



COMMUNITY HERITAGE COMMITTEE MEETING

Wednesday, June 24, 2020

3:00 – 4:30 pm

VIA MS TEAMS

MINUTES

Present: Jennifer Clay
Rob Griesdale
Jim Paul (Vice-Chair)
Anne Savill (Chair)
Cllr. Matthew Bond

Regrets: Philip Baynton
Mel Montgomery
Daniel Francis
Alastair Moore

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

1. Call to Order

The Vice-Chair called the meeting to order at 3:05 pm.

2. Adoption of the Agenda

MOVED by Jennifer Clay and seconded by Rob Griesdale
To adopt the agenda.

CARRIED

3. Adoption of the February 26, 2020 Minutes

MOVED by Jennifer Clay and seconded by Rob Griesdale
To adopt the minutes.

CARRIED

4. Roundtable Check-In

Members provided some brief comments on experiences during the pandemic.

5. 2020 Workplan – COVID-19 Impact

Nicole Foth provided an update on impacts due to the pandemic. It was reiterated that the District is still committed to the items on the workplan but the timing of some of the items may have to shift due to the pandemic and the reconfiguration of work and staffing changes. Overall the items that were identified for the first year will be the items that the Committee will focus on. At this time, committee meetings are on hold but the Committee will be provided

with information in the fall about if the regular schedule will recommence and how committee meetings will function.

One of the items of the workplan was grants, and the Committee was informed that funding in the budget of approximately \$50,000 was approved for an expanded grant program. As such, the Terms of Reference will need to be amended as a result of the increased funding. Staff will draft the amendments to the Terms of Reference, and it will be brought to the Committee for input, and then once Council meeting schedules are determined, to Council for approval. As a result, grant applications may open later than last year.

In terms of the workplan some Committee members noted concern that not much progress has been made recently and whether there were items that the Committee could begin work. At this time, focus of work will remain on the amendments to the grant funding Terms of Reference and then to begin looking at developing the incentive guide as there could be some background research needed to look at what other communities have done. Also, as the award nominations are done online, the heritage award nominations will open in the fall.

Action: Nicole Foth will touch base on Basecamp when a draft of the revised Terms of Reference is ready for Committee input.

Action: Jim Paul plans to have a short presentation at the next meeting on accessibility to heritage buildings.

6. Heritage Award Guidelines

At the February meeting, the Committee provided input on draft guidelines on how the Committee reviews applications and the review process for the heritage awards, which would be included on the heritage awards webpage. Suggestions from the Committee have been incorporated into the guidelines. The guidelines will be posted to the website before nominations open. The guidelines could be revisited at some point in the future to ensure the guidelines continue to contain necessary information.

Action: Nicole Foth to have the heritage award guidelines posted on the webpage before the heritage award nominations open online.

7. 361 E. Kings Road – Demolition Permit Application

The Committee was informed that the owner of 361 East Kings Road recently submitted a demolition permit application to the District. The property is on the Heritage Register and there have been several conversations with the owner about exploring other options to encourage preservation of the house. The owner has expressed no interest in any potentials and is not looking to preserve the house. As the building is not legally protected, staff will now be reporting to Council on the demolition application for Council's consideration of the matter.

On discussion of this item, the following comments were provided:

- Request that a 60-day waiting period is put on the demolition permit application.
- Develop an education and awareness campaign on heritage with an objective of informing homeowners of all possible options for preserving heritage homes.
- In some situations, owners may wish to designate a property, however a developer may offer more money for the property than the owner would get if the property is designated as heritage, and depending on the owners' financial situation at the time, owners may then choose to sell the property to a developer.
- In some municipalities, heritage properties are worth more money than non-heritage and if the owner takes advantage of the incentives and is passionate about the heritage value, perhaps it is worth it to the owner to not sell to a developer.
- Explore whether a company, such as Nickel Brothers, can move the house on 361 E. Kings Road to a different location, if the owner is not interested in preservation.
- Instead of demolishing the house, and if relocation is not an option, have a company take the house down in a salvage-friendly manner in order to re-salvage pieces of the house. It was also noted that salvaging a building is more environmentally friendly than demolition.
- Develop a policy wherein there is a requirement that an applicant applying for a demolition permit has to report on all possible options including moving or salvaging the building.

Action: Nicole Foth to explore feasibility of the suggestions.

8. Information on Previous Heritage Award Winners

A project was suggested by some Committee members which would involve visiting past heritage award winning properties to collect information on the building's condition, and talk to the owners about the past heritage award and share information about the Committee. It was noted that this initiative is outside of the current workplan.

Members were informed that because of the pandemic, the District's current approach is that now is not the time to generally do public engagement for projects, which would include this initiative of visiting previous heritage award winners. While the idea of collecting the information is a worthwhile suggestion for background information (not an action item on workplan), this initiative should be paused for the time being. Members should be cognizant that they would be perceived as representing the District as a member of the Committee and knocking on doors during the pandemic may not be favourably received. A suggestion was presented that for now, members could view a property from the sidewalk to see its condition, but not to knock on doors to actively attempt to engage people. Another suggestion was

presented that members could wait to reassess the situation in the fall, or when the District's engagement approach changes.

Anne Savill reported that she recently visited the homeowners of the Harris House and that the homeowners provided feedback on the positive and negative aspects of restoring a house. Some of the topics covered during their conversation were as follows:

- Application process for a \$500 grant was not worth the effort. As such, it was suggested that larger grant amounts would entice more applications for the grant.
- Information should be more readily available from the District when homeowners are thinking about designating their properties as heritage.
- Suggestion to consider designating the war memorial boulder at Cates Park as a heritage site.

The Committee's current workplan does not include considering additions to the Heritage Register. It was suggested that it may be useful for a Committee member to flag the suggestion on Basecamp to track suggestions for reference.

9. Any Other Business

None reported.

10. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 4:27 pm.

11. Next Meeting

The Committee will break for the summer and communication will be provided to the members as to whether there would be a schedule in the fall.