Queen's University
Heritage Study

HERITAGE POLICY

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Purpose

In addition to legislated requirements and pursuant to the 1994 Campus Plan, the University has recognized the need to develop comprehensive heritage resource management policies and a process for implementing them. Heritage policies and a management process are necessary for several reasons: first, the University, as a large institution, needs to manage all of its resources, including physical ones; second, the University, as a large landowner, must have the means to manage its properties on a daily basis, as well as for the long term; third, the buildings and landscapes owned and managed by Queen's are vital parts of its educational function, both as physical infrastructure for teaching and support and (less tangibly but nonetheless important) as crucial elements of the University's image. As noted in the 1994 Campus Plan, the older buildings and landscapes on the campus are essential elements of the University's and City's character, both for the sense they give of continuity through time, and for their intrinsic qualities.

The Campus Plan also notes that simple preservation cannot be the sole aim of the University's heritage resource management policy. The University is first and foremost an educational institution with needs which require ongoing modifications to its physical setting. The Plan states that "a balance between campus development and heritage protection should be established in which the historical roots of the campus and its setting are clearly apparent within the context of a vital and current university environment." Recognizing that heritage conservation is a significant constraint on campus development, the Plan advocates policy and process that integrate new requirements with existing heritage settings in ways which maintain their integrity, within a cohesive whole, and which recognize the evolutionary character of all human settlements. This approach will prevent arbitrary destruction of irreplaceable resources while meeting changing academic and administrative requirements. It is a process that not only examines the heritage resources in detail but also recognizes different degrees of protection, as suited to the importance of each resource. In this way, a clear process is created, one that achieves the balance between preservation and development as advocated in the Campus Plan.

As a first step towards preparing these management tools, the University has undertaken a comprehensive inventory and evaluation of all University-owned buildings and all planned landscapes within the Main Campus and its adjoining areas (this process is described further in the Methodology and Evaluation sections of this document). The evaluation was completed by the University's heritage consultant (Commonwealth Historic Resource Management Limited) with input from the University Campus Planning and Development Department and the City of Kingston Local Architectural Conservation Advisory Committee (LACAC). Although no agreement has been reached with the City on heritage policy, it is recommended that Queen's finalize an internal process for managing its heritage resources.

The heritage policies recommended below are situated within the current regulatory context of provincial and municipal legislation, as stated in *The Planning Act* and *Ontario Heritage Act*, and as specified in the City of Kingston's Official Plan, Zoning By-law and Site Plan Control policies. They are based on the best practices of international conservation and are modelled on Canadian federal and provincial prototypes.

The management process for heritage resources is a University-initiated voluntary approach, self-administered but compatible with the legislated requirements (see Appendix B for a discussion of this approach). It is, however, more comprehensive than the legislation requires. It includes landscapes, for example, which are currently excluded from both planning and heritage legislation. It provides a broad range of evaluations, from *Excellent* to *Fair/ Poor*, and has a detailed rationale for each rating, backed up by extensive historical research. Thus, the process is comprehensive, taking in all buildings and landscapes owned by the University, not just the best ones.

This self-administered process was designed specifically to suit the University's needs. The evaluation was undertaken by both the City and the University, using criteria which were mutually agreed upon. Evaluation text for each property is specific and uses consistent terminology, thus giving Queen's an effective management tool, and providing the City with clear reasons for the University's decisions. With the evaluation process as a precedent, both City and University should have a good basis for reaching consensus on future management of heritage resources.

1.2 Objectives

The objectives of the University heritage policy can be summarized as follows:

- to ensure that the University recognizes the heritage value of its buildings and landscapes through policies to safeguard these features
- to provide tools for the responsible, long term management of its heritage resources through an accountable process which has clearly stated objectives, criteria, and means of resolving disputes
- to encourage a consultative process with the City of Kingston on managing heritage programmes
- to ensure that such heritage policies are directed primarily at structures or landscape features with demonstrable heritage value and are not applied indiscriminately
- to provide sufficient flexibility for and not be unduly restrictive of the University's long term development plans which are essential for meeting its evolving academic, administrative, residential, and financial needs

1.3 Essential Features

A heritage policy and process should include:

- principles for managing heritage resources
- a range of approaches for proposed changes to heritage properties, setting out corresponding intent and impact
- a process for such changes (or "interventions") to heritage properties, with a conflict resolution mechanism
- the methodology for continuing the documentation and for the inventory and evaluation of heritage buildings and landscapes, if new properties are acquired

The following sections describe a policy and process which has these features, beginning with principles and definitions, then proceeding into the processes of intervention review and continuing assessment.

