

Present:

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

Guests:

**Barry McGinn, McGinn Engineering
Graham Farstad, The Arlington Group
John Remple, Remple Development
Group
Lori Richards, H.Y. Engineering**

Staff Present:

**E. Schultz, Planning & Development
J. Boan, Engineering Department
J. Lamontagne - Planning & Development
J. O'Donnell, Parks, Recreation and Culture
J. Wilson - Land Development and Customer
Service
J. Sowik, City Clerk
P. Lau, Planning & Development
C. Atkins, Planning & Development
T. Mueller, Legislative Services**

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

It was Moved by Commissioner Hart
Seconded by Commissioner Hol
That the Surrey Heritage Advisory
Commission recommends the agenda for the July 23, 2009 meeting be varied due to the
number of Land Developers present. Proposal was made to bring agenda items 2. (d) and
(f) to the beginning of the meeting and to add an additional item to the agenda entitled
Item #4 - Report from Commissioner Hart on the Heritage Conference attended in
Kelowna.

Carried

Following the motion Commissioner Paton requested that another section be added to the
Agenda entitled "Business Arising from the Minutes".

A. ADOPTION OF MINUTES

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

It was Moved by Commissioner Hol
Seconded by Commissioner Farrand
That the Surrey Heritage Advisory
Commission minutes of June 17, 2009, be adopted.

Carried

It was Moved by Commissioner Hol
Seconded by Commissioner Hart
That the Surrey Heritage Advisory
Commission recommends that the following amendments be made to the adopted
minutes:
The June 17th minutes were revised to reflect the following edits:

1. Amendment requested for ***Item 2 (b) replacement of windows missing on the front of the building.***
2. Amendment requested for ***Item 2 (e) Moved by Commissioner Tannen. Carried Commissioner Paton against.***
3. Amendment requested for ***Item 2 (f) It was Moved by Commissioner Tannen.***

It was Moved by Commissioner Lindenbach
Seconded by Commissioner Foulkes
That the Surrey Heritage Advisory
Commission minutes of June 17, 2009 be adopted as amended.
Carried

B. DELEGATIONS

C. CORPORATE REPORTS

1. ENGINEERING

(a) Semiahmoo Trail Servicing Study

Memo dated June 29, 2009 from the Acting Transportation Manager. Packages were previously sent out to the Commission members for review concerning this item.

Engineering presented the report, noting the following:

- There was a vision for Semiahmoo Trail and issues between 28th Avenue and 32nd Avenue.
- Services were planned to be relocated out of the Trail. A full servicing study was needed for the area to determine what is possible and practical.
- The relocation of all of the servicing from Semiahmoo Trail would cost \$3.7 million to complete and the City budget could not accommodate such significant funding.
- Engineering outlined the services and the constraints regarding the landscaping that can be put in.
- Engineering discussed with Parks leaving the pathway such that emergency services can utilize it without issue. Emergency services require a six meter wide clear area along this corridor as they cannot rely on access via the lane servicing the properties to the east.

- There are opportunities to do significant tree planting and certain types of planting as outlined in the drawings that were provided for the Commission's consideration.
- It was noted that Engineering can move toward the vision outlined by the Commission but there would be constraints because of the existing utilities.
- There would be one extension along the sanitary lines and some connections to tie into the existing lines. All new utility services would be taken away from the trail.
- It was explained that the Landscape Architect for the study initially interpreted the guidelines incorrectly regarding the setback areas. A copy of a report was provided on-table which is more reflective of this issue.

