



Surrey Heritage Advisory Commission - Minutes

Planning Boardroom #1
City Hall
14245 - 56 Avenue
Surrey, B.C.
WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 24, 2010
Time: 5:09 p.m.

Present:

Chair - Councillor Steele
W. Farrand
B. Hol
L. Tannen

Absent:

R. Hart

Guests:

J. Bliss, President of Surrey
Historical Society Guest

Staff Present:

N. Marach, Planning & Development
E. Schultz, Planning & Development
R. Gill, Planning & Development
J. O'Donnell, Parks, Recreation and Culture
S. McKinnon, Parks, Recreation and Culture
J. Boan, Engineering
B. Fisher, Engineering
M. Petrovic, Engineering
S. Fillion, Finance and Technology
N. Dyrbye, Legislative Services

The Agenda was varied at the start of the meeting.

A. ADOPTION OF MINUTES

It was

Moved by Commissioner Farrand
Seconded by Commissioner Hol
That the minutes of the Surrey Heritage
Advisory Commission meeting of January 27, 2010, be adopted, as circulated.
Carried

B. DELEGATIONS

1. Sheila McKinnon, Arts Manager

The Commission requested at their January 27, 2010 meeting to invite the City Arts Manager to discuss the Heritage Storyboards.

A PowerPoint presentation was provided and the following comments were made:

- The Commission had requested an overview of the Public Art Program with respect to updating the City's storyboards to create signs with more artistic elements. Most of the examples provided are from the Port Kells signage.
- The benefits of having Public Art in the City include:
 - Inspiration;
 - Beautify ordinary infrastructure;
 - Amusement;
 - Create character by building into everyday streetscapes;
 - Create identity and sense of place;
 - Support tourism; and
 - Commemorate and celebrate.

- The background of Surrey's Public Art Policy includes:
 - In 1998, the Public Art Policy was developed including 1.25% of City construction project budgets to be allocated to Public Art;
 - In the first 10 years \$1 million was spent on Public Art and 27 projects were completed;
 - Thanks to the Cultural Capitals of Canada Award, six projects were budgeted at \$816,000 and were recently completed; and
 - Over \$683,000 has been allocated to future capital projects.
- The City's Public Art Advisory Committee is comprised of nine dedicated members selected from the fields of urban design, architecture, visual arts, art history and administration, education, engineering and the performing arts.
- The members promote and are actively engaged in the establishment of a public art installation for a variety of City sites including aquatic centers, arenas, libraries, recreation centers, parks, fire halls, the Museum, Arts Center and engineering infrastructures.
- The volunteers are appointed by Council and meet on a monthly basis. All departments in the City of Surrey are also involved in some way with the Public Art Program.
- The Public Art Process includes the following:
 - Begins with Council's approval of the annual capital budget.
 - 1.25% of the construction budget of each capital project is dedicated to a public art component.
 - Of this amount, 10% is set aside for long term maintenance, 15% for administration and 75% goes to the art budget.
 - Inter-departmental art teams meet to review proposed projects, the budgets, sites and possible themes.
 - The Public Art Master Plan for the City is updated, reviewed by the Public Art Advisory Committee and forwarded to Council.
 - With each project a decision is made to proceed with either a direct commission, a limited call to artists or an open call.
 - Artists are asked to submit their resumes with a portfolio of their work.
 - A selection panel reviews these materials and will often short list two or three artists.
 - The artists will be paid a small fee to develop a site specific proposal; they often create a model for their proposal.
 - Then the artists present their proposals to a selection panel.
 - Staff conduct a technical review.
 - The selection panel reviews this work and makes a recommendation to the Public Art Advisory Committee that then goes to Council.
- There are different types of art within the Public Art Program including community art projects, gifts and donations.
- The Port Kells' signage has incorporated archival images as watermarks in the background of the signs, have superimposed Wally Sandvoss' images on top, and had an emblem designed for the Port Kells Community Association. There are currently ten of the historical markers in Port Kells.
- The signs themselves consist of a steel stand that is about 3mm and a sign that is about 2mm. The cost was approximately \$3,000 per sign and the overall

project cost approximately \$30,000. The Port Kells Community Association contributed at least \$20,000 of the total cost towards the signage.

