

Present:

W. Farrand, Vice-Chair
R. Hart
B. Hol
S. Thomas

Absent:

L. Tannen
Councillor Steele

Guests:

A. Kopystynski, Heritage Consultant
D. Johnson, Surrey Historical Society
P. Lovick, Elgin Esso Project

Staff Present:

D. Luymes, Planning & Development
D. McCarron, Parks, Recreation and Culture
E. Schultz, Planning & Development
H. Kamitakahara, Planning & Development
J. O'Donnell, Parks, Recreation and Culture
M. Petrovic, Engineering
P. Bellefontaine, Engineering
S. Low, Planning & Development
T. Mueller, Legislative Services

A. ELECTIONS AND APPOINTMENTS

Councillor Steele was appointed Chair of the Surrey Heritage Advisory Commission (SHAC) by Mayor and Council on December 10, 2012.

It was

Moved by Commissioner Hart
Seconded by Commissioner Thomas
That Commissioner Hol be elected as

Vice-Chair of the Surrey Heritage Advisory Commission (SHAC) for the 2013 calendar year.

Carried

B. ADOPTION OF MINUTES

1. Surrey Heritage Advisory Commission Minutes – November 21, 2012.

It was

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

Advisory Commission (SHAC) meeting of November 21, 2012, be adopted.

Carried

C. DELEGATIONS

1. **Heritage Roadside Street Markers**
File: 6800-01

M. Petrovic, Roads and Transportation Planning Engineer with D. McCarron, Marketing and Community Relations Manager were in attendance before the Commission to provide revised Heritage Roadside Street Marker examples based on the comments received at the October 24, 2012 SHAC meeting.

The following comments were made:

- Staff explained that in developing the revised roadside heritage marker concept the following criteria were taken into consideration:
 - 1) Consistency with the City of Surrey design guidelines,
 - 2) Public safety (i.e., sign clarity/font size), heritage feel, cost effectiveness, ease of adaptation of existing heritage signage,
 - 3) Requirement for UV reflective materials, and;
 - 4) Longevity of design.
- Staff noted that the colour scheme provides a distinct connection to the previous heritage signs.

Staff presented the Commission with a storyboard which contained various designs for review.

The Commission made the following comments:

- The Commission thanked staff for the variety of design options and noted that the two signs presented in the bottom row of the sample set showcased excellent heritage elements/features.
- After much discussion, the Commission selected the lower right sign (Design #9) as the preferred design for the new Roadside Heritage Street Marker Standard for the City of Surrey.

RECOMMENDATION

It was

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

Commission (SHAC) recommends that Council endorse "Design #9" with the heritage border element, as the new Roadside Heritage Street Marker Standard for the City of Surrey.

Carried

D. OUTSTANDING BUSINESS

E. NEW BUSINESS**1. PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT****(a) Proposed Rezoning and Development Permit Adjacent to the Semiahmoo Trail (14313 Crescent Road)**

File: 6880-56

The following comments were made:

- Staff reported that the applicant is applying for a rezoning and development permit to have a Subway sandwich counter located within the existing convenience store on the site. The reason the Development Application is coming to the Commission is because it is adjacent to the Semiahmoo Trail which is a protected heritage route.
- The Semiahmoo Trail is located on the Elgin road side (which is closed to traffic). Staff noted that the applicant cannot comply completely with the design guidelines relative to the requirement for a 10-metre wide landscape buffer.
- The applicant is proposing an outdoor patio with a pathway made up of crushed limestone providing a connection to the trail. If the project is approved, the trail design guidelines would require the developer to provide landscaping improvements; staff noted the Parks Department has come up with a recommendation for the developer to pay \$8,000 in upgrades/plantings on the public side of the trail.
- The Commission asked for clarification on the nature of the restaurant and expressed concern that having a path to the Subway sandwich store could change the dynamic of the trail and that people might use the trail for garbage. The Commission suggested that careful consideration be given to how the proponent can protect the green space and ensure the trail remains clean.
- The Commission asked if the rail fence could be relocated and if there was a way of using some of the public land to build out the buffer to where people are walking. In response, staff noted that relocating the spit rail fence onto public land would be a deviation from the guidelines, although it might not be out of the question. Staff also noted that the financial contribution from the application will be used in part to landscape the trail.
- Staff clarified that only counter-space is being added to the existing building inside and the outside canopy of the gas station would be removed to create a patio.
- In response to questions posed by the Commission, staff clarified that the adjacent ditch is not fish bearing and the gas pump location will remain the same.

