



City of Surrey

Surrey Heritage Advisory Commission Minutes

Executive Boardroom
City Hall
14245 - 56 Avenue
Surrey, B.C.
WEDNESDAY, APRIL 29, 2009
Time: 5:10 p.m.

Present:

Chair - Councillor Steele
W. Farrand
J. Foulkes
R. Hart
B. Hol
H. Lindenbach
B. Paton
L. Tannen
W. Tracey

Absent:

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

Staff Present:

J. McLeod, Planning & Development
G. Ward, Section Manager - Urban Forestry &
Environ Prog., Parks
H. Dmytriw, Legislative Services

A. ADOPTION OF MINUTES

It was Moved by Commissioner Hol
Seconded by Commissioner Hart
That the minutes of the Surrey Heritage
Advisory Commission of March 18, 2009 be adopted, as circulated.
Carried

B. DELEGATIONS

C. CORPORATE REPORTS

1. PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

(a) 13124 – 14A Avenue – Western Red Cedar

Memo dated April 8, 2009 from the Acting Manager – Trees and
Landscape.

In June of 2008, Kathleen Kolody sent in a request for the Western Red
Cedar on their property to be included on the Heritage Tree List.

The tree is at the rear of their property. It is approximately 100 years old,
32 meters tall, 15 meters wide and 115.5 cm DBH.

A staff arborist has assessed the tree and given it a rating of 72% which is
above what is needed for Heritage designation (65%).

The Kolody's are very interested in preserving this tree from future
development and would like the tree to have a special designation to
protect it.

Steven Whitton, Manager, Trees & Landscape Acting Manager introduced himself to the Commission and advised he is new in this position, having started three months ago. He has been with the Parks, Recreation and Culture Department for a number of years.

The following comments were made:

- The request to have this tree designated as a heritage tree originally came up one year ago. The owner has expressed an interest to have the tree saved.
- Staff evaluated the tree and determined it is deemed to have a heritage value of 48%. The location of the tree is good – at the rear of the property. The overall condition was rated at 80% with an overall rating of 72%.

The Commission questioned as to what the difference is between a significant tree and a heritage tree. Information needs to be brought forward with the definition to help with the determination of a tree's status.

It was Moved by Commissioner Hol
Seconded by Commissioner Paton
That the Surrey Heritage Advisory
Commission request staff provide information regarding the process and
the definition of a heritage tree versus a significant tree.
Carried

(b) Heritage Advisory Commission Workshop Summary

Memo dated April 15, 2009 from the Manager, Long Range Planning & Policy Development.

The Heritage Advisory Commission participated in a workshop on March 28, 2009 at the Pondsides Meeting Room. The workshop was organized and facilitated by City staff from the Planning and Development and Parks, Recreation, and Culture Departments. All Commissioners attended the workshop and shared their ideas about:

- Guidelines for working together successfully;
- The Commission's mission statement and values;
- What would make the Commission successful;
- The types of initiatives and activities the Commission would like to participate in; and
- What subcommittees are needed to fulfill the Commission's goals.

It was decided that the issue of Commission Liaison with other City Advisory Committees would be put on the agenda of the next meeting on April 29, 2009. Councillor Steele will speak with Council liaisons for other committees to determine where there is interest and value in having the HAC liaise with other committees. Additionally, it was recommended

that, at the next meeting, one priority item from each of the three 'Action Plan Groups' be targeted as a priority for action in 2009.

The following comments were made:

- The workshop was a success and some very good suggestions were provided. The outcome was to have three working groups look at the goals and tasks by taking one priority item from each of the action plan groups to be targeted for 2009 and a work program developed.

The Commission made the following comments:

- Suggestion was made to go through the set priorities on the list and based on the time lines, with everything compiled, due dates could be set. As well, someone could liaise with other committees to decide the best fit for action and the resources required.

Staff made the following comments in response to the Commission:

- Staff will summarize the list of the priorities at the next meeting. This will also provide the opportunity to determine the availability of staff resources and which Commission members will assist and become involved with these issues.

