



# City of Surrey

## Surrey Heritage Advisory Commission Minutes

Executive Boardroom  
City Hall  
14245 - 56 Avenue  
Surrey, B.C.  
WEDNESDAY, MAY 28, 2008  
Time: 9:10 a.m.

---

**Present:**

Chair - Councillor Higginbotham  
W. Farrand  
J. Foulkes  
R. Fuller  
H. Lindenbach  
M. Stibbs  
W. Tracey

**Absent:**

J. Monk

**Guests:**

Edward Warzel, By-Law Enforcement &  
Licensing Section  
Gordon Anderson, Fire Department  
Sgt. Roger Morrow, RCMP

**Staff Present:**

A. Kopystynski, Planning & Development  
D. Luymes, Planning & Development  
J. O'Donnell, Parks, Recreation and Culture  
N. Dyrbye, Legislative Services  
W. Power, Realty Services

---

**A. ADOPTION OF MINUTES****1. Surrey Heritage Advisory Commission Minutes - April 30, 2008**

It was Moved by Commissioner Lindenbach  
Seconded by Commissioner Fuller  
That the minutes of the Surrey Heritage  
Advisory Commission of April 30, 2008, be adopted, as circulated.  
Carried

**B. PRESENTATIONS (Realty Services)****1. Exterior Painting of the Historic TJ Brown House – 13275 Colebrook Road**

Report from the Realty Asset Manager dated May 20, 2008. Verbal report to be provided concerning the Historic TJ Brown House.

The Realty Asset Manager made the following comments:

- The City has been working on this house for the last three years. It is owned by the Parks Department and is situated in parkland.
- The City has now secured funding for this project and would like to proceed with the painting of the house. There are two options the City proposes for the new paint to the house, one being of lighter colours and the other of darker colours.
- The lighter colours for the house more accurately reflect the original colours used for the house as opposed to the darker colours and the City's preference is to use the lighter palette.

The Commission made the following comments:

- Question regarding the original colour of the window frames was made.
- Further question as to the use of the house once it is completed was made.

The following comments were made in response to the Commission:

- The original colour for the window frames for the house was cream.
- The house is currently rented out and it is used for filming purposes. There are usually two to three films per year shot at the house and it was previously used for the television series “The X-Files”.

It was

Moved by Commissioner Fuller  
Seconded by Commissioner Tracey  
Opposed by Commissioner Lindenbach  
That the SHAC recommend that Option 1

being the lighter coloured paint be used for the finishing colour paint to the Thomas Joseph Brown House.

Carried

W. Power left the meeting at 9:17 a.m.

## C. CORPORATE REPORTS

### 1. PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

#### (a) Protection of Heritage Properties

This item was dealt with after item C.1(b).

Report dated May 6, 2008 from the Senior Planner (Heritage) thanking various staff for their attendance to discuss problems and solutions for protection of Heritage Properties and requesting further suggestions.

Discussion ensued and the Commission and Guests made the following comments:

- The issue of protection of heritage properties in the City had been discussed at a previous meeting to come up with suggestions for making the rules tighter for those who own heritage homes that are damaged either from neglect or in the process of development and/or restorations.
- One of the biggest problems is the length of time in which heritage matters take to deal with and houses are ending up being left vacant and being damaged while the negotiations are taking place.
- From a Fire Services perspective, they have been having many issues with vacant houses in general. Whether it is heritage or not, these vacant houses pose an attractive means of shelter for certain people and this creates a significant hazard not only to the occupants of the building but also for the surrounding neighbourhood. They have found that in many of these types of situations when they remind the owners that it is their responsibility for the safety and upkeep of these

properties, they are under the impression that the City is responsible for security of the buildings.

