



City of Surrey

Surrey Heritage Advisory Commission Minutes

Planning Boardroom #1
City Hall
14245 - 56 Avenue
Surrey, B.C.
WEDNESDAY, MARCH 18, 2009
Time: 5:04 p.m.

Present:

Chair - Councillor Steele
W. Farrand
J. Foulkes
R. Hart
B. Hol (5:13 p.m.)
H. Lindenbach
B. Paton
L. Tannen
W. Tracey

Absent:

Guests:

K. Broersma, Planning & Development
J. Bliss, President of Surrey Historical Society
Guest

Staff Present:

J. McLeod, Planning & Development
E. Schultz, Planning & Development
J. O'Donnell, Parks, Recreation and Culture
M. Petrovic, Engineering
N. Dyrbye, Legislative Services

A. ADOPTION OF MINUTES

It was

Moved by Commissioner Tannen
Seconded by Commissioner Paton
That the minutes of the Surrey Heritage
Advisory Commission of February 18, 2009 be adopted, as circulated.
Carried

B. DELEGATIONS

C. CORPORATE REPORTS

1. PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

(a) White Rock Seventh-Day Adventist Church – 16017 – 8th Avenue

Memo dated February 13, 2009 from the Manager, Long Range Planning
& Policy Development.

This item was dealt with after item C.1(c).

On February 10, 2009, the Planning and Development Department
received a letter from an architect who was retained by the Church to
assess their building and land. He was asked to determine the feasibility
of repairing, upgrading to code, and moving and adding to their existing
building.

The architect has concluded that:

1. The building in its current state is unsafe, is a health risk and should no longer be used by the Church. The Church has followed this recommendation and will not be using the building.
2. Whether the building is moved or left in its present state, repairing and upgrading is not financially feasible given its advanced state of deterioration.

As a result of these findings, the Church is requesting that the building be removed from the Surrey Heritage Register and that the Church be permitted to demolish the building. The Church would sell the land to enable it to move to another site.

The White Rock Seventh-Day Adventist Church is on the City of Surrey's Heritage Register. This enables the City withhold the issuance of a demolition permit for 60 days, during which time the site can be evaluated in more detail, and discussions can take place with the owner. The City cannot prevent the demolition of the Church after this "temporary protection" period has elapsed. The Seventh-Day Adventist Church has not yet applied for a demolition permit; however, it appears that it is their intent to do so.

Assessment of the Seventh-Day Adventist Church:

City staff performed a site visit and preliminary inspection of the building on March 5, 2009. Apart from some rot in the sill of one of the windows at the rear of the building, an unfinished joint between the chimney and the bevel siding, some broken cladding at the concrete foundation wall on the east side and the removal of rainwater leaders (resulting in runoff water being channeled along the foundation), the building appears to be in relatively good condition. The cedar shingle roof and soffits on the original parts of the building, and general paintwork appear to be in particularly good shape.

The Church appears to be interested in selling the property as a vacant development site. One option that could be considered by the HAC is to retain a suitably qualified registered professional to provide a review of the initial assessment of the structure and to undertake an independent assessment of the structural integrity of the Seventh Day Adventist Church. If the structural integrity warrants, staff and the HAC could explore options for retention of the building while taking into account the needs of the congregation.

Conclusion

Given the time sensitivity of this matter, it is recommended that the Heritage Advisory Commission allocate funds from its budget for a complete, independent assessment of the structural integrity of the Seventh Day Adventist Church.

The Commission made the following comments:

- Question was raised as to whether there is money in the SHAC budget for an independent assessment and what the cost of this may be.
- It seems that this is an issue that keeps coming up and the process must be flawed when there is nothing the Commission or the City can do to protect heritage buildings from demolition.
- It is the Commission's goal to protect heritage but there needs to be a line drawn at what the cost of protecting heritage should be. If the owners have their mind set on having the building demolished, then no matter how much money is spent on an independent assessment, there is nothing that can be done to save the building.

