



## HERITAGE STRATEGIC PLAN

# Background and Analysis

DISTRICT OF NORTH VANCOUVER  
HERITAGE STRATEGIC PLAN

**This page is intentionally left blank.**

## Table of Contents

<b>DISTRICT HERITAGE PROGRAM: TECHNICAL ANALYSIS.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>1.0 HERITAGE INFORMATION, ACCESS, AND AWARENESS .....</b>	<b>4</b>
1.1 <i>Heritage Awareness within the Community .....</i>	<i>4</i>
1.2 <i>Public Access to Heritage Information .....</i>	<i>5</i>
1.3 <i>Accessibility of Heritage Resources.....</i>	<i>6</i>
<b>2.0 HERITAGE REGULATIONS, POLICIES, TOOLS, AND INCENTIVES.....</b>	<b>7</b>
2.1 <i>Civic Heritage Leadership .....</i>	<i>7</i>
2.2 <i>Heritage Planning Initiatives .....</i>	<i>9</i>
2.3 <i>Zoning Bylaw.....</i>	<i>10</i>
2.4 <i>British Columbia Building Code .....</i>	<i>11</i>
2.5 <i>Heritage Procedure Bylaw .....</i>	<i>11</i>
2.6 <i>Heritage Alteration Permit Procedure Bylaw.....</i>	<i>12</i>
2.7 <i>Heritage Property Standards of Maintenance Bylaw.....</i>	<i>13</i>
2.8 <i>Heritage Conservation Areas.....</i>	<i>13</i>
2.9 <i>Heritage Incentive Program .....</i>	<i>14</i>
<b>3.0 ENQUIRY AND APPLICATION PROCESSING.....</b>	<b>15</b>
3.1 <i>Heritage Enquiry Procedures.....</i>	<i>15</i>
3.2 <i>Heritage Site Application Procedures .....</i>	<i>16</i>
<b>PUBLIC CONSULTATION SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>1.0 PHASE 1 CONSULTATION.....</b>	<b>17</b>
1.1 <i>Open House .....</i>	<i>18</i>
1.2 <i>Online Questionnaire.....</i>	<i>19</i>
<b>2.0 PHASE 2 CONSULTATION.....</b>	<b>22</b>
2.1 <i>Stakeholder Workshop .....</i>	<i>22</i>
2.2 <i>Small Group/One-on-one Stakeholder Meeting .....</i>	<i>30</i>
2.3 <i>Online Questionnaire.....</i>	<i>32</i>
<b>ACCESSIBILITY RECOMMENDATIONS.....</b>	<b>37</b>

# DISTRICT HERITAGE PROGRAM: TECHNICAL ANALYSIS

The District’s current Heritage Program was reviewed, and this review is organized into three parts: (1) heritage information, access, and awareness; (2) heritage regulations, policies, tools and incentives; and (3) enquiry and application processing. Within each part, there are various facets of the program that have been analyzed with a SWOC (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, Challenges) chart. The Heritage Strategic Plan is informed by this analysis. This section includes recommendations which inform the action plan.

## 1.0 HERITAGE INFORMATION, ACCESS, AND AWARENESS

### 1.1 HERITAGE AWARENESS WITHIN THE COMMUNITY

The District of North Vancouver is home to a variety of heritage resources and many are well-known to residents, however others are obscure or are less understood as historic. Newcomers to the community may not be aware of the rich history that exists in North Vancouver, and therefore may not understand the community value placed on certain resources. Differing perceptions of what is considered ‘heritage’ has also led to recent neighbourhood opposition regarding certain heritage conservation proposals. Not all residents may be aware their property is listed on the Heritage Register. For all of these reasons, heritage awareness in North Vancouver should be increased so that the District can more effectively communicate the overall community benefits of heritage conservation.

	Strengths	Weaknesses	Opportunities	Challenges
<b>Heritage Awareness Within the Community</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Forty years of heritage research and planning serves as strong foundation</li> <li>Heritage Register</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not all residents are aware of the Heritage Register and/or District’s Heritage Program</li> <li>Neighbourhood opposition to certain projects</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Explore ways to better communicate heritage benefits to greater cross-section of the community</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Difficulties providing heritage background information to newcomers</li> </ul>

## 1.2 PUBLIC ACCESS TO HERITAGE INFORMATION

Many heritage property owners take great pride in the maintenance of their historic site. These owners are often knowledgeable about the heritage research information available for their property. Other owners may not be as aware and therefore there is room for improvement on the public access of heritage site information. There is an opportunity to add an enhanced 'heritage layer' to the District's GIS map (GEOweb), which would improve access to this information, for both owners and those seeking to buy property. Providing a transparent layer of heritage information will also increase the general level of heritage awareness in the community. Before the District's information on heritage sites is made more publicly accessible, the accuracy of the information should be confirmed.

<b>Public Access to Heritage Information</b>	<b>Strengths</b>	<b>Weaknesses</b>	<b>Opportunities</b>	<b>Challenges</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Four decades of heritage research available</li> <li>● Heritage Register provides base level research for each site</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Not all residents are aware of the level of heritage information available for certain sites, sometimes including their own property</li> <li>● Requests for basic heritage information from the District requires staff time/resources</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Ensure accuracy of heritage lists/statuses and files</li> <li>● Establish enhanced 'heritage layer' on public GIS map (GEOweb) so that residents or prospective buyers can easily access information regarding the heritage status of a property</li> <li>● Provide copies of Heritage Register to applicable property owners</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● None identified</li> </ul>

### 1.3 ACCESSIBILITY OF HERITAGE RESOURCES

In addition to greater access to heritage information about properties, there are opportunities to improve the physical accessibility of heritage sites in the District. In consultation with the North Shore Advisory Committee on Disability Issues (ACDI), accessibility issues have been flagged regarding the code and design challenges that often face heritage buildings. Heritage buildings often cannot meet current building code standards, but that does not mean there should not be an attempt made to make them more accessible to a wider range of residents and visitors. Minimum standards for accessibility are a start, but these *minimums* rarely equate with *comfortable* access, especially when accessible entrances are most often uncovered and/or confined to the rear of buildings, which is clearly less preferable. Privately-owned heritage properties are potentially more difficult to address from an accessibility perspective, however a good place to start would be publicly accessible heritage properties. These properties should be assessed for their comfortable accessibility and strategies should be proposed to make them premier examples of welcoming community facilities to each ability level.

There are also opportunities to increase the visibility and accessibility of heritage site interpretation signage. With better location, design, construction, etc., these physical signs can be enjoyed by a greater number of community members.

Finally, digital access to heritage site information should be reviewed to ensure it is also fully accessible to the public. Detailed strategies to increase heritage accessibility in the District can be found in **Accessibility Recommendations, page 37**.

Accessibility of Heritage Resources	Strengths	Weaknesses	Opportunities	Challenges
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● ACDI availability for consultation and oversight</li> <li>● Council policies regarding building accessibility exist</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Not every building can keep up with the accessibility requirements of changing technologies</li> <li>● Many accessible entrances are uncovered or confined to less preferable rear/secondary entrances</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● In consultation with the ACDI, assess publicly accessible heritage sites for their physical accessibility and improve comfort levels wherever feasible</li> <li>● Construct more accessible physical signage for heritage site interpretation (see <b>Accessibility Recommendations</b> for details)</li> <li>● Digital information can be presented in a way that is more accessible to all ability levels of the public</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Privately-owned heritage properties are more difficult to address from an accessibility standpoint</li> </ul>

## **2.0 HERITAGE REGULATIONS, POLICIES, TOOLS, AND INCENTIVES**

### *2.1 CIVIC HERITAGE LEADERSHIP*

The District of North Vancouver has a forty-year foundation of heritage activities to build upon, yet the current Heritage Program has been challenged, from both an internal and external perspective. One of the most effective ways to reaffirm the District-wide value placed on community heritage is to show heritage leadership at the municipal level.

#### *Staff Resources*

The first major municipal recommendation is to explore additional resources to implement the Plan such as reallocating existing staff resources, or funding additional staff resources up to 1 full-time Heritage Planner; the existing part-time role cannot adequately address a fully functional Heritage Program, especially as it proceeds through an update and expansion, as recommended through this Heritage Strategic Plan. With an increased Heritage Planning function at the District, a greater number of initiatives (both internal and external) can occur and the public will be able to better access the Heritage Program.

#### *Interdepartmental Relations*

The understanding of Heritage Planning among other municipal departments can be improved. A productive meeting regarding heritage issues was held with staff members from a variety of departments as part of this project's consultation process. The meeting was regarded as a successful way to address ongoing challenges with the District's handling of heritage permits, projects, and outreach. A bi-annual or quarterly meeting of a similar nature will help increase education and awareness of heritage issues and processing at the District, especially as new staff members are hired. This inter-departmental discussion will ultimately help streamline the public's interaction with the heritage permitting process.

