

Present:

Chair - Councillor Steele
W. Farrand
J. Foulkes
R. Hart (5:42 p.m.)
B. Hol
H. Lindenbach
B. Paton
L. Tannen
W. Tracey

Guests:

Craig Taylor, Taylor Kurtz
Architecture and Design
Darlene Bowyer, Port Kells
Community Association
Wally Sandvoss, Port Kells
Community Association
Gordon Ross, WildPlay
Element Parks

Staff Present:

J. Lamontagne, Planning & Development
G. Siudut, Planning & Development
E. Schultz, Planning & Development
S. Whitton, Planning & Development
L. Anuik, Planning & Development
J. O'Donnell, Parks, Recreation and Culture
G. Ward, Parks, Recreation and Culture
R. Reny, Parks, Recreation and Culture
T. Mack, Parks, Recreation and Culture
V. Wilke, Finance & Technology
M. Petrovic, Engineering
W. Power, Realty Services Division
K. Woodward, Realty Services Division
N. Dyrbye, Legislative Services

It was

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

Commission Agenda be varied to discuss the Currie and Parr Houses at the start of the meeting.

Carried

The Chair opened the meeting by advising the Commission that with respect to the Currie and Parr Houses, there was a flaw in the system and apologized that the information concerning the City's decision to document and demolish these houses was not passed onto the Commission for their information. The discussion surrounding these houses was brought to the May 4, 2009 Closed Council meeting and a motion was not made at that meeting to bring the report into an open meeting and to be released to the public.

It was further mentioned that the City is prepared to provide funds to assist with the costs for a consultant that can organize and set up a Heritage Foundation. This will be much like the Homelessness Foundation in that the Foundation will be able to raise funds and have funds left by bequests and other such means.

With respect to a heritage consultant, further work should be done with an appropriate, qualified consultant, to review the heritage register.

A handout was provided on-table from the Commissioner Paton with the following concerns:

1. Who supervised the documentation and do we have as built drawings?
2. Do the conditions under which Walmark Homes donated \$50,000 mean the money has to be returned?

3. Require the City to build and locate replicas of the Parr and Currie houses in accordance with City Policy and HRAs of By-laws No. 16646 and No. 16647.
4. Since our Council Representative voted to demolish the aforementioned houses, which vote was the determining vote, SHAC requires a written explanation from our Council Representative, to be presented at our July meeting, explaining how her actions reflect she acted in accordance with By-law 13282 (A By-law to establish a Surrey Heritage Advisory Commission) which in Section 16(a) outlines her role to liaise with the Commission and speak to Commission recommendations.

The Commission made the following comments:

- There were many different occasions on which staff could have let the Commission know what the status of the Currie and Parr houses was, but that never happened. Instead the Commission was left to read about the demolishing of the houses in the newspaper.
- Question was raised as to what the status was of the two houses at the time of being demolished and what steps were taken to ensure the documentation of the buildings and salvaging of materials. As well, question was raised as to whether the drawings were given to Council when Corporate Report No. CCo28 went to Closed Council.

Staff made the following comments in response to the Commission:

- The as-built information on the houses was put together by Allan Diamond Architects. All information and drawings were passed on to staff and there is adequate documentation concerning these houses, however, the drawings were not given to Council at their closed meeting. There were other options mentioned in the Corporate Report such as doing another round of advertising for interested buyers, but the other options were not chosen.
- Both the houses were gutted inside and there were no artifacts left to salvage at the time of demolition. The Parr House was somewhat more intact internally than the Currie House, which had been broken into and had windows smashed and internal damage.

The Commission made the following additional comments:

- The problem with these houses was that both the property and the houses themselves were City owned. When a developer comes to the table and wants to demolish a house, the Commission and the City encourages them to protect the property as opposed to demolishing.
- The Commission was not given the final input with respect to this decision which is very frustrating. The City must ensure that this situation does not occur again without making the Commission aware first.
- Question was raised as to why the possibility of having City lots created for the houses to be put on and selling them as is was not explored.

