



City of Surrey

Heritage Advisory Commission

Minutes

Executive Boardroom
City Hall
14245 - 56 Avenue
Surrey, B.C.
WEDNESDAY, JUNE 28, 2006
Time: 9:00 a.m.

Present:

Chair - H. Lindenbach
Councillor Higginbotham
A. Clegg
R. Fuller
J. Monk
M. Stibbs
W. Tracey

Absent:

D. Bowyer
C. Johnston
S. Sidhu

Staff Present:

A. Kopystynski, Senior Planner (Heritage),
Planning & Development
B. Sommer, Manager, Heritage Services, Parks,
Recreation and Culture
C. Bonneville, Assistant City Clerk, Legislative
Services
B. Clark, City Architect, Planning and
Development
S. Godwin, Natural Areas Coordinator, Urban
Forestry, Parks, Recreation & Culture
L. Giles, Environmental Technologist,
Engineering Department

A. ADOPTION OF MINUTES

1. Heritage Advisory Commission Minutes – May 31, 2006

There was a brief discussion regarding items within the minutes and the Chair advised that these issues should be addressed under 'Other Competent Business' of this agenda.

The Commission agreed that the motion on page eight should include that the recommendation is to the General Manager, Planning and Development.

It was Moved by Commissioner Stibbs
Seconded by Commissioner Fuller
That the minutes of the Heritage Advisory
Commission of May 31, 2006, be adopted, as circulated, as amended.
Carried

B. DELEGATION

1. SNAP Delegation

Parks Department and summer students were in attendance to present Surrey Natural Areas Partnership (SNAP) program, which is an integral part of the City's new Nature Matters initiative, a comprehensive initiative to protect, enhance and enjoy the City's natural heritage.

Stephen Godwin, Natural Areas Coordinator, Urban Forestry of the Parks, Recreation and Culture Department and Liana Giles, Environmental Technologist of the Engineering Department provided the following comments regarding the Nature Matters Program:

- The Nature Matters Program is a new year round environmental stewardship program that was approved by Council in the Fall of 2005. The Program's mission is to enhance natural habitat, increase youth involvement and address environmental issues.
- The main thrusts of the program are to increase awareness, spark interest, create partnerships and build on current success.
- The program is administered through Engineering and the Parks Departments. There is more funding for SNAP and SHaRP programs.
- Some of the existing programs are SHaRP, SWAP (Solid Waste Action Plan), and Adopt a Street. Engineering potential initiatives are restoring and enhancing natural areas, integration with school curricula, agricultural stewardship, program outreach, and education topics for the Community. Parks initiatives are youth, volunteer programs, school programs, environmental events/programs, green infrastructure, and SNAP.
- The SNAP program is now in its sixth year and has increased its capacity to ten members.

Kim Tendelend presented the Surrey's Natural Areas Partnership (SNAP) and provided the following comments:

- The SNAP is nine post secondary students working on restoration and enhancement, public education, and school programs.
- Restoration and enhancement includes trail closures and maintenance, invasive species removal and native planting, and yard waste and refuse removal.
- Public Education includes distributing pamphlets door-to-door, children's nature camps, talking to and informing parks users, hosting and attending community events, and school programs.

Yelda presented information on the Eco Ranger Program stating the following:

- The goal of the Eco Ranger program is to raise people's awareness and knowledge of the natural diversity in our parks through public awareness.
- Volunteers are recruited from all over Surrey. This year volunteers have come with a wide range of backgrounds. Volunteers are high school students, university graduates, and adults. Volunteers gain valuable skills in bird and plant identification and public speaking.
- Eco Rangers raised the public's awareness of natural areas through a series of short interpretive programs about: biodiversity in parks, species that depend on parks as their habitat, and parks bylaws. The lectures provide valuable and relevant information for all age groups.
- The Eco Ranger program for 2006 will include the Eco Rangers being more involved with park visitors through introduction of new activities in parks, such as scheduled interpretative walks, and there will be information booths in each park.

