants.
• currently only offered to protected designated properties. It should stay that way re: people should designate to be eligible. Much more funding would be necessary
• NW city has spent too much money for this already. The city maintenance has been neglected. Need more programs for elderly and children.
• I am a rate payer in NW
• I don't think this would be well received by the rest of the city residents
• My property, my responsibility! Renos of heritage homes should not be offloaded onto the taxpayer ever.
• I don't think tax payers should pay for QP homes. Incentives are plenty.
• Grant monies are solely drawn from tax revenues. Public money should not benefit private individuals
• This whole program will cost me
• The present system for designated housing city wide is fine. Taxpayers in New West do not want their money going to old houses in QP. No fair to them.
• Many more civic programs I value above giving more $ to homeowners. Priorities: new pool, accessibility, etc. youth centre, skate park, arena replacement...
• I'd love this but hard to justify given $ spent on HCA already and other city priorities.
• One reason * program works well is all directors are exceeding knowledgeable of houses, *. It would take awhile for a clerical person to magically take over.
• This could have potential but the devil is in the details
• Will never be enough money to make a difference. Waste of city funds.
• Should be available to all heritage homes in the city if they agree to a level of protection
• Yes, I support the model City of Vancouver uses with Vancouver Heritage Foundation. Over 10 years the COV grant went from being the main funding source of VHF to being one of many funding sources, due to growth in capacity and fundraising by VHF.
• But I would need to know that the "The New Westminster Heritage Foundation" is to limited and registered with city. As to not allow a small interest group, the ability to dictate all policy without proper consultation to all households in the affected area. No more of the no voice of the people most affected by the "said Policies"
• Any grant program should be offered to all of New Westminster and not only to Queen's Park
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• Should be available to all pre 1940 houses in city if they agree to a level of protection for the properties.
• Definitely should be expanded as the Heritage Foundation has been very exclusive, and not family friendly.
• I would like to know more about this before supporting or rejecting this proposal. Put me down as undecided for now.
• As a non Queen's Park resident I do not support providing my tax dollars to protected properties in Queen's Park.
• A small grant will not compensate owners for what has been taken from them.

**Interpretive Sign Program**
• Not necessary. Not significant as an incentive.
• This should be on the planning depts list of everyday things to do
• Don’t understand this as an incentive.
• There's enough money being spent on the HCA. This money could be better spent elsewhere.
• This is a waste of money. We all know the neighborhood is historic, there are already signs on 2nd and 5th indicating that. I’d rather see funds from this diverted to general maintenance.
• This program shows the city's commitment to this special conservation area and will deter developers intent on building homes that do not conform to our guidelines.
• Do it if you want, this shouldn't be part of the incentive program.
• Good idea!
• maybe just do this for public bookings, city hall, armouries, etc
• oh brother!
• Why doesn’t the city give money to the NWHPS to do this?
• Sounds like a waste of money."-spend money like it is your own"
• I do not see this as a serious incentive as it could have a negative impact. Signs have a very limited positive impact, but an expanded brochure programme may have a positive impact.
• Waste of money glorifying something the city wishes not to share with the homeowner
A waste of taxpayers money. History buffs have Irving House and the Library to get this kind of info. I have lived here since 1950 and could not care less.

Incentive for whom? If the City is thinking in terms of a "tourist draw" would it not be more useful to invest in "period" lighting and getting rid of creosote-laden poles instead of the wasted money on derelict Twelfth Street?

Could say yes more!!! GREat idea

As long as the cost is not outrageous (and perhaps proud homeowners might be interested in contributing towards a sign for this house), I like this idea. Goes well with the Heritage Walking tour app that the NWHPS has out forward

LOVE IT! Let's herald the HCA!!

yes, great idea,

Great idea!

Too elitist, and embarassing.

The phrase "importance of the neighbourhood" is mired in nostalgia and is elitist. While heritage and history is a nice hobby; we need to keep 21st challenges top of mind. Signs such as this way to public water fountains, shade, and community gardens would better reflect current concerns.

OK with signage at the entrance to the neighbourhood but prefer that people use the NWHPS app over signage as it's less expensive and less visual clutter in the neighbourhood.

Great idea!

Education and information of the heritage significance of this area is a really good idea. Really like this idea

I support this incentive, but only on the condition that signage be offered to other historic neighbourhoods in New Westminster, i.e., Sapperton, Massey Heights and Brow of the Hill.

We have signs already, I think this money can be better spent elsewhere.

?

We do not need signs all over the neighbourhood...there is an app for a walking tour pointing out relevant info re: houses

Great idea- always read this signs when we travel.

This is insulting... How will signs help increase my house value??

How is putting up a sign considered an incentive?

Some assessment of worth of the sign for this particular property is in order. i.e. not all houses should have a sign telling their story!

This would be nice but money can be spent on other things. The NWHPS has an app that provides information on various houses and its inventory is continuing to grow. Maybe further down the road money from the movies, which love to shoot in the QP niebourhood could go towards such signs.
• But maybe money from the film industry could go to plaques for the houses that have been designated but have never received their designation plaque. There are several throughout the city. The NWHPS has a good app for this.
• Great idea but is this an incentive for individual property owners?
• This and other initiatives to promote awareness of the HCA will generate economic wins for our City. The economic benefits aside from sustained or increased property valuations for Queen's Park residents include being able to attract new comers to New Westminster and in particular those who like high tech entrepreneurs and business owners will settle and grow businesses here.
• This is a lot of BS. No one needs another sign on or near their property proclaiming something that is meaningless to the majority and if someone is really interested it is already on the internet. I call this a memorial to fallen politicians
• Interpretive signs would be so easy to be ugly. If on someone's boulevard would have an impact on their privacy and the ease of maintaining their boulevard. If they were located on the wide centre boulevards on 2nd and 5th Streets and made of wrought iron and heritage style that might look okay but then city crews are mowing around them and anyone who wants to read them is crossing into the middle of the road - which is confusing for motorists.

Attractive Street name signs should be created and installed immediately. As well as heritage-style, low-wattage street lights (not more than we currently have - people already light up their homes so brightly that we see no stars!)
• Who is this incentive for? I don't believe residents want a sign in front of their homes or on their street corner. Why not try this in some other neighbourhood first and then if its successful introduce it City wide.
• No one neighbourhood is more important than another. Stories should be online or at the library or in an app. We don't really need more clutter on our streets.
• don't waste money on signs only the heritage people care about
• I don't see a lot of value to homeowners in this incentive. I'd rather have seen some of the other neighborhood benefits that are apparently off the list of considered incentives (improved sidewalks, paving, and particularly street lighting which could add neat character).
• A potential benefit for all NW residents is the protection of a significant heritage amenity that will enhance livability and hopefully drive "heritage tourism." Enhanced signage would likely have many spin-off benefits, not the least of which would be education, which in turn reinforces the heritage preservation value proposition.
• I am not sure how this is an incentive, or to whom.
• This would increase tourism and civic interest of each house. Increasing awareness about the area and city's history.
• This is a great idea as it will increase tourism, and allow the youth to engage with the history of our community. It will allow me to further appreciate the amazing city that I live in.
• Why is this limited to Queens Park? All of our neighbourhoods add to the rich heritage of our City.
• It has been suggested that revenue from industry to be used. However, there is an app available for walk tour - we do not need more signs.
• Money from filming industry!
• Should be done regardless, not because QP is an HCA
• This should be done anyway, but not as an incentive
• Like signs. But the NWHPS has been doing that for years. Defer to them.
• Have seen this in many other cities - local and international. Let's do it here!
• The NWHPS app should be promoted by the city and it would cover the historic facts of the QP neighbourhood as well as the rest of the city
• This will make the value of the houses known and gives pride to NW as a community.
• Yes, good idea for marking the "special place"
• N/A City initiative - I don't see how this involves homeowners
• Totally unnecessary and costly
• No real benefit
• cost tax $
• No need or benefit
• who cares?
• good idea
• Sure the money can come from the film industry using QP.
• Would rather RA or Heritage Association do this. Seems waste of $
• Great idea. Worth the money.
• Hard to justify
• ?
• Don’t put anything around or near my property promoting my home the City has done enough damage to our area!!!
• An excellent idea if tastefully done.
• Really??
• Yes. This brings history alive and shares the historic value of the homes with the entire city.
• Who would benefit from this incentive?
• I like this idea but I wonder if the funds would better be spent in a one time Heritage grants for homeowner maintenance
• There are many houses in New Westminster that around the same ages as those in Queen's Park. I am sick of only hearing about Queen's Park. Why can't the idea of protection be applied outside of that area?
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- You're kidding right? You consider this as an incentive to a homeowner who has lost hundreds of thousands of dollars in property value? Why not pave our roads and make sure sidewalks are in good working condition first. Now that would be an incentive! Why wasn't that listed here?
- Good idea if tastefully done
- A home owner should have this option, as the history is what we are protecting. We always stop and read these signs when we are visiting other heritage areas in North America and Europe.
- I think this is a fantastic idea! It would increase the enjoyment of both visiting and resident walkers, and thereby, in some fashion, the walkability of the neighbourhood itself. There is much fascinating and quirky historical narrative that can bring many of the homes to life for those walking by. Historical neighbourhoods have a rich story to tell -- sometimes inspiring or thought-provoking, sometimes jaw-dropping or risqué -- but always entertaining!
- And while we are on about it, what about some "historical"-looking street signage, à la what the Brow-of-the-Hill neighbourhood has, or something along the fonts seen in the entry-way to the neighbourhood along Second St. from Sixth Ave. or on the "Queen's Park" sign at Sixth Ave. and McBride Blvd.?
- Our current, bland, blue signage with boxy white letters is pretty hurtin'. Why not find inspiration in the original bakelite style, or something with a three-dimensional profile? I have spoken to many different neighbours about this, and numerous have agreed they would be willing to pay a once-off levy, if required, to gain a more sympathetic street sign for their block. (-:)
- I like the interpretive signs telling the stories & history of Queen's Park. I do not understand how this would be offered as an incentive, nor support it being offered as such.
- I don’t understand how this is an incentive.
- This is not an incentive. Some of us want to live in the present and look ahead to the future, not pretend that it's still 1902.

