



# City of Surrey

## Heritage Advisory Commission

### Minutes

City Hall West (Annex)  
7452 - 132 Street  
Surrey, B.C.  
WEDNESDAY, MAY 25, 2005  
Time: 9:00 a.m.

#### Present:

Vice Chair – A. Clegg  
Chair - Councillor Higginbotham  
(10:11 a.m.)  
D. Bowyer  
R. Fuller  
C. Johnson  
H. Lindenbach  
J. Monk  
S. Sidhu (9:19 a.m.)  
M. Stibbs  
W. Tracey

#### Absent:

#### Staff Present:

A. Kopystynski, Senior Planner (Heritage) -  
Planning & Development Department  
B. Sommer, Manager, Heritage Services Section -  
Parks, Recreation and Culture  
J. Boan, Transportation Engineer - Engineering  
Department  
M. St. Cyr, Assistant City Solicitor - Legal  
Services Division  
C. Bonneville, Legislative Services

## A. ADOPTION OF MINUTES

### 1. Heritage Advisory Commission Minutes – April 27, 2005

It was Moved by Commissioner Lindenbach  
Seconded by Commissioner Bowyer  
That the minutes of the Heritage Advisory  
Commission of April 27, 2005, be adopted, as circulated.  
Carried

### 2. Special Heritage Advisory Commission Minutes – May 9, 2005

It was Moved by Commissioner Bowyer  
Seconded by Commissioner Johnson  
That the minutes of the Special Heritage  
Advisory Commission of May 9, 2005, be adopted, as circulated.  
Carried

## B. DELEGATION

### 1. Gillis House

Ms. Eva Winterluk, Mr. Casey MacNamara, and Ms. Kelly (Gillis) MacNamara were in attendance to discuss their concerns regarding the demolition and future replication of the Gillis House. The following comments were made during the presentation:

- We are here today to discuss the destruction of the A.W. Gillis Heritage House; we are the grandchildren of the late Wes and Edna Gillis.

- We are confused by what has occurred and the explanations that have been given. According to a letter from the Developer (dated February 28) the heritage house was destroyed accidentally, however in an article in the Now newspaper (dated April 4) it was stated that the Developer had worked out an agreement with the city to replicate and renovate sections of the house and the Heritage Commission was not informed that this was happening.
- The Heritage Designation By-law states: “A heritage designation bylaw is placed on a property to protect a building, structure or heritage feature, and it can be done with or without the owner’s consent. The heritage designation by-law may also protect specific interior features or a landscape feature. The by-law can prohibit any exterior alterations, which include structural changes, moving of a structure, excavation or other action that would damage the protected feature. Alterations to a designated building, structure or feature cannot be made with specific approval from the city.”
- While my brother and his wife (Kelly and Michelle MacNamara) were the residents of the house they were not allowed to update the building in anyway unless they strictly followed the rules of the by-law. The developer on the other hand was able to disregard the by-law entirely. They had gutted the inside of the house, removed the fireplace built by my grandfather, excavated around the base of the house and moved the house to a muddy field. Eventually they destroyed the structure of the house and began to replicate it but altering exterior features such as the dining room window facing east.
- We would like to see the agreement between the city and the developer to replicate the house. We do not understand how the developer’s wishes supersede the wishes of our family who had heritage status placed on the structure several years before it changed hands. Council passed the heritage status at least three years before they purchased the property.
- The comment from the developer that it was the construction crews who were unaware of the rules does not exonerate them. The developer should be held accountable. You would think that it would be highlighted on the company’s work order that this was a heritage house.
- If Surrey is serious about protecting its heritage then now is the time to do something about it. Something must be done to prevent the callous destruction of our heritage largely by big developers. If the city does not make the destruction of part of Surrey’s Heritage a financial burden to the developer and put them up as precedent as to what will happen to other developers if they destroy our heritage then very little heritage will be left in Surrey.
- We feel that the Gillis House should be replicated as closely as possible at its original site. The developer should be required to make a large donation to the community of Sullivan to compensate them for the loss of heritage, which could be earmarked for the protection and enhancement of remaining and future heritage sites.

Commissioner Sidhu entered the meeting at 9:19 a.m.

