

**HERITAGE ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
September 27, 2006  
MINUTES**

**PRESENT:**

Mr. Tom Creighton, Chair  
Ms. Andrea Arbic, Vice Chair  
Councillor Dawn Sloane  
Councillor Bob Harvey  
Mr. Clarence Butler  
Mr. Elias Metlej  
Mr. Mark Pothier  
Mr. Paul Shakotko  
Mr. Bill Mont

**REGRETS:**

Ms. Dianne Marshall  
Mr. Paul MacKinnon (absent)

**STAFF:**

Ms. Maggie Holm, Heritage Planner  
Mr. Bill Plaskett, Heritage Planner  
Ms. Stephanie Parsons, Legislative Assistant

**Table of Contents**

1.	CALL TO ORDER .....	3
2.	APPROVAL OF MINUTES - June 28, 2006 .....	3
3.	APPROVAL OF THE ORDER OF BUSINESS, ADDITIONS AND DELETIONS .	3
4.	BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES .....	3
5.	DEFERRED BUSINESS .....	5
5.1	Heritage Incentives Program .....	5
6.	CORRESPONDENCE, PETITIONS & DELEGATIONS .....	7
6.1	Correspondence .....	7
6.2	Petitions .....	7
6.3	Presentations .....	7
6.3.1	HRM Civic Addressing Corrections Group re: Street renaming proposed names .....	3
7.	REPORTS .....	7
7.1	H00192: Request for approval of alterations to 5221 Spring Garden Road (St. Mary's Basilica), Halifax .....	8
7.2	H00189: Request for approval of alterations to 46 Dahlia Street, Dartmouth .....	8
8.	ADDED ITEMS .....	8
9.	DATE OF NEXT MEETING .....	8
10.	ADJOURNMENT .....	8

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

The Chair called the meeting to order at 3:15 p.m. in Halifax Hall, 1<sup>st</sup> Floor, City Hall.

**2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES - June 28, 2006**

**MOVED by Councillor Sloane, seconded by Councillor Harvey that the minutes of June 28, 2006 be approved, as circulated. MOTION PUT AND PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**3. APPROVAL OF THE ORDER OF BUSINESS, ADDITIONS AND DELETIONS**

Deletions:

1. Approval of the August 23, 2006 minutes.
2. Item 7.1
3. Item 7.2

Move item 6.3 to be the first order of business.

**MOVED by Councillor Sloane, seconded by Mr. Butler that the agenda be approved as amended. MOTION PUT AND PASSED.**

**4. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES - NONE**

**6.3.1 HRM Civic Addressing Corrections Group re: Street renaming proposed names**

- A document entitled Heritage Names for Streets dated September 27, 2006 was before the Committee.

Ms. Donna Davis, Division Manager, Data/Business Information Management Shared Services addressed the Committee and advised of the following:

- HRM is in the process of improving its civic addressing process;
- Part of the process is renaming and renumbering streets;
- The focus is on changing street names where there may be public safety concerns;
- They are requesting the assistance of the Committee in identifying names that have heritage value;
- There is a complete list of street names on HRM's website;
- The goal is to not duplicate street names;

- Those residents affected by a street name change will be notified next month;
- A long term goal is to draft a consistent commemorative name policy.
- Today's mission is to request HAC to offer suggestions for our current project in the urban core.

The Committee offered the following suggestions:

- Mayors and any person who have made great contribution to their community should be considered for a commemorative name;
- That staff make a presentation to the Urban Design Task Force, Heritage Trust, District 12 PAC and the Community Councils for suggestions;
- Review the names on the plaques of heritage properties and consider the original owners names.

Responding to Councillor Harvey, Ms. Davis advised that Sackville will be reviewed in May 2007.

Mr. Metlej advised that the trend is to avoid naming schools after people because you do not want to name a school after a person that may have a bad history. If you are going to use some person name that person should be deceased for a long time.

Ms. Davis advised that it is an important consideration. However, staff is currently operating without policy and the choosing of a name is a discretionary decision. Criterion is needed to select appropriate names.

In response to Comments by the Committee Ms. Davis advised of the following:

- Streets are currently named by developers. The question is, does the municipality feel strongly enough to implement a policy that would require a portion of the street name to be historic;
- They are trying not to retire historic names, if the street is discontinuous they would maintain the historic name and retire the other, the historical significance of the name would have to be considered.

In Ms. Davis's concluding remarks she advised the Committee to forward their suggestions to Ms. Gayle Maclean, Civic Address Corrections Technician.

The Chair requested that this item be added to the next agenda.

The Chair advised the Committee that applications are now available for membership if your term has expired members will have to re-apply.

## 5. DEFERRED ITEMS

### 5.1 Heritage Incentives Program Review

- A staff report dated August 23, 2006 regarding the Heritage Incentives Program was before the Committee.
- A document entitled Heritage Incentive Program for Commercial Development was circulated to the Committee.
- A draft minute extract of the August 23, 2006 meeting was circulated to the Committee.

Ms. Holm provided an overview of the Heritage Incentive Program for Commercial Properties report and noted the following:

- Staff is requesting that a Building Conservation Plan be provided from an architect to describe the existing conditions of building and to prioritize the restoration/repair work required;
- This requirement will assist staff in justifying an expenditure of taxpayers' money;
- A facade drawing will be required for one time grant applications,
- A Building Conservation Plan will be required for work more than \$5000.