The following comments were made in response to the Commission:

- The annual SHAC budget can be used for this type of activity and has been used in the past for the George Lawrence House. The City is in the position that if the applicant applies for a demolition permit, there will be 60 days in which the City can attempt to negotiate with the owner to save the building, but the owners ultimately have the right to demolish.
- The City would hate to see the Church demolished without determining the condition of the building and attempting negotiations with the owners to see whether there would be someone interested in buying the property to save the building from being demolished.

Commissioner Hol arrived at the meeting at 5:13 p.m.

The Commission made the following additional comments:

- Perhaps the cost associated with an independent assessment should come out of the City's budget as opposed to the Commission's budget. Whatever the case, this is a significant heritage building, in a prominent location and we need to do everything possible to try to save this building.
- Suggestion was made that the Commission look into changing the legislation to improve the processes and to have more money available to deal with these types of situations.
- If the building ends up being demolished, perhaps there is some way to recoup the money from the loss of heritage from a possible re-zoning application for the property.
- There is nothing that the City can do to protect the building other than negotiate so spending taxpayers' money to assess the building when it will most likely be demolished anyway is not supported.

The following additional comments were made in response to the Commission:

- The City can address the Commission's concerns with the applicant when they apply for a demolition permit and see whether this may have any affect. The problem that we have is that since the property is not designated, there is not much else that can be done under the current legislation.
- In order for this building to be protected, Council would have to pass a bylaw to have it designated, but in this case, the property is private and Council does not have jurisdiction over private properties.

It was

Moved by Commissioner Lindenbach
Seconded by Commissioner Foulkes
Opposed by Commissioner Hart
That the Surrey Heritage Advisory

Commission request that the General Manager, Planning and Development, direct staff to obtain quotes for an independent assessment of the White Rock Seventh-Day Adventist Church located at 16017 – 8th Avenue and at staff's discretion, choose a consultant on behalf of the Commission to perform an assessment of the building.

Carried

(b) Heritage Alteration Permit 7909-0028-00 for interior and exterior changes to the former South Westminster School

Memo dated March 2, 2009 from the Manager, Long Range Planning & Policy Development.

The South Westminster School is located at 12469 – 104th Avenue. Built in 1914, the Tudor Revival/Carpenter Gothic style building features open raked eaves, two prominent cross gables and lower porch gable with fake half timbering on end supported by triangular carved brackets. The building is currently being used as St. Mary's Coptic Orthodox Church, and will also be used as a Montessori School once renovations have been completed.

The Heritage Revitalization Agreement (HRA) that protects South Westminster School (By-law No. 16072) was adopted by Council on June 11, 2007 and requires that:

Prior to a building permit being issued for any alteration, including the restoration of the exterior or interior of the South Westminster School, the Owner shall apply to the City for a Heritage Alteration Permit (HAP).

In most cases, after an application for a HAP is received, the HAP will be considered for issuance by City Council upon the recommendation of the General Manger of Planning and Development and the Heritage Advisory Commission, or by a City official delegated by City Council. In this case, numerous changes to the South Westminster School were made without the necessary HAP nor building permits being in place. The City became

aware of the alterations to the property when the owners sought to obtain final occupancy for the building and were unable to do so without the necessary permits.

For the most part, the character defining elements on both the exterior and the interior of the building were left intact during the renovations. Numerous changes have been made to the interior of the School to better address the space needs of the building's occupants. The interior of the building is not subject to protection with the exception of the following elements which are to be retained in accordance with the HRA:

- *The push button light switch on the west wall at the front entrance.*
- *Allowing sample segments of the fieldstone foundation to remain exposed in the basement.*

While the non-functioning push button light switch was initially removed during the renovation, the owners have agreed to restore it in its original location. Sample segments of the fieldstone foundation were retained during the renovations as per the HRA.

The Conservation Plan which forms a part of the Heritage Revitalization Agreement for the School stipulates that:

If windows are to be altered, replace the metal with wood windows in the original proportions and locations as seen in historical photographs.

