

August 6, 2020

The Honourable David Eby Attorney General AG.Minister@gov.bc.ca

The Honourable Anne Kang Minister of Citizens' Services Anne.Kang.MLA@leg.bc.ca

Dear Honourable David Eby and Honourable Anne Kang,

I am writing to express the deep concern of the Royal Architectural Institute of Canada (RAIC) upon hearing of the decision to convert The Law Courts Inn restaurant, an important and publicly accessible architectural space designed by the late Arthur Erickson, into private offices. Having reviewed the letters written by Adam Howden-Duke, President of The Lawyers Inn Society and the Arthur Erickson Foundation (AEF), as well as having spoken with Steve Chamli, General Manager of The Law Courts Inn, we stand firmly behind the call for an open and informed consultation process, before a decision is made around The Law Courts Inn change of use and design.

The RAIC is the leading voice for excellence in the built environment in Canada, demonstrating how design enhances the quality of life, while addressing important issues of society through responsible architecture. The RAIC's mission is to promote excellence in the built environment and to advocate for responsible architecture. As such, we fully support the AEF in its own mission to advocate for the respectful stewardship of Erickson's physical works, including his buildings and landscapes, of which the Law Courts Inn and its reflecting pond are a part of.

Arthur Erickson is arguably one of Canada's most important architectural figures, and his buildings represent a significant contribution not only to Canadian architecture, but architecture at large. Erickson's work has been critically recognized through the awarding of six Massey medals, three Governor General's Awards, the Royal Architectural Institute of Canada Gold Medal, the American



the interior space and the organic nature of the exterior garden, complete with a linear reflecting pond only accessible from this space. These are all trademarks of Erickson's work.

The value that would be lost should such a modification of the space proceed, is not something that could be undone, and thus the onus of this decision is not one that should be taken with-52(t)0.7(a)-4(h)-0.(n)-0.6 (o)-41(t)0.nd b