Expedited Approval Process

- Anything that streamlines the process reduces the paperwork burden and the costs of delays
- Applications to demolish an Advanced category house should go through rigorous City committee and Council reviews. Other approval processes could be streamlined.
- I prefer Council to have some say in these matters
- I wouldn’t want to let go of an approval process. Only takes one staff member not paying attention or not fully versed in the implications of some requests to lose the whole point of having an HCA
- Demolition permits should not be fast tracked. Yes to everything else.
• Yes! I don’t want the preservationists protesting any little thing I want to do. Let’s keep things simple, smooth, and FAIR!
• Demolitions require a very rigorous process to protect the area.
• giving priority to heritage is a huge welcome incentive.
• Please have someone from The nwhps be a part of the process and maybe the qpra
• no comment
• The success of this programme is seriously impacted by the abilities of the personnel involved. There needs to be community oversight on such a process.
• 2018 election year, we will have a new mayor and council
• The HCA was approved without adequate preparation. Incentives should have been decided before the HCA was approved. In addition, Vancouver designated pre 1940 homes in the Shaughnessy area' New West decided on pre 1941. Was this a typo when the HCA was passed or was there a good rationale?
• House demo requests should stay with council until the 2 year review is complete.
• I agree with this in terms of alteration permits, but DO NOT agree with it at all with any demolition applications. The whole point of the HCA was to protect houses so it makes no sense to expedite the ability to demo so I am totally against that.
• While I think it is beneficial to shorten a costly wait-time for homeowners, I think some care needs to be paid to exactly what is being done to a home. If it is straightforward and safe to allow as far as the conservation of a home's heritage then I am all for it. I am not in support of a streamlined process that would not look too closely at what is being done and might miss some heritage component. If conditions need to be applied then there will need to be some time spent on this.
• While expediting the process may benefit homeowners, the pressure on Development Services to grant demolitions without the additional step of Council oversight could potentially leave a backdoor open for developers and homeowners who wish to demolish their homes in the advanced protection category.
• The decision process needs to be democratic and transparent.
• How will the staff be trained, how much staff would be used to make these decisions? Who will decide the eligibility of the staff in these decisions? How will these decisions retain a democratic system?
• Regards to previous question- interpretive signs are wonderful to have in a historic neighbourhood - adds interest & attracts visitors - could complement the digital tour a Member us creating.
• All demolition requests for Advanced category properties should still go through the Community Heritage Commission for comment
• One major and consistent complaint has been the long turnaround times, so I think this is very important
• Applications to demolish an Advance Category house should ALWAYS require Council and/or Committee review.
• This process feels like it has been dragging on forever and people are losing faith that it can work. Now we're talking about adding incentive complexity, we heard from the
realtor at the Q&A session that home values have dropped. We are starting to worry so I think simple is best going forward. Make things as easy as possible and get rid of as much red tape as you can.

- Do not allow heritage activists to try to block our wishes for our own homes. That is petty behavior, and the city should not permit it. If they want to control my house, they can buy it!
- This is fine but not for major changes to the appearance of the house
- Only if the changes are small...no major renos or changes to the house
- The conditions being an obvious house that is not salvageable or has no true heritage relevance.
- City Council needs to let go of control and give it to the Director and his/her council.
- This is one of the only incentives so far on this survey I approve of. What we absolutely CANNOT have is special interests involved in any of the decision making on any approvals or permits. There are members of this community that seek to control it and shape it in their own vision. The people who demanded the HCA have created so much strife in this community and I would hate to see a process in which they delegate against and continue to vilify their neighbours over insignificant home matters.
- YES YES YES
- This is acceptable except when the house requesting a demolition permit is noteworthy. I would not like to see house such as the Boss Johnson house come down because it slipped through the cracks.
- Dwellings of merit should require a more intense review to make sure that key elements are not removed or that alterations will maintain and or restore the heritage value and style of the the building.
- A demolition order in the QPHCA should never be allowed without Council or City committee review.
- Is this a means to bypass the Heritage Conservation committee? Not sure that is the correct name of the committe. I'm not in favor of anything that speeds up demolitions in Queen's Park.
- No expedited demolition permits of HCA homes.
- Council should be focusing on the big picture not down in the boiler room were they already have highly paid folks to do this type of work
- EVERY SINGLE PROTECTED PROPERTY!! And, the cost of any Heritage alteration permits, development, and renovation permits need to be comparable to the cost for non-heritage home renovations. We've already lost equity and if it costs us more than it costs anyone else in the city to do renovations that are already seriously curtailed in scope that would be unacceptable.
- Offer streamlined approval processes to all residents not just a select few. We don't need the CHC, LUPC and Council to weigh in.
- Yes. Lets not bog down council. We don't want endless council meetings to be an HCA legacy.
• Who ever is at the desk when an application needs to be extremely aware of the end look on a project. One would assume being an employee, that would happen. I am a bit nervous that only one set of eyes might be involved. Sorry staff.
• Anything that reduces red tape and approval congestion would be welcomed, but then, wouldn't it beg the question as to why the rest of the City doesn't deserve the same?
• It would be difficult for administrators to use objective judgement from case to case. Transparency in the process would help this incentive.
• This whole process should be transparent and the community should have input on any house that is planned to be demolished.
• Only simple renos
• For simple, straightforward issues i.e. alterations to the back.
• Don't support staff making the decisions.
• Uncomfortable with staff making some of these decisions
• Fast is OK but not at the expense of a quality product.
• Would want to know first what is being proposed for "other" streamlining.
• Significant houses and building must require a broader review process such as a public hearing and RA presentation and input
• Once a house is destroyed/altered, its historical value cannot be preserved. We cannot speed up process and end up not protecting important houses.
• Our own permit process was delayed by approx 1 calendar year to satisfy heritage-related requirements/assessments. Interest rate rose by 0.75% in the meanwhile. This translates to tens of thousands of $$$ over amortization period. Expedited approval would represent double standard measure.
• I agree in principle however when it comes to demolishing houses - there needs to be input from the community (maybe the CHC), at least for the first 2 years (until the review)
• not for downgrading protected status, or for demolitions
• Yes for permits EXCEPT for demos. All demos should go to Council for approval.
• But not for demolition permits
• Strong yes. The process needs to be streamlined. Avoids long delays and putting families in tough positions.
• should not be allowed to demolish without public input
• Some significant houses must be brought to public hearing and Council
• These projects are hard and take time. Good idea to help in the paper work process.
• Agree with expedited process with the exclusion of demolition which should still go before Council.
• DO NOT INCLUDE DEMOLITIONS!
• This should not include demolition.
• I don't believe major decisions should be made without community input. I am concerned that this process could be used to weaken the HCA.
- Be very clear about demolitions. The ultimate goal of preserving these homes is at odds with expedited demolition permitting processes.
- Tricky question, removes the communication of home/land owners, from chambers and public disclosure at council meeting. Their voice may be lost. As Council changes, so will the direction that this change has to the needs/environment of the community.
- Don't make it easier to demolish an Advanced category house!
- After seeing some of the houses that have been demolished over the last couple of years, it is essential to keep an approval process in place.
- Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes.

**Online Surveys Not Submitted**
- Council has delegated all of this power to the Director of Development Services to determine whether I can demolish my home or not? How in any way could this be considered as an incentive to a homeowner. If the Director feels your home has heritage value, there would be no place to turn to appeal this decision. Too much power being given to city staff is not democratic and will lead to a lot of very frustrated homeowners.
- This sort of change should not be allowed without community input. If implemented I worry that this process would be abused if implemented.
- That is what a Director of Development Services should be in charge of..not City Council.
- I am not sure I completely understand the process being proposed. I am happy with de-cluttering City council's work-load. However, if a controversial demolition application comes forward to the DDS, how would the neighbourhood (especially the immediate neighbours) be notified? How would they be able to give feedback, individual or corporate? Would the DDS be able to apply rigorous restrictions here, or could they potentially make concessions (as has happened in the past) without a real understanding of what was going on, on the part of the property's neighbours. The devil, as they say, is always in the details on these sorts of things. And, uncomfortable as it may be to say, the very real perception (and stated concern) on the part of many Queen's Park residents in the recent past (say 20-25 years especially) has been that those most affected by changes (property-owning ratepayers) seem to have had less say than those least affected (i.e. city staff, particularly where those staff do not live in our neighbourhood, or even our city).
- I do not see the benefits to streamlining demolition of heritage homes. It should require full Council approval and committee review.
- Approval process should be consistent across the city.
- Absolutely. The process should be fast to approve and free to apply.
- Please also keep the community "heritage police" out of any decision-making on individual properties. They've already given more than enough input, and some of
them have made residents feel threatened. This has been very harmful to our neighbourhood.

Other Comments

Is there anything else you want to say about the Queen’s Park Heritage Conservation Area Incentives Program?