It was suggested that the delegation stay during the discussion of the next agenda item, Corporate Report regarding the Gillis House.

It was Moved by Commissioner Monk  
Seconded by Commissioner Tracy  
That the Surrey Heritage Advisory  
Commission recommends that if replication is to happen it should be authentic on  
site presentation and one member of the delegation should be utilized as a  
consultant in the final appearance.

Before the main motion was put to question:

It was Moved by Commissioner Bowyer  
Seconded by Commissioner Stibbs  
That the Surrey Heritage Advisory  
Commission table the main motion until discussion of the future of the Gillis  
House has taken place.

Carried

It was Moved by Commissioner Stibbs  
Seconded by Commissioner Lindenbach  
That a copy of the delegations presentation  
notes and the Leader newspaper article (dated April 6, 2005) be received.

Carried

## C. CORPORATE REPORTS

### 1. PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

#### (a) Discussion of the Future of the Gillis House

The following recommendation made at the March 30, 2005 Commission meeting was referred by Council to the General Manager, Planning and Development:

That the Surrey Heritage Advisory Commission recommends that Council:

1. *accept the construction of a replica and requests that the developer provide details of the exterior and interior construction and revised cost estimate for the Heritage Advisory Commission's consideration;*
2. *accept the principle of "no net loss of heritage value in the community", such that where a development proposal adversely impacts the heritage value of heritage property, that monetary compensation toward enhancing other heritage features in the City be considered as a way to mitigate the impact on the overall heritage value loss in the community; and*
3. *consider the adequacy of the compensation donation and make a recommendation to Council; and*
4. *request that the heritage replacement value of the property be determined by the City of Surrey, based on the insurance*

*replacement value and that this amount be used to determine the compensation that should be used to make a recommendation to Council.*

The Senior Planner (Heritage) provided the following comments:

- The Gillis home was one of the earlier properties placed on the Surrey Heritage Register, recognizing the contribution of the Gillis Family to the Sullivan community and the architectural and historical significance of the house itself.
- The house was to be retained at the location where it stood since it was built.
- When a townhouse development proposal was submitted encompassing the Gillis House, it was protected by way of a (Heritage) Restrictive Covenant. This Covenant included a Conservation Plan specifying how the exterior of the house was to be restored and maintained. It allows the interior of the house to be altered as long as the exterior would not be changed.
- The developer exercised the option to pour a new foundation to replace the existing one. To do so, the Gillis House was temporarily moved with the expectation that it would be placed back on the new foundation.
- The next event was the house was demolished.
- The developer is willing to make a donation to compensate for the loss in heritage value and to build a replica of the house.
- The City is working on a policy regarding the *principle of "no net loss of heritage value in the community"*. Referring to the memo in the agenda package, staff has identified the following four mechanisms to evaluate heritage value; Fair market value; Construction value; Insurance value; and Community value.
- The original proposal by the developer was to make a contribution of \$25,000 dollars. A construction value assessment was done and an analysis of the cost to do the renovations and addition versus what the cost is for building a replica e was about \$45,000; however staff has not yet verified these figures.

In response to questions from the Commission, the Senior Planner (Heritage) responded:

- Where assessments of this type are required, a developer is asked to retain a consultant acceptable to the City at the developer's cost. The work is submitted to the City. Polygon retained an architect acceptable to the City to prepare this assessment.
- Based on staff research and discussions with other heritage planners, it appears that there is no clear and simple method to arrive at loss in heritage value. Further, the number of heritage houses changing ownership in the City of Surrey is insufficient to have statistics on heritage value though market sales.

It was Moved by Commissioner Stibbs  
Seconded by Commissioner Monk  
That the information provided by the Senior  
Planner (Heritage) be received.  
Carried

It was Moved by Commissioner Monk  
Seconded by Commissioner Johnson  
That the motion regarding this issue that was  
tabled earlier in the meeting be lifted from the table.  
Carried

It was Moved by Commissioner Monk  
Seconded by Commissioner Tracy  
That the Surrey Heritage Advisory  
Commission recommends to the General Manager of Planning and  
Developer that since the replication of the Gillis House is to happen, that it  
should be authentic on site presentation and that one member of the Gillis  
family delegation should be utilized as a consultant to ensure authenticity  
in the final replication.  
Carried

It was Moved by Commissioner Stibbs  
Seconded by Commissioner Monk  
That the letter (dated April 22, 2005) from  
the Sullivan Community Association be received.  
Carried

The meeting recessed at 9:49 a.m. and reconvened at 9:52 a.m. with the same members in attendance.

