

**Present:**

W. Farrand  
R. Hart  
B. Hol  
L. Tannen

**Absent:**

Chair - Councillor Steele  
M. Petrovic, Engineering

**Staff Present:**

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

**A. ELECTIONS AND APPOINTMENTS**

Councillor Barbara Steele has been appointed as the Chair for the Commission.

The Commission is requested to elect a Vice-Chair for the 2010 calendar year.

It was

Moved by Commissioner Farrand  
Seconded by Commissioner Hol  
That Lesley Tannen be appointed as Vice-

Chair of the Surrey Heritage Advisory Commission for the 2010 Calendar Year.

Carried

**B. ADOPTION OF MINUTES**

It was

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

Advisory Commission of December 16, 2009, be adopted, as circulated.

Carried

**C. DELEGATIONS****D. OUTSTANDING BUSINESS****E. NEW BUSINESS****1. PARKS AND RECREATION****(a) Community Heritage Storyboards – Current Inventory and Future  
Priorities**

**File No. 6800-01**

Memo dated January 15, 2010 from the Manager of Heritage Services.

The Commission made the following comments:

- The Commission should look at different styles of storyboards that could be implemented throughout the City. Having higher quality signage and better street presence will go a long way. We need to look at what has been done, what works, what doesn't, and what can be done moving forward.
- The costs associated with these storyboards also need to be explored and items prioritized. If funding is difficult, perhaps phasing the project is an option.
- An important aspect to consider is that every time an asset is added to the inventory that creates a maintenance issue. Since the SHAC is currently only able to maintain about half of the current storyboards each year out of the budget, we need to be careful. The cost to maintain the storyboards is approximately \$200 per storyboard.

Staff made the following comments in response to the Commission:

- At one time there was a subcommittee that worked with the Parks Department and designers to determine the design, structure and fabrication of the storyboards. The Commission was very involved in determining the outcome.
- The design of these storyboards was also very much determined by the budget available, which has not changed much through the seven or so years this program has been in place. The budget is \$5,000 per year.
- Currently, the signs consist of a 'sandwich board' construction with Plexiglas covering the lexan storyboard. This is suspended in the metal sandblasted structure. Over time, depending on whether the sign is facing north or south or whether it is under trees or beside a road, the storyboards are accumulating various debris, dirt and mould within the 'sandwich' which is creeping into the lexan board.
- Staff was previously asked by the Commission to research other fabrication methodologies that would allow all of the storyboards to be maintained in each year. The findings were brought forward to the Commission but no decision was made.
- The new technology suggested is an embedded polycarbonate material that can be mounted on aluminum. The product is called 'Digital Diamond'. This material could be mounted directly onto the existing metal frame without significant alterations to the structure.
- The Commission needs to decide whether they would like to create new storyboards using the new technology or to update the existing inventory.

The Commission made the following additional comments:

- The current structure of the existing storyboards seems outdated and lacks appeal. We should allocate the funds to develop new storyboards or to upgrade the existing storyboards to the new material. Overall, there is preference to do a combination of both.

- Question was raised whether the new material is scratch and graffiti proof.
- Suggestion was made to have a steel silhouette attached to the existing structure to draw attention to the storyboards. Perhaps utilizing different themes will help to draw more people to these structures by creating more of an art piece than just a storyboard.
- It would be good to engage the public in the design process of how the new storyboard structures should look.

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

- The new material is supposed to be graffiti proof, however, it would need to be confirmed whether it is scratch proof.
- If the Commission has a desire for the storyboards to be redesigned then this will require funds to do so. There will need to be funds allocated to work with a designer as there is not that type of expertise available on City staff.
- In addition, if there is the desire to change the current structures from a sign to something that incorporates an artistic element, then this becomes 'Public Art'. The storyboards will then fall within the public art jurisdiction and will need to be dealt with by the Public Art Advisory Committee.

