

Present:

Councillor Woods, Chair
R. Hart
B. Hol
D. Plug
P. Sooch - Youth Representative
M. Westwood - Youth Representative

Absent:

A. Smith-Weston
P. Priddy, Vice-chair

Staff Present:

D. Luymes, Planning & Development
J. O'Donnell, Parks, Recreation & Culture
R. Gallagher, Parks, Recreation & Culture
K. Tiede, Transportation Planning
L. Anderson, Legislative Services

The Chair called the meeting to order and requested that the agenda be varied as follows:

1. **Henry Bose Farm Site (16488 – 64 Avenue) Proposed Conservation Plan Changes** on-table report be added as **Item D.1.(e)**.

David Plug was welcomed as the newest Commissioner along with Mark Westwood as the new youth representative to the Commission and round-table introductions were made.

The Chair thanked the Commissioners for their participation and assistance during the Fusion Festival, July 18th and 19th. Although the event was successful, it was felt that the extremely hot weather during the event reduced the anticipated attendance overall.

The Agenda was varied.

D. NEW BUSINESS**1. PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT**

- (e) **Henry Bose Farm Site (16488 – 64 Avenue) – Proposed Conservation Plan Changes**
File: 6800-01

D. Luymes, Manager, Community Planning, provided a report dated July 22, 2015, regarding proposed changes to the Conservation Plan for the Henry Bose Farm site.

It was recommended that the Commission provide comments on changes to the Conservation Plan for the Henry Bose Farmhouse and Milk Cooling Shed proposed by the applicant, as detailed in Appendix I to the report.

A brief history of the two Bose Farmhouse protected structures (Bose Farmhouse and Milk Cooling Shed) and the agreement between the City and the developer of the property to protect those structures, was provided.

Adrian Kopystynski, Manager of Planning Services, Green City Planning Services and John Gray, Platinum Group of Companies, were introduced to the Commission and comments were as follows:

- A Heritage Revitalization Agreement (HRA) permitted the deconstruction and reconstruction of the Henry Bose Farm House. The structure was such that it could not be moved as it would fall apart. As much of the original structure as possible was to be used in the new construction.
- The Milk Cooling Shed seemed to be in better condition. The plan was to pick up and move the structure on to a concrete pad to be used as a detached garage for the house.
- Recent information regarding the condition of the structures has warranted a review of the conservation plan that sets out how these structures will be protected and restored.
- A series of tests were done to measure for lead and asbestos which revealed significantly higher levels than the acceptable tolerance on the boards of the old farmhouse. This was likely caused by a lack of barriers between the asbestos and the building, resulting in a lot of cracking and further infiltration of water. When the home was later insulated, the insulation used had asbestos in it; vermiculite was also identified on the surface of the materials.
- As a result, the materials previously identified as salvageable to reattach to the new frame, are rotting. Contamination has been measured at ¼ inch into the wood, deeming it not structurally sound.
- Similarly, the milk cooling shed has a significant amount of rot and will also require replicating materials as opposed to using the existing materials.
- As noted in the correspondence from Green City Planning Services, the house structure is now in place. However, being unable to meet the requirement of the use of 50% of the original materials, the applicant is seeking City approval for the proposed replica.
- Assurances were given to the Commission that the replica buildings will have the same footprint, and that all of the new replacement millwork will resemble the original materials. However, it was noted that there is the potential that the original trim and knee braces can still be used for the new structure.

- Staff noted that the HRA does not refer to the use of more than 50% of original materials. However, it does set out that the use of less than 50% of the original materials shall be subject to the prior written approval of the City. The Commission's wisdom is being sought with respect to these two sections, in particular as to whether a permit requirement would be triggered by the proposed changes.
- The Commission noted that there are four instances within the Conservation Plan that refer to the use of 50% of the materials. An approval letter from the City would be necessary to permit the use of replica materials; an amendment to the HRA was not needed.
- It was further noted that the story board created for this site would need to be changed to identify the buildings as replica buildings.
- Concern was expressed by the Commission with respect to the heritage value of the replica buildings and potential compensation for the loss of that heritage value. It was felt that there should have been sufficient opportunity for the applicant to assess the farm house and the milk cooling shed prior to the HRA. However; the benefit of bonus density for the heritage assets is still realized for the applicant. Bonus density is an issue that will need to be further examined by the Commission for future applications.
- The Commission were satisfied that staff will work with the applicant with respect to the loss of heritage value. A summary was requested to be provided at the September meeting of the Commission.

It was reported that the sales centre for the site is anticipated to be open for operation by September 20th.

It was
 Moved by Commissioner Hol
 Seconded by Commissioner Hart
 That the Surrey Heritage Advisory
 Commission (SHAC) receive the report from the Manager, Community
 Planning, entitled "Henry Bose Farm Site (16488 – 64 Avenue) Proposed
 Conservation Plan Changes', dated July 22, 2015, as information.
Carried

A. ADOPTION OF MINUTES

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

1. Surrey Heritage Advisory Commission Minutes - June 17, 2015

It was
Commission (SHAC) recommends that the June 17, 2015 minutes be adopted as presented.