- It is surprising that owners feel it is the City's responsibility for security of the houses. This needs to be clarified to them.
- Question was raised that if there are so many people interested in occupying these vacant houses then why does the City not insist that the developers ensure that the houses are kept permanently occupied for security during the development/restoration process.
- Some suggestions that may help to improve the situation are:
  - Requirement for a security person to be on site. There are programs in place where police officers live in these sites rent free to ensure their integrity prior to restoration;
  - If the premises are not habitable then a requirement for secure fencing around the property would greatly enhance monitoring of the property;
  - If the premises are not habitable then a requirement for an alarm system would greatly enhance the ability for monitoring;
  - A provision to immediately secure the property is needed if it has been breached; and
  - A sign to identify the property as a heritage building with a property reference phone number.
- The intention of these possible solutions should be to apply different requirements for a house depending on the specific circumstances.

The Senior Planner (Heritage) made the following comments:

- The two main concerns of house protection come from maintaining security between the time the Development Application comes in and when it is approved. The other aspect of this is once the Application is approved, how can security be maintained between the approval and when the restorations are complete. This is where the Heritage Revitalization Agreement comes into play, which also relies on provisions contained in the *Local Government Act*.
- The Heritage Revitalization Agreement can be amended to add clauses to allow efforts to be triggered more quickly so the owner will recognize their responsibilities. And, if things do not happen, what is available to the City to take action on where a building is not secured and/or damaged.
- The Legislation allows for temporary protection where a building is at threat. Legal Services has advised that the owner would have to maintain the building and keep it secure should it be required to enter into a "No Build Restrictive Covenant".
- When a Development Application is submitted to the City that involves a property on the Heritage Register, then the Commission is required to be a part of the decision as to how the development will or will not proceed.
- A possibility the City could look at would be to require a bond from developers immediately and that it can only be released if the building is maintained, secured and successfully restored. This would create

some incentive if they want their money back to make sure they look after the house.

The Commission and the Guests made the following additional comments:

- Perhaps introducing a temporary permit for heritage protection once the Development Application comes in would require a signed agreement for the protection of the property and buildings.
- It would be helpful to have in the Agreement where the Commission would become involved in the process. If this were included, then developers would be aware that they have special circumstances that they will need to deal with for it to be approved and no matter how long the application may take, have it state that they are solely responsible for the property.
- There needs to be consequences put into play should these requirements of the owners and developers not be met. A more creative approach should be taken to ensure the City has recourse for those who do not comply.
- These projects are multimillion-dollar projects and having the developers pay a bond will not create incentive for them as they will just look at it as the cost of doing business. There needs to be a bigger consequence than just monetary to ensure protection of these houses.
- If money isn't the issue for these developers then perhaps adding into the application that if the building is not secured and should become damaged then it must be rebuilt to City standards. This would give the City much more clout to ensuring heritage protection.
- Perhaps looking into requiring the developers to keep the power and other services to the houses intact can assist. The policy that is developed needs to be strong enough to save the houses but also flexible enough to save the houses.
- Suggestion was made to break down the protection requirements of a property based on whether the house is being moved or not. If the house is being restored on site as opposed to being moved should have different criteria for the developers to adhere to.

The Planners made the following additional comments:

- At the present time, if there is a Development Application with a Heritage Revitalization Agreement, the Agreement is adopted concurrently with the Development Application. It may be worth looking into considering that the Agreement be approved independently of the re-zoning so that the protection tools are available to the City right from the start of a property being deemed heritage.
- Creating a simple document that has the replication aspect included would definitely be more of an incentive for developers to protect the property rather than if they only had a bond to pay upfront.

The Commission and the Guests made the following concluding comments:

- It is a big challenge to try to make dealing with heritage worth the developers' whiles as well as still enticing them to take on these projects. Hopefully some of these suggestions can be put into play to see how effective they will be.
- It would be of further help if the RCMP, Fire Services and By-law Enforcement could look at the current existing Agreement and insert some clauses that would help to achieve this goal and discuss this matter further at a future sub-committee meeting of the Damage Prevention and Heritage Protection Sub-Committee.