Staff made the following additional comments in response to the Commission:

- When the houses were first moved, the City conducted a number of open houses but there was no interest. Letters were submitted to have a portion of Harvie Park carved off and a foundation put for the Currie House which were brought to Council in 2006, however, the community did not support creating a lot or taking away any of the public park land for a private home.

Discussions concerning this matter were paused to hear the first Delegation.

Discussions resumed following the first Delegation at 5:40 p.m.

Staff advised that items No. 2 and 3 in Commissioner Paton's list of concerns would need to be researched and the information concerning these provided to the Commission at their next meeting.

The Chair advised that she would get back to the Commission concerning item No. 4 in Commissioner Paton's list of concerns.

It was
Commission recommend that staff forward the as-built drawings and photos of the Currie and Parr Houses to the City Archives.

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

Carried

Commissioner Hart arrived at the meeting at 5:42 p.m.

The Commission made the following additional comments:

- More creative processes should be explored to preserve heritage properties and the community needs to be given more opportunities to step up. If we continue to allow properties to deteriorate then this same thing will just keep happening again and again. We have to enforce the rules upon ourselves and the City needs to lead by example. It is a good idea to have an independent consultant to help with the heritage register as well as with setting up a Heritage Foundation.
- Suggestion was made that the City should provide the Heritage Foundation with seed money from the loss of heritage value for the Currie and Parr houses being demolished.
- It was quite shocking to find out about this situation in the newspaper and equally as disturbing that the Commission members were not advised ahead of time. It seems that this Commission spends money without a real end result. The tools are not available even though there is the desire. It is discouraging that there are many small communities such as Nelson and Vanderhoof that are able to preserve heritage and it seems as though the City of Surrey can't. When there is a will, there is a way.
- The City of Surrey is lacking a Heritage Planner that may have had some role in stopping this. This is an outstanding issue that needs to be addressed.
- The suggestion of creating a 'Heritage Village' and moving houses that otherwise had no place to go was made so many times over the years and yet continues to fall on deaf ears.

COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION

It was
Commission recommends that Council direct staff to resume the search for a full-time, dedicated Senior Heritage Planner.

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

Carried

The meeting adjourned at 6:04 p.m. and reconvened at 6:09 p.m. with the same members in attendance.

A. ADOPTION OF MINUTES

It was
Advisory Commission of April 29, 2009, be adopted, as circulated.

Moved by Commissioner Paton
Seconded by Commissioner Foulkes
That the minutes of the Surrey Heritage

Carried

B. DELEGATION**1. Port Kells Community Association**

Darlene Bowyer and Wally Sandvoss to provide a presentation concerning the Port Kells Heritage Art and Wayside Markers.

The delegation made the following comments:

- They have spoken to the Commission before concerning this project. All the funding for the heritage markers is already in place and they are looking to receive approval from the Commission.
- They have presented this proposal to the Parks and Community Services Advisory Committee who have given the O.K. in principle and they wanted to also come to the Heritage Commission to get their feedback and approval. The plan is to have the markers completed by this summer.
- All the backdrops for the markers will have a historical photo included and the bases will consist of half inch steel. Eventually they plan to have the design of the artist cut out on the sides of the markers.
- They have worked to set aside \$20,000 of their own money to complete this project and have recently spent another \$6,000 for park banners.

The Commission made the following comments following the presentation:

- Question was raised whether they feel confident that they have done everything possible in their design to ensure that the markers are vandalism proof.

- Comment was made that the Civic Enhancement Committee discussed this project at their last meeting and wanted to pass along their support for this project with their only concern being for maintenance.
- Suggestion was made that the delegates see whether they can receive a grant for their work from the City.

The delegation made the following additional comments:

- Yes, they have worked to ensure the markers are heavy duty and can withstand vandalism by including tamper proof bolts and graffiti guards on the faces.
- The City has helped the Port Kells Community Association financially in that they paid for the artists' time and designs surrounding this project.

It was
 Commission congratulate the Port Kells Community Association for their hard work and endorse the proposed drawings for the Port Kells Heritage Art and Wayside Markers.

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

Carried

The Delegates left the meeting at 5:40 p.m.

C. CORPORATE REPORTS

1. PARKS AND RECREATION

(a) WildPlay Element Park Proposal for Redwood Park

Parks Planning Manager and WildPlay representatives to provide a verbal presentation.

