



City of Surrey

Heritage Advisory Commission

Minutes

Executive Boardroom
City Hall
14245 - 56 Avenue
Surrey, B.C.
WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 26, 2005
Time: 9:00 a.m.

Present:

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

Absent:

W. Tracey

Staff Present:

A. Kopystynski, Senior Planner, Planning & Development
B. Sommer, Manager, Heritage Services Section, Parks, Recreation and Culture
S. Palmer, Legislative Services

J. McLeod, Manager Long Range Planning & Policy Development
M. Dickinson, Senior Planner, Planning and Development
J. Boan, Acting Traffic Operations Manager, Engineering

A. ADOPTION OF MINUTES

1. Heritage Advisory Commission Minutes – September 28, 2005.

Commissioner Monk requested the following amendments to the minutes be made:

Page 4:

Insert a bulleted item after the fourth bullet from the bottom of the page, to read:

- "Before the report is finalized, it be brought back to the Surrey Heritage Advisory Commission for review."

Page 5:

Delete the statement "Commissioners Monk and Bowyer volunteered to sit on the Tree Sub-Committee."

Insert the following bulleted item after the final bullet:

- "That sufficient numbers of trees cannot be planted due to restricted area."

It was

Moved by Commissioner Jack Monk
Seconded by Commissioner Bowyer
That the minutes of the Heritage Advisory
Commission of September 28, 2005, be adopted, as amended.
Carried

B. DELEGATIONS

C. CORPORATE REPORTS**1. PARKS, RECREATION & CULTURE****(a) Mound Farm**

Report from Parks, Recreation & Culture regarding Mound Farm.

The Manager, Heritage Services Section, provided the following comments:

- Recommendations have not been implemented, as funding had not yet been received.
- The phased strategy proposed in 1999 was over \$3 million.
- The first phase of implementation is now in the range of \$6 million due to development processes.
- The Surrey Heritage Advisory Commission had input into the development of the report and had additional input in the draft version of the report.
- A member of the Commission sat in on the design development of the report and also reported back on the tree study.
- The report will be on filed in Legislative Services.

Discussion ensued and it was noted that remediation work is currently being undertaken on the forested areas of Mound Farm. The statement was made that there are some environmentally sensitive habitat areas which present concern as to the location of trails. It was noted the trails would be less than standard width in order to create a minimal impact to the environmentally sensitive trail and to address old and unstable trees.

The suggestion was raised to schedule a tour of the Mound Farm for members of the Commission. It was added that the City, however, had acquired the Mound Farm funding could not found in order to retain the barn. The statement was made that funding opportunities for lost heritage buildings would be explored for next year's budget.

Discussion ensued with respect to funding for improving trails, buildings, and retention/maintenance of trees. The following comments were then made:

- Some funding is available through special funding from the City.
- Council provides annual funding for acquisition purposes.
- After acquisition, purpose studies are done and budgets prepared for actual development.
- Each year, the Parks Division puts in a budget to Council identifying a variety of different capital projects and would include natural area and built areas within it.
- Built area comes through the Realty Section of Parks, Recreation and Culture.

- Both units put in a cooperative budget so that Council may use dollars with direction and priorities of the City's phase time.

A. Kopystynski, Senior Planner, entered the meeting at 9:25 a.m.

The Chair requested an update on properties over a period of time. Commissioner Clegg then commented that parking at Mound Farm is an issue and if the site were developed as a destination for tourists, parking would be limited on the Mound. He continued that an asphalt parking lot could be added outside the area, but noted that arborists don't put asphalt near tree roots and the lot would have to be moved further out.

The Manager, Heritage Services Section commented that she would provide an update on all Surrey heritage sites and schedule a tour of the Mound Farm area for the spring of 2006.

It was
Moved by Commissioner Clegg
Seconded by Commissioner Fuller
That the Surrey Heritage Advisory
Commission receive the report on the Mound Farm and request staff to
schedule a tour of the area for the spring of 2006.
Carried

Museum Opening

The Manager, Museum reported that the opening of the new Surrey Museum was very successful and she added that it was great to see the Heritage Advisory Commission members in attendance. She then distributed complimentary signed copies of a new history book by John Pearson and Lorne Pearson titled "The Valley of the Fraser" depicting early history of Surrey and an account of the log cabin built by Eric Anderson, which still exists on site. It was noted that it was a good community book that documents the history of the original Anderson family.

