

**MINUTES OF THE  
SAANICH HERITAGE FOUNDATION MEETING  
HELD VIA REMOTE MEETING  
TUESDAY, JANUARY 11, 2022 AT 5:30 P.M**

Present: Veronica McEllister, President; Sonia Nicholson, Vice President; Art Joyce, Treasurer; Sarah Anderson; Charlotte Clar; Sheila Colwill; James Thomson; and Councillor Karen Harper

Regrets: Silvia Exposito, Planner (Community Planning)

Guests: Kate Lemon, Architect KMBR; Joana Nicolae, Designer, KMBR; Greg Brown, Project Advisor, KMBR; Chuck Morris, Director of Facilities, School District #61 (Greater Victoria)

Staff: Cameron Scott, Manager of Community Planning; and Shirley Leggett, Secretary

---

Minutes: MOVED by S. Colwill S. and Seconded by A. Joyce: "That the Minutes of the November 9, 2021, Regular Meeting be adopted as circulated."

CARRIED

**3910 CEDAR HILL ROAD – CEDAR HILL MIDDLE SCHOOL (REGISTERED) – PROPOSED RE-DEVELOPMENT OF SITE**

The Manager of Community Planning stated:

- The School District is proposing a re-development of the site and a seismic replacement for the current Cedar Hill Middle School which could mean the potential removal of it from the Saanich Heritage Register.

Kate Lemon, Principle Architect, KMBR, provided an overview of the proposal and the following was noted:

- Cedar Hill Middle School currently accommodates 515 students and has an H-1 seismic rating which is identified as the highest priority need for seismic mitigation measures to ensure student safety.
- The original school was constructed in 1931 and over several decades several structures and additions have been added. In 2016 the School District began the process of seeking funding for seismic upgrades. A Building Condition Assessment was done in 2017.
- A Project Definition Report (PDR) was submitted to the Ministry in April 2019; the seismic replacement option was deemed to be the most economically and logically feasible – a subsequent revision was submitted in May 2020 refining the proposal for replacement.
- In June 2020, the School District (SD) received a letter from the District of Saanich regarding their interest in retaining the 1931 school structure. The SD and KMBR were aware that it was on the Heritage Register but were of the understanding that this would not be an obstacle to replacement.
- Retention and seismic upgrade of the 1931 building could result in the project being shelved. It would require the SD to re-apply to the Ministry for funding for heritage retention which could take 2 to 3 years, be significantly more costly, and result in the project being shelved due to cost or Government Funding priorities changing before a new Funding Agreement is negotiated and signed.
- There is no other property available in the District to house the current 515 student population if a seismic upgrade is pursued. Retention and seismic upgrade of the 1931 building would be cost prohibitive and require extensive modification of the building foundations, the envelope, and the interior to address conservation deficiencies, seismic upgrade implications, building code non-compliance, mechanical/electrical system

- obsolescence, and hazardous material risks.
- Little of the 1931 building would be original if it was retained. The original entry (including doors, stairs, windows, and ornaments around the main entrance) have replaced by mechanical grilles and other utility meters and connections. If heritage restoration is pursued, it is likely that no part of the existing mechanical system could be retained.
- Given its location in the centre of the site, incorporating the 1931 building into the new school would leave it partially or totally obscured from the street. The new build cannot be located on the footprint of the existing school as it has to remain standing in order to house the current students during the course of construction.
- Retention of the 1931 structure would mean the community would lose 1 of 2 playfields; this will impact the student and the community. Retention of the 1931 structure would require the field to be pushed west into the steep bank requiring extensive retaining or fill rendering it unviable due to cost. It will also complicate the zoning of the like areas within the school and most likely leave it orphaned away from the other classroom communities.
- Cedar Hill School is a utilitarian building and does not significant architectural character. The heritage value of the school is in the stained-glass windows and student art. A replacement school will be designed to feature the stained-glass from the original school as well as the history of the site, historical photographs, and artwork.

