



CHOnews

QUARTERLY PUBLICATION OF COMMUNITY HERITAGE ONTARIO/PATRIMOINE COMMUNATAIRE DE L'ONTARIO

ONTARIO HERITAGE CONFERENCE 2019



Guided Tour of Marine Harbour
Photographs: Jan Hawley



IN THIS ISSUE

Ontario Heritage Conference 2019	1	More Ontario Heritage Conference 2019	10
President's Message	2	Understanding the Role of Municipal Heritage Committees	11
The White House—265 St. David Street, Stratford	3	News from the Board of Directors	11
Conference Highlights from a Student's Perspective	6		
A Cemetery Symposium in Rideau Lakes	8		

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE



Bill 108—Amendments to the Ontario Heritage Act

On Thursday June 6, 2019, the Ontario Legislature passed Bill 108. Once the Bill is proclaimed, it will, among other matters, amend the Ontario Heritage Act (OHA) in ways which will have a considerable impact on the operations of municipalities and their heritage advisory committees (MHCs) under the OHA. In the brief time that the public had to comment on the proposed legislation, CHO/PCO submitted a response suggesting constructive changes to the Bill – to no avail. Our requested changes to the Legislature on Bill 108 can be found on the CHO/PCO website.

One of the most significant changes requires that all appeals under the OHA be made to the Local Planning Appeals Tribunal (LPAT) rather than the Conservation Review Board. LPAT will hold a hearing reconsidering all evidence a municipal council considered in making its decision under appeal. Matters that can be appealed to LPAT include designation by-laws, repeal of designation by-laws, amendment of designations by-laws and alterations to designated properties. These are in addition to appeals to remove or demolish structures on designated properties which have always been dealt with by LPAT (formerly the OMB). LPAT has the power to amend Council's decision or to order Council to repeal its decision, including by-laws designating properties. LPAT's decisions are final; they cannot be appealed

Other significant changes include:

- ★ notification of property owners after Council has listed a property within its Heritage Register;
- ★ the right of owners to appeal to Council of their property's listing in the Register; and
- ★ a two-step appeal process for designations for property owners - first to Council on its intent to designate and then to LPAT following designation.

Bill 108 also introduces a number of terms which must be addressed in the various processes under the OHA. These include prescribed: principles, event, circumstance, modifications, information and material, and required steps and actions.

None of these terms is defined in the Legislation; rather they will be defined by OHA Regulation. It is possible that Regulation 9/06 will be changed. CHO/PCO has been advised by provincial staff that there will be an opportunity for public comment on the proposed Regulations. Stay tuned as the definitions will have an important impact on municipal actions taken under the OHA.

Finally Bill 108 introduces new time limits to various OHA processes. Adhering to these time limits is critical to ensuring that municipal actions taken under the OHA are legal.

In summary, passage of Bill 108 means that, under the OHA, heritage conservation is more prescriptive for municipalities. It is essential that MHCs understand and conform to this new legislation. All of this is on a 'go-forward' basis and will not affect existing listings and designations.

The Bluewater/Goderich Conference—Disaster Planning

One important take-away from our successful Ontario Heritage Conference is the impact of disaster planning on the conservation of heritage resources. This includes not only the event itself, such as the 2011 tornado in Goderich, but

CHOnews

SUMMER / ÉTÉ 2019

CHOnews is published quarterly by Community Heritage Ontario.

**Community Heritage Ontario,
24 Conlins Road,
Scarborough, ON M1C 1C3
416.282.2710**

info@communityheritageontario.ca

Contributors permit further copying of their works only for the purposes of educating the public on heritage matters. Copyright remains with the author or creator. Credit must be given to the author or creator and to the source, CHOnews, on all copies made. No work can be reprinted in any published form without permission of the copyright holder.

The content of CHOnews does not contain nor reflect any opinion, position, or influence of the Board of Directors or the Editor.

The financial support of the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport is gratefully acknowledged.

 facebook.com/CHOntario

 twitter.com/CHOntario

ISSN 1201 – 9852



Submitted articles must be in Microsoft Word format. Images must be sent as .jpg attachments in high quality resolution (300 dpi). Do not embed the images in the text of the article. Captions and credits must be provided.

Newspaper articles as updates to MHC activities cannot be used without permission of the newspaper and/or the original author. Text written by the MHC is encouraged.