- The concessions need to be offered to owners of all existing buildings in the city who wish to renovate and/or add/on.
- I would like to eventually see guidelines around appropriate front landscaping to prevent owners from paving over their front yards or landscaping with artificial turf.
- The best thing that has happened in New West / QP in a long time. Glad Council had the guts to vote it in and I'm glad I live in an area that has some protection and design controls for it's old houses and the neighbourhood
- I think it’s admirable that the city has spent such a great amount of time trying to come up with incentives to be offered. I don’t believe you need to have so many since it is not likely the largest percentage of home owners who would be taking advantage of them and it will be considerable administration to stay on top of them.
- I'm very happy with the current direction. I hope that this program can become a template to how streamlined heritage incentives can be applied elsewhere in the city as well.
- I’ve been watching this thing closely and it astounds me we are so far in without having this figured out. What about that working group? Didn’t they sort out these details years ago?
  Anyway, I’ve been against this from the beginning. Way I see it you stole my rights so you should be giving me something very good as a result. What I’m seeing is what I was afraid of. Incentives that benefit the rich owners with big homes and lots of land. Doesn’t feel all that fair to be honest. Where are the incentives for the rest of us?
- Many concerned long term residents of Queen's Park worked extremely hard to give this neighborhood the protection it deserves. We were very happy and relieved when the City Council voted unanimously to support the development of a conservation area. It has been very disheartening reading about all these suggested incentives, the vast majority of which completely undermine the concept of a heritage area.
- Long survey, but well done. Thanks to all for much good work.
- these are fantastic ideas and the process has been well thought out with superb community consultation. my only concern about all the increased density is decreased greenspace, so i especially like it when density increase is above and below and at the rear, basement, attics. i'd like to see where you could combine a garage with a living space above like done in lots or other areas, using the density vertically instead of covering too much greenspace. maybe parking pads could be pavers with some greenspace too. keep up the good work.
• this just wasn't thought out ahead of time. Several of these "incentives" have the city's comment "cost may outweigh the benefits". These incentives really aren't incentives for anyone who just wants to live in their home and doesn't want to have another house in their back yard. The only time I would take advantage of this would be when I'm going to sell and if it would add value to my selling price. Are we trying to retain the integrity of Queen's Park or just add density? I hope we don't end up with too many carriage/laneway homes as it will detract from the beauty of the neighborhood. Also, what is the value of the lost green space when you add another home to your property? Who is going to enforce that people park on their required parking when the city doesn't even do that now? Nobody in their right mind would teach a 16 year old to drive in this neighborhood. Too many cars on the street as it is!
• Need to address homes where incentives are not going to make up the loss in value from protection. Where is the long-awaited economic impact study?
• I support the HCA and am not sure why we need to express this again. If I felt strongly about whether incentives were actually needed the City would have heard from me. Of course you are going to be bombarded with wish lists. The HCA is enough. There will always be naysayers but recent market activity certainly has not hurt Queen’s Park and if anything the entry level homes do better financially.
• No incentives of the kind you are proposing should be offered. In fact, NO INCENTIVES of any kind should be part of the HCA implementation. Incentives will only benefit developers and the elite few that have unlimited resources or those that have a desire to over build the neighborhood and increase density beyond historical levels thus degrading the livability of our precious neighborhood. The things you are proposing will have a lasting affect on our lives and the values of our homes. The real issue is the concern we all have about what has happened to the marketability of our homes. Some of us are third or fourth generation living in this neighborhood and the reasons we stay here are because we like it pretty much the way it is. We don't want to add on to our Heritage home, we don't want a carriage house and certainly don't want to tear down our home and build a new one. It would be nice to think that at least some of our neighbors think the same way.
Please don't throw out Heritage in the process of trying to save it.
• Please protect our west end from McMansions. We have lovely 1930's homes here.
• No thx
• The best incentive is allowing anyone that wants out of protection to move to limited. You’re holding people hostage otherwise and i dont think history will judge you favourably for it. Let people do what suites them. If you insist on forcing people into your policy, then you owe it to them to make all these incentives available.
• Incentives being offered are going to have an impact on the other homeowners in the City. Any programme would have to very carefully explained or offered to everybody in the City. This last part may nullify any incentive.
• Please publish and make visible how much this has cost the taxpayers of NW. Should have been a plebesite vote. Mayor and council ignored all home owners who did not
lobby for this bylaw. Election will soon correct this stupid mistake. Money poorly spent when city infrastructure is decaying. The city may own the name of QP, but I own my house and that’s something I will never allow to be dictated to in this free country. Shame on you mayor and council!

- I believe a small minority of very vocal owners pushed the HCA through. In asking most of my neighbours, they do not belong to the QPRA and don’t wish to join. Most of the homes around us have been torn down and replaced with beautiful heritage style homes and, as their owners are not affected by the HCA, they did not get involved. I believe a Canada Post survey should have been sent to each home in Queens Park. The HCA should not have been approved until the incentive program was clearly spelled out. This is now a bit of a mess and this was clearly apparent and stated openly by a panel member in the last open house attended by the guests from Vancouver, North Van, Patti Goss and the financial consultant. I will certainly keep this in mind when voting in the next election.

- I'm in favour of the qphc

- The very complicated incentives offered are, on the whole, of no use to a home owner who has no need or desire to increase living space and no interest in adding housing to the area. Such incentives strike me as a back door method of increasing density in the city when other neighbourhoods have rejected such an increase. Very expensive for the homeowner, especially in the face of what seem to be falling property assessments because of the HCA.

Why not something simpler, as perhaps a list of reliable contractors especially with the threat of mandatory maintenance standards as the City "moves forward" with the HCA?

- Get the incentives in place as soon as possible! Delays will be used by anti HCA residents as a reason to continue their opposition!

- The HCA has been approved, many of my neighbors and even myself to a lesser extent can’t figure-out why there is still an ongoing debate with a few on eliminating it. Yes some of their valid concerns should be heard, but I'm concerned that they are making the HCA seem like QP residents are nothing but complainers where nothing is ever enough and that they now want the city to pay for their renovations. I think the vast majority are happy with what has been approved so far! Thank you!

- The HCA is what the homeowners of Queen’s Park wanted. The heritage homes and the history here is the reason we live here so it is in everybody’s best interest to keep the heritage homes in QP.

I am in favour of incentives and less red tape that will help homeowners restore, improve (eg an addition) or maintain their homes. But I am not in favour of incentives that make things a cash grab for some greedy homeowners (eg stratifying a lane or carriage home).

We renovated and added on to our 1931 home when we could afford to. There are some homeowners who seem to think that the City somehow “owes them” because of the HCA and should be footing the bill for them to add a basement, etc. The answer
is no. Get real. This is 100% the responsibility of the homeowner regardless of the HCA.

- Why are we still arguing about this HCA? The biggest incentive IS living in an HCA. This conservation area is going to help balance the need for density and affordable housing while retaining streetscapes and heritage homes big and small. I have friends who live in Vancouver and they are jealous that we have an HCA. They have infill and secondary suites but many lovely homes are demolished to make way for a lot filled with new construction. Our HCA will save houses and offer housing options. Thank-you New West council!

- I very much support the Queens Park Heritage Conservation Area and would like facades, landscapes to remain as much as possible as is with conditional changes keeping in character with neighbourhood.

- It would be a good thing to expand the Coservation area to other areas in New Westminster as Queen’s park isn’t the only area with heritage homes. eg. Brow of the Hill

- The objective and spirit of the Queen's Park Heritage Conservation Area must be upheld. I have never seen another neighbourhood in most other provinces in Canada with such a high number of heritage homes in such a small area. Queen's Park is a very unique and rare neighbourhood. Personally, I would like to see restrictions on removing heritage features on the insides of many of the homes in Queen's Park. As an owner of a heritage home, I see the necessity if some renovations as older homes are not always practical for today's lifestyle. However, the particularly special features of these homes should be preserved.

- I think this is a great idea. Thank you for taking the time to do this. In the long run the careful work put into this will pay off!

- Could this be extended to people living in Brow on the Hill? Some Historic Signage would be a great addition to the community.

- Really appreciate all the work that volunteers and City staff have done to do an extensive community consultation to create this HCA and develop these incentives. THANK YOU - the heritage character and residential feel is why I bought in this neighbourhood over 30 years ago and like that it is going to be maintained or even improved over the coming years!

- My family has lived in New Westminster since 1874. One or more family member has lived in Queen's Park for 100 years. Myself in 6 homes. I feel that the Queen's Park Area that was to be saved will be changed . I as a child remember the homes that had been converted after WW2 . In 1979 we purchased one of these homes10 people were living in it. IT WAS A PROBLEM HOUSE. . However with alot of work and money it became our Home. I personally talked at meetings in the early 1980's in Vancouver hoping more people would do the same. They did. I LIKE Heritage. But I do not like someone to tell me to like it.
I think that the Area HAS been CHANGED FOREVER and not in a good way. It has divided the people that made this area so special. Homes were passed on from one generation to the other or people waited for homes to come up so they could buy them. The amount of the people cars etc. will change. I feel that houses may be saved but HOMES will be lost.

- I grew up in the neighbourhood. Many of my friends thought is was a conservation area anyways!! It is a special area.
- I will probably not be eligible for any of these specific incentives, and I am okay with that. The incentive to me is the getting the HCA!
- I am proud of the work that has been done and the decisions that have been made to protect these beautiful homes, the trees and green space. I like that changes in this area will be carefully considered, especially with the design guidelines for new construction.
- My final thought is that I support incentives that minimizes City costs. I would much rather see financial resources to go to the many homeless people or those struggling to find affordable housing here in NW. I'm getting a little tired of some of the QP homeowners who some how feel the city owes them something and that they are entitled to city resources. I also think some of the no cost incentives (like FSR binusing in basements and attics) could also be accessed by other owners of homes older than 1940 in other areas of New West.
- I appreciate the implementation of the HCA to protect the heritage of Queens Park which is an asset to all of us in the community.
- I'm not a huge fan of the QPHCA. These incentives do little to mitigate the problems raised by the QPHCA. They are only appropriate when someone is looking to develop on the property.