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

Carried

B. DELEGATIONS

C. OUTSTANDING BUSINESS

D. NEW BUSINESS

1. PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

(a) Heritage Advisory Commission Revised Draft Restricted Reserve Fund Policy
File: 6800-01

D. Luymes, Manager, Community Planning, provided a brief overview of the subject report, dated June 19, 2015.

Additional comments were as follows:

- Contributions to the Restricted Reserve Fund are the result of a number of possible scenarios including donations, heritage loss compensation fees for the destruction of heritage structures or fees charged as part of a neighbourhood plan.
- The intent of the Policy is to set out some structure as to how the Restricted Funds can be spent.
- As set out in Appendix I of the report, there are four principles that would guide the Commission in terms of money from restricted funds:
 - 1) Allocate funds to heritage sites within the local community where collected (e.g. Cloverdale, Fleetwood, Newton,).
 - 2) Funds obtained as a result of a loss of a heritage building will be used to assist in the protection and/or restoration of other threatened heritage sites, structures and features (not to be used for community events).
 - 3) Where possible, the funds should be used to assist with the protection and restoration of heritage buildings in situ. In some cases, where retention of the building in situ is not possible, the expenses associated with the relocation of the building may be eligible.

- 4) No more than 50% of any restricted fund may be spent on a single project (funds cannot be depleted for one project).

RECOMMENDATION

It was Moved by Commissioner Hart
Seconded by Commissioner Hol
That the Surrey Heritage Advisory
Commission (SHAC) recommends that Council:

1. Receive the Heritage Advisory Commission Revised Draft Restricted Reserve Fund Policy; and
2. Approve the Heritage Advisory Commission Revised Draft Restricted Reserve Fund Policy as the guideline for the future use of funds held within the Commission's Restricted Reserve.

Carried

(b) **Willard Kitchen House (2590 O'Hara Lane) – Building Preservation Program Grant Application**

File: 6800-14

D. Luymes, Manager, Community Planning, reviewed the subject report, dated June 26, 2015, as follows:

- The City has a program whereby funds, attached to each protected structure to a maximum of \$15,000, are held in a reserve and made available to owners of heritage properties for renovations, restoration and maintenance, 50% of which is paid by the homeowner.
- With respect to this beach front house application, it was a requirement of the home owner to receive three independent quotes.
- Three quotes were received, with one quote coming in at half the cost of the other two. Staff questioned the discrepancy and was advised that the lower quote was of equal completeness and that the use of a scaffolding system resulted in lower labour costs. The lower quote is also the preferred quote, noting that the same company recently completed work on the neighbouring property.

- The Commission noted that in the past, copies of all quotes were included with the reports requesting the Commission's recommendation(s) in order to provide the opportunity to review the information and ensure all of the standards have been met. Staff circulated (on table) copies of the three quotes received for this application and reported that future applications for the Commission's consideration will include copies of quotes for the Commission's review.
- Staff confirmed that funding is not issued until confirmation is received that the work has been done.

RECOMMENDATION

It was Moved by Commissioner Hol
 Seconded by Commissioner Hart
 That the Surrey Heritage Advisory
 Commission (SHAC) recommends that Council:

1. Receive the Willard Kitchen House (2590 O'Hara Lane) – Building Preservation Program Grant Application as information,
2. Approve financial assistance in the amount of \$6,562.50 which represents 50% of the value of the works as per the quote provided by J.J.J. Painting & Company Ltd.; and
3. Recommend that staff advise the applicant that payment of financial assistance shall only be made following inspection by appropriate City staff to ensure that the works have been undertaken in accordance with the original terms of the application.

Carried

- (c) **Pyke House – 5646 182 Street**
 File: N/A (Verbal Update)

The following comments were made:

- Staff reported that the owners are selling the subject property and would like the house to be retained as it is; however, they are experiencing some difficulty when potential purchasers discover the property is on the heritage inventory.
- Staff has assured the owners that the home is not a registered structure and that if new owners want to demolish and replace with a modern home, they can. It is unlikely the City would designate this home as a heritage property.

- Discussion ensued with respect to how to deal with similar properties in the future. Staff noted that a designated bylaw could be put on the property, however, it was agreed that there may be a better appetite for the property owners to consider heritage status if the benefits could be easily understood.
- It was suggested that an information sheet be created explaining the benefits of retaining heritage status and that the sheet could be distributed and displayed within the heritage booth at various events. Staff noted that a similar document has been prepared and once complete, the information sheet could be circulated to realtors in an effort to spread the information to potential buyers.
- It was recommended that staff look at the alternatives or incentives offered in municipalities with similar experiences. The example of a new category of 'character home' was noted for the City of Vancouver, which addresses and protects homes built before a certain time.
- The Commission was advised that since the preparation of the meeting agenda, the subject property has been sold.

(d) **SHAC Task List**

File: 0540-20V

Staff reviewed the HAC Task List with the Commission, noting the items that have been completed.

It was reported that a review of the Heritage Inventory Review will be provided at the September meeting.

It was
Commission (SHAC) receive the SHAC Task List as information.
Moved by Commissioner Hol
Seconded by Commissioner Plug
That the Surrey Heritage Advisory
Carried

Commissioner Hol advised that he would be leaving the meeting and quorum would be lost. As a result, the meeting adjourned and all remaining agenda items were recorded as notes.

J. ADJOURNMENT

It was Moved by Commissioner Hart
Seconded by Commissioner Plug
That the Surrey Heritage Advisory
Commission (SHAC) meeting do now adjourn.
Carried

The Surrey Heritage Advisory Commission (SHAC) adjourned at 7:20 p.m.

Jane Sullivan, City Clerk

Councillor Woods, Chair

The Commission briefly recessed in order to present Jaqueline O'Donnell, Manager, Heritage Services, with a retirement gift from the Commission and to express their sincere appreciation for all the assistance she has given the Commission over the years.

The remaining agenda items were recorded as notes.