- The Commission did not see the benefit in having a connection from the patio area to the trail given that there is an existing connection just north of the proposed patio on public property. The Commission also noted that in order to protect the buffer zone, it might make more sense to have no connection to the trail from the patio. In response, staff clarified that the guidelines do permit access to the trail through the buffer and that if access were to be provided it would be achieved through a switchback in the split rail fence.

It was

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

Commission (SHAC):

1. Receive the report re: Proposed Rezoning and Development Permit Adjacent to the Semiahmoo Trail (14313 Crescent Road) as information; and
2. Request that staff work with the applicant, taking the concerns raised by the Commission at the January 30, 2013 meeting into consideration.

Carried

(b) **Memo re: Revised Development Proposal for Bose Farm
(Eastern site at 16420 – 64 Avenue)**
File: 6880-56

Planning staff were in attendance before the Commission to obtain comments and recommendations from the SHAC regarding proposed changes to the conservation strategy for the Bose Farm (eastern site).

The following comments were made:

- Staff noted that in the original proposal presented to the Commission in 2012 three registered heritage buildings were proposed to be retained and restored, 1) the Bose Farmhouse, 2) the Milk Cooling Shed, and 3) the Calf Barn. Following endorsement from the Commission, the application was forwarded to Council who sent it back to staff to address comments received from members of the public during the Public Hearing.
- Since that time, staff has been working with the applicant to develop an alternative proposal. The revised proposal includes the retention and restoration of two registered heritage buildings: 1) the Bose Farmhouse and 2) the Milk Cooling Shed, the demolition and replication of the Calf Barn, and the preservation of 2.83 acres of forest.

- The Heritage Consultant for the site was present to speak to the application and clarified that before demolition, the Calf Barn will be carefully documented. The milk cooling shed will be paired with the farmhouse to form a detached garage; they will be kept together.
- The Heritage Consultant noted that because of the changes requested at the Public Hearing, the applicant is unable to retain and restore all three heritage buildings as was previously proposed. The applicant would like to retain the heritage feel of the property and is therefore proposing to construct a replica of the calf barn for use as an amenity building.
- The Heritage Consultant also noted that one of the benefits of the revised proposal is that the farmhouse will remain on 64 Avenue at the entrance into the complex. It will also be positioned in such a way that the public will be able to see the restored wrapping porch.

The Commission made the following comments:

- The Commission asked for clarification regarding how similar the replica will be and whether it will articulate the actual detail of the heritage elements (i.e., no vinyl windows). In response, staff shared that it is important to differentiate old from new so as not to give a false impression that this is a heritage building.
- The Commission asked for clarification regarding the proposed deconstruction and reconstruction of the house. In response, the Heritage Consultant noted that the home will be carefully taken apart and reconstructed and the builder will spend the time and energy removing the materials with minimal damage. The applicant will ensure that the best possible heritage practices are used and that any items removed are properly catalogued for reinstatement. Staff clarified for the Commission that the Heritage Revitalization Agreement (HRA) clearly states the deconstruction and reconstruction shall be overseen by a qualified Heritage Consultant. The Heritage Consultant further clarified that materials would be used from the horse barn before custom "like" materials would be introduced in the building. With respect to windows, some might need to be combined to have complete working windows; others might be substituted by "like" materials. In the case of this application, the shell of the structure will be retained although it needs to be physically taken apart and rebuilt due to its precarious condition.

- The Commission asked for clarification regarding the proposed density of the site relative to the NCP for the area. In response, Staff explained that in the NCP, a portion of the site is suburban 2 upa and a portion is 6 upa. This would amount to approximately 80 single-family units. The subject site is within a relatively old NCP, it is common to see higher densities proposed in new developments than what might be reflected in an older NCP, whether or not there are heritage buildings located on the property.
- The Commission asked if the restored calf barn could still be used as the amenity building and questioned the rationale for demolishing the building and replacing it with a replica. In response, the Heritage Consultant noted that the proposed revisions are due to the changing economics of the project, now that a portion of the forest is proposed to be retained. The loss of the calf barn is the unfortunate trade-off.
- The Commission supported retaining a portion of the forest but questioned what the downside could be of also relocating the calf barn and restoring it as was originally proposed. In response, the Heritage Consultant noted that heritage value is not a quantitative element it is qualitative. Based on the outcome of the Public Hearing, the public puts a high value on the forest. In comparing the two proposals, preserving the heritage value of two buildings and the forest is greater than three heritage buildings. The Commission asserted that the calf barn is an important part of the Bose Farm and therefore there should be a way to protect it, rather than creating a replica.