The following comments were made:

- The Commission requested information regarding feedback received from Friends of the Semiahmoo Trail. Engineering said that the "Friends" agree to the infrastructure and noted that a natural native ambience of the land could be created even with the current infrastructure.
- Planning met on July 16, 2009 with two members of the "Friends". They reinforced the importance of appearance of the boulevard and would like to see some enhanced maintenance on the West side of the Trail.
- It was discussed that some of the residents had concerns about speed humps needing to be added to calm traffic and keep speeds down.
- Question was raised concerning the underground wiring and whether the City would undertake an underground beautification project.
- It was further discussed that the pole lines cross the trails and are a visual impediment. Development services require that an underground service be removed from existing houses that are not removed.
- Engineering addressed the removal of the lines with the Commission and stated that to do so would not only be a financial burden but it may also be difficult to convince Council to support this type of expenditure. It was stated that as a result, more short term methods are being put forward at this point.
- Comment was made that the speed humps would detract from the feeling of the area being a little road. Another Commissioner noted that this is outside of what the Commission is here to represent. Engineering explained that speed humps would not meet typical traffic calming criteria and it would only be considered because it is a Heritage Road. As a result, Engineering was interested in their view on this issue.
- If the developer would take down the abandoned house in the area the removal would solve a number of health and safety issues. The street address of the abandoned residence was provided to Staff, it was relayed that the abandoned residence poses a danger to younger children who play in the area and also detracts from the beauty of the surroundings.
- Staff indicated the application did come up previously and it was reviewed. The Commission accepted the application on the condition

that they would proceed after the report has been brought forward to the SHAC. Staff committed to contact the developer to relay the concern and make the developer aware of the issues posed by the home on the property.

- A comment was made that more information is required before making a decision or voting regarding speed humps, several members of the Commission wanted to better understand the situation.
- The Commission questioned the cost estimate applied to moving the hydro for the area. It was further asked if the City had actually put a bid out and priced out the cost.
- Staff explained the panel existing in the house would need to be replaced. It was clarified that BC Hydro is not reluctant for underground service; they are reluctant to pay for it. The other challenge is that there are existing homes and there will be a requirement for them to be rewired.
- Further question was raised as to whether the Trail would eventually be redone in gravel. Engineering explained that consideration would be given to converting the road to gravel when all driveways are removed from the Trail. Currently there is not a budget identified for this work.
- An alternative to speed humps was discussed such as pavers that can have grass growing through and it was explained by staff that firstly, it can be difficult to have grass growing in this setting and there is a large cost differential associated with pavers versus gravel.
- The Commission asked if there were development funds put aside to maintain the road.
- Staff responded by advising that the fire departments need four meters as a minimum requirement to support the fire trucks. The stabilizers used on fire trucks require an additional 1.0 meter on each side for support and visually the road must be maintained at four meters. The City would ensure that if there was low planting that on either side there would be structural allowances for the fire department to easily respond without impediment.
- The Commission asked to hear more about environmental issues and asked if this could be looked into for the individuals who have property on the Trail.
- Staff agreed to send Section 4 with associated appendices to the Environmental Manager for review and confirmed that the Planning Department has copies.

It was

Moved by Commissioner Paton

Seconded by Commissioner Lindenbach

That the Surrey Heritage Advisory Commission recommends that the Semaimoo Trail Servicing Study be approved in principle.

Carried

2. PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT**(a) Heritage Advisory Commission Priority Tasks and Initiatives**

File No. 0540-20V

Memo dated June 1, 2009 from the Manager, Long Range Planning & Policy Development. Deferred from the June 17, 2009 meeting. The Commission reviewed the Summary of HAC Priority Tasks and Initiative that was created at their retreat in March. The items were categorized into 3 areas and the Commission were asked to select 1 item from each area to approve as the priority.

The Commission made the following comments:

- Some items on the list could be referred to Staff.
- On the 3rd item in Strategic Planning it was stated that there is another issue regarding the buildings currently under threat and to what degree. A review is expected from a Consultant.
- The Commission still has the issue of hiring a Consultant to go through all the Heritage Buildings. The process is underway and there should be a draft Terms of Reference before the Commission in September 2009.
- It was suggested that the Commission would like some interim measures between now and 2011 on this item.
- The Chair suggested that this is the type of work is better left for the Consultant to complete when he/she is brought on board.
- The Chair shared that Council has asked that Staff prepare a report looking at heritage management approaches taken by other cities in Canada. This would include a review of the roles and responsibilities of the Heritage Advisory Commission. Setting up a Surrey Heritage Foundation and the possibility of receiving Seed Money from the City was discussed.
- The Summary Sheet should outline the start date and end date of each task and initiative.