The Commission made the following additional comments:

- The Heritage Commission should be profiled in the Leisure Guide and see some activities put into there. The Commission needs to know the deadlines for getting information into this publication.
- Suggestion was made that the Heritage Financial Budget should be a standing item on the Agenda for the Commission's review.

It was
Moved by Commissioner Paton
Seconded by Commissioner Hart
That the Surrey Heritage Advisory
Commission requests that the Heritage Financial Budget be a standing
item on the Agendas henceforth.

Carried

- Further comment was made that an action list for the Commission should be kept.
- As well, amending all the relevant documents to reflect the revised Commission mission statement should be an action item.

It was
Moved by Commissioner Hol
Seconded by Commissioner Farrand
That the Surrey Heritage Advisory
Commission receive this report as information.

Carried

(c) **Draft Policy on Compensation for the Loss of Heritage Value and Fund Allocation**

Memo dated April 15, 2009 from the Manager, Long Range Planning & Policy Development.

Recommendation

That the Surrey Heritage Advisory Commission (the 'SHAC'):

- 1) Receive this report for information; and
- 2) Provide comments and commentary to staff for the preparation of the final draft policy for consideration by Council.

Background and Discussion

At the SHAC workshop held on March 28, 2009, the Commission requested that staff provide an update on the Compensation for Loss in Heritage Value policy currently under development.

The draft policy for the Compensation for the Loss in Heritage Value has been developed in consultation with the Commission and Legal Services staff.

This policy stems from concerns by the SHAC over the destruction of a number of at-risk heritage buildings such as the Bourassa House (2005), Gillis House (2005), Lawrence House (2006) and the Bell House (2008). Following destruction of the Gillis House and negotiations with the owner (Polygon) to place a monetary value on the lost heritage value, the SHAC initiated a research project to establish a policy related to the loss of heritage buildings.

On March 30, 2005, the SHAC articulated its intentions as follows:

Accept the principle of "no net loss of heritage value in the community", such that where a development proposal adversely impacts the heritage value of heritage property, that monetary compensation toward enhancing other heritage features in the City be considered as a way to mitigate the impact on the overall heritage value loss in the community.

The SHAC held a workshop session to consider different methods of assessing the loss in heritage value. The methods included:

- Insurance replacement value;
- Real estate value;
- The cost savings between being a replica and restoring an existing building;
- Public perception of value; and

- A sliding scale based on building type and ownership.

This last method was called the "relative value approach" and was recommended by the SHAC on July 14, 2005 as follows:

That the use of the Relative Value Approach be endorsed in assessing the compensation to be paid for loss of built heritage, and that the Senior Planner develop an appropriate policy for consideration by the HAC.

On July 27, 2005, the SHAC considered a referral from Council about the allocation of heritage loss funds and recommended the following:

Any funds collected under the new policy for Compensation for Loss of Heritage [Value] be used in part for the enhancement of heritage within the affected community with the balance to be ear marked for the establishment and/or improvement of heritage sites in Surrey.

The draft policy was reviewed on June 28, 2006, and several changes were suggested by the SHAC, including differentiating between large and small apartment developments. The SHAC approved the following motion:

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

Following legal review, the final policy and procedure to allocate funds under the policy was brought forward to the SHAC on March 11, 2008. The SHAC passed the following motion:

That the SHAC receive the Draft Compensation Policy and that once the legal issues have been resolved, the Policy should be forwarded to Council for consideration.

Through the process of legal review, the concept of the use of 'no build' covenants was explored and has been incorporated in this further draft. Legal Services has vetted and found that the policy for 'Compensation for the Loss in Heritage Value and Fund Allocation' (the "Compensation Policy") and the bylaw for the 'Allocation of Financial Assistance under the Compensation Policy' (the "Allocation By-Law") are acceptable as to form.

Conclusion

At the SHAC's request, and for the benefit of the new Commission members, the draft policy is being forwarded to the Commission for discussion purposes at this time. It is recommended that the SHAC receive this report as information and provide commentary to staff on the preparation of a final draft policy for consideration by Council.

