

Present:

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

Absent:

R. Hart

Staff Present:

D. Luymes, Planning & Development
E. Schultz, Planning & Development
M. Daniwall, Engineering
M. Petrovic, Engineering
P. Bellefontaine, Engineering
T. Mueller, Legislative Services

A. ADOPTION OF MINUTES

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

1. Surrey Heritage Advisory Commission Minutes – June 27, 2012.

It was

Moved by Commissioner Tannen

Seconded by Commissioner Farrand

That the minutes of the June 27, 2012, Surrey

Heritage Advisory Commission (SHAC) meeting be adopted.

Carried

B. DELEGATIONS

1. **M. Daniwall, Transportation Planner, Engineering Department**
File: 8630-01

In attendance before the Commission to provide information regarding the examination of possible alternative road access into Crescent Beach.

The following comments were made:

- Engineering staff were before the Commission to provide background to the work being undertaken, discuss potential solutions for access, explain some of the impacts of the alternatives (including heritage features), and gain preliminary and early input from SHAC.
- For a number of years the Crescent Beach community have raised concerns regarding emergency response into the area during times when Crescent Road was blocked due to passing or stopped trains. The City of Surrey Engineering Department was asked to examine potential alternate access to Crescent Beach. A significant event occurred in 2007 when access into the community was blocked for 1.5 hours because of a faulty train; this event highlighted the need to review access issues for the community.

There are additional challenges regarding access into and out of Crescent Beach especially for residents and visitors during peak season with Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railway (BNSF) trains typically requiring 12-15 minutes to clear the crossing.

- The concerns were such that Council directed staff to examine alternative ways of improving access. As part of this process, City Emergency Services promoted a series of initiatives, including a Stopped Train Protocol (STP) (involving the Emergency Services advising the rail operator of an emergency call to the Crescent Beach community and any train stopping before reaching Crescent Road to allow emergency vehicles to gain access), Neighbourhood Emergency Preparedness Program (NEPP), and a Tsunami Contingency Plan (TCP). Due to the various initiatives developed, the Emergency Services indicated emergency access within Crescent Beach would be manageable with the implementation of the STP, which would lower the probability of conflict between trains and emergency vehicles.
- City Engineering staff also reviewed opportunities to develop an alternative access route under the wooden trestle bridge at the Marina. It was determined that the minimum costs would be \$1.5M to achieve an acceptable crossing, but likely, would be significantly more largely due to poor soil conditions in the area. Furthermore, if this option was implemented, BNSF would require the City to assume liability against vandalism and any associated potential spill of materials from a train as well as insuring BNSF against loss of revenue. Staff explained this solution exposed the City to very high risk and did not suitably address other resident concerns (i.e., need for improved community access).
- In 2010, staff provided Council with a Corporate Report R168 – "Emergency Access to Crescent Beach Neighbourhood" and recommended the City not pursue an emergency access under the wooden trestle bridge. Council further directed staff to explore all reasonable emergency and non-emergency solutions with the community.
- In 2011, a Phase I of the Crescent Beach Community Access study was conducted to review all reasonable solutions and a range of options were presented for consideration. These included:
 1. Marina Underpass
 2. Crescent Road Underpass
 3. Crescent Road Overpass
 4. McKenzie Avenue Underpass
 5. McBride Avenue Underpass; and
 6. 5 potential pedestrian only and emergency solutions
- An extensive stakeholder consultation process was held where each of the options was evaluated by key stakeholders including representatives from the Crescent Beach Property Owners Association, BNSF, the Emergency Services, and Transport Canada.

- Phase I of the study concluded with Option 2: **Crescent Road Underpass** identified as the preferred option. Preliminary estimates indicate approximately \$4M for the road and underpass, with an additional \$2M to relocate two **Greater Vancouver Regional District (GVRD)** pressurized sanitary mains. Staff provided members of the Commission with a visual overlay of this option and explained how the underpass would be constructed, highlighted various access points, and how the right-of-way would work concerning landscaping and properties. Staff noted further work would be required to determine the underpass structural requirements, constructability, and detailed costs.
- Phase II of the study commenced early this year, staff are working with both the BNSF to identify structural needs, and with the GVRD to address the challenges of the pressurized mains. GVRD continue to explore the potential to reroute the mains but are currently requiring the Phase 1 underpass road alignment to be offset further away from their pump station to avoid impacts to this costly structure. Additionally, this potential re-routing of the mains has significant heritage impacts.