Articles are published in the language they are received.

municipal protocols dealing with the immediate aftermath (e.g., tarping buildings with damaged roofs to prevent further damage from rain water), and the planning regime, such as heritage conservation district plans, that address reconstruction of severely damaged buildings. An interesting case study was presented by an owner whose one storey building was destroyed by the tornado but he was required to construct a two storey building. The photographs below show a nearby building that was partially damaged but reconstructed. It is important that you examine your municipal disaster plan and protocols to ensure the best outcome for your heritage resources.

Until next time,

Wayne Morgan



Partially damaged 50 West Street, Goderich
Photograph: Bob Davis, 2011



Reconstructed 50 West Street, Goderich
Photograph: Wayne Morgan, 2019

THE WHITE HOUSE—265 ST. DAVID STREET, STRATFORD

PAUL R. KING

Remember going to the eye doctor and being asked by the doctor which image is better (“*this?*” spin the dial or “*this?*”). Well, what about the heritage attributes of buildings?

In Stratford, there is a large red brick heritage home referred to as the White House. The red bricks have been, of course, painted white although the white paint has recently been partially removed making the house look derelict with fragments of the underlying red bricks exposed. The home is a prominent structure on spacious grounds with a circular driveway fronting on St. David Street, a beautiful historic street flanked by a number of 19th century homes. The original house on the property was a one-storey Regency cottage built in 1866 by John Holmes, a well-regarded Stratford contractor, who was responsible for building a number of important heritage buildings in Stratford. The Regency cottage with an added second storey now sits behind the main portion of the White House which dates from the early to mid-1870s when Michael Hayes, City of Stratford Clerk and Attorney, owned the property. In the early 1920s, a towering two-storey southern-styled portico supported by 18 - yes 18 - large concrete pillars was added to the front of the home. [Note: I have not found any clear evidence of construction dates, but assessment records show a substantial jump in the value of the building between April 1871 and April 1876, and then again between September 1919 and September 1920.] The impressive and overpowering portico with its Ionic pillars was unique and iconic in Stratford but it obscured the facade of the impressive Italianate home built in the 1870s.

There have been major controversies about this property over recent years. The house sits on a deep and wide lot (210 feet/64 metres of frontage) spanning the block between two side streets, so the owner applied to sever 3 building lots. He faced protracted opposition from a vocal and organized neighbourhood group. The issue ended up at the Ontario



Stratford White House c.1890s
Photograph: Copy provided by Deb Koch

Municipal Board on May 31, 2016 where the severance applications were denied.¹ Prior to the OMB hearing, the owner threatened to demolish the entire home. The owner never carried through with his threat but he did apply for a demolition permit in order to demolish the iconic portico and pillars. The National Trust for Canada put this property on its 2018 list of the ten most endangered places in Canada. The Stratford Planning and Heritage Committee advised the City Council to designate the property but the Council voted against designation in a 7 to 3 vote.² One of the main reasons voiced by a councillor was that Stratford has an unwritten policy of not designating properties without the owner's consent. This policy is, of course, not in keeping with the provisions of the *Ontario Heritage Act* as supported and confirmed by case law.³ Unfortunately, the matter was never sent to the Conservation Review Board for expert advice about the cultural heritage value or interest of the property. Also, it is clear from Stratford Council minutes that the cultural heritage value or interest of the property was of little concern in the decision against designation. The

minutes of the Stratford meetings reflect an appalling misunderstanding of designation implications and the designation process under the *Ontario Heritage Act*. Given that the Stratford City Council voted against designation, the City was obligated to issue a demolition permit for the portico and the 18 pillars.

This is a critical issue which municipal heritage advisory committees sometimes have to consider. Should later additions to a heritage building be preserved and perhaps be included in a designation statement or should such additions be removed? Some restoration projects have a "terminal date" meaning that any additions after that date are removed. It is one thing if later additions compliment the original structure but what if they do not? Also, later additions are often heritage attributes which add to the cultural heritage value or interest of the property. One example is the pillared portico at the front of Dundurn Castle in Hamilton. It was a later addition in the mid-1850s and it was designed by the architect F.J. Rastrick to compliment the original 1835 building designed by a different architect, namely, Robert Charles Wetherell. Even in that case,

however, some people (e.g. apparently Anthony Adamson) disliked the portico and argued for its removal. A decision was eventually made to keep the portico and set the terminal date for the Dundurn Castle restoration at 1855.