**(b) Baron von Mackensen House  
9564 – 192 Street**

At the April 27, 2005 HAC meeting, the following recommendation was referred to the General Manager, Planning and Development:

*That the Heritage Advisory Commission agrees with the concerns outlined in the above correspondence and requests that this item be referred to Planning and Development to request that the applicant commence the conditions of the Heritage Revitalization Agreement as soon as possible to ensure the structure is adequately protected, and in the meantime, a six-foot perimeter fence be completed to prevent intrusion, a central alarm system be installed and that motion sensitive lighting be installed.*

The Senior Planner (Heritage) referred to the letter sent to the owner of the Baron von Mackensen House by the Manager, Area Planning, North Surrey and highlighted the following:

- Staff has relayed to the developer the Commission's concern about site security;
- A site inspection revealed that the fence is not completely installed and the building is not fully secured.
- The Development Permit for the commercial site, which includes landscaping requirements for the Baron von Mackensen House, has not been finalized.

The Commissioners stated the following comments during the discussion of the Baron von Mackensen House:

- The developer may or may not know the value of this heritage house to the community.
- While at the house this morning there was no security, there is no gate and there was no fencing. The house is wide open to vandalism.
- The original plan for the house was for it to become a restaurant. Area zoning may not allow for a restaurant.
- Legally how strong and forceful can a letter be worded to ensure the developer protects the heritage house.

#### COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION

It was Moved by Commissioner Fuller  
 Seconded by Commissioner Tracy  
 That the Surrey Heritage Advisory  
 Commission recommends that Council request staff to send a registered letter to the developer (of the Baron von Mackensen House site) stating that if the developer does not put in security and fencing by a specified time of 10 days then the City will install the security and fencing at the developers expense.

Carried

(c) **Development Permit Application No. 7903-0222-00  
 Proposed Rezoning and DP for a 104 Bare Land Strata Lot  
 Subdivision**

At the April 27, 2005 HAC, Commission received the above development permit application, and adopted the following recommendation adopted:

*That the Heritage Advisory Commission advise the General Managers, Planning & Development and Engineering that Commission accepts the treatment interface between Crescent Road and Elgin Road and the proposed strata development subject to the following:*

1. *That the Semiahmoo Heritage Trail guidelines, including the 10-metre setback requirements, be strictly adhered to;*

2. *That the building scheme be sensitive to the heritage character of the area with respect to massing of buildings along the Trail, waterfront park and Crescent Road;*
3. *That the developer be required to install an appropriate storyboard or similar kiosk, commemorating the history of the area;*
4. *That the driveway placement along Elgin Road be located further south to enhance location options for alignment of the Trail;*
5. *That the final site grades be sensitive to the elevation of Crescent and Elgin Roads;*
6. *That the pump station adhere to the 10-metre setback along the Trail and that the massing and cladding be sensitively dealt and in keeping with the heritage character of the area; and*
7. *That Commission be provided with an updated proposal prior to a report going to Council.*

Councillor Higginbotham entered the meeting at 10:11 a.m.

The Senior Planner (Heritage) provided the following comments during his presentation using renderings of the project provided by the developer:

- The entrance to the site is shown closer to Crescent Road as requested by the Commission.
- There is a 15-meter proposed park dedication along the natural edge of the river, within the 15-meter setback there is a pathway and then the buildings are constructed another 5-meters from the 15-meter setback.
- The pump house will be designed to look like an agricultural building and is proposed to be sited in compliance with the Semiahmoo Trail Guidelines.
- The building facades were reviewed for the Commissioners.
- There was a rendering of the development from Crescent Road, showing trees being retained.
- The developer is proposing to retain the existing grade for most of the site.
- In terms of compliance with the guidelines the developer has provided a sheet showing that they have either met or exceeded setbacks in all cases.

It was

Moved by Commissioner Bowyer  
Seconded by Commissioner Stibbs  
That the Surrey Heritage Advisory

Commission advise the General Manager, Planning and Development that the Commission supports Development Permit Application No. 7903-0222-00 as presented by the Senior Planner (Heritage).