Robin and Lee of the SHaRP, Salmon Education Team Group presented the Salmon Habitat Restoration Program and stated the following:

- SHaRP is a City of Surrey initiative that has been 11 years in the running. It is a student-based program of 9 University Student Team Leaders and 23 High School Student Team Members.

- The goals of SHaRP are to minimize urban impacts on streams, city beautification, and educating people about environmental issues.
- The Education team is involved in such events as graffiti removal and garbage clean up, storm drain marking, industrial education, community events, day cares, and neighborhood awareness campaigns
- The Field Team is involved in invasive species removal and native species planting, erosion control and bank stabilization, livestock exclusion fencing, and landowner contact.

In response to questions from the Commission, the delegation stated:

- SNAP is a paid program, Eco Rangers is volunteer run, and the SHaRP is contracted to Dhillon as paid employees.
- SHaRP does work with the Semiahmoo Fish and Hatchery Club.

C. REPORTS

1. PARKS AND RECREATION

a. Storyboard Meeting

The Manager, Heritage Services provided a verbal update regarding the Storyboard Meeting, stating:

- The Storyboard meeting was last night, June 27/06.
- An invitation was sent to the Panorama Ratepayers Association however they were not in attendance.
- Each of the three communities (Fleetwood, Guildford and Newton) has identified two team leaders and they will take a lead on involving their community and develop the themes and stories for storyboards.
- Their first task would be to identify more participants and then staff will meet with each community team to discuss storyboards formats and to support research and verify content.

The Commission members commended the Manager, Heritage Services for a very good presentation and stated their support for the Storyboard program.

There was a brief discussion regarding the division line between South Surrey and Newton and it was stated that the division line should be adjusted and located at Colebrook Road. (*The community town centre planning area for Newton includes Panorama Ridge south to Colebrook Road already. This map was provided to meeting participants and this is the area under consideration*)

b. 1912 Hall Rehabilitation Program

The Manager, Heritage Services provided the following comments regarding the 1912 Hall program:

- Council has approved the 1912 Hall rehabilitation program. The timeline is to have the tenders prepared and have the contract awarded by the first week of August.
- The nature of the seismic upgrading has been significantly reduced; as the building is no longer settling the intervention proposed has been minimized.
- The outdated electrical system requires replacing.
- The gable stucco and caulking in the stone foundation will be restored.
- The south awning will be replaced and the building will be painted.
- The original doors that are in the Museum collections will be brought back into the Hall.
- The project is anticipated to complete by the end of October.
- Relocation of the collections and offices will be in November with an anticipated opening in late November (approximately November 18 – Archives Week).

2. PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

a. Christopherson House

The Senior Planner (Heritage) stated that staff have been in touch with the property owners, regarding the request to photo-document the Christopherson House prior to demolition.

b. Fourth Round of Surrey Statements of Significance File: 6800-20

The Senior Planner (Heritage) stated the following regarding the Surrey Statement of Significance:

- Surrey has participated in preparing Statements of Significance for the last three years. To date a total of 67 Statements of Significance have been prepared and about a third are displayed on the Canadian Register of Historic Places. Given the volume of sites across Canada, the uploading is being done gradually.
- This year, the HAC is being asked to include a list of sites in the call for proposals. The proposed criteria for selecting site is as follows:
Criteria 1: Sites selected but not undertaken in the previous review: For this criteria, the Nicholas/David Kitzel House and Root House, located at 216 – 184 Street would qualify; Criteria 2: Sites in communities that do not have many completed Statements of Significance: The distribution by community is as follows: Fleetwood 0; Surrey City Centre 1; Newton 3; Whalley 7; Guildford/Anniedale/Port Kells 8; South Surrey 15; and Cloverdale 29. Therefore the following 5 sites are also recommended: Fleetwood United Church (Fleetwood); Goodmanson Building (City Centre); Strawberry Hill Farmers Institute (Newton); Burkart House (Newton); and South Westminster School (Whalley).

COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION

It was Moved by Commissioner Clegg
Seconded by Commissioner Stibbs
That the HAC recommend to Council, in anticipation of an announcement by the Heritage Branch for funding to undertake Statements of Significance for 2006 – 2007, that a proposal call be sent out to qualified heritage consultants to undertake a further six Statements of Significance, that the work be undertaken subject to confirmation of provincial funding and that the Commission be authorized to spend up to \$4,200 as the Surrey contribution for this study, for the following sites:

Site 1: Nicholas/David Kirzel House and Root House;

Site 2: Fleetwood United Church (Fleetwood);

Site 3: Goodmanson Building (City Centre);

Site 4: Strawberry Hill Farmers Institute (Newton);

Site 5: Burkart House (Newton); and

Site 6: South Westminster School (Whalley).

Carried

c. Heritage Compensation Policy

The Senior Planner (Heritage) to provide a verbal report regarding the proposed Heritage Compensation Policy. He stated that the Commission asked that the policy have these main provisions:

- Applies when development application or heritage protection are made for sites with heritage buildings or features.
- Discourages significant moving of heritage buildings.
- Compensation is to be paid at the time the heritage value of heritage building is affected.
- Compensation payment categories are to have a sliding scale in relation to the type of development.
- An application would be required to obtain grants from the compensation fund.
- Priority will be given to allocating funds on a geographic basis, close to where the loss occurred.

He then provided the Compensation Categories:

Category 1

- Heritage buildings being protected as part of commercial developments, industrial developments and residential development consisting of 24 or more dwelling units or lots.
- Protected individual commercial, institutional or multiple residential buildings without being associated with development application.
- Heritage buildings moved out of Surrey; to be treated as being demolished and are subject to this category.
- Proposed compensation is \$100,000.

Category 2

- Heritage building being protected as part of institutional development, and residential developments consisting of less than 24 dwelling units or lots.
- Protecting individual institutional buildings without being associated with development applications.
- Proposed compensation is \$50,000.

Category 3

- Heritage buildings, including residential and farm buildings being protected as part of development in agriculture areas. Protecting individual single-family buildings or farm buildings anywhere in the City without being associated with development applications.
- Proposed compensation is \$15,000.

The policy is proposed to include the following mechanism and criteria for funds to be dispensed by the City:

- Only protected heritage properties would qualify.
- Applications submitted and reviewed by HAC.
- Three cost estimates are to be submitted for the proposed work.
- The applicant would need to demonstrate the effect of the proposed work on heritage value.
- HAC forwards its recommendation on funding to Council for approval.

The proposed policy would include the following eligible works:

- Preservation – protecting, maintaining and or stabilizing existing materials, form and integrity of a heritage building or feature.
- Rehabilitation – continued or compatible contemporary use of the heritage building or feature.
- Restoration – revealing, recovering or representing the state of the heritage building or feature.
- Essential Maintenance – repairing of some physical element of the building critical to allowing the character-defining element of the building to be preserved, rehabilitated or restored.
- Not including: routine maintenance such as painting, cleaning, damage to wear-and-tear, re-wiring, re-plumbing, paving, grounds maintenance or landscaping replacement is not subject to funding.

The Senior Planner (Heritage) concluded by indicating the next steps with respect to this policy:

- HAC considers endorsing this policy.
- Staff prepares corporate report, including HAC recommendations.
- Council considers corporate report.
- If approved, City staff informed and bulletin for public is prepared.

The Commission provided the following comments during their discussion of this issue:

- Relocating structures from their originating site causes loss of heritage value. Heritage money should not be used to relocate homes.

- There was a discussion as to the definitions of preservation, rehabilitating and restoring.
- The categories involving multiple residential building should be done based on dollar value of the building construction rather than the number of units or lots.

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

- Only protected properties would be able to apply for this funding.
- The policy is intended mostly for heritage buildings not features.
- This policy does not propose matching funds being provided by the property owners.

It was

Moved by Councillor Higginbotham
Seconded by Commissioner Stibbs
That the HAC receive the Heritage

Compensation Policy and that staff further consider the HAC comments in the Heritage Compensation Policy.