The Manager, Long Range Planning & Policy Development entered the meeting at 9:24 a.m.

Further discussion ensued with respect to the museum opening and it was noted that approximately 4,000 people attended and since the opening, an average of 220 people have attended on a daily basis. It was noted that school programs will commence next week and that the Surrey History Gallery is in keeping with the Surrey Heritage Advisory Commission's concept of heritage: past, present and future.

It was added that the Ripley Exhibit from Orlando, Florida, is here until the end of the year and will be going back into collections, so people should take the opportunity to view this wonderful and fun exhibit. In response to a question from the Commission, it was noted that group bookings and guided tours may be arranged on site.

The comment was made that the City Archives has also reopened at the old museum site in Cloverdale and Reference Specialist M. Chan would be working with the Manager, Heritage Services Section, to assist in storyboards and research. It was added that M. Chan is a recent grad of the UBC Archival Studies Program and that reference services would be available to the community on Fridays and Saturdays from 9:30 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.

Other items noted were the Surrey Crime Prevention Society's beautiful commemorative mural on the storage building; the Royal Canadian Legion's cenotaph has been restored and relocated; and a large clock has been installed on the lawn area.

Commissioner Monk left the meeting at 9:32 a.m. and returned at 9:33 a.m.

It was noted that there were also two storyboards depicting the history of Surrey firefighters on location.

The members of the Surrey Heritage Advisory Commission then congratulated the Manager, Heritage Services Section for her work on the opening of the Surrey museum.

2. PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

(a) Tree Preservation Bylaw – Sub-Committee Update

Commissioners Monk and Bowyer provided an update on the report by the Sub-Committee regarding the proposed Surrey Tree Preservation Bylaw. The update referenced Corporate Report R185 and attachments distributed at the September 28 meeting of the Commission.

The Manager, Long Range Planning & Policy Development provided the following comments:

- She met with three committees of Council on two occasions; met with Surrey Environmental Partners; and received input from the Development Advisory Committee. Staff will report back to Council prior to preparing a final by-law for Council's consideration.

Commissioner Monk then referenced Corporate Report R185 dated July 25, 2005 and provided three salient points:

1. **The reason for and the need for the Tree Protection by-law to include a reference to an Environmentally Sensitive Area plan.**

There is a reason for and a need for a Tree Protection by-law to include references to environmentally sensitive areas. The current Tree Preservation By-law (No. 12880 from 1996) contains a schedule of environmentally sensitive areas. Environmentally sensitive areas

continue to have a part to play in the new by-law and it is important to identify and target those areas that can be saved in the future or if they come under threat. The City does not have control over agriculture land areas nor does it have total control over developable areas; but it does have enough control to design, negotiate and keep areas; that is why an environmentally sensitive area study is necessary for the Tree Preservation By-laws.

2. Valuation of Trees and Penalties

The penalties for failure to observe the terms of the by-law, and unauthorized removal of protected trees must have a sliding scale of values, which correlate tree size, type, location and whether intent to circumvent the by-law is proven or suspected. Many people in the community could take more concern for large or beautiful trees based on size, quality, location and penalties for intentional or non-intentional damage. This has to be undertaken by City staff.

The Manager, Long Range Planning and Policy Development commented that under the current by-law, any tree of 30 cm diameter measured at chest height is protected. She added that any protected tree, whether on private property, removed through development or for any reason without permit would face fines in place under the City by-law. She noted that there are other avenues such as municipal ticketing which are set rates, and not based on a sliding scale.

The Acting Traffic Operations Manager entered the meeting at 9:45 a.m.

Commissioner Stibbs asked whether rules could be formulated to assess the relative value of trees and he encouraged staff to take that into consideration.

