

ATTACHMENT 2 – Community Feedback on the Draft CHAP

The draft CHAP was presented for Council’s consideration and input ([report IDE-2019-41](#)) on April 9 2019 followed by two community consultation sessions held on April 24 of that year. The community consultation sessions were followed up by an online feedback form made available to the public on the City’s website following the sessions until May 12 2019 through the City’s “Have Your Say” online forum. The two community engagement sessions drew a total of 28 people attending. The online survey resulted in 177 responses.

A workshop was held with Heritage Guelph to obtain members feedback on May 27, 2019 and a follow up discussion was held with the consulting team and Heritage Guelph on September 9, 2019. (Minutes of the September 9 Heritage Guelph meeting is included as Attachment 3 to this report.)

The following comments were received on the questions posed through the engagement sessions and the online forum:

Question 1

Do you feel that all the cultural heritage landscapes in Guelph are identified on the map and Table 1 of the CHAP?

- There should be an area along south Gordon Street that recognizes former agricultural communities that existed in what is now Guelph. (This may be a way to address the extant farm barns in that area.)
- Perhaps the Guelph Arts Council’s historic walk guides already define many of the CHL’s
- From the lens of Indigenous Voices, from pre-contact with visitors (since time immemorial), during settler initial contact, and from post-contact colonialism to now, individual and community Indigenous Voices are missing completely.
- I know of First Nations archaeological sites in the vicinity of the Guelph Airpark, Turfgrass Institute, Hillcrest Park and Prospect Avenue

Question 2

Do you agree with the five cultural heritage landscapes as high priority in Part E – Table 2?

- The Waterloo Avenue CHL and the Junction CHL should be higher priority or Exhibition Park should also be a medium priority.
- Old University; cut off for the Gordon Street corridor is too narrow. Should also include University Avenue and further into the housing on the west.
- Catholic Hill to be made a high priority for designation, not medium. It is THE most iconic and important landscape in the community.

- Catholic Hill must be a high priority – it is the most significant cultural heritage feature and landscape in Guelph...it is an icon and has been a central part of how we plan our downtown. Guelph Collegiate, Old Downtown and Exhibition Park should all be high priority.
- The top 3 threatened landscapes are Catholic Hill – high threat from adjacent inappropriate development [...] The Correctional Centre lands: high threat from York Road widening – the Kortright /Niska lands: high threat from sale of lands by GRCA for development – Clair/Maltby barns: high threat from inappropriate demolition and development

Question 3

Are there additional types of incentives that the City should offer heritage property owners beyond those outlined in Part C – Incentives?

- To maintain these buildings, it is important to consider the financials of the owners. Likely, these buildings could be repaired and made into higher value housing, thus preserving their cultural heritage.
- Love the incentives in general! [...] Could the City put on a workshop to help owners locate old images, knowledge and better understand all the cultural assets that a property offers? [...] These incentives would help owners get engaged with their cultural history and excite participation.

Question 4

Are there other actions that the City should take to promote cultural heritage resources?

- Heritage Planning should work with the Guelph Civic Museum when heritage-related interpretive panels are needed
- An education strategy to inform WHY CHL are worth preserving.
- Tourism: Emancipation scenic tour promotion targeting US tourists through a collaboration with Ontario Heritage Trust, and various towns along the Underground Railroad routes of southern Ontario, along with microbreweries, wineries, Bed & Breakfast associations and University of Guelph students in arts, hospitality and tourism [...]
-
- Information sessions run by certified heritage conservation professionals such as CAHP members and skilled trades that can consult on appropriate practices for conservation of our landscapes and buildings.

Question 5

Additional comments?