#### *Conservation of Heritage Sites*

The following set of municipal recommendations concern the physical conservation of heritage resources. One way to show leadership on the topic is to ensure that legally protected heritage resources have adequate heritage management documentation in place, including Conservation Plans. This will confirm that these important resources are effectively maintained for the continued enjoyment of the community. Another way to signal the District's renewed heritage focus is to consider using Community Amenity Contributions (CAC) for heritage conservation projects. This will align heritage conservation with other community-wide planning goals and provide financial assistance that is vital to the continued conservation of some of the District's most important heritage resources.

#### *Partner Relationships*

Consultation with the North Vancouver Museum & Archives (NVMA) revealed that there are challenges with the District's awareness and perception of the institution. There is an overall desire to revive the relationship such that the NVMA is better understood as a community service. Their mandate, resources, and holdings are essential to the Heritage Program, and there are opportunities to increase staff and Council education regarding the exciting role the NVMA plays as the safe keeper of District history and culture. Staff and Council tours of the facility on a regular basis would be a step in the right direction of encouraging a more robust working relationship with the NVMA. Other community partners, including NSH and the ACDI should also continue to be consulted on heritage issues, when possible.

*Heritage Register Evaluation*

Based upon best practice, values-based heritage management models (see the **Values-Based Heritage Management** section of the **Heritage Strategic Plan (HSP) Supporting Documentation Report**), the evaluation system should be updated for sites that are eligible for inclusion on the Heritage Register. The current evaluation system dates to the 1980s and is numerically based and additive, meaning sites must earn points in multiple categories to achieve a score high enough to be considered for addition to the Heritage Register. Best practice dictates that heritage values should be self-sufficient, meaning that a site can be considered for addition if it ranks particularly high in any one category. A new evaluation methodology will require a separate initiative by the District, supported by HAC. As municipalities move away from numerical, additive systems to values-based frameworks that encompass a much greater variety of heritage values (beyond the traditional and formerly primary heritage value of architectural style), there is an opportunity to demonstrate a broader civic view of what is considered heritage. The same system can also be used to evaluate properties that are being considered for removal from the Heritage Register. In this situation, a registered Heritage Professional should review relevant research information and conduct a Heritage Assessment, which analyzes heritage values. This information can then be provided to the District/HAC to make a final decision on removal.

Finally, there are recommendations for Heritage Program components that are included in other sections of this report, such that, when implemented together, will make a major, positive impact on the District’s heritage management. Ranging from increased building accessibility to a robust incentive program, the District stands to greatly benefit from a recommitment to heritage.

	<b>Strengths</b>	<b>Weaknesses</b>	<b>Opportunities</b>	<b>Challenges</b>
<b>Civic Heritage Leadership</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The four-decade foundation of the city’s heritage conservation activities and the Heritage Register communicate to the public that heritage conservation is a civic priority</li> <li>• Community partners, such as the NVMA, NSH, and ACDI support the heritage planning function at the District</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not enough heritage planning capacity at the District</li> <li>• Coordination of heritage issues across District departments not as efficient and effective as it should be</li> <li>• Relationship between District and certain community partners not as robust as it could be</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Resource/fund a full-time Heritage Planner</li> <li>• Hold bi-annual or quarterly meetings between departments that deal with heritage permits, projects, and outreach</li> <li>• Prepare Conservation Plans to ensure the continued, long-term maintenance of legally protected heritage resources</li> <li>• Consider using CAC funds for heritage conservation projects</li> <li>• Work with NVMA to reinvigorate relationship, beginning with Staff and Council tours of the facility</li> <li>• Study a new heritage evaluation system for addition to/removal from the Register</li> <li>• Continue working with NSH and ACDI</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited resources for these initiatives</li> </ul>



## 2.2 HERITAGE PLANNING INITIATIVES

One of the most effective strategies to ensure that heritage has been effectively considered by the District’s Planning Department is the preparation of a Historic Context Statement/Thematic Framework. This overarching planning tool communicates the most important historic forces at play over the course of a municipality’s development, and distills them into a thematic grouping of heritage sites, both already identified and to-be identified. Heritage Register sites across the District would be better understood in the continuum of the community’s history and sites that were not traditionally considered ‘heritage’ would be better captured and evaluated for their cultural significance. The preparation of these reports also assists the District in moving to a best-practice model of values-based heritage management since they lay the foundation for the renewed evaluation and identification of heritage resources, which has been identified as a District priority. See the **Values-Based Heritage Management** section of the **HSP Supporting Documentation Report**, for additional information on Historic Context Statements and Thematic Frameworks.

Additionally, as Town/Village Centre Plans are updated across the District, there are opportunities to further integrate heritage into the process by preparing neighbourhood-level Historic Context Statements/Thematic Frameworks. Historic neighbourhood narratives can also be explored through a variety of innovative ways, such as oral history projects. Lost heritage features, such as the streetcar network, can be recalled through interpretation projects that add a colourful layer of placemaking (capitalizing on local inspiration and potential, with the intention of creating memorable public spaces) across the District. This work should proceed in partnership with the North Vancouver Museum & Archives and other community stakeholders. Grants may be available for certain projects.

Heritage Planning Initiatives	Strengths	Weaknesses	Opportunities	Challenges
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Heritage Planning role in the District is understood as a crucial partner to the overall planning process</li> <li>• Heritage linkage with placemaking initiatives</li> <li>• North Shore Cultural Mapping Project underway</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The lack of a Historic Context Statement/Thematic Framework makes it more difficult to effectively capture the full variety of sites in the District that are valued for their heritage and/or culture significance</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prepare District-wide Historic Context Statement/Thematic Framework in order to move the District toward a best-practice, values-based heritage management model (See <b>Appendix C</b>)</li> <li>• Consider neighbourhood-level Historic Context Statements/Thematic Frameworks as Town/Village Centre Plans are updated</li> <li>• Continue to explore a variety of initiatives that link heritage with neighbourhood planning</li> <li>• Work with NVMA on oral history projects</li> <li>• Link Heritage Register sites with the North Shore Cultural Mapping Project</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Significant resources required (time/budget) to adequately fund these reports and projects, however grants may be available</li> </ul>

### 2.3 ZONING BYLAW

This bylaw regulates the development of property in North Vancouver by encouraging land use and building according to community goals and visions for the future of the city and its neighbourhoods. Provisions under the Zoning Bylaw may be relaxed where requirements would result in unnecessary hardship in carrying out the restoration or renovation of a heritage property. Alternatively, Heritage Revitalization Agreements can vary the provisions of the Zoning Bylaw for the purposes of preserving a heritage resource for the benefit of the community. Heritage buildings are particularly impacted by the following zoning considerations.

#### *Stratification/Multiple Dwelling Units/Adaptive Reuse*

The Heritage Register resources of North Vancouver are primarily composed of single-family residential buildings. There are instances where a more flexible attitude toward the application of single-family zoning regulations for certain heritage resources may be appropriate. When the long-term economic viability of a single-family heritage resource is threatened, the District could explore options related to the number of units or uses permitted. Single-family neighbourhoods are not always equipped or supportive of alternative uses or living arrangements, however, when the community benefits of heritage preservation are effectively communicated to neighbours, these alternatives may find better collective support. A potentially lower-impact strategy could be to explore the stratification of infill/coach houses.

#### *Density/Form of Development*

Density increases and/or the addition of an infill building are some of the most appealing benefits that can be offered to heritage retention projects. The extra time and costs involved in heritage conservation projects can be partially offset by offers of extra density and/or the permission to construct an infill building on the property. However, there are challenges to these policies that can often derail a conservation project. There is an opportunity to consider exempting the basement spaces on heritage properties to incentivize the retention of the primary heritage building on the site.

Zoning Bylaw	Strengths	Weaknesses	Opportunities	Challenges
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HRA incentives already available for heritage conservation projects (as described in the <i>Local Government Act</i>)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rigidity of single-family zoning regulations can present challenges to the long-term viability of certain heritage resources</li> <li>• Not all heritage properties are adjacent to a lane, which can better enable infill development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Flexibility in certain zoning regulations have the potential to offer additional incentives for heritage retention projects (including stratification [especially infill]; exclusion of infill basement space in FSR calculations; and relaxation of lane requirement for infill buildings on heritage properties</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Zoning incentives may not be as enticing as they can be in an extremely active real estate market</li> </ul>

## 2.4 BRITISH COLUMBIA BUILDING CODE

Building Code upgrading is the most important aspect of heritage building rehabilitation, as it ensures life safety and long-term protection for the resource. It is essential to consider heritage buildings on a case-by-case basis, as the blanket application of Building Code requirements does not recognize the individual requirements and inherent performance strengths of an existing building. A number of equivalencies have been adopted in the *British Columbia Building Code* that enable more sensitive and appropriate heritage building upgrades; a heritage building is defined as either a designated site or one included on a Heritage Register. As example of a Code equivalency is the use of sprinklers in a heritage structure to satisfy fire separation and exiting requirements.