The metal windows in the building, which were not original, have instead been replaced with white vinyl windows. This is not in accordance with the requirements set forth in the HRA. In addition, two new vinyl windows were added to the lower portion of the building to allow enough light into the space to permit it to be used by the Montessori School.

In addition to the changes that have already been completed, the applicant has also proposed, and is required, to add a ramp for accessibility purposes. This work has not yet been completed but will be once the HAP and Building Permit is issued.

Discussion:

Because the majority of the work has been completed, the Owner is required to apply for a HAP and Building Permit retroactively. While the majority of the changes have had no impact on the protected elements of the building, the addition of the vinyl windows has raised concern.

Staff from the City's Planning and Development and Legal Departments have met with the owners to discuss possible solutions. The owners are eager to obtain final occupancy to allow their new tenant, the Montessori School, to move into the building. They believe that the alterations they

have made to the building have improved its integrity and safety and have noted that having a tenant occupying the space during the week, when the church is not using the building, will improve safety of the site.

Staff support the adaptive reuse of heritage buildings, and recognize the importance of ensuring that the building is inhabited and secured. As such, staff have agreed to proceed with preparation of the HAP. However, the processing of the HAP application is conditional upon the issue of the windows being resolved as part of another pending application for the site or within five years time.

Staff recommend that the vinyl windows be replaced with wood windows in their original proportions in accordance with the HRA. Due to their financial circumstances at this time, however, the church has advised that it would be extremely difficult for them to replace the vinyl windows with the required wooden windows at this time. As the church is intending to undertake further additions to the building in several years, they have suggested as a compromise that the vinyl windows be allowed to remain on a temporary basis, but that they be removed and replaced with wood windows at the time of the addition to the building which is anticipated in the future and which will require a further Heritage Alteration Permit.

While the owners are open to this solution, they would prefer to replace only those windows that are visible from the front of the building due to the cost involved. Staff recommend that instead, a HAP can be issued which clearly sets out that all vinyl windows are temporary, and that they must be replaced with wood windows in their original proportions at the time of the future additions to the building or within five years time. If at that time the owners of the building can make a case, based on the proposed design, that not all windows need to be replaced, this proposal can be considered.

Conclusion:

It is recommended that staff prepare a report to Council recommending that Council consider issuing Heritage Alteration Permit No. 7909-0028-00 to allow for the alterations to the buildings, based on the following:

1. That the HAC advise the General Manager, Planning and Development, that the HAC supports the preparation of a report to Council recommending that a Heritage Alteration Permit be considered by Council that would allow for the following renovations to the South Westminster School:
 - (a) Replacement of the existing single-pane metal frame windows on the south, east, and west elevations of the School with double-pane vinyl windows on a temporary basis, PROVIDED THAT the temporary vinyl windows shall be replaced with wood windows (as further detailed in

the Heritage Instrument) to the satisfaction of the City Architect by the sooner of:

- (1) Completion of a further renovation or addition to the School pursuant to a subsequent Heritage Alteration Permit applied for and issued for the Lands, or;
 - (2) Five years from the date of issuance of this Permit, such replacement to be carried out upon application for an issuance of a Heritage Alteration Permit for the work;
- (b) Addition of two 0.91 meter (3 ft.) x 0.91 meter (3 ft.) windows on the west lower floor elevation of the School;
 - (c) Replacement of existing interior wood staircase with steel staircase and handrail inside front entrance of the School;
 - (d) Installation of fire alarm system in the School;
 - (e) Installation of security system in the School;
 - (f) Installation of new hot water tank in the School;
 - (g) Upgrading and changing of interior walls, flooring, ceilings, lighting, paint and other upgrading associated with changes necessary for the adaptive reuse of the School;
 - (h) Addition of new hedges and plants at the south end of the Lands and general landscape improvements;
 - (i) Addition of a play area enclosed with chain link fencing to the Lands at rear of the School on north elevation;
 - (j) Addition of wooden cross to entrance dormer on south elevation of the School; and
 - (k) Addition of a ramp and handrails to allow for accessibility on the west elevation of the School.