The Guests left the meeting at 10:28 a.m.

**(b) Bose Farm – Heritage Conservation Concept**

Report dated May 14, 2008 from the Senior Planner (Heritage) concerning the Bose Farm Conservation Concept.

The Senior Planner (Heritage) made the following comments:

- The Commission is requested to provide staff with feedback concerning a Heritage Conservation Concept submitted for the conservation of heritage buildings at 16390 – 64<sup>th</sup> Avenue, which is known as the Meadow Ridge Farm that once formed part of the original Bose Farm.
- The strategy has been submitted and the Commission is requested to comment on the proposal, and specifically:
  - 1. The natural heritage value of the 15-acre forest and the built-heritage value of the farm buildings and the historical farm unit;
  - 2. The proposal for relocation, replication and accommodating one additional heritage building on the site;
  - 3. Impacts of the various options being considered on the character-defining elements in the Statements of Significance (the “SOS”) prepared by Commonwealth for the City; and
  - 4. Other issues, concerns or suggestions.
- The intent is to take the comments received from the Commission and discuss with the developer the best ways to preserve and then to proceed with an application for this site.
- There will be a full referral back to the Commission once discussions with the developer have taken place and the Commission can have the final say before anything goes ahead.

Sgt. R. Morrow arrived at the meeting at 9:22 a.m.

The Commission and made the following comments:

- Question as to what will happen to the current farm buildings with this application was made. The buildings should be retained for their heritage value rather than there be a push to develop the area.

- Both the forest area on the land and the built heritage elements of the site are of equal heritage importance to the Commission and neither should be torn down or changed.
- It does not make any sense to move the buildings into the floodplain portion of the land. It will not only be difficult to move them in the first place but there is a reason they have been built where they are and they should remain there.
- The buildings on the site are landmarks and will no longer be historical should they be moved from where they are currently situated.
- Clarification was requested with regard to the actual land in question and where the buildings are proposed to be resituated and new ones built.

The following comments were made in response to the Commission:

- The tentative plan is to move the barn in the ALR portion of the land and turn it into an equestrian centre. The majority of the buildings on the land are not currently subject to a Development Application at the present time. Historically, the Bose Farm was an assembly of buildings associated with the original farm.
- Right now there is an agreement to purchase the land, but this agreement has not yet been completed and therefore the suggestions for the application are being brought forward to the Commission for comment.

G. Anderson arrived at the meeting at 9:27 a.m.

- The northern portion of the lot has an assembly of buildings with a barn, single-family dwelling and a few outbuildings. The issue is how to deal with the developer to allow some type of density while looking at a different way of buildings to save the nature of the existing buildings on the site.

E. Warzel arrived at the meeting at 9:35 a.m.

A. Kopystynski left the meeting at 9:35 a.m. to retrieve more detailed maps of the site for the Commission to review.

Discussions on this item ceased when the guests arrived to discuss item C.1(a). Discussions on this item resumed following item C.1(a) at 10:29 a.m.

The Senior Planner (Heritage) made the following comments:

- The current site that is under application contains four heritage buildings. At the top of the hill is the Meadowridge Farm House and the assembly of buildings including the main barn, the dairy barn and various other components of the farm operation.
- The developer is proposing as part of the development to relocate a portion of the agricultural building assembly that had the

Meadowridge farm logo on it and place it down the hill in the agricultural land.

Councillor Higginbotham left the meeting at 10:30 a.m. and Commissioner Lindenbach took over the meeting as Vice Chairperson.

- Over the course of the last few years, requests have been made to have the barn structurally checked, however, the building is in a state of decay and therefore very little has been done other than basic maintenance. An engineering report has identified that the building is unsound and cannot be moved from where it is situated. The consultants were unable to fully explore the building as there was risk to physically enter the structure.
- From a Planning perspective, this site is right along an agricultural land reserve and the City prefers that development decreases closer to these areas rather than becoming denser.