Given that Code compliance is such a significant factor in the conservation of heritage buildings, the most important consideration is to provide viable economic methods of achieving building upgrades. In addition to the equivalencies offered under the current Code, the District can also accept the report of a Building Code Engineer regarding acceptable levels of Code performance.

The primary issue with alternative methods of heritage compliance with the Building Code is the challenge ensuring all approving staff are fully aware of the alternatives. Confusion regarding the alternatives can delay heritage projects, or worse, lead to the unnecessary destruction of heritage character-defining elements or the heritage values of a site.

	Strengths	Weaknesses	Opportunities	Challenges
<b>British Columbia Building Code</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Code exemptions, equivalencies, and alternative compliance methods better facilitate heritage conservation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not all relevant departmental Staff (Building Inspectors, Engineering, etc.) may be aware of the alternatives for compliance</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased education and awareness of alternative methods of compliance for heritage buildings</li> <li>Consider involving Building Inspectors early in heritage building permit discussions to avoid surprises when an Inspector visits a heritage building that has alternatively complied with the Code</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site level implementation – each heritage site is different and achieving the conservation goals of certain projects can be challenging from a regulatory perspective</li> </ul>

## 2.5 HERITAGE PROCEDURE BYLAW

The District's Heritage Procedure Bylaw was adopted in 2012. The bylaw authorizes the Chief Building Official to withhold the issuance of a permit or approval that would negatively affect the heritage value of a building or structure (e.g. building or demolition permit), and directs the Chief Building Official to bring the matter to Council for consideration of the need for a heritage inspection, extending the temporary protection, or providing continuing protection. If a Heritage Register property owner applies for a permit that may impact the heritage value of the property, staff should suggest the property owner obtain a Statement of Significance (SOS) from a registered Heritage Professional. The SOS helps staff, HAC, and Council understand the level of heritage significance and will help determine if and what aspects of the property should be preserved and how the property can be altered in a way that is sympathetic to the understood heritage values of the site. There is also the potential to use a *Heritage Assessment* as the first

step of understanding a heritage site; this report can often be constructed more quickly than an SOS, thereby saving valuable time within the permitted review period.

The temporary protection enacted for Heritage Register properties while sympathetic redevelopment schemes are explored is considered a valuable tool in the ongoing conservation of the District’s heritage resources. This bylaw could eventually be made even more effective by including additional heritage procedures, such as Heritage Revitalization Agreements and heritage designation/protection, in order to consolidate the District’s official heritage procedures in one convenient location. The District should also review and consider formally adopting the Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada (Parks Canada, 2010). This will ensure that overarching, consistent conservation standards are applied to all heritage projects.

	Strengths	Weaknesses	Opportunities	Challenges
<b>Heritage Procedure Bylaw</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Demolition delay procedures help ensure alternatives to demolition of heritage buildings are considered before a demolition permit is granted</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada not formally adopted as overarching conservation guide for the District</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Include all applicable heritage procedures in a single bylaw, not just situations in which permits can be withheld</li> <li>Provide a package of more transparent and accessible heritage procedures</li> <li>Consider Heritage Assessments as precursors to Statements of Significance to expedite heritage reviews of a temporarily protected sites</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Staff time and resources would be required to undertake the expansion and amendment of the bylaw</li> </ul>

## 2.6 HERITAGE ALTERATION PERMIT PROCEDURE BYLAW

The District currently does not have a Heritage Alteration Permit Procedure Bylaw. However, under the Local Government Act, once a property is legally protected, substantial changes or any alteration to the identified heritage characteristics of the property requires a Heritage Alteration Permit (HAP) which outlines the process that legally protected heritage properties must follow to ensure their heritage values and character-defining elements are maintained through any proposed alterations to these properties.

	Strengths	Weaknesses	Opportunities	Challenges
<b>Heritage Alteration Permit Procedure Bylaw</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Outlines procedure for obtaining Heritage Alterations Permits</li> <li>Increases District transparency regarding heritage property procedures</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None identified</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Solicit feedback from heritage property owners on the effectiveness of the District’s communication and application of the Bylaw</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None identified</li> </ul>

## 2.7 HERITAGE PROPERTY STANDARDS OF MAINTENANCE BYLAW

A Heritage Property Standards of Maintenance Bylaw could be considered to provide an extra layer of oversight for legally protected properties. The bylaw outlines minimum requirements for maintenance to ensure heritage values are upheld, and prevents the deterioration of important heritage resources through neglect.

	Strengths	Weaknesses	Opportunities	Challenges
<b>Heritage Property Standards of Maintenance Bylaw</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Encourages (protected) heritage property owners to maintain their properties and helps avoid deterioration of heritage resources due to neglect</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Can only apply to legally protected heritage properties</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is a potential to enact the bylaw as an extra layer of oversight for the District's most important heritage resources</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Enforcement may pose challenges to staff, and may require additional resourcing</li> </ul>

## 2.8 HERITAGE CONSERVATION AREAS

The option to enact Heritage Conservation Areas (which do not currently exist in the District) is available through the *Local Government Act*. The District could consider studying certain areas. Heritage Conservation Areas signal strong community and municipal support for an important, historic period/type of development in the District. The process of defining and enacting a Heritage Conservation Area requires a substantial public consultation process that can often be contentious, however when community buy-in is achieved, such an area often becomes known as one of the most valued in a municipality.

	Strengths	Weaknesses	Opportunities	Challenges
<b>Heritage Conservation Areas</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Places heritage conservation at the forefront of neighbourhood development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ample study time/funding required to plan future Heritage Conservation Areas</li> <li>Lengthy (and often contentious) notification and public consultation process required when areas considered</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The existence of Heritage Conservation Areas sends a strong municipal message that certain areas of heritage resources are important for the entire community</li> <li>Heritage Conservation Areas have the potential to become one of the most valuable communities in a municipality</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Potential neighbourhood opposition</li> <li>Potential for legal challenges</li> </ul>

## 2.9 HERITAGE INCENTIVE PROGRAM

Incentives generally fall into three categories: *Financial, Developmental and Administrative.*

Current District financial incentive programs for building conservation work (exterior only) are focused on a small granting program (maximum \$500 per grant; total 2018 grant program budget was \$3,167, as part of a fund with a July, 2018 market value of \$60,575). Provincial and Federal funding has been largely withdrawn or reduced over the past decade and has not been extended to houses, which are the vast majority of the resources on the District’s Heritage Register. Therefore, the maximum \$500 grants are often the only financial incentives available for most sites.

Based upon a review of municipal best practices across the Lower Mainland and further afield, a healthy level of funding that should be available for financial incentives roughly equates to \$1 per resident, per year. With more than 85,000 people (2016 census), a budget of \$100,000 would be effective for the District to offer a reliable source of heritage conservation grants for the entire community. This budget will also need to include administrative fees, namely to cover the costs of the body charged with the award of the grants. Again, based upon municipal best practice, the establishment of a Heritage Foundation is likely to generate the greatest return on investment, since such an organization is able to fundraise and increase the endowment. A Heritage Foundation was recommended as part of the previous Heritage Strategic Plan and its feasibility was studied at that time. A renewed study would need to unfold, based upon contemporary circumstances, however, there are local precedents, namely the Vancouver Heritage Foundation that can serve as a model for the establishment of a new foundation in the District.

See the ***Heritage Conservation Incentives*** section of the ***HSP Supporting Documentation Report***, for a full report on heritage incentive programs and models.

	Strengths	Weaknesses	Opportunities	Challenges
<b>Heritage Incentive Program</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Existing granting program is a way to indicate the District is working to offer financial incentives to heritage property owners</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Small dollar figure available per grant unable to effectively stimulate property owners to undertake more costly heritage conservation projects</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Study feasibility of new Heritage Foundation that would serve as ideal grant administrator</li> <li>Identify \$100,000 budget to serve as reliable, yearly source of heritage granting funds; Heritage Foundation would be able to further increase endowment through fundraising</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Substantial time and resources necessary to establish new foundation</li> </ul>

### 3.0 ENQUIRY AND APPLICATION PROCESSING

#### 3.1 HERITAGE ENQUIRY PROCEDURES

The process for fielding enquiries regarding heritage properties (those properties listed on the Heritage Register or the Heritage Inventory) can be improved. Additionally, the public and internal flagging system for these properties can be improved to provide early and consistent information to property owners.