Carried with Commissioners Stibbs, Monk and Tracey against.

**d. Park Lane (Elgin) Ltd. - Heritage Alteration Permit (HAP)
File: 7903-0222-00**

The Senior Planner (Heritage) provided the following comments:

- The Heritage Alteration Permit (HAP) would allow certain services necessary for a development project located at 14215/14241 Crescent Road and 3651 Elgin Road.
- The HAP is necessary because these works will be installed within the rights of way of Elgin and Crescent Roads, which are subject to heritage designation by-laws.
- The works include the installation of a single permanent driveway access to the development site from Elgin Road, a natural pedestrian walkway along the north side of Crescent Road and underground services.
- This HAP does not include the road upgrading and Semiahmoo Trail works on Elgin and Crescent Roads as Engineering will bring those forward at a future HAC meeting.
- It is recommended that the HAC provide comments to the General Manager, Planning and Development Department to forward to City Council for information as part of their consideration of the HAP.

The Commission made the following comments regarding this application:

- The Friends of the Trail are and have been working with the developer to ensure as many trees as possible would be preserved.
- There was a brief discussion as to the status of the Tree Preservation By-law.

It was Moved by Commission Monk
Seconded by Commission Stibbs
That the HAC recommend to the General
Manager of Planning and Development that no trees designated for
retention on the tree retention plan be removed or damaged by the works,
and clause 5 (c), be now amended to read, ‘The Permittee shall be
responsible for mitigating physical damage to trees, shrubs or lawns due to
the Works caused by the Permittee, or its agents or subcontractors and for
restoration to its original or better condition to the satisfaction of the City.’
Carried

The Commission recessed at 10:35 a.m. and reconvened at 10:55 a.m. with the same members present.

**e. Henry Parr House – Proposed new Location
5072 – 184 Street
File: 7906-0019-00**

The Senior Planner (Heritage) provided the following comments:

- The Parr House, built sometime in 1912 by Mr. Henry Parr, a Surrey pioneer, has a rating of 78% in the Surrey Heritage Evaluation Worksheet.
- The Parr House was reviewed as part of 2005 Statement of Significance Assessment and is listed on the Canadian Register of Historic Places.
- HAC practice: buildings on the Surrey Heritage Register to be protected as part of development.
- July 14, 2005 HAC gave an approval in principle to the developer to move the Parr House provided it would become protected at the new site.
- On January 11, 2006 the City received a development application involving a rezoning from RF to CD to allow the construction of a 4-storey apartment building accommodating 61 units with underground parking.
- The developer submitted the following options: 1. Relocate the house to “Heritage Lane”. 2. Temporarily relocate the Parr House to a park or other City owned property until a permanent site becomes available. 3. Move the Parr House to another permanent site in Cloverdale. City lands are not available so the developer has been pursuing option 3.
- Owners of property at 5072 – 184 Street have expressed interest in taking the Henry Parr House, however, the prospective owner is reluctant to enter into a protection agreement (such as a HRA); and the commitment by the prospective owner is based on a verbal agreement with the developer and is subject to a building move application; and further there is not confirmation that the Parr House is structurally sound, guaranteeing that the move will not compromise the long-term viability of the House.
- If there is no agreement to move the House or it is found not to be structurally sound, the developer intends to demolish it and to

compensate for the loss of the Parr House by donating \$50,000 to the City for use towards future heritage preservation initiatives.

The Commission members made the following comments:

- The house is relatively unchanged and has significant heritage value and it's on the Canadian Register.
- It is one of the last few heritage buildings in this east side high-density neighbourhood. Its loss would be significant to the heritage and history of Cloverdale.
- The developer should do whatever it can to save and preserve this house.
- There needs to be some assurance that this house would be preserved if placed on the farm site.
- It was suggested that this item be referred to staff until the developer finds a firm relocation site and that the Cloverdale fairground be considered.
- Accepting donations in exchange for demolishing a heritage building is not acceptable to the Commission.
- It was suggested that staff make a strong effort and work with the developer to retain the Parr House on site and incorporate it into the development.
- It was suggested that staff review the possibility for Council to designate the Parr House with a bylaw.

