



# City of Surrey

## Heritage Advisory Commission

### Minutes

Surrey Arts Centre  
13750 – 88 Avenue  
Surrey, B.C.  
WEDNESDAY, JUNE 29, 2005  
Time: 9:03 a.m.

#### **Present:**

Councillor Higginbotham - Chair  
A. Clegg – Vice Chair  
D. Bowyer  
R. Fuller  
C. Johnston  
H. Lindenbach  
J. Monk  
S. Sidhu  
M. Stibbs  
W. Tracey

#### **Regrets:**

#### **Staff Present:**

A. Kopystynski, Planning and Development  
D. Nikolic Planning and Development  
T. Wallace, Planning and Development  
B. Sommer, Heritage Services  
J. Boan, Engineering  
B. Fisher, Engineering  
S. Fillion, Budget Manager, Finance  
G. Ward, Parks, Recreation and. Culture  
K. Miller, Legislative Services

#### **Also Present:**

Ken Johnston, British Group  
Dan Weins, Park Lane Developments  
Norm Hol, Arborist, Arbortech Consulting  
Ed Kolic, Cloverdale Consulting  
Rudy Plett, Web Engineering  
Marion Harris, Sto:lo Nation  
Tom Harris, Sto:lo Nation  
Verna Harris, Sto:lo Nation

## **A. ADOPTION OF MINUTES**

### **1. Heritage Advisory Commission - Minutes**

It was Moved by Commissioner Bowyer  
Seconded by Commissioner Lindenbach  
That the minutes of the Heritage Advisory  
Commission meeting of May 25, 2005 be adopted as circulated.  
Carried

## **B. DELEGATION**

### **(a) 2005 HAC Operating Budget**

Suzanne Fillion, Budget Manager, requested that Commission review the 2005 operating budget and if necessary, provide recommendations to the General Manager, Finance, Technology and Human Resources.

Ms. Fillion reviewed each line item of the current budget, committed funds, and expenses to date. There followed a general discussion relative to the Reserve for Future Expenditures (RFFE) for 2005.

There followed a general discussion relative to budget expenditures, and items which are not included in the budget, i.e., vandalism of storyboards. It was suggested that annual budget be increased, in order to accommodate unforeseen expenses.

It was agreed that the budget sub-committee would convene to plan the 2006 operating budget, and provide an update at a future HAC meeting.

S. Fillion withdrew from the meeting at 9:40 a.m.

## C. CORPORATE REPORTS

### 1. PARKS, CULTURE AND RECREATION

#### a) School Board Presentation – June 16, 2004

The Chair and the Manager, Heritage Services, provided an overview of the above presentation.

Overall, the presentation was very well received by the Board of Trustees, and it is expected that the School District will be following up shortly. It was noted that students who are home-schooled are now eligible to participate in this program.

### 2. PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

The agenda was then varied to accommodate the developers, who were in attendance.

#### (g) Proposed Development & Heritage Home Retention at 14040 – 32 Avenue (Charles Feedham House) File: 7905-0152-00

The applicant is proposing a rezoning from One-acre Residential (RA) to Comprehensive Development Zone (CD), and half-acre Residential Zone (RH) for the construction of a neighbourhood commercial development and creation of two suburban single-family lots. Charles Feedham House, which is listed on the Surrey Heritage Register, is located on the subject development site. The policy is for properties on the register to be protected as part of development to ensure the long-term conservation of the City's heritage stock. Protection of the Charles Feedham House is justified by its rating of 84/100, as detailed in the Evaluation Worksheet.

The house is proposed to be shifted from its existing location to the smaller of the two proposed suburban lots. A second accessory building will be constructed behind it first to function as a dwelling during the revitalization of the house, and later as a studio and garage.

It was noted that the actual relocation of the house will occur sometime in the near future. Commissioner Monk noted that he had advised a member of the Elgin Ratepayer's Association that a development was intended to occur at 14040 – 32 Avenue.

Concerns were expressed relative to staff and therefore the City, taking all necessary precautions to avoid another unfortunate incident such as the destruction of the Gillis House.