- Landscapes that are no longer evident need recognition. First Nations use of pre-settlement land, early settlement landscapes (sadly many early farm houses neglected with development, then demolished.) Afro-Americans arriving via Underground RR and their settlement history. More recognition of preserving, restoring and interpreting.
- Much good work has been done on the building of this guide to date! Much work is still to be done! It will all depend on respect, responsibility, reciprocity and relationships with All Our Relations.
- The Ward is being overdeveloped quickly without any consideration for its existing character. The so-called "factory designs rising up on the old Biltmore site are aesthetically annoying but less invasive than the massive development taking place and going to take place on the former Wood property. [...] This will alter the entire character of the neighbourhood. Gentrification is one thing; utter annihilation of a neighbourhood's character and history is another.
- There is an urgency to designating St. George's and Exhibition Parks as heritage landscapes. There has already been quite a lot of erosion of these neighbourhood and their character. The sooner this is addressed, the better off Guelph will be. It is a rich blend of mixed housing that makes Guelph so great. I feel this is besieged [...] this is a very valuable and worthy endeavor
- The obvious individuals to reach out to would be the elders of various First Nations who know the locations of burial sites (eg. Baker Street parking lot) [...]
- The City needs a solid statement that addresses a commitment to Indigenous community and their heritage in Guelph. It should include pre-contact, the present day presence on the land to show continued and constant cultural and physical existence here in Guelph. Under the Truth and Reconciliation Commission this is really important.
- I think that the tree canopy in central Guelph is slowly reducing and the replacement trees are not good enough. I think this should be a consideration in heritage neighbourhoods. I also wonder whether the heritage districts are too small and broken up? I think you will encounter opposition when you attempt to designate every heritage area, and so why not designate in a bigger area/swath and fight the battle once? But I want to say that basically I am in full support of this plan and I think it's well done. I think it provides a great framework for moving ahead – and when I look at the construction and reno activity in Guelph, it's just in time.

Staff's response to the main comments received:

Comment: Are the CHL boundaries in the CHAP presented as conceptual or final?

Staff response: The intent of the CHAP process is to identify preliminary CHL areas that are considered candidates for conservation. The preliminary boundaries are conceptual and it is intended that refinements will be made to these boundaries through further study (such as the listing and designation process) of a specific candidate CHL in the future. Through the CHL study, the exact boundary for a proposed heritage conservation district will be determined.

Comment: Members of Heritage Guelph have expressed concern that the consultants and staff have used the current level of risk as the determining factor when ranking the candidate CHLs in priority. It was suggested that the level of risk should only be one factor in ranking the CHLs in terms of when to move toward designation and that heritage significance be the ultimate deciding factor.

Staff response: Priorities have been assigned to the candidates (as 'high', 'medium' and 'low') based on current knowledge of the area, actual and potential development activity level, and the perceived risk to the heritage attributes and character-defining elements of the candidate CHLs.

Risk to heritage attributes is the main factor that the consultants used to rank CHLs in order to advise the City as to when to conduct further study that would move CHLs closer to becoming protected property. The consultant used a variety of sources of information to help them understand the type of pressures for change being experienced by CHL areas that could lead to loss of heritage resources including building permit applications submitted to the City (either approved or not approved). Cultural heritage value or significance is always an important factor in the study of CHLs but it is also prudent to be prepared to take appropriate action when the level of risk to heritage attributes is high.

Three keys to understanding the ranking process used in the CHAP are:

- all candidate CHLs identified by the CHAP have cultural heritage value and significance, and
- Guelph's current capital budget and staff resources affords one CHL study being carried out at a time, and
- when deciding how to prioritize which CHLs the City should deal with first, it makes sense to start with those CHLs where the perceived or actual risks to loss of the CHL's heritage attributes is greatest, and
- many of the owners of our most significant built heritage resources are choosing not to put their property's heritage attributes at risk and it is felt that their pride in heritage property ownership or stewardship will continue until such time as the City has the resources to proceed

with further study of their properties to fully understand, protect and celebrate these cultural heritage resources through heritage designation bylaws.

Comment: Members of Heritage Guelph and the public expressed an opinion that Catholic Hill be one of the top priority CHLs for further study and potential designation.

Staff response: Catholic Hill is already a top priority for individual designation as a cultural heritage landscape but not because of any current risk to its heritage attributes. City staff continue to discuss individual heritage designation as a CHL under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act with the owner. The owner (the Roman Catholic Diocese of Hamilton) demonstrates a strong commitment to the conservation of the Basilica and its associated buildings.

The Catholic Hill cultural heritage landscape extends across an entire city block and is one property owned by the Diocese of Hamilton. The Basilica of Our Lady is the most recognizable built heritage resource and architectural feature in Guelph. It is the most prominent landmark which can be seen from many points outside and inside the city. Three of the five listed heritage buildings within the CHL are also visual landmarks within the downtown. Since the mid-1850s, the Basilica has been flanked by its Rectory and Convent buildings. Since 1883, St. Agnes School has been a prominent landmark when viewing Cork Street West uphill from downtown.

None of the buildings are currently at risk of demolition and/or loss of cultural heritage resources as the property owner:

- continues to conserve and celebrate the Basilica of Our Lady which is particularly evident through the major restoration work to the Basilica
- has worked with the City to successfully rehabilitate the former Loretto Convent for use as the Guelph Civic Museum
- has restored the Rectory to its original 1850s appearance and continues its use as residential and office space
- continues to use the Annex building
- has mothballed the St. Agnes School building while it considers options that might enable the rehabilitation of the building.