As stated by proponents of the QPHCA, their belief that a heritage conservation area will actually improve property values in the long run. Our experience in other jurisdictions with architectural controls is that they do maintain value but only if all houses are kept in good condition. These incentives do nothing to improve the dilapidated buildings within Queen's Park that are holding down property values. In fact, the increased repair costs imposed by the QPHCA's HAP process will likely discourage people from maintaining their existing buildings due to cost. They already have to deal with spiralling cost of property taxes and mortgages. Rather than development incentives, the owners within Queen's Park need specific monetary incentives to help them maintain these already expensive buildings.

- Very vague on any details. Complicated information and hard to link to maintenance reno costs of existing homes. Most incentives seem aimed at people who are going to heavily invest in additions/ new builds/ new suites and less on repairs to ageing difficult to fix houses. What about possible secondary cost impacts like increased insurance cost due to heritage designation? Not optimistic about path forward and my cost of ownership.
I am honestly feeling a lot less optimistic than I once was. I had concerns initially, but was convinced through many conversations with city staff and heritage protection supporters that this would be a great thing for the neighbourhood. I even had a little white sign on my lawn, but now I'm wishing I had taken a more neutral stance. I'm watching real estate more closely now and things don't look good. It's been almost 2 years since the moratorium was instituted and we're still having conversations about incentives. I was told repeatedly I could just move down to Limited, but I have little confidence that could ever happen now. I'm just generally confused about the state of things. I'm also not seeing many incentives that would benefit me personally. I have to wonder if some of my neighbours get ALL of this stuff and I get next to nothing, how is that fair? Will I be able to remove protection on my home if that's the case?

All incentives should be offered and owners can pick and use all that works for them.

Yes - it does not include any provisions for the owners with average size dwellings. No one with less than 6000 square feet of land can use any of these incentives. No one will want to buy those average homes at fair market value anymore. My grown children believe that young families will be put off by all these rules and restrictions. We should be doing what we can to attract them, not driving them away by making home ownership an impossible burden.

I am happy living in an area that is protected despite the fact that our home is not protected as it was built after 1940

We currently live in a home built in the 1940's. We plan to request our home be given protected status. We like living in a neighbourhood that we know will maintain the charm and character that led us to buy here. I think enough time and energy has been spent on this topic. Can we move on?

I do not want to see the neighbourhood I grew up in and have returned to live in turned into another Kits or VGH neighbourhood.

Needs to be speeded up so owners can get on with updating to the 21st Century family living.

Virtually all of these incentives benefit *some* homes in this neighbourhood. Many are left out in the cold with Advanced protection and little to no incentives that can be obtained. How is this fair? Why can't Advanced protection be a chosen path where the incentives justify the protection? If residents really want this HCA and they really want these incentives there's no reason they wouldn't choose to keep their home fully protected. Why can't you trust homeowners to do what's best for their own families? For those of us with smaller homes on small lots and zero development potential, this process has felt a lot like being dragged through the mud. You have had YEARS to figure this out (the working group was formed in 2014). We are almost one year into this HCA and now the city is back-peddling on incentives (by making them conditional and tied to full designation) that were promised to many residents because they wouldn't want to give anything to residents in QP that would be an unfair advantage... What about those of us who opposed this HCA from the beginning and
are losing home value and won't be able to use these incentives? How come the city can't look out and do what's best for us as well?

- The entire HCA process has been very unfair. Our neighbourhood consists of hundreds of different styles of homes, and the sizes of lots vary greatly. This is NOT First Shaughnessy, where it was proven that every single owner could use every incentive offered due to their large lots. From the outset, the QP HCA has been designed to only benefit owners of large properties with lots of money to spend. What is the city going to do to help everyone who cannot use any of these so-called incentives? All that will result from the current ill-conceived plan is that the excluded homes will be further devalued. Currently, the only way one of those families can move down to Limited is via a subjective heritage value assessment. All the city has to do is say "Your house looks ok" and you are trapped with lots of restrictions and receive no compensation for it. How is this an ethical policy? If you cannot obtain any benefit, you should be moved down!

- I am glad to see the way the city is seriously trying to retrofit the HCA to make it a manageable, understandable benefit to those of us who are not convinced such a program was necessary in the first place! If we are to move forward the city has to make things easier not more complicated. We are already under a complex arrangement that is only in the early stages of implementation and whose long term impact is not clear. My high priority is that we have simple, actionable incentives (I could argue to use the word compensation/mitigation instead!) that can allow us to regain some of the real loss of value that has impacted us (both in an absolute sense for the HCA area but also in a relative sense. BTW I have yet to see a report that details the relative price gain comparisons with neighbouring areas in New Westminster) Simplify simplify simplify. Clarity clarity clarity. Keep up the good work. We have to live with this. Lets not make it harder and more complicated.

- I like the HCA and I would support it even if there were no incentives because it protects the character of the neighbourhood which was the driving force behind the move for an HCA in the first place. HCAs work which is made all the more evident by the fact that none have ever been rescinded.

- Lest we forget; the HCA exists to protect the heritage character and the streetscape of the Queen's Park neighbourhood. Many, if not most of these incentives if implemented would significantly alter these very components that the HCA was intended to preserve. Wasn't it great to see all the lawn signs supporting conservation of the this unique area of the city?

- It’s not fair what you did to our property values. It’s also not fair that limited properties and glenbrooke properties were enriched as a result. Please do what you can to try to restore our property values.

- We want to maintain and sustain the the heritage beauty in our district. Some consideration should be given to "grants" for home owners to heating and insulation systems to make our old homes more efficient and affordable in terms of heat and light.
- I am delighted and relieved to have the QPHCA in place to protect the character of the neighbourhood, but also believe incentives will make this protection more palatable to more homeowners. I approve of more density, but would like to see it done with consideration and thoughtfulness.

- I am glad to be living in a Heritage Conservation Area, and wish that everyone was. Incentive programs could help soften the stance of the anti-HCA homeowners.

- Preserving heritage homes is important. However, there are too many limitations in the current plan. Life does require evolution and not everything staying the same.

- The "development" of the Westside of New Westminster has been unsupervised and has reduced the feel of the neighbourhood. I'm supportive of density, the City is supportive of density but please make small, consistent and regulated changes to Queen's Park.

  This survey seems to want to go well beyond what the recent consultation discussed and i am doubtful that the Residents of Queen's Park were pushing for the changes discussed in the survey. This leads me to wonder why the City is so focused on changing Queen's Park, it makes me suspicious of their motives and leads me to ask whether builders and developers are driving this more than the Residents or even the City planning department.

- The City is at a significant crossroads. If New Westminster wants to be case study that all others refer to in how to completely mess up the implementation of an HCA ...... or worse yet, the only HCA to ever be retracted, then go ahead and implement your additional tier of restrictions as the only means for homeowners to access higher value

- This has been a phenomenal process to be part of! The City and staff have executed marvellously. The process has been exceptionally professionally delivered. It takes courage and vision to move a change like this forward. I am thrilled with the outcome. Thank you for all your hard work.

- I would like to build a laneway home to replace a garage that is from 1930, sinking into the ground and leaking. It was badly built with scraps in 1930 and needs to be rebuilt. I would then move into the new home and allow one of my children to use the main house to raise a family. They will never be able to purchase a home within the current real estate market.

- The conservation conditions for pre-1940 homes must be rigorously enforced by the city or the HCA will become a joke.

- In an age when public transit is encouraged, and the use of single occupant vehicles is discouraged, the 2 adjacent parking spaces for a laneway house is too restrictive. Many families have one vehicle and car sharing is on the rise. Allow the laneway houses to have 1 parking space if the laneway is under x sqft. This can be an incentive in exchange for conditions if necessary.

- Earlier in all of the presentations an incentive was proposed for a variance on protection of mature trees. This has disappeared now, and is not even being discussed here. This is extremely important to have. Almost none of the development
incentives described make sense if trees are not cut down to make room. Tree bylaws are slowing development and hindering the ongoing development/repair/and maintenance of the neighborhood. Why was this incentive removed?

- This survey like all the last ones, open houses, and any other input should have been only available to the folks in QP as it is our money and property not anyone else's that is involved here
- The City has taken away owner's rights by applying protection that in many cases is not warranted due to the condition of the property and very low heritage value except the property age.

There are very few designated heritage homes in QP and there is not a line up of homeowners that will do so. QP is a great neighbourhood to live in but many older homes are small and quirky and unattractive. These homeowners are unlikely to spend any money on incentives or do not have the savings nor the inclination to do so. The purpose of HCA was to bring in design guidelines for new homes so let the neighbourhood evolve and not let us all be trapped in a time capsule.