The Commission made the following comments:

- It was expressed that the materials the Commission would like to use for the signs would be a long lasting and affordable one.
- Suggestion was made that perhaps some art could be implemented on the existing signs. The concept would be to make the signs less boring and perhaps something could be added to make the signs 'heritage monuments'.

Staff made the following comments in response to the Commission:

- At this point, it is a bit premature to know whether the Port Kells signage is successful or not as they are still quite new. There is an anti-graffiti coating on the signs and they are very sturdy, but it is not yet known whether there are maintenance or vandalism problems. The signage in Fort Langley has been there for quite some time and perhaps checking with them on the success of their signage would be useful information for the Commission.
- The funding for upgraded signage would go through the heritage budget and most likely would not have to go through the public art process. Perhaps it could be recommended that the Commission go through the process of finding an artist to help with the design first. These signs would not become part of the City's public art inventory.

The Commission made the following additional comments:

- Request was made that the Arts Manager check with the success of Fort Langley's signage and report back to the Commission.

K. FINANCIALS

1. Financial Summary as at December 31, 2010.

Staff made the following comments:

- The General Manager of Finance & Technology attended the Commission's December, 2009 meeting in which the Commission requested various improvements to the financial reporting. Those changes have been made and a copy is attached for the Commission's review.

J. Boan and B. Fisher arrived at the meeting at 5:41 p.m.

The Commission made the following comments:

- Suggestion was made on the Heritage Site Improvement page that changing 'entitlement' to 'top up' would make more sense.

R. Gill arrived at the meeting at 5:42 p.m.

Staff advised they would make the suggested change for future financial summaries.

S. Fillion left the meeting at 5:49 p.m.

D. NEW BUSINESS

3. ENGINEERING

**(b) King George Heritage Oak Tree Impact
Project 7909-0236-00 – 32nd Avenue Extension
File No.: 6800-05**

Memo dated February 22, 2010 from the Transportation Engineer.

Staff made the following comments:

- There is a road link planned between 32nd Avenue and Crescent road that conflicts with one of the Heritage Oak Trees on King George Boulevard.
- The original plan came about in 1995 and since then the area has developed somewhat. Crescent Road is often congested with delays in the area and the City feels it is important to create more linkages.
- The more recent 2002 plan included a realignment of 148th Street, however it has been determined that this will conflict with a heritage oak tree.
- There are many oak trees that will be planted along the King George Boulevard once upgrades are completed. Years back acorns were collected from the existing trees, planted, and have been cared for at a nursery. Currently, there are a total of 300 trees and 70 of them are ready for planting.
- The options that could be considered are to:
 - Abandon the road all together. The City feels however that this connection is important for mobility and access for the growing population in the area.
 - Realign the road on the other side of King George Boulevard. This option has costly implications however in the \$500,000 to \$600,000 range and staff does not feel this to be a viable option.
 - Relocate the tree. This is a possible option should the Commission wish. Special equipment will be required and the process will take in excess of a year and a half. In addition, special treatment and trimming of the roots of the tree is required before the tree spade removes the tree to ensure it lives. This option would cost approximately \$65,000 and there would be a 90% chance that the tree would survive. A suitable

location not far away from where the tree is currently situated has been selected for relocation if this is the chosen option.

- The final option would be to remove the tree.
- There may be greater value in putting money towards gathering more acorns and growing more trees to be planted in the future. There is currently no budget for this; however, Engineering is prepared to provide a budget that would allow the plan to move forward should the Commission choose so.

The Commission made the following comments:

- Question was raised as to who would pay for the relocation of the tree if that option were to be chosen. It would seem that it would be difficult to get the money from the developer for this.
- It would be better to see the tree relocated if there is a feasible way of sharing the cost with the developer; this should be something that staff should try to negotiate.
- The information concerning heritage trees needs to be available in COSMOS so that heritage trees won't be missed again in the future.
- Perhaps this situation could become a sort of precedent if the developer were to contribute to saving and moving the tree. It would create good publicity for the City in showing money well spent toward heritage.
- It would be most beneficial if the tree could be saved and moved as well as money put toward the collection of acorns and new trees raised for planting in the future. Doing both would be the most beneficial.

