

THE CORPORATION OF THE DISTRICT OF WEST VANCOUVER

HERITAGE ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING AGENDA

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 30, 2022

4:30 PM VIA ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATION FACILITIES

(Members of the public may hear, or watch and hear, the meeting by attending the Atrium in the Municipal Hall, or via electronic communication facilities through the link provided on the Committee's webpage)

Note: Council Committee meetings are conducted in accordance with Council Committee Procedure Bylaw No. 5020, 2019 (as amended), subject to the discretion of the Chair.

CALL TO ORDER

1. Call to order.

Note: Chair will confirm that the meeting is being conducted via electronic communication facilities, pursuant to s. 5.7(b) of Council Committee Procedure Bylaw No. 5020, 2019 (as amended).

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

2. **Approval of March 30, 2022 Meeting Agenda**

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the March 30, 2022 Heritage Advisory Committee meeting agenda be approved as circulated.

ADOPTION OF MINUTES

3. **Adoption of February 22, 2022 Meeting Minutes**

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the February 22, 2022 Heritage Advisory Committee meeting minutes be adopted as circulated.

REPORTS / ITEMS

4. **Preliminary Heritage Revitalization Agreement Proposal for 1591 Haywood Avenue**

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the presentation regarding Preliminary Heritage Revitalization Agreement Proposal for 1591 Haywood Avenue be received for information.

5. 2021 Annual Committee Evaluation

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the results regarding 2021 Annual Committee Evaluation be received for information.

6. Public Engagement Initiative to Identify Heritage Resources

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the results regarding Public Engagement Initiative to Identify Heritage Resources be received for information.

7. Heritage Project Updates

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the presentation regarding Heritage Project Updates be received for information.

PUBLIC QUESTIONS

8. Public Questions

NEXT MEETING

9. Next Meeting

The next Heritage Advisory Committee meeting is scheduled for April 27, 2022 at 4:30 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT

10. Adjournment of the March 30, 2022 Heritage Advisory Committee Meeting

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the March 30, 2022 Heritage Advisory Committee meeting be adjourned.

**THE CORPORATION OF THE DISTRICT OF WEST VANCOUVER
HERITAGE ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
VIA ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATION FACILITIES
TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 2022**

Committee Members: P. Grossman (Chair), L. Anderson, B. Clark, M. Geller, A. Hatch, P. Hundal, J. Mawson; and Councillor S. Thompson attended the meeting via electronic communication facilities. Absent: S. Abri.

Staff: E. Syvokas, Community Planner (Staff Liaison); A. Banks, Senior Manager of Parks; and J. Suggitt, Executive Assistant (Committee Clerk) attended the meeting via electronic communications facilities.

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 4:33 p.m.

B. Clark and M. Geller entered the meeting at 4:39 p.m. via electronic communication facilities.

The Chair informed that L. Xu has resigned from the committee.

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT the February 22, 2022 Heritage Advisory Committee meeting agenda be approved as circulated.

CARRIED

J. Mawson absent at the vote

3. ADOPTION OF MINUTES

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT the January 26, 2022 Heritage Advisory Committee meeting minutes be adopted as circulated.

CARRIED

J. Mawson absent at the vote

REPORTS / ITEMS

4. Update on Klee Wyck Park Site

A. Banks, Senior Manager of Parks, Culture & Community Services provided an update regarding the Klee Wyck Park Site:

- The District will be engaging with the community on the future use of the Klee Wyck Park site. Information on the Klee Wyck Park site was distributed to the committee to keep the committee informed. The documents include a memo on the community consultation, a draft communications & engagement plan,

and a Preliminary Heritage Investigation report on the Gate House which includes a draft revised statement of significance for the Klee Wyck Park site.

