



City of Surrey

Surrey Heritage Advisory Commission Minutes/Notes

Executive Boardroom
City Hall
14245 - 56 Avenue
Surrey, B.C.
WEDNESDAY, JULY 25, 2007
Time: 9:02 a.m.

Present:

Chair - H. Lindenbach
Councillor Hibbinbotham
D. Bowyer
A. Clegg
R. Fuller
C. Johnston
W. Tracey

Absent:

J. Monk
S. Sidhu
M. Stibbs

Staff Present:

A. Kopystynski, Senior Planner (Heritage)
Planning & Development
Ron Gill, Planner, Planning & Development
B. Sommer, Parks, Recreation and Culture
C. Bonneville, Recording Secretary
N. Dyrbye, Recording Secretary

A. ADOPTION OF MINUTES

Commission is requested to pass a motion adopting the minutes as circulated.

1. Heritage Advisory Commission Minutes

The minutes of the Surrey Heritage Advisory Commission of June 27, 2007 were deferred to the next meeting.

B. DELEGATIONS

C. NEW BUSINESS

1. Annual Conference of Heritage Canada in October 11 –14 in Edmonton.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

It was
Moved by Commissioner Bowyer
Seconded by Commissioner Johnston
That the Surrey Heritage Advisory
Commission (SHAC) recommends that Council approve one Heritage
Commissioner to attend the Heritage Canada - Annual Conference in Edmonton,
Alberta, from October 11 through to the 14, 2007 and that all expenses be
approved in accordance with Council policy.
Carried

D. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

E. REPORTS**1. PARKS, RECREATION & CULTURE****(a) Brownsville Park Bar Kiosk**

The Manager, Heritage Services provided the comments regarding the above issue:

- The storyboard at the Brownsville Park Bar Kiosk were stolen; totally removed.
- Heritage Services is filing a report with the RCMP and may be able to report to the SHAC that the Boards have been replaced.

It was suggested that aluminum frame be changed to steel on the newly installed story boards.

2. PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

The meeting was varied to deal with the following item.

**e. Status Report on the Baron von MacKensen House
(File No. 6800-10-HAC; 7905-0288-00; 7904-0077-00)**

The Senior Planner (Heritage) provide a memo and a structural Assessment Report prepared by the owner's engineer for the Commission's review and provided the following comment:

- The SHAC has been given regular reports about the status of security and restoration of the Baron von MacKenson house.
- Separate permits are being pursued for exterior and interior restorations.
- The owner's architect has submitted final heritage revitalization agreement plans for exterior restorations. The building permit application is being review by Building staff against the requirements in the heritage revitalization agreement (HRA);
- Scaffolding has been erected around the building in preparation for starting restorations once the building permit is issued;
- Asbestos abatement has been completed. Unfortunately, the majority of the interior walls were removed before a permit for interior works was submitted."
- However, the key elements (e.g. the interior stairwell and flooring materials) are intact or stored.
- The abatement process revealed some unexpected structural matters that will affect the restoration strategy, including:
 - A foundation suggesting an earlier house under the existing one.
 - The second storey on the western end of the house was an addition above the original roofline, possibly done by the Baron as part of the two-storey addition to the eastern end of the structure.

- There are some significant structural concerns requiring more significant intervention than originally envisioned. These include a proposal to disassemble the roof and upper floor and reconstruct it to the current code.
- With respect to security, there are workers on-site during the day, and after hours there is an on-site security guard.
- Staff has discussed concerns, the degree of intervention being proposed and the potential that a HAP may be required before the structural work can be done. Consequently, the need for a second opinion, paid for by the developer, is necessary.

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

- The original HRA was based on historical information and assumptions about how the building was constructed as was available at the time.. Structural issues were uncovered during part of the abatement process.
- All of the interior was photographed prior to being altered.
- There is no stop work order on the site.
- The question for the Commission is ‘whether to proceed with the restoration based on the structural engineer’s report or whether a second option is required to determined if an approach more sensitive to the heritage fabric can be done’.
- The developer is prepared to obtain another opinion.
- Depending on the degree of intervention to be taken, the HRA may need to be taken back to Council for amendment. Staff has authority to approve minor amendments.
- Having a list of engineers and architects that would assist in Heritage alterations or approve Heritage building improvement.
- The second opinion should not take any longer then two weeks.