Councillor Higginbotham returned to the meeting at 10:33 a.m. and resumed as Chairperson.

The Commission made the following comments:

- Question was raised regarding the possibility to preserve the Bose House on the site as part of the development.
- Comment was made questioning why this proposal is even being considered at all since it clearly does not follow the rules when it comes to the agricultural land reserve. Moving buildings into the flat lands is not acceptable.
- The cultural and historical integrity of the site will be lost if the landmarks are moved. There is no way that any development either amongst the existing buildings or moving them is going to maintain the heritage element of the location.
- No development at all should be taking place on this site as it will ruin any heritage element that is currently existing by either moving or developing around the houses.
- Reconstruction of the barn in a location that is not consistent with the original location will undoubtedly eliminate its historical meaning. The heritage value and elements will be lost if this building or any other building is moved.
- We should be mindful that our decision to have no development take place will penalize the owners who are wanting to sell this property.

The Planners made the following comments in response to the Commission:

- The position of the house is close to the property line at 64<sup>th</sup> Avenue which makes it easier to plan development around it. However, the barn's position is more problematic from a development perspective if it is not moved. There are also grade issues on the site that come in to play with this situation.

- The parcel of land to the east of the site is not yet subject to a Development Application at this time and the City does not know what will happen with that. But, because there are heritage buildings on the adjacent site it may be worthwhile to see the strategy of how all the heritage houses will be handled.
- There are currently no heritage protection instruments applied to this property. The concern is for the continued decay of the buildings and heritage value loss if nothing is done to the site.

It was Moved by Commissioner Tracey  
Seconded by Commissioner Lindenbach  
That the SHAC recommends that the  
General Manager, Planning and Development direct staff that:

- 1) The SHAC would like to see a revised Heritage Conservation Strategy for the Bose Farm involving the retention of the heritage buildings as defined in the two Statements of Significance prepared by Commonwealth and as referenced in the Surrey Heritage Register on the subject site and how it would be integrated with the heritage buildings to the east of the site;
- 2) The SHAC has grave concerns about further deterioration of the heritage fabric of the buildings on the site and that the developer and owner work together to stabilize the key character defining elements so that they do not further deteriorate;
- 3) The SHAC does not agree with moving either the barns or the house on the property and that it would be unacceptable to the SHAC for reconstruction or replication of any buildings on the agricultural portion of the site;
- 4) The SHAC agrees that the forested part of the site is an integral part of the natural heritage of the site as identified in the NCP and should be retained;
- 5) The SHAC recommends that this matter be forwarded to the Agricultural Advisory Committee and the Environmental Advisory Committee for further review and discussion; and
- 6) The SHAC recommends that this application not be forwarded to Council until the heritage issues have been resolved to the satisfaction of the SHAC.

Carried

A. Kopystynski announced to the Commission that he will be leaving the City of Surrey as of May 28, 2008 and thanked City staff and the Commission for their efforts, cooperation and enthusiasm and advised that Don Luymes will be the staff member temporarily taking over the Heritage Planner role until another Heritage Planner is hired.

(c) **Rezoning Application No. 7907-0227-00  
13827 – 108<sup>th</sup> Avenue – Ernest Wood's House**

This item was dealt with after the Parks and Recreation items.

Report dated May 16, 2008 from the Current Planning Manager, North Area Planning & Development concerning the rezoning application for Ernest Wood's House.

The Senior Planner (Heritage) made the following comments:

- The City conducted a site visit on May 9, 2008 at which point it was discovered that the house had been demolished. It was determined that the demolition permit was issued in February of this year.

It was Moved by Commissioner Stibbs  
Seconded by Commissioner Lindenbach  
That the SHAC receives the information  
from staff that the former Councillor Ernest Wood's house has been demolished.  
Carried

(d) **Heritage Trees at 4100 – 152<sup>nd</sup> Street**

Memo dated May 23, 2008 from the Senior Planner (Heritage) requesting consideration of rescinding a previous motion due to an error.