Comment: Should the Catholic Hill CHL overlap with the Old Downtown CHL?

Staff response: When further study occurs to determine the boundary of the Old Downtown CHL, it is possible that the boundary may be expanded to include the Catholic Hill block.

Comment: Why do Table 1 and Table 2 present the candidate CHLs in order of their ID number and not according to their level of priority? Why are the three designated CHLs included in the table?

Staff response: In the March 2019 draft of the CHAP, Table 1 had presented 32 candidate CHLs with an identification (ID) number that corresponds to the consultants' research inventory. The consultants used a geographic order to their study beginning in the northwest corner of the city. The numbering in Table 1 was not intended to indicate a priority value. CHLs that were designated (or were in the process of being designated at that time of the study) were included in the table as important precedent examples of how CHLs can be protected and to provide a complete inventory

In the March 2019 draft of the CHAP, Table 2 (like Table 1) showed all 32 CHLs in the order of their ID number. Table 2 in the final draft of the CHAP (Page E-4) has been changed to show the 29 candidate CHLs in order of their assigned priority and then alphabetically by name. The ID number column has been moved to the far right. The CHLs that have already been designated under the Ontario Heritage Act have been given a priority value of "protected" and are at the end of the table.

Comment: Heritage Guelph has suggested that the Waterloo Avenue CHL should be moved up to high priority.

Staff response: It will be recommended to Council that staff continue to monitor the high and medium priority residential candidate CHLs and as funding becomes available for subsequent CHL studies staff would determine, with advice from Heritage Guelph, the order in which these CHLs receive further study. Priority will be reassessed when the CHAP is updated following completion of the top 3 priority CHLs. The consultants continue to recommend Waterloo Avenue CHL as a medium priority.

Comment: Members of Heritage Guelph and the public expressed concern that the CHAP does not include specific references to the First Nations, Inuit and Metis and Indigenous history of Guelph.

Staff response: The City of Guelph is required by the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) to ensure that significant cultural heritage landscapes are conserved, and that the interests of Indigenous communities are considered in conserving cultural heritage and archaeological resources. The scope of the CHAP has not included the research or evaluation of archaeological sites. The City of Guelph would undertake such work in the context of an Archaeological Management Plan. Staff acknowledge that the history outlined in the Cultural Action Plan is limited to post-1827 settlement and does not include the history of Indigenous people in this area. Staff are committed to learning more about local Indigenous history and associated cultural heritage landscapes, and to continue to build partnerships with local communities to collaboratively identify all significant cultural heritage landscapes.

Consultations between First Nations and the City of Guelph are conducted at the corporate level. Discussion and collaboration with Guelph area Indigenous communities is being coordinated by the office of the General Manager of Culture, Tourism and Community Investment, Public Services. It will be through this future interaction that City staff would learn about known or potential cultural heritage resources that are of value to Indigenous communities.

Comment: Concern was expressed regarding the remaining farm barns in the city and which barns should have priority for designation under the Ontario Heritage Act.

Staff response: The fourteen farm barns remaining within the city are presented in Attachment 3.

When identifying cultural heritage resources, a farm barn is a building which was designed for agricultural storage use in a rural context and not within the city's original urban built up area. Many of these farm barns still stand near their associated farmhouses. For example, the Humphrey barn was converted to residential use in the early 1970s. Some of the barns are being conserved as storage buildings or with compatible institutional uses while others are within areas slated for future development.

All fourteen farm barns are listed on the City's heritage register and because of this, any proposal for demolition or removal must be considered by Council. Also, any proposal for development adjacent to or on the property would require a Cultural Heritage Resource Impact Assessment.

To date, three of these farm barns have been protected by heritage designation. The designated barns are the University of Guelph Alumni House and the two farm barns within the Marcolongo Farm Cultural Heritage Landscape.

Of the fourteen extant farm barns, the following three are seen to be at the greatest risk and therefore should be seen as priorities for individual designation under the Ontario Heritage Act:

- 2167 Gordon Street – James Kidd Barn
- 284 Arkell Road – Walsh Barn
- 1858 Gordon Street – Robinson/Mulvaney Barn

The James Kidd barn at 2187 Gordon Street is unique in Guelph as a stone slot barn. The original 1850s bank barn was constructed of fieldstone with a late 19th century, heavy timber addition. Staff and Heritage Guelph are currently composing draft reasons for designation of this building.

Staff monitor the extant farm barns listed on the heritage register and recommend individual designation under the Ontario Heritage Act as appropriate and/or through secondary plans or development proposals.