There are opportunities to ensure heritage (and potential heritage) status is understood at the beginning of the enquiry process. An alternative flagging mechanism in the municipal database will help front-line employees communicate heritage status if an inquirer is not aware. Promoting heritage site information on the District’s GIS map (GEOweb and GEOTools) will also help increase awareness of heritage (and potential heritage) status before an enquiry makes its way to the District Hall. Once property owners understand a site’s heritage/potential status, a more formalized approach to the enquiry can unfold, with information regarding the necessary heritage documentation (Statement of Significance, Conservation Plan, Heritage Revitalization Agreement, Heritage Alteration Permit, etc.) that will be required for a repair or redevelopment project.

	Strengths	Weaknesses	Opportunities	Challenges
<b>Heritage Enquiry Procedures</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Heritage site information is available, it is just not as transparent as it could be</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lack of strong database flagging system for property heritage status</li> <li>Formal architectural drawings required for preliminary application, before heritage value of site fully understood</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Institute better enquiry flagging system for heritage properties (Heritage Register/Heritage Inventory) in the municipal database</li> <li>Involve Development Planners in heritage property enquiry process</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development Planner enquiry time and resources will need to be balanced with preliminary applications</li> </ul>

**3.2 HERITAGE SITE APPLICATION PROCEDURES**

The application process for heritage sites in the District does not currently incentivize owners to consider heritage retention projects. Heritage permit applications are not standard and therefore require special handling; this may be considered a disincentive, as it adds time, and therefore cost, to the process.

There is an opportunity to flag certain heritage site retention applications such that they are available for priority processing. Combined with a more transparent enquiry process where heritage values are better understood at the beginning of a site redevelopment exercise, heritage permits are more likely to proceed through the municipal approval process in an expedited manner if each department is made aware of the special handling required for these permits. Building on the need for increased internal awareness and education regarding the exemptions, equivalencies, etc. of heritage projects, District Staff can be better equipped to process heritage permits more effectively and efficiently. A reduction in processing time would be considered an incentive for owners to maintain heritage resources. Further incentives for heritage projects can be considered, such as a reduction in permit fees.

Heritage Site Application Process	Strengths	Weaknesses	Opportunities	Challenges
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Heritage retention projects qualify for certain site relaxations, exemptions, and code equivalencies that make this type of project attractive</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lack of departmental staff awareness and education regarding the special handling necessary for heritage permits</li> <li>No incentives in place for heritage permit applications</li> <li>Increased processing time for heritage permits</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Flag permits as 'heritage' in permit intake system to alert all departments to the special handling required</li> <li>Better educate departmental staff of the relaxations, exemptions, and equivalencies available to heritage projects</li> <li>When processing times are reduced for heritage permits, note this fact as an incentive for heritage projects</li> <li>Consider permit fee reductions for heritage projects</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased departmental staff awareness and education will take time and resources</li> <li>Permit fee reductions for heritage projects will reduce District revenue</li> </ul>



# PUBLIC CONSULTATION SUMMARY

The Heritage Strategic Plan included the following public and stakeholder engagement process:

*Phase 1: Understanding community perspectives and experiences*

- District of North Vancouver staff workshop
- Meetings with the Community Heritage Advisory Committee (HAC)
- Stakeholder consultation:
  - North Shore Heritage (Preservation Society)
  - North Vancouver Museum and Archives
  - North Shore Advisory Committee on Disability Issues
- Public online questionnaire (34 participants)
- Public open house (18 participants)

*Phase 2: Develop and refine the draft plan*

- Meeting with the HAC
- Stakeholder workshop (17 participants [5 of the 17 participants also attended the Phase 1 public open house])
- Public online questionnaire (23 participants)
- Stakeholder consultation:
  - Youth (3)
  - Parks and Natural Environment Community Advisory Committee
  - Heritage homeowner/developer (1)

*Phase 3: Deliver final plan for Council consideration:*

- Meeting with the HAC
- Meeting with and presentation from Tsleil-Waututh Nation
- District Council workshop
- Regular District Council meeting

The following section includes summarized public and stakeholder feedback, and is organized by phase of consultation.

## 1.0 PHASE 1 CONSULTATION

The first phase of public consultation for the Heritage Strategic Plan included one Open House on April 11, 2018, and an online questionnaire, available from April 12 to 28, 2018. 18 people attended the Open House and 34 people completed the online survey.

Invitations to the Open House and online questionnaire were sent by mail to all heritage inventory and Heritage Register property owners, as well as promoted online and through email notification. The District Heritage Strategic Plan website also provided access to all available materials (<https://www.dnv.org/property-development/heritage-strategic-plan>), including the questionnaire.

Phase 1 feedback from the stakeholder consultation with the North Shore Advisory Committee on Disability Issues is included in ***Accessibility Recommendations, page 37.***

## 1.1 OPEN HOUSE

### OPEN HOUSE FORMAT

The Open House was held at the North Vancouver Archives in Lynn Valley. The purpose of this event was to seek feedback from the community regarding the preparation of a Heritage Strategic Plan and to gauge community interest in, support for, and awareness of the District's Heritage Program in general.

The Open House format consisted of a series interactive presentation boards, which attendees could review at their own pace, and engage with District staff and the consultants.

### RESULTS OF THE OPEN HOUSE

#### **Places of Significance**

Open House attendees were given the opportunity to annotate a large map with their 'favourite places and buildings of significance in the District'. Interestingly, only 12 of the 40 suggested places were physical buildings, the remainder being made up of natural and First Nations sites (11), roads, trails, and industrial places (11), and intangible heritage including people and events (6).

#### **Definitions of Heritage**

Different types of heritage places were pictured and attendees were asked to mark the images that they 'considered to be heritage'. The number of votes broke down as follows:

- [two versions of] early-twentieth century houses: 9 and 8 votes
- mid-twentieth century house: 8 votes
- Cates Park and the working waterfront: 7 votes
- 'Grandpa Capilano' tree: 6 votes
- Deep Cove streetscape: 6 votes
- Lynn Canyon suspension bridge: 4 votes
- Cleveland dam: 3 votes

When asked if there was anything that was considered heritage that was not included in the photos, attendees mentioned logging artefacts/history and Lynn Valley.

#### **Heritage of the District**

Attendees were asked to comment on the aspects of the District's history in which they were most interested. Participants mentioned fish/fishing, trees, waterways, a strong need to preserve and protect built heritage, and the visual and non-visual history of North Vancouver (including logging).

#### **Knowledge of the Heritage Program**

This board asked attendees to gauge their knowledge on the various assets of the District's Heritage Program (on a scale of 1 to 4, with 4 being defined as 'have participated/read document'). Attendees were most aware of the Heritage Register, Heritage Awards, and Community Heritage Grants, respectively. They were least aware of the Heritage Inventory and Heritage Modern Inventory and Heritage Revitalization Agreements, respectively.

When asked what attendees thought was most important for the District to focus on, the following responses were recorded:

- preservation of more heritage resources: 12 votes

- maintenance of historic neighbourhood identities: 11 votes
- integration of heritage conservation into more community planning efforts: 11 votes
- increasing the storytelling about heritage resources and community history: 8 votes
- increasing awareness of heritage resources in the community: 6 votes
- creating more opportunities for community heritage celebration: 5 votes

### **Appreciation of Heritage**

Attendees were asked to vote on issues that could increase appreciation of the District's heritage. The votes broke down as follows:

- maps illustrating locations of heritage resources: 11 votes
- interpretative signage along walking paths: 10 votes
- plaques in front of heritage resources: 8 votes
- community events celebrating heritage and history: 7 votes
- public tours of heritage resources: 6 votes
- community workshops on heritage topics and programs: 4 votes
- public art focused on community heritage and history: 2 votes

When asked what other initiatives might increase awareness or appreciation of the District's heritage, attendees mentioned displays of local heritage at public events and contacting people who have memories of early North Vancouver history.

### **Incentives**

Finally, attendees were asked to vote on the incentives they think would encourage more people to preserve their heritage properties and for the most part, all incentives were supported. The votes were as follows:

- permit fast-tracking for heritage retention projects: 13 votes
- property tax relief/rebates for heritage properties: 12 votes
- increased yearly grants for exterior maintenance of heritage properties: 10 votes
- relaxed subdivision and coach house guidelines involving retention of heritage properties (setbacks and parking requirements): 9 votes
- extra density available for heritage retention projects: 7 votes for and 1 vote against

## ***1.2 ONLINE QUESTIONNAIRE***

To elicit additional feedback, an online survey was posted on the project website and 34 people participated. The questions aligned with those asked at the Open House.

