



MUNICIPAL HERITAGE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

**Monday, April 15, 2013
12:15 PM**

Larry Schneider Board Room, Main Floor, City Hall



**Public Agenda
Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee
Monday, April 15, 2013**

Approval of Public Agenda

Minutes of the meeting held on February 11, 2013

Communications

MHAC13-14 MHAC13-14 OCP Update - Sheri Birkeland

Recommendation

That this item be received and filed.

MHAC13-15 MHAC13-15 Work Plan item 3 - Official Community Plan participation

Recommendation

That the committee select up to four members to participate in a Stakeholder Session related to the development of the Cultural Plan and the OCP.

MHAC13-16 MHAC13-16 Questions about Planning and Development in Lakeview

Recommendation

That this item be received and filed.

MHAC13-17 MHAC13-17 - 2013 Heritage Saskatchewan Forum and AGM update

Recommendation

That this item be received and filed.

MHAC13-18 MHAC13-18 Work Plan Review

Recommendation

That this item be received and filed.

Adjournment

AT REGINA, SASKATCHEWAN, MONDAY, FEBRUARY 11, 2013

AT A MEETING OF THE MUNICIPAL HERITAGE ADVISORY
COMMITTEE
HELD IN PUBLIC SESSION

AT 12:15 PM

These are considered a draft rendering of the official minutes. Official minutes can be obtained through the Office of the City Clerk once approved.

Present: Victor Thomas, in the Chair
Donald Black
May P Chan
Bianca Currie Poirer
Ken Lozinsky
Ray Plosker
David McLennan
Ingrid Thiessen
Robert Truszkowski
Councillor John Findura

Regrets: Joseph Ralko
Margot Mack

Also in Attendance: Committee Assistant, Linda Leeks
Policy Analyst, Liberty Brears
Director of Planning, Diana Hawryluk
Manager, Current Planning, Fred Searle
Manager, Government Relations, Sheila Harmatiuk

Approval of Public Agenda

David McLennan moved, AND IT WAS RESOLVED, that public agenda be approved as submitted.

Minutes of the meeting held on January 7, 2013

Ray Plosker moved, AND IT WAS RESOLVED, that the minutes of the January 7, 2013 meeting be adopted as circulated.

Working Group Reports

MHAC13-5 Regina Indian Industrial School Cemetery

Recommendation

That the Community and Protective Services Committee ask City Administration to formally engage with stakeholders and seek the creation of a covenant that will ensure suitable and appropriate protection and recognition for the site of the Regina Indian Industrial School cemetery based on the following principles:

- ☐ Respect for the memory of the First Nations and Métis children buried there.
- ☐ Respect for the memory of the children of Rev. McLeod buried there.
- ☐ Respect for the true legacy of the Regina Indian Industrial School.
- ☐ Respect for First Nations beliefs.
- ☐ Respect for Christian beliefs.
- ☐ Respect for the rights of the current property owners.

May Chan moved, AND IT WAS RESOLVED, that the recommendations contained in the report be concurred in.

Administration Reports

MHAC13-6 Former Regina Indian Industrial School cemetery

Recommendation

That the Community and Protective Services Committee direct the Administration to consult senior levels of Government and report back on the City of Regina's options and role with respect to facilitating the commemoration and protection of the former Regina Indian Industrial School cemetery.

David McLennan moved, AND IT WAS RESOLVED, that the Community and Protective Services Committee direct the Administration to consult senior levels of Government and report back with an update to the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee on the City of Regina's options and role with respect to facilitating the commemoration and protection of the former Regina Indian Industrial School cemetery by the end of December 2013.

Communications

MHAC13-7 Presentation - Heritage Conservation Branch

Recommendation

That this communication be received and filed.

May Chan moved, AND IT WAS RESOLVED, that Ray Plosker, Ken Lozinsky and Don Black form a working group to assist the administration with the review of evaluation criteria used when reviewing applications for designation of a property as Municipal Heritage Property.

MHAC13-8 Committee Structure Review

Recommendation

That this communication be received and filed.

May Chan moved, AND IT WAS RESOLVED, that this communication be received and filed.

MHAC13-9 Heritage Saskatchewan Conference

Recommendation

That this communication be received and filed.

(David McLennan left the meeting)

Ken Lozinsky moved, AND IT WAS RESOLVED, that Ingrid Thiessen be approved to attend the Heritage Saskatchewan Forum and AGM on February 22 and 23rd and that the registration fee of \$150 be funded from the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee 2013 travel budget.

MHAC13-10 OCP Working Group - Work Plan item #3

Recommendation

That this communication be received and filed.