- Can we bring some common sense to this process and allow old homes without merit to be rebuilt without a million hoops and hurdles to jump through. I read in the paper recently and article that a house was going to have to replace their vinyl windows with wooden windows at an expected cost of between $120,000-$140,000. This is ridiculous and few people can afford to do renovations that meet compliance. The result is a lot of derelict houses because homeowners can't afford the necessary repairs to the standard required. Lets back down and rethink this whole process!
- I think incentives implies that someone is being "bribed", offered incentives to do the right thing. In this case, "doing the right thing" (preserving heritage) has become mandatory - with an unfortunate side effect of temporarily freezing sales and, even with the recent sale of a couple of properties, leaving many languishing on the market for months, and homes like mine impossible to sell. (Being on piers and beams for a foundation means anyone who needs CMHC mortgage insurance won't get it - cut out buyers who are newer to the market. Having 2 bedrooms and no family room, one bedroom quite small with no closet, means no families with children will buy. Steep stairs limits the number of senior buyers who might appreciate 2 bedrooms and have more than 25% down - therefore not needing CMHC mortgage insurance. The nature of heritage homes includes a need for near constant, and costly, maintenance - anyone who is not handy, on a fixed income, or prefers new and/or low maintenance homes is not interested. Even without an HCA that limits how and what a potential buyer could do with this property, there are 8 healthy, well-off, middle-years, hands-on hippie heritage enthusiasts in the whole lower mainland who are the "market" for this house. Realtors have never been optimistic about finding them - but they used to figure someone would be able to demolish the house and build something that would work for them. Not so now.)
- I think it’s unfair what you have done. Please fix it.
Incentive - An incentive is something that motivates an individual to perform an action. What are you trying to get people to do, invest hundreds of thousands of dollars in an addition? Life was so much simpler before the HCA. If one wanted to protect their home they could easily do so. Negotiate the terms with the City to the satisfaction of both parties. The Mayor has said HRA's are a tool that is working well. Yet instead of trying to enhance that very successful program you throw a blanket over the entire neighbourhood and then attempt reparations. The majority of the items cited as being character defining elements were always under the purview of the City. The grid pattern of the streets, the wide boulevards on Second and Fifth streets, zoning, tree protection, views of the river etc. Building codes and zoning bylaws dictate the size and siting of your house. You do not force old homes to conform to these unless they want to make major changes and even then there can be exceptions and alternative options made available. Other residents aren't forced to build in a style complementary to relics of the past. This whole thing is flawed and pits pre-1941 homes against all others and changes what was once a level playing field.

Many of the parts in this survey ask more than one question but I can only select one of three options. One possible condition can be okay in principle while another is horribly bad. Saying Yes or No doesn't accurately reflect my choice but I dare not select Offer with conditions, not knowing which conditions will make the final cut.

I can not name a single benefit I have received by this HCA there are only negatives. Given that changes to the bylaw were planned right from the beginning, at your first opportunity, reverse the HCA. Think of all the tax dollars that could be saved, in the long run this will amount to many millions. Enhance the already very successful HRA program so that more homes citywide take advantage of it and the stronger legal protection requisite therein. Many marginal homes have been caught in the crossfire and none of the so called "incentives" may work or be relevant to them. Council says it may move some of these homes to the unprotected category but there are no guarantees this will happen. Even more disturbing would be for Council to automatically include more homes into the protected category once they pass a certain age or to move a home from unprotected to protected at the behest of a few citizens in a small local preservation society, group or committee. How long before all 1950's homes are captured by the heritage net. The only incentive necessary is to give ALL home owners the option to be either in or out of the heritage conservation area. Your attempt to fix something that was never broken has been miserable for many and glee for only a select few.

A waste of time and money - favoritism - maybe the incentives should be for people who live outside of queens park

Overall I am unfortunately quite disappointed in the list of incentives being considered. One of the biggest objections to the HCA that I had personally, as well as many others who voiced their objection, was that it would most hurt small houses on small lots. I see almost none of the proposed incentives would benefit these types of homes, exactly as we feared. So for small home and small lot owners such as ourselves, the HCA has taken away some of our rights, without appearing to be able
to offer anything in return. The HCA appears to have negatively impacted our property value (based on the most recent assessment particularly relative to other neighborhoods), and the proposed incentives are not mitigating this, neither indirectly via any opportunities (since we don't have space for an addition/laneway home/dividing into multiple units) nor directly via any financial incentives. I was very disappointed when the HCA bylaw passed, yet hopeful that something could be done to mitigate the negative impact. As feared though, this does not seem to be the case as mainly the benefits slant to larger homes and larger lots only.

- The prestige of Queens Park has and will continue to attract price premiums compared to other areas of NW. Resident of the QPN are not "hurting" and in my view incentives are not absolutely required to maintain property values, which will likely continue to rise as the area is by definition not going to increase in size. Policy makers should look at the HRA and incentive package as possibly determinative of other neighbourhoods looking to protect their own unique character through the HCA mechanism. A balanced set of incentives will ensure the QPN is not perceived to be getting a windfall while at the same time generating positive momentum for heritage preservation in the city. But don't give away the farm!

- I think conditions that regulate the conservancy of those aspects of a home that give it cultural and historic value. Just having an “old” house shouldn’t necessarily be reason enough to receive benefits. Owners that renovate or build should do so in a historic manner to benefit.

- I just love this neighbourhood. When people chose to move here and buy an older house, if they don't understand that maintenance is going to be an issue they need their heads read. Having said that, every penny spent becomes equity. Good old fashion pride has created a most pleasant spot to live. Incentives should weigh heavily with family enjoyment and not be put in place to have the neighbourhood become an urban renewal project or the pleasant factor will quickly disappear.

- I am concerned there are too much tax payer resources being spent on a small area, and that this is only the first. This is a disguise to move freedom of design and lifestyle choice from the Homeowner to a select few, if not one person at City Hall.

- Transparency and consultation will be imperative to the success no matter what implementation goes through.

- As a young resident of the Queen's Park area, I feel it is important to maintain the heritage of the houses. I enjoy walking from my house to the grocery store because I feel a sense of heritage and appreciation of where we have come from. Heritage homes are unique and beautiful. I strongly feel that this will be an attraction for tourism in the future, as well as I will be able to bring my own children up understanding and appreciating the heritage of our community. We have a unique opportunity presented to us; it is rare to find so many original heritage homes located in the same areas. We should not give this up as once it is gone we can not get it back.
• Please change the name of this program to be more inclusive of others who own heritage homes in the City.
• Keep up the good work
• I am truly opposed to more laneway and carriage houses - any stratification of single family homes. Our neighbourhood is already congested with traffic and parking is an issue on many streets i.e. Third Street - when do we say we are full? We intend to place our home - built in 1946 - on the protected list. We are happy our neighbourhood is now protected from demolition any development.
• Can we not get on with this? The HCA has been implemented - our neighbourhood is protected AND house prices have not been impacted which seems to be the major complaint. I have real issues with some incentives which increase density and changes streetscapes and the heritage character of the neighbourhood.
• I think the HCA is an excellent move by the City. And I think SOME incentives are a good idea but I don't support catering to only QP.
• I'm very supportive of the HCA and think the City made a great decision in implementing it. The incentives program is also an excellent idea, but want to be careful not to offer incentives that only benefit QP, if houses in the rest of New West can take advantage of them.
• Right direction. Incentives should be provided as long as principal residence from the exterior front facade gets full restoration or remediation (i.e. porches/gables/windows/landscaping).
• The biggest and most valuable incentive IS living in the HCA. If we are unhappy with something will we always expect compensation? (If so - let me talk to you about garbage collection and parking issues!) The HCA was never intended to line pockets of developers who will densify the charm out of the hood. Density is coming but please NOT the way Vancouver has done in some hoods. Way too much. Too fast. Gregor has been a decent mayor but has been very influenced by developers. Density has NOT led to affordable housing.
• I thought the intent of the OCP and our city's initial foray into infill housing was a noble one. Allow homeowners to add inlaw or rental accommodation. These worksheet questions would make any realtor and developer salivate with glee. Living in an HCA is the main incentive. The QP hood should have what any other hood could have: 958 sqft. infill. Of course the (perhaps) more affluent would want and could afford more but is that the vision for QP? Become a version of Mt. Pleasant circa 1980s. UGH. Very sad. Common sense manageable density. Do not pimp "heritage".
• It's good to use a carrot rather than stick approach - what will help with restoration of heritage properties. But shouldn't be a way for developers to make profit without giving back to QP community. Make sure any bonus/incentive results in a win for the community as well as the homeowners. I am willing to give a homeowner "more" in return for guarantee that principal home is also improved (restored). Giving homeowners on Fifth St TEN YEARS to replace out-of-character vinyl windows is
exactly what shouldn't be done. Council needs to NOT give too much away! Needs to be win-win.

- I support the HCA without incentives. My bonus/incentive is the HCA itself. The HCA was supported by the residents of QP to protect the character of the homes and the streetscape of the neighbourhood. The majority of the homes in the QP neighbourhood displayed the Heritage "We support conservation" signs. We still support the HCA and that should speak for itself.

- I moved to Queens Park because of its historical significance and beauty. Seeing all these destructions of our history is disheartening.

- There seems to be a sense from some people that incentives are being offered as compensation for having a house in the CA. The only thing incentives should address is encouragement for retaining the house.

- Many of our assessments are down, not because the HCA was passed in June but because of the uncertainty it created in the previous months. Not wanting to give us tax breaks because of impact on other tax payers in the city - you are already impacting the entire city with the huge cost of this entire process, staff time, staff, consultants, etc. Any so called incentives that increase density will change the character of the neighbourhood. Queens Parks will be "heritage" homes, some grant but many not grant, with new builds squished in.

- Increased density should NOT be allowed at the expense of green space and the "leafy" ambiance of our neighbourhood. Also, any "financial" incentives should not be unequal to or impact on the rest of New Westminster. They should not bear the brunt of our protected neighbourhood.

- 1 - Protect greenspace. Density should not sacrifice trees and lawns to the extent that it changes the look of the neighbourhood.
  2 - Consider property tax reduction.

- Crazy to think that all this was NOT done prior to implementation of the HCA - should be rescinded - unfair to many homeowners. City's HCA has taken money already out of our pockets and these incentives will do more of the same!

- Good luck!