Comments from the Commission members were as follows:

- Putting a stop work order on the house is not the answer; we need to have the restorations done as soon as possible before the building is lost. Keep the façade and the outside of the building as the original building.
- We need to advise the developer to get another opinion.
- The developer, it was feared, could approach with another thing (e.g. the foundation) and then the building will end up being a replica.
- Assessment of structural integrity needs to be done by a combination of an architect and engineer with expertise in heritage conservation.
- Consider adding qualification requirements in to the agreement for firms that should be contracted for restorations and/or alterations.
- SHAC is mainly concern about the exterior of the building; however in this case the interior is affecting the exterior of the building.
- SHAC should tour the building with the architect and engineer who undertake the second assessment.
- An email be provided of a day by day action made by the developer.

The Senior Planner (Heritage) stated daily progress reports from staff would not be possible.

It was Moved by Commissioner Johnston
Seconded by Commissioner Bowyer
That the SHAC provide comments
on the proposed restorations to the Acting General Manager of the
Planning and Development, including that the owner insures that:

- a. The consultants retained and pay for a sub-consultant from the list that is attached to the memo that has experienced with restoration of heritage building, to submit a report to the SHAC as a second option on the structural condition of the building and the best option for structural work and restoration to best retain the heritage fabric of then Baron House;
- b. The consultants and contractors used for restoration by fully familiar with and apply the heritage conservation standards approved by Council for conserving heritage building in Surrey;
- c. An architect acceptable to the SHAC be appointed an be on site to supervise restorations;
- d. Code equivalencies are to be applied to the maximum extent to insure that the heritage character and the heritage value of the Baron House is retained and enhanced; and
- e. There be periodic site meeting between staff and the consultant's architect and contractor to monitor the progress of the restorations;
- f. That the time frame of a second opinion be provided within one week and that a consultant be available for a SHAC site inspection.

Carried

A discussion ensued regarding developing a list of architects and engineers that specialize in heritage restoration and rehabilitation. It was noted that there is a clause within the Heritage Revitalization Agreements ('HRA').

It was Moved by Commissioner Bowyer
Seconded by Commissioner Tracy
That the SHAC recommends to the General
Manager, Planning & Development that HRAs include a clause that
requires consultants and contractors to be used for restoration to be fully
familiar with and apply the heritage conservation standards approved by
Council for conserved heritage building in Surrey and that a statement of
that effect be provided in the information related to requirements for
development application submission requirements to the City for HRA,
HAP, or similar applications.

Carried

This item was dealt with again later in the meeting.

a. Proposed 3-storey, 154-unit, seniors housing/care facility building at 15024 – 24th Avenue (Project No. 7906-0435-00)

There was a memo from the Manager, Area Planning and Development Division, South Division.

The Senior Planner (Heritage) provided the following comments:

- The Commission was referred to a table in which summarized the developer's responses to HAC concerns as follows:
 - The applicant has agreed to permit the City to relocate the Trail such that it is entirely on City property and to fund this Trail relocation.
 - That no portion of the internal walkway will enter the 10 metre buffer area along Semiahmoo Trail.
 - The massing of the structure has been reduced from 4-storeys to 3-storeys, the total number of units reduced from 197 to 154 and that the building will step down to 2-storeys where it is closest to the trail.
 - That the applicant has agreed that there will be no change of the natural grade within the 10 meter buffer area.
 - That the proposed building will be shifted 1 meter further to the west, away from Semiahmoo Trail and closer to the existing church. The project architect contends this is the maximum possible in order to have a reasonable transition between the two properties, for fire safety and to accommodate the entrance driveway.
 - That the developer will work with staff and the Friends of Semiahmoo Trail to retain more trees on the site.
- The main heritage issue is how to ensure an adequate interface between the development and the Trail.
- With regard to public process about density and land use concerns associated with the rezoning proposal, the procedure is a letter are sent to the public in the surrounding area about the proposed development area shown and residents can then bring up their concerns to the City.
- If an application proceeds to By-law Introduction, a Public Hearing is held to allow residents to address their concerns directly to Council.

Comments from the Commission members were as follows:

- The massing of the building compared to the school and church is gigantic and dwarfs everything else around it. It is much too massive and does not fit in this area.
- Friends of Semiahmoo Trail and residents living in the area do not want the building there.
- There has not been enough done to move the building a sufficient distance away from the Trail.
- The proposed building is to be built 42 feet from the edge of the Trail.

- There have been many compromises made for the building, it would be good to have a place for seniors.
- There are currently traffic issues and this building will promote an even bigger lack of parking and more congestion.
- There have been 104 trees already removed and 14 remain.
- That the concentration should be on the preservation of the Trail and the rest of the issues should be brought to Council.

Commissioner Johnson left the meeting at 10:55 a.m.