It was Moved by Commissioner Hart
Seconded by Commissioner Farrand
That the Surrey Heritage Advisory
Commission recommends that the report be received as information.
Carried

(b) White Rock Seventh-Day Adventist Church

File No. 6800-10

Memo dated June 30, 2009 from the Manager, Long Range Planning & Policy Development.

The Commission made the following comments:

- The Chair recommended that this item be deferred.

- The Commission expressed concern regarding timing and the chance that someone may request demolition permits.
- Concern was also expressed regarding potential requests for properties to be removed from the Register.
- Commission members expressed concern that buildings will be destroyed while they are waiting for someone to come on board.

COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION

It was Moved by Commissioner Lindenbach
 Seconded by Commissioner Foulkes
 That the Heritage Advisory Commission recommends to Council that that effective immediately no houses, buildings or structures be removed from the Surrey Heritage Register pending the outcome of a review of the Register and Inventory by a qualified Heritage Consultant. The criteria of the review should include a hierarchic classification of all Heritage Assets on the Register and Inventory, similar to that used in other jurisdictions and should provide for an immediate classification of any buildings under threat.

Carried

- It was suggested that “Class A” properties will permanently remain on Heritage Register.
- Commissioner Hart would like the SHAC to recognize the individuals who are affected by some of the decisions of SHAC and some of the hardships the owners are put through. Compassion needs to be extended to the people involved. They may not have the resources to move forward and wish to sell their properties. The properties can be kept on the Register but the individuals should have the right to some relief. The Commission should discuss this matter further and understand that there are other people involved in these decisions.
- It was offered that the reason the Register was invented was to give an even playing field to anyone purchasing.
- It was discussed that there was a project to document the history of Surrey. Should the status of a building change then drawings and other documents should be preserved in the archives.
- There were a number of issues identified with the building.
- A projected \$70-80,000 would be required in order to bring the building up to code. The cost estimate does not involve moving the building to the other side of the property.
- Water was coming into the building and there were drainage issues.
- It was questioned why there is a request to demolish the building.
- The Commission is concerned about timing on this project, the only way a 60 day stay can be achieved is to go to Council and there is a recess for August.
- A question was raised as to why the owner wanted to demolish the building before the property was sold.
- It was discussed that the property was originally zoned for assembly and it does not make sense to override this.

- There was a photograph of a plaque on the site which indicates that there was some public money spent in the past.
- Staff explained that the plaque was actually a request for donations and the Church received no support from the City.
- The Commission asked if staff could be sent to discuss alternatives.
- It was offered that whatever is done with this building that there would be a cost to the owners associated with it.
- A question was asked regarding where the money would come from to save the building, move it, repair it to code.
- It was asked what the Commission could do to assist with this process and what the options are.

It was Moved by Commissioner Lindenbach
 Seconded by Commissioner Hart
 That the Surrey Heritage Advisory
 Commission recommends that Staff work with the applicant to put the
 White Rock Seventh Day Adventist Church site on the market with the
 HRA that is currently in process.

Carried

- It was suggested that the Commission could look at this site to do some bonus density, i.e., selling the air above the church and the ground for density.
- A question was posed as to whether this property could be included in a strategic planning session.
- It was discussed that there are environmental lands and bird habitats across from this property.
- The Commission requested a copy of the Terms of Reference as they applied to the Engineering Report. The concern with the previous report is that it was paid for by the Developer. The expectation of the second report was to be more in-depth.
- It was offered by a Commission member that at the March meeting when this matter was discussed originally, Staff were directed to “get on with it”.
- With respect to the issue of the Church raising money it was thought that they were initially going to make it a nice façade for weddings to generate revenue.
- It was pointed out that the Engineering study was requested in March and it was only just received at today’s meeting.
- Staff explained that the timeline was contingent on a procurement process which is why there was a time factor. Based on the structure, a walk-through evaluation was deemed appropriate.
- It was offered that old houses have value in the construction materials and that is a message that SHAC needs to get across to people.
- Members of the Commission stated that the Engineering Report was speculative and negative terms were used.
- A question was raised whether it was a wise expenditure to find out for a second time that there are serious issues that have to be dealt with because the property has not been kept up.