The Commission requested that staff work with the applicant to retain and restore not only the farmhouse and milk cooling shed, but also the calf barn as was originally proposed.

It was Moved by Commissioner Hart
Seconded by Commissioner Thomas
That the Surrey Heritage Advisory

Commission (SHAC):

1. Receive the Revised Development Proposal for Bose Farm (Eastern site at 16420 – 64 Avenue) report as information;
2. Recommend to the General Manager, Planning and Development that staff work with the applicant to retain and restore the Calf Barn in addition to the Farmhouse and Milk Cooling Shed as part of the site development;
3. Recommend to the General Manager, Planning and Development that an HRA and Interim HRA for the Henry Bose Farmhouse, Milk Cooling Shed, and Calf Barn be forwarded to Council for consideration once outstanding issues are resolved to staff's satisfaction; and,

4. Endorse the removal of the Emma Churchland House, Horse Barn, and Storage Shed from Surrey's Community Heritage Register only when a detailed Development Permit for the multifamily site is approved by Council.

Carried

The Vice-Chair requested the agenda be varied to review the items from Parks, Recreation and Culture prior to the SHAC Task List.

It was

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

Commission (SHAC) agenda be varied.

Carried

The agenda was varied.

H. INFORMATION ITEMS

1. **Heritage Week / Heritage Bus Tour (February 21 & 23)**
File: 0330-20

The Heritage Bus Tour will start at the Historic Stewart Farm and is designed to give participants a special glimpse into Surrey's unique architectural, natural, and cultural sites. Additional details can be found on the City of Surrey website:
<http://www.surrey.ca/culture-recreation/2882.aspx>

Members of the Commission who are interested in attending were asked to please contact Jacqueline O'Donnell, Heritage Services Manager directly at (604) 502-6460.

2. **2nd Annual Doors Open Event – June 2013**
File: N/A (Verbal Update)

The inspiration for Surrey's Doors Open stems from origins in France where the first Doors Open event (La Journee Portes Ouvertes) took place in 1984. The idea soon spread to neighbouring countries and has since expanded around the globe.

Staff announced the Parks Recreation and Culture Department received funding to continue the event and is recruiting members from the community (and staff) to serve on the 2013 Doors Open Planning Committee. Meetings will be held in the evenings; Commissioners were asked to please contact Jacqueline O'Donnell, Heritage Services Manager directly at (604) 502-6460 if they would like to represent the Heritage Commission on the Doors Open Committee.

I. OTHER BUSINESS

1. **Loyal Orange Lodge Hall – Permanent Security Fencing**
File: 6800-10 LOL

Staff reported that the Parks Department has purchased fencing to replace the rental fencing that surrounds the Loyal Orange Lodge Hall.

RECOMMENDATION

It was
Commission (SHAC) recommends that Council endorse that funds in the amount of \$6,160 be allocated from the Heritage Commission Reserve to purchase security fencing for the Loyal Orange Lodge Hall.

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

Carried

E. NEW BUSINESS

1. **PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT (Continued)**

- (c) **SHAC Task List**
File: 0540-20V

It was
January 3, 2013 be received as information.

Moved by Commissioner Hart
Seconded by Commissioner Hol
That the SHAC Task List dated

Carried

2. **PARKS, RECREATION AND CULTURE**

3. **ENGINEERING**

4. **LEGISLATIVE SERVICES**

F. ITEMS REFERRED BY COUNCIL**G. CORRESPONDENCE**

H. INFORMATION ITEMS (Continued)

3. **BC Historical Federation Annual Conference (May 9 – 11, 2013)**
Kamloops, B.C.
File: 0330-20

RECOMMENDATION

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

1. Approve Commissioners Hart and Hol to attend the BC Historical Federation Annual Conference (May 9 – 11, 2013) to be held in Kamloops, B.C., on behalf of the Surrey Heritage Advisory Commission; and,
2. Authorize Finance to reimburse applicable conference registration fees for Commissioners Hart and Hol, including accommodation at the designated hotel (or similarly priced equivalent), transportation expenses and applicable per diem from the Surrey Heritage Advisory Commission Budget based on City of Surrey policy.