The Senior Planner (Heritage) made the following comments:

- The SHAC passed a motion at the March 26, 2008 meeting concerning the 13 Important Trees located on private property. It has been noted that the address provided of 4117 – 152<sup>nd</sup> Street is actually incorrect and should read 4100 – 152<sup>nd</sup> Street.
- It is requested that the Commission rescind the previous motion made concerning these Important Trees and revise the motion to read the correct address.

It was Moved by Commissioner Stibbs  
Seconded by Commissioner Foulkes  
That the SHAC agrees to rescind the motion  
made at the March 26, 2008 SHAC meeting concerning the 13 Important Trees,  
however wishes to have this item deferred to a later date pending additional  
information before the motion is resubmitted.  
Carried

**(e) Gerow Barn – 9641 – 176 Street**

Report dated May 26, 2008 provided on-table from the Senior Planner (Heritage) concerning the Gerow Barn located at 9641 – 176<sup>th</sup> Street.

The Senior Planner (Heritage) made the following comments:

- There has been quite a bit of highway upgrading near Highway No. 1 and 176<sup>th</sup> Street which may have potential impacts to the Gerow Barn located at 9641 – 176. The Barn is listed on the Surrey Heritage Register.
- The City has been in contact with Metro Vancouver Parks Department and they are proposing to remove the buildings that are not on the Heritage Register on that corner and to secure the Gerow Barn with temporary fencing as well as to employ an Architect and Structural Engineer to inspect the barn and advise on its stability and/or improvements required to stabilize the structure.
- The Commission may want to look at possibly moving the Barn to another location to be adapted for re-use. The Commission would be consulted before any process for disassembly and reassembly would be put into place.
- Part of the problem is finding funding to deal with the impact of these types of projects to heritage sites and the Commission may want to send a letter to the Ministry of Transportation asking that their budget for upgrading projects should include sufficient financial resources to help to mitigate the impact put on these heritage sites.

It was  
 May 16, 2008 from Metro Vancouver concerning the highway construction impacting the Gerow Barn heritage site located at 9641 – 176<sup>th</sup> Street.

Moved by Commissioner Foulkes  
 Seconded by Commissioner Stibbs  
 That the SHAC receives the letter dated  
Carried

It was  
 send letters to:

Moved by Commissioner Stibbs  
 Seconded by Commissioner Foulkes  
 That the SHAC recommends that Council

- 1) Metro Vancouver, stating that the SHAC supports the intentions of Metro Vancouver as outlined in their letter of May 16, 2008 and ask that Metro Vancouver continue informing the City about their progress to conserve the Gerow Barn; and

- 2) The Minister of Transportation, stating that their budget associated with highway upgrading projects in Surrey should accommodate sufficient financial resources to mitigate the impact of these projects on heritage sites such as the Gerow Barn at 9641 – 176<sup>th</sup> Street, Old Anniedale School at 9744 – 176<sup>th</sup> Street, the Charlie Perkins Memorial Stump at Highway No. 1 on the right-of-way east of the 176<sup>th</sup> Street interchange, and the Grand Fir Tree located at 18407 – 96A Avenue, as well as the replacement of heritage road markers.

Carried

(e) **Charles Bell House – 16588 Old McLellan Road**

Letter dated May 26, 2008 from Joe Dhaliwal of 57<sup>th</sup> Avenue Developments Ltd. concerning the replica of the Charles Bell House.

The Senior Planner (Heritage) made the following comments:

- A letter has been received from the developer advising that he has agreed to build a replica of the Charles Bell House as per the HRA both inside and out. They will apply for a Heritage Alteration Permit so that the detailed drawings of how the house will be restored and will be reviewed by staff and the Commission prior to the replication.
- The Commission is requested to support the replication of the Charles Bell House and approve the house to be demolished in a controlled fashion so that any reusable materials can be salvaged.