Don Black moved, AND IT WAS RESOLVED, that a working group be formed at the next meeting to participate and provide input on the development of the OCP and the Cultural Plan.

MHAC13-11 Review of Work Plan

Recommendation

That this communication be received and filed.

Don Black moved, AND IT WAS RESOLVED, that this communication be received and filed.

MHAC13-12 RPC Approval of MHAC 2012 Annual Report

Recommendation

That this communication be received and filed.

Ray Plosker moved, AND IT WAS RESOLVED, that this communication be received and filed.

MHAC13-13 CPS Approval of MHAC 2012 Annual Report

Recommendation

That this communication be received and filed.

Don Black moved, AND IT WAS RESOLVED, that this communication be received and filed.

Resolution for Private Session

Chairperson

Secretary

Memo

April 15, 2013

To: Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee

Re: Official Community Plan 2013 Update

RECOMMENDATION

That this communication be received and filed.

BACKGROUND

The process to develop a new Official Community Plan (OCP) is in the final phase. Design Regina will replace the current OCP and will be the city's plan for guiding growth, development and change for the next 25 years. As such, the Plan will provide a city-wide policy framework that guides decisions on investments, services and actions.

The Administration will be giving an OCP update presentation to the committee to provide an overview of the final phase of work coming up in 2013, including opportunities for stakeholder and public input into OCP policy.

Sincerely,

Kim Sare, Project Manager
Official Community Plan Project

Memo

April 15, 2013

To: Members,
Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee

Re: Work Plan item 3 - Official Community Plan participation

On April 15, the Administration will provide an overview of the Cultural Plan and the Cultural Heritage Management Strategy. The City of Regina is currently developing a Cultural Plan through a process that both contributes to and is informed by the development of the new Official Community Plan (OCP). The Cultural Plan will deliver both cultural development policies and an embedded Cultural Heritage Management Strategy. Information on the Cultural Plan is available online at <http://www.designregina.ca/cultural-plan/>.

In order to provide meaningful and timely input into the development of the OCP and Cultural Plan, members are encouraged to participate in upcoming opportunities for feedback on the topic areas for the Cultural Plan and on the development of the OCP policies. According to the Committee's current work plan, the members had planned to "provide recommendations to the Administration" regarding the development of the OCP. However, the process to develop the OCP is now in *Phase 4: Developing Policy* and the best venues for providing input are through the opportunities listed below:

1. All members of the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee are encouraged to attend an upcoming public forum on the Cultural Plan. The public forum is scheduled to take place on Tuesday, April 23rd from 6:30 to 8:00 p.m. at the Conexus Arts Centre. This will be a key event related to the development of the Cultural Plan.
2. As the Design Regina process is now in *Phase 4: Developing Policy* all members are encouraged to review the Public Engagement Summary for Phases 1-3 available on the Design Regina website at (www.designregina.ca).
3. All members can participate in the Design Regina process by attending public events, providing feedback via email to designregina@regina.ca or by reviewing and providing feedback on Discussion Guide #2 once it is advertised in April.
4. If members haven't already done so, they are encouraged to sign up for the Design Regina newsletter at: <http://www.designregina.ca/keep-me-informed/>
5. On April 15, the members will be asked to select up to four members to participate in a Stakeholder Session related to the development of the Cultural Plan and the OCP.

While all members can attend the public events or provide feedback through the next Discussion Guide, the Committee may chose to form a Working Group tasked with participating in each event and activity associated with the OCP and the Cultural Plan. The Working Group could be asked to provide input to the development of the plans and the heritage policies, and then provide a brief verbal update at MHAC meetings in 2013.

Your interest and participation in the development of both the OCP and Cultural Plan is greatly appreciated.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Liberty Brears". The script is cursive and fluid, with the first letters of each word being capitalized and prominent.

Liberty Brears
Policy Analyst

LB/

I:\Wordpro\CURRENT\HERITAGE\MHAC meetings\2013\April - Work Plan 3 - Internal Memo.doc

Memo

April 15, 2013

To: Members,
Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee

Re: Questions about Planning and Development in Lakeview

The Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC) work plan for 2012 refers to the need for an educational session on neighbourhood planning and development. Due to the technical nature of the information, the Administration felt it would be appropriate to provide a written explanation to the Committee instead.

The purpose of this memo is to provide answers to the planning and development questions that were raised by members of the Committee. This memo is also to advise the Committee that it would be premature to provide recommendations to Council on the conservation of neighbourhood character as it pertains to the direction in the 2012 MHAC work plan.