Dundurn Castle
Photograph: Rick Cordeiro, 2008

In the case of the White House, the southern-styled 18-pillared two-storey portico did not compliment the main building but instead hid and overpowered the handsome Italianate home. On the other hand, the original home lacks the eye-popping impression created by the pillars and the portico. Generations of the Walsh family owned and lived in the White House for over one hundred years. I spoke to two members of the family who confirmed that their aunt, Dorothy Walsh, lived in the house in the

- 1 Ontario Municipal Board, Case # PL150859; Decision # 20160025
- 2 Stratford Council May 10, 2018 decision
- 3 *Tremblay v. Lakeshore (Town)*, Ontario Divisional Court, November 2003

Now that the portico has been demolished, the facade of the Italianate home is fully exposed. The portico with its 18 large pillars may have been iconic but it overpowered and hid most of the home's facade. In your opinion, which is better: (i) the home with the portico and pillars; or (ii) the original facade of the home?



Photograph: Jessie B Gussack, 2017



Photograph: Paul R. King, 2019

early 1920s when the portico and pillars were likely added. Dorothy was enamored by the large stately Southern homes when she visited family and friends in Georgia, hence the inspiration for the portico and pillars. I have been searching but have not yet found any further information about the associative value of the pillars and portico. If, as is likely the case, it was Dorothy who decided to build this addition, who were the architect and builder? Was there any consideration of compatibility with the main house? While the pillars and portico were iconic and created a well-known landmark in Stratford, should they have remained and blocked the handsome original facade? After reviewing *The Standards & Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada*, available online, and the criteria for designation under Regulation 9/06 of the *Ontario Heritage Act* set out below, what do you think?

1. *The property has design value or physical value because it,*
 - i. *is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, expression, material or construction method,*
 - ii. *displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit, or*
 - iii. *demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement.*
2. *The property has historical value or associative value because it,*
 - i. *has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization or institution that is significant to a community,*
 - ii. *yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of a community or culture, or*
 - iii. *demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer or theorist who is significant to a community.*
3. *The property has contextual value because it,*
 - i. *is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an area,*
 - ii. *is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings, or is a landmark.*

Provincial Bill 108 (*More Homes, More Choice Act, 2019*), which amends a number of statutes including the *Ontario Heritage Act*, received Royal Assent on June 6, 2019 but only comes into force with respect to the heritage statute on a day to be named by proclamation of the Lieutenant

Governor. Amendments to regulations are to follow so, at the moment, we do not know whether Regulation 9/06 will be amended. We do know that the Conservation Review Board (CRB) will no longer deal with designation issues, which is unfortunate because the CRB was very effective in resolving thorny cultural heritage issues. Any appeals of designation bylaws will be heard by the Local Planning Appeal Tribunal (LPAT) with a return to the same powers as the predecessor planning appeal body, the Ontario Municipal Board. This may well be bad news for cultural heritage because municipal councils will no longer have the final say on individual property designations (as was the case prior to Bill 108) when an appeal to the CRB could only result in non-binding recommendations for municipal council's consideration. To add to the bad news, members of LPAT are not experts in heritage matters, unlike members of the CRB. This provincial paternalistic approach of overriding municipal council decisions is intended to benefit the development community ("more homes, more choice") at the expense of cultural heritage values. As stated in the Building and Land Development Association's (BILD's) recommendations for amendments to the Ontario Heritage Act:

"A significant barrier to the timely delivery of new housing in the province is the current regime for designating and conserving cultural heritage resources, including various processes under the Ontario Heritage Act... Therefore, BILD recommends a more objective and rigorous process for determining cultural heritage value or interest."⁴

The provincial government's consultation document titled "*Increasing Housing Supply In Ontario*" emphasizes quantity (not quality), a faster development process, reducing restrictions, and reducing development costs.⁵ There is, however, no analysis of how to pass any savings on from the development industry to the public. In all likelihood the amendments to the *Ontario Heritage Act* will put a damper on heritage designations especially when property owners oppose designations. Will cost-sensitive municipal councils want to incur potential appeal costs?

In the meantime, municipal heritage advisory committees still have a job to do. Pondering the choices for the preservation of Stratford White House heritage attributes is a valuable exercise.

Paul R. King is the Chair of Finance for CHO/PCO.