It was

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

Commission recommend that the preference would be to save and relocate the Heritage Oak Tree on King George Boulevard and to have staff look into sources that may be available to contribute toward the collection of acorns and the growing of new heritage oak trees.

Carried

J. Boan, B. Fisher and R. Gill left the meeting at 6:15 p.m.

C. OUTSTANDING BUSINESS

D. NEW BUSINESS

1. PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

**(a) Heritage Foundation Workshop
File No.: 6800-01**

Memo dated February 1, 2010 from the General Manager, Planning & Development.

The following comments were made:

- The Workshop will be taking place on March 23, 2010 at 1:00 p.m. and the Chair will also be in attendance.
- Two volunteers from the Commission are requested to be in attendance at this Workshop.

It was agreed that Commissioner Tannen, Hol and Farrand will attend the Workshop.

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

Memo dated February 1, 2010 from the General Manager, Planning & Development.

The Commission made the following comments:

- Request was made to have the restricted future expenses included on the list.
- Question was raised regarding the Kensington Prairie School and whether any heritage character would be retained on the exterior of the building.

Staff made the following comments in response to the Commission:

- Many changes have already been made to the exterior of the building, however there currently there is no plan to restore the exterior of the building to its original state. Further changes to the character defining elements of the building are not proposed at this time.

**(c) John Sedgewick House – Update
File No.: 6800-10**

Memo dated February 8, 2010 from the General Manager, Planning & Development.

The following comments were made:

- The current owner of the house will be making a request shortly to come to the Commission as a delegation to discuss this issue further.

It was
Commission
That the Surrey Heritage Advisory
Commission approves the owner of the John Sedgewick House to come and speak as a delegation at the next meeting once the request is received.
Carried

(d) Heritage Website 101

Demonstration to be provided at meeting.

This item was deferred to the next meeting.

The following comments were made:

- The publicist, Dani Brown, who put together a portion of the website should also be invited for this presentation at the next meeting.

2. PARKS AND RECREATION

There are no reports from Parks and Recreation.

3. ENGINEERING

**(a) Final Copy of the Semiahmoo Trail Servicing Study
File No.: 6800-10**

Memo from the Development Services Project Coordinator, Engineering Department.

It was
Commission
That the Surrey Heritage Advisory
Commission receives the Final Copy of the Semiahmoo Trail Servicing Study for information.

Carried

**(b) King George Heritage Oak Tree Impact
Project 7909-0236-00 – 32nd Avenue Extension
File No.: 6800-05**

Memo dated February 22, 2010 from the Transportation Engineer.

This item was dealt with earlier in the meeting.

4. LEGISLATIVE SERVICES

There are no reports from Legislative Services.

E. ITEMS REFERRED BY COUNCIL

F. CORRESPONDENCE

There are no Correspondence items.

G. INFORMATION ITEMS

1. **Heritage BC Quarterly Newsletter – Winter 2010**
(to be provided on-table at the meeting).
2. **The Magazine of the Heritage Canada Foundation – Vol.XII No.3**
(to be provided on-table at the meeting).
3. **Old News – Vancouver Heritage Foundation –
February 2010**

It was

Commission receive the information items.

Moved by Commissioner Tannen
Seconded by Commissioner Hol
That the Surrey Heritage Advisory
Carried

H. OTHER BUSINESS

1. **Building Surrey – 1890s – Present Exhibition**
File No.: 6800-01

Email dated February 13, 2010 from Commissioner Tannen.

It was

recommends to Council that \$1,500.00 from the Heritage budget be allocated towards the “Building Surrey, 1890’s – Present” Exhibition.

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

I. TASK/LIAISON GROUPS

J. FRIENDS OF HERITAGE

K. FINANCIALS

1. Financial Summary as at December 31, 2010.

This item was dealt with earlier in the meeting.

L. NEXT MEETING

The next meeting of the Surrey Heritage Advisory Commission is scheduled for March 31, 2010 in the Planning Boardroom #1 – 5:00 p.m.

M. ADJOURNMENT

It was

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

Commission meeting do now adjourn.

Carried

The Surrey Heritage Advisory Commission adjourned at 6:45 p.m.

Jane Sullivan, City Clerk

Councillor Steele, Chairperson
Surrey Heritage Advisory Commission