- It was stated that if we do not have opportunities to explore different options, we will get no further ahead as a Commission.
- It was discussed that if there is no willingness of the party involved to keep the property then the next thing the Commission will have to deal with is keeping it on the Register and hope for the best. If the owners are not on board the Commission will need to come up with other solutions.
- Staff offered that the applicants want to sell the site but perhaps the applicant would be willing to sell the site with the HRA that is currently in process.

(c) **East Kensington Elementary School and Clayton Elementary School**
File No. 6800-10

Memo dated July 6, 2009 from the Manager, Long Range Planning & Policy Development.

Staff discussed renovations regarding the two schools.

It was Moved by Commissioner Lindenbach
Seconded by Commissioner Hart
That the Surrey Heritage Advisory
Commission receive the information concerning the East Kensington
Elementary School and Clayton Elementary School.
Carried

(d) **George E. Lawrence House**
File No. 7906-0351-00

Memo dated July 9, 2009 from the Manager, Area Planning & Development – North Division.

C. Atkins, Planning & Development attended the meeting on behalf of the developer and shared the following information:

- The applicant is proposing an Official Community Plan (OCP) amendment from 'Suburban' to 'Multiple Residential' and rezoning from 'One-Acre Residential Zone (RA) to 'Comprehensive Development Zone (CD)' (based on a the Multiple Residential 30 Zone (RM-30)) to allow for the development of 73 townhouse units. The applicant is also seeking a Heritage Revitalization Agreement.
- The intent of the Agreement is to use the house as an amenity building.
- The house will be located at the corner of two public streets and will be oriented toward Fraser Highway.
- The Commission asked how the Developer agreed to do this and wanted to know if the Developer was receiving any additional density.
- It was explained that this project is moving forward ahead of a Neighbourhood Concept Plan (NCP) for the area on the premise that the Developer will save the house as part of the development.

- Concern was expressed by the Commission regarding the continuity of the townhouses as part of the development; the Commission wants to ensure that the design is complementary and that it presents itself well.
- This project has been ongoing for two years and the design is not intended to be a heritage design.
- It was explained that the problem with the building that the SHAC wishes to preserve is that it has been badly neglected over the years. The building is at serious risk of not surviving if things do not move forward quickly. The structural soundness is there and the building can be restored at this point.
- The Commission discussed that when these types of developments arise in the future that it would be helpful to take a look at the context for the full project.
- It was asked whether there would be some type of signage on the property to show what the house used to look like and what it now looks like to tell a story.
- Concern was raised about what would happen if the building should disappear due to fire.
- It was pointed out that there is a clause indicating that the building needs to be replaced should it be destroyed.
- The Commission asked whether there could be no post barrier placed around the site to ensure undesirable individuals would be prevented from accessing the property after hours.
- It was stated that the back of the property has already been breached and indicated that fencing is the least of the concerns.
- It was asked if it was possible that while the restoration is happening if there could be a temporary sign showing what is happening and why. Staff said it was possible.
- It was discussed that in future, requirements for signage may be incorporated as part of the Heritage Revitalization Agreement.
- The cost for signage of this nature was estimated at \$5,000.
- It was discussed that a temporary sign can be put up easily.
- It was suggested that the house be moved and restoration be started before any work is done on the development. It was suggested that it would be advantageous to have the house moved onto the foundation right away before work commences on the townhomes. It was mentioned that the request for signage seems like a reasonable request.

COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION

It was

Moved by Commissioner Lindenbach
Seconded by Commissioner Foulkes
That the Surrey Heritage Advisory
Commission recommends that Council approve the Heritage Revitalization Agreement (HRA) (Appendix II) for the George E. Lawrence House, provided that any outstanding revisions are acceptable to the General Manager, Planning.

Carried

- Question was raised as to whether on-site security could be arranged by the Developer. This will be looked into.
- A question was raised regarding page 57 of the report provided. Concern was expressed over whether or not the building would be maintained to the minimum standard.
- Staff clarified what the terminology used in the agreement. The house would have to be renovated with Phase 1 and occupancy would not be granted until the restoration was completed.
- Staff shared that some of the detailed requirements might change. If there is a requirement outside of what the HRA specifies it would have to come back to the Commission for consideration.
- It was pointed out that on Page 58, Item G covers off any concerns regarding security.

COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION

It was
 Moved by Commissioner Foulkes
 Seconded by Commissioner Tracey
 That the Surrey Heritage Advisory
 Commission recommends to Council that a temporary coroplast "heritage proposal" sign be placed at the site of the George Lawrence House as soon as possible and a permanent interpretative heritage sign at completion of the renovation project.

Carried

- It was suggested that an amendment be made to the current HRA to include temporary signage prior to beginning any restoration process.
- The presentation was closed by a showing to the Commission of an illustration depicting the detail of a chimney that was added for esthetics.

**(e) Heritage Advisory Commission (HAC) requests from
 June 17, 2009 meeting
 File No. 6800-10**

Memo dated July 9, 2009 from the Manager, Long Range Planning & Policy Development.

It was
 Moved by Commissioner Hart
 Seconded by Commissioner Farrand
 That the Surrey Heritage Advisory
 Commission recommends that the memo concerning the HAC's requests from the June 17, 2009 meeting be received for information.

Carried

**(f) Henry Bose (Meadow Ridge) Farm
 File No. 7907-0115-00**

Memo dated July 9, 2009 from the Manager, Area Planning & Development – North Division.

Mr. Barry McGinn, Architect is the applicant's heritage consultant and Mr. John Remple of Remple Development Group is the applicant. Mr. McGinn presented the following information:

- The proposal is for a multi-residential development which retains a forest on a portion of the site and restores and rehabilitates the Bose barn, the dairy building and the farmhouse. A multi-residential project is necessary to accomplish the forest and heritage retention.
- The site is 45 acres, including 15 acres of forest which will be given to the City as Park.
- There is a large barn that will be restored as an amenity building, the original house will be relocated and restored as residential.
- The barn to be restored as an amenity building will house a fitness area, lounge, meeting rooms, indoor theatre and crafting room. The potato barn area will be restored and have minimal improvements.
- The structure on the dilapidated section of the barn will be altered and other l restored with few changes, just a few dormers for extra light.
- The windows will be refurbished, the joist and trusses repaired, underpin the concrete wall and footings. The west side retaining wall needs bracing.
- Building will be painted in the original colours of cream and green and have the original rockery type landscaping recreated.
- The dairy building will be restored and converted into gardening shed.
- The Farm House will be converted into a duplex.
- A road is proposed along the Eastern property line of the forest.
- When the property is developed there will be a continuation of 63 Avenue.
- The Commission asked for clarification on the differences between today's plan and the original. There are two extra units on the plan.
- Mr. McGinn explained that the development moved away from the residential use in a portion of the barn. The barn will have an amenity use and it is a better fit from a Heritage perspective.
- The loft floor is entirely compromised and will be removed above the lounge area and will open up the area.
- The barn will not be open to the public as previously discussed as there are several liability issues and concerns with how to mix a public and private situation with a Strata.
- The Developer explained that the barn project will be tied to the rezoning of the property. He is hoping that the proposal will go to first and second reading at the July 27 Council meeting. Realistic timing to commence will be next summer.
- Concerns were expressed about site security and the Developer stated that there have been concrete barriers and steel gates installed. In future there will be construction crews doing daily checks.
- The Developer explained that 50% of the project needs to be completed before the end of Phase 1 to get occupancy. If the barn is not 50% completed at the completion of phase 1 of the development he will be

required to issue a bond to the City to cover the remaining cost of the barn restoration.