M. Dickinson, Senior Planner, entered the meeting at 9:46 a.m.

3. Amendment to Zoning By-law.

Corporate Report R185 suggests that it is important to have zoning flexibility, but by-law amendments should also include an addition to the Definitions section, that is, stands of exceptional trees be protected by including such stands in the Definitions section as not developable, along with areas that are too steep, too wet or riparian areas, etc. There are some reasons not to do this, however it would be beneficial to the preservation of heritage trees if heritage trees if able to be put in place. The Commission would be comfortable with having such an addition to the Definitions if its application to specific locations would be at the discretion of Council only, after advice by the Commission and the Manager, Planning and Development.

It was noted that the objective is a good one and when the City goes into new NCP areas, it should look at land large enough that stands of trees

may be protected. In addition, the comment was made that more flexibility in by-laws would allow planning consultation to assess trees, and then design subdivisions that distribute densities differently. The statement was made that one way to save trees and special areas is to use a mix of housing.

In response to a question regarding the City's use of Heritage Protection Covenants, the Senior Planner noted that there have been a number of Heritage Revitalization Agreements dealing with natural cultural heritage together with other features that are to be protected.

There followed a general discussion with the following comments provided:

- The City is actively involved in conserving wildlife corridors through NCP and OCP process. A recent example is an area Fergus Creek in the Highway 99 corridor area.
- Planning and Development practices a very deliberate and planned focus in cooperation with neighbourhoods.
- The City is planting trees and has more salmon returning to spawning creeks.

Commissioner Monk then provided the following comments with respect to the proposed Tree Preservation By-law (page 10 of Corporate Report R185:

- (Item 1, page 14) He agreed with the recommendation to approve a Tree Administrator position.
- (Item 2, page 14) Focus on enforcement must be during developers' hours of work (as well as evenings, weekends and holidays).
- (Item 3, page 14) Update and augment the list of significant trees.
- Educate the public on how to report illegal cutting of trees and how to advise the City of significant trees that need to be preserved.
- (Item 4, page 14) The existing by-law is well standardized and no improvements were needed.
- Item 6, page 15) In many cases, the design standards for protective tree barriers (height, method of construction, distance from tree, etc.) are not being enforced or maintained. Chainlink fencing may be a better choice for tree protection. However, it has been noted that developers will take the fencing down, run a backhoe through the protected tree area and put the fence up again afterward. Fencing must be identified as not being removable.
- (Item 5, page 15) Arborist must be employed by the City, not by developers and charged through to developers.
- (Item 7, page 15) The option of looking at pruning techniques would be preferable to tree removal.
- (Item 9, page 16) When properties are deemed too small to handle a replacement of two trees for one tree, have the option of putting in no trees or one tree and then pay the City to do something else. Serious

consideration of upsizing those trees that may be planted must be undertaken. These issues should be examined on a case-by-case basis.

- (Item 10, page 17) The City should investigate location, longer-term survival, and other kinds of resources to plant in other areas. Demonstration trees may be a better solution as opposed to taking money in lieu of planting a tree. Smaller trees would have a better chance of survival.

Commissioner Sidhu entered the meeting at 10:08 a.m.

- (Item 11, page 17) Include multi-stem tree species under the definition of protected trees.
- (Item 12, page 17) No refund should be made to developers for having completed work until such time as final inspection had been undertaken by the City. This could take one or two years depending upon agreement.
- (Item 13, page 18) When an owner makes application to remove trees for agricultural purposes on a lot in the Agricultural Land Reserve, a Restrictive Covenant is registered on title that documents such tree removal is for agricultural purposes only and the owner agrees that for a minimum of five years from the date of permit issuance, the owner will not make application for, nor will the City give consideration to, subdivision or development of the lot other than for the construction of buildings and other improvements in relation to the use of the lot for agricultural purposes. This time period should be extended from five years to ten years.
- (Item 14, Page 18) Require that tree surveys be undertaken as a requirement of the development application review process. Everything should be in place when the developer brings plans in to the City. In some cases, input from local citizens could be beneficial, particularly during final review, whenever possible.
- (Item 17, page 19) Increase the rate of \$300 per tree as the amount that will be collected by the City as cash-in-lieu for replacement trees – it is not enough and should be based upon a sliding scale.
- (Item 19, page 19) Recognition and award program does not have much effect on developers.
- (Item 20, page 20) Surrey Municipal Ticket Information By-law should be amended. There is little evidence of stop work orders.
- (Item 22, page 20) There should be some funding available for replacement tree funds. There are no concerns with the recommendation to collect 2% of City's revenues from building permit process to be placed in a Green City Reserve Fund. All cash-in-lieu replacement charges should be placed in the Green City Reserve Fund.
- (Item 23, page 21) Concern was raised regarding the application processing time under the provisions of the existing by-law within 12 months of the date of adoption of the amended by-law. It was noted that this time period is too short.