The draft Heritage Revitalization Agreement was reviewed, and the following issues were discussed:

- The house would be protected by way of a Heritage Revitalization Agreement (HRA);
- A conservation plan would form Schedule A of the HRA which outlines the historical and architectural background of the house, as well as stating the maintenance standards and permit approvals;
- Restoration standards and specification are also stated, and are expected to include reference to enlarging the basement, rebuilding the porch, restoring the front entry to its original location, relocating the existing bathroom and consideration to repainting the house to be more reflective of an Edwardian type colour scheme and restoring the original cedar shingle roof;
- Concerns relative to associated with uninhabited, unsupervised heritage buildings were expressed;
- Lot layouts in the immediate area;
- Schedule B of the HRA will vary the minimum subdivision requirements of the Zoning Bylaw relative to the minimum width of the smaller of the two lots;
- It was suggested that weekly inspections be conducted by the City to ensure all components of the development are congruent with the original plans;
- It was understood that a permanent resident will be on site during all portions of the construction.

Commission was then requested to provide comments to the General Manager, Planning and Development.

It was

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

Commission (HAC) recommends to the General Manager, Planning and Development that the HAC supports the application no. 7905-0152-00, the relocation of the heritage building and further supports the Heritage Revitalization Agreement as presented by the Senior Planner (Heritage).

Carried

**(b) Baron von Mackensen House**

Commission reviewed the memorandum of June 28, 2005 from the General Manager, Planning and Development. The Senior Planner provided the following additional verbal information:

- For the most part, the property owner has complied with the security suggestions made by the Commission on May 30, 2005. Consequently no registered letter was sent.
- By-law enforcement are conducting regular site visits;
- No electronic alarm system has been installed, as utilities are disconnected.

It was Moved Commissioner Fuller  
Seconded by Commissioner Monk  
That staff continue to conduct regular site inspections on the property and that the site be secured with locked fencing, and that staff provide regular updates to Commission.

Carried

**(e) Development Application No. 7903-0222-00 – Tree Retention Plan at 14215/41 Crescent Road & 3651 Elgin Road**

Commission reviewed the memorandum of June 21, 2005, regarding the removal of hazardous trees, and were requested to consider recommendations to the General Manager, Planning and Development.

Commission was informed that Planning and Development staff have met on site with the consulting arborist, developer, City Arborist/Landscape Architect and representatives of the Semiahmoo Heritage Trail, in order to review the tree retention and replacement plan. All parties agreed that the trees proposed for removal along Elgin Road should be removed, however, staff have proposed to retain the trees along Crescent Road in order to evaluate their condition over a longer period of time.

It was agreed that the conclusion stated within the above memorandum was to be replaced with the following:

- Five trees along Elgin Road would be removed; and
- Affected trees along Crescent Road would be monitored.

Staff recommended that Commission accept for information the Arborist's Report and Tree Retention / Replacement Plan, support the removal of the five trees along Elgin Road (Numbers 102, 105 and 384), and support the retention and further evaluation of the trees within the Crescent Road right-of-way and buffer area that have been proposed to be removed due to hazardous conditions, and provide comments as necessary to the General Manager, Planning and Development.

There followed a discussion relative to the species of the affected trees and to those trees in the surrounding area.

It was Moved by Commissioner Lindenbach  
Seconded by Commissioner Fuller  
That the Heritage Advisory Commission  
accepts for information the Arborist's Report and Tree Retention /  
Replacement Plan, supports the removal of the five trees along Elgin Road  
(Nos. 102, 103, 104, 105 and 384), and support the retention and further  
evaluation of the trees within the Crescent Road right-of-way and buffer  
area.

Carried

It was Moved by Commissioner Monk  
Seconded by Commissioner Bowyer  
That in addition to trees already identified  
for retention, that trees numbered 398, 399 and 401 be retained as brought  
forward in the Arborist's Report and that efforts be made to save  
additional healthy trees by retention and/or relocation.

Carried

Mr. Sidhu withdrew from the meeting at 11:17 a.m.

It was Moved by Commissioner Bowyer  
Seconded by Commissioner Fuller  
That the Heritage Advisory Commission  
receive correspondence of June 7, 2005 from Ms. Barb Paton.