The Administration is planning to update the development standards in the Zoning Bylaw following the approval of the new Official Community Plan (OCP). In addition, direction on the use of Architectural Control Districts (ACDs) will be provided in the new OCP. No new ACDs can be prepared at this time due to sensitivities, policy, and potential budget implications.

The majority of the area of concern, referred to as “Old Lakeview,” is zoned R1. The development standards for this and other zones are provided in Chapters 5 and 6 of the City of Regina Zoning Bylaw (Bylaw No. 9250). The map in Appendix A shows the “Old Lakeview” area defined by the boundaries of the original Lakeview and Wascana Park Subdivision Plans. Appendix B provides answers to the planning and development questions specifically related to the Lakeview neighbourhood.

The members should direct inquiries about specific development proposals to the Planning Department. The Administration has established a formal relationship with the Lakeview Community Association and consults the Association on matters of planning and development. At the time of the Zoning Bylaw update, the Lakeview Community Association will be consulted on any significant changes that apply to development in that neighbourhood. The Committee members may choose to relay this information to those inquiring about development in Lakeview.

Please be sure to participate in the Design Regina process and share your thoughts about the changes to the Official Community Plan (OCP). The Zoning Bylaw and other

planning and development tools are directed by the policy statements in the OCP. For information about upcoming events, please visit the Design Regina website at www.designregina.ca.

Yours truly,



Liberty Brears
Policy Analyst

Enc.

LB/sk

cc: Director of Planning
Senior City Planner

Appendix B – Planning and Development in Old Lakeview

1. How big can a house be in relation to the lot it sits on? How high can it be?

In the R1 zone, the development standards for detached dwellings (not on a zero lot) apply to site coverage, floor area ratio and height, as follows:

- The maximum site coverage is 50%. Coverage is defined as the percentage of the lot which is covered by buildings or structures excluding uncovered swimming pools, uncovered terraces, uncovered porches and decks.
- The maximum floor area ratio is 0.75. Floor area ratio (FAR) is defined as the gross floor area of all buildings on a lot divided by the lot area.
- The maximum building height is 11 m (36 ft). Height is defined as the vertical distance measured from grade level to the higher of (a) the highest point of a flat roof; or (b) the mean level between the top of the highest exterior wall plate and the ridge of a pitched roof.

In the R1 zone, the development standards for detached dwellings also apply to lot area and frontage. All lots must have a minimum lot area of 325 m² and a minimum lot frontage of 10.5 m (34.5 ft). However, there are existing lots in Old Lakeview that are smaller and/or narrower than the minimum standards. The original subdivision plans were laid out with 7.62 m (25 ft) lot frontages and subsequent development occurred on lots ranging in size from 7.62-15.24m (25-50 ft).

In some cases, larger properties comprised of two 7.62 m lots were developed under single ownership (i.e. with two lots identified or included on a single title). However, under the new land registration, each lot or parcel has a separate title. Parcels can be “tied” which prohibits separate sale or transfer without the City’s approval. In c.2001, Information Services Corporation introduced a new land registration system but did not place parcel ties on the properties comprised of the two small lots. As a result, these adjacent small lots can be sold and developed separately.

In the R1 zone, the development standards for detached dwellings also apply to setbacks:

- The minimum front yard setback is 6 m (20 feet). The front yard is that part of a lot which extends across the full width of a lot between the front lot line and the nearest wall or supporting member of a building or structure.
- The minimum rear yard setback is 5 m (16.4 feet)
- The minimum side yard setback is 1.2 m (4 feet)

The relaxation of setback standards is referenced in response to questions 4 and 10.

2. Can a house dwarf or shade an adjacent house or garden or block the views of light coming into a neighbor's window?

In the R1 zone, a detached dwelling is limited to a height restriction of 11 m (36 ft). The scale and massing of the dwelling is only further constrained by maximum site coverage and FAR standards as well as minimum setback standards. If the development meets the defined development standards within the defined building envelope, it can be approved for development.

3. Are there any restrictions with regard to style/design? Can a house be electric pink with yellow stripes, a green roof and "I Hate Regina" and "Santa Doesn't Exist" signs painted on the front? Are there any rules/laws/bylaws regarding structures being incongruous with others on a street?

According to the *Planning and Development Act* development standards in the Zoning Bylaw cannot apply to style, design, or color. Design guidelines can be established through Architectural Control Districts (ACDs) that can apply to architectural style and design. Direction on the use of ACDs will be provided in the new OCP.

4. How close can a structure be to the property lines?

See the minimum setback standards provided in response to question 1.

According to the Zoning Bylaw, where a detached dwelling does not abut a public alley or street on the rear or side yard, and does not have a carport or attached garage, the minimum single side yard requirement is 2.5 m. This minimum width shall not be required where a dwelling unit incorporates a garage envelope. (Note: most if not all lots in Old Lakeview are adjacent to public alleys.)