The Commission made the following comments:

- Concern was raised regarding the sustainability issues with putting in wooden windows as opposed to the vinyl windows.
- Question was raised as to why the Church didn't know what was expected of them in terms of renovations and went ahead without the proper permits in place.
- Question was raised regarding whether these owners could be faced with fines for not ensuring proper permits were in place before the renovation were done, especially with this property being subject to a HRA.

- Comment was made that this building should not be singled out for having vinyl windows instead of wood ones as there are many other heritage buildings that have upgraded to vinyl windows. The standards should be made the same across the board for all buildings.

The following comments were made in response to the Commission:

- In this particular instance, the property changed hands and the new owners did not comply with the HRA on the building. The good news, however, is that this building is being retained and re-used.
- The City can deny occupancy until the required changes are made. In this case, the City is doing a permit after the fact.
- There are reasons this building has the specification for wooden windows as opposed to other heritage buildings. The owners are required as part of the HRA to replace the windows with wood framed ones.

It was

Moved by Commissioner Hol
Seconded by Commissioner Foulkes
That the Surrey Heritage Advisory

Commission accepts the recommendations suggested by staff for the South Westminster School.

Carried

(c) Further Proposed Amendments to the Semiahmoo Trail Design Guidelines

Memo dated March 2, 2009 from the Manger, Long Range Planning & Policy Development.

This item was dealt with first on the Agenda.

It is recommended that the Heritage Advisory Commission support the addition of the following further proposed amendments to the “Design Standards” section of the Semiahmoo Trail Design Guidelines:

Development Standards on Private Land Abutting the Semiahmoo Trail

- *Prior to the issuance of a permit for tree removal, building or any other development on a property abutting the Semiahmoo Trail, the applicant shall place temporary signage facing the Trail to identify that construction traffic is not to use the Semiahmoo Trail, to the satisfaction of the General Manager, Planning and Development.*
- *Where tree removal is required to provide for development, prior to obtaining a Tree Cutting Permit, the applicant is required to install tree protection barriers around the entire 10-meter wide*

landscape buffer area, to the satisfaction of the General Manager, Planning and Development.

- *Prior to obtaining a Building Permit for any construction of buildings, the applicant is to complete the installation of landscaping and split-rail fencing within the 10-meter wide landscape buffer area along the Semiahmoo Trail to the satisfaction of the General Manager, Planning and Development.*

To address these issues, the Semiahmoo Trail Design Guidelines could be further amended to clarify that **prior to issuance any Tree Cutting or Building Permit**, the applicant install signage facing the Semiahmoo Trail to identify that construction traffic is not to use the Semiahmoo Trail.

In addition, staff are recommending that **prior to issuance of a Tree Cutting Permit**, the applicant install protective tree barrier-type fencing around the landscape buffer area. These measures will demonstrate that the buffer area is not to be disturbed, and that no vehicular access is permitted through the buffer area. Additionally, in accordance with the previously proposed amendments, prior to Building Permit issuance the applicant will be required to completely install the landscaping and split-rail fencing within the 10-meter wide landscape buffer area.

Where servicing is required on the Semiahmoo Trail, a Heritage Alteration Permit is required, and construction traffic would be permitted on the Trail in these limited instances. All other construction traffic is required to use alternate routes to the development site for installation of services, site grading, land clearing and house construction. At the Pre-Construction meeting with the Engineering Department, the developer will be notified that construction traffic is not a permitted use of the Semiahmoo Trail.

The following comments were made:

- The Commission was provided with a presentation in January on the Semiahmoo Trail and many ideas were suggested concerning the protection buffer for the area prior to servicing.

Commissioner Hart arrived at the meeting at 5:07 p.m.

- Essentially, the idea is to use the Tree Cutting Permit as a lever to protect the area from the start. As well, Building Permits will not be issued until the fence is up and protection around the landscaped areas is provided.
- The City has also had meetings with the Friends of the Semiahmoo Trail who are in support of the new changes to the Guidelines.

