

Delegation to Committee of the Whole re the Cultural Heritage Action Plan
January 11, 2021
Susan Ratcliffe

To Mayor Guthrie and City Councillors

I am writing to ask you NOT to accept this CHAP as it is written or the recommendations from staff based on this CHAP, because of its serious flaws in methodology, content and recommendations. My reasons are as follows:

1. Community engagement
 - a. Indigenous communities not consulted. The statement on P. 22 is not a plan for consultation with the Mississaugas of the Credit First Nation of the Anishinaabe peoples (“The City is committed to continuing to learn about local Indigenous history and associated cultural heritage landscapes and to continue to build partnerships with local communities to collaboratively identify significant cultural Heritage landscapes.”)
 - i. Centre Wellington: The Indigenous engagement program for the Study followed the approach of separate and direct engagement with the right-bearing indigenous communities or organizations – with established or potential Aboriginal or Treaty rights within the township. . six communities or organization were contacted about the project.
 - b. Public meetings and engagement methods
 - i. Public input ignored – top 3 in meetings were Catholic Hill, Reformatory and Downtown Guelph
 - c. What about the Phelan Heritage Grove? 20 heritage maples, one 273 years old, predate founding of Guelph
 - d. Heritage Guelph Advisory role compromised and opinions ignored in the process
 - i. Heritage Guelph’s role is to identify and advise on Heritage issues like Designation and identifying CHLs and HCDs
 - e. Neither consultants nor staff included key heritage groups in Guelph, nor did they mention the work done in the past eg., Guelph Culture Map
 - f. BUT, they did mention in the Draft report having consulted with developers.
2. Criteria for Priority CHL ignored: See Heritage Tool Kit, Reg. 09/6 and 10/6
 - a. “for cultural heritage landscapes to be significant they must be “valued for the important contributions they make to our understanding of the history of a place, an event or a people”
3. Municipal and Provincial actions endanger our key heritage landscapes but this is not mentioned
 - o MZO and changes to Conservation Authorities Act and Heritage Act
CHLs and Guelph: Catholic Hill viewsapes not protected in Downtown Plan,

although the report says it is protected

- Adjacency to HCD or CHL needed for Catholic Hill – 75 Dublin
- SkyDev – adjacency of oldest house, Drill Hall, VIA Station, Armoury, City Hall
- Ontario Reformatory lands – individual designations underway but do not include the site as a whole – planned, integrated landscape “live-work community of prisoners” Quarry, industries, cells, landscapes: decorative and functional
- Threatened by York Road widening – move the creek and the walls??
- No mention of Downtown Guelph as a CHL, despite public meeting identifying it as such

4. Lip-service to Sustainability in City Strategic Plan – need facts to support statements

- a. The value of heritage buildings in
 - 1. Cultural Heritage Tourists spend \$\$\$
 - b. Spend more, Stay longer
 - c. More interested in taking part in extra activities than other tourists
 - d. Cultural heritage tourists spend an average of \$994 per trip
 - e. “general” travellers spend \$611 per trip – almost 50% more
 - f. Community well being
 - i. studies found visiting historic houses, museums, other heritage sites improved life satisfaction, happiness, social relations, social connectivity
 - g. Save and reuse strategy, rather than destroy and replace
 - i. Older neighbourhoods are already walkable communities, have higher density
 - ii. Cost of new construction = 50% materials and 50% labour
 - iii. Cost of restoration/rehabilitation = 25% materials, 75% labour
 - iv. In Europe, historic restoration creates 16.5% more jobs than new construction
 - v. 35% of waste stream comes from construction and demolition waste
 - vi. Modern windows last 15-25 years, made with imported materials but restored window will last 200years
 - vii. Film and TV locations, main street revitalization, small business incubators

5. Incomplete research on heritage promotion (existing but not funded)

- a. Referenced other city plans from 2002 – 2016, no later – the narrative has shifted
 - i. Eg., Centre Wellington CHLandscape Study Nov. 2020
- b. Guelph Culture Mapping Project 2013
- c. Heritage Awards: were given by Planning until 2009 when offered to ACO but with no funding, Community Fund paid, then ran out of money

- d. Doors Open Guelph: the only one of 35 in Ontario run by an Arts Council and volunteers with little money – 19 years, av. 6000 per year 120,000 visits
 - e. Now Virtual DOG and tours e.g. Pond Creek, Silver Creek and Guelph Tunnels
 - f. Two Rivers Festival – heritage of our rivers
 - g. Victory School Tiles project, school walking tours
6. No heritage justification for Ward West being chosen as the first CHL with HCD provisions when the top three CHLs, as identified by citizen engagement were ignored