- Staff suggested that Page 130, Item 3 covered off the items of discussion regarding timing and phasing of the project.
- The Commission asked for an explanation as to why the farm house was being moved and the Project Architect explained it was from a design perspective.
- A question was posed to the Developer why there was a wait until summer of 2010 to do anything to the barn.
- The Developer shared that the rotting hay has been removed and they are working on how to shore up the foundation.
- Concerns were expressed by the Commission with respect to what would happen to the farm house in the meantime.
- Concern was again expressed regarding site security for both the barn and the house.
- The Developer said that it would be looked into but said a full-time security detail is cost prohibitive.
- Additional clarification was requested regarding Page 133, second paragraph which states the original windows will be restored and efficient new windows will be installed on the rear of the building.
- The Developer explained that windows on the backside of the building will be contemporary. Original single pane windows on the front would be restored.
- Concern was expressed regarding preserving the heritage look and feel of using efficient new windows.
- Further clarification was requested on Page 130 regarding Phasing and when the bond occurs.
- The Commission asked about the silos and when they were removed. The Project Architect was not able to provide an answer at the time of the meeting.
- The Commission asked if the Developer would be willing to erect signage both on a temporary basis during construction and then on a permanent basis once the development was completed and the Developer said that it was an excellent suggestion and he would be happy to do that.

COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION

It was

Moved by Commissioner Hart

Seconded by Commissioner Farrand

That the Surrey Heritage Advisory -

Commission recommends that Council approve the Heritage Revitalization Agreement (HRA) (Appendix II) for the Bose Farm, barn, dairy and farmhouse, provided that any outstanding revisions are acceptable to the General Manager, Planning, and that a temporary coroplast "heritage proposal" sign be placed at the site as soon as possible and a permanent interpretative heritage sign at completion of the renovation project.

Carried

(g) Kensington Prairie Designation By-law

File No. 6800-20-227

Memo dated July 10, 2009 from the Manager, Long Range Planning & Policy Development.

The Commission made the following comments:

- A memo was issued to inform SHAC that there were two amendments to the Heritage Designation Bylaw for Kensington Prairie School:
 1. "Neutral heritage paint colour with complimentary neutral trim paint colour was added". A paint analysis could not be conducted to determine the original paint colour.
 2. The wording "Associated landscape features such as terraced sloped site" was removed.
- Staff explained that in the original document stated one of the designated features would be the terraced sloped site. Further review has indicated that the terraced sloped site is outside of the surveyed area and will house the parking lot for the Community Centre.

It was

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

Commission approves the amendments as presented concerning the Kensington Prairie Designation By-law and receives the report for information.

Carried

The Commission inquired as to whether anyone viewed the site; a member of City Staff had.

D. CORRESPONDENCE

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

1. Email dated June 22, 2009 from Terril Leishman concerning the Redwood Park and proposed 'Zip line' amusement feature.
 - The Commission requested that Staff issue a response to this individual.
 - The Commission requested the City Clerk to ensure that all Staff responses issued on behalf of the SHAC be copied to all members of the Commission via email.

It was

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

Commission receives the correspondence item for information.

Carried

2. Letter dated June 23, 2009 to Christ Redeemer Anglican Church enclosing Financial Assistance cheque in the amount of \$5,421.25.

