



# COMMUNITY HERITAGE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Wednesday, May 26, 2021  
3:00 – 5:00 pm  
Via MS TEAMS  
**MINUTES**

---

**Present:** Jennifer Clay  
Philip Baynton  
Rob Griesdale  
Mel Montgomery  
Alastair Moore  
Bob Muckle  
Jim Paul (Vice-Chair)  
Anne Savill (Chair)  
Cllr. Mathew Bond

**Regrets:** None

**Staff:** Nicole Foth, Community Planner  
Mary Jukich, Community Service Clerk

---

**1. Call to Order**

The Chair called the meeting to order at 3:02 pm.

**2. Adoption of Agenda**

MOVED by Alastair Moore and seconded by Jim Paul  
To adopt the agenda.

**CARRIED**

**3. Adoption of the April 26, 2021 Minutes**

MOVED by Alastair Moore and seconded by Mel Montgomery  
To adopt the minutes.

**CARRIED**

**4. Heritage Grants Policy and Terms of Reference**

As background, work is underway with revisions to the Heritage Grants Program as the District has a new source of funding for heritage grants. There are now two sources of funding; the interest from the North Shore Community Foundation which provides approximately \$2,000 to \$3,000 per year, and the new source of funds from the District in the amount of approximately \$50,000 per year for the heritage grant program. After a review of the two funds and how they are managed, it was determined that two guiding documents were required, the Terms of Reference for the Heritage Funds Agreement with the North Shore Community Foundation and the Heritage Grants Policy, if approved by Council, to guide how the District's funds are administered. The Policy includes categories for grant funding: heritage planning, heritage

conservation, and heritage awareness and education. A meeting was also held on May 21<sup>st</sup> with staff and interested members of the Committee for review and feedback.

On review and discussion, the following comments were provided:

- A question was raised about including heritage trees, views, and landscapes. Information was provided that the heritage conservation category includes designated heritage trees in the tree bylaw, and that if the heritage landscape features are mentioned in either the statement of significance or heritage register listing they could be eligible for the heritage conservation grant.
- A comment was made that a heritage landscape or view could involve multiple owners and property, and the eligibility focuses on the property owner.
- Clarification was requested on the wording for “consecutive” five year maximum for grant funding, and suggested the wording be modified to indicate “rolling five year maximum”.
- A question was raised about opportunities for the Committee to apply for grants from the federal government to increase the amount of funding available in the grant program. Information was provided that most grant applications have to be for a specific project, rather than providing funds to then be re-distributed by the recipient.
- Clarification was requested with regard to why archaeological work is an ineligible cost, and the suggestion was made to remove it from the ineligible list. Staff will take this item back for further review and consideration. Information was provided that excavating activities may require approvals for permits from senior government levels and possible consultation with the First Nations prior to the excavation work.

MOVED by Jim Paul and seconded by Rob Griesdale

The Community Heritage Advisory Committee supports the Community Heritage Grants Policy and the updated Community Heritage Grants Fund Agreement Terms of Reference for heritage grants, subject to clarification of the items discussed at the May 26, 2021 Committee meeting.

**CARRIED**

**Action: Nicole to report back on Basecamp about the archaeological work question.**

## 5. 2021 Work Plan

The Committee was informed that a new Heritage Planner position was recently approved, and will be able to dedicate more staff time and resources to implementing the Heritage Strategic Plan. It was noted that once the new hire is in place, they will likely serve as the staff liaison on the Committee and replace Nicole Foth.

The 2021 work plan was developed prior to approval of the new Heritage Planner position and once the new hire is in place it may be beneficial to re-visit the work plan with a view to increasing the number of activities that are underway.

With respect to the work plan, the following comments and feedback were provided:

- Consider having subcommittees so some work can take place outside of Committee meeting time, then bring the item to the whole Committee to thus move work items forward more quickly. Items could include plaques, or researching incentives.
- In terms of the plaques work item, the Committee members previously undertook research and the next step is for staff to consider the direction and come back with recommendations.
- Some of the longer term Committee members indicated there may be a need to assess the overall feeling of the Committee around the level of accomplishments happening and whether the Committee as a resource is being fully utilized. Of particular concern was the number of heritage properties that are not being saved with the current tools and process that are in place.
- The Committee may benefit from a discussion between being a working committee versus a policy committee, either setting a direction or doing work. It may be useful to determine where the current members are in that spectrum especially with the new Heritage Planner who should have more time to complete work and address some of the challenges for the longer term.
- A concern was raised that heritage homes are still being demolished and that there are not enough incentives or policy for houses to be maintained and be retained. The HRA application process is risky for a property owner because of the uncertain outcome. There may be more tools or options for HRAs and zoning to make retention of houses more financially feasible, and less uncertain. Possibly have a discussion or plan to find more options and information that could be added to having effective HRAs.
- The Committee may wish to request presenting at Council for a discussion on heritage and determining Council's support for heritage. It may be beneficial to provide Council with information about challenges the Committee has seen, properties lost, and possible incentives that could have helped mitigate some of the losses.

Members were reminded that there is always an opportunity for any member of the public to address items of the Council agenda or speak to Council at their meetings. Members were also reminded not to speak publicly on behalf of the Committee, unless the Committee members agree.

- A comment was made about partnership between the Committee and Council, and opportunities for conversations between Council and the Committee.

- A question was raised whether Council sees the input from the Committee on applications. Information was provided that when there is a Council report on a heritage property, input from the Committee is included in the staff report.
- In terms of the OCP, a question was raised whether the Committee should get involved with the Targeted OCP Review.
- In terms of the Bylaws, consider revising the Bylaws around heritage properties to require upkeep.
- In terms of permits, consider fast tracking permits for heritage.
- A suggestion was presented that the Committee develop a workshop presentation for Council on its work.

**Action: A folder will be created on Basecamp for members to discuss their presentation to Council.**

## 6. May 31<sup>st</sup> Council Meeting

- 3729 Edgemont Blvd – Development Permit

This application on a heritage register property was previously brought to the Committee, and this application will be brought to Council on May 31<sup>st</sup>. After receiving a stop work order, the property owner is applying for a development permit, as this is a multi-family building, as well as a variance for the building footprint. The Committee's comments on the project were incorporated in the staff report. A heritage consultant took a look at the work that was completed.

A concern was raised that after the Committee's site visit, there was no reference to the feedback on the report. Information was provided that after the site visit, the feedback was sent to the development planner and the property owner for consideration. As the property is not a legally protected heritage property, the property owner has the ability to decide what can ultimately be done on the property in terms of renovations within permitted zoning.

- 3073 (was 3075) Fromme Road – Demolition

This is an application for demolition of a heritage register property. There was an HRA application previously, but the applicant did not take it for Council final decision because of the negative feedback from the community. This application will be going to Council on May 31<sup>st</sup> that permits are withheld until the permits for the new house are issued.

A concern was raised about the pending demolition of this home, and that the HRA was not proceeding.

## **7. 1160 Ridgewood – HRA Construction**

This property was designated in 2011 with an HRA. The HRA was to retain a portion of the house and permit an addition in the back and a coach house in the front. Construction is starting to build the plans per the HRA. The conservation plan was shared with the Committee on Basecamp. The following comments were provided:

- It may be interesting to see how much will be retained versus rebuilt as parts like the timbers, the windows and frames, and some concrete will need to be replaced.
- The real estate listing photograph did not look like the rendering that was presented to the Committee.

## **8. Any Other Business**

None

## **9. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 5:03 pm.

## **10. Next Meeting: Wednesday, June 23, 2021 – 3:00 – 5:00 pm.**