The allowable side yard reductions for dwellings on small lots are as follows:

- Frontages less than 8.0 metres must have a minimum side yard of 400 mm
- Frontages 8.0-8.4 metres must have a minimum side yard of 550 mm
- Frontages 8.5-8.9 metres must have a minimum side yard of 700 mm
- Frontages 9.0-9.4 metres must have a minimum side yard of 850 mm
- Frontages 9.5-9.9 metres must have a minimum side yard of 1000 mm

According to the Zoning Bylaw, where a lot abuts a public alley or street right-of-way:

- The minimum width of a required side yard abutting an alley or street may be reduced by one-half of the width of the abutting alley or street. The width of the side yard after this reduction must not be less than 450 mm.
- The minimum depth of a rear yard may be reduced by one-half the width of the abutting public alley or utility right-of-way. This applies only to principal buildings and in no case shall the rear yard be less than 3.5 m.

According to the Zoning Bylaw, the minimum required front yard setback may be changed for Centre Lots in the following situations:

- Where the lot is situated between two lots, each of which contains a principal building, the setback may be the average of the two building setbacks on the adjacent lots;
- The established building setback of an existing principal building on an adjacent site, when there is only one adjacent site or there are two adjacent sites of which one does not have a principal building; or
- The minimum required front yard setback for the applicable zone.

Whichever is the less of the above.

5. Can anyone put a driveway in the front of their property? 1 or 2 cars wide? Can anyone build a garage on the front of the house accessible from the front street?

The Zoning Bylaw contains regulations for front yard parking in residential zones.

Front yard parking shall be permitted on a lot that:

- (a) has an attached or detached garage, carport or parking pad located in the side or rear yard, with access provided from the front yard; or
- (b) has no alley access, has insufficient room to provide access from the front yard to the side yards, and does not have and cannot accommodate parking spaces in the rear or side yards. (Note that most if not all lots in Old Lakeview are adjacent to public alleys.)

However, where a lot meets the criteria of (a) or (b), the number of spaces that may be located in the front yard is limited to the capacity of the garage, carport or parking pad, or two spaces, whichever is greater. In addition, where a lot meets the criteria of (a), the parking spaces shall be located on a driveway leading to an attached or detached garage, carport or parking pad located in the side or the rear yard.

Note: an attached garage must comply with the minimum front yard setback standard as it is deemed part of the principal building. A detached garage can't be located in front of the dwelling.

6. Can anyone construct secondary buildings or attached structures of any size?

According to the Zoning Bylaw for 1- and 2-unit dwellings in residential zones, the maximum floor area of a building or structure including a detached garage that (a) is located in a residential zone and (b) is accessory to a detached, semi-detached, or duplex dwelling, or mobile home that is not part of a planned group of dwellings, shall not exceed 75 square meters in floor area. Attached structures generally form part of the principal building and are subject to the maximum lot coverage standard.

7. Can any homeowner/builder construct a deck of any height and size?

The Zoning Bylaw contains the following regulations for decks in residential zones:

- A balcony, deck, or uncovered platform may project 1.5 m into any required front or rear yard.
- An uncovered platform or deck that is more than 300 mm in height shall comply with the minimum side yard setback requirements for a principal building on the site. The minimum side yard setback for a raised platform or deck for a dwelling with non-conforming side yards shall be the existing side yard set back of the dwelling.
- An uncovered platform or deck that is not more than 300 mm in height does not require setbacks.
- A porch that does not exceed three square meters may project 1.5 m into the required front yard.

8. Can any homeowner/builder construct a fence of any height and size?

According to the Zoning Bylaw, the height of a fence above the ground level shall not exceed 1.83 m adjacent to rear and side yards and 1.22 m in or adjacent to front yards.

9. Can city trees be removed from private property?

According to the Zoning Bylaw regulations with respect to the protection of existing trees on public and private property during construction:

“Every attempt should be made to preserve and protect existing trees and vegetation during construction. Trees should only be removed when no cost-effective alternative is available. It is the responsibility of contractors to notify Parks and Open Spaces Department in advance of any site where construction activities will occur closer than 5 meters to a public tree. Where any tree on public land or trees on private land that are to be credited toward the fulfillment of the site landscaping requirements are impacted by development, the developer shall provide a Tree Preservation Plan for the site that incorporated the requirements outlined in the *Regina Urban Forest Management Strategy*.”