It was Moved by Commissioner Hart
Seconded by Commissioner Hol
That the Surrey Heritage Advisory
Commission receive the correspondence item for information:
Carried

3. Email dated June 23, 2009 from Patricia E. Mountain concerning the Redwood Theme Park.

It was Moved by Commissioner Hart
Seconded by Commissioner Hol
That the Surrey Heritage Advisory
Commission receive the following correspondence item for information.
Carried

4. Letter dated June 26, 2009 from Robert Buckland concerning the Loyal Orange Lodge.

It was Moved by Commissioner Hart
Seconded by Commissioner Hol
That the Surrey Heritage Advisory
Commission receives the correspondence item for information:
Carried

- Commissioner Foulkes shared that he is dealing with this individual personally but asked that SHAC formulate a motion to direct to Council's approval to find a property that SHAC can put this building on. He asks that SHAC consider it.

It was Moved by Commissioner Foulkes
Seconded by Commissioner Hart
That the Surrey Heritage Advisory
Commission will discuss finding a permanent location for the Loyal Orange Lodge at the September 30, 2009 meeting.
Carried

- The Commission discussed further that the Loyal Orange Lodge is viewed as a building that is under threat.
- It was suggested that the Lodge be placed on the top of list for the newly hired Consultant.
- The Chair suggested that Mr. Buckland be invited to come before the Commission as a delegation to discuss this matter further.

5. Email dated July 15, 2009 from Al Cleaver concerning the Crescent Road park benches.

It was Moved by Commissioner Hart
Seconded by Commissioner Hol
That the Surrey Heritage Advisory
Commission receives the correspondence item for information.
Carried

6. Letter dated July 16, 2009 to Hazelmere United Church advising that Council has approved their Application for Financial Assistance.

It was Moved by Commissioner Hart
Seconded by Commissioner Hol
That the Surrey Heritage Advisory
Commission receives the correspondence item for information.
Carried

E. INFORMATION ITEMS

1. Heritage Tree Plaque

File No. 6800-05

Update – The owners of the Western Red Cedar are ecstatic about the installation of a plaque on the tree. The installation date may be in August 2009 or sometime after Labour Day.

It was Moved by Commissioner Hart
Seconded by Commissioner Paton
That the Surrey Heritage Advisory
Commission receives the correspondence item for information.
Carried

2. HAC Participation in 11th Annual Whalley Community Festival

File No. 8200-20

Commissioner Tannen reported that Commissioner Hart and herself had attended the Whalley Festival and were very pleased with the results.

- Overall, feedback of the Whalley Festival event was very positive.
- A suggestion for future events would be to collect names or business cards from attendees to ensure there is proper follow up and connections are not lost.
- Attendees engaged each other and talked about Community.
- It was discussed that it is important to engage the community and understand where people are coming from.

- Commissioner Hart encouraged his fellow Commissioners to attend similar events because there is a value to meeting the public and making them aware of the SHAC vision.

General comments were made as follows:

- Staff presented the Commissioners with an opportunity to review the Flavours of Surrey information boards.
- The Chair was asked where the historic pictures are that used to be displayed in the City hallways; staff will look into and report back to the Commission.
- Copies of the Surrey Heritage Advisory Commission brochure were distributed on table for consideration, and members were asked for feedback.
- It was asked whether it would be possible to sell copies of the DVD at upcoming City events. It was explained that only a City staff person would be able to sell the DVD due to City policy.
- It was suggested that people can be instructed how they pick up a copy of the DVD and this info be circulated at events and in publications directed to the general public to create further awareness.

3. **Surrey's Stories – Summer/Fall 2009**

File No. 7800-01

The Commission made the following comments:

- Copies of Surrey stories were presented on table for Commission review/comment.
- Commissioner Farrand will prepare an article for the October edition.

4. **Heritage BC Annual Conference The Way Forward: Meeting the Challenges of the 21st Century Kelowna, BC, June 4-6, 2009**

Commissioner Hart attended on behalf of the SHAC and provided the following feedback:

- A formal thank you letter should be prepared by Staff and sent to the organizers of the Kelowna event.
- One of the key messages of the conference was to ask youth what is important.
- The conference provided ideas of how to engage members of the community.
- The conference provided ideas on how to get others passionate about Community Support.
- Many attendees shared that a successful community outreach program needs to encompass passion.
- Some of the success stories were about Heritage Groups that were also champions of the community.
- It was discussed that there are challenges moving forward to protect property and also find newer young people who will provide interest.
- The common thread was how to engage younger people to champion the importance of Heritage preservation.