It was

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

Commission wants to ensure that the Parr House be protected and designated; and that the Surrey Heritage Advisory Commission further recommends to the General Manager, Planning and Development that this application be referred back to staff for more information from the developer about:

1. Keeping the Parr House on it's current site and incorporating the Parr House into the development; or
2. Relocating the Parr House to another property in the Cloverdale area.

Carried

The City Architect, Planning and Development Department entered the meeting at 11:15 a.m.

f. Boothroyd House

The Senior Planner (Heritage) and the City Architect provided the following information regarding the Boothroyd House:

- The previous referrals and decisions by HAC, the Heritage Interventions, and the summary of the HRA were provided.
- The owner has plans to place the house on a new foundation and this project is coming before the Commission to show the changes proposed as part of the restoration program shown in the Building Permit drawings.

- The Commission has previously agreed to a new basement, subject to a number of provisos (i.e. complete photo documentation of the existing structure, retention of the floor assembly, including the original beams, the process of lifting and placing the building on a new foundation, etc.).
- The main floor of the house will be a restaurant, the upper floor an office, and the basement will also be an office that will extend to the back of the house with a stairwell.
- The owner proposes to raise the roof of the north block to accommodate additional headroom for the upper floor office (i.e. storage, washroom, etc.).
- The owner desires to use the attic in the original Boothroyd House and would like to insulate it. The Building Permit drawings indicate that a new roof including insulation, strapping and an air space be incorporated over the existing roof, with a 10" fascia board to conceal the new assembly. He feels that this will not be visible since a new gutter will be installed over the fascia.
- Some other changes are pending subject to resolution of Building Permit issues, such as a proposed exterior exit stair from the top floor to grade.
- The owner proposes to re-clad the building in cement board siding ("hardie plank") and add new flashings around the windows. It is of note that metal flashings are not seen on heritage houses of this era or in this locality.
- The house is a designated Heritage building, and civic funds have been invested in this heritage building.

The Commission members provided the following comments:

- The exterior of the house should not significantly vary from the original and the owner should comply with the Heritage Revitalization Agreement, which is based on retention of as much of the original building as possible.
- All renovations should be in strict compliance with the HRA: This key site at the historic Five Corners intersection has benefited from various City interventions on this basis, all based on retention of the heritage dwelling as a historic landmark.
- The Commission strongly requests that the porch be retained, that the roofline and height of the building not be changed, the wood siding and windows frames be retained and that the foundation be retained to respect the heritage nature of the building.
- Mr. Boothroyd had the materials for this building milled in New Westminster and pulled into the construction site.
- Re-cladding the entire house with cement board siding is not supported if all or some of the original wood siding can be retained. It is preferable that unsalvageable pieces be replaced with wood boards in the same profile and module as the original siding. It may be difficult to match the original siding given there are not very many profiles available in "Hardie board". Ideally, the owner would not use concrete

board when there are plenty of wood boards available and these can be milled to match the original wood cladding.

- The height of the services may necessitate special provisions to accommodate a washroom in the basement – the building should not be raised above grade and should retain the same relationship to the ground, as it currently has to preserve its historical character.

In response to questions from the Commission, staff advised:

- Currently there is only a crawl space in the house, which will be deepened to become the basement.
- Discussions related to the review of the building permit drawings suggest that an exterior exit stair may be needed from the top floor, as no sprinkler system is proposed.
- The house was not protected when the owner purchased the house.

It was

Moved by Commissioner Monk

Seconded by Commissioner Stibbs

That since the plans do not reflect the intent or details of the HRA and because the Boothroyd House is located on such a high profile heritage site, the HAC recommends to the General Manager, Planning and Development, that all renovations be in compliance with the HRA, and further, that compliance include, but is not limited to, retaining the existing porch, roofline, and exterior wood siding and trim, with the objective to respect and preserve the heritage character. Any further alterations as shown in the proposed building permit drawings submitted to the HAC on June 26, 2006, will require a Heritage Alteration Permit to assess the impact of the changes to the heritage character of the building.