The following comments were made:

- In 2008, the City issued a Request for Partnerships and received a proposal from WildPlay Element Parks to utilize a portion of a park for a public recreation facility. Council has directed staff to work with WildPlay to review potential park locations for this proposal.
- The proposed facility is a nature based recreation opportunity for youth and adults to recreate and experience the natural environment.
- Staff and WildPlay have been reviewing a number of park locations for this facility and in the process have consulted with a number of stakeholders including the Green Timbers Heritage Society, Sunnyside Acres Society and Campbell Watershed Society. Overall, they have received support for the concept; however, the challenge has been to find a location.
- Through much searching, they have determined that the best park for the outdoor recreation facility is in Redwood Park located in South Surrey. The proposed location in the park is outside the heritage

protection area and the original Brown Brothers Property, and will not impact protected heritage trees. It would be located in lands not currently accessible to the public, buffered from the ALR and the heritage park areas.

- WildPlay's proposal includes an obstacle course elevated in the trees that will include tightropes, zip lines, suspended bridges, scramble nets, swinging logs, and other fun and active elements. There is a great potential for recreation and this would be a very accessible type of facility. WildPlay has already introduced similar type outdoor obstacle courses in Nanaimo and Whistler.
- An ecosystem assessment was conducted of the site in Redwood Park and it has been determined that this would be a suitable location for the facility. WildPlay would remove invasive species, in particular in the southwest portion of the park where there is a lot of ivy growth up the trees.
- WildPlay started in 2005 with the goal of bringing nature based recreation to where people are as opposed to having people make longer trips to get to recreation. They wanted to produce something that would be accessible to a broad range of people. Their facilities are intended to bring people into a wilderness type environment outside of their usual city existence.
- This facility would be constructed in a way that would not be damaging to the trees. They would be using compression and nothing would be drilled into the trees. As well, they would not be using any chemically treated wood and the trees would be climbed with a rope system.
- This recreation facility would provide the community with a new outdoor adventure close to home and would help to create full-time employment for the area.

The Commission made the following comments:

- Question was raised as to why this park was more desirable than other sites. There doesn't seem to be a lot of parking provisions made and further question was raised as to how many protected trees will need to be eliminated to accommodate the parking and people.
- Question was raised whether this proposal had gone to the Parks Committee yet for their consideration, and if not, it should go before the Heritage Commission makes its final decision.
- Question about the security plan for the site was raised.
- Further question concerning the anticipated volume and revenues from this facility was put forward.

The following comments were made in response to the Commission:

- This is the first presentation of this proposal. It will not be going to the Parks Committee until the fall.
- Many locations were considered for this facility including Green Timbers Park, Colebrook Park and Latimer Lake Park. For various reasons, it was determined that these parks would not be suitable. In many cases, there were many issues needing resolution before this type of facility could be constructed. Redwood Park was the only one that

had trees stable enough and was easily accessible enough to accommodate this facility.

- The access ladders provided will be removable and able to be locked down for security measures. They plan to have caretakers on or near the site to provide surveillance and security.
- Nothing has been formalized as of yet in terms of a lease or license arrangement. WildPlay would provide the City with revenues generated and the caretaker would be the responsibility of WildPlay.
- They project this facility's revenue and volumes would be similar to that of the Nanaimo facility which sees peaks of 300 people on a busy Saturday. It is expected that there would be more days like that in Surrey as it is not as rural as Nanaimo. The pricing would be approximately \$40 per adult and \$20 per child with school and youth group rates at about \$30.

The Commission made the following additional comments:

- Question was raised whether a tree assessment will be conducted of the site showing all the significant trees before construction commences. It would also be nice to hear from the Environmental Advisory Committee in making a decision.
- Concern was raised for the increase in the potential for fires in this park adding this many public going through it on a constant basis.

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

- Staff will provide the dedication by-law for the Commission's review. The heritage trees discovered in this park have been worked on and restored over the years, there are original plantations that have been almost entirely restored.
- This type of facility would be a great opportunity to help create a greater appreciation and awareness for the public while also providing a heritage experience.