2. PRINCIPLES AND DEFINITIONS

2.1 Heritage Policy Statement

Queen's has outlined its commitment to the ongoing management of campus heritage resources in the following Heritage Policy Statement:

> "Queen's University recognizes the heritage value of its buildings and landscapes and is committed to efforts in ensuring a balance between campus development and heritage conservation. The University reflects this commitment in ongoing inventory, evaluation, controls and implementation which shall apply to any alterations or renovations to buildings and grounds, and new construction to ensure consistency of application."

The following text provides a basic set of policies and outlines a procedural structure for use by Queen's staff.

2.2 Conservation Principles

Principles are general statements of belief and conduct by which the conservation of heritage resources should take place. They govern implementation of heritage policy and cover a range of specific options for intervention, from routine maintenance to major alteration and new development. They are explained in greater detail in Section 2.3.

Conservation (or heritage conservation) is a term generally used to describe all actions directed at protecting and enhancing historic and cultural properties for the future. The principles and management process that follow reflect good conservation practice, as guided by such international agreements as the Venice Charter (1964) and subsequent, more detailed charters[1], all of which form the basis for widely accepted heritage doctrines.

[1] The Venice Charter, prepared by the International Council on Munuments and Sites (ICOMOS), is the most important document in establishing international conservation principles. It stresses respect for the integrity of the resource and its setting; the importance of historical and scientific research; the importance of continued use; the need for an interdisciplinary approach; and the need for interventions to be modest, legible and well-documented.

ICOMOS Canada's Appleton Charter adapts the Vence Charter to a wider variety of resoruces and activities. Its definitions of conservation terminology are similar to those used in this policy. The Appleton Charter is used as a primary reference by a number of provincial governments, including Ontario.

Conservation work, regardless of the degree of intervention required, should be governed by the following general principles:

- All building and landscape conservation work should be based upon, and preceded by, sufficient historical research, site analysis and documentation to fully identify and safeguard the heritage features to be conserved.
- The evolution of structures and landscapes through time should be respected. Contributions of all periods are important to the historical development of the resource and may merit retention. Decisions about appropriate levels of intervention should be based upon the heritage value of each contribution, as determined by the campus Inventory and Evaluation.
- Long-term protection of the historic resource should be balanced with user requirements, and future resource management goals should be identified prior to undertaking any work.
- The approach to all heritage conservation projects should ensure the maximum preservation of the existing and authentic physical fabric and retention of the signs of age (also known as the patina).
- A well-defined maintenance plan for all heritage resources should be established.

2.3 Definitions and Levels of Intervention

A wide range of heritage conservation approaches will be required to meet the University's needs in the future. These approaches are often referred to as "levels of intervention" and vary according to the relative heritage value of the building or landscape (as determined in the evaluation), the extent of the changes involved, and the degree to which such changes have an impact on the historical fabric.

Most heritage conservation projects, by necessity, involve a combination of approaches rather than isolated interventions. Thus, in a project that seeks to return a building to an earlier appearance ("restoration"), it may be necessary to reinforce historic structural elements ("retrofit"), upgrade entrances, exits and services ("rehabilitation"), replace missing elements ("replication") and, perhaps, rebuild a long-demolished appendage ("reconstruction"). For most of the properties listed in the Inventory and Evaluation, only the exterior is involved, and thus the need for combined approaches is reduced. However, for *Excellent* and *Very Good* properties, the extent of heritage features will probably entail the use of several approaches if anything more than a minimal intervention is proposed. The ways in which such interventions are combined will be discussed in the Conservation Report to be prepared for such properties.

The levels of intervention discussed here range from minimum intervention (with maximum respect for the historic fabric), to maximum intervention (with minimum respect for the historic fabric).

2.3.1 Minimal Interventions:

Minimal Interventions include: Monitoring, Housekeeping, Mothballing, Maintenance, Repair, and Stabilization, which are focused on maintaining a historic resource with maximum respect for the historic fabric.

- *Monitoring* is undertaken to ensure that adverse impacts on archaeological sites, buildings and structures, landscapes, and biological life-forms that could not be predicted or evaluated prior to construction activities are addressed. For archaeological sites, monitoring requires the presence of a licensed archaeologist; for other heritage resources, it should be carried out by appropriate professional personnel. This may take the form of scheduled site visits and/or on-call availability during a long-term project.