Commissioner Bowyer commented that she had no additional comments and that she would like to see the final draft of the by-law come back to the Commission for review purposes.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

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

Commission:

1. receive the report as submitted by the Tree Sub-Committee; and
2. refer the matter to staff and request that the final version of the Tree Preservation By-law be provided to the Surrey Heritage Advisory Commission for further review prior to final adoption by Council.

Carried

(b) Semiahmoo Trail – Heritage Alteration Permit

The Chair left the meeting at 10:27 a.m. and Commissioner Clegg assumed the Chair.

The Senior Planner referenced the October 24, 1005 report for a Heritage Alteration Permit, Application 7905-0335-00 for temporary drainage service in portions of Semiahmoo Trail between 28 Avenue and 32 Avenue. He also referred to an initial report from Engineering considered by the HAC on May 25, 2005.

The following comments were provided:

- The Semiahmoo Trail is subject to the Surrey Semiahmoo Trail Heritage Designation By-law, which prohibits services such as water, cable and phone. Services are allowed without prior approvals when located under, in or over the main arterial roads listed and crossing Semiahmoo Trail.
- In all other locations it is necessary to obtain a Heritage Alteration and to demonstrate that there are no alternatives for placement of services other than in Semiahmoo Trail.
- The proposed Heritage Alteration Permit indicates exactly what is allowed to be installed, measures to be taken following installation to retain heritage characteristics and the heritage value of the Trail, and ensuring proper replanting remediation work is done.
- This application is for a permit to allow temporary and permanent drainage services to be constructed to service approved applications on the west side of Semiahmoo Trail. The transition between the Trail and development was previously reviewed and accepted by HAC as complying with the Semiahmoo Trail Design Guidelines.

- The entire area to the west side of the Trail is designed to drain to a detention pond on the east side.
- Connections from these projects ideally would go through lands to the north, and one pipe crossing of the Semiahmoo Trail to the detention pond.
- The lands to the north were not subject to development when applications came forward
- A right-of-way could not be obtained through lands to construct the services within those lands as part of the development. Therefore a temporary drainage service needs to be constructed within Semiahmoo Trail.
- The Heritage Alteration Permit specifies what portions of the Trail can be altered to allow installation of the required temporary and permanent drainage service; and other reasonable and necessary actions allowed in association with the installation or service removal, including: excavation, storage of drainage pipes and access over the Trail by construction vehicles during the course of the construction.
- There is provision for routine maintenance, provided any actions that alter the physical or heritage character of the Trail will be remediated.
- When the ultimate service alignment through the lands to the north is built, the temporary service can be abandoned or removed. Trees and vegetation can be planted once the service is abandoned without the usual restrictions due to root impact near underground services; trees, vegetation and landscaping disturbed during the course of construction or removal of the temporary drainage services will be restored; where pavement is damaged or needs to be removed.
- The permit will not sanction access to any development sites that abut Semiahmoo Trail.
- Only vehicles and equipment necessary for construction purposes will enter 28 Avenue; the Permit does not allow vehicles to enter abutting properties being developed through the Trail.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

It was Moved by Commissioner Stibbs
Seconded by Commissioner Johnston
That the Surrey Heritage Advisory
Commission would advise the General Manager, Planning and Development, that the Commission has no concerns and supports the preparation of a report to Council recommending that a Heritage Alteration Permit be considered by Council that would allow for the following in a portion of the Semiahmoo Trail between 28 Avenue and 32 Avenue:

1. the removal of existing, unnecessary utility connections under, on or over Semiahmoo Trail to the lands subject to development and identified in Appendix A;

2. the installation, maintenance and abandonment or removal of a temporary drainage service as identified on the map in Appendix B;
3. actions reasonable and necessary to undertake the excavations and restoration works detailed in the Heritage Alteration Permit; and
4. letters be sent informing all residents of the proposed works, including vehicles undertaking the works entering the Trail.