Carried

### **3. ENGINEERING**

#### **(a) Semiahmoo Trail Options at Crescent and Elgin Roads**

Commission reviewed the memorandum of June 21, 2005 from the  
Transportation Planning Engineer.

Councillor Higginbotham left the meeting at 11:29 and returned at 11:32 am.

The following elements were discussed relative to the Semiahmoo Trail  
Head:

- a) Semiahmoo Trail alignment (3 options);
- b) Roadway alignments / operation for the two legs of Elgin Road  
immediately north of Crescent Road;

- c) Traffic calming and/or intersection control for the curvilinear section of Crescent Road and 144 Street. As an arterial road, Crescent Road does not qualify for traffic calming under the City's bylaws and would thus require a special exception approved by Council. Traffic calming is only being considered at this location due to a combination of unique conditions: road curvature / sight lines at this location, heritage classification / road standard and Semiahmoo Trail crossing.
- d) Roadway design standards for Elgin Road; and
- e) Special pedestrian crossing of Crescent Road for the Semiahmoo Trail (pedestrian activated crossing with flashing lights).

T. Wallace withdrew from the meeting at 11:41 a.m.

Commissioner Bowyer left the meeting at 12:08 p.m.

B. Sommer withdrew from the meeting at 12:09 p.m.

Commissioner Bowyer returned to the meeting at 12:11 p.m.

Commissioner Monk left the meeting at 12:12 p.m., and returned at 12:15 p.m.

Commissioner Stibbs left the meeting at 12:20 p.m. and returned at 12:22 p.m.

Commissioner Bowyer withdrew from the meeting at 12:24 p.m.

R. Plett, J. Boan and B. Fisher withdrew from the meeting at 12:30 p.m.

It was Moved by Commissioner Lindenbach  
Seconded by Commissioner Wendy  
That the Heritage Advisory Commission  
 advises the General Manager, Engineering, of the following  
 recommendations:

- Pathway Alignments: Option 1 - Crescent Road North Alignment;
- Roadway Alignments: Option 1 – Elgin Road East Leg Closure;
- Traffic Calming: Option 1 – Roundabouts and traffic calming options with speed humps on Elgin Road with low-lying shrubberies with consideration of heritage; and
- Heritage Design Issues: Option 2 – Special crosswalk, protective signage with pedestrian activated crossing lights.

Carried

**(b) King George Highway Trees between Highway 10 and 64 Avenue**

This item was not dealt with.

## 2. PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT CONT'D

### a) Compensation for loss of Heritage Value Policy

Commission was requested to review the memorandum of June 22, 2005 and provide recommendations to the General Manager, Planning and Development.

On March 23, 2005, submitted a report to Council requesting that monetary compensation be paid when a heritage property is affected by development. Staff then assessed the following approaches:

- Legal penalties;
- Financial assessment;
- Compensation approach; and
- Relative value approach.

Staff are recommending the Relative Value Approach as it can be easily applied in most circumstances. In structuring this approach, advice from the Commission was requested upon the following:

1. Does Commission agree with compensation being charged when a heritage building on a site being developed is proposed for relocation or demolition?
2. How would the Commission prefer the compensation be charged based on the heritage status? In other words, would the compensation be different for a building on the Heritage Inventory, Register or subject to a Designation or Revitalization by-law?
3. Under what circumstances (e.g., the status and the rating on a Surrey Heritage Evaluation Worksheet) would the Commission prefer for both construction of a replica as well as additional monetary compensation?
4. How does Commission see the compensation being affected by the rating on a Surrey Heritage Evaluation Worksheet (e.g., a sliding scale based on certain thresholds, say 70% versus 80% versus 90%)?

The Senior Planner noted that based upon Commissions responses to the above questions, a Corporate Report will be forwarded to Council for consideration.

It was  
Move by Commissioner Fuller  
Seconded by Commissioner Tracey  
That in order to deal with the issue of a policy for the compensation of loss of heritage, the Heritage Advisory Commission convene a special meeting on July 14, 2005 at 9:00 a.m., in a location to be announced.

Carried

Councillor Higginbotham withdrew from the meeting at 12:49 p.m.

