

## COMMUNITY HERITAGE ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES

Wednesday, April 23, 2025  
Hybrid (In Person and via MS Teams)  
7:00 – 9:00 pm

---

<b>Members:</b>	Jim Paul (Chair) Glade Schoenfeld Mitchell Baker	Jennifer Clay Catherine Rose Mel Montgomery
<b>Regrets:</b>	Rob Griesdale Cllr Jim Hanson	
<b>Guests:</b>	Erica Wolowidnyk Elana Zysblat Chris Wensley Rev. Sharon Smith Paul Reynolds Alistair Peacock	
<b>Staff:</b>	Holly Adams, Community Planner Mary Jukich, Committee Clerk	

---

### 1. Call to Order

The Chair called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm.

### 2. Adoption of Agenda

MOVED by Jim Paul and seconded by Mel Montgomery  
To approve the agenda.

**CARRIED**

### 3. Adoption of Minutes

MOVED by Jim Paul and seconded by Glad Schoenfeld  
To approve the March 26, 2025 minutes.

**CARRIED**

### 4. 1058 Ridgewood Drive - Preliminary Planning Application

Committee members were provided with a presentation on the preliminary planning application on 1058 Ridgewood Drive (St. Catherine's Capilano Church). The preliminary planning application provides an opportunity for the committee to review the proposal and provide feedback to the applicants; however, Council has the ultimate decision on the proposal.

Erica Wolowidnyk, EW Architecture reported that the applicant wishes to save St. Catherine's Church and the development proposed is intended to raise funds to refurbish the church. The parking lot would be rezoned to single-family residential and the gym would be demolished. A summary of the proposal was provided as follows:

- Rezone and subdivide parking lot and portion of lot 1
- Sell two single-family residential lots to raise funds
- Use proceeds of land sale to restore and upgrade church
- Dismantle gym building sustainably for reuse
- Provide required parking at former gym location
- Retain and preserve the most significant heritage resource

On completion of the presentation, the following comments were provided by the committee members:

- The presenter indicated that there was uncertainty on whether the addition was one level or two levels as this would depend on the available funds. However, there has been some consideration for adding accessible washrooms in the administration section.
- A concern was raised that in terms of whether or not the gym is demolished, without knowing the form of the Church addition, it was difficult to support demolishing the existing gym structure (the new form has to be sympathetic to the character of the building without over-powering it).
- Information was provided that in terms of the addition the standards and guidelines for the conservation of historic places in Canada would be used and the new addition would meet the requirements of Standard 11 which would mean the addition would be compatible with, distinguishable from, and subordinate to the church. Any new additions to the church building would meet the requirements for additions to historic places as per those standards and guidelines; however, the applicant has not yet designed the addition.
- On page 3 and 4 of the SOS, the only architectural elements described relate to the A-Frame building and there is only one mention of the gym in the section on character defining elements which indicates that the gym is less important. The presenter indicated that the historic place was the church and there are many elements to the church and the gym is considered as an accessory/utility building to the site and not described as an historic place but as a character defining element to the church. Because of its location in the rear and low aesthetic value, this is a program/service value and subsequently did not come up in the research about the site itself.
- Whether the roof line will be recreated in the smaller building and having the windows and wood ceiling. The presenter indicated that there has been discussion about having this in the lobby/public spaces, but this will be dependent on the available funds and the idea is to be respectful of the character and subordinate to the main church.

MOVED by Catherine Rose and seconded by Mitchell Baker

The Heritage Advisory Committee has reviewed the proposal for 1058 Ridgewood Drive and supports the general concept as presented.

**CARRIED**

## **5. Heritage Awards and Nominations**

Nominations for heritage awards recently closed and one nomination was received for the Tomahawk Restaurant under the category of heritage advocacy.

There was a discussion on possible ways to improve the program and other forms of advertising such as videos, social media, North Shore News, etc. to increase the number of nominations and bring awareness in the community. In addition, it was suggested that in moving forward the committee consider expanding the categories to include cultural significance or other forms of heritage.

MOVED By Catherine Rose and seconded by Mel Montgomery

The Heritage Advisory Committee recommends that the Tomahawk Restaurant be nominated for a 2024 heritage award under the category of heritage advocacy.

**CARRIED**

Staff is to review with management regarding the cultural sensitivity, optics, and eligibility of the proposed award then follow up with recommendation of how to proceed.

## **6. Youth Art Contest**

The submission deadline was recently closed and 5 submissions received: 3 in the 7 – 10 age category, and 2 in the 11 – 14 age category. The submissions will be brought to the next meeting for review by the committee and further discussion on generating more interest for next year.

## **7. Properties Tracker**

Staff provided an updated on the following the property:

- 233 Wooddale Road - new preliminary application for residential units and restoration of heritage structure.

## **8. Any Other Business**

No other business was presented.

## **9. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 9:00 pm.

**Next Meeting: Wednesday, May 28, 2025**