- *Housekeeping* is the least intrusive of all maintenance procedures, comprising those actions which have little or no deleterious or irreversible effect on the fabric of the cultural landscape but which through basic, scheduled procedures help to retard deterioration.

- *Mothballing* (also known as 'de-commissioning') is a long-term stabilization process, intended to safeguard a resource from the elements and vandalism over an extended period, often years, until such time as it is decided to proceed with an undertaking. Mothballing involves reducing occupancy to nil.

- *Maintenance* comprises the regular, routine actions taken to retard the natural deterioration of a resource (or fixture, chattel, and/or equipment). These actions are intended to keep the resource from premature loss due to failure, decline, wear, or change attributable to normal use or the effect of the natural environment. Such activities are usually conducted on a cyclical basis. The period of the actions may be hourly, daily, weekly, monthly, seasonally, or yearly. Maintenance activities are not regulated under the Ontario Building Code. Maintenance is a pro-active kind of intervention.

- *Repair* is the process of returning a resource (or fixture, chattel, and/or equipment) to its prior condition when it has undergone changes attributable to failure, decline, wear, normal use, or abuse. A repair action does not alter or enhance the integrity, character, performance, or design intent; otherwise it becomes an Alteration. Repair is a reactive kind of intervention.

  Repair may include patching of existing components using technologically compatible materials and methods; limited replacement in-kind of components; complete replacement in kind of a component when the degree of change it has undergone precludes any other type of action. Repair activities may be regulated under the Ontario Building Code.

- *Stabilization* is a minimum amount of work done to safeguard a resource from the elements and/or destruction and to protect the public from danger. This work may involve emergency structural reinforcing, cabling (with trees), protective coverings, or hoardings of a temporary

nature. In most cases, stabilization is undertaken in order to preserve the building for a future undertaking, often over a relatively short-term period.

   With respect to archaeological sites, this work may be required in the case of eroding archaeological deposits and may involve the salvage excavation of the eroding area and/or the construction of retaining walls or barriers.

   Stabilization is often an emergency measure, intended to provide temporary protection against an immediate threat. Emergency stabilization should not affect the integrity of the heritage fabric, and should also be reversible.

2.3.2 Moderate Interventions

Moderate Interventions include: *Restoration* (including Composite and Period Restoration), and *Rehabilitation*, *Renovation*, *Modernization*, and *Retrofit*, which involve varying degrees of alteration to a site or structure and which show moderate respect for the historic fabric.

- ***Restoration*** is the activity in which a building, structure, site, or object is returned to the appearance of an earlier time by removing later material and by replacing missing elements and details.

   There are two variations to this approach, the first one more moderate and the second more extreme. Both have in common the criterion of authenticity — that is, a respect for the value of the building fabric as a document of the past.

   - *Composite Restoration* is a form of restoration in which all significant features from all historical periods are left intact. With this form of restoration the process becomes one of revealing the continuity of the history of a resource. Newer material which is judged to be of little or no value may be removed if this will expose intact historical features of greater value. Designed vegetative features or missing architectural elements may be replaced, but only when this does not obscure the existing historic fabric. This approach, which is recommended for most restoration projects, requires a concerted effort at research and documentation.

   - *Period Restoration* is the process of returning a building or site to its appearance at an earlier time. It is sometimes described as achieving a 'Unity of Style'. This is an exacting form of restoration that, in most cases, is undertaken only when a compelling case for it can be made on the basis of the exceptional architectural or historical importance — and consequent educational value — of the state to which the building is to be restored, or when the removal of later additions will reveal the unity of the original work. Material and components which have been added since the period to which the resource is being restored are removed — even though they may have historic value in their own right — and missing elements may

be replaced. There must be sufficient evidence to allow restoration without conjecture and all material which is removed must be properly documented.

With respect to landscapes, as with buildings and structures, period restoration is a treatment that should be considered only when the earlier history is so significant that it justifies removal or alteration of features or materials that would ordinarily be retained.

In any restoration it is critical not to create an appearance which never existed, particularly an appearance which actually predates the building or structure being restored. This process is known as 'earlying-up'. With restoration, as with other interventions, the construction of features that were designed but never built is not considered appropriate.