J. Mawson entered the meeting at 5:05 p.m. via electronic communication facilities.

Committee Questions and Comments:

- There appears to be a flat roofed structure attached to the west side of the Gate House, what is it? *Staff response: The structure is a cinder block building that was the furnace heating system for the greenhouses that were behind the Gate House which have been demolished.*
- One of the conservation options presented in the report is to remove the two additions and just retain the small original building. How big is the original portion of the building? *Staff response: Donald Luxton's report indicates that the overall size of the Gate House is 250 square metres. However, the report does not specify the size of the original building.*
- Is community engagement for the general Klee Wyck Park site or just for the Gate House? *Staff response: The community engagement planned for March and April is for the entire Klee Wyck Park site not just for the Gate House.*
- Is there a possibility of incorporating a memorial to recognize the people who died in World War I as the Klee Wyck donor's family, Dr. Trapp, had four brothers and three of them (Stanley, George and Donovan) were all pilots and were lost in the war. Would that be something that can be considered? *Staff response: This is up to community to decide. It would be helpful to submit this suggestion as part of the community engagement process so that it can be incorporated in the overall synopsis of the engagement at the end.*
- In the communications and engagement document, a risk identified is potentially "interpreting the heritage significance of the property incorrectly" and it is indicated that staff are obtaining additional heritage advice from Don Luxton related to the Gate House. What does that mean? *Staff response: Staff wanted to make sure that the heritage aspect of the site and Gate House was properly evaluated and that is what we have done by engaging the heritage expert, Donald Luxton, to prepare the Preliminary Heritage Investigation report and updated Statement of Significance.*
- The focus seems to be on Dr. Trapp but there was another family before them that developed the site, the Fearnshides. Should we raise this here or is there another way to have them mentioned as the site would not be there if not for them? Can this information be contributed as a member of the public? *Staff response: The draft Statement of Significance and draft Preliminary Heritage Investigation report refers to the history of the house and previous owners. More signage on site could be a consideration moving forward. We are at the very beginning stages and that can be flagged now and as we go through the process, we will keep that information. The information can also be submitted by individual committee members or the Heritage Advisory Committee as a whole can also contribute information. There are many options for this committee to engage, either through the upcoming consultation or after through comments from this committee.*

- Will there be an opportunity to view the video before it is completed and disseminated to the community? *Staff response: The video is being undertaken by our Communications department.*
- Is it right to assume this will come back to us after the public consultation period? *Staff response: The committee has provided comments on the site at a previous meeting and staff are working to address those comments as the project moves forward. Staff will keep the committee informed as we progress with the site and engage with the community.*
- In the Preliminary Heritage Investigation report, there were 5 different conservation strategies outlined and in the Community Engagement one of the key messages is the house not being salvageable. Is it been decided that the house cannot be salvaged or are those options still on the table? *Staff response: The Community Engagement Plan was referring to the main house that was on site that was demolished late last year. The Preliminary Heritage Investigation report is a review of the Gate House that is still standing at the entrance of the site.*
- Was any of building material salvaged (i.e. original doorknobs)? *Staff response: Staff will look into this and get back to the committee through the Staff Liaison.*
- Will the family be involved with the ongoing process and engagement process? That is very important. *Staff response: The family is aware of what is going on and they are very active and are aware of the community engagement process coming up and will be participating in the process. They are also very engaged in trying to ensure that Dr. Trapp will be remembered on the Klee Wyck site and staff will be working with them to do that.*
- In the Preliminary Heritage Investigation report next steps for additional heritage assessment are outlined. Will this work be completed before the community engagement or after? *Staff response: Staff have asked Donald Luxton to wait until feedback from the community is received before he completes his work.*
- What can we do as a committee and what is appropriate for the original family, the Fearnshides so they are not forgotten? *Staff response: Staff will contact Donald Luxton to see if there is any further input that can be provided into the Statement of Significance or if he has any suggestions on how they might be recognized elsewhere.*
- In the Statement of Significance there is quite a detailed write up on the Fearnshides which was helpful to see. As far as anything remaining on the property, it would only be the Gate House that they were apart of. It is important to keep in mind that the property was a donation to the District from Dr. Ethlyn Trapp. The only thing left of the Fearnshides contribution to the site was building the Gate House. Dr. Trapp went one step further by donating the land; this is her story, she named the site Klee Wyck.
- We appreciate Dr. Trapp's contribution to the community but it is a historic site and there are a number of influences on that site, not only the Fearnshides

but also indigenous people. Want to advocate that they are not forgotten as they are part of the history.