It was Moved by Commissioner Fuller
 Seconded by Commissioner Tracey
 That the Surrey Heritage Advisory
 Commission recommend to the Acting General Manager, Planning and
 Development endorses the proposed interface treatment between the
 proposed seniors housing/care facility building and the Semiahmoo Trail.
Carried with Commissioner Clegg and
 Councillor Higginbotham opposed.

Commissioner Johnson re-entered the meeting at 10:57 a.m.

b. Inclusion of a remaining corner lot into an approved bare land strata subdivision (Park Lane) (File No. 7907-0192-00)

This item was dealt with later in the meeting.

c. Request to be Placed on the Surrey Heritage Register and to Seek Heritage Protection.

(13565 56 Avenue)

(File No. 6800-01-HAC; 6800-20-203)

Memo provided by Senior Planner (Heritage).

The Senior Planner (Heritage) provided the following comments:

- That the owners of property at 13565 56 Avenue expressed interest in being added to the Surrey heritage Register; and
- That it is proposed the roofing of the building be replaced. The existing roof is cedar shakes.

A sample of an alternate composite material for roofing was available on table for the Commissioners to inspect.

Comments from the Commission members were as follows:

- It was agreed that the Commissioners would like to keep the roofing wood as opposed to the proposed composite material brought to table.

It was Moved by Commissioner Bowyer
Seconded by Commissioner Clegg
That the Surrey Heritage Advisory
Commission recommend to the Acting General Manager of Planning and
Development:

1. That the property at 13565 56 Avenue be added to the Surrey Heritage Inventory;
2. That a consultant be retained to assist in the preparation of a Surrey Heritage Evaluation Worksheet which will be forwarded to a future Surrey Heritage Advisory Commission meeting to determine whether to recommend the property be added to the Surrey Heritage Register; and
3. That the proposed simulated slate material is not acceptable replacement roofing for this proposed heritage house, as it is not keeping with the heritage home requirements.

Carried

It was Moved by Commissioner Johnston
Seconded by Commissioner Tracey
That the SHAC recommend to the Acting
General Manager, Planning & Development that if required, that the
SHAC recommend to Council that up to \$300 from the SHAC budget be
set aside for this study.

Carried

d. John Sedgewick House

(7172 – 184 Street to 5441 – 184 Street)
(File No. 6800-10-HAC; 6800-20-203)

Memo provided by the Senior Planner (Heritage).

It was Moved by Commissioner Clegg
Seconded by Councilor Higginbotham
That the Surrey Heritage Advisory
Commission receive this memo and advise the Acting General Manager of
Planning and Development to:

1. Encourage the owners of 5441 – 184 Street to move the John Sedgewick House from 7172 – 184 Street to 5441 – 184 Street;
2. Should this happen, forward a heritage revitalization agreement for moving, restoring and maintaining the Sedgewick House to the SHAC for consideration;
3. Recommend, consistent with the policies of the Official Community Plan (the OCP), that Council consider allowing zoning at densities slightly higher than otherwise permitted in the OCP in order to zone the property at 5441 – 184 Street to accommodate a subdivision for the Sedgewick House; and
4. Once the Sedgewick House is moved, that the SHAC advise Council that it supports removing the property at 7172 – 184 Street

from, and adding the property at 5441 – 184 Street to the Surrey Heritage Register.

Carried

C. NEW BUSINESS (continued)

1. Staffing

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

It was Moved by Commissioner Bowyer
Seconded by Commissioner Johnston
That whereas the support to the SHAC by Planning and Development Department in the 2003 Heritage Management Plan assumed the allocation of half the time of one staff member, however the current heritage planner is working full time on heritage matters, and

Whereas the SHAC is dealing with ever more challenging heritage matters as part of its mandate and as an outcome of the recently approved 2007 - 2008 Work Program; as referred to the SHAC by Council; as presented by Staff in development applications; and, as directed or endorsed by Council for SHAC to provide advice;

Whereas the staff support to the SHAC from Planning and Development Department has not changed although the workload has significantly increased; and,

The SHAC recommends that Council make provision within next year's budget to increase planning staffing from one to two full time equivalent planners to insure both SHAC support and policy development envisioned in the Heritage Management Plan and the 2007 - 2008 Work program can be achieved.

Carried

Commissioner Bowyer left the meeting at 11:10 a.m.

2. PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT (continued)

b. Inclusion of a remaining corner lot into an approved bare land strata subdivision (Park Lane) (File No. 7907-0192-00)

Memo provided by the Manager, Area Planning and Development Division, South Division.

The Senior Planner (Heritage) provided the following comments:

- An additional property is being added to allow the Park Lane development to be completed.