- *Rehabilitation* is the process of returning a property to a useable state through repair or alteration. Rehabilitation makes possible an efficient contemporary use while preserving those portions and features which are significant to the property's historic, architectural, and cultural values. With landscapes, rehabilitation is the most common intervention, since it allows for change necessary to satisfy present-day demands upon the site.

  Rehabilitation can be further defined as either continued-use or adaptive reuse, depending on the reasons for and nature of the intervention.

- *Renovation* occurs when extensive changes and/or additions are made to an existing building internally and externally in order to 'renew' the structure. These changes, particularly as they affect private residences, are often made in response to the need for more space, repair, general improvements, or lifestyle considerations. Renovations may be made in harmony with the existing building and neighbourhood, although conservation of heritage fabric is not the first priority of this intervention.

- *Modernization* is a conscious attempt to hide, deface, or alter heritage features in order to achieve a 'modernized' appearance. Commercial storefronts, streetscapes, and landscapes are quite often updated in this way as merchandising and advertising trends change. As opposed to renovation, where some respect (often unconscious) is given to the intrinsic heritage value of a building, remodelling is, by definition, anti-heritage. Modernization is included as a level of intervention in order to put the previous levels of intervention in perspective.

- *Retrofit* involves brining an historic building up to contemporary standards by the insertion, change or upgrade of its structure and/or systems. Conservation of heritage fabric is of secondary importance and it is assumed that the property in question contains little of heritage value.

2.3.3 Maximum Interventions

Maximum Interventions include: Reassembly, Moving, Replication, Reconstruction, Demolition, Fragmentation, and Salvage, all of which involve various degrees of mitigation of unavoidable adverse impacts on an historic resource.

- *Reassembly* is when an historic building, structure, or artifact is carefully dismantled and reassembled in situ, if possible, but often on another site. Reassembly is often undertaken out of structural necessity, to repair deteriorated material, or to observe historic construction techniques. Reassembly is also sometimes called 'reconstitution' or 'anastylosis'.
- *Moving* (or relocation) is when an historic building, structure, or site-related artifact is relocated to another site, often as a last-resort alternative to demolition. The decision to move a building should be made only after a thorough look at conserving it in situ. The loss of site integrity and historic associations and the potential damage to historic fabric during a move are significant reasons to leave the building on its original site. Once moved, buildings often stay vacant for some time and can be subject to vandalism, fire, and decay.
- *Replication* is the making of an exact copy of portions of an existing structure, feature, or artifact. The purpose of replication is usually to replace a missing or decayed component in order to maintain aesthetic unity and harmony. Replication is often used for cosmetic reasons in restoration work. If valuable cultural property is being threatened or damaged irretrievably by its environment, it may have to be moved to a more protected environment. A replica may be substituted in order to maintain the unity of a site or building.
- *Reconstruction* occurs when a building, site feature, or artifact that no longer exists is reproduced with new construction that exhibits the shape, material, and detailing (and often construction methods) of the resource as it once appeared. Reconstruction differs from replication in that the original from which the copy is made no longer exists. Authenticity is dependent on the amount of historical and pictorial evidence available for the original resource. Good documentary information is essential in order to justify a reconstruction. There should be an absolute minimum of conjecture.

  With landscapes, careful planning should consider the age and arrangement of vegetation, allowing for growth and maintenance to continue an appearance that replicates the reconstruction period. Reconstruction is seldom recommended as a conservation option because, unless skilfully executed and clearly explained, a reconstruction may be confused with an authentic historic element.
- *Demolition* is the systematic and deliberate destruction of a building (or fixture, chattel, and or equipment) or portion thereof. This includes not only removals of sections of buildings, i.e. additions, wings, sheds, etc., but also integral design and structural components (both interior and exterior), surface finishes such as plaster or panelling, and design

treatments such as store fronts, windows, and doors. In general, demolition of heritage sites implies the obliteration of historic fabric, unless otherwise specified for the purposes of reassembly (see salvage). While demolition is not a conservation process per se, it is recognized as a valid component in preservation programmes in which certain accretions made over time are being removed. It should be noted that demolition is an irreversible process and in terms of historic structures, would be undertaken only after thorough study has ascertained the value of the fabric in question. Any heritage fabric likely to be lost through demolition should be recorded beforehand.

- *Fragmentation* is the process in which portions of a building are retained, either on the original site or reassembled elsewhere. It is justified only for research, commemorative, or aesthetic purposes. Other heritage conservation measures, such as stabilization, can be used on the salvaged fragments in the process of incorporating them into the new context.