The Forestry Bylaw states that any person who damages or prunes a public tree, alters the grade level or drainage pattern, fails to erect a protective barrier around trees before beginning construction or interfering with protective barriers is guilty of an offence.

In cases where a public tree must be removed to accommodate a development project or root pruned, the contractor shall contact the Parks and Open Space Department to conduct an assessment. The request to remove a public tree must be approved by the Department's Director.

In cases where transplantable trees are to be destroyed as a result of grading or building activities, the City shall be given the option of relocating the tree at public expense for planting on public land.

10. If rules/laws/bylaws are broken, what avenues are there for challenges or complaints? Have any recent (post, say, post-1999) Lakeview residential construction projects including new homes, additions, garages, fences, tree houses, et cetera, been in contravention of an existing bylaw?

Inquiries about particular developments are directed to the Planning Department. The Planning Department will explain the process followed to determine if the development complied with the development standards in the Zoning Bylaw.

1. The Planning Department reviews the applicant's plans to ensure compliance with the development standards in the Zoning Bylaw. A Building Permit is issued if it complies.
2. Once the foundation is poured, the Planning Department will receive a real property report (i.e. survey) to ensure the development still complies.
3. If it complies, then an Occupancy Permit is issued. If it's not compliant, then the applicant will not receive a full Occupancy Permit. An Order to Comply is then issued.

The Minor Variance process is described in the Zoning Bylaw. The Development Officer in the Planning Department is authorized to grant a minor variance for variation only of:

- Yard setbacks up to 25% of the minimum required distances for buildings and decks;
- 10% of the height for a principal or accessory building;
- Additions to legally non-conforming buildings; and
- 10% of the parking requirements.

The development must still conform to the Zoning Bylaw with respect to the use of the land.

The Zoning Appeal process is also described in the Zoning Bylaw. If an application for a Minor Variance is refused or approved with terms and conditions, the applicant may appeal the Development Officer's decision to the Development Appeals Board (DAB) within 30 days. A Notice of Appeals is circulated to property owners within a 75 m radius. If the Zoning Appeal is successful, it means the DAB has decided to relax the development standards requested by the applicant or identified in the City of Regina's Order to Comply. If the Zoning Appeal is not successful, the applicant has the right to submit an appeal to the Planning Appeals Committee of the Saskatchewan Municipal Board within 20 days of the receipt of the DAB decision.

Since 1992, there have been 96 Development Appeals in the Lakeview subdivision. By way of example a selection of Appeals are listed below:

- The appellant is constructing a detached accessory building (garage) in the rear yard with a proposed height of 6.293 metres instead of the maximum permitted height of 4.0 metres. The appeal was granted with no conditions.
- The appellant is proposing to construct a front yard parking space that requires relaxation of residential parking regulation. Specifically, the proposed parking space is to be constructed on a lot that has no front yard access to a side or rear parking space and that has alley access. The appeal was denied
- The appellant is proposing to legalize a deck in the side yard area of the subject property having a setback to side lot line of 0.0 metres instead of the minimum required side yard setback of 1.2 metres. The appeal was granted without conditions.
- The applicant is proposing to construct an accessory building (detached garage) that requires relaxation of Zoning Bylaw development standards so that the area of the accessory building may be 82.15 square metres instead of the maximum permitted area of 75 square metres for accessory buildings. The appeal was granted without conditions.
- The applicant is proposing to construct a detached accessory building (detached garage) in the rear yard that requires relaxation of residential accessory building regulations. Specifically, the proposed garage is to be constructed with a height of 4.87 metres instead of the maximum permitted height of 4.0 metres; a floor area of 113.65 m² instead of the maximum permitted floor area of 75 m²; and with a 1.2 metre setback from the alley instead of the minimum required setback of 1.5 metres. Consideration of this application requires a variance with respect to Subparts 11B.6, 11B.7, and 11B.8 of Zoning Bylaw No. 9250. The Saskatchewan Municipal Board's decision to sustain the appellants appeal to the Planning Appeals Committee thereby set aside the decision of the Development Appeals Board. The City is therefore ordered to issue a development permit for the development proposed in the appellant's application.

11. If someone is contravention of the Zoning Bylaw, what were the penalties applied to the homeowner and what enforcement methods are used?

It is the duty of the Development Officer to enforce all provisions of the Zoning Bylaw. The Development Officer may suspend or revoke a development permit, revoke a building permit, or file an application for injunction in the Court of Queen's Bench.

Any person who violates any provision of the Zoning Bylaw is guilty of an offense, and is liable on conviction to the penalties specified in Part XII, Div 2 of the Planning and Development Act.

