

Present:

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

Absent:

Councillor Steele
J. O'Donnell, Parks,
Recreation and Culture

Guests:

Barry McGinn, McGinn
Engineering

Staff Present:

J. McLeod, Planning & Development
E. Schultz, Planning & Development
M. Petrovic, Engineering
V. Wilke, Finance & Technology
P. Lau, Planning & Development
N. Dyrbye, Legislative Services

The Agenda was varied at the start of the meeting.

A. ADOPTION OF MINUTES

The following changes were suggested for the November 18, 2009 minutes:

- 1) Commissioner Paton would like it noted that the reason she voted against the Application for Financial Assistance for the Arthur Hedley House is because she opposed the use of single pane windows.

Commissioner Foulkes arrived at the meeting at 5:09 p.m.

- 2) Commissioner Paton advised she did not move the motion to adopt the 2009 Budget and Expenditure Analysis. Commissioner Hart advised he could be named as mover of the motion instead.
- 3) Commissioner Foulkes advised that the wording under G.5 is incorrect and should be changed to read:

"It appears that the City has installed a pedestrian crossing island on the 6100 block of 184th Street north of 60th Avenue."

It was

Moved by Commissioner Tannen
Seconded by Commissioner Hart
That the minutes of the Surrey Heritage

Advisory Commission of November 18, 2009, be adopted, as circulated.

Carried

B. DELEGATIONS

D. NEW BUSINESS**1. PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT****(b) Proposed amendments to the Meadow Ridge Farm Conservation Plan****File No.: 7907-0115-00**

Memo dated December 14, 2009 from the Manager, Long Range Planning & Policy Development.

Barry McGinn of McGinn Engineering, Architect for Rempel Construction, the Bose Farm, and the conservation plan was in attendance and made the following comments:

- This past fall, a site investigation was conducted. It was found that the tie beams that connect the top joint of the arch trusses were seriously deteriorated on the calf, dairy and machine barns. The potato barn was deemed in good condition.
- The Structural Engineer indicated that with the extent of deterioration, it would not be possible to stabilize the barn in place and it would be easier to repair the trusses on the flat rather than in an erected form. Therefore, the proposal is to disassemble the arch trusses and have them repaired in the potato barn.
- Essentially, the request is to make changes to the construction process, with the end product being the same as previously approved. It is felt that with these changes being made, the result will be a higher quality end product while still achieving the upgrades that are required. The Engineer is concerned about stabilization of these buildings and hopes to advance the repairs to be done in the first phase of construction.

Staff made the following comments:

- This Application is currently at 2nd reading and is subject to the Agricultural Land Commission's (ALC) review. If it is approved, then staff plans to proceed to Council with a secondary report requesting Public Hearing.

The Commission made the following comments:

- Concern was raised that the longer the building is left without repairs, the further it will deteriorate. With winter upon us, the weather is not favorable and these buildings need to be dealt with as soon as possible so they are not lost.

The Architect made the following additional comments:

- The conservation plan indicates that the barn construction is to commence in January, 2010.
- The interior ground floor of the west side of the dairy barn has been shored from a structural standpoint and they have looked into tarping

the building, but are afraid that this will increase the wind loads to the building.

- The Applicant is aware of the significant penalties embedded into the HRA. There is a fair amount of incentive to act responsibly, so we are keen to move forward with this.
- The intent is to save as much heritage fabric as possible and the arch trusses are key character defining elements on the building.

The Commission made the following additional comments:

- Request was made to have the Applicant erect legible signage on the site so that the public can be made aware of what is happening on the property once construction commences.

Commissioner Hol arrived at the meeting at 5:41 p.m.

The Architect made the following additional comments:

- The Applicant will ensure that they make all necessary efforts to install signage on the site to advise the public of the plans for the site.

It was

Moved by Commissioner Tannen
Seconded by Commissioner Foulkes
That the Heritage Advisory Commission

supports the proposed changes to the Conservation Plan for Meadowridge Farm as presented to the Commission by Barry McGinn, the Architect for the project.

Carried

P. Lau and B. McGinn left the meeting at 5:51 p.m.

C. OUTSTANDING BUSINESS

At the November 18, 2009 SHAC meeting, the Commission made the following motion:

1. **Heritage Advisory Commission Budget & Expenditure Analysis for 2009.**

The Surrey Heritage Advisory Commission previously recommended to the General Manager, Finance and Technology that a representative from the Finance Department come to the Commission to present the Heritage Commission's budget on a spreadsheet that separates the operating budget from the financial assistance and also states what the reserves from previous years are as well as operating budget carry forwards.

V. Wilke, General Manager, Finance & Technology was in attendance and answered any questions the Commission had concerning the Budget & Expenditure Analysis for 2009.

The Budget and Expenditure Analysis for 2009 was reviewed and the Commission thanked the General Manager of Finance and Technology for making changes to make the documents more legible.