⁴ BILD Submission & Recommendations on How to Make Housing Happen – Provincial Consultation on Housing Supply Action Plan – Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing – January 25, 2019

⁵ see www.ontario.ca/housingsupply

CONFERENCE HIGHLIGHTS FROM A STUDENT'S PERSPECTIVE

CAROL-ANN CHEFF

As a student currently enrolled in the Heritage Carpentry program at Algonquin College in Perth, Ontario, the opportunity to travel to Goderich, Ontario for a heritage conference was a chance to learn from experienced heritage consultants, contractors, architects and various community representatives. Before touching on the highlights of the conference, I would like to briefly share a bit about the Heritage Carpentry program.

I am often asked what the difference is between a carpenter and a heritage carpenter. In the Heritage Carpentry program, we learn basically the same skills as a carpenter, and then some. In the first year we learned to prepare foundations, build walls, construct different types of roofs, and install windows and doors, all according to building code standards. In joinery we recreated heritage architectural details like casings, baseboards, crowns, and other decorative moldings. One main difference in heritage carpentry is the focus on heritage structures, their components and how to recreate them using both traditional hand tools and modern machinery. Downtown Perth is a Heritage Conservation District and class walkabouts introduce students to different architectural styles and materials used in heritage buildings. **Standards and Guidelines For the Conservation of Historic Places In Canada** is an important document used in the learning process.¹ Second year students learn traditional timber frame, log building and proceed to larger, more complex joinery skills to produce staircases, windows, doors and columns. So, travel to Goderich was a chance to compare what I had learned in the past ten months with what the conference had to offer.

As I drove along highway 8 toward Huron County, the first regional differences I noticed were the larger farmers' fields and the variety of coloured stones used to build some homes. Upon registration conference attendees were each given a copy of **The Beauty and the Bounty** (2103), a picture book authored by Telfer Wegg, David Bishop and Bonnie Sitter. The book further illustrated regional differences in agriculture, flora, fauna and the community in general.

The conference opened Thursday with a reception at the historic Hensell Heritage Hall. Unfortunately, I arrived too late to attend and instead I took the time to tour downtown Goderich and area. The downtown is unique with its octagonal shape and centrally located courthouse, with streets radiating from the core. According to one local historian, Walt Disney visited Goderich and later based his design for Disneyland on the downtown Goderich plan.

Friday morning the plenary session opened with a brief welcome from the Mayor of Goderich, John Grace, and was followed by Kelly Hill of Hill Strategies Research Inc. Hill's topic was on the research his company has completed on *'Measuring the Economic Impacts of Heritage'*. The statistical data he presented was very easy to understand. What makes Hill's research useful is that it can readily be accessed on his website.² In addition to presenting the economic impacts of heritage activity, Hill also touched on the positive impacts to health as a result of participating in heritage activities and the arts.

The next session I attended was *'Disaster Strikes: Lessons Learned from Post-Tornado Goderich'*. A lead into the panel speakers was a film clip, which depicted the devastation that resulted from the 2011 tornado in Goderich. This clip seemed to set an emotional charge in the room. Not only did this session raise the issues faced directly after the disaster, but the panel also told of the coordination that took place to ensure a speedy recovery. One of the main issues that arose immediately after the tornado was community members not having access to their properties. The question of who has control of a disaster site as clean up efforts ensue is one to consider in Emergency Preparedness planning.



The Livery

Friday's lunch was served at The Livery in downtown Goderich. The Livery, as its name implies, was once a livery stable and is now a designated heritage building owned and operated by the Goderich Little Theatre. The space is used for theatre, film, music, and can be rented for special occasions. The buffet lunch was a pleasant mix of sandwiches and salads. There was enough time after eating

1 see <https://www.historicplaces.ca/en/pages/standards-normes.aspx>

2 see <https://hillstrategies.com/resource/measuring-the-economic-impacts-of-heritage/>

to view the surrounding area before boarding the buses.

Friday's first afternoon session, *'Blowing in the Wind: Designations Versus Industrial Wind Turbines'*, focused on how a heritage designated property could be impacted by wind turbines, and how communities can petition based on heritage status. Heritage status can extend to landscape views and vistas that can be deemed heritage significant. The presenters pointed out that the *Green Energy Act* could pose a threat to heritage communities.