It was Moved by Commissioner Farrand  
Seconded by Commissioner Tracey  
That the SHAC recommends to the General  
Manager, Planning and Development that:

- 1) The SHAC receives the letter dated May 26, 2008 from Joe Dhaliwal;
- 2) That upon receipt and approval of a Heritage Alteration Permit and payment of compensation for the loss in heritage value for the interior and exterior of the Charles Bell House, then a controlled demolition of the House is permitted;
- 3) That the controlled demolition of the Charles Bell House is done under the supervision of a qualified Architect with heritage experience satisfactory to the City Architect and that the salvaged materials be stored in a secure internal environment; and
- 4) That a Heritage Alteration Permit be granted only after the detailed plans showing how the house will be restored both internally and externally is submitted to the City of Surrey and forwarded to the SHAC for their review and approval.

Carried

**(f) John Sedgewick House Relocation**

The Senior Planner (Heritage) made the following comments:

- There is a proposal to have the house moved from its current location and the Commission is requested to provide comments concerning this issue. This will entail quite lengthy discussions and the Commission may consider deferring this item to a future meeting.

It was

Moved by Commissioner Stibbs  
Seconded by Commissioner Foulkes  
That the SHAC recommends that the issue

concerning the relocation of the John Sedgewick House be deferred to a future SHAC meeting for discussion.

Carried

**2. PARKS AND RECREATION****(a) Peace Arch Beaver Relic**

Report dated May 16, 2008 from the Museum Manager providing update regarding the status of the Beaver Relic.

The Museum Manager made the following comments:

- The Commission had previously requested that the City look into retrieval of the Peace Arch Beaver Relic that is in the possession of the Vancouver Maritime Museum.
- Upon discussions with the Curator of the Museum, it was articulated that this matter would be referred by the Executive Director to the Board of Directors for consideration. Removal of the artifact would involve a review by the Board and if approved, a formal deaccessioning process. The Curator also mentioned that this request would not be looked upon favorably and the return of the relic is highly unlikely given its significance to the collection of the Vancouver Maritime Museum and their ownership of other artifacts from the historic Beaver.

The Commission made the following comments:

- Question was raised as to whether this artifact would be put on display in the Museum should the City of Surrey be successful in retrieving it from the Vancouver Maritime Museum.
- Commissioner Foulkes donated this relic to the Museum so there shouldn't be a problem to get it back since it should belong to Surrey.

The Museum Manager made the following comments in response to the Commission:

- The big issue is that this is an artifact that has historical significance to Surrey. The Surrey Museum puts its collection on display in rotating temporary exhibits.
- It may be difficult to retrieve this artifact because when an artifact is given or 'donated' to a Museum, they have technically legally acquired it and therefore have legal ownership.

It was

Moved by Commissioner Stibbs  
Seconded by Commissioner Farrand  
That the SHAC receives the report

concerning the Peace Arch Beaver Relic and awaits further information from staff once the Vancouver Maritime Museum has considered the City of Surrey's request for return of the relic.

Carried

**(b) Heritage Awareness Award Program**

The Museum Manager made the following comments:

- Two submissions have been received for the Heritage Awareness Award Program; namely the Iqra Islamic Elementary School and Sullivan Heights Secondary School.
- It is recommended that the Commission award the Islamic School the Award and have it presented to them following a delegation at Council.
- The SHAC made a previous recommendation that if the Sullivan Heights Secondary School submitted an application for the award that they not be eligible to receive it this year as they had already received it last year.

The Commission made the following comments:

- Comment was made that the award is for an elementary school and a secondary school, and since two applications were received and one was from an elementary and one from a secondary then both schools should be awarded.
- Presentations were made to the School Board concerning this Program, however this did not seem to make much difference. Participation in this program has been poor. Perhaps the program should be cancelled due to the lack of participation received over the last few years.