The Commission made the following comments:

- An editing error is on page 44 of the report; the second bullet in the second row of the table does not make sense and should be changed to say 'Heritage Assets' rather than 'Industrial Heritage Assets'.
- This Policy should not be held up anymore; the ground rules need to be set for heritage buildings. This needs to go forward to Council so it can finally be put into place.
- Perhaps some wording could be added into the Policy concerning having monies paid out on the value of the development rather than on the value of the heritage.

The following comments were made in response to the Commission's comments:

- This draft policy has been subject of much review. Based on recommendations from the Legal Department, the wording quantifies the policy as replacement of heritage buildings that are part of a development process, or buildings or sites where the owner voluntarily agrees to protect a property.
- Staff will revise the policy further in light of the Commission's comments and bring a final draft to the next meeting of the Commission.

**(d) RCMP Exhibition Status Update
(brought to the Agenda at the request of the Chair)**

Memo dated April 6, 2009 to Mayor and Council from the General Manager, Parks, Recreation and Culture.

The following comments were made:

- The old Steward Hall is the meeting centre (the old weaving centre).
- The Commission is invited to attend the official opening of the exhibition on September 3, 2009 at 7:00 p.m.

(e) Collishaw House

The following comments were made:

- Pat Harrison, the owner of the Collishaw Farm House is aware of the soil subsidence issue that has rapidly developed over the past three years around the house. This was caused by the peaty soil surrounding the house drying out. The Drainage Planning Manager in the Engineering Department is aware of this situation, and is monitoring the property. The Commission will be advised of any changes.

2. PARKS AND RECREATION**(a) Greg Ward, Manager, Urban Forestry and Environmental Programs**

It was agreed that the presentation regarding heritage trees would be deferred to the next Surrey Heritage Advisory Commission meeting.

3. ENGINEERING

There were no reports provided.

4. LEGISLATIVE SERVICES**(a) Christ the Redeemer Anglican Church
Application for Financial Assistance**

The Commission made the following comments:

- Question was raised as to how much money is available for Financial Assistance for this applicant.
- This application has come to the Commission before and it was approved but they missed the cutoff for fulfilling the requirements to be granted the financial assistance.
- Question was raised whether the work has been inspected yet.

It was

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

Commission recommends that Council approve heritage financial assistance for the Christ the Redeemer Anglican Church to the maximum of \$5,421.25 (*five thousand four hundred twenty one dollars and twenty five cents*), which represents 50% of the value of the work as per the quotation from Your Local Handyman (Billcandoit) and as per section 10 of the By-law No. 15099 (*a by-law to provide a procedure for consideration of financial assistance for protected heritage sites*).

Carried

D. CORRESPONDENCE

Commission is requested to adopt a motion to receive the following correspondence items:

There are no correspondence items.

E. INFORMATION ITEMS

It was Moved by Commissioner Paton
Seconded by Commissioner Lindenbach
That the Surrey Heritage Advisory
Commission received information items E.1 through to E.9.
Carried

- 1. Regular Council – Public Hearing Minutes – Monday, March 9, 2009 – Delegations – Presentation of the Friends of Heritage Award to the Fleetwood Community Association**
- 2. Regular Council – Public Hearing Minutes – Monday, March 9, 2009 – RES.R09-362**
- 3. The Magazine of the Heritage Canada Foundation – Vol. XI, No. 4**
(to be provided on table at the meeting).
- 4. Journal of the British Columbia Historical Federation Magazine – Vol.42 No. 1**
(to be provided on table at the meeting).
- 5. Historic Stewart Farm Information Pamphlet – Spring, 2009**
(to be provided on table at the meeting).
- 6. Surrey Museum Information Pamphlet – Spring, 2009**
(to be provided on table at the meeting).
- 7. Dormers & Doorways Information Newsletter – Spring, 2009**
- 8. Heritage BC March 2009 Update – Heritage BC Annual Conference**

Previously sent to the Commission via email – information concerning the Heritage BC Annual Conference.