12. What constitutes an application process for building a new structure (for a new home, an addition, a garage)?

A permitted use is a use or development to which an owner is entitled to a development permit provided the use or development conforms to the applicable development standards and regulations in the Zoning Bylaw.

Discretionary uses are the use of land, building or other structure that may be permitted in a zone only at the discretion of and at a location specified by City Council.

A building permit is required for the construction of a residential dwelling, an addition or detached residential garage. Any development must comply with the Zoning Bylaw requirements and building codes.

13. Foundations. The distance between houses is very tight in old Lakeview. If a home is having basement structural issues, it is difficult to repair due to the width between homes. How will the updated OCP address these known concerns? Though piles may be mandatory on new homes, the old homes may still need repair.

It is unlikely that the OCP will contain a strategy to deal with the structural integrity of older homes.

14. Permeable Surfaces. Flooding and run-off are becoming costly issues for municipalities. Some jurisdictions in the United States are implementing percentages of impervious surfaces for any given lot. In turn, this has positive benefits for the tree cover which is affected by impervious materials. In addition, when an entire lot is hard surface, drainage becomes an issue for neighbours whose basements could be flooded. The higher the density, the greater this concern. How will the updated OCP address these issues?

It is unlikely that the OCP will contain a strategy to deal with the amount of permeable surfaces in residential zones.

15. Expanding on 14 above. As a landscape architect working on residential projects in the city I would like to see perimeter or back lot elevations on all survey plans to ensure overall subdivision drainage is maintained.

The Zoning Bylaw provides a list of the information that shall be contained in a Landscape Plan, such as the direction and percent/ratio of slope of landscaped areas; how the landscape plan is consistent with the site drainage plan and the overland flow plan for major storms for the surrounding area; and the existing and final site grading of the landscape areas. However, a landscape plan is not required for one and two unit dwellings.

Building Bylaw No. 2003-7 addresses Control of Grade Elevations. All new construction must meet Subsections 2.8 and 2.9 of this Bylaw, which deal with Drainage into Storm Sewers. The Engineering Branch sets the grades for infill construction. The Building Standards Branch of the Planning Department does not deal with existing drainage other than to give advice.

The back of lot elevations are shown on engineering plans for the development. These engineering plans are reviewed by the Engineering Branch and a copy of the approved grading plan is submitted to the Planning Department.

Additional Information

For more information about Community Planning, the Ministry of Municipal Relations has prepared the following helpful guides on Community Planning in Saskatchewan:

Zoning Bylaw components:

<http://municipal.gov.sk.ca/Zoning/Bylaw-Components>

The Community Planning Process:

<http://municipal.gov.sk.ca/Community-Plan/Community-Planning-Process>

MUNICIPAL HERITAGE ADVISORY REPORT

Heritage Week February 21-23, 2013

I attended a number of activities during heritage week. This included the eco-museums workshop on Thursday February 21, the Strategies for Urban Revitalization on Friday and the 'Heritage Off The Grid' Saskatchewan Heritage Forum Friday/Saturday.

THE ECO-MUSEUMS WORKSHOP: This workshop was not what I expected. I went thinking that we would be told what an eco-museum was and how it is connected to official eco-museums elsewhere in the world. What I discovered was that each place defines what an eco-museum might mean to them. The group workshop was focussed on a definition appropriate to Saskatchewan. The workshop resulted in an eight page framework, compiled by Glenn Sutter of the RSM. I can distribute it to anyone who is interested via email. This concept may have applications for marketing the Heritage Rivers designation and as a possible tourist strategy for regions, rural municipalities, towns and cities. The focus was on interaction by doing as opposed to static museum displays.

STRATEGIES FOR DOWNTOWN REVITALIZATION: Speaker-Mr Rypkema. This was by far the most practical of all of the presentations I attended. As a result of hearing him speak, I would be motivated to read his books and use the information with clients. During the workshop he handed out works sheets under the title: Common Denominators of Successful Downtown Revitalization. There were 100 of these sheets intended as a group exercise. There were 10+/- questions on each work sheet to be rated and then an opportunity to expand below. An example is attached. Of course we did not get through all of them, but one got a taste of the process and how going through each denominator might foster downtown revitalization with a focus on heritage and sustainability.

HERITAGE OFF THE GRID

Trade show: I attended each trade show booth and they were fun and informative. It included everything from book and museum displays, (I liked the RCMP display where you had to match the Queen's hat with the year of her visit), to making contacts with heritage construction consultants.