Carried

I. OTHER BUSINESS (Continued)

2. **George E. Lawrence House (18431 Fraser Highway)**
File: N/A (Verbal Update)

Staff noted that the George E. Lawrence House is a protected heritage building located at 184 Street and Fraser Highway. The House was protected by a Heritage Revitalization Agreement (HRA) as part of a development application that was approved in 2011. The applicant had committed to relocating and restoring the House on-site for use as an amenity building for a new townhouse development. Prior to the approval of the development application, the House was damaged by fire on three separate occasions. After each fire, a qualified professional was engaged to confirm whether the House could be still be relocated and restored. Each time, the City was informed that the House could still be relocated and restored despite the fire-damage.

Recently, a professional engineer retained by the applicant submitted a letter to the City declaring the house structurally unsafe, recommending that workers not be permitted to enter the house. The engineer also indicated that since no remedial actions can be taken to make the house structurally safe, it should therefore be demolished. Because an engineer has deemed the house structurally unsafe, WorkSafeBC will not permit workers to enter the house. In order for the house to be relocated, it must be cleaned out and braced. If workers are unable to enter the house, it cannot be cleaned out and braced in preparation for the move. Consequently, the applicant's heritage consultant and architect have now submitted alternative plans for the house as follows:

- **Option 1** – reconstruction of the heritage house while blending old and new materials to such an extent that a visual distinction between the two is almost impossible for a visitor or user of the future amenity space.
 - **Option 2** – independent new structure close to the form, scale and massing of the historic house while being simplistic and contemporary in its design. Salvaged historic materials would be installed as artifacts in their original location on the exterior walls in order to clearly distinguish between old and new construction. As a mitigation measure for the lost heritage value, the consultant recommends site interpretation including but not limited to exhibition panels and perhaps interior slide shows and/or videos documenting the conservation work.
- Staff clarified that the developer was granted permission to proceed with a townhouse development on the site in advance of an NCP due to the comprehensive heritage preservation plan attached to the George Lawrence House.
 - Given the present derelict condition of the George E. Lawrence House, the developer is now proposing a salvage/replicate approach that will be facilitated through an HRA amendment. Staff noted the amended HRA will enforce specific timelines and any provision for financial heritage assistance will be removed.
 - Staff is exploring whether compensation for loss of heritage value applies in this situation.

Staff reported that Donald Luxton & Associates will take the Commission's feedback from the January 30, 2013, meeting and include it in an amended conservation strategy.

The Commission made the following comments:

- The Commission noted that the house should be restored and there should be penalties for not restoring the house in accordance with the agreed upon terms of the HRA. The Commission expressed concern regarding the lack of attention to the requirements of the HRA, noting that according to the applicant's own consultant, the house could have been moved and restored at the time the application was approved. Since that time, that house has been under the stewardship of the applicant. The Commission characterized the decline as wilful destruction by negligence.

It was

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

Commission (SHAC):

1. Endorse "Option 1 – reconstruction of the George E. Lawrence House blending salvaged and new materials," and
2. Recommend to the General Manager, Planning & Development that in accordance with the terms of the George E. Lawrence Heritage Revitalization Agreement (HRA), compensation for loss of heritage value be levied against the developer for the ongoing neglect and ultimate loss of the house.

Carried

3. **Sidney Partlo Residence**
File: N/A (Verbal Update)

The following comments were made:

- A demolition permit application for the Sidney Partlo House has been submitted to the City. The application is currently incomplete. Once complete, the City can withhold issuance of the permit for a period of 60 days in accordance with the *Local Government Act*.
- Staff will provide the Commission with a report once the demolition permit application is complete.

J. TASK/LIAISON GROUPS

K. FINANCIALS

1. **Financial Summary as at December 31, 2012**
File: 0540-20 V

It was

Commission (SHAC) receive the Financial Summary as at December 31, 2012, as information.

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

Carried

L. NEXT MEETING

The next meeting of the Heritage Advisory Commission is scheduled for Wednesday, February 27, 2013, in the Planning Boardroom #1, at 5:00 p.m.

M. ADJOURNMENT


It was

Commission meeting do now adjourn.

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

Carried

The Surrey Heritage Advisory Commission adjourned at 7:36 p.m.



Jane Sullivan, City Clerk



Commissioner Farrand, Vice-Chair