The Commission made the following additional comments:

- Question was raised as to whether it could be determined how many changes were made from submission to approval to the Port Kells' storyboards as they went through the Public Art process. It would be interesting to know how different the end result was from what the Port Kells Community Association originally proposed.
- The hope would be that if the Commission was to come up with a good design and do it well that we could be given guidance by the Public Art Advisory Committee and work collaboratively but the Heritage Commission would maintain ownership of the design.
- Perhaps since the Port Kells' storyboards have already been approved by the Public Art Advisory Committee, then we could use those designs for the rest in the City.
- The Commission cannot make a decision on the signage until there is more information so perhaps having a discussion with the City's Art Manager would be useful to see what direction we should take.

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

- If the storyboards are upgraded from their current design to anything that is more creative, then this would be considered 'Public Art' and would need to go through the Public Art process.

- The definition of 'Public Art' is quite broad. The moment that something begins to have interpretive artistic elements, it would be considered Public Art.
- The Port Kells storyboards are not a City asset; they are under the jurisdiction of the Port Kells Community Association so it may not be that easy to just adopt that design for other signage throughout the City.

It was Moved by Commissioner Hol  
 Seconded by Commissioner Farrand  
 That the Surrey Heritage Advisory  
 Commission requests that Sheila McKinnon, Arts Manager be invited to the next meeting to discuss Surrey's storyboards and the process followed in order to redesign these structures.

Carried

Commissioner Hart and Commissioner Farrand volunteered to work together on a task group concerning the storyboard issue.

**(b) Heritage Services Community Advisory Board**  
**File No. 0540-20V**

Memo dated January 15, 2010 from the Manager of Heritage Services.

The following comments were made:

- The meetings are typically held at 7 p.m. and are every second month or so. Meetings are topic related.

It was Moved by Commissioner Hart  
 Seconded by Commissioner Farrand  
 That the Surrey Heritage Advisory  
 Commission appoints Commissioner Bert Hol to serve as the liaison for the Heritage Services Community Advisory Board.

Carried

**2. PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT**

The Agenda was varied to deal with item 2.(c) first.

J. Koch-Schulte arrived at the meeting at 5:57 p.m.

**(c) Louis Dahl House – Proposal – On-site Relocation and Protection –  
 11334 River Road**  
**File No.: 7909-0243-00/6800-10**

Memo dated January 18, 2010 from the Manager, Area Planning and Development – North Division

The Commissioner made the following comments:

- We have seen these types of proposals many times before, and many times have been disappointed. It seems that there isn't any incentive for the developer anymore when property is purchased that includes a heritage building.
- It happens all too often that the heritage building is placed on the worst lot, in this case, the smallest lot with an easement. What needs to happen is the heritage lot is given a certain type of zoning which will accommodate a garage with carriage house as an incentive to create interest and appeal in the heritage building for potential buyers.
- Question was raised as to why the Louis Dahl House is being moved to the smallest lot in the subdivision as well as what the actual footprint of the house is.

Staff made the following comments in response to the Commission:

- The house's footprint is quite small and is likely less than 1,000 square feet in size. The easement on the lot where the house will be moved to is for a shared driveway to allow access to the rear of the lot. The easement may be removed when the neighbouring property develops in the future.
- The house has been lived in and has some water damage in the basement cellar due to springs being discovered on the property. Moving the house will be a benefit and make it more livable as it will get a new foundation. There will be geo-tech reports and recommendations for the new site to protect the house from future water damage.

The Commission made the following additional comments:

- The house cannot just be moved to the most undesirable lot in the subdivision. This will only cause the same problem that we have seen again and again – no one will be interested in purchasing and protecting this heritage house. The house needs to be the showpiece of this development.
- By the very fact that the Louis Dahl House is part of this development, the developer has gained an additional two lots with the relocation of the house which makes it a total of 13 instead of 11 lots. This is a benefit to the developer, so they should be willing to make some concessions with respect to this heritage house.
- Suggestion was made that moving the house to another lot in the subdivision may be an easier, more cost effective solution. As well, reducing the 20 meter internal roadway could assist with making the lots bigger to accommodate the plans.

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

- The issue with making the road narrower is that it would create a bottle neck as the existing road further up the street is already that wide.