In response to questions and comments from Foundation members, the following was noted:

- At the public open house in November, there were no concerns raised about demolition of the school. Only 2 of the 367 respondents to the public survey in November noted an interest in retaining part of the existing building; 10 people noted a desire to retain the stain glass or art.
- It may be possible to replicate some of the architectural features from the 1931 structure into the design of the new school such as the roof timbers. However, it would be difficult to duplicate a hipped roof on 6,000 square foot building.
- It's important for there to be some kind of interpretive/educational signage somewhere on the site so that it's accessible to the public to see. There could also be some information connecting the different generations that attended the school.
- There are two mature Arbutus trees that are important to the site; they are waiting for the Arborists Report so see if they will be impacted.

The President requested that the Building Condition Assessments for Cedar Hill School be forwarded to the Foundation for their review. Once members have had a chance to submit their comments, then a draft response will be prepared for members' review prior to sending to the Planning Department.

\*\*\*\*\*

The Planner and Guests left the meeting at 6:20 p.m.

\*\*\*\*\*

## **2022 HOUSE GRANTS PROGRAM – RESTORATION GRANT SUMMARY AND APPLICATIONS**

The owners of the following properties submitted 2022 Restoration Grant Applications for the following projects:

### **1996 Ferndale Road – Replace 12 single pane units with sealed units** **35% Grant portion based on lowest quote – \$1,278.30**

PnR Windows and Screens                      \$3,652.29

---

Fenshur Windows and Doors 2,950.00 (for 7 screens)  
**2895 Colquitz Ave. – Repair/replace wood window trim and shingles as needed; Exterior painting**  
**35% Grant portion based on lowest quote – Carpentry - \$9,996.00; Painting - \$11,385.15**

Big Foot Carpentry	\$39,999.75
New Vintage Renovations	28,560.00
Sean Nowak Carpentry	51,712.50
Kingfisher Painting	\$37,642.50
KMiller Painting	37,327.50
Brad McDonnell Painting	\$32,529.00

**1040 Burnside Rd. W. – Exterior Painting**  
**35% Grant portion based on lowest quote - \$6,128.06**

Envision Painting	\$25,152.75
Low Cost Painters	17,508.75

The President noted that she had contacted the applicant to ask for clarification on the proposed colour scheme that was submitted with the Grant Application.

**1228 Mariposa Ave. – Roof Replacement**  
**35% Grant portion based on lowest quote - \$6,422.50**

Square Deal Roofing	\$18,350.00
Brokop Roofing	22,000.00
Victoria Roofing	24,727.50

S. Colwill commented that perhaps the proposed colour of the new shingles could be changed from black to more of a weathered-looking shingle.

**MOVED by S. Nicholson and Seconded by S. Colwill: “That the 2022 Restoration Grant Applications be received.”**

**CARRIED**

#### **SAANICH COMMUNITY GRANTS PROGRAM – GRANT REQUEST TO COUNCIL**

The Secretary advised that the Foundation has received grant funding in the amount of \$35,000 from Council each year for the past three years under the Contribution Agreement that recognizes a specific group of long standing grant recipients that provide a service, operate a facility owned by the municipality, or have another formalized arrangement on an on-going basis.

**MOVED by S. Nicholson and Seconded by V. McEllister: That based on the total dollar amount from the Restoration Grant Applications for 2022, the Foundation submit a Saanich Community Grant request to Council in the amount of \$52,000.”**

**CARRIED**

#### **DRAFT SECRETARIAL INVOICE – JULY 1, 2021 TO DECEMBER 31, 2021**

Draft invoices in the amounts of \$6,592.43 for Secretarial Services provided from July 1, 2021 to December 31, 2021 and \$179.72 for stationary, overhead costs, photocopying and postage

(totalling \$6,772.15).