Two alternative underpass alignments were developed to address GVRD concerns:

1. **Alignment A** - preserves the heritage home in near proximity, but compromises heritage trees. The grade of the road is 18% which significantly exceeds Canadian road standards and is not supported by the Engineering Department.
2. **Alignment B** - goes through a heritage home, with the mature trees preserved, and providing a road grade that is 12.9% (closer to acceptable maximum of 12%).

No impacts are foreseen at this point to Dunsmuir Farm because of the underpass options presented.

Staff requested feedback from the Commission as part of the review process given the heritage impacts.

- The Commission asked for clarification regarding the road grade and the sea level. In response, staff noted ground water issues in the community are documented with on-going upgrading and improvements to pumping facilities in the area by the City of Surrey's Engineering Drainage Section.
- The Commission asked for clarification regarding the Phase 1 alignment and the feasibility of relocating the pump station. Staff noted that the GVRD is reluctant to move the forced pressure mains and does not support an alignment in close proximity to the existing pump station facility.

- The Commission commented that from a Heritage Perspective, the subject home is site specific and there is limited opportunity for relocation. The trees should be protected and in addition, the proposed reconfiguration of Crescent Road, which is a Heritage Road, is not a positive change. The Commission suggested that if GVRD is willing to explore relocating the pump station, the system could potentially be upgraded to last for the next 20 years.

The Commission supported the Underpass Option, as identified in conclusion to the Phase I Study in principle and suggested staff continue discussions with GVRD regarding the possibility of relocating the pump station.

C. OUTSTANDING BUSINESS

D. NEW BUSINESS

1. PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

- (a) **Memo re: Ocean Park Community Hall (1577 – 128 Street) Application for Financial Assistance**
File: 6800-20

The following comments were made:

- The Ocean Park Community Association has applied for financial assistance to replace the existing gutters and downspouts on the Ocean Park Community Hall. Staff noted that the Association's preferred option is the most expensive option; however, it is also the most sympathetic to the heritage character of the Hall.
- The Commission asked if the leaf guard system was included; staff clarified that the proposed system includes an enhanced leaf guard system.

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

1. Receive the Memo re: Ocean Park Community Hall (1577 – 128 Street) Application for Financial Assistance as information;
2. Approve financial assistance in the amount of \$949.20 which represents 50% of the value of the works as per the quote provided by Precision Gutters; 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

(b) **Seventh Day Adventist Church (16017-8 Avenue) Application for Financial Assistance**
File No. 6800-20

The following comments were made:

- The HRA for this building had Public Hearing on July 9, 2012 and will be considered for Final Adoption at July 23, 2012, Regular Council Land Use meeting.
- Staff noted the applicant is looking for financial assistance to relocate the building on its existing property. For the purpose of relocating a protected heritage building, property owners are permitted to apply for 3 years of assistance within the 1st year.

It was Moved by Commissioner Farrand
Seconded by Commissioner Hol
That the Surrey Heritage Advisory

Commission recommends that Council:

1. Receive the Seventh Day Adventist Church (16017-8 Avenue) Application for Financial Assistance report as information;
2. Recommend that, once Heritage Revitalization Agreement (HRA) By-law, 2012, No. 17700 has been granted Final Adoption, Council approve financial assistance in the amount of \$7,840.00 which represents 50% of the value of the works as per the quote provided by Nickel Bros; 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) **SHAC Task List**

File: 0540-20V

The following comments were made:

- **Fusion Festival** - Staff has purchased heritage candy, and a gift basket was assembled using City of Surrey promotional items and a variety of Surrey history books. The remaining Right-to-Play Balls will be used as give away items. The basket will be given away on a draw basis. Heritage Services has put together a matching game under the theme "*scenes from the past and today*" along with the popular barn mapping game used in last year's booth.
- **Bulman's Garage** - Staff clarified they will be proceeding with a standard HRA because the zoning is already in place. Staff will keep the Commission apprised of any further developments on the proposal.
- **Interpretive Sign Pilot Project** - Heritage Services will provide a status update at a future SHAC meeting, it was noted the test sign will be installed at Sullivan.
- **Gerow Barn** - The Chair advised the Commission that the Metro Vancouver Parks Department has indicated that to-date no funds have been identified for the restoration and interpretation of the Barn.
- **Ocean Park Community Hall** - Engineering staff reported that the street signage report is finished and will be presented at an upcoming SHAC meeting.
- **Semiahmoo Trail Marker Location** - Engineering will present options for Commission review at an upcoming SHAC meeting.
- **Ocean Park Hall Community Hall Paint Job** - Staff reported that upon inspection, it was determined some of the trim must be repainted. The Ocean Park Community Association has advised that they will repaint the trim.

2. **PARKS, RECREATION, AND CULTURE**3. **ENGINEERING**4. **LEGISLATIVE SERVICES**E. **ITEMS REFERRED BY COUNCIL**F. **CORRESPONDENCE**

G. INFORMATION ITEMS

1. Future Demolition Permits

Staff informed the Commission that the owner of Meadow Ridge Farm (16390 64 Avenue) has applied for a demolition permit to remove the portions of the barn that are not proposed to be retained. Staff clarified that several conditions must be met by the applicant prior to the issuance of the demolition permit and during the demolition. Those conditions are as follows:

1. The applicant's heritage consultant, Barry McGinn, must provide confirmation in writing that all requirements of the proposed Heritage Revitalization Agreement (HRA) and Conservation Plan with respect to documentation and salvage (e.g., measured drawings, photo documentation, historic documentation; salvage of artifacts etc.) have been completed.
2. The applicant is required to arrange for an onsite meeting between the demolition contractor and Barry McGinn to ensure that the demolition of the structures does not compromise the conservation strategy for the property.
3. The applicant is required to retain Barry McGinn to oversee the demolition of the structures to ensure that the three (3) structures proposed for retention/restoration are not compromised.

The Commission was supportive of this approach and requested that staff advise members of the Commission when the demolition permit is issued.

2. Bose Farm Application

Staff clarified that there are two active development applications on the former Bose Farm property. "Meadow Ridge Farm" is the western property and "Bose Farm" is the eastern property. Three heritage buildings are proposed to be retained on each property. The forest on the west property is proposed to be retained while the forest on the east property is proposed to be removed.

The Chair noted that staff and members of Council will do their best to ensure the information given to the public is correct. The Chair requested members of the Commission to direct any inquires received from members of the public / media to staff for response and to provide clarification.

3. Canada's 150th Birthday

The Commission requested thought be given to allocating funds in support of the Canadian Sesquicentennial Celebrations. The Canadian Sesquicentennial will be a year-long celebration held in 2017 when Canada celebrates the 150th anniversary of the Canadian Confederation. It was suggested the Commission to do something significant, such as a restoration project or heritage documentation project.

Staff suggested that this item be discussed at a future SHAC meeting when Heritage Services staff is present.

H. TASK/LIAISON GROUPS

I. FINANCIALS

1. **Financial Summary as at June 29, 2012**

File: 0540-20V

It was Commission (SHAC) receive the Financial Summary as at June 29, 2012, as information.

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

Carried

J. NEXT MEETING

The next meeting of the Surrey Heritage Advisory Commission is scheduled for **Wednesday, September 19** in the **Executive Boardroom at 5:00 p.m.**


K. ADJOURNMENT

It was Commission meeting do now adjourn.


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

Carried

The Surrey Heritage Advisory Commission adjourned at 6:35 p.m.



Jane Sullivan, City Clerk



Councillor Steele, Chairperson