Carried

3. ENGINEERING

There were no reports from Engineering.

D. CORRESPONDENCE

1. Border Infrastructure Program

File: 0330-20

Letter dated June 15, 2006, regarding Highway 10 Community Open House June 27, 2006, was emailed out the Commission members on June 19, 2006.

A Commission member advised that he attended on behalf of the HAC and stated that there were series of panels that explained the Border Infrastructure Program.

E. INFORMATION ITEMS

1. Gord Tolan

File: 6800-01

Letter dated June 5, 2006 from Mr. Gord Tolan regarding the Grandview Heights School. There was a brief discussion regarding the Grandview Heights School and it was stated that the school is not for sale. It was also stated that this is the only one room schoolhouse that is located at its original site, it is a valuable site and may be used by Parks for an adaptive re-use.

It was Moved by Commissioner Clegg
Seconded by Commissioner Monk
That any correspondence received by the
HAC should receive a response, and further that a letter be written to
Mr. Gord Tolan advising that the HAC share his interest and that the HAC
encourages him to work with his community to save the school.

Carried

2. List of Outstanding Items

The Commission reviewed the list of outstanding items and made the following comments:

- Rolls Carpentry Shop – ongoing.
- Statement of Significance – Bose Farm – Pending.
- Old Yale Road Heritage Register listing – ongoing.
- Heritage Branch Contract – remove, report will be forwarded to Council.
- Hazelmere Village – awaiting input from HAC.
- George E. Lawrence House – Engineering; ongoing.
- 182 Street Neighbourhood – pending.
- Currie House Update – report came back last month.
- 7905-0184-00 – pending.
- Compensation for Loss of Heritage – pending.
- Henry Parr House – pending.
- 1912 Municipal Hall – change name to Five Corners – pending.
- 1891 Lodge Status Report – pending.
- 7902-0389-00 – pending.

F. OTHER COMPETENT BUSINESS**1. Anne A. Hargreaves Letter**

The Senior Planner (Heritage) advised that that the letter was only copied to the HAC. The Commission provided comments stating that although Crescent Road is a Heritage Road it is not HAC mandate as to the City's policy regarding mowing grass on a property.

2. Story Board program

A member of the Commission stated his concern regarding the boundary line between South Surrey and Newton. He stated that the boundary line is Colebrook Road and therefore Colebrook is in South Newton and not in South Surrey and technically Colebrook is in Newton.

3. Scott Road Signage

A member of the Commission stated that when there is a difference of opinion, such as the motions from last meeting regarding the Scott Road signage, it would be best to delay the item until the next meeting when more members are present.

4. Summer BBQ

A member of the Commission advised that she would like to host a BBQ at her house for the Commission in July and that she will advise of a date that is most suitable.

5. Friend of the Trail

A member of the Commission advised that the Friends of the Trail had applied for a grant to Evergreen (supported by Home Depot) and have received cash and services totaling \$11,000 for the upkeep of the Trail.

6. Heritage Society of B.C.

A member of the Commission advised that Dr. Stibbs was in attendance on behalf of SHAC at the Heritage Society of B.C.'s annual conference in Nanaimo in early June and suggested an update be provided at the next meeting.

G. NEXT MEETING

The next meeting of the Heritage Advisory Commission is scheduled for July 19, 2006 in the Mayor's Executive Boardroom at 9:00 a.m. Please note that there is no Heritage Advisory Commission meeting for the month of August.

H. ADJOURNMENT

It was

meeting do now adjourn.

Moved by Councillor Higginbotham
Seconded by Commissioner Clegg
That the Heritage Advisory Commission

Carried

The Heritage Advisory Commission adjourned at 12:45 p.m.

Margaret Jones, City Clerk

Hazel Lindenbach, Chairperson
Surrey Heritage Advisory Commission