- Commissioner Hart challenged the SHAC to think of ways to engage youth.

F. SUBCOMMITTEE/LIAISON UPDATES

G. OTHER COMPETENT BUSINESS

- The Commission inquired as to why invitations have not been forthcoming to City Events. The invitation process will be looked into by staff.
- It was discussed that there might be interest in having a member of the Commission attend the Heritage Canada Foundation's 36th Annual Conference in Toronto from September 24 – 26, 2009.
- A question was raised regarding funding available in support of sending two attendees from the Commission.
- Staff shared that a cash advance can be made available if attendance is approved by Council. Staff will provide details on the Conference and funding request paperwork should Council approve the request to attend.

COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION

It was

Moved by Commissioner Lindenbach
Seconded by Commissioner Paton
That the Surrey Heritage Advisory
Commission recommend that Council approve Commissioner Foulkes and
Commissioner Tannen to attend the Heritage Canada Foundation's 36th Annual
Conference: The Heritage Imperative: Old Buildings in an Age of Environmental
Crisis in Toronto from September 24-26, 2009 and all expenses be paid for from
the SHAC budget as per policy.

Carried

H. OTHER BUSINESS ARISING FROM MINUTES

- The strategic review of Surrey's Heritage Register and Inventory and especially 'heritage under threat' must be completed ASAP.
- The Commission will work with the Consultant to look at reviewing Heritage Buildings.
- Staff suggested that the SHAC review the Terms of Reference used to hire a Consultant to do the study.
- The Commission requested that the Terms of Reference be emailed to all SHAC members for comment.
- The Chair suggested that it would be more advantageous to discuss it in person rather than through email and indicated that a special meeting could be called to review the Terms of Reference.

It was Moved by Commissioner Tracey
Seconded by Commissioner Farrand
That the Surrey Heritage Advisory
Commission recommends that a Special Meeting be held prior to the September 30, 2009
regular meeting date with the intent of reviewing the Terms of Reference to be used in
hiring a Consultant in support of the SHAC mandate.

Carried

- The Commission made mention of an "Action List" that should have been provided from the July 17, 2009 meeting. Members of the Commission would like to see a complete list of items that were referred and have the process tracked.
- Staff indicated that an up-to-date Action List would be provided at the September 30, 2009 meeting.

I. FINANCIALS

1. **Budget & Expenditure Analysis for 2009; Heritage Site Improvements; and Reserve for Future Expenses** File No. 1700-01

It was Moved by Commissioner Hart
Seconded by Commissioner Tannen
That the Surrey Heritage Advisory
Commission receives Budget & Expenditure Analysis for 2009 regarding the
Heritage Site improvements; and Reserve for Future Expenses report as
information.

Carried

The Commission made the following comments:

- It was asked if the story boards can be cleaned up prior to October. A report was provided at the June HAC meeting that outlined the Storyboard Maintenance Plan for 2009.

J. NEXT MEETING

A Special Meeting of the Heritage Advisory Commission will be held in September on a date mutually agreeable to members of the Commission. Staff will send out an email to Commission members regarding meeting time and availability of meeting rooms.

The next meeting of the Heritage Advisory Commission is scheduled for September 30, 2009 in the Executive Boardroom – 5:00 p.m.

Commissioner Paton asked the Chair if there was any further information on the demolition of the Currie and Parr Houses. The Chair explained that the issue was dealt with at the last meeting.

K. ADJOURNMENT

It was

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

Commission meeting do now adjourn.

Carried

The Surrey Heritage Advisory Commission adjourned at 8:40 p.m.

Jane Sowik, City Clerk

Councillor Steele, Chairperson
Surrey Heritage Advisory Commission