Next topic, *'The Who, What, Where, When, Why, and How of Heritage Contracting'*, was presented by a panel from the Ontario Association of Heritage Professionals. One presenter posed the question "Who thinks you are an expert aside from yourself?". Since Parks Canada no longer has in-house designers, Federal public tenders can be contracted out to companies that have neither knowledge nor experience in following heritage principles. The results are evident in poorly designed additions or changes to buildings that are not in keeping with heritage principles.

Bon Vivant, a local catering company, provided Friday evening's gala dinner. The highlight of the evening was the guest speaker Anthony Wilson-Smith, the President and CEO of Historica Canada. He talked about the making of *Heritage Minutes* and presented some film clips. *Heritage Minutes* are the bite size pieces of Canadian history that document snippets of our country's change through time.

Saturday morning I was able to attend the Community Heritage Ontario Annual General Meeting. There, I was introduced to members and was able to get a sense of its mandate as an umbrella organization. This led into the first session of the morning presented by CHO, entitled *'Orientation for New Members of a Municipal Heritage Committee (MHC)'*. The session covered the role of MHCs, issues to be aware of, developing council and staff relationships, public outreach, listing properties in the Heritage Register and the relevance of Bill 108.

In the following session, John Rutledge presented *'Grist, Rails and Crystals'*. He focused on industrial and agricultural buildings in and around Huron County. Although his focus was regional, the mills, railway lines and stations, and crystal palaces that were built in other parts of the province have some of the same identifying characteristics. For example, heritage mills were always located by a water source that provided power. He also talked about how some of these structures have been converted for modern day use. One example given was the Cow Bell Brewery in Blyth, Ontario that was once a leather factory and tannery.

For lunch that day we were bussed to The Coach House at the Hessenland Country Inn in St. Joseph, Ontario. St. Joseph is noted for being the only community in the region that was settled by French-Canadians. The names of the founding settlers proudly live on within the community.

Following lunch, the afternoon was spent visiting heritage sites of interest.

At the St. Joseph Settlement Memorial we were able to walk the grounds. In Zurich, Ontario we visited St. Peter's Lutheran Church, the Lutheran Pioneer Cemetery and Hay Hall. St Peter's Lutheran Church houses the Hess Clock—a three-sided clock in the church tower that is wound once a week and still chimes hourly. There are only three such clocks in Canada that still operate as they were originally



The Coach House (above) and St. Peter's (below)



designed to operate.

The last stop was the downtown Bayfield Conservation District. Due to rain we could only view the area from the bus, but Bayfield is definitely a destination place for heritage buffs. There were so many buildings that looked interesting. From the downtown we proceeded to a small park on Lake Huron. Despite the rain, the bus driver relented and allowed us ten minutes to dismount from the bus. According to the bus driver some of the best sunsets can be viewed from the park.

Overall the conference was informative, provided an opportunity to meet people with a passion for heritage, provided meals that were well presented and a pleasure to eat. Although a lot of information was presented in two and a half days, each session I attended was interesting and left

me wanting more. The speakers were knowledgeable with lots to share and the sessions were kept within the allotted time frames.

In closing I would like to thank CHO/PCO for their sponsorship which enabled me to attend the conference and learn more about heritage affairs in Canada. Reading about an area gives a limited understanding of a place. Experiencing a place firsthand is so much more memorable because of the people that are met along the way, the distinct energies that surround a district and the land that lies silent, waiting to be explored.

Carol-Ann Cheff is a student at Algonquin College. Images taken by the author.

A CEMETERY SYMPOSIUM IN RIDEAU LAKES

TRACY GAYDA

On June 22, the Rideau Lakes Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee hosted an informative day of speakers, to highlight their work on municipal cemeteries. Attendees gathered at Forfar Community Hall to learn about the Royal Sappers and Miners Cemetery in Newboro, the care of older headstones, and the responsibilities of the Bereavement Authority of Ontario. The day included a headstone cleaning demonstration at the Forfar Cemetery adjacent to the hall, and a delicious lunch.

After introductions by former CHO/PCO board member Neil Patterson, Alan Fleming gave a presentation on the work taking place at the Royal Sappers and Miners Cemetery. This particular cemetery has a connection with the Rideau Canal since some of the 7th Company Royal Sappers and Miners who helped construct the canal, are buried there. It also contains an ordnance stone used in the canal's survey.