It was Moved by Commissioner Lindenbach  
Seconded by Commissioner Foulkes  
That the SHAC recommends to Council that  
both the Iqra Islamic Elementary School and the Sullivan Heights Secondary  
School each be awarded \$2,000 (Two Thousand Dollars) for their participation in  
the Heritage Awareness Award Program and that the awards be presented at the  
next available Council Meeting.

Carried

It was Moved by Commissioner Lindenbach  
Seconded by Commissioner Farrand  
That the SHAC recommends to Council that  
the Heritage Awareness Award Program be discontinued for 2009 and  
reconsidered for continuation at a later date due to there not being much  
participation over the past years the Program has been available.

Carried

A. Kopystynski, D. Luymes, and J. O'Donnell left the meeting at 12:05 p.m.

The meeting recessed at 12:05 p.m. and reconvened at 12:15 p.m. with the same members in attendance.

### **3. ENGINEERING**

There are no reports from the Engineering Department.

### **4. LEGISLATIVE SERVICES**

There are no reports from the Legislative Services Department.

## **D. CORRESPONDENCE**

It was Moved by Commissioner Stibbs  
Seconded by Commissioner Farrand  
That the following correspondence items  
1 - 6 be received.

Carried

#### **1. Statements of Significance and Condition of Barn – Lower Bose Farm Site**

Letter dated April 16, 2008 to Mr. Carson Noffle concerning stabilization of the Barn.

#### **2. Charles Bell House – Heritage Revitalization Agreement**

Letter dated May 6, 2008 to Mr. Joe Dhaliwal impressing the urgency to proceed with the terms of the Agreement concerning the Charles Bell House.

**3. Hazelmere United Church – Application for Financial Assistance**

Letter dated May 15, 2008 to E. Thompson advising that Financial Assistance in the amount of \$5,671.05 has been approved and that the Building Preservation & Design Sub-Committee will deal with the water damage issues and retention of a heritage specialist to assist with restorations of the Church.

**4. Robert Dougal MacKenzie House – Financial Assistance**

Letter dated May 15, 2008 to Fernanda McCleneghan advising that Council will approve Financial Assistance for the completed restorations of the House upon Legislative Services receipt of the receipts for costs incurred.

**5. Commissioner Absences – Satnam Singh Sidhu**

Letter dated May 15, 2008 to Satnam Singh Sidhu advising that Council approved termination of Mr. Sidhu's position on the Surrey Heritage Advisory Commission and a replacement will be found to fill his vacancy.

**6. Fraser Valley Heritage Railway Society – Council Resolution**

Letter dated May 15, 2008 to John Sprung and Allen Aubert advising that Council passed a resolution to add the Sullivan Station to the Surrey Heritage Register so they would then be entitled to Financial Assistance for restorations.

**E. INFORMATION ITEMS****1. Colebrook Section House**

Email dated April 30, 2008 from Andrew Ward expressing concern for the state of abandonment of the Colebrook House.

It was

Moved by Commissioner Stibbs

Seconded by Commissioner Foulkes

That the SHAC recommend that the General

Manager, Planning and Development direct staff to report back to the SHAC on the heritage significance of the Colebrook Section House at a future meeting.

Carried

**2. Heritage Advisory Commission 2008 Sub-Committees and Liaisons**

Updated list of SHAC Sub-Committees and Liaisons as of May 8, 2008.

**3. British Columbia History Magazine**

Volume 40 No. 4 (copies to be provided on table).