The following additional comments were made:

- On page 1 of the document, the \$1,800 spent for a consultant is under the storyboard column and needs to be moved.
- Suggestion was made that it would be helpful to have a financial summary cover page to this document in the future.

V. Wilke left the meeting at 6:14 p.m.

D. NEW BUSINESS

1. PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

(a) Heritage Strategic Review

Staff will present an overview of the two consultants' proposals that were submitted for preparation of the Heritage Strategic Review.

A handout was provided on-table with comparisons of the two proponents and their proposals.

Staff made the following comments:

- To date, two proposals have been received, one from Donald Luxton & Associates Inc. and one from Commonwealth Historic Resource Management Ltd. Both came in on budget.
- Both of these consultants are very experienced and respected and have experience working in Surrey on various heritage projects.
- Both have a good understanding of the project at hand and have proposed similar approaches to the strategic review.
- Staff described the proposals in detail and provided copies of each for review.
- The proponents will be working with the HAC to conduct a complete review of the heritage register and inventory to determine priority sites and develop evaluation criteria to determine level of threat. Both proponents will be advocating a values-based approach and developing a evaluation criteria and a rating system.
- The draft strategic review will be presented to the Commission for review prior to the final documentation being provided to the City.
- The proposed timeline for completion differs in that Luxton estimates completion by September 2010 while Commonwealth estimates completion by June 1, 2010.

The Commission made the following comments:

- Question was raised as to whether the consultants advised how busy they currently were with other work.
- Question was raised as to why Donald Luxton estimates a longer time for completion as opposed to Commonwealth.
- Comment was made that it appears that the key personnel that will be involved in the study from Donald Luxton & Associates have a more diverse skill set than those from Commonwealth.

Staff made the following additional comments:

- The consultants did not specifically say how busy they already were but staff have asked for a commitment in terms of time and personnel. Each submission includes how many days each firm will commit to this project.
- Donald Luxton estimates a longer timeline for completion most likely because this is a fairly large project. This may be a more realistic timeline for completion.

It was
recommends to the General Manager, Planning and Development that Donald Luxton & Associates Inc. be chosen to complete the Heritage Strategic Review.

Moved by Commissioner Tracey
Seconded by Commissioner Hart
That the Heritage Advisory Commission
Carried with Commissioner Farrand
opposed.

2. LEGISLATIVE SERVICES

(a) Application for Financial Assistance – Arthur Hedley House

The Commissioner made the following comments:

- Suggestion was made that quotations from businesses in Surrey should be given precedence when choosing who to hire to perform works.
- Comment was made that the quotation from the business that has the most expertise should be chosen, not necessarily only from Surrey.

COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION

It was
recommends that Council approve heritage financial assistance for the Arthur Hedley House to the maximum of \$3,937.50 (*three thousand nine hundred thirty seven dollars and fifty cents*), which represents 50% of the value of the work as per the quotation from Williams Roofing & Drainage Ltd. 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*).

Moved by Commissioner Foulkes
Seconded by Commissioner Tannen
That the Heritage Advisory Commission
Carried

(b) **Application for Financial Assistance – Arthur Hedley House (from November 18, 2009 SHAC meeting)**

The following comments were made:

- At the last SHAC meeting, the Commission received another Application for Financial Assistance concerning the Arthur Hedley House.
- The Commission had made a motion that the Applicant choose Personal Touch Painting as opposed to the Applicant's choice of Master Painting to complete the works because it was initially believed that they would be using a higher quality paint.
- Since then, it has been determined both companies were proposing to use the same paint. It has therefore been requested that the Commission reconsider allowing the Applicant to choose Master Painting.

COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION

It was

Moved by Commissioner Hol

Seconded by Commissioner Tannen

That the Heritage Advisory Commission

recommends that Council approve heritage financial assistance for the Arthur Hedley House to the maximum of \$3,193.90 (*three thousand one hundred ninety three dollars and ninety cents*), which represents 50% of the value of the work as per the quotation from Master Painting and Nor-Del Glass Ltd. 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

E. ITEMS REFERRED BY COUNCIL

F. CORRESPONDENCE

There are no correspondence items.

G. INFORMATION ITEMS

H. OTHER BUSINESS

1. Loyal Orange Lodge

Commissioner Foulkes advised that he has spoken with Mr. Buckland about this site. It has not yet been determined what will happen with the building. It is currently situated on a large piece of Surrey owned land.

Commissioner Hol left the meeting at 7:10 p.m.

I. SUBCOMMITTEE/LIAISON UPDATES

J. FINANCIALS

This item was dealt with under section C.

K. NEXT MEETING

The next meeting of the Heritage Advisory Commission is scheduled for January 27, 2010 in the Planning Boardroom #1 – 5:00p.m.

L. ADJOURNMENT

It was

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

Commission meeting do now adjourn.

Carried

The Surrey Heritage Advisory Commission adjourned at 7:14 p.m.

Jane Sullivan, City Clerk

H. Lindenbach, Chairperson
Surrey Heritage Advisory Commission