Carried

Councillor Higginbotham assumed the role of Chair.

**(d) Phase III Heritage Review**

The Senior Planner provided the draft Surrey Heritage Evaluations Worksheets for sites forming part of the Phase III Heritage Review and made the following comments during his review:

- Don Luxton, Consultant has complied the evaluation worksheets and comments from the Commission are requested before mid June; subsequent to receiving comments the worksheets will be presented to the Commission.
- There were a number of sites the Commission wished to retain on the Surrey Heritage Inventory, and to do further assessments. We now have a quote from Don Luxton of \$7,500 to evaluate these other sites.

The Commissioners made the following comments:

- Whether the worksheets be referred to the Heritage Register subcommittee that consists of Commissioners Johnson, Lindenbach and Fuller.
- It is important that the houses be red flagged as heritage, even though the owners were opposed to having their houses added to the Surrey Heritage Register. It would be valuable to have information to add to our knowledge base.
- The information is required for the future generations to have a record of the heritage status of the properties.

**COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION**

It was Moved by Commissioner Lindenbach  
Seconded by Commissioner Clegg  
That the Surrey Heritage Advisory

Commission:

3. Receive the draft heritage evaluation worksheets as presented, and
4. Recommends that Council approve \$7,500 for Donald Luxton, Consultant to assess the remaining heritage sites.

Carried

The agenda was amended to add the following under motion under item C.1 (a), and also to hear item C. 3 prior to hearing item C.2.

**(a) Discussion of the Future of the Gillis House (continued)**

It was Moved by Commissioner Monk  
Seconded by Commissioner Clegg  
That the Surrey Heritage Advisory

Commission received the letter (dated April 22, 2005) from Mr. Robin Stutt, President, Sullivan Community Association and request staff to provide the appropriate response to Mr. Stutt's letter.

Carried

### 3. PARKS AND RECREATION

#### (a) Printing Costs for Brochures

The Manager, Heritage Services, provided the following comments during her review of the projected costs for printing brochures:

- Staff reviewed printing 3-fold brochures using marble paper with one color ink and the cost was per 5,000 copies \$1,020, and per 10,000 copies \$1,584. If we were to print in 4-color the cost would be per 5,000 copies \$2,082 and per 10,000 copies \$2,704.
- Staff also reviewed distribution of the brochures thru the ferry and tourism racks. The ferry distribution price varies depending on which route you place the brochures. We would also need sufficient stock levels to keep the ferry stocked. The cost of the ferry mainland connection is \$165.50 per month x 12 months. The tourism racks includes major hotels (176 outlets), and our printing stock would be over 10,000 to keep the tourism racks supplied. The cost of distribution through the tourism racks is \$396 per month x 12 months.
- A summer student could work with the appropriate department and post the brochures onto the City's website and the Commission may want to plan for heritage brochures printing in their 2006 budget.
- The City's print shop is not able to print the large quantity of color printing and folding that is required for the heritage brochures.
- The public is more likely to be drawn to the color brochures than the one-color brochures.
- Tourism racks are a better investment then the ferry distribution. The tourism racks have two areas in the lower mainland and each area has 176 outlets.
- The Surrey Museum and Archives in 1992 produced the previous brochures, however there are no funds available for printing brochures, the brochures are not museum brochures they are community heritage brochures.

The Commissioners made the following comments:

- The Heritage look of the brochure is attractive; color printing is expensive and may not make a difference.
- Consideration should be given to having only one brochure with all the kinds of heritage within it or having two brochures, one for local distributions within the libraries and other public places, and another for distribution outside of the City of Surrey.
- It was suggested that a partnership with another department be considered to share the cost of the brochures.

It was Moved by Commissioner Bowyer  
Seconded by Commissioner Stibbs  
That the Surrey Heritage Advisory

Commission:

1. Receive the information regarding the printing cost of the brochures; and
2. Budget the cost of the heritage brochures into next years (2006) budget.

Carried

A discussion ensued regarding the Surrey Heritage Advisory Commission Budget and it was decided that the procedures and issues of the Budget would be placed on the next agenda of the Commission for discussion.