The Commission made the following comments:

- Staff should be commended for their hard work to improve the Guidelines.

- It is a very good idea that can help eliminate problems along the Trail to ensure that Building Permits are not issued until the split-rail fence is constructed and landscape protection in place.

It was Moved by Commissioner Tannen
Seconded by Commissioner Hart
That the Surrey Heritage Advisory
Commission approves the proposed changes to the Semiahmoo Trail Guidelines.
Carried

K. Broersma left the meeting at 5:09 p.m.

(d) Verbal Updates

i. Conditions on issuance of demolition permits for heritage buildings

The following comments were made:

- Staff has liaised with the Legal Department at the request of the Commission, and it has been determined that with respect to requesting conditions through the issuance of demolition permits, the City can ask for them but they cannot be required. The City would not legally be able to withhold a demolition permit because the applicant refuses to meet a request.

ii. George Lawrence House

The following comments were made:

- The City has received an application for the property on which the George Lawrence House is situated – on Fraser Highway and 184th Street. The applicant has advised that they are prepared to renovate the building and use it as an amenity building for the proposed townhouse development. However, they also would like to move the building from its current location to a more central location on the site.
- Staff and Area Planning will be working with the applicant to ensure that the building will be properly preserved. As well, the applicant has agreed to ensure that the work they do will be green and sustainable.

The Commission made the following comments:

- Question was raised as to the placement of the George Lawrence House on the site and whether it would be visible from outside of the development and whether the surrounding development will have a heritage look to it.

The following comments were made in response to the Commission:

- This application will be coming to the Commission in a report form when the particulars are worked out for their review and approval. Staff will be working with the applicant to ensure that this development is sensitive to the heritage of the George Lawrence House.

iii. Heritage Oak Trees on King George Highway

The following comments were made:

- Further to the Commission's enquiry, there will be more Oak trees planted along King George Highway, and the plaques for these trees have been ordered.

The Commission made the following comments:

- Question was raised as to whether the cost for the plaques will be coming out of the Commission's or the City's budget.

The following comments were made in response to the Commission:

- Staff will check into where the money for the plaques will be coming from and report back to the Commission.

iv. Camp Alexandra

The following comments were made:

- The City had a previous zoning bylaw under which a number of properties are still covered. Camp Alexandra is still covered by this particular bylaw, and therefore they are not required to have the property rezoned in order to have it used as a school for autistic children.

v. Kensington Prairie School

The following comments were made:

- A Designation Bylaw has been drafted for Kensington Prairie School and will hopefully be brought to Council for their consideration in April.

The Commission made the following comments:

- It was noted that there are some problems with the current eaves troughs where it appears that water is going into the building.

The following comments were made in response to the Commission:

- Staff will pass this information along to the property managers so they can look into rectifying the eaves troughs.

2. LEGISLATIVE SERVICES

(a) Hazelmere United Church – Application for Financial Assistance

Letter dated February 20, 2009 from Eleanor Thompson, Treasurer to the Council for Hazelmere.

The Commission made the following comments:

- The applicant is seeking approval for Financial Assistance having provided only one quotation. Three quotes are required as per the Financial Assistance bylaw and special privileges should not be given to the Hazelmere Church when everyone is supposed to comply with the rules of the bylaw.
- By there being only one quotation, the Commission cannot make an informed decision because they have nothing else to compare it with. They need to follow the bylaw and come back with three quotations.

It was Moved by Commissioner Lindenbach
Seconded by Commissioner Hol
That the Surrey Heritage Advisory
Commission receives the Application for Financial Assistance from the
Hazelmere United Church and requests staff to advise the applicant that they must
adhere to the bylaw which states that three quotations are required before the
Commission can consider the application as per the Financial Assistance Bylaw
(No. 15099).

Carried

(b) Anniedale Heritage School

Memo dated March 3, 2009 from Legislative Services.