Dedicated volunteers have worked hard since 2014 to repair and maintain this cemetery. Allan highlighted some of the completed work and outlined plans to conserve headstones, wall work and decorative fencing. They have done extensive work to repair many of the headstones and Allan discussed the equipment they have come to rely on for the conservation and preservation work. They have sourced local companies to make braces that reconstruct pieces of broken headstones, as well as to buy pins, epoxies and cleaners. Queen's University made a geophysical survey of the cemetery using ground-penetrating radar and other techniques, to expand knowledge of the original cemetery. A heritage plaque and information about the cemetery can be found on site.

Kim Proud presented an enlightening discussion on the topic of cleaning headstones, followed by a hands-on demonstration at the cemetery. With help from her Mother

and a member of the workshop, they worked on a marble slab headstone and demonstrated the steps involved to remove lichen and moss with plastic painter spatulas, remove grit and environmental stains with Orvus® soap, and plastic scrub brushes to restore the beauty of the headstone. Orvus soap paste has other uses, from washing livestock to cleaning vintage fabrics and quilts! It's a detergent that does not contain additives such as phosphates, perfumes and whiteners. The process can be time-consuming depending on the size and condition of the headstone but the efforts are worth the elbow grease. An important point made in Kim's talk, was to take before and after photos; photographs track accomplishments while also serving as a record of activity if questions arise afterward.

In 2016, the Ministry of Government and Consumer Services delegated administrative authority of cemeteries to the Bereavement Authority of Ontario (BAO).¹ Michael D'Mello, the Manager of Licensing, Education and Outreach, gave an overview of the BAO's responsibilities as well as some interesting reflections on his job. Ontario has 386 municipalities licensed to oversee a total of 2,565 sites. Of those sites, 869 are active and 1696 are inactive. There are 1,205 religious organizations caring for a total of 1,752 sites, for which 1,461 of those sites are active and 291 are inactive. That is a lot of cemeteries that need care and a lot of volunteers assist in their care! Michael explained licensing, maintenance and care criteria, and interment and scattering rights, among other responsibilities of the organization. The attendees had many questions and remarks as the presentation progressed!

Tracy Gayda is a Vice-President of CHO/PCO. Images taken by the author.

¹ see <https://thebao.ca/>



The headstone before cleaning (above) and after (below)



ADVERTISE IN CHOnews!

REACH A PROVINCE-WIDE READERSHIP COMPOSED OF ALL MUNICIPAL HERITAGE COMMITTEE MEMBERS, HERITAGE SOCIETIES, MUNICIPAL OFFICIALS, AND HERITAGE CONSCIOUS INDIVIDUALS!

DISPLAY ADS must be supplied in camera-ready tiff or pdf format.

CLASSIFIED ADS are \$12.00 per column inch.

Location of ads is at the discretion of the Editor. Cost is per issue:

Full Page	\$300
Half Page	\$150
Third Page	\$100
Quarter Page	\$75
One Sixth Page	\$50
Business Card	\$25

SPECIAL! TWO BUSINESS CARD SUPPLEMENTS IN CHONEWS WITH A 6 MONTHS PAID BANNER AD ON THE WEBSITE FOR \$250.00.

AN ADVERTISER REQUEST FORM CAN BE FOUND ON OUR WEBSITE:

www.communityheritageontario.ca/advertise-with-us

or contact Rick Schofield
416.282.2710

schofield@communityheritageontario.ca

CHOnews DEADLINES

MARCH 10
JUNE 10
OCTOBER 10
DECEMBER 10

ARTICLE SUBMISSIONS ALWAYS WELCOME.





Pioneer Cemetery, Zurich



Bill Smith receiving the *CHO/PCO* Award



Mary Smith receiving the *MHC* Award



Ginette being thanked for her conference work

Photographs: Paul R. King

UNDERSTANDING THE ROLE OF MUNICIPAL HERITAGE COMMITTEES

TRACY GAYDA

The Municipal Heritage Committee's role is advisory and consultative. Like other advisory committees, it assists municipal councils in gathering and communicating community input for local issues. Committees also assist municipal councillors and staff in understanding the challenges and needs for meeting community goals. Its role is to advise and make recommendations as defined by the terms of reference approved by municipal councils.

Committee members are volunteers drawn from the community, representing a cross-section of interests and perspectives. The advisory committee is recognized as a vehicle for conveying community interests in local heritage.