The Traffic Engineer entered the meeting at 11:25 a.m.

The agenda was varied to add the following item C.3 (b).

**(b) School Board Presentation**

The Manager, Heritage Services advised that a presentation regarding the new Heritage Awareness Award program will be given to the Surrey School District Board on Thursday, June 16, at 7 p.m., this Board meeting will be held at the School District Conference Centre, located at 9260 – 140 Street.

**2. ENGINEERING**

**(a) Storm Sewer Works Within the Existing Semiahmoo Trail / Roadway South of 32 Avenue Development Application No. 7803-0268-00 & Semiahmoo Trail / Development at Elgin Road**

The Traffic Engineer provided the following comments:

- The Applicant is trying to obtain a right-of-way from the property to the north, however this property is currently involved in estate settling and they cannot secure the right-of-way at this time. They are now servicing the site by extending a temporary storm sewer within the existing open road section of Semiahmoo Trail south of 32 Avenue (between the north end of the site and the existing detention pond).
- A special asphalt paving will be used on those sections of the Trail that are disturbed due to the installation of the storm sewer system. The asphalt will have a coarse finish to keep with the current condition of the Semiahmoo Trail roadway.

In response to questions from the Commissioners, the Traffic Engineer responded:

- The Applicant had approached the owners of 2169 Semiahmoo Trail and they had no interest in developing.
- The owners of the property that is tied up in estate settling is not interested in having an easement on their property.

- There are four individual properties involved in this project.
- The ground water drains to the north and the applicant is required to maintain the same amount of water flow.

It was Moved by Commissioner Monk  
 Seconded by Commission Bowyer  
 That the Surrey Heritage Advisory  
 Commission advise the General Manager of Engineering that the  
 Commission accepts the temporary storm sewer along Semiahmoo Trail  
 until such time that the properties to the north redevelop and an alternate  
 alignment is achievable.

Carried

**(b) Semiahmoo Trail (Provision of Continuity of Setbacks)**

The Assistant City Solicitor was in attendance and responded to questions from the Commission:

- The City Solicitor is advising in his memo that a zoning by-law amendment be enacted as a Council initiative to protect the setback at an appropriate distance from the centre line of the trail.
- Land title searches, which show restrictive covenants registered on properties, are open to the public
- The restrictive covenant should be registered on the parent parcel before the strata lots are developed or prior to the strata plan

**COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION**

It was Moved by Commissioner Bowyer  
 Seconded by Commissioner Monk  
 That Surrey Heritage Advisory Commission  
 recommends that Council enact a zoning by-law, as a Council initiative, to  
 protect the setback at an appropriate distance from Semiahmoo Trail.

Carried

It was Moved by Commissioner Bowyer  
 Seconded by Commissioner Monk  
 That Surrey Heritage Advisory Commission  
 recommends to the General Manager, Planning and Development that all  
 properties abutting Semiahmoo Trail that are subject to development be  
 also subject to a restrictive covenant or other suitable instrument to ensure  
 that the Semiahmoo Trail guidelines are adhered to; including the  
 landscaping buffering immediately adjacent to Semiahmoo Trail along the  
 abutting private properties.

Carried

(c) **Green Timbers – Portion of Provincially owned Lands at 9800 – 140 Street**

The Traffic Engineering reviewed the memo and aerial map of lands from the Realty Asset Manager, and responded to questions from the Commissioners, stating:

- Block A is to be transferred to the federal government for use by the RCMP. Blocks B & D are to be retained by the Province for its use, including in part the provincial emergency program. Blocks C & E are intended for use and control by the City for park/urban forest purposes.
- Prior to the finalization of the transfer, Parks, Recreation and Culture staff will engage consultants to undertake a complete assessment of the buildings designated to be included with the land.

A member of the Commission stated that the buildings are designated heritage and are currently being looked after by the Green Timbers Society. And then questioned that if the buildings are currently vacant and unused who will be preserving the buildings.

The Senior Planner (Heritage) advised that there are three or four buildings on site and one is identified as heritage and part of the Phase III Heritage Register.

The Commissioners expressed their concern for the heritage building being unoccupied and requiring security.

The meeting recessed at 12:22 a.m. and reconvened at 12:31 a.m with the same members in attendance.