The Commission made the following additional comments:

- Suggestion was made that the trees on this site should be considered. Having the house situated among trees will add to the heritage character and appeal of the house.
- There are several options that can still be explored to have a 'win-win' situation for both the developer and the City. The developer has already gotten two additional lots from the original plan so splitting the difference to accommodate the heritage house doesn't seem like a bad option so everyone can be happy.
- The point that needs to be stressed in situations like these is that having a heritage house as part of a development is not a punishment but rather an advantage.

J. Koch-Schulte left the meeting at 6:51 p.m.

**(a) HAC Task List**  
**File No. 0540-20V**

Memo dated January 5, 2010 from the General Manager, Planning & Development.

The Commission received the report for information.

**(b) Tynehead Community Hall (9568 – 168<sup>th</sup> Street) – Heritage Alteration Permit**  
**File No. 6800-10**

Memo dated January 14, 2010 from the General Manager, Planning & Development.

The Commissioner made the following comments:

- The Applicant is proposing to change the roof from cedar shakes to duroid shingles. As long as this change does not modify the character dramatically to lose the heritage aspect then this should be fine.
- Question was raised as to how the building would fair at this time considering the last valuation of this house was done in 1997.

Staff made the following comments in response to the Commission:

- It is important to note that the Tynehead Community Hall was designated in 1993 and designated for its social and cultural value, not for its architectural value.

- The house has not changed much since the last evaluation, so it would be likely very similar. The purpose for the proposed addition is to upgrade the washrooms and make them wheelchair accessible.

### 3. ENGINEERING

There are no reports from Engineering.

### 4. LEGISLATIVE SERVICES

#### (a) Heritage Advisory Commission Establishment By-law Amendment File No. 3900-01

The Commission requested that Legislative Services send a copy of the amended By-law to them via email for their information.

N. Marach left the meeting at 6:57 p.m.

### F. ITEMS REFERRED BY COUNCIL

### G. CORRESPONDENCE

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

#### 1. Applications for Financial Assistance – Arthur Hedley House

Letter dated January 18, 2010 to Muir Elston advising that Council approved two Applications for Financial Assistance.

### H. INFORMATION ITEMS

#### 1. Heritage BC Quarterly Newsletter – Fall 2009 (to be provided on-table at the meeting).

This item was received.

#### 2. Journal of the British Columbia Historical Federation Magazine – Vol. 42 No. 4 (to be provided on-table at the meeting).

This item was received.

**3. Sustainability Charter – Checklist Workshop**

Memo dated December, 2009 from Commissioner Hol.

Suggestion was made to have an overview of the updated website at the next SHAC meeting.

**I. OTHER BUSINESS**

**1. Friends of Heritage Awards Program Nomination Form – Green Timbers Heritage Society and Peter Maarsman  
File No. 6800-01**

The following comments were made:

- The process for the Friends of Heritage Award Nominations needs to be reviewed in terms of when the notification goes out. The last few years there has been difficulty gaining interest and nominations.
- Suggestion was made that the advertisements for this program start to go out in September once the kids are back in school as opposed to in December and January. It seems people are too caught up with Christmas and Holidays at those times that starting earlier may create more interest and response.
- There should be a task group created to work on this and to revamp the process. Commissioner Hart and Commissioner Tannen will work together during the summer to prepare for the Friends of Heritage Awards Program. Suggestion was also made this item could be put onto the Heritage Task List as a reminder as well as have Friends of Heritage as a standing Agenda item to ensure that nothing gets missed.
- Suggestion was made that Mr. Wady Lehmann should be the nominee for the Green Timbers Heritage Society as he has been part of this Society and contributed for many years.

It was

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

Commission recommends that Mr. Wady Lehmann and the Green Timbers Heritage Society be nominated for the Friends of Heritage Award.

Carried

**J. SUBCOMMITTEE/LIAISON UPDATES**

**K. FINANCIALS**

**L. NEXT MEETING**

The next meeting of the Surrey Heritage Advisory Commission is scheduled for February 24, 2010 in the Planning Boardroom #1 – 5:00 p.m.

**M. ADJOURNMENT**

It was

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

Commission meeting do now adjourn.

Carried

The Surrey Heritage Advisory Commission adjourned at 7:39 p.m.

---

Jane Sullivan, City Clerk

---

Lesley Tannen, Vice Chairperson  
Surrey Heritage Advisory Commission