### **RESULTS OF THE ONLINE QUESTIONNAIRE**

#### **Places of Significance**

Of the 11 responses that were received, natural places received 3 votes while buildings, including Edgemont Village, received 8 votes total.

#### **Definitions of Heritage**

Several examples of different types of heritage places were pictured and respondents were asked to mark the images that they 'considered to be heritage'. The votes were:

- 'Grandpa Capilano' tree: 26 votes
- [two versions of] early-twentieth century houses: 26 and 23 votes
- Lynn Canyon suspension bridge: 25 votes
- Cates Park and the working waterfront: 24 votes

- Deep Cove streetscape: 23 votes each
- Cleveland dam: 15 votes
- mid-twentieth century house: 12 votes

When asked if there was anything that was considered heritage that was not included in the photos, respondents mentioned more natural heritage, neighbourhoods and communities, streetscapes, infrastructure and built features (including the horse trough at the corner of Mountain Highway and Lynn Valley Road), the grid-system, archaeological sites, and waterfronts.

### **Heritage of the District**

Respondents were asked to comment on the aspects of the District's history in which they were most interested. There was mention of natural history and interpretive walks, people, the lifestyle of the North Shore, parks, old buildings, the stories associated with the early history of the area, logging, First Nations history and traditions, maritime history, the history of planning, mountaineering history, and the 'small town feeling' of the District.

### **Knowledge of the Heritage Program**

Participants were asked to gauge their knowledge on the various assets of the District's Heritage Program (on a scale of 1 to 4, with 4 being defined as 'have participated/read document'). Most awareness was indicated regarding the Heritage Register, Heritage Awards, and Community Heritage Grants, respectively, and the least awareness surrounded the Heritage Inventory and Heritage Modern Inventory, and Heritage Revitalization Agreements, respectively.

### **Appreciation of Heritage**

Respondents were asked to vote on issues that could increase appreciation of the District's heritage. The tally below indicates which suggestions were selected for their ability to offer 'much greater appreciation.'

- plaques in front of heritage resources: 7 votes
- maps illustrating locations of heritage resources: 6 votes
- interpretative signage along walking paths: 6 votes
- public tours of heritage resources: 6 votes
- community events celebrating heritage and history: 3 votes
- community workshops on heritage topics and programs: 3 votes
- public art focused on community heritage and history: 2 votes

When asked what other initiatives might increase awareness or appreciation of the District's heritage, respondents mentioned:

- storytelling
- nature walks
- performances
- interpretation at events
- sustainable educational programs
- additional media coverage, including getting the word out to realtors, developers and potential home owners
- more attention from the District on heritage issues and the protection of heritage sites
- school programs
- increasing laws on preservation
- interactive online tools
- celebration of design

- bringing back heritage features (like the streetcar)
- integration of heritage appreciation into existing programs

Additionally, events that promoted heritage were mentioned, including Heritage Days and Culture Days, the heritage home tour, the heritage awards ceremony, tours at Lynn Valley Park and the Shipyards (featuring actors), and *North Shore News* articles.

### **Incentives**

Finally, participants were asked to vote on the incentives they think would encourage more people to preserve their heritage properties. All incentives were generally supported. The votes were as follows:

- permit fast-tracking for heritage retention projects: 24 votes
- property tax relief/rebates for heritage properties: 23 votes
- increased yearly grants for exterior maintenance of heritage properties: 19 votes
- relaxed subdivision and coach house guidelines involving retention of heritage properties (setbacks and parking requirements): 16 votes
- extra density available for heritage retention projects: 10 votes

## **2.0 PHASE 2 CONSULTATION**

### *2.1 STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOP*

During a workshop on September 19, 2018 held at the Lynn Valley Community Recreation Centre, seventeen participants had small group discussions about the draft vision, goals, and actions. Participants included heritage property owners, a heritage developer, and representatives from the following organizations: Community Heritage Advisory Committee, North Shore Advisory Committee on Disability Issues, OCP Implementation Monitoring Committee, Parks and Natural Environment Committee, North Shore Heritage Preservation Society, North Shore Wetland Partners Society, North Shore Stream Keepers, North Vancouver Community Arts Council, North Vancouver Recreation Commission, Inter River Community Association, and Seymour Community Association.

#### ***Feedback on Vision***

- Extensive – includes natural heritage
- Could think about how to better incorporate First Nations heritage
- Does not talk about fostering appreciation
- More focus on identity – who we are – where we have come from
- Include reference to budget allocation
- No reference to intangibles – all cultures that make North Vancouver
- Keep vision high level
- Include all citizens – First Nations/Chinese/others
- Vision excellent - like “foster”
- Distinction between ‘invite’ and ‘make welcome’ First Nations –consider whose land this is
- Add tangible/intangible in front of “cultural resources”

#### ***Feedback on Goal #1***

**Question #1: What questions, issues or concerns about this goal and associated actions do you think need to be considered?**

- Heritage Value: - consider official definition from Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada: the aesthetic, historic, scientific, cultural, social or spiritual importance or significance for past, present and future generations. The heritage value of an historic place is embodied in its character-defining materials, forms, location, spatial configurations, uses and cultural associations or meanings.
- Better process includes priority staffing, etc.
- Include specific definition of timeframes and actions

**Question #2: What was your biggest takeaway from the first round (Question #1)? How can that apply to this goal? What do we still need to know, learn about or consider?**

- Intangible heritage
- Public education
- Definitions
- How do we analyze?
- Implementation targets?

- Need more definitive actions (especially Actions 1.2 and 1.4)
- Funding
- Protection
- Economic, social, cultural, and environmental heritage
- Top-down approach (starts with council)

### **Feedback on Goal #2**

#### **Question #1: What questions, issues or concerns about this goal and associated actions do you think need to be considered?**

##### Heritage Education

###### Who?

- Youth (Capilano University Film Program, Kingfisher Club)
- Children
- Adults
- Seniors
- Tourists
- New Citizens
- Awareness – more than just a website – creating interest

###### What?

- Buildings; Art Gallery
- Future Heritage Protection
- Watersheds (Integrated Stormwater Management Plan)
- Importance of creeks/rivers/parks/conservation areas
- Stories/sites

###### Where?

- List of key sites of importance
- After School Programs (Moodyville)
- Curriculum from kindergarten → university
- Make exciting! (competitions)
- Storytelling (puppet theatre)
- Public Art
- Linking Organizations
- Communication (websites)
- Art Workshops
- Photograph workshops
- Hop On/Off Bus/Boat
- Walking Tours/Events
- Cultural Maps

###### Issues

- North American heritage is seen as “new” compared to the rest of the world
- Communicate why it is important to conserve

###### Ideas

- Natural Heritage
- List of Native Plants (and values/locations)

- Best practices
- List of Heritage Trees/Stumps – 2012 Report to Council – submitted by Parks Adv. Committee
- Bald Eagle Maps
- Reach members of the public

**Question #2: What was your biggest takeaway from the first round (Question #1)? How can that apply to this goal? What do we still need to know, learn about or consider?**

**Built Heritage and Education**

- Address development pressures
- DNV permit processing times are slow
- Restoration better than redevelopment/demolition (for sustainability)
- Campaign/incentives to promote heritage resources (from DNV)
- Easy “How To” Fact Sheet for Homeowners to better navigate the DNV Heritage Process
- Simplified Policies/Processes
- Educating DNV staff on Heritage Process and exemptions and value of Heritage
- Youth – engaging in Heritage research projects and (Action 2.3) 2.2 connecting organizations
- Heritage Fair – connect with CNV, DNV, NVMA
- Organize ALL Heritage Resources and make them accessible; connect resources (Culture Map)
- Action 2.8: Tours – connect with Cultural Map
  - In person
  - Led by stories/personal connection
- CNV – Good Heritage Plaque program
- Need more funding/sponsorships
- Could expand plaque program from homes to streetcars
- Tangible and intangible sites recognized by plaques
- Coordinate efforts with Heritage BC
- Heritage Site Markers
- Link Accessibility and Education
  - More than just a website
  - Consider all disabilities (blind, deaf, language barriers, etc.)