- Since the Heritage Advisory Committee was re-formed three years ago, one theme that has been talked about has been the District's stewardship of the assets it has been gifted. During a discussion around Klee Wyck in September 2020 there was concern expressed for stewardship of this property and particularly that there had been little if any maintenance for the buildings on the property over a ten year period. Since 2015 the District has been moving toward an asset management plan. It is really important as we look towards the future that others may consider gifting resident assets to the community for ongoing use and for the assets the municipality currently has, that it is seen to be a good steward of those assets. Part of that means not just public consultation but stewardship goes beyond simply public consultation, there has to be a visible asset management plan for Klee Wyck. Are there currently funds set aside for the stewardship for the gardens, walkways, and perimeter? *Staff response: The District does have an asset management plan and does set aside money. For the current Gate House and 2 greenhouses, we will wait to see what happens with the public consultation to determine the end use of this site and the use of the facilities. When we build something we have to list the costs and that goes into the asset management plan so there is money in the future to replenish. The plan is to reinvest in the structures on the site when there is a plan in place.*
- Dr. Ethlyn Trapp's house was demolished because it fell into disrepair. If there has not been active maintenance on the remaining structures on site, with every year that goes by without active maintenance of the site and its structures, the ask gets greater. Council is then faced with needing to find a bigger return on investments, to justify the expense of bringing a site and its buildings back up to an appropriately maintained level. Staff and Council need to be aware that the expectation is that the District is a good steward of the assets that it has been gifted.
- What is the reference to \$170,000 in the report? Has this money been used? What was it for? *Staff response: The money was used to pay for the removal of greenhouses and for rehabilitation after the main house was removed. For example, works are underway to rehabilitate the area where the house used to be with grass, fix up the area where the greenhouses were, and for trail works and landscaping of the site after the removal of the house.*
- On a tour of the site noticed a very nice collection of rhododendrons and it was very overgrown. Would any of that money have gone to clearing out the overgrowth or undergrowth? *Staff response: Yes, some of that money is being spent to remove some invasive English laurels and some money was spent to do some plant inventory referred to in the report. A comprehensive plant inventory was done on the site; the inventory is not complete, we are waiting for flowers this spring to try and identify species and varieties.*
- Can we share Donald Luxton's report, is it public? *Staff response: The report is a draft but it is a public document now that it has been shared with the committee. Please ensure that if it is shared that it is referenced as a draft. Following the community engagement, process staff will be able to further*

finalize the document when further direction is received from the community/Council.

- If those rhododendrons have survived from their original planting by Colonel Fearnside because they were spectacular at the time, that would be a great thing for the project. Encouraged to see that there is a consideration for the community gardens and plant staging area at Klee Wyck for the community so that peoples' gardens are not demolished along with the houses. People will be encouraged if that became a feature of the project. Thank you for including that.
- Have you been in touch with the Rhododendron and Azalea Society as they would have a lot of knowledge? They know about the rare rhododendrons and azaleas on site or at least there is some historic knowledge there. *Staff response: Not yet. Staff are waiting for our consultant to identify the species and subspecies on site. Once that is completed, staff may potentially reach out to this society.*
- Donald Luxton's report begins in the 1920s and provides a history of the building on the site. Who is providing the indigenous history of the site and how will that be worked into the future interpretation of the site? Is that a requirement of the project to seek input? *Staff response: We are reaching out to First Nations as part of the community engagement process to seek their input.*

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT the presentation regarding Update on Klee Wyck Park Site be received for information.

CARRIED

L. Anderson left the meeting at 5:20 p.m. and did not return.

5. Challenges Related to Insurance for Heritage Homes

M. Mesic from Schill Insurance Brokers provided a presentation to the committee as follows:

- The Strata for the Vinson House development had issues trying to find insurance coverage. They came to Schill Insurance and we were able to procure coverage for the risk, however they asked that we write a letter to the District of West Vancouver with respect to the difficulties that they and other heritage risks go through when trying to find insurance on their locations.
- Insurance companies are hesitant to provide capacity and coverage for heritage risks. Currently, there are only a handful of insurance markets that provide coverage to risks that are on a municipal heritage register.
- If an insurance company agrees to write a heritage risk these properties are subject to increased insurance rates and deductibles, added exclusions to the policy, and inability to purchase full coverage.
- Issues with a heritage risk:

- Length of planning approvals: typically a lengthier approval process for repairing or rebuilding a heritage property than for non heritage risks. The added timeframe means the insurance company may pay for additional living expenses for a longer period of time and added costs to engage experts (e.g. engineers and planners).
- Insurer expertise: to assess the property adequately, insurance companies require appraisals done by qualified professionals with heritage property expertise that places added expenses to the Strata Council and their contingency reserves.
- Bylaws: Generally it is a requirement under municipal bylaws that a heritage property be rebuilt on the original site to its original specifications with building materials that are equivalent to the ones used at the time it was built. As such, the cost of claims escalate on the insurer side.
- Restricting coverages: insurers restrict certain perils when it comes to heritage; flood and earthquake coverage are the top two.
- Distinctive and unique features: due to the craftsmanship associated with heritage properties, specialty contractors and building materials may be necessary. This can add costs and time delays.
- Cost of claim settlements: often heritage risks contain materials known to be contaminants (such as asbestos), which may or may not be covered depending on the policy exclusions. If covered, the cost to mitigate, remove and safely dispose of the matter adds extra costs.

Committee Questions and Comments:

- There are two tiers of heritage status:
 - 1) properties which are listed on the Heritage Register. For these properties there are no bylaws that require it to be restored with original materials or to any standard in the case of damage. The Heritage Register is a tool for understanding and managing the community's resources and for accessing heritage conservation tools and incentives; and
 - 2) properties that are designated. These properties are subject to bylaws which do have replacement requirements.
- Why would insurance companies be concerned about homes on the Heritage Register when the requirement to replace with original materials only applies to designated properties? Is that terminology creating a problem? *Staff response: Perhaps there is some clarification that can be made on the District website or in a communication to insurance providers to clarify the different requirements for properties that are listed on the Community Heritage Register vs. properties that have gone through the Heritage Revitalization Agreement process and are designated by bylaw.*
- A lot of insurance companies do not understand heritage risk in general. There is a lag in education that underwriters have with respect to different legalities or bylaws around those that are deemed heritage by way of

designation or the ones on the Heritage Register. Sometimes it is easier just to exclude them all. We can provide clarification to the insurance companies and hope a senior underwriter may be able to relax their criteria for properties on the Heritage Register. *Staff response: Staff will work on some language to provide to clarify the distinction between properties that are covered by a Heritage Revitalization Agreement and that are municipally designated by bylaw vs. properties on the Heritage Register. This particular solution will not help the Vinson house and those who have been protected by the heritage bylaw but it would be beneficial to properties on the heritage register.*

- It is important to clarify this so that it does not become a disincentive for additions to the Heritage Register.
- Are there any wording changes that can also be made to the Heritage Revitalization Agreement bylaw because otherwise there may be less interest for developers and homeowners in wanting their property to go through a Heritage Revitalization Agreement process. There are often debates on this committee on the relative importance of some interior features of a building and their preservation/protection. If we can avoid potential costs because the District of West Vancouver or other municipalities are not going to insist that elaborate woodwork/millwork has to be reproduced in the exact same way in a loss event that might reduce the cost of insurance and help address the problem. We should discuss whether reproducing millwork and stained glass windows, which can be extremely expensive, are absolutely essential with regards to future Heritage Revitalization Agreement developments.
- Language in Heritage Revitalization Agreements could be modified going forward to recognize that if there is a loss event, that different rules apply. Using the example of elaborate woodwork, would want to see protections on those features from being just renovated out. Agreements can be written in a way that if there is a fire or insurable loss, then these rules do not apply. To give more flexibility so from insurer's point of view, they will not be stuck with the cost of replicating the stained glass window. It would have to be explicit that those relaxations only apply to losses that occur that are insured rather than throwing away those protections generally so that they can be renovated. We have a lot of flexibility with the legislation that allows us to write in those specifics. *Response: If you do this, it would be for West Vancouver and locations in a set territory, there is no bearing on other municipalities. Insurance companies do not want to write these risks where there is different rules and regulations from other municipalities. To make it easier for heritage risks to get insurance in West Vancouver, we need to create an insurance program specific for West Vancouver where you can write the manuscript wording to allow us to insert and remove coverages from the Insurance Bureau of Canada.*
- There might be a way to do something provincially and have more standard wording in bylaws. Wording for West Vancouver for Heritage Revitalization Agreement legal agreements is different from one municipality to the next. Maybe we need to bring the idea of standard wording to the Province.
- This is coming up on a provincial level already and Heritage BC is looking into it. If we can take what we have learned on this committee and forward it to