Dr. Kingwell's address, entitled '*The Knowns, Unknowns and Thinking Past the Frame*' was a fun intellectual look at how one thinks about the past. This was thoroughly enjoyable as he mixed pop culture with ancient philosophical discourse. Though I did not understand much of his presentation, it occurred to me, that his talk was very applicable to heritage issues surrounding the Qu'Appelle Valley. In particular, his references to Plato and Socrates where he discusses what we know and don't know could apply to all the unknowns surrounding development in the valley:

- those who know what they know,
- those who don't know what they don't know
- those who don't know what they know,
- those who know what they don't know,

In the end society has to wrestle with what is important and what we are willing to bring forward, through the framework, to the next generation. No doubt some of what should have been saved will be left behind, and some things of no value will be saved. Heritage is part of society's journey, wrestling with what is valuable and worth keeping.

Julian Smith's address focused on the current shifts in heritage thinking across Canada. He began his presentation by placing heritage into a continuum of cultural theory:

1. He began with an antiquarian bias as seen in ancient countries where the focus is on archeology.
2. The 19th century commemorative bias was presented by Parks Canada where objects are seen as important.
3. In the 20th century, the bias turns towards an aesthetic focus, where materials and guidelines are seen as important. He gave the example of needing the exact same paving material, street furniture or paint colour on the walls to get a certain period look.
4. We are now entering a 4th phase which has an ecological bias. This is where culture and ecology meet and ritual and artifact are important but not in static displays but in an historic experience of a culture. Cultural landscapes you experience; historic landscapes you observe.

In this new era of heritage one can easily tell what is new and what is old. For example when a building is a ruin it remains a ruin and you adapt the space not by fixing the ruin to a particular period in time, but allow the ruin to become part of the new space. Another example: a mask in a case is not the same as a mask that is danced. The most interesting example was a place (notes not clear) where a temple is taken down every 20 years, so that a new generation can learn the building skills needed to build the temple and pass along the skills required.

As a landscape architect I was pleased he referenced Kevin Lynch who wrote textbooks on site planning. He referred his work with cognitive mapping to be able to understand what is important to the people as they go about their daily lives. Cognitive mapping information was viewed as more important than accurate GIS mapping.

He ended his presentation speaking about UNESCO's focus on tangible and intangible heritage components. He spoke of layering of historic, cultural and natural values rather than being defined by one period of significance. If a community is dependent on sustainability experts, it's not sustainable. Rather than slotting culture, heritage and environment into components they should be woven together for the benefit of all.

Respectfully submitted, Ingrid Thiessen

Common Denominators of Successful Downtown Revitalization

How are we doing?

PEDESTRIAN ORIENTATION and MARKET SENSITIVITY					
	1	2	3	4	5
Are there people on the street?					
Is downtown in active use 18 hours a day?					
Is there circular pedestrian movement?					
Are automobiles appropriately accommodated but not at the expense of pedestrians?					
Is downtown demand driven?					
Is downtown customer driven?					
1 = Poor 2 = Fair 3 = Average 4 = Good 5 = Excellent					

Which one will we try to improve in the next 3 months?
How?

Which one will we try to improve in the next 2 years?
How?

Additional efforts to improve Pedestrian Orientation and Market Sensitivity?
--

April 15, 2013

To: Members,
Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee

Re: Review of 2012 Work Plan

The purpose of this communication is to facilitate the review of the progress report and provide an opportunity for further discussion, if required. Attached for reference is the current 2011/12 Work Plan.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Linda Leeks".

Linda Leeks, Secretary
Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee

Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee 2011/12 Work Plan

Page 1

<i>Deliverable (What)</i>	<i>Action(How)</i>	<i>Resources (Who)</i>	<i>Participate/Lead</i>	<i>Budget</i>	<i>Start/Complete Date (When)</i>	<i>Progress to January 2013</i>
1. a) Improved Heritage Awards Program	Identify opportunities to raise the profile of the awards for Council;	All Committee Members (or New working group to be established)	Lead	N/A	Immediately to end of 2011	2012 Working group met early in Dec. to discuss awards and reception
b) Ceremony	Identify opportunities for Council to promote the award-winning projects. Provide options through research of existing Heritage Awards Ceremonies across Canada for raising the profile of the awards (e.g. exploring alternate venues for hosting the Heritage Awards ceremony).	All Committee Members (or New working group to be established)			End of May 2011	Report – to City Council information – Awards presentation Feb. 25/13. Keith Knox Award report to Community & Protective Services – December 2012 - to City Council Dec./12.
2. Provide recommendations to Council and the Administration on further development of award categories and criteria.	Review Open Space Category and participate in updating the brochure.	MHAC working group (existing)	Participate		End of June 2011 - Administration to report at Sept. meeting regarding status of criteria provided to Council for awards program. - Criteria provided and approved by Council – pamphlet has been updated.	Standards and guidelines are now on the web site.

Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee 2011/12 Work Plan

Page 2

<i>Deliverable (What)</i>	<i>Action(How)</i>	<i>Resources (Who)</i>	<i>Participate/Lead</i>	<i>Budget</i>	<i>Start/Complete Date (When)</i>	<i>Progress to January 2013</i>
3. Provide recommendations to the Administration regarding development of new OCP. Community priorities – last piece that was introduced	Discuss with City Staff; Give input on OCP and Cultural Plan; **Review definition of heritage	All Committee Members (or new working group to be established)	Participate		Immediately to end of 2012 - Hosted Citizen Circle on Aug. 8 - Administration to follow up to ensure heritage definition was forwarded for the Cultural Plan. - Admin reported that the definition will be seen next year (2012) during the policy direction phase. - Admin will ensure that the process to develop the Cultural Plan definition of Heritage is reviewed and that MHAC is informed.	See updates under deliverable. Working group to be formed April 2013.
4. Promotion and awareness of events	Review City website, Facebook and Twitter; Promote events such as Jane's Walk, International Museum Day (through their organizations); also the anniversary of the tornado in 2012.	All Committee Members (or new working group to be established)	Lead		Immediately to end of 2012 - Administration to provide report regarding City website and what changes can and cannot be accommodated presently.	Committee has discussed and Administration has made suggestions to Communications area. Ingrid Cazakoff from Heritage Sask spoke to committee Dec. 2011. D. McLennan & K. Lozinsky attended Heritage Saskatchewan Conference 2012.

Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee 2011/12 Work Plan

Page 3

<i>Deliverable (What)</i>	<i>Action(How)</i>	<i>Resources (Who)</i>	<i>Participate/Lead</i>	<i>Budget</i>	<i>Start/Complete Date (When)</i>	<i>Progress to January 2013</i>
5. Provide recommendations to the Regina Planning Commission, City Council and Administration regarding the conservation of neighbourhood integrity (i.e. character) through neighbourhood planning. Education session on policies – Don Meikle Input/terminology re: Neighbourhood – in OCP	Provide input into the neighbourhood planning process (i.e. Heritage (formerly Core) Neighbourhood planning process); Provide input into the implementation of the Regina Downtown Neighbourhood Plan.	All Committee Members (or new working group to be established).	Participate		Immediately to end of 2012 - Underway - Some committee members attending ideas forum for Design Regina.	- Review policy for 5 inner City neighbourhoods to inform OCP Examples: Definition of neighbourhoods Architectural controls district Typology – vernacular Conservation of trees Scale of developments Garages facing streets or lanes Community Association meetings etc. - Item is still on-going
6. Provide input on the heritage designation form	Review evaluation criteria used when developing the statement of significance on applications for designated heritage properties.	All Committee members (or new working group to be established).	Participate		Second quarter to end of 2012.	Working group formed Feb. 11/13 to look at the “Language” which is the evaluation criteria.
						Presentation to Committee by Heritage Canada on evaluation system heritage property designation – Feb. 11/13

Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee 2011/12 Work Plan

Page 4

<i>Deliverable (What)</i>	<i>Action(How)</i>	<i>Resources (Who)</i>	<i>Participate/Lead</i>	<i>Budget</i>	<i>Start/Complete Date (When)</i>	<i>Progress to January 2013</i>
7. Provide advice on and an understanding of the history of Aboriginal people in Regina and the surrounding district.	<p>Awareness building for members of MHAC regarding Regina's Aboriginal heritage.</p> <p>Recommendations developed for suitable and appropriate recognition for the site of the Regina Indian Industrial School Cemetery.</p> <p>Discuss ways to build bridges with Aboriginal community so as to interest and attract an Aboriginal member to participate in this committee.</p>		Participate & Lead		<p>Invite resources from the Heritage Branch to speak to the committee and share their expertise on options for recognizing and protecting historic places (e.g. cemeteries) within city limits as well as exploring ways to integrate and celebrate Aboriginal Heritage in this city.</p>	<p>Presentation – by Stantec December 3/12</p> <p>Working group will complete a report on recommendations for next steps.</p> <p>Working Group Report went forward to CPS Feb. 2013 on Cemetery.</p>
<u>Items for 2013 to be added to workplan.</u>						<p>Davin Fountain working group report to MHAC January 2013 and CPS January 2013.</p>
Heritage Display @ City Hall						<p>Working group to be formed 2013 to look at a Heritage Display at City Hall</p>

i:\taxonomy\council and committee management\municipal heritage advisory committee\working documents\municipal heritage advisory committee 2011-12 updated.doc