

LACH

Planning and Policy Subcommittee Report – July 3, 2014

At its meeting of July 3, 2014 the Planning and Policy Subcommittee discussed the following matters for consideration by LACH:

Present: Derek Dudek (chair), Heather Garrett, Jim Cushing, Kira Westby

Absent: Stephanie Potter, Greg Thompson, Wes Kinghorn

1. The London Plan - draft

The P&P subcommittee discussed the heritage planning policies in the draft London Plan found in Sections 630 – 686 and recommends the following changes and/or clarification from City planning staff through follow up discussions:

- a. Policy 630 – Add the word “**artifacts**” after books. ... whether it’s the furnishings in a living museum like Eldon House, Tempo VII, weapons in the RCR Museum, a pioneer diary, bone dominoes from the Fugitive Slave Chapel site or projectile points excavated at the Lawson site, artifacts are tangible heritage elements that help tell the story and enhance our understanding of our past.
- b. Policy 632 – In consultation with First Nations Group, replace the words “how our region was first used by indigenous people, and how our city evolved over time” with “**human occupation of our city**”. Current wording suggests indigenous people are no longer involved in our city.
- c. Policy 637 – remove the words “from time to time” and replace with “**as necessary**”. Current wording is too vague.
- d. Policy 639 – Recommend using semi-colons or numbering 1-4 the places where a view or vista may be identified. Current paragraph is difficult to read.
- e. Policy 644 – LACH is supportive of this policy but questions the intent of what it is trying to achieve. How is the City intending to implement such protection?
- f. Policy 645 – Delete the portion of the policy starting with “by addressing...”. LACH questions the necessity of including the specific means by which to address impacts. Alternatively, change the section to say “**by completing a Heritage Impact Assessment**”.
- g. Policy 655 – Revise subsection a) under point 2 – Geographic area as follows “Area contains **natural** features **or functions** that make a significant contribution to its heritage character”. Current wording is intended to address natural characteristics of area, but isn’t clear.
- h. Policy 660, 669, 679, 683 – These policies addresses the need for a Heritage Impact Assessment where site alteration or demolition is proposed on lands adjacent to the City’s cultural heritage resources. Nowhere in the plan is the need for a HIA discussed on protected lands or lands identified in the register. LACH suggests wording similar to that found in Policy 645 (on and adjacent).
- i. Policy 663, 672 – Add the words to the end of the paragraph “**and may require that notification be posted on the property where a permit has been received.**” LACH has previously requested of the City that this be made a requirement for permit holders.
- j. Policy 665, 674 – Add the words to the end of the paragraph “; **and the salvage of materials exhibiting heritage value for the purpose of reuse.**” LACH frequently recommends such wording on its recommendations to Council and believes that it contributes to the concepts of sustainability. In addition, LACH requests clarification from the City regarding what becomes of the documentation of lost heritage resources? (owned by applicant, given to City, etc.)
- k. Policy 668 – That subsection 1 be amended by adding the following words at the end of the paragraph “**that contribute to the character of the district**”. LACH believes that there are examples of structures within all the of the HCD’s that are out of character with the broader district and could be removed and replaced by new structures which better contribute to the district.

Subsection 2 in turn be amended by adding the word “**redevelopment**” after the word “infilling”.
- l. Policy 670 – Add “**Part V**” before the words “of the Ontario Heritage Act” for clarity.

- m. Policy 675, 680 – LACH recommends removing the map and specific references to identified HCD's and CHL's as they will evolve over time. Recommend referencing resource where items may be found (Register, CityMap, etc.)
- n. Policy 681 – LACH seeks clarification from the City as to how this policy will be implemented. Is the City intending to implement measures to facilitate preservation of archaeological sites and materials beyond what is required of by landowners and licensed archaeologists?
- o. Policy 682 – That the word “**update**” be inserted following the word “prepare”. LACH is concerned that the wording is too vague and that the current AMP has not been updated in over 18 years, despite the recommendation within the AMP itself that it be updated on a 5 year basis.
- p. Policy 686 – LACH recommends that a new policy be added similar to this policy, or that this policy be expanded, recognizing the importance of consultation with other stakeholder groups (cultural, ethnic, religious) that may arise on a site-specific basis.
- q. Policy 1343-1345, and 1437 – LACH recommends that more direction be given to the requirements of a Heritage Impact Study. This could be done by expanding on the policies of 1343 – 1345, and/or by developing or adopting a detailed Guideline Document to be included under the Cultural Heritage section of Policy 1437.

THAT LACH approve the proposed changes to the draft London Plan and forward to forward to the City, care of Heather McNeely, for consideration, noting that LACH may have additional comments as The London Plan moves forward through consultation.