Heritage BC they can help on the Provincial level. In the event a heritage house were lost would it need to be re-built exactly to the current building code, is that completely overwritten by the Heritage Revitalization Agreement? *Staff response: There are equivalencies in the building code for heritage homes but the language in the Heritage Revitalization Agreement is very specific to how it needs to be built to essentially a replica of what was approved through the Heritage Revitalization Agreement. The features of the home will need to be rebuilt. If there are changes to the building code a heritage alteration permit may be required depending on the circumstances.*

- Would the Heritage Revitalization Agreement override the building code? *Staff response: It is worked out between the Heritage Consultant and Staff reviewing the building code. However, life safety requirements of the building code generally takes precedence.*
- *Response: One issue of heritage risk is those potential upgrades to the building code that may need to be done. Seismic upgrades and fire suppression are big ticket items and are not always included in the total insured value. A lot of the upgrades whether by bylaws or building codes may be excluded from the insurance policy and an individual or strata may have to pay out of pocket for those costs and until they do so, it will hold up the rebuild.*
- How is this different from an existing building that is not heritage, if you are doing a renovation to an existing building you must upgrade it and heritage buildings are exempt from upgrades in the way that existing buildings are not. From the insurer's perspective, why are those upgrades a risk for heritage buildings but not for existing non-heritage buildings? *Response: The simplistic answer is that for a building that is not deemed heritage, there is more flexibility. In the event of an insurance claim for a building built in 1967 which was destroyed by fire and now a fire suppression system is required in each unit, an insurance policy will have a set percentage of what can be paid and once that limit has been reached, the rest is out of pocket. Many insurance companies, will not insure these older buildings because the bylaws have changed so much, so unless the building is grandfathered as is, where is, it exposes a potential large uninsured portion of that loss.*
- Is there value to come up with some boilerplate clauses that insurance companies will accept? If the Heritage Revitalization Agreement contains boilerplate clauses insurance providers will know they have a controlled risk. *Response: It would work with some insurance providers, such as Lloyds of London, as they are more attuned with manuscript/boiler plate policies. They would be easier to convince to write a program with wording and exclusions, and terms of payout than a domestic market would do. Standardizing clauses on a provincial level would may have a bigger impact.*
- Have you been having this discussion with other municipalities? *Response: West Vancouver is more proactive than other municipalities in this regard. However, Port Alberni on Vancouver Island have raised the issue as well.*
- What is the difference in cost as a percentage between a designated heritage property and a non-designated property? What about an old house in West

Vancouver that is not designated? *Response: Heritage risks generally pay between 30-40% more for premiums, as well as higher deductibles. They are typically insured by companies who insure properties that have special considerations.*

- Is consideration given for rehabilitation that has occurred and building code upgrades have been done. *Response: The industry is becoming more automated and homeowners can now go online and answer detailed questions to determine if they will get coverage or get declined.*
- There is an initiative at Heritage BC at a Provincial level. The National Heritage Trust for Canada has also circulated a survey nationwide regarding the insurance issue to owners of heritage properties. Thus, three levels of government have taken an interest in the issue.
- Fundamental issues to address:
 - We need to help the industry understand the difference between being on the Heritage Register vs being encumbered by a Heritage Revitalization Agreement bylaw that has specific requirements for replacement and rebuilding in a loss. There are 170 on the Heritage Register in West Vancouver but only a small handful that are encumbered with a Heritage Revitalization Agreement. It is important for all levels of government and the insurance industry to be aware that 95% of properties on the Heritage Register are not encumbered in any way. It is simply a label that may facilitate access to municipal tools should the property owner choose to legally protect the property. *Response: No issue with assisting or leading a charge to get the message out.*
 - Secondly, for designated properties, it is determining if there is some way to make them affordable to insure. There are mechanisms available for properties that burn down and need to be replaced, in the form of a heritage alteration permit that allows the committee to weigh in on what is appropriate or not to replace.
- From a process point of view, the committee should be working with staff to prioritize review of heritage projects. This would help homeowners looking to rebuild after a loss.
- If there is suggested wording change from the wording typically used for a Heritage Revitalization Agreement that can be identified that may result in some savings, we would be interested in it. *Response: We are looking at getting a lawyer to do a presentation on bylaws and put on a webinar.*

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT

The Heritage Advisory Committee decide to:

1. inform the insurance industry on the risk associated with insuring buildings on the Heritage Register vs. municipally designated properties;

2. investigate if changes can be made to the clauses in Heritage Revitalization Agreement bylaws regarding the requirements for rebuilding in the event of loss to make them more insurance friendly; and
3. pass this information on to Heritage BC to take broader action at a Provincial level.