**MOVED by A. Joyce and Seconded by S. Colwill: “That a cheque be issued from the Operating Account in the amount of \$6,772.15 for Secretarial services and other associated administrative costs for the period of July 1, 2021 to December 31, 2021.”**

**CARRIED**

#### **1248 BURNSIDE ROAD WEST (STRANTON LODGE) - UPDATE**

The President stated:

- She is still working on quotes for window replacement in 2022.
- Some of the attic vents are showing signs of rot which will need to be replaced.

#### **4139 LAMBRICK WAY (DODD HOUSE) – UPDATE**

S. Colwill stated:

- Trevor from Arbor Renovations cleaned the gutters and removed the moss on both Dodd House and Hall House.
- Trevor is going to check all of the fence pickets to see if any need to be replaced this year prior to re-painting the fence next year.
- She is starting to get quotes to have insulation put into the crawlspace as per the recommendation in the Consultant’s Report.

#### **TREASURER’S REPORT – UPDATE**

The Treasurer provided the following balances as of December 21, 2021:

Operating Account:	\$10,469.20		
Grant Account:	\$61,385.41	GIC:	\$20,810.06 (due April 4, 2022)
		GIC:	\$13,489.04 (due May 7, 2022)
Hall House Account:	\$5,379.72	GIC:	\$24,302.24 (due June 12, 2022)
		GIC:	\$ 5,254.91 (due Nov. 1, 2021)
Dodd House Account:	\$37,122.07	GIC:	\$21,604.34 (due Oct. 4, 2022)
		GIC:	\$10,509.80 (due Nov.1, 2021)

**MOVED by A. Joyce and Seconded by V. McEllister: “That the Treasurer’s report be received for information.”**

**CARRIED**

#### **HERITAGE HOME INSURANCE ISSUE – THE PLAN AND NEXT STEPS**

Email information from the Senior Heritage Planner with City of Victoria regarding the difficulty heritage property owners are experiencing acquiring and keeping their home insurance.

The BC Financial Services Authority (BCFSA) is a Crown Agency responsible for supervising and regulating BC insurance companies and a variety of other providers of financial services. The BCFSA cannot influence the supply of insurance in the market and can’t prescribe pricing or enforce premiums.

As a result of a meeting he had with representatives from the BCFSA, the Victoria Heritage Foundation and Heritage BC, they have come up with a plan that will look for reasons given for policy changes and insurance termination, etc. If an insurance company has a blanket policy against providing insurance to heritage properties, it may be a violation of provincial legislation.

The plan is to contact heritage home owners that have experienced sudden termination of home insurance or large rate increases with partial or unsatisfactory explanations and Heritage BC will prepare a cover letter to BCFSA to be endorsed by the contributing heritage organizations.

Members agreed that it was a good plan and if Heritage BC were to set up a roundtable they could join in the discussions. It was also agreed that we could set up a survey through our social media platforms asking heritage homeowners for their experiences with obtaining house insurance.

### **SOCIAL MEDIA UPDATES**

C. Clar stated:

- This year she plans to focus on architects and some of the hidden gems they designed in Saanich.

### **ADVOCACY AND OUTREACH – UPDATE**

The Vice President stated:

- A Uvic student is volunteering her time and doing some research on the history of the commercial building that was built c. 1935 at the corner of Quadra Street and Tattersall Road. The property is slated to be rezoned.
- The student is putting together an article and a timeline of the history of the building. There are lots of photos of the property and the neighbourhood.
- Perhaps we could ask her to do other properties as well.

### **UPDATES FROM THE ARTS, CULTURE AND HERITAGE ADVISORY COMMITTEE (ACH)**

The Vice President and liaison to the ACH stated:

- The committee discussed the recent decision to eliminate Old Town at the Royal British Columbia Museum; there were no motions or conclusions.
- They are hopeful that the Saanich Arts, Culture and Heritage Awards will be able to be held once again this year.
- The next ACH meeting is Jan. 26th.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 7:00 pm.

---

**NEXT MEETING**

The next Regular meeting of the Saanich Heritage Foundation will be held **via remote meeting on Tuesday, February 8, 2022 at 5:30 p.m.**

..... CHAIRPERSON