The following comments were made:

- There are two buildings on the site. The Old Anniedale School is the smaller building and is protected by a designation bylaw.

It is currently being used for special programming rather than regular classes. The school building that is proposed to be closed has been used as a traditional school and is not a heritage building.

- The surrounding area has gone through significant changes with the highway improvements for connections to the new Golden Ears Bridge and through this process, the area has become somewhat isolated. As well, access into the property is difficult and not particularly safe.
- A report will be going to Council March 30, 2009 concerning this matter. Staff will also have the opportunity to work with the school board on this issue, but it looks like the building will end up needing to be moved.

D. CORRESPONDENCE

It was

Moved by Commissioner Paton

Seconded by Commissioner Tracey

That the following correspondence items be

received.

Carried

1. Heritage Week – February 16 – 22, 2009

Letter dated February 13, 2009 from the City Clerk.

E. INFORMATION ITEMS

It was

Moved by Commissioner Hart

Seconded by Commissioner Tannen

That the Surrey Heritage Advisory

Commission receives the following information items:

Carried

1. Fraser Valley Heritage Railway – Notification of Annual General Meeting

2. Heritage BC Quarterly Magazine – Winter 2009

(To be provided on table at the meeting).

3. Heritage Workshop

REMINDER – Heritage Workshop scheduled for **Saturday, March 28, 2009**
in the Pondsides Meeting Room at 9:00 a.m.

F. SUBCOMMITTEE/LIAISON UPDATES

This item to be discussed at the Heritage Workshop.

G. OTHER COMPETENT BUSINESS**1. Friends of the Surrey Museum & Archives Society**

Invitation to become member of Friends of Surrey Museum.

The following comments were made:

- The Surrey Museum is embarking on a new fundraising initiative to sponsor admission for a public pass to the museum. That money will also assist with helping to build their endowment fund.

The Commission made the following comments:

- We need to work on getting more people involved, in particular young people. There must be some way to make more of an impact to get interest in our museum.
- At one time the Commission used to do school events during Heritage Week. This should be something the Commission get involved in again, and also look into incorporating the schools with the museum.
- A more active role needs to be taken by the Commission, and perhaps more involvement with the Surrey Fusion Festival could be one way. As well, having a meeting at the Surrey Museum would be worthwhile, and more effort can be focused on how to promote the museum.

2. Collishaw Farm House

The Commission made the following comments:

- When the Commission went to the Collishaw Farm on the Heritage Bus Tour, the Commission noticed that a large portion of the driveway to the house was impassible due to soil subsidence. The owners are very concerned about this and wanted it brought to the Commission's attention. Likely a survey of the property is needed to see what needs to be done to rectify this problem before there is substantial damage.

The following comments were made in response to the Commission:

- Staff will look into this matter and report back to the Commission.

3. Eco Management Study

The following comments were made:

- At the Ecosystem Management Study meeting, staff presented a map of Surrey, but there seemed to be a lot of heritage elements missing, in particular the Semiahmoo Trail as well as heritage trees throughout the City.

The following comments were made in response to the Commission:

- This process does not necessarily involve looking at the individual built heritage or heritage trees. The goal is to look at vegetated areas in the City and to also identify hubs and sites throughout the City. This project is still early in the process, and the stakeholders have been invited to provide their input and suggestions.
- The goal is to look at the City's inventory and through process, develop management guidelines of how to provide links between the significant vegetated areas. This project is taking on an interesting approach to achieving biodiversity in the City of Surrey.

H. NEXT MEETING

The next meeting of the Heritage Advisory Commission is scheduled for April 29, 2009 in the Executive Boardroom – 5:00 p.m.

I. ADJOURNMENT

It was

Moved by Commissioner Hart
Seconded by Commissioner Tannen
That the Surrey Heritage Advisory

Commission meeting do no adjourn.

Carried

The Surrey Heritage Advisory Commission adjourned at 7:08 p.m.

Jane Sowik, City Clerk

Councillor Steele, Chairperson
Surrey Heritage Advisory Commission