**F. OTHER COMPETENT BUSINESS**

**1. Rock Tree (Plaque Ceremony)**

Marion Harris, Thomas Harris, and Verna Harris were in attendance, representing the Sto:lo Band, in relation to the Rock Tree. The Harris family was requesting that a plaque be placed on the Rock Tree, and that an appropriate ceremony take place.

The Harris family requested that text on the plaque appear in the Sto:lo language, with an interpretation in English included.

The delegation withdrew from the meeting at 1:23 p.m.

It was  
Moved by Commissioner Monk  
Seconded by Commissioner Johnston  
That the Heritage Advisory Commission  
receive the delegation regarding the Rock Tree, and that staff be requested to  
investigate the ownership and condition of the tree and its care.  
Carried

**(c) Applying Heritage Conservation Standards & Guidelines Seminar (SFU) at Harbour Centre**

This item was not dealt with.

**(d) Grandview Heights Heritage Study**

Commission reviewed the memorandum of June 20, 2005 and received the information accordingly.

**(f) 2005 HAC Operating Budget**

This item was addressed under item B. 1

**4. LEGISLATIVE SERVICES**

**(b) Heritage Canada Foundation  
Annual Conference September 15 – 17, 2005-06-29  
Regina, Saskatchewan Heritage & Sustainability: Canadian  
Communities & Kyoto (Registration \$295)**

Commission was requested to consider a recommendation to approve attendance at the above event. Commission requested that Commissioner Bowyer be asked to attend.



This item was deferred to the next meeting.

**(a) List of Outstanding Items**

Commission was requested to review the list of outstanding items and provided direction accordingly.

**D. CORRESPONDENCE**

It was  
receive the following items of correspondence.

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

Carried

**1. Delegation Request: Sunnyside Acres Heritage Society**

Correspondence of May 4, 2005 from Dr. R.M. Strang, requesting to appear before Commission to discuss possible financial assistance for the production of a 2006 calendar.

The Administrative Assistant was requested to forward correspondence accordingly.

**2. Mr. Art Carlock, Chairman  
Bakersfield Hwy. 99 Cruise 'N' Show**

Commission reviewed the correspondence of May 24, 2005, and Commissioner Clegg provided an overview of the luncheon, which was held June 22, 2005.

**3. Port Kells Tree Nomination**

This item was not dealt with.

**4. Heritage Trees located at 12244 – 102 Avenue**

This item was not dealt with

**5. Removal of Heritage Tree Located at 18537 – 54 Avenue**

Memorandum of June 15, 2005 from the Manager, Urban Forestry.

**6) St. Oswald's Anglican Church, 190 Street and 96 Avenue  
Wheelchair Ramp Installation**

Correspondence of June 15, 2005 from Mr. Patrick N. Goode, Archivist on behalf of the Church.

**7) Referral from Council**

Memorandum of June 17, 2005 from Legislative Services.

**8) Request for Significant Tree Status  
Horse Chestnut Tree Located at 6033 – 168 Street**

This item was not dealt with.

**E. INFORMATION ITEMS**

**1. Green Timbers Portion of Provincially owned Lands Located at 9800 – 168 Street**

Correction to memorandum of May 17, 2005.

**2. Council Resolutions – May 30, 2005**

Memorandum of May 31, 2005 from Legislative Services.

**3. Cloverdale Business Improvement Association & Cloverdale District Chamber of Commerce.**

Correspondence of June 3, 2005 from Mr. Lyle MacMillan, advocating for the relocation and protection of heritage homes that are impacted by development in Cloverdale and of June 14, 2005 from the City Clerk.

**4. Council Resolutions – June 13, 2005-06-29**

Memorandum of June 14, 2005 from Legislative Services.

**F. OTHER COMPETENT BUSINESS CONT'D**

**1. Plaquing of Heritage Sites**

Commissioner Clegg provided an overview of the above project.

**L. ADJOURNMENT**

It was

Moved by Commissioner Stibbs  
Seconded by Commissioner Tracey  
That the Heritage Advisory Commission do

now adjourn.

Carried

The Heritage Advisory Commission adjourned at 2:05 p.m.

---

Margaret Jones, City Clerk

---

Councillor J. Higginbotham, Chair,  
Heritage Advisory Commission