CARRIED

L. Anderson absent at the vote

6. Annual Committee Evaluation

E. Syvokas provided an update on the 2021 evaluation results as follows:

- Two members responded and the main concern identified was the difficulty of achieving quorum. Staff are working on bringing the Committee up to full membership.
- The evaluation was sent to the Committee in December and was to help inform ongoing meeting planning and orientation and identify the strengths and gaps.

Committee Questions and Comments:

- Do not recall seeing the evaluation survey. Perhaps members can complete now if beneficial.
- If Legislative Services sees that only two members completed the survey after all the effort to get this Committee back in place, it might send the wrong message.
- Can we defer receipt of the results for a month to keep the questionnaire open? *Staff Response: The survey has closed. The deadline for completion was in December of 2021. Staff will check with Legislative Services to see if the survey can be reopened for the Committee's purposes to review and discuss the results further.*
- Next time we need more reminders. It was a busy time. *Staff Response: This was the first year the survey was sent to all committees. Staff can put more emphasis on the timing now that we are aware this will be an annual survey.*

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT the Annual Committee Evaluation be deferred for a month and be re-opened for members of the Heritage Advisory Committee to complete.

CARRIED

L. Anderson absent at the vote

7. Heritage Project Updates

E. Syvokas provided an update as follows:

- Case studies on the six approved Heritage Revitalization Agreement projects have been posted to the website.
- A demolition permit has been received for 578 Glenross Road. The "Warner residence" is listed on the District's inventory as a Heritage Support building.

Staff are seeking a 60-day temporary protection order from Council to consider options to save the heritage residence from demolition.

- The public callout asking the community to suggest heritage resources that are valued by community is now live. The suggestion form is on the webpage under the news section. There is also a WestvancouverITE project page with the survey that can be filled out online. Paper forms are available at the Seniors' Activity Centre and at the Library. The e-Newsletter has also been sent to those who subscribe to WestvancouverITE and the initiative will also be on social media. Heritage Advisory Committee members are encouraged to forward the information to heritage contacts. The form is available for 3 weeks and is timed for Heritage week. Following the standards of public engagement, the minimum is 3 weeks which will extend past Heritage week. The deadline for completion is Tuesday, March 15, 2022.

Committee Questions and Comments:

- Can the deadline be extended? It may take some time to think about suggestions. Does it have to have a deadline? *Staff Response: The deadline was suggested by the Communications department and relies on staff resources to review the forms and staff time required to answer questions.*
- If there not a lot of responses we should look to have it be extended. This time of year seems strangely busy. *Staff Response: Staff will look whether there are any concerns in extending the deadline to submit suggestions.*
- Suggestion to try and get a story about this in the North Shore News.

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT the presentation regarding Heritage Project Updates be received for information.

CARRIED

L. Anderson absent at the vote

PUBLIC QUESTIONS

8. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

C. Reynolds commented on the following:

- Can agenda packages be added to the website? If there is correspondence for this Committee, who should it go to and is it discussed at the meeting? If there are suggestions about giving more information or corrections to the minutes, how is that done? *Staff response: The agenda and draft minutes from the previous meeting are posted on the website but the package that is circulated to Committee members is not posted and that is standard for all committees. Correspondence and any suggested edits to the minutes should go through the Staff Liaison. Any suggested edits should be provided a minimum of 1 day prior to the meeting to allow time for review.*
- Heritage Week starts every year on the 3rd Monday in February. The first Heritage Week was held in February 1989 and this is the 33rd.

- Heritage Fayre will be at the Community Centre on Saturday from 2 to 4 p.m. The Heritage Advisory Committee is welcome to put the information out, including forms. *Staff response: We would like to encourage people to complete the form online to track results.*
- Some committees have a member who gives the correspondence report to the committee at the meeting. Suggest you have someone do that.

NEXT MEETING

9. NEXT MEETING

Staff confirmed that the next Heritage Advisory Committee meeting is scheduled for March 30, 2022 at 4:30 p.m.

10. ADJOURNMENT

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT the February 22, 2022 Heritage Advisory Committee meeting be adjourned.

CARRIED

L. Anderson absent at the vote

The meeting adjourned at 6:45 p.m.

Certified Correct:

Chair

Committee Clerk