The role of an Municipal Heritage Committee may be summarized as follows:

To advise and recommend;

To provide knowledge and expertise;

To facilitate community awareness, support and education about issues at hand;

To assist in the work of the municipality by ensuring open dialogue on specific issues;

To create a climate of consensus;

To enable and share best practices;

To be sensitive to the range of views in the community it represents;

To promote goodwill and trust within the community; and

To act as a liaison between politicians, organizational staff, members of the public and other stakeholders.

Tracy Gayda is a Vice-President of CHO/PCO.

NEWS FROM THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS

RICK SCHOFIELD

The CHO/PCO Board of Directors meets quarterly to discuss the business of the corporation. Following a successful Ontario Heritage Conference in Goderich, the Board met at the Scarborough Archives on Sunday, June 23rd.

First order of business was to welcome Regan Hutcheson from Markham as a new Board member. Regan will join Ginette Guy in the planning and organization of the 2020 Annual Ontario Heritage Conference which will be held in Markham, tentatively set for May 28-30, 2020. Regan brings a wealth of heritage knowledge and a long-standing background in Markham planning.

Following approval of the minutes of the last Board meeting, the Corporate Secretary called for nominations for CHO/PCO President and Vice President. Wayne Morgan was unanimously chosen to continue as President and Tracy

Gayda was elected for a second term as Vice-President. Committee Chairs and members were drafted with Tracy continuing as Communication Committee Chair, Ginette chairing the Conference Committee and Ian MacLean taking over the Education Committee Chair. Other committee Chairs include Wayne Morgan (Membership), Paul King (Finance & Policy/Liaison), Rick Schofield (Nominating) and Matthew Gregor (Awards).

The Corporate Secretary reported that membership stands at 898 individuals, representing 107 MHCs/Groups. A few MHC are awaiting their municipal budget approvals so they can renew as well. The auditor has submitted his report outlining 2018 revenue of \$28,122 and disbursements of \$25,673, leaving a surplus of \$2,449 to cover outstanding obligations. The Board also approved the annual application for the Provincial Heritage Organization Grant for which

CHO/PCO is grateful since it represents a major part of the revenue and enables CHO/PCO to hire a part-time Program Officer. The Board also reviewed and approved the general operating policies governing the Board.

Committee reports were then discussed and relevant information from the Chairs will appear elsewhere in this and future issues of CHOnews. The Conference Committee did mention that ACO has agreed to return as a Conference partner, joining OHAP who has worked with CHO/PCO during the past several annual heritage conferences.

Under new business, the Board reviewed the applications to fill the vacant Program Officer position. The Board agreed to hire Ginette Guy to take over this role based on her experience with the organization.

Finally, with a look back at various reports, it was noted that the current strategic and business plans are due to be reassessed for the next five years. Board members will review the basic plans over the coming months.

Rick Schofield is the Corporate Secretary/Treasurer of CHO/PCO.



BOARD MEETINGS

CHO/PCO Board of Directors meetings are open to any MHC member. Please contact the Corporate Secretary to confirm each date before attending. Scheduled meetings will be held at 6282 Kingston Road, Scarborough.

2018-2019 BOARD OF DIRECTORS

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

President

Wayne Morgan

Sutton West 905.722.5398

waynemorgan@communityheritageontario.ca

Vice-Presidents

Tracy Gayda

Toledo 613.275.2117

tracygayda@communityheritageontario.ca

Ginette Guy

Cornwall 613.363.5312

ginetteguy@communityheritageontario.ca

Chair of Finance

Paul R. King

St. Marys 416.274.4686

paulking@communityheritageontario.ca

DIRECTORS

Matthew Gregor

Scarborough 647.204.7719

matthewgregor@communityheritageontario.ca

Regan Hutcheson

Markham 905.477.000 Ext. 2080

reganhutcheson@communityheritageontario.ca

Ian MacLean

Almonte 613.406.2356

ianmaclean@communityheritageontario.ca

Dennis Warrilow

Barrie 705.797.1410

denniswarrilow@communityheritageontario.ca

CORPORATE SECRETARY/TREASURER

Rick Schofield

Scarborough 416.282.2710

schofield@communityheritageontario.ca

Program Officer **Ginette Guy** ginetteguy@communityheritageontario.ca

CHO/PCO MISSION STATEMENT

To encourage the development of municipally appointed heritage advisory committees and to further the identification, preservation, interpretation, and wise use of community heritage locally, provincially, and nationally.