It was decided amongst the Commission that Commissioner Tannen and Commissioner Hart will attend the conference, paid for out of the Heritage budget, which must be approved by Council. As well, Erin Schultz from Planning and Development will attend, paid for out of the Planning budget.

It was also agreed that those attending the conference would register themselves and later submit receipts to the City Clerk's Office for reimbursement.

It was Moved by Commissioner Foulkes
Seconded by Commissioner Farrand
That the Surrey Heritage Advisory
Commission recommend that Council approve Commissioner Tannen and
Commissioner Hart to attend the 2009 Heritage BC annual conference in
Kelowna from June 4 to 6 and all expenses be paid for from the SHAC
budget.

Carried

9. Regular Council – Public Hearing Minutes – Monday, April 20, 2009 – RES.R09-638

Council Resolution – that Corporate Report R059 be forwarded to the Heritage Advisory Commission as information.

F. SUBCOMMITTEE/LIAISON UPDATES

G. OTHER COMPETENT BUSINESS

1. Anniedale School

The Commission made the following comments:

- The Commission had received information that the Anniedale School is being closed. It was noted that there are two buildings, the newer building which has been operating as a non-catchment school, and the older school house building which is designated as a heritage building.

The following comments were made in response to the Commission:

- The building is owned by the School District and is on their property. A new NCP is starting in that area. Staff will discuss this matter with the School District and report back to the Commission when more information is available.

2. Oak Trees on King George Highway

The following comments were made:

- The new trees planted will have plastic plaques affixed to them to inform of their heritage status.

3. Bose Farmhouse

The Commission made the following comments:

- It appears that the developer has not yet erected a fence around the farmhouse for protection. The building is apparently worsening and nothing is happening. Staff should follow up with the developer on this matter.

The following comments were made in response to the Commission:

- This building has been assessed as dangerous. Staff will follow up with the developer on this matter.

It was Moved by Commissioner Lindenbach
 Seconded by Commissioner Paton
 That the Surrey Heritage Advisory
 Commission recommend that the General Manager, Planning and
 Development direct staff to contact the developer and ensure that they
 work to further secure the Bose Farm House.
Carried

4. National Heritage Conference

Mention was made that the National Heritage Conference is taking place in Toronto this year and the Commission will need to think about who should be sent to attend.

5. Semiahmoo Trail

The Commission made the following comments:

- There is no pedestrian crossing on 24th Avenue where the Semiahmoo Trail meets this road but there is one approximately 400 meters from the intersection. Perhaps staff could look into whether another crossing could be added here.

The following comments were made in response to the Commission:

- Staff will look into this matter and conduct a survey to see whether a crosswalk is warranted and report back to the Commission.

Further discussion ensued concerning the following:

1) Canada Day – July 1, 2009

- It would be a good idea for the Commission to participate in some way on this day.

2) Fusion Festival at Holland Park – July 18th and 19th

- Many other City departments are involved in this event, this could be a great opportunity for the SHAC to get involved to promote Surrey's heritage.

- 3) Flavours of Surrey at Stewart Farm House – July 26, 2009
- There will be 10 restaurants from Surrey participating as well as various vendors with local products, artists, musicians etc. If the Commission would be interested in participating in this event, it could be arranged to have a heritage tent set up with a display about the history of the agriculture in Surrey.

It was agreed that Commissioner Hol, Commissioner Tannen and Commissioner Hart would meet with staff on Monday, May 11, 2009 to further discuss these events and brainstorm how the Commission could be involved and contribute.

H. NEXT MEETING

The next meeting of the Heritage Advisory Commission is scheduled for May 20, 2009 in the Planning Boardroom #1 – 5 p.m. (This meeting may be re-scheduled due to availability of Commissioners).

I. ADJOURNMENT

It was Commission meeting do no adjourn.

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

Carried

The Surrey Heritage Advisory Commission adjourned at 7:26 p.m.

Jane Sowik, City Clerk

Councillor Steele, Chairperson
Surrey Heritage Advisory Commission