It was Moved by Commissioner Hart
Seconded by Commissioner Tannen
That the Surrey Heritage Advisory
Commission support the WildPlay Element Park proposal for Redwood
Park in principle and receive the information presented.
Carried

The Delegates left the meeting at 7:19 p.m.

The Agenda was varied to deal with item D.2 was dealt with next.

The Agenda was further varied to deal with item H.1 next.

Commissioner Lindenbach took over the role of Chairperson at 7:42 p.m.

The Agenda was varied to deal with item C.2(b) next.

(b) Heritage and Significant Trees

G. Ward to provide the Commission with a verbal presentation deferred from the April 29, 2009 SHAC meeting.

The following comments were made:

- The determination of heritage trees in the City of Surrey was developed with staff in collaboration with the Commission a number of years ago which then resulted in the valuation of many trees.
- There are three general factors when considering what a heritage tree is which include:
 - Condition;
 - Location; and
 - Heritage.
- In addition to this, the following elements are also considered when determining a heritage tree:
 - Outstanding characteristics;
 - Rarity (species);
 - Uniqueness (form);
 - Historical; and
 - Landmark.
- In determining a heritage tree, the starting point is someone identifying a tree or group of trees as having heritage designation potential. From there, a numerical rating system determines whether the tree falls into a heritage category. A heritage tree or trees can be a single or group of trees, on private or public property. The Parks, Recreation and Culture Department deal with public trees whereas the Planning and Development Department deals with private trees.
- Protection of these trees is governed by the *Community Charter* and *Local Government Act* which enable the City to protect trees through by-laws of various kinds. Currently, the City of Surrey has two types of by-laws for protection of trees: the Heritage Designation By-law and the Tree Protection By-law.
- The heritage designation by-laws protect trees that pertain mostly to public property, but this does not include boulevard trees adjacent to private property.
- For a tree on private property to be deemed significant, an owner must agree. Significant trees cannot be removed or damaged in any way unless they are first removed by order of Council.

(c) **Heritage Storyboard Maintenance Plan 2009**

Memo from the Manager of Heritage Services.

It was Moved by Commissioner Hart
Seconded by Commissioner Lindenbach
That the Surrey Heritage Advisory
Commission receive the Heritage Storyboard Maintenance Plan for 2009.
Carried

(d) **Special Event Tent Design and Cost**

Memo from the Manager of Heritage Services.

The following comments were made:

- This is the result of the Commission's discussions at the workshop and interest expressed in having the Commission participate in more community events. It was recommended from the subcommittee that met that the costs of a tent be explored and reviewed. This would help to ensure that the general public becomes more aware of heritage in the City and the workings of the Heritage Commission.

G. Ward left the meeting at 8:49 p.m.

- Comment was made that this does not seem to fall within the Commission's mandate and question was raised whether the Commission should be participating in these types of events.
- This was discussed at the workshop and Commission expressed an interest in participating more in community events. There is frustration that the community and youth are not understanding and becoming involved in heritage.
- There were Commission members that took time out of their personal time to meet and discuss options for the Commission as a whole to become more involved in the community. There are three events this year that the subcommittee found an interest in participating in to help promote the role, function, mandate, and initiatives of the Heritage Commission and to offer some type of hands on activity to engage the public to participate in heritage. It is a surprise now that it seems the other Commission members are not interested in pursuing this anymore.
- As well, a handout was prepared describing the role and mandate of the Commission as well as detailing past achievements of the Commission. Another information pamphlet has been prepared which will be put on display stands to help engage the public and to have some hands on conversation concerning heritage.
- Time has been spent trying to make positive changes regarding the way the Commission goes about its business. These efforts should be shown more appreciation from the fellow Commission members. It is

very disappointing that the Commission is now in disagreement about things that were previously discussed and agreed upon.

It was Moved by Commissioner Hart
 Seconded by Commissioner Farrand
 That the Surrey Heritage Advisory
 Commission approve the recommendation that the Commission evaluate the impact and success of participation at three special events during the summer and fall of 2009 in order to determine the need of a tent for future Commission outreach and promotion use.
Carried with Commissioners Tracey, Foulkes, Lindenbach and Paton opposed.

2. PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

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

Memo from the Manager of Trees and Landscapes.

The following comments were made:

- The purpose of this memo is to receive the Commission's approval to have the Western Red Cedar tree located at 13124 – 14A Avenue plaqued and registered as a Heritage Tree.
- There are very few cedar trees at this level and quality in the City. This tree has been in Surrey for over 100 years and it has a lot of heritage value to it. The overall heritage rating number is 72%.

It was Moved by Commissioner Lindenbach
 Seconded by Commissioner Tracey
 That the Surrey Heritage Advisory
 Commission recommends to the General Manager, Planning & Development that the Western Red Cedar tree located at 13124 – 14A Avenue be added to the registry as a significant tree and a plaque to that effect be affixed to the tree.

Carried

(b) Kensington Prairie Elementary School Renovations

Craig Taylor from Taylor Kurtz Architecture and Design presented the plans for the renovation/seismic upgrade to the School.

This item was dealt with earlier in the meeting.

The following comments were made:

- Taylor Kurtz Architecture and Design was commissioned by the City of Surrey to undertake the design for renovations of the Kensington

Prairie Elementary School. The plan is for a conversion into a daycare/preschool facility.

- A portion of the site will be designated under a heritage by-law. The site itself consists of three existing buildings; one is the Kensington Prairie School built in 1914, and the other two are a classroom annex and a gymnasium, both built in the 1950s and 1960s. The classroom and gymnasium are not included in the heritage designation.
- Over the years there have been a number of additions and modifications to the existing building and their proposal is to restore the building to its existing condition.

Councillor Steele resumed as Chairperson at 7:47 p.m.

- The plan is to not remove the existing stucco cladding on the building but to maintain the building from further decay and perform any minor upgrades to the building exterior to bring up to current code. The major change is to the front stairs and guardrails which will also bring the building back closer to its original configuration. Currently, the stairs do not comply with code or the original character of the building.

The Commission made the following comments:

- It would be nice to see something put back into the building to emulate what it originally was, at least from a visual perspective.
- Question was raised whether City staff will be working on restoring this building.
- Question was raised whether the clapboard around the windows will also be included in the restoration.

The following comments were made in response to the Commission:

- The plans have not yet been finalized but depending on the workload, there will most likely be City workers assisting on this project.
- The specific intent is to just maintain this building from further deterioration. This proposal is not to provide upgrades and restorations as money for this is not currently available.

The Commission made the following additional comments:

- Suggestion was made that the City put the money forward that is necessary to conduct a full restoration of this building. The costs associated with doing this later as opposed to now will be much higher. It makes sense to do it completely, not just half way.

It was Moved by Commissioner Paton
Seconded by Commissioner Tannen
That the Surrey Heritage Advisory
Commission recommend to the General Manager, Planning and
Development that staff return to the Commission with a cost estimate of
doing a complete restoration of the Kensington Prairie Elementary School
including removal of the stucco, replacement of windows missing on the
front of the building and replacement of the trim around the windows as
opposed to only the proposed maintenance plan.

Carried

The Commission made the following additional comments:

- Question was raised concerning the current handicapped access to the building and what will be put in place if none exists.

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

- There is an existing wheelchair hoist for this building, and they will ensure that the accessibility is upgraded to meet code requirements.

The Delegate left the meeting at 8:12 p.m.

(c) Kensington Prairie Elementary School – Heritage Designation By-law

Memo from the Manager, Long Range Planning & Policy Development.

The following comments were made:

- In March, 2008, Council passed a resolution that staff prepares the necessary by-law to have the Kensington Prairie Elementary School designated. The Statement of Significance was prepared by Donald Luxton. The addition to the building is not subject to the Heritage Designation By-law.
- It was requested by the Commission that the comments and recommendations concerning the by-law be forwarded to Council for their consideration, and before it goes, it is before the Commission once more for any last comments and suggestions.

The Commission made the following comments:

- It was suggested that on page 44, the prohibition #5 be made bold.
- Comment was made that there is no mention of colour in the by-law. This should be researched and included.

COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION

It was Moved by Commissioner Paton
Seconded by Commissioner Hol
That the Surrey Heritage Advisory
Commission recommends that Council receive and support the Heritage
Designation By-law for the Kensington Prairie Elementary School.
Carried

(d) Amendments to the Surrey Heritage Advisory Commission Mission Statement, Roles and Values

Memo from the Manager, Long Range Planning & Policy Development.

COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION

It was Moved by Commissioner Hol
Seconded by Commissioner Hart
That the Surrey Heritage Advisory
Commission recommend that Council endorse the proposed changes to the
Surrey Heritage advisory Commission Mission Statement, Roles and
Values.
Carried

(e) George Kennedy House – 9948 – 123A Street

Memo from the Manager, Long Range Planning & Policy Development.

The following comments were made:

- The George Kennedy House was added to the Register in 2000. The owner was told this would not prevent further development of the site.
- The temporary protection period has elapsed now and at this point, there is nothing else the Commission or the City can do to prevent the demolition of this house.
- Staff have been working with the owner over the last few years to see if there is a way proceed with the subdivision and to preserve and retain the house. The owner has no interest in preserving the house. Discussions concerning demolishing the house began approximately two months ago.

The Commission made the following comments:

- The Commission has in the past held special meetings to deal with issues such as this. Question was raised as to why a special meeting was not held concerning the George Kennedy House.
- There are very few remedies available to the Commission to save houses; what is needed is to work to raise the pride in the community which goes back to reaching out. Rather than spending time at this

meeting table, a special committee should be struck to work to find resolutions to these issues. What has been done in the past does not work so we need to look at the future and new ways to make things work.

- Question was raised whether the option of moving the house was ever explored.

Staff made the following comments in response to the Commission:

- The 60 day period in which the City can attempt to negotiate with the owner to save the house expired back in 2007. He has had the opportunity to demolish for all this time but has waited until now.
- The process of moving the house is very expensive and extensive; this would have to come from a recommendation of Council.

The Commission made the following additional comments:

- If there is no one from the public interested in moving and restoring the house, then there is no point in having the City move it as it will end up being the same situation as the Currie and Parr houses. No one is interested in spending the money this would require and then not being able to recover the same costs involved.
- It was acknowledged that the owner has the right under the law to demolish and the City and the Commission must give their permission.

Staff made the following additional comments in response to the Commission:

- It is important to note that the heritage value of a home diminishes substantially when it is moved away from its original location.

COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION

It was Moved by Commissioner Tannen
 Seconded by Commissioner Hol
 That the Surrey Heritage Advisory
 Commission recommends that Council consider having funds put aside to investigate development of a heritage precinct in Surrey that can be City property and will accommodate heritage buildings that are moved or replicas.

Carried

It was Moved by Commissioner Tannen
 Seconded by Commissioner Hart
 That the Surrey Heritage Advisory
 Commission advises City Council that it endorses the removal of the George Kennedy House from the Heritage Register provided the building is properly documented.

Carried Commissioner Paton against

(f) HAC Participation in Community Events

Memo from the Manager, Long Range Planning & Policy Development and the Manager, Heritage Services.

The following comments were made:

- Monies have already been spent for the Commission to attend the Whalley Festival. If the Commission is no longer interested, Heritage Services can absorb the costs.
- Commissioner Hol is to attend the Flavors of Surrey event while Commissioners Tannen and Hart are to attend the Whalley Festival.

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

Commission:

1. Request that Council authorize the expenditure of up to \$250. From the HAC budget for the development of outreach and display materials for each of the three events that HAC will be attending this year.
2. Where possible, ensure that at least two members of the Commission are available to attend and represent the Commission at each event.

Carried with Commissioners Lindenbach, Tracey, Paton and Foulkes opposed.

(g) Heritage Advisory Commission Priority Tasks and Initiatives

Memo from the Manager, Long Range Planning & Policy Development.

It was requested that this item be deferred and that staff report back to the Commission concerning this item.

3. ENGINEERING

There are no reports from Engineering.

4. LEGISLATIVE SERVICES**(a) Hazelmere United Church – Application for Financial Assistance**

Re-submission of the Application for Financial Assistance.

COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION

It was Moved by Commissioner Paton
Seconded by Commissioner Hart
That the Surrey Heritage Advisory
Commission recommends that Council approve heritage financial
assistance for the Hazelmere United Church to the maximum of \$4,225.68
(*four thousand two hundred twenty five dollars and sixty eight cents*), which
represents 50% of the value of the work as per the quotation from At Your
Service Renovations 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

It was Moved by Commissioner Hart
Seconded by Commissioner Tannen
That the Surrey Heritage Advisory
Commission receive the following correspondence items:

Carried

1. Friends of the Surrey Museum and Archives Society

Letter dated May 19, 2009 from the President, Bruno Zappone.

It was Moved by Commissioner Hol
Seconded by Commissioner Tannen
That the Surrey Heritage Advisory
Commission approves payment from the budget for a Corporate Membership with
the "Friends of the Surrey Museum and Archives Society".

Carried with Commissioner Lindenbach
abstaining.

2. South Westminster School

Letter dated June 7, 2009 from Allan Cleaver.

This item was dealt with earlier in the meeting.

It was Moved by Commissioner Hart
Seconded by Commissioner Paton
That the Surrey Heritage Advisory
Commission receives the letter dated June 7, 2009 from Allan Cleaver.

Carried

The following comments were made:

- Comment was made that the cross on the building should be removed as it is not representative of the building. It would be more representative to have a free-standing cross instead of affixed to the building itself.
- They should be requested to respect the heritage value of their building for us as a Commission and City to respect their use of the building.

It was Moved by Commissioner Lindenbach
 Seconded by Commissioner Paton
 That the Surrey Heritage Advisory
 Commission request that staff contact the owner of the South Westminster
 School and request that they remove the cross from the building in
 compliance with the Heritage Revitalization Agreement and have a
 different indicator that this is their place of worship.
Carried

E. INFORMATION ITEMS

It was Moved by Commissioner Lindenbach
 Seconded by Commissioner Paton
 That the Surrey Heritage Advisory
 Commission receive the following information items:
Carried

1. **Regular Council – Pubic Hearing Minutes – Monday, April 20, 2009 – RES.R09-625**
2. **Regular Council – Public Hearing Minutes – Monday, May 25, 2009 – RES.R09-925**
3. **Regular Council – Public Hearing Minutes – Monday, May 25, 2009 – RES.R09-926**
4. **The Magazine of the Heritage Canada Foundation – Vol.XII, No.1**
(to be provided on-table at the meeting).
5. **Heritage BC Quarterly Newsletter – Spring 2009**
(Provided on-table at the meeting).
6. **Heritage BC – Annual Report 2008**
7. **Historic Stewart Farm Information Pamphlet – Summer, 2009**
(Provided on-table at the meeting).
8. **Surrey Museum Information Pamphlet – Summer, 2009**
(Provided on-table at the meeting).

F. SUBCOMMITTEE/LIAISON UPDATES**G. OTHER COMPETENT BUSINESS****1. Outstanding List**

Request was made that the Outstanding List be brought to the next Agenda for review.

H. FINANCIALS**1. Budget & Expenditure Analysis for 2009;
Heritage Site Improvements 2009; and
Reserve for Future Expenses**

This item was dealt with earlier in the meeting.

The financial documents were explained in detail to the Commission members.

It was
Commission receives the financial documents as presented.

Moved by Commissioner Lindenbach
Seconded by Commissioner Hart
That the Surrey Heritage Advisory
Carried

V. Wilke left the meeting at 7:41 p.m.

I. NEXT MEETING

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

Commissioner Hart advised he would like to give an update at the next meeting concerning the 2009 Heritage BC Annual Conference held in Kelowna that he attended.

J. ADJOURNMENT

It was
Commission meeting do now adjourn.

Moved by Commissioner Hart
Seconded by Commissioner Farrand
That the Surrey Heritage Advisory
Carried

The Surrey Heritage Advisory Commission adjourned at 10:04 p.m.

Jane Sowik, City Clerk

Councillor Steele, Chairperson
Surrey Heritage Advisory Commission