4. **Regular Council – Public Hearing Minutes – Monday, May 12, 2008  
RES.R08-1045**
5. **Regular Council – Public Hearing Minutes – Monday, May 12, 2008  
RES.R08-1048**
6. **Regular Council – Public Hearing Minutes – Monday, May 12, 2008  
RES.R08-1049**
7. **Regular Council – Public Hearing Minutes – Monday, May 12, 2008  
RES.R08-1050**
8. **Regular Council – Public Hearing Minutes – Monday, May 12, 2008  
RES.R08-1051**
9. **Regular Council – Public Hearing Minutes – Monday, May 12, 2008  
RES.R08-1052**
10. **Regular Council – Public Hearing Minutes – Monday, May 12, 2008  
RES.R08-1053**
11. **Heritage BC Quarterly Magazine – Spring 2008**  
(copies to be provided on table).

#### **F. SUBCOMMITTEE/LIAISON UPDATES**

##### **1. Heritage Tree Sub-Committee**

Heritage Tree Management issue to develop policies to deal with trees on private property referred from SHAC April 30, 2008

(no written update received).

- Sub-committee has not met yet, nothing to report.

##### **2. Building Preservation & Design Sub-Committee**

Hazelmere United Church – investigations into water damage and retention of a heritage specialist to assist with restorations referred from SHAC April 30, 2008

(no written update received).

- Sub-committee has not met yet, nothing to report.
- Commissioner Farrand is to set up a meeting with the owners and staff at the Hazelmere United Church to discuss this matter.

**3. Damage Prevention and Heritage Protection Sub-Committee**

Sub-Committee formed at April 30, 2008 SHAC meeting and issues regarding protection of Heritage Houses referred to Sub-Committee for discussion

(no written update received).

- Sub-committee has not met yet, nothing to report.

**4. Community Advisory Board (Museum, Archives & Stewart Farm)**

It was Moved by Commissioner Foulkes  
Seconded by Commissioner Lindenbach  
That the SHAC appoints Commissioner  
Farrand as the new liaison for the Community Advisory Board with  
Commissioner Lindenbach as an alternate.

Carried

**G. OTHER COMPETENT BUSINESS****1. 3056 – 184<sup>th</sup> Street**

Email from Lorna Lancaster asking whether her property at 3056 – 184<sup>th</sup> Street would be of Heritage interest to Surrey.

It was Moved by Commissioner Farrand  
Seconded by Commissioner Tracey  
That the SHAC recommends that:

- 1) the General Manager, Planning and Development direct staff to investigate and collect further information concerning the property located at 3056 – 184<sup>th</sup> Street and report back to the SHAC at a future SHAC if there is any heritage interest at a future meeting; and
- 2) that the Clerk's Office acknowledge the SHAC received the owner's request and advise in a responding letter that this matter has been referred to staff to look into further.

Carried

**2. Closed Session**

**MOTION TO HOLD A MEETING IN A CLOSED SESSION**

It was Moved by Commissioner Lindenbach  
Seconded by Commissioner Farrand  
That the Commission to pass a resolution to  
close the meeting to the public pursuant to Section 90 (1) (a) (e) (g) and (i) of the  
*Community Charter*.

Carried

The meeting adjourned for Closed Session at 12:27 p.m. and reconvened at 1:06 p.m.  
with the same members in attendance.

**3. Anniedale School**

It was Moved by Commissioner Foulkes  
Seconded by Commissioner Farrand  
That the SHAC recommend that the General  
Manager, Planning and Development direct staff to contact the School Board to  
request that they keep the SHAC updated as to the time frame for the closure and  
relocation of the Anniedale School.

Carried

**H. NEXT MEETING**

The next meeting of the Heritage Advisory Commission is scheduled for June 25, 2008 in  
the Mayor's Executive Boardroom - 9:00 a.m.

**I. ADJOURNMENT**

It was Moved by Commissioner Lindenbach  
Seconded by Commissioner Farrand  
That the Surrey Heritage Advisory  
Commission meeting do now adjourn.

Carried

The Surrey Heritage Advisory Commission adjourned at 1:07 p.m.

---

Margaret Jones, City Clerk

---

Councillor Higginbotham, Chairperson  
Surrey Heritage Advisory Commission