Subject to the following conditions:

1. All physical impacts to the heritage property containing Semiahmoo Trail, including the paved surface, ditches, pedestrian paths, trees, vegetation and landscaping impacted by the construction, maintenance or removal of the temporary drainage service, are to be remediated and restored in accordance with sound heritage practices and requirements set by the City; and
2. Construction equipment or vehicles shall not use Semiahmoo Trail for access to and from the development sites shown in Appendix A.

Carried

The suggestion was raised that the community be educated on how to report infractions concerning the Trail and to provide signage indicating the construction work in progress. It was also noted that using cement blocks to prevent access to the Trail from adjacent development sites could be explored and that Engineering staff would review and develop educational material for area residents.

The Manager, Heritage Services Section, left the meeting at 10:46 a.m.

3. ENGINEERING

4. LEGISLATIVE SERVICES

(a) List of Outstanding Items

Commission will be requested to review the list of outstanding items and provide direction accordingly.

The following comments were provided:

- Under P & D Plaque Sub-Committee, insert the words "look for funding later on "under Status column.

- Delete the Tree Sub-Committee "Tree Preservation By-law" entry.
- Insert the words "Planning & Development sending out proposal call" in the Status column for "Heritage Branch Contract for Undertaking 6 Additional Statements of Significant in 2005/06.
- Combine the two sections on Application 7904-0364-00 – 7075 – 180 Street.
- Delete the entry for the "Rock Tree & Boulder". Commissioner Monk commented that the wording on the plaque should not read "since time memorial" as the tree is only 75 years old.
- Under "Cloverdale Business Improvement Association – Cloverdale Community Heritage Village" insert "Henry Parr House"
- Delete the entry for "Mound Farm"

The Manager, Heritage Service Section, entered the meeting at 10:55 a.m.

(b) Council Resolutions – October 3, 2005

Memorandum from the Assistant City Clerk advising that owners of Heritage Homes who have applied for a tax exemption will now receive 100% exemption on the municipal taxes for the building and land on which the building stands.

A brief discussion ensued and the following comments were provided:

- There is a provision in the *Local Government Act*, which allows tax exemptions for building design for heritage purposes and states that designated private heritage buildings are eligible for tax exemption application.
- Commissioner Lindenbach noted that at a recent provincial heritage conference, the issue was raised that designated heritage property owners were finding it increasingly difficult to obtain house insurance. She added this could be a detraction for some property owners; however there is a list of insurers available that specialize in insuring heritage homes.

The Senior Planner to review the matter.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

It was
Moved by Commissioner Bowyer
Seconded by Commissioner Lindenbach
That the Surrey Heritage Advisory
Commission suggests to the General Manager, Planning & Development,
that all designated heritage house owners be notified of 100% municipal
tax exemption as per Corporate Report R222 and inform them that they
need to apply for tax exemption annually.

Carried

Discussion then took place regarding the storage of the Petro Canada heritage sign and landmark. There were no suggestions brought forward as to storage options other than its present location.

D. CORRESPONDENCE

It was
to 3 be received.

Moved by Commissioner carol
Seconded by Commissioner Stibbs
That the following Correspondence Items 1

Carried

1. Hazelmere United Church

Letter from Hazelmere United Church requesting consideration of replacement of gutters and downspouts with an estimated total cost of \$2,000.00.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

It was
Commission would recommend to Council, approval of 50% of the cost up to \$3,000 maximum, pending submission of an application and three quotes for the work to complete the gutters and downspouts.

Moved by Commissioner Stibbs
Seconded by Commission Fuller
That the Surrey Heritage Advisory

Carried

It was noted that the work is subject to the City Architect's review.