- My house has a HRA which allowed the previous owner to subdivide without off street parking for the heritage home, quite a problem.

- These are great initiatives and hope fully they will give the flexibility to the residents to work within the HRA and yet keep the neighbourhood affordable.

- LOVE THE HCA

- Another policy like the province - Ready! Aim! Shoot!

- Why do you need consultants are they to be used because you don't have knowledgeable staff or is it just a perk for some people

- If you increase density too much it will change the character of QP for the worse

- No more property restrictions
  -KISS principle - follow it
- Restore our property value - should be the only priority

- The majority of residents support the HCA (remember all the signs). I like the HCA, the building guidelines and the maintenance standards. I do not care about the incentives. I just want the neighbourhood saved.

- Thank you for the wonderful consultations and materials and answering all our questions! We are really hoping for incentives to go through and apply to our special limited house. We wouldn't be able to add a 3rd bedroom otherwise as our FSR is essentially maxed out. Addition would be invisible from street due to * high attic space and dormer would face back of lot.

- any size. monitoring program for laneway houses

- It is great to see the City is taking progressive steps to preserve homes with heritage value and offer ways for families to enhance their lives.

- The site coverage (currently at 35%) will not allow the full benefit of a proposed FSR increase from 0.5 to 0.6 to be fully realized. Site coverage and FSR go hand in hand and need to be studied together. Increase site coverage to 40-45%.

- As a non Queens Park resident I fully appreciate the concerns of some residents with the HCA, BUT as a resident of New West I appreciate and support the HCA. Our heritage is important to all of us and to the future residents. The many outweigh the few, kudos to Council for standing up for heritage.

- I would like to thank the Council and all of the staff for the time and careful, thoughtful consideration that they have dedicated to this process.

- I am watching how this plays out for Queens Park. I own a large heritage home on Fifth Street and I feel the home has a better future if it is turned into multiple dwellings - my neighbours don't agree. I want to preserve the home well into the future without losing the heritage features nor the building itself.

- Through 3 years of public consultation, significant funds spent and lengthy consideration the measured decision to create an HCA was made. Council cannot let a minority of fear mongers erode the work to date. Several of the incentives independently will compensate for any perceive negative financial impact of the HCA. The aim of the HCA is not to prevent development - with incentives - the aim is to focus on the right type of development.

- I think the program should have been put out prior to adoption of the bylaw!! Now the City wants input into a totally flawed process from the beginning it was not even fair none of the pro has people even give a dam about the incentive process, that are all happy , so now you throw us some incentives and we are all to be really happy with what the City is offering!!! Joke!

- I am in favour of greater density if done tastefully but the purpose of the HCA is to preserve the ambiance of the neighbourhood. Too much infill would detract from this. I would prefer fewer incentives to too many. The HCA will increase the value of the existing stock in the neighbourhood; We don't need to buy homeowners off.

- Adding a bigger bow and fancier paper doesn’t change what is in the box - the HCA has had a significant negative effect on our situation as well as many others in the
area. Reduced assessment, & restrictions that will certainly limit the market of potential buyers. Unlike some owners, we can’t wait several years for values to rebound.

We were in favour of some design guidelines but Council insisted they could not bring in those without the HCA. But reading the consultants report to Council, they show that 5 areas - Victoria, Nanaimo, Saanich, North Van City, & Delta all brought in an HCA to achieve design guidelines but without building protection. Why was that not possible here? If that had been done as a first step, then maybe the rest could have been sorted out rather than imposing the HCA before figuring out details.

- Offer all the incentives outright, asap. That's how you repair the damage you've caused to the Queen's Park protected property market.

Buyers obviously do not want to pay market price for protected properties. We can see that clearly from the last nine months of sales data. Protected properties have lingered on the market, the few sales that have happened were sold for well under assessment. That's bad, guys. Especially when you see comparable heritage properties in Glenbrooke selling quickly and over assessment, and limited properties in Queen's Park selling quickly and over assessment. That's the market speaking to you. Are you getting the message?

If buyers knew there was easy access to a wide variety of incentives, they would be incentivized to purchase an old protected house, that they have to - expensively - maintain forever. Forever. Think about that through the eyes of a potential buyer. Expensive maintenance forever. That's scary stuff. So a buyer moves on, a few blocks away, and buys the same old house with none of your heavy-handed rules.

Your bylaw has made owning an average protected property in Queen's Park an expensive, scary and off-putting endeavor. That reality can maybe be fixed with a large, varied, easily-accessed incentives package. Maybe.

- Do the right thing. Don't make it difficult. Don't hold back.

- Just to stress that heritage house preservation is very important, and Queens Park area is an iconic and historic part of our city's fabric. Incentives may be costly, but they can make a difference when a homeowner is deciding between demolition and restoration.

- The cart is in front of the horse on this one. I still have no clear idea as to clear development guidelines, or complete policy, which includes incentives and direction. Yet my home is significantly restricted and limited, and yet the policy has been signed off on. I will never like a minority of invested individuals, dictating to the majority. If 51% support I will be on board, anything less, not acceptable, ever. I believe in heritage, and policy can be developed, but not this way. Just listen to the community that is most effected, Change has occurred, just not good change. Division and resentment in our community is alive and well.

- Any incentives selected to be put in place should be ones that do not create an untenable administrative burden on the city. The HCA will be a benefit to all of New Westminster with or without adding any incentives. I have had conversations with a few house hunters lately who have been drawn to QP because of the HCA so council...
has made the right decision in putting this in place. Having a few incentives may convince the few homeowners who are not in favour of the HCA to be somewhat happier with their home location but it doesn't make sense to be focussed on their issues to the exclusion of other city work. There are much broader and more important social issues to be dealt with in our city.

- I hope that the taxes in Queen's Park make up for what they seem to get as special treatment, when the rest of us in New Westminster are being used as fodder for developers!

**Online Surveys Not Submitted**

- The VAST majority of the neighbourhood was and is in favour of the HCA and don’t think incentives need to be offered. Any incentives offered to Queen’s Park should also be offered to any pre 1940’s house in the City.

- As previously stated, this whole process has been a complete shambles and puts into question the good reputation city staff had when it came to consulting with the community. Everyone living in Queen's Park that is now becoming aware of what has transpired is furious at council. We can't wait until the October election in order to get rid of the entire crew.

Property loss mitigation strategies should have been negotiated with the residents PRIOR to the HCA being implemented, not afterward. That's why this entire consultation process is considered a sham. These are NOT incentives as is implied in the survey. If someone doesn't have the money to invest in their property, but has experienced a real loss of $300,000 in value, these incentives do nothing to assist them. As they say, the horse has left the barn and now we must wait for the election.

- I think that there should be individual consultation with each home owner, especially with those in the Special Limited category. Not just visual assessments but looking at home's history and talking with the owner. There has been over three years of study, so should have been ample time to set up appointments.

- I am not sure it directly relates, but I have spoken to a number of residents in my immediate two-square block area (most of us know each other well) as well as other friends in the Queen's Park neighbourhood, about how we can share in the revenue received from movie shoots.

The current model sees (generally) a single property owner reaping a direct windfall from a production company, while the City pockets other fees charged to the production company. However, immediate neighbours affected by the late-night lighting, noise, door-knocking and solicitation, and parking restrictions, receive no compensation whatsoever. This is done differently in other areas of the world, certainly Europe.

I appreciate that the City of New Westminster may or may not allocate some of its share of film revenue to heritage conservation grants, but this only benefits those residents who are planning to make alterations or renovations to their homes. But in any given year, the vast majority of residents are not doing so. So, what about re-thinking this, whereby some kind of levy is paid by production companies whereby
the most-inconvenienced (e.g., immediate neighbours, with equipment encroaching on their property, or having to forgo natural usage of their property (such as prohibited entry corridors or parking being off-limits)) would receive some kind of "inconvenience pay"? Alternatively, to save on administration/payment systems, the equivalent $ amount could instead be deducted from their City property tax account at the beginning of the next year.

I would suggest that modernizing the system in the fashion above, would result in a much greater degree of sympathy for the industry amongst the majority of QP residents, especially those who do not happen to live in the most beautiful homes (the ones which tend to receive repeat patronage from the film industry).

- I thank City Council and Staff for all the effort that they have put into researching this to try and wade through all the misinformation that some have tried to put out there. I was impressed with what I saw of councilors Out in the neighbourhood knocking on doors in an effort to understand the true wishes of the community. When my opportunity came to speak to council there were so many points that I did not get a chance to voice and didn't hear others state either. When the vote was taken councillor after councillor articulated all that wished I had raised in my 5 minutes on the floor. The concern that you have shown trying to make this process as fair as possible to all is commendable. I thank you all.

- I am very pleased to see this kind of thought being given to save both the Queen's Park houses and the historic neighbourhood that they make up. Thank you for your work and consultation!

- I fully support the HCA, think it is fabulous to protect the character of the homes, gardens and streetscapes in Queen's Park for everyone to enjoy. Even those of us who do not live in Queen's Park.

- Please make things right for my neighbours that have suffered because of the HCA. They spoke loud and clear and the city did not listen. Now home values in the park are impacted and buyers are turned off. Please listen now and give them something that they can use to rebound from the mess that has been created.