- That there is an existing heritage alteration permit, already reviewed by SHAC and approved by Council, which allows for alterations to be done to Crescent Road and Elgin Roads in front of the development
- With the addition of other lot, the heritage alteration permit needs to reflect the continuation of the proposed pedestrian walkway, tree plantings and removal of two unstable trees in front of the lot being incorporated into the townhouse development. i.

It was Moved by Councillor Higginbotham
Seconded by Commissioner Fuller
That the Commission receive this memo as information and recommends to the Acting General Manager, Planning and Development, that it supports the proposed amendment to the Heritage Alteration Permit and the proposed tree removal.

Carried

3. ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT

a. Semiahmoo Trail South of 32nd Avenue File: 6800-01-HAC

Memo provided by the Transportation Manager.

The Engineering Department made the following comments:

- The concept is that only residents, city forces/contractors and emergency service providers would have a code to open the gate.
- It is an open road at the moment with access to 12 homes on a cul-de-sac.
- They met internally with Friends of Semiahmoo Trail and concluded that the gate was an appropriate treatment there.

They put forward a chart explaining the expected outcome for various approaches and the gate option seems to be the most viable of them all.

- The gate installation is subject to a Heritage Alteration Permit.
- They questioned whether making the trail look like a paved driveway was a good temporary approach.
- They would like a second choice from the Commission as an alternative to the gate option.

Comments from the Commission members were as follows:

- The Commission Members were in agreement with the gate option for Semiahmoo Trail.
- The Commission agreed that a good second choice to the gate option was that of traffic calming.

Councillor Higginbotham left the meeting at 11:25 a.m. at which time quorum was lost, and notes were taken for the remainder of the meeting.

2. PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT (continued)

e. Status Report on the Baron von MacKensen House (File No. 6800-10-HAC; 7905-0288-00; 7904-0077-00)

The Senior Planner (Heritage) provided the additional following comments:

- The general contractor working for the developer made an inquiry at the counter as the HAC was meeting.
- There was concern expressed whether another Engineer could inspect the Baron von MacKensen House and provide a report to determine problems and action plans within one week as requested by the HAC.
- The contractor also noted that he cannot afford to have his crews tied up and waiting on whether or not to do repairs to the Baron von MacKensen house, he may simply take his crew and moving them to another project.
- Among the work that the contractor wishes to proceed with as soon as possible include:
 1. Remove the roof assembly and salvage wood for re-use as false rafters on interior. Re-build new roof assembly including all gables, dormers and other massing to replicate the Baron's residence;
 2. Remove the second floor hinged walls and replace with full height engineered walls. Salvage and re-use wood for display features. Re-build the second floor walls using current engineered materials and codes.
 3. Remove the second floor and replace with engineered floor system. Salvage and re-use wood for windows and millwork features. Re-build floor using current engineered materials and systems to provide the structural diaphragm required as long as #2 is not done in advance.
 4. Remove brick fireplaces, salvage and re-use brick for new fireplaces inside and out to replicate original.

Additional comments from the Commission members were as follows:

- Unless there were no alternatives, the HAC is not supportive any of these alterations. The historic fabric of the Barron House is to be retained as part of any necessary structural work.
- That with respect to point #3, it was agreed to hold off on millwork and exterior frames of the building.
- According to comments from the contractor, the historic appearance will not be changed, but the degree of alteration is like creating a replica.

- That digression for assessing the work to be done and best retention of the heritage fabric be granted to the Planning and Development Department.
- That it is preferred that a stop work order be put into place until all matters are resolved, including whether this work would need a heritage alteration permit.

F. OTHER BUSINESS

1. AAC Farm Tour

There was a discussion regarding the Agriculture Advisory Committee ('AAC') Farm Tour, and it was suggested that staff review partnering with the AAC on their next farm tour.

2. Budget

A discussion ensued regarding the budget and it was determined that the Financial Advisor would attend the next SHAC meeting to discuss financial issues.

G. CORRESPONDENCE

H. INFORMATION ITEMS

1. Updated List of Outstanding Items

This item was deferred to the next SHAC meeting of September.

I. NEXT MEETING

The next meeting of the Surrey Heritage Advisory Commission is scheduled for September 26, 2007, at 9:00 a.m. in the Mayor's Executive Boardroom at City Hall.

J. ADJOURNMENT

At the time of adjournment, there was no Quorum.

The Surrey Heritage Advisory Commission adjourned at 12:09 p.m.

Margaret Jones, City Clerk

Hazel Lindenbach, Chairperson
Surrey Heritage Advisory Commission