- *Salvage* as a mitigative action is the process of retaining and protecting from deterioration, historic fabric (or fixture , chattel, and or equipment) which has been removed from its context, through the process of demolition. Material may be salvaged for various reasons, including protection of significant individual features from permanent loss, protection of materials for reconstruction, or simply the reuse of resources. Regardless of the reason for salvage, records of all historic fabric's in-situ characteristics should be made, to accurately document associated design and process. If historic fabric is to be used in new and different applications, especially in restoration, renovation, remodelling or reconstruction, it should be clearly discernible that the material is not original to the new application, either through design, treatment of finishes, or written description. Archaeological excavation when carried out as a means of mitigation of impact is referred to as salvage archaeology and is always less preferable than avoidance.

3.0 MANAGEMENT PROCESS

3.1 Overview

The management process is essentially a review mechanism which requires that the University, as a whole, scrutinize any changes to its historic fabric proposed by component departments and agencies. The review process is a clear, fair and flexible one designed to address the full range of changes or interventions to the buildings and landscapes owned by Queen's, especially those which have been identified as having *Excellent* or *Very Good* heritage value.

While under University control, the process can accommodate consultation with the municipality and the community. For example, informal consultation with LACAC is included as a part of this internal review process and occurs before proposed changes are sent to the Board of Trustees for approval. This consultation is in addition to the reviews of such changes by LACAC mandated as part of the municipal planning process. The City also has an active role in reviewing development through the process of Site Plan control.

As for new development, it should be noted that the University's initiative in preparing heritage policy and in managing its heritage resources complements the general policies of the City of Kingston's Official Plan. Some issues remain to be resolved, however, particularly those relating to expansion of the campus into adjacent residential neighbourhoods.

Within the University, the review process will be the primary responsibility of the Campus Planning and Development Office (CPD). Staff will review proposed interventions based on the information contained in the inventory, evaluation and documentation process.

The Board of Trustees (the Board), via the Campus Planning and Development Committee (CPDC), is involved in the process as the final approval agency and has delegated authority to the Campus Planning and Development Committee. Thus the Board, via the Committee, arbitrates disputes and approves recommendations made by the Campus Planning and Development Office for projects involving alterations, new development or demolition/disposal. For properties designated under the *Ontario Heritage Act*, Kingston City Council is the final arbiter within the constraints of the *Act*.

3.2 Documentation

All properties currently owned by the University have been documented as part of the Inventory and Evaluation of Buildings and Landscapes. The management process is based on the hierarchy of heritage values identified in this evaluation. For the most valuable properties - those rated as *Excellent* and *Very Good* - the key heritage features, or character defining elements, are listed as part of a more

extensive description of the form, history and significance of the property. For properties rated as *Good* or *Fair/Poor*, a shorter text provides general guidance as to the features of each building or landscape that have heritage value.

In addition to this basic documentation, further guidance for future interventions is required for *Excellent* and *Very Good* properties. This documentation should be in the form of a Conservation Report. The report should be prepared in advance of any proposed changes to the property's use, and should provide detailed strategies and guidelines to permit needed change while conserving the setting's heritage character. Conservation Reports are normally prepared for the University by qualified heritage consultants.

3.3 Levels of Scrutiny

The management process responds to the various requirements of the University by suiting the level of scrutiny for heritage conservation to the level of intervention proposed. These different types of intervention (as described in Section 2.3) may warrant a fast-track review, in the case of minimal interventions, or may require scrutiny by all relevant levels of the University administration, in the case of maximum intervention.

- *Minimal Interventions* do not require approval from the University administration and are essentially the responsibility of Physical Plant Services (PPS). All PPS project managers should make reference to the Inventory and Evaluation for specific guidance on key heritage characteristics of each resource. Campus Planning and Development (CPD) staff should monitor all minimal interventions, in consultation with PPS project managers.
- *Moderate and Maximum Interventions* have enough impact on the heritage resources to require approval from the University administration. All development proposals involving heritage buildings and landscapes should be administered using the Construction Project Process for Queen's. In this process, capital projects of all scales are coordinated by a PPS Project Manager. CPD staff should ensure that the project respects the Inventory and Evaluation and applicable reviews. If the resource is an Excellent or Very Good one, CPD staff should ensure that proposed interventions are guided by the Conservation Report