- Although I happen to have a large lot, I can certainly see how this policy does not take my neighbours with smaller lots into account. This will create further resentment and equity loss. The city seems keen to move people up the protection ladder, so why not let some people go down if they are not being compensated under this plan? Otherwise, the city is admitting that these residents do not matter. The HCA was completely unnecessary, and has created so much unhappiness in this community. I've lived here for two decades and I don't know anyone who likes it. Most of us do not want our entire lives to revolve around heritage conservation, and more should be done to reduce the negative impact.
There is no Report with this Item. Please see Attachment(s).
# INCENTIVE FRAMEWORK FOR PROTECTED PROPERTIES IN THE QUEEN’S PARK HERITAGE CONSERVATION AREA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Incentive</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0 Increase in Density</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Increased Floor Space Ratio (FSR) for the Principal Dwelling</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>Increase the FSR by 0.20 for all protected properties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Existing Basement Floor Space Exclusion</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Offer a larger increase in FSR instead of this incentive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Existing Attic Floor Space Exclusion</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Offer a larger increase in FSR instead of this incentive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 More Achievable Laneway or Carriage House Density</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>Allow a larger density transfer to enable a laneway or carriage house of up to 958 square feet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Larger Laneway House or Carriage House</td>
<td>Yes, for some</td>
<td>Medium Term</td>
<td>Allow only for large properties with houses that are already over density.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| 2.0 Relaxation of Regulations | | | |
| 2.1 Policy to Support Additions to Buildings that do not Conform with the Zoning Bylaw | Yes | Medium Term | Existing policy for Development Variance Permits would be reviewed and a guide created |
| 2.2 Relaxations for Laneway and Carriage House Regulations and Guidelines | Yes | Short Term | Minor relaxations to guidelines will be supported, when appropriate. |
| 2.3 Relaxation of Sewer Separation Requirements for Laneway and Carriage Houses | Citywide | - | Citywide relaxations when the principal dwelling is being retained. |
| 2.4 Building Code Relaxations | Yes | As requested, starting in the short term | Opportunities for owners will be identified when they apply to renovate. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Incentive</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.0 Change of Tenure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Stratified Laneway or Carriage House</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Allow for all protected properties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Stratified Principal Dwelling</td>
<td>Yes, for some</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Allow only for large properties with houses that are already over density.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Multiple Unit Conversion (Rental)</td>
<td>Yes, for some</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Allow only for large properties with houses that are already over density.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 Small Lot Subdivision</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Only allow through a Heritage Revitalization Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.0 Process and Other Changes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Heritage Home Grant Program</td>
<td>Citywide</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Explore expansion of the program citywide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Interpretive Sign Program</td>
<td>Citywide</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Incorporate into an existing citywide work plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 Expedited Approval Process</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Explore ways to expedite other related city permits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Explore additional services to assist owners when they apply to renovate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Refine the Evaluation Checklist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Develop additional design guidelines during Heritage Conservation Area review.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There is no Report with this Item.
Please see Attachment(s).
What are we trying to achieve?

Queen’s Park Heritage Conservation Area

The purpose of the HCA is to:

- recognize and protect the historic nature of the neighbourhood for the benefit of present and future generations;
- ensure that all building alterations and property development or redevelopment within the neighbourhood, including landscape design, respects the history and enhances the heritage character and heritage value of the neighbourhood;
- promote conservation, restoration, rehabilitation and renovation of the heritage buildings in the neighbourhood;
- maintain current neighbourhood layout and residential lot sizes to protect the park-like character of the area;
- accommodate development, including infill, that is consistent with the existing heritage buildings and enhances the heritage character of the neighbourhood.
What are we trying to achieve?

Incentives Program

The Queen’s Park protected properties add value to the neighbourhood and the city overall. Towards maintaining this value, the house may not be able to be demolished, certain renovations have to meet the intent of the design guidelines, and owners may have to go through an additional permit process.

The purpose of the Incentives Program is to:

• To account for the additional costs associated with a protected property.
• Provide clarity to owners and the marketplace, rather than relying on negotiating benefits at the time of redeployment.
What role does the economic analysis play?

The impact of the Heritage Conservation Area on property value cannot be explained through an assessment of market trends because:

- Many other factors are also impacting the market (e.g. higher mortgage rates, foreign buyer tax). It is impossible to pinpoint the impact of each factor.
- Queen’s Park is too small and diverse of a study area, and there are too few sales to draw conclusions.
- Not enough time has passes since the adoption of the policy.

The economic analysis identified and explored two economic impacts on a protected property:

1. The lower value of sub-par basement space (low ceiling height, subterranean, unfinished, etc.).
2. A renovation cost premium.

The economic analysis also express the importance of better communication to confirm the HCA still means that the full development potential can be achieved on protected properties.

Note: Neither the Discussion Paper nor the economic analysis recommended implementing incentives for non-protected properties. The HCA is expected to have either no impact or a positive impact on these properties.
What role does the economic analysis play?

The economic analysis focused on the worst case scenario. Houses in this circumstance are already accounted for in the Heritage Conservation Area program and are not the focus of the Incentives Program.

It would be too much change to character of the home and neighbourhood to try to make these work through incentives.
Possible Implementation Approach

**Outright Entitlements** – Incentives could be implemented as an outright entitlement for all protected properties. This means that property owners could take advantage of an incentive without any additional approval process (e.g. no public hearing).

**Conditional Entitlements** – In exchange for meeting the additional conditions, further incentives with a more significant benefit could be offered to the owner of a protected property. The conditions could include:

- requiring restoration of the house, and/or
- requiring work done to the house to meet a higher standard of conservation than required by the Heritage Conservation Area design guidelines, and/or
- requiring Heritage Designation (a higher level of heritage protection than the Heritage Conservation Area).

**Heritage Revitalization Agreements** – will continue to be an option for homeowners.

**Staff Recommendation:**

That the implementation approach not include conditional incentives.

Staff also recommends updating the citywide HRA program, as part of a future work program.
Proposed Incentive 1.1: Increase the FSR

**Staff Recommendation:** implement a larger Floor Space Ratio bonus than proposed during consultation instead of also implementing the basement or attic exclusions. Staff proposes an increase of 0.20 FSR.

**Considerations:**

- Community support for one, not all, of the three main density increase options (FSR, basement exclusion, attic exclusion).
- Of the three, the highest community support and lowest option was for the FSR increase of 0.1 FSR.
- Concerns raised by the community about the amount of increase in density being considered due to the impact on green space and trees, character of the house, and character of the neighbourhood.
- This approach is less than recommended by economic analysis, which suggested a basement exemption (an average of 0.16 FSR) plus an increase of 0.1 FSR, for a total on site of 0.76 FSR (on average).

Proposed for implementation in the **short term**, for all protected properties.
Visualizing Basement Exemption Plus FSR Increase

This is based on average basement size. Some basements are larger and would allow for a larger addition.
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All additions would be limited to 0.2 FSR.
Proposed Incentive 1.1: Increased FSR

Why staff recommend this approach:

• What each property qualifies for would be very clear. Unlike basement/attic exemptions were each owner would need to confirm what they their opportunity would be.

• This is the most flexible approach. It is up to the owner how to take advantage of the opportunity (e.g. add a new basement, take advantage of unused attic space, add an addition).

• The greatest number of properties would benefit (e.g. houses without a basement, very small basement, or a lower floor that doesn’t meet the definition of a basement still qualify).

• Some houses have very large basement and would qualify for an addition larger than what the community is comfortable with. An addition of this large size may not be feasible on some properties.

Note: The HCA design guidelines are ensure additions would be compatible with the character of the home.
Proposed Incentives 1.2 and 1.3: Exemption of Existing Basement or Attic Floor Space

Staff Recommendation: do not implement either of these incentives and instead implement a larger increase in Floor Space Ratio than proposed.

Considerations:

- Owners would still have the opportunity to add an addition above ground equivalent to the average basement, even if the house is currently at the maximum density.
- Owners would also have the opportunity to raise their home to make the basement space more functional.
- Owners would have the opportunity to add an addition larger than the size of their attic or to take advantage of underutilized attic space, even if the house is currently at the maximum density.

Not recommended for implementation.
Proposed Incentive 1.4: More Achievable Laneway or Carriage House Density

Staff Recommendation: allowing additional unused principal dwelling density to be transferred to the laneway or carriage house. The laneway house would still be limited to the maximum permitted size of 958 square feet.

Considerations:

- This change would make it easier for laneway and carriage houses to be built at the maximum size without increasing the overall density entitlements on the site.
- The proposed increase in FSR proposed means owners would have the option to build a maximum size laneway house.

Proposed for implementation in the short term, for all protected properties.

Note: The HCA and laneway/carriage house design guidelines ensure these buildings are liveable and compatible with the character of the home.
Proposed Incentive 1.5: Larger Laneway or Carriage House

**Staff Recommendation:** explore this as an incentive specifically for large properties with homes that are already over density.

**Considerations:**
- Targeted at homes that would not benefit from the proposed increase in floor space ratio.
- Targeted at larger properties that would more likely able to appropriately accommodate a larger laneway or carriage house.
- Though further analysis required to determine parameters, early analysis indicated a relatively small number of properties would be eligible.

**Proposed for implementation in the medium term, for some protected properties.**

**Note:** The laneway/carriage house design guidelines, which ensure these buildings are liveable, would still apply (as would the HCA design guidelines).
Proposed Incentive 2.1: Policy to Support Additions to Buildings that do not Conform with the Zoning Bylaw

Staff Recommendation:

1) Explore ways to refine the existing Development Variance Permit evaluation policy to further support additions to protected properties.
2) Create a guide for owners about the policy.
3) Explore ways to streamline the approval process.

Considerations:

• Council would still be required to consider the issuance of the Development Variance Permit, which cannot be delegated to staff.
• Over the long term staff recommends monitoring implementation to assess whether a variance is being consistently approved. This could inform future discussions about making an outright change to zoning regulations.

Proposed for implementation in the medium term, for all protected properties.
Proposed Incentive 2.2: Relaxations for Laneway and Carriage House Regulations and Guidelines

Staff Recommendation: implement some minor relaxations to the development permit guidelines, when appropriate, while still maintaining the intent of the guidelines.

Considerations:

- Similar approach already taken for energy efficient units, accessible single story units and tree protection.
- The Director of Development Services already has this authority when considering the approval of the Development Permit.
- Staff does not propose implementing any changes to regulations (e.g. parking, height) at this time.

Proposed for implementation in the short term, for all protected properties.
Proposed Incentive 2.3: Relaxation of Sewer Separation Requirements for Laneway Houses

**Staff Recommendation:** relax sewer separation requirements for the principal dwelling, when the principal dwelling is being retained.

**Considerations:**
- Other upgrades will still be required (e.g. to the service connection) to ensure that the servicing needs for the property are still met.

Proposed Incentive 2.4: Building Code Relaxations

**Staff Recommendation:** move forward with this incentive on a site specific basis, when requested by an owner.

**Considerations:**
- Staff would explore the usefulness of the incentive with owners when they apply to renovate their house.
Proposed Incentive 3.1: Stratified Laneway or Carriage House

**Staff Recommendation:** allow stratification of a laneway or carriage house, which would allow for separate sale.

**Considerations:**
- Recommended by the economic analysis due to the increased value created through stratification.

Proposed for implementation in the **medium term**, for all protected properties.
Proposed Incentives 3.1 and 3.3: Stratified Principal Dwelling and Multiple Unit Conversion Dwellings (Rental)

**Staff Recommendation:** explore both incentives specifically for large properties with homes that are already over density.

**Considerations:**
- Like today, a maximum of three units would be permitted on a property.
- Owner would not be permitted to also build a laneway or carriage house.
- Targeted at homes that would not benefit from the proposed increase in floor space ratio.
- Targeted at large properties that would are more likely able to appropriately accommodate a larger laneway or carriage house.
- Though further analysis required to determine parameters, early analysis indicated a relatively small number of properties would be eligible.

Proposed for implementation in the **medium term**, for some protected properties.

**Note:** The incentives proposed would allow a large home on a large lot to choose one of three options:
1) Larger laneway house
2) Stratified Principal Dwelling
3) Multiple Unit Conversation (Rental)
Proposed Incentives 3.4: Small Lot Subdivision

**Staff Recommendation:** do not implement this incentive and instead maintain this as an incentive that could be offered through a Heritage Revitalization Agreement (HRA).

**Considerations:**

- The power of an HRA allows for relaxation to be granted (e.g. minimum lot size, site coverage, floor space ratio) that make subdivision viable.
- Without additional relaxations, only a very small number of properties may be eligible to use this incentive.

Not recommended for implementation.
Proposed Incentive 4.1: Heritage Home Grant Program

**Staff Recommendation:** expand the grant program be incorporated into the citywide update of the Heritage Revitalization Agreement program.

**Considerations:**
- The citywide program would have the objective of further encouraging the retention of heritage buildings.
- As part of this work plan, staff would consider the unique context of the Queen’s Park Heritage Conservation Area.

Proposed for implementation **citywide**, in the long term.
Proposed Incentive 4.2: Interpretive Sign Program

**Staff Recommendation:** expand of the interpretative sign program being implemented by New Westminster’s Museum and Archives to include signs for Queen's Park.

**Considerations:**

- Signs for Queen’s Park could be included as a tier two project, which would be implemented in the next five years, using existing funding.

Proposed for implementation **citywide**, in the long term.
Proposed Incentive 4.3: Expedited Approval Processes

Staff Recommendation: find additional ways to expedite the approval process by exploring ways to expedite related City permit processes (e.g. tree permits, building permits).

Considerations:
• Find ways to make the approval process shorter than what is typical, despite the additional review required by the Heritage Conservation Area.

Proposed for implementation in the medium term, for all protected properties.
Proposed Incentive 4.3: Expedited Approval Processes

**Staff Recommendation:** explore additional services that could be provided to protected property owners when they make a Heritage Alteration Permit application.

**Considerations:**
- In the short term this would start with offering one-on-one pre-application review meetings.
- Additional opportunities would be explored.

Proposed for implementation in the **medium term**, for all protected properties.
Proposed Incentive 4.3: Expedited Approval Processes

**Staff Recommendation:** make refinements to the Evaluation Checklist.

**Considerations:**
- Staff and consultants would identify possible refinements that ensure the criteria are working as intended.
- Staff would develop an accompanying guide that outlines the intent of the checklist, how it will be used, and how decisions will be made.

Proposed for implementation in the **medium term**, for all protected properties.
Proposed Incentive 4.3: Expedited Approval Processes

**Staff Recommendation:** Draft additional design guidelines for protected properties.

**Considerations:**

- Design guidelines could be added to provide more direction and clarity about City expectations for different types of additions.

Proposed for implementation for all protected properties at the time of the Heritage Conservation Area review (spring 2019).
Questions?

For more information about the Queen’s Park Heritage Conservation Area:

www.newwestcity.ca/heritage/qphca

Britney Quail – e: bquail@newwestcity.ca    t: 604-527-34621
Lynn Roxburgh – e: lroxburgh@newwestcity.ca    t: 604-515-3805
# Report

## Engineering Services

**To:** Mayor Coté and Members of Council  
**Date:** 5/14/2018

**From:** Jim Lowrie  
Director of Engineering Services  
**File:** 05.1020.20 (Doc#1205997)

**Item #:** 214/2018

**Subject:** Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure: Outstanding Referral for Street Closure Bylaw No. 7935, 2017

---

**RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT**  
Council rescind adoption of Street Closure Bylaw No. 7935, 2017.

---

**PURPOSE**

The purpose of this report is to request Council rescind adoption of this bylaw which must be referred to the Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure prior to adoption.

**BACKGROUND**

Section 41(3) of the Community Charter outlines the following: “As a restriction on the authority under section 40 (1), if the highway or part of a highway to be closed or reopened is within 800 metres of an arterial highway, the bylaw under that section may only be adopted if it is approved by the minister responsible for the Transportation Act.”

**ANALYSIS/DISCUSSION**

It has come to the City’s attention that the street closure bylaw has not been referred to the Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure prior to Council adoption, as required. At this time, staff requests Council rescind adoption of this bylaw which would be forwarded to the Ministry for approval prior to being brought forward to Council for adoption.
OPTIONS

There are two options for Council’s consideration:

1. That Council rescind adoption of Street Closure Bylaw No. 7935, 2017;
2. That Council provide staff with alternative direction.

Staff recommends Option 1.

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

Approved for Presentation to Council

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

Lisa Spitale
Chief Administrative Officer
There is no Report with this Item. Please see Attachment(s).
CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF NEW WESTMINSTER

BYLAW NO. 7935, 2017

A Bylaw to Close the Highway between Wood and Boyne Street

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 40 of the Community Charter, Council may, by bylaw, close a portion of a highway to traffic and remove the dedication of the highway if, prior to adopting the bylaw, Council publishes notice of its intention in a newspaper and provides an opportunity for persons who consider they are affected by the bylaw to make representations to Council;

AND WHEREAS the Council of the Corporation of the City of New Westminster deems it expedient to close to traffic and remove the dedication of highway of that portion of lane between Wood and Boyne Street comprising approximately 1,072 square metres, created by the deposit of Plan NWP2620, which area is shown outlined in bold black on the Road Closure Plan;

AND WHEREAS notices of Council's intention to close that portion of highway to traffic and to remove its dedication as highway were published in the newspaper and posted in the public notice posting place, and Council has provided an opportunity for persons who consider they are affected by the closure and disposition to make representations to Council;

AND WHEREAS Council does not consider that the closure of the Closed Road will affect the transmission or distribution facilities or works of utility operators;

NOW THEREFORE THE CITY COUNCIL of the Corporation of the City of New Westminster in open meeting assembled ENACTS AS FOLLOWS:

1. This Bylaw may be cited for all purposes as “Wood-Boyne Street Road Closure Bylaw No. 7935, 2017.”

2. Attached to this Bylaw as Schedule “A” and forming part of this Bylaw is a copy of reference plan of highway closure Plan EPP73469, prepared by Andrew Jenkins and completed and checked on June 27, 2017 (the “Road Closure Plan”).

3. The City hereby authorizes the closure to traffic and removal of highway dedication of approximately 1,072 square metres of highway created by the deposit of Plan NWP2620, labeled “Road to be Closed” on the Road Closure Plan (the “Closed Road”).

4. On deposit of the Road Closure Plan and all other documentation for the closure of the Closed Road in the New Westminster Land Title Office, the Closed Road is closed to public traffic, it shall cease to be public highway, and its dedication as a highway is cancelled.

5. The Mayor and Corporate Officer are authorized to execute all deeds of land, plans, and other documentation necessary to effect this road closure.
READ A FIRST TIME this 10th day of July, 2017.

READ A SECOND TIME this 10th day of July, 2017.

READ A THIRD TIME this 10th day of July, 2017.

THIRD READING RESCINDED this 28th day of August, 2017.

READ A NEW THIRD TIME this 28th day of August, 2017.

ADOPTED and the Seal of the Corporation of the City of New Westminster affixed this 11th day of September, 2017.

ADOPTION RESCINDED this _____ day of __________________, 2018.

APPROVED by the Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure this _____ day of __________________, 2018.

ADOPTED and the Seal of the Corporation of the City of New Westminster affixed this _____ day of __________________, 2018.

______________________________  ________________________________
Mayor                               Corporate Officer
SCHEDULE "A"

REFERENCE PLAN OF CLOSED ROAD EPP73469