Responding to questions of the Committee staff advised of the following:

- All applications would be received once a year, there will be more applications than funding,
- The applications will be evaluated and ranked against a list of priority criteria. The conservation plan will assist in ranking the applications;
- The recommendation is to eliminate the distinction between commercial and residential buildings;
- Staff has determined that there is no relevance in the distinction; the overarching idea is to make funding accessible to all heritage property owners;
- Any funds not used by commercial applications will be made available to residential applications.

Mr. Shakotko and Mr. Pothier expressed the following concerns:

- A requirement for a Conservation Plan may be a barrier to those who want to register heritage properties;
- The requirement for a Conservation Plan creates another level of bureaucracy;
- A professional architectural drawing is not required to evaluate the property;

- A property owner should not be required to spend funds in advance for a program they may not receive funding from;
- Most applications are for roof or window repairs.

Responding to comments made by Mr. Shakotko and Mr. Pothier staff advised of the following:

- The requirement for a Conservation Plan maybe seen as a disincentive however, it may provide the applicant with access to a larger pool of funds;
- The funds need to be distributed equitably and there need to be checks and balances in spending taxpayers' dollars;
- The expenditure of funds is to obtain professional advice on the best approach to restore the property and determine what should be fixed first;
- The registration of a property is a commitment in recognizing the heritage value;
- It is assumed that the owner intends to protect the property for present and future generations;
- Assistance is also available from the province for Conservation Plans,
- It is staff's opinion that a requirement for a Conservation Plan is reasonable.

Staff further suggested that the Conservation Plan requirement be removed and included as part of the priority criteria. Those applicants who see the value in a Conservation Plan will receive a higher priority.

Further discussion ensued, while the Committee agreed that this was a better option, concern was expressed that an applicant who can afford a Conservation Plan would receive a higher ranking, while another applicant whose property requires more significant repairs and cannot afford a Conservation Plan would receive a lower ranking.

Staff advised that only applications more than \$5,000 would require a conservation plan, and that a facade improvement drawing will also be required.

Mr. Elias Metlej, pointed out:

- Page 4 of the staff report, item five, states that Building Conservation Plans should be required for all residential and commercial heritage incentive applications, where the cumulative grant value exceeds \$5000. This means that an application can be received in year one for \$2000 and in a few years the applicant may put in an application for \$4000 for other work. This would be more than \$5000 cumulatively and would still require the applicant to provide a Conservation Plan.
- The requirement for a Conservation Plan prepared by an architect is too strict and expensive,

- A Property Inspector can provide pictures and an explanation on the condition of the building as well as an engineer;
- He suggested that the wording be open to persons other than a professional architect;
- A facade drawing should not be required for work such as repairing a roof or painting.

Councillor Sloane suggested that the distinctions between residential and commercial properties be put back in and only require a conservation plan for commercial buildings.

Mr. Bill Mont entered the meeting at 4:05 p.m.

Further discussion ensued and the following was noted:

- That HRM inspectors be used to conduct a cursory overview of the property based on pre-established criteria and submit a report to staff;
- This allows HRM to control the process as you do not know who the applicant is going to hire and avoids adding any additional cost to HRM and the applicant.
- It was suggested that an application for a conservation plan not be counted as a grant.
- In reference to the facade drawings, it was suggested that it be open to a reasonable illustration of the work required of the site, which can include photographs.

**MOVED by Mr. Butler, seconded by Councillor Sloane that the Heritage Advisory Committee recommends that Halifax Regional Council, commencing in 2007, restructure the Heritage Incentive Program in accordance with the Revised Terms of Reference outlined In Attachment "D" with the following amendments:**

- 1. Delete the requirement for a Conservation Plan for applications more than \$5000**
- 2. Add as part of the Priority Criteria:  
" Preference will be given to those applications supported with Conservation Plans"**
- 3. Delete the requirement for a Conservation Plan or Facade Improvement Drawing to be prepared by an accredited architect;**
- 4. Include a statement indicating that the Conservation Plan may be prepared by an architect, inspector or engineer or any other qualified restoration consultant;**
- 5. Include a statement requiring that the facade drawing be a reasonable illustration or photograph of the work required for the site.**

**MOTION PUT AND PASSED.**

**6. CORRESPONDENCE, PETITIONS & DELEGATIONS**

**6.1 Correspondence - None**

**6.2 Petitions - None**

**6.3 Presentation**

This matter was dealt with earlier in the meeting see page 3.

**7. REPORTS**

**7.1 H00192: Request for approval of alterations to 5221 Spring Garden Road (St. Mary's Basilica), Halifax**

Deleted from the agenda during the approval of the order of business.

**7.2 H00189: Request for approval of alterations to 46 Dahlia Street, Dartmouth**

Deleted from the agenda during the approval of the order of business.

**8. ADDED ITEMS - None**

At this time a discussion ensued and Mr. Shakotko suggested that a subcommittee be formed to create a list of heritage buildings that the Committee would like to see registered. He noted that at the present time there is not a convincing argument to expand the program.

Staff advised that the direction of the Regional Plan is to move towards a heritage district approach, however this does not preclude individual designations.

The following was noted by the Committee:

- The Committee should be proactive in educating individual owner and communities in the heritage value of registering their properties;
- A student from the universities could do the research as a project;
- Staff will research what information is available from the province and HRM;

Mr. Butler volunteered to work with Mr. Shakotko to create a list of unregistered heritage buildings and report back to the Committee.



9. DATE OF NEXT MEETING - October 25 2006

10. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:35 p.m.

Stephanie Parsons  
Legislative Assistant