#### **4. LEGISLATIVE SERVICES**

(a) **List of Outstanding Items**

The Commissioners reviewed the list of outstanding items and provide the following direction:

- Rothwell House – remove from list.
- Christ the Redeemer Anglican Church – remove from list.
- Heritage Society of BC Conference - remove from list
- Walk Tour Brochures – leave on list.
- Storyboards – pending, leave on list.
- Development Application 7903-0222-00 – leave on list.
- Tree Preservation By-law – leave on list – this item will be coming forward at the end of July.
- Gillis House – leave on list.
- 1891 Lodge – leave on list – filming at the heritage building was discussed.
- Semiahmoo Trail – leave on list – group together with the same type issue was requested by the Commissioners.

- Heritage Budget – leave on list – this item will be addressed on the next agenda of the Commission.
- St. Oswald Anglican Church – remove from list.
- Baron Von Mackensen House – leave on list.
- Gillis House – leave on list – delegation was heard – group together with other Gillis House issues.
- Plaquing Sub-committee – leave on list.
- Thomas Joseph Brown House – remove from list.
- Gillis House – leave on list – group together with other Gillis House issues.
- Bourassa – leave on list.
- Semiahmoo Trail – remove from list.
- 1891 Lodge Status Report - leave on list – group together with other 1891 Lodge issues.
- Fraser Highway through Green Timbers Urban Forest – leave on list.
- 1891 Lodge – leave on list – group together with other 1891 Lodge issues. – Councillor Higginbotham advised that she has requested the General Manager of Parks, Recreation and Culture to research an adaptive use for 1891 Lodge.
- Heritage Revitalization Agreement for White Rock Church – leave on list.

## **D. CORRESPONDENCE**

It was

Moved by Commissioner Bowyer  
 Seconded by Commissioner Johnson  
 That the correspondence items D.1, D.2, and

D. 3 be received.

Carried

### **1. Henry Parr House**

Commissioner Clegg reviewed the correspondence to Councillor Higginbotham from Mrs. Rachelle Loepky, stating location of heritage houses is the concern, and that the Commissioners should consider development of a Heritage Road.

The Senior Planner (Heritage) advised that there are possibly six houses in the Cloverdale area that are in development areas and that it may require a strategy if they are to be protected.

A member of the Commission stated that the Cloverdale Chamber of Commerce and the Business Improvement Association maybe interested in working with the City, as it may become a way or promoting Cloverdale.

**COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION**

It was Moved by Commissioner Clegg  
Seconded by Commissioner Bowyer  
That the Surrey Heritage Advisory  
Commission recommends that Council request staff to prepare a financial strategy  
for the relocation and protection of heritage homes that are impacted by  
development in the Cloverdale area, including the consideration of creating a  
community heritage village for the adaptive reuse of the buildings.  
Carried

Commissioners Fuller and Bowyer left the meeting at 1:02 p.m.

**2. Thomas Joseph Brown House**

The memorandum of May 3, 2005 from the Realty Asset Manager, regarding the  
status of the T.J. Brown House was reviewed.

A member of the Commission noted that the two windows from the lower level of  
the house have been removed.

**3. Development Application No. 7803-0210-00  
32 Avenue and Semiahmoo Trail**

The memorandum (dated May 11, 2005) from the General Manager, Engineering,  
in response to request for information from HAC, was reviewed. The Senior  
Planner (Heritage) noted that there has been progress in landscaping being  
restored, where the services along Semiahmoo Trail north of 32 Avenue were  
installed. There was discussion about other portions of Semiahmoo Trail.

It was Moved by Commissioner Monk  
Seconded by Commissioner Tracy  
That the Surrey Heritage Advisory

Commission:

1. Consider dedicating and plaquing the Aspen Grove on the Semiahmoo  
Trail (close to 26 Avenue) as a heritage site, and further
2. Have the Aspen Grove placed on the heritage inventory for future  
assessment and inclusion in the heritage registry.

Carried

**E. INFORMATION ITEMS**

It was Moved by Commissioner Lindenbach  
Seconded by Commission Stibbs  
That the information items E.1 through to

E.10 be received.

Carried

**1. Heritage Matters (Elsie Preedy)**

In response to Mrs. Preedy's correspondence received April 22, 2005, responses of April 27, and May 9, 2005 from Legislative Services and Planning and Development respectively.

Also attached is research conducted by Planning & Development and Legislative Services, providing a history of the recommendations, which arose from the Port Kells Heritage Study.

**2. Heritage Legacy Fund of BC Grant Application**

Correspondence of April 27, 2005 from Planning and Development to the Heritage Legacy Fund of BC (HLFBC), with the completed application form, and a response acknowledging receipt from the HLFBC.

A Commission member advised that the Province has acknowledged receipt of the application.

**3. Semiahmoo Trail (R.J. Dowle)**

Correspondence of April 29, 2005.

**4. Baron von Mackensen House (Wally Sandvoss)**

Correspondence of April 29, 2005 from Councillor Higginbotham.

**5. St. Oswald's Anglican Church (Patrick Goode)**

Correspondence of April 29, 2005, referring the query regarding the installation of gutters to the City Architect, and internal correspondence from the City Architect, confirming status.

**6. Application for Financial Assistance (James Creighton House)**

Correspondence of May 3, 2005 to Mr. V. Puchmayr, providing information regarding a possible application for financial assistance.

**7. Application for Financial Assistance (Rothwell House)**

Correspondence and cheque in the amount of \$2,250 following approval of application for financial assistance.

**8. Application for Financial Assistance (Christ Church)**

Correspondence and cheque in the amount of \$9,000 following approval of application for financial assistance.

A Commission member noted that the letter to Mr. Arie Van Halst, last sentence read 'progress of your home' it should read 'progress of your church'.

**9. Council Resolutions – May 2, 2005**

Memorandum of May 3, 2005 from Legislative Services.

**10. Application for Financial Assistance (Tynehead Community Hall)**

Correspondence of May 4, 2005 to Mr. R. Terris, providing information regarding a possible application for financial assistance.

**F. OTHER COMPETENT BUSINESS**

**1. Map of Registered Heritage Sites**

The Senior Planner (Heritage) reviewed a new map of the registered heritage sites and reviewed the map legend for the Commissioners. He will provide maps to the Commission members at the next meeting, he also advised that the map will be available on the City's website.

**2. Currie House**

A member of the Commission advised that an article in the Surrey Leader of today's date, states that the Currie House will be moved today.

**3. Petrocan Sign**

The Senior Planner (Heritage) advised that he would provide more information regarding the Petrocan/Pay-n-Save Gas sign at a future meeting.

**4. 2005 Annual Report and Strategic Plan 2005 – 2008  
Heritage Society of BC**

It was

Moved by Commissioner Stibbs  
Seconded by Commissioner Johnson  
That the Heritage Society of BC's 2005

Annual Report and Strategic Plan 2005 – 2008 be received.

Carried

**5. Applying Heritage Conservation Standards and Guidelines  
Simon Fraser University at Harbour Centre**

It was Moved by Commissioner Clegg  
Seconded by Commissioner Stibbs  
That the Surrey Heritage Advisory

Commission:

1. Authorize Commissioner Sidhu to attend the 'Applying Heritage Conservation Standards and Guidelines' course, and
2. Recommend to the General Manager, Planning and Development that the Senior Planner (Heritage) attend the 'Applying Heritage Conservation Standards and Guidelines' course, to be held on Thursday, June 2, 2005 at the Inn at the Quay in New Westminster.

Carried

**6. Heritage BC Newsletter**

It was Moved by Commissioner Johnson  
Seconded by Commissioner Stibbs  
That the Spring 2005 Heritage BC

Newsletter, be received.

Carried

**G. NEXT MEETING**

The next meeting of the Heritage Advisory Commission is scheduled for June 29, 2005 at 9:00 a.m. It was suggested that the next Commission meeting be held at either the Arts Centre or at the Parks Annex.

**H. ADJOURNMENT**

It was Moved by Commissioner Lindenbach  
Seconded by Commissioner Monk  
That the Heritage Advisory Commission

meeting do now adjourn.

Carried

The Heritage Advisory Commission adjourned at 1:29 p.m.

---

Margaret Jones, City Clerk

---

Councillor Higginbotham, Chairperson  
Heritage Advisory Commission