2. Hazelmere United Church

Letter from Hazelmere United Church enclosing final inspection certificate for Holding Tank installed at the church in 2004.

3. Tree Preservation By-law

E-correspondence from Darlene Bowyer and Jack Monk dated October 17, 2005 regarding review of the Tree Protection By-law. (Note: this item is listed for report under Planning & Development)

E. INFORMATION ITEMS**1. Friends of the Surrey Museum & Archives Society**

Information from the Surrey Museum & Archives Society advising of new 3-year membership cycle, and new fees.

A brief discussion ensued and it was noted that membership expires at the end of December 2005. The Manager, Heritage Services Section, noted that if the Commission wishes to renew its group membership status, the fee is \$40.00 for a three-year period and one Commission member to be designated at a representative who will receive membership benefits.

COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION

It was
Commission review its membership with the "Friends of Surrey Museum and Archives Society".

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

Carried

2. Charlie Perkins Tree – New Release from Nina Grewal

News Release from Nina Grewal asking residents to sign a petition to have the Charlie Perkins Tree memorial recognized as a national historic site by the Minister of the Environment.

Note: At its meeting held September 28, the Heritage Advisory Commission asked that a letter be sent to the Whalley Legion asking for information on the Charlie Perkins tree. A letter has been sent, but there has been no response to date.

It was noted that there was correspondence on table, dated October 13, 2005 from the Royal Canadian Legion, Whalley Branch No. 299. The Chair noted that the Commission had not requested the Charlie Perkins Tree Memorial as a national historic site. The Senior Planner commented that there were funding mechanisms in place for national monuments under the Heritage Places Initiatives.

The Chair left the meeting at 11:44 a.m. and Commissioner Clegg assumed the Chair.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

It was
Commission request staff provide information regarding location and ownership of the Charlie Perkins Tree Memorial.

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

Carried

The Chair returned to the meeting at 11:50 a.m. and then called for a five-minute recess.

The meeting reconvened at 11:55 a.m. with all members in attendance except Commissioner Tracey.

F. OTHER COMPETENT BUSINESS

1. Provincial Heritage Conference

It was requested that an invitation to Mr. B. Parliament of the Provincial Heritage to provide a presentation to the Surrey Heritage Advisory Commission on heritage matters in the Cloverdale area.

The agenda order was then varied.

MOTION TO HOLD CLOSED SURREY HERITAGE ADVISORY COMMISSION MEETING

It was
accordance with Section 90(e) of the *Community Charter*.

Moved by Commissioner Clegg
Seconded by Commissioner Fuller
That the meeting be held in a Closed session in

Carried

The open Surrey Heritage Advisory Commission meeting reconvened at 1:00 p.m. with all members in attendance except Commissioners Tracey and Bowyer.

2. Budget Discussion

The Acting Traffic Operations Manager, left the meeting at 1:04 p.m.

The Manager, Heritage Services Section, provided a brief outline of the Commission's budget.

The following comments were provided:

- Heritage awards funding (\$1,000) was not intended for one-time funding, therefore, it should it be deferred from the 2005 Operation budget.
- The Commission has the opportunity to defer unallocated 2005 budget monies into reserve for future expenditures.

COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION

It was
Commission would recommend to Council that under the "Heritage Financial Regulation" by-law, all unexpended funds be deferred to 2006 and that the 2006 budget be brought forward for final review.

Moved by Commissioner Stibbs
Seconded by Commissioner Johnston
That the Surrey Heritage Advisory
Commission would recommend to Council that under the "Heritage Financial Regulation" by-law, all unexpended funds be deferred to 2006 and that the 2006 budget be brought forward for final review.

Carried

G. NEXT MEETING

The next meeting of the Heritage Advisory Commission is scheduled for November 30 in the Mayor's Executive Boardroom - 9:00 a.m.

H. ADJOURNMENT

It was
meeting do now adjourn.

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

Carried

The Surrey Heritage Advisory Commission meeting adjourned at 1:11 p.m.

Margaret Jones, City Clerk

Chairperson: Councillor J. Higginbotham
Surrey Heritage Advisory Commission