**Question #3: What changes would you recommend? What needs our immediate attention?**

**Street naming**

- Innovate ideas
- Engage youth

**Maplewood Conservation Area:**

- Integrate with developments in Maplewood to ensure ecological protection
- Consider native plant studies in Maplewood



- Prevent fragmentation of habitats
- Awareness of developers

**Build Awareness:**

- Areas that need protection (DNV)
- Endangered plants?
- DNV understanding of Heritage resources

**Public Art:**

- Identifying/celebrating unique local features/sites

**Connecting environmental protection with HAC:**

- Consider expanding committee members to include:
  - Environmental sector reps.
  - Cultural reps.
  - Artists
  - Museum reps.
- Organizational Map and Roles
- NVMA
- NS Heritage

**Education**

- K-3 – presentations
- Storytelling
- Curriculum Development
  - Framework needed
  - How best to create?
  - What to include?
- Funding
  - NS News, Articles, Educating council
- Criteria
  - Consider existing curriculum
  - Social studies programs
  - Include non-tangible heritage
- Keeping it fun!/Celebrate
  - Walking tours, mountain biking tours
  - Birdwatching
  - Acting
  - Integrating play
  - Youth and ensuring sustainable

**Additional Signage**

- Coordinate between CNV, DNV and DWV
- On bike trails

**Role of DNV?**

Heritage grants

Link heritage with climate change

New Tech

- Apps
- Audio programs with info on art/heritage
- QR Codes

Schools

- Afterschool/learning program/NV Rec

Key Organizations

- Lynn Valley Services
- Elders Council for Parks
- First Nations
- MW Conservation Areas
- Ecology Centre
- North Shore Heritage
- NVMA
- NV Arts
- NV Rec and Culture
- Community Associations
- NS Wetland Partnership
- NS Streamkeepers
- Heritage Committee
- NS Advisory Committee on Disability
- Heritage Restoration Company
- NS Black Bear Society
- Old Growth
- Lighthouse
- Parks Advisory Committee
- CNV, DWV

***Feedback on Goal #3***

**Question #1: What questions, issues or concerns about this goal and associated actions do you think need to be considered?**

- Are people aware of accessible heritage resources that already exist?
- Do people know how/where to access ramps/elevators that already exist?
- Make sure staff are aware of how to accommodate people
- Idea: make a list of accessible resources
- ACCESSIBILITY FOR ALL; not just wheelchairs (e.g. high contrast signage, tactile letters, braille, etc.)
- Set the bar high, but through implementation understand things may not be perfect
- Language can be more accessible to a variety of people who speak different languages

- Consider a fund for venues to translate their didactic descriptions/signs
- Produce a list of committees people can contact for accessibility concerns (e.g. disability, heritage, etc.)
- Checklist of things to think about - including how to make things accessible both online and physically
- Advocate to change building code at provincial level
- Leverage innovative technology to make things accessible
- Include an icon on cultural map that shows which features are accessible (consider varying degrees of screen legibility)
- Increasing accessibility of information will increase appreciation
- Italicize signage to help mark natural and cultural heritage (and built heritage that includes more than residential sites)
- Public art pieces can lead you into accessing heritage information
- Consider hiring an accessibility/disability consultant

**Question #2: What was your biggest takeaway from the first round (Question #1)? How can that apply to this goal? What do we still need to know, learn about or consider?**

- Leverage storytelling to make history more accessible and understandable for people
- Leverage non-profit resources for others to organize a tour (maybe once a year) that's accessible (e.g. for the deaf/blind) so we can make the best use of DNV resources
- Ensure natural areas are accessible while also ensuring that we don't trample/ruin these resources (consider conservation as part of/balance it with accessibility)
- For sites that are popular (e.g. Grouse Grind) be sure to consider how we can preserve environmental conservation, preservation, and environmental sustainability
- Better, more accessible signage, but it's a balance; too much signage can be bad in its own way
- Also, have information on signs listed elsewhere maybe one central place for heritage information
- Heritage map with all of the resources
- Use 360 degree cameras to create digital tours of places so people can "see" it even if it's not "physically" accessible
- Within urban parks, make sure pathways are safe/accessible/wide enough/made of materials that are easy to walk on/there are ramps
- Build paths; tactile path signage
- Ensure conservation of riparian areas while making things accessible
- Hunter Park and Donovan Pond – Lynn Valley needs more information – no one knows about the history

**Question #3: What changes would you recommend? What needs our immediate attention?**

- Increase knowledge of variety of types of heritage (especially mid-twentieth century)
- Make heritage adaptable as needs change
- How can we make heritage houses accessible for ageing in place while preserving the heritage?

- Updating plumbing, adding an elevator??
- Provide clarification to people about what they can and can't change to make these homes more accessible/updated
- Priority: improve audio resources (different languages and for people who are blind)

#### ***Feedback on Goal #4***

#### **Question #1: What questions, issues or concerns about this goal and associated actions do you think need to be considered?**

- Standards of Maintenance
  - Neglect of heritage properties
  - Relation to grants for maintenance
- Slow permit approval process - heritage projects placed behind multi-family applications (and inter-department coordinating issues)
- Fast-tracking as incentive for heritage projects
- "Heritage pod" at DNV –staff expertise from different departments on heritage process
- Actions biased toward built, not natural, heritage
- Should be district-wide inventory of natural heritage
- Support for Action 4.9: use of CACs for heritage
- More details needed on what "incentives"
- Support for coach houses at heritage sites (including those without lanes)

#### **Question #2: What was your biggest takeaway from the first round (Question #1)? How can that apply to this goal? What do we still need to know, learn about or consider?**

- Tax break for heritage properties that will be restored
- Heritage property ownership considered a burden
  - Takes more money, more time to restore heritage building than to build new
- District must offer financial incentives/grants to encourage properties to be restored
- Heritage designation viewed as a negative
- More valuable incentives
- Lack of connection between owners/developers and heritage of DNV

#### **Question #3: What changes would you recommend? What needs our immediate attention?**

##### **Incentives**

1. Property tax break (credits for restoration)
2. Fund dedicated to exterior/streetscape improvements – increase property value – perhaps a competition?
3. Existing grants not enough to make serious financial dent in projects – onerous application process

##### **Porous land**

- Incentives for property owners
- Connection to streams

- Reduces flood risk

#### Lynn Creek

- Not enough funding streaming toward its conservation – consider community partners, such as port, for funding
- More people translates into more use
- Erosion issues
- Education opportunities – why do we want to conserve the creek?

More awareness around why natural heritage/features are important in community

Action 4.1 – Need action word – allocate staff resources

Action 4.6 – Supported; can grants be used for events, not just building projects

Action 4.10 – Need more communication to public from district and more district staff awareness of these exemptions

#### **Feedback on Goal #5**

##### **Questions #1 to #3:**

- Identify the documents already existing in First Nations communities
  - Municipal efforts to do so
  - First Nation records of their cultural history
  - Designate a liaison with First Nations (if attendance not possible)
- Create a singular location for plans and policies
- Action 5.3 – be more proactive – identify and review plans and policies (TC/VC) for future insertion of heritage goals (By keeping a running list)
- Work with HAC
- Include definitions in Heritage Strategic Plan and other plans (especially if integrating into other plans)
- Not just DNV plans, but also fitting in with museums and archives
- Broaden scope – definitions provide clarity
- Age limits on “Heritage”
- How do we protect other “Heritage” resources e.g. public art
- Ensure “language” is identified as a heritage resource throughout all plans and policies – e.g. First Nation language, Japanese Canadians
- Ensure the definitions are consistent (e.g. “cultural” should mean the same thing in all plans and policies)
- Define and identify and provide clarity on how First Nations history is captured within scope of the Heritage Strategic Plan (e.g. archaeological significance of pre-contact sites)
- Not ‘multi-cultural’ – they are the first people and should be recognized as such

#### **Plenary Discussion**

##### **What stood out from table discussions? What collective insights have emerged?**

- Natural heritage – climate change impacts

- Super grand plan, but questions about funding resources and commitment
- Ensure implementation and council support
- Focus on allocation of budget to recognize heritage
- Improved signage/history of building view, situates where you are educated public heritage
- Provincial parks – metro
- How is this plan linked to CNV/DWV heritage plans/policies?
- Is there \$ allocated in DNV budget for heritage conservation/education?
- Small grants/HAC budget indicate diminished priority DNV places on heritage
- DNV should consider:
  - Finance incentives
  - Development permit fast-tracking
  - Administrative incentives
  - Larger grants than \$500

### **Other Notes**

Consider multiculturalism

Land based vs maritime history

Celebration through story and dramatization, including indigenous perspectives

Today is tomorrow's heritage

Adjustments to plan:

- Aspirational implementation
- Inclusion of First Nations

Historical use/function of buildings revealed by narrative from seniors, newspaper archives

1. Value: function in communities memories, legacy
2. Financial value to community of heritage conservation, tourism, commerce

Concern for mid-century heritage

## **2.2 SMALL GROUP/ONE-ON-ONE STAKEHOLDER MEETING**

### **Meeting #1 (heritage property owner/developer): October 1, 2018**

- At the outset of a project it would be helpful to receive an estimated timeline for both the HRA process, and any subsequent steps
- Building code exemptions under the provincial legislation understood and championed by staff, where applicable
- Meetings with the community and neighbours are helpful
- Heritage projects/preservation could be encouraged more if (1) opportunity to expedite, (2) have clear communication about process and timelines, (3) DCCs are reduced or waived, (4) policy requirements (e.g. storm water) are grandfathered in if project takes a long time and policies change
- Recommend maintaining one development planner throughout process

### **Meeting #2 (One Youth [over age 18]): October 3, 2018**

- Happy to see that intangible heritage is included in the plan
- Feels there should be more focus on partnership building, including partnerships with NVMA
- Additional funding to NVMA could increase hours of operation to be more accessible to youth (outside of school hours)
- Need to further define what a heritage values-based approach is: e.g. could it include unique, but not necessarily 'aesthetically' the most prestigious buildings such as the Vancouver special houses, or stories that are about specific places? Whose values are they? Are they collective values?
- Experiences volunteering at NVMA are that people typically want to engage with history as it relates to them- most often ancestry.
- Thinks that heritage homes are in part significant because of the inherent value of knowing the history of the place before you arrived. In the world today, and in Canada specifically, there is not much that has a mark of continuity
- Under goal #3 accessibility: to further make NVMA more accessible it could be that weekends are free, and it is free to students
- Plaques with audio could be developed beside heritage resources
- Distinguish between legislative actions and others that are focused on partnerships (e.g. education)
- Action 5.6: need to explain the practical benefit of connection to education
- Action 5.3: need to expand on and further describe
- Action 2.6: Important! Make it stand out what people are willing to invest in.

**Meeting #3 (Two Youth [under age 18]): October 12, 2018**

- Understanding history helps communities move forward
- Shipyards, NV is a good example of storytelling
- Stories about people's culture and languages being taken away (such as First Nations) should be told
- Learned from a school research project that there are a lot of important trees, but not all are labelled.
- Action 1.5: What does it mean to 'identify additional sites'?
- Action 2.2: NVMA has resources, but if your class uses NVMA depends on who your teacher is
- There should be more information/marketing to social studies teachers
- Could put up a poster/information board about volunteer opportunities
- More field trips and tying archival research into class projects
- NVMA and DNV should visit classes
- Action 2.4: Idea to do projects that grab people's attention such as an Instagram picture. Idea to use the area where filming was done to draw in people with pictures or signage opportunity- to get people engaged and inform more people
- Actions 2.3 and 2.7: Same
- Action 3.4: Let schools know about project. Wondering more information about this map- is it printable? Can it be printed like a book? Can input audio into maps?
- Schools have 'collaboration days' where people could come to present for an hour (occurs every six weeks)
- Action 4.3: Clarify that it's flagging in a computer system
- Goal 2: Suggested partnerships with Grouse Mountain, Capilano Suspension Bridge
- Goal 5: Why Upper Lonsdale? Need more explanation

- Develop a Youth Council e.g. West Vancouver Youth Fine Arts Council

## 2.3 ONLINE QUESTIONNAIRE

### ONLINE QUESTIONNAIRE AND RESPONSES

To elicit additional feedback, a second online questionnaire was posted on the project website and 23 people participated. The questions focused on the draft vision, goals, and actions. Note that not all 23 respondents answered all questions in the questionnaire.

#### **DEMOGRAPHICS**

Do you live in the District?

Yes: 17

No: 2

Do you own a heritage property?

Yes: 10

No: 9

What is your age group?

19-35: 3 people

36-50: 5 people

51-60: 5 people

60-65: 2 people

Over 65: 5 people

#### **GOAL #1 INSTITUTE A VALUES-BASED APPROACH TO HERITAGE MANAGEMENT (21 RESPONSES)**

On a scale of 1-5 (1 = not correct/effective at all, 5 = correct/effective), ranking the efficacy of Goal #1 and its associated Actions:

- Rank of 1: 0 votes
- Rank of 2: 1 vote
- Rank of 3: 3 votes
- Rank of 4: 5 votes
- Rank of 5: 11 votes

Some of the comments regarding Goal #1 and its Actions:

- Please be inclusive of pre-colonization, First Nations influences and early-days contributions of various immigrant groups
- Great job. This would have to be done in collaboration with the DNV Parks Department who has the same goals of protecting and preserving natural heritage landscapes and have done an amazing job so far.
- The District needs to also consider early structures that are not currently on the Register, as some may have been overlooked due to lack of knowledge about them.
- I was overjoyed to see that the DNV is at last taking an interest in recognizing natural heritage. For the last two decades I have been advocating for recognition and protection of three such areas on DNV land with little success. The areas are:
  1. The Mosquito Creek old-growth forest.
  2. Roche Point Forest and Roche Point Creek.



3. Significant trees and groves on DNV land.

- The timeline is concerning. Little in the plan has a timeline less than 3-5 years. That is an eternity with the rate of development. How much will be left to save in 5-10 years?
- How are you going to establish which groups of trees or views or sites are culturally significant? Are you working with environmental groups? Are you working with neighbourhoods? Are you looking at the environmental classifications?

**GOAL #2 INCREASE HERITAGE EDUCATION AND AWARENESS  
(20 RESPONSES)**

On a scale of 1-5 (1 = not correct/effective at all, 5 = correct/effective), ranking the efficacy of Goal #2 and its associated Actions:

- Rank of 1: 2 votes
- Rank of 2: 2 votes
- Rank of 3: 3 votes
- Rank of 4: 3 votes
- Rank of 5: 10 votes

Some of the comments regarding Goal #2 and its Actions:

- I am an owner of a mid century Register property. No one understands current lack of protections. Everyone who asks is shocked that we could knock this house down if we want. It seems there is a widespread appetite for protection. Real estate profits are a HUGE factor in the barriers facing heritage protection. Agents need to be a major part of the re-education plan. Everyone tells us that if we voluntarily designate, we will lose lots of money when we go to sell. But is there any proof of this? Why does everyone believe this?
- Excellent. There are so many cultural and natural heritage groups on the North Shore that could be networking with each other programming, events, workshops and sharing information.
- All good things to do, but will you really reach out to many people this way? If your goal is to truly increase awareness how do you get a flag on a Google map?
- The proposals are too vague. It's not clear what you actually plan to do.
- Education is very hard to do in this context. Incorporating heritage into the operations of DNV would do a lot to emphasize the "specialness" of heritage sites. Hosting events in heritage homes, celebrating these places will raise awareness.
- There is a huge gap in knowledge about this issue. Prospective buyers of properties have a hard time finding out about this. Realtors are ignorant and probably prefer to stay that way, as the term heritage is seen as something that scares buyers off.
- As a general rule, I believe that private industry should be encouraged as much as possible in order to foster a strong public awareness of heritage. Some museums/archives on the North Shore receive as little as 2% of their budget from fundraising.
- Even if the site is not a Heritage property, there is so much history on each property that it would be very valuable to have all properties receive information about what was on their land prior to today. We live near Cates park and keep finding things in the garden like pieces of clay pottery and big wooden blocks. It would be great to learn more about what was in our location in the past 100 years. We don't know where to start on this.
- I do not think this is a valuable use of the District's money.

**GOAL #3 MAKE HERITAGE MORE ACCESSIBLE  
(20 RESPONSES)**

On a scale of 1-5 (1 = not correct/effective at all, 5 = correct/effective), ranking the efficacy of Goal #2 and its associated Actions:

- Rank of 1: 1 vote
- Rank of 2: 0 votes
- Rank of 3: 3 votes
- Rank of 4: 4 votes
- Rank of 5: 12 votes

Some of the comments regarding Goal #3 and its Actions:

- There is lots of work to do in getting the population interested and invested in heritage preservation and value.
- Opportunities online.
- This sounds very good.
- As I mentioned in the point, celebrate these places, encourage accessibility -- plaques, awards, hosting events, make these places important to the operations of the District.
- As much detailed information as possible should be digitized about heritage sites, cultural traits such as dialect, or archival material. The Dictionary of Canadianisms on Historical Principles is an example of this.
- Can more information be added to the Museum and Archives online database? Can more information be searchable through a regular Google search? Can the information you do find on line be well organized and easy to view with good links to related data?
- Again, I do not think this is a good use of the District's money.

**GOAL #4 INCREASE PROTECTION OF THE DISTRICT'S BUILT HERITAGE, AND  
NATURAL AND CULTURAL LANDSCAPES  
(20 RESPONSES)**

On a scale of 1-5 (1 = not correct/effective at all, 5 = correct/effective), ranking the efficacy of Goal #2 and its associated Actions:

- Rank of 1: 3 votes
- Rank of 2: 1 vote
- Rank of 3: 1 vote
- Rank of 4: 5 votes
- Rank of 5: 10 votes

Some of the comments regarding Goal #4 and its Actions:

- There is lots of work to be done in this area. As a register-property owner (mid century) - and speaking to others in the same boat - we feel somewhat like martyrs and philanthropists in the choices we make to preserve our homes. Financial implications (for owners) are a huge factor. In a nutshell, this is the question we are faced with when we eventually sell: How much money will it take for us to sell to a developer vs. a heritage advocate who wants to live in and maintain the home? Would we take a 200K hit? a million? Difficult decisions for one family to make. Having some support on our side (including financial incentives) would be a huge benefit to preservation.
- Currently, ownership of a heritage designated building is considered a negative - the district should, through incentives etc., change this to be a positive label. This would encourage long-term investment by private stakeholders.

- Help owners of "heritage" properties (not just those on the Register) preserve their homes by offering tax incentives/grants.
- While policies, guidelines and bylaws are being "developed and analyzed" heritage properties will be lost. Demolition of any place or structure that may even possibly be of heritage value should be stopped until these policies, guidelines and bylaws are set
- Help owners of "heritage" properties (not just those on the Register) preserve their homes by offering tax incentives/grants. For example, home over a certain age should automatically qualify for an additional homeowner grant due to the additional cost of maintaining such properties. This could also serve as an incentive to maintain rather than demolish, thus sending less waste to the landfill.
- While policies, guidelines and bylaws are being "developed and analyzed" heritage properties will be lost. Demolition of any place or structure that may even possibly be of heritage value should be.
- There were a lot supportive statements in the objectives, but nothing really results oriented.
- The District needs to work harder on actual investment in identifying and proactively engaging with property owners. This needs to be economically viable and we need to make this something that speeds things up for owners, rather than bogs them down.
- Define natural and cultural landscapes. Is Quarry Rock such a landscape and if so - is protecting it, simply protecting that portion of park land or are you protecting the view of it from Gallant Avenue and if so what does that mean for redevelopment.
- Protecting heritage homes is a poor use of resources, and retains inefficient housing at the cost of building denser housing that is better for the environment and more affordable.

**GOAL #5 CONNECT HERITAGE WITH OTHER DISTRICT POLICIES AND PLANS  
(20 RESPONSES)**

On a scale of 1-5 (1 = not correct/effective at all, 5 = correct/effective), ranking the efficacy of Goal #2 and its associated Actions:

- Rank of 1: 1 vote
- Rank of 2: 0 votes
- Rank of 3: 1 vote
- Rank of 4: 6 votes
- Rank of 5: 12 votes

Some of the comments regarding Goal #5 and its Actions:

- Sounds good.
- Get the developers on board.
- Connect with schools as well
- Will help to have these sites included (and supported) through District planning.
- As noted in another section, the rate of development is considerable. It is noted that midcentury buildings are under threat.
- Tied to the education goal, it would be great to have more signage about "what was in this location before" - historical snapshots in time, all throughout the district and trails.

**Do you have any other thoughts you would like to share about heritage in the District?**

- I've been involved in this issue, more or less, over the last 20 years... I am glad to read of these initiatives but so far I've been underwhelmed by the district's attention to the alarming loss of heritage homes. I do hope this signals a real change in investment in this important topic.

- It is unfortunate that we have lost so many of our lovely old homes to developers. There must be some way of preserving these and still using the large lots they stand on
- Thank you for reaching out to the community!
- Current property taxes encourage the tear down of heritage houses. The problem is that property taxes are based on the assessed value of the property, not on the value of the house itself, e.g., many heritage houses have an assessed building value of only 10%-20% of the assessed property value due to them being a small house on high-value land. This is not uncommon for old heritage houses that are relatively small for the size of the lot. Hence one unintended consequence of property taxes is that they treat an old 2 bedroom heritage house almost the same as a monster 10 bedroom house on the same lot if the land value is high, hence this tax encourages the tear down of old small houses such as mine, heritage or otherwise.

If the district really wants to protect heritage houses, it should either exempt houses on the Heritage Register from property taxes, or at a minimum, base the property tax on the percentage of the assessed value of the building versus the assessed value of the property. It would probably be easier from an administrative view to just exempt them from property taxes. This would also encourage people to put their houses on the Heritage Register and protect them.

- The District needs to act to stop the senseless destruction of perfectly good homes, buildings and parks. Our heritage is disappearing is so fast we cannot keep up with the losses. The waste of resources and materials is a disgrace. The sense of community is being eroded with every demolition/new anonymous cube home that appears.
- Heritage in the District is not just about a structure here or a place there. It is more also about protecting areas and neighbourhoods and many of these are already gone.
- Glad the DNV is reflecting on this topic, but alas many places have already been lost. The critical mass of important sites may have vanished, leaving a hard to support patchwork of sites left. It might be too late.
- I own a heritage property so this is of concern to me. I believe the District of North Vancouver is a unique place but with the rate of development, determining what we want to retain is needed now. Taking a fresh look at heritage preservation is needed.
- I support heritage conservation and increasing appreciation for what makes our community special. But I also recognize that buildings and structures age, and that landscapes are impacted by storms and pests.
- This is a wonderful project and needs to be advertised more. There is so much history and knowing the heritage of the place where you live, work and play is superbly important for connecting the community not only to its roots but to itself.

# ACCESSIBILITY RECOMMENDATIONS

The Development and Inclusion Subcommittee of the North Shore Advisory Committee on Disability Issues (ACDI) was consulted in person on April 5, 2018. Specific issues, related to accessibility standards of heritage sites and heritage information, were discussed. The Subcommittee of the ACDI prepared the following recommendations, along with their rationale.

Specific Recommendation From ACDI	Reason for Recommendations from ACDI
<p>Priority is having access to heritage buildings/sites including entrances, bathrooms and interior spaces as much as possible.</p> <p>If exterior paths are created to provide access, consider having these paths covered so that the journey to an “alternate” accessible entrance is not even more inconvenient or a cause of additional barriers.</p>	<p>People with disabilities would like to be able to enter and enjoy heritage buildings/sites</p>
<p>Physical Signage: there are many options for physical signage that can be considered to increase accessibility, including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Placing physical signs as close to sidewalks as possible.</li> <li>2. Placing signage so that it is close to average eye level. Approx. 5 foot 3 to 5 foot 5.</li> <li>3. Have high contrasted signage, 70% contrast (dark letters on a light background or vice versa) Black on White, White on Black: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clear fonts (like Arial) are considered the easiest to view;</li> <li>• Large and clear <b>bold</b> lettering – the bolder the easier to see.</li> </ul> </li> <li>4. Braille signage could be considered.</li> <li>5. Tactile TEXT letters should be highly considered and can be combined in use with the high contrast bold text mentioned above. This type of information will mean that any tactile letters should be placed a tad lower than average sight level, something closer to 5 feet at the highest point. This should not disrupt the readability of any other user.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. This is best for all members of the public to be able to read the signage without stepping onto private property, in the case of personal homes that may have heritage plaques/signage available.</li> <li>2. This will help people with low eyesight to best be able to get close and view the text/photos. All other user groups should still be able to read comfortably.</li> <li>3. For the best visibility of people who have partial sight</li> <li>4. Braille is that first language of people who are born without sight or lose sight at an early age.</li> <li>5. Tactile raised letters are read by finger touch by those who cannot read Braille and by those who usually lose their sight later in life. Those who read Braille usually cannot read tactile TEXT letters and vice versa.</li> </ol>

Specific Recommendation From ACDI	Reason for Recommendations from ACDI
<p>Digital Access to Information:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Consider having a phone app that someone could download to access digital information on the go, as they come across a heritage site in their neighbourhood.</li> <li>2. Information should be available on all municipal websites and the website should be W3C compliant.</li> <li>3. Consider digital virtual tours on the exterior and interior of heritage buildings/sites. Tours should have described video and closed caption services (DVS and CC).</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. More and more people with disabilities are gaining access to smart phones as an accessibility tool.</li> <li>2. W3C is information for website programmers and guidelines for accessibility. Much of it is about labelling and programming headings for access to screen reading programs used by people who are blind/partially sighted.</li> <li>3. Virtual tours can be accessed by everyone and are great for people with mobility disabilities who may not be able to get out of their homes. This user group would like to experience heritage properties the same as everyone else.</li> </ol>

Also see the ***Accessibility for Historic Places*** (Heritage BC, November 2018) report, linked to in the ***HSP Supporting Documentation Report***.