

From: "Johnston, Sadhu" <Sadhu.Johnston@vancouver.ca>

To: "Direct to Mayor and Council - DL"

CC: "City Manager's Correspondence Group - DL"

"Pickard, Gail" <Gail.Pickard@vancouver.ca>

"Foley, Sonja" <Sonja.Foley@vancouver.ca>

"Postma, Tobin" <Tobin.Postma@vancouver.ca>

"Kelley, Gil" <Gil.Kelley@vancouver.ca>

Date: 3/10/2020 11:12:03 AM

Subject: Response to Questions Re: Report #4 Heritage Action Plan, March 10 Council - RTS# 12164

Attachments: Memo to Mayor and Council - Response to Questions Re Report #4 Heritagepdf

Dear Mayor and Council,

Please see the attached memo from Gil Kelley regarding the upcoming Heritage Action Plan at the March 10th Council meeting –

- Staff received questions from a Councillor seeking additional information on a number of matters related to the report. This memo seeks to respond to this question.
- In general, the questions relate to permit volumes and process related matters, green building, retrofits, retention and demolition, as well as consultation with Indigenous groups.
- Please refer to the enclosed memo for details, and staff welcome the opportunity to discuss further at the March 10th Council meeting.

Should you have any questions, please contact Gil Kelley at 604-873-7456 or Gil.Kelley@vancouver.ca.

Best,
Sadhu

Sadhu Aufochs Johnston | City Manager
Office of the City Manager | City of Vancouver
604.873.7627 | sadhu.johnston@vancouver.ca

Pronouns: he, him, his



The City of Vancouver acknowledges that it is situated on the unceded traditional territories of the Musqueam, Squamish, and Tsleil-Waututh peoples.

MEMORANDUM

March 10, 2020

TO: Mayor and Council

CC: Sadhu Johnston, City Manager
Paul Mochrie, Deputy City Manager
Karen Levitt, Deputy City Manager
Lynda Graves, Administration Services Manager, City Manager's Office
Rena Kendall-Craden, Civic Engagement and Communications Director
Katrina Leckovic, City Clerk
Anita Zaenker, Chief of Staff, Mayor's Office
Neil Monckton, Chief of Staff, Mayor's Office
Alvin Singh, Communications Director, Mayor's Office

FROM: Gil Kelley
General Manager, Planning, Urban Design and Sustainability

SUBJECT: Response to Questions Re: Report #4 Heritage Action Plan, March 10th
Council Agenda (RTS# 12164)

Thank you for expressing interest in the Heritage Action Plan report scheduled for Council's consideration on March 10, 2020. The following is a response to questions raised by a Council member. We are providing this response to the Mayor and all Councillors for their benefit as well.

1. How many applicant[ion]s [were there] last year for Heritage permits and revitalization agreements?

Heritage reviews and approvals in 2019 included:

- 500 heritage application reviews.
- 401 permits issued (109 DP reviews, 228 BP reviews, 62 Pre-submittals, and a number of Sign permits).
- 65 Heritage Alteration Permits (permits for designated sites)
- 2 Heritage Revitalization Agreements.
- 7 Heritage Designations with accompanying Restoration Covenants.
- 2 stand-alone Restoration Covenants.

2. Action 2 of the Heritage Action Plan streamlined permits/revitalization agreements. How much faster are these? What is average time for a permit or agreement? What particular requirements do applicants find most time-consuming?

HAP Action #2 - To simplify and streamline the approvals process for retention applications. Staff have implemented policies and practices to bring clarity and certainty to the heritage evaluation process. For example:

- Where applicable, the Director of Planning uses Section 3.2.5 of the Zoning and Development By-Law 3575 to administer relaxations for restoration and renovation of buildings eligible for addition to the heritage register. This covers a large percentage of applications where by detailed pro-forma reviews and complex legal agreements can now be omitted. This improves both processing timelines and complexity of reviews.
- When required to achieve a desired result for retention and project delivery, legal agreements for heritage designation and restoration covenants are considered to support exemplary levels of conservation and restoration. Often, this process is impacted by the applicant's resources and ability to achieve the high level of heritage conservation rather than processing timelines.
- Based on Posse data: Heritage's overall average review time (contains BP, DP, and RZ) was 11.34 weeks in 2019 based on the actual start date of the review. For instance, the Development Permit review timeline is approximately 16 weeks. Heritage reviews of applications are, in general, within the timeframes required by the approvals process.

In summary, Heritage reviews of active applications continue to fall within the timelines set for the approval process as noted above. To respond to action Item #2 and more specifically industry feedback, the Heritage review process has been focused on bringing clarity and therefore certainty to reviews, especially at the early, pre-application stages. This has been primarily achieved through utilizing the relaxations within the Zoning and Development By-Law rather than through the more complex and less certain legal agreements and pro-forma reviews found in Heritage Revitalization Agreement process.

3. We've increased the demolition fee for pre 1940s houses – by how much? How high can it go? Can the demolition fee potentially include loss of embodied carbon? What does our new deconstruction strategy require that's different?
 - An additional \$350 Green Demo permit fee was added for pre-1940 houses in 2014. This fee covers the additional staff costs of reviewing the Green Demo compliance reports to ensure bylaw requirements for demo material recycling have been met. The Green Demo bylaw also uses a refundable \$14,650 deposit to ensure compliance reports are submitted for review.
 - Permit fees are set at amounts that recover costs of processing permits, with oversight from Finance.
 - Incorporating a fee structure whereby the loss of embodied carbon has not been addressed by this report.
 - The requirement for deconstruction (defined as salvage of a minimum of 3 metric tonnes of wood) for pre-1910 and heritage-listed houses came into effect January of 2019. Staff are learning from this first year of

implementation, refining the compliance process for these projects and exploring the expansion of the requirements.

- To advance the new deconstruction strategy, Staff have been working to establish a Deconstruction Hub. The Hub will support the marketplace for salvaged materials; a contract to operate the Hub was signed in February of 2020 and it is expected to be operating later this year.
4. Action 6 amended the RS schedules to encourage retention...how? How have we measured success? Can we determine how many homes NOT demolished?
- BC Assessment indicates that in 2013 there were 24,090 pre-1940's homes in RS and RT zoned areas of the city. The latest data from 2019 indicates that there are now 19,650 (4,440 pre-1940's homes have been demolished in last six years).
 - In January 2018, new incentives to encourage retention of character homes were enacted. In 2018 we received 23 permit applications and in 2019, 26 permit applications were received.
 - In June 2019 staff provided a memo to Council evaluating the character retention program and identified a number of concerns, in particular, the low level of actual retention being achieved in "retention" projects along with the complexity and costs of these renovations. The memo is included as a reference here. <https://vancouver.ca/files/cov/2019-06-20-character-home-retention-incentives.pdf>.

A further report on the topic of character retention and its relationship to other city objectives is anticipated in late April in response to a Council motion approved in fall 2019.

5. Does our energy retrofit program for heritage buildings provide sufficient grants to meet demand? Have policies/bylaws changed in order to make it easier to retrofit?
- Yes, the program is meeting demand. In the first iteration developed the program with VHF (2014) we had 20 spaces, we enrolled 19 homes, in the second iteration we had 40 spaces and we enrolled in the 30's in terms of homes. The City is now in its 3rd iteration; we have 60 spaces with room to grow that if need be. The policy/bylaw revisions to make retrofits easier have not been implemented yet. Staff are currently completing research/consultation to streamline processes and requirements.
6. Why did the hired consultant not provide any advice regarding Action 14.1 and 14.3 (re: Mature Trees and Landscape on private and public lands) (Appendix B p. 20)? What has the Park Board done re: mature trees and forests on public lands and has the city expanded it to other city lands?
- The Urban Forest Update for Private Property is scheduled for Council presentation on April 28, and all related questions will be addressed at that

time. Heritage consultant did not elaborate on action item 14 because this subject was pursued through this alternative work stream.

7. How does a heritage building (SRO) in the Downtown Eastside get a heritage plaque?
 - A heritage plaque is given to a designated heritage building after the designation by-law is enacted. Regardless of what it is (SRO or not), it needs to be designated to be eligible for the plaque.

8. Action 10 notes that we have developed an enhanced deconstruction strategy. How successful has this been? What % of the deconstructed materials are being re-used? What continue to be barriers related to deconstruction and re-use of materials? Are we considering pursuing climate related issues that favour deconstruction and re-use – e.g., accounting for embodied carbon?
 - Staff are reviewing this in further detail and will be able to respond with additional information in the near future.

9. Action 12 notes that we have developed an energy retrofit program for existing heritage buildings. How many buildings have pursued this? Any feedback on outstanding issues around retrofitting heritage buildings – e.g., related to the building code and costs?
 - Staff are reviewing this in further detail and will be able to respond with additional information in the near future

10. Do we have a sense of how the Heritage Action Plan and Vancouver Plan will enable the “appropriate” inclusion of the MST nations?
 - Through a comprehensive engagement process including Musqueam, Squamish and Tsleil-Waututh Nations and Urban Indigenous people, the Heritage Action Plan and Vancouver Plan will lead a meaningful and respectful engagement and self-directed process in accordance with Reconciliation and Equity initiatives as presented in the earlier approved Culture I Shift Plan by ACCS. Please see Appendix C: chapter 1 “Truth & Reconciliation” and chapter 3 “Cultural Heritage”. Please also see the Report Summary, page 2 for additional context. Additional information can be provided if required by the Culture I Shift Plan team in ACCS

11. Appendix D includes changes to the Vancouver Building Bylaw. Should there be a specific recommendation for Council to approve these changes?
 - No. This content falls under the jurisdiction of the Chief Building Official (CBO) and is provided for information purpose, mainly to demonstrate a

coordinated approach to improving the process. Clarifying edits to this guideline were made to better integrate heritage terminology and remind the public of the CBO's ability to accommodate heritage conservation through alternate approaches.

I trust the foregoing provides you with the information in response to your question. I hope you will find this information helpful and welcome further questions and dialogue as part of the Council meeting on March 10th.

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of a large, stylized 'G' followed by a horizontal line that tapers to the right.

Gil Kelley, FAICP
General Manager, Planning, Urban Design and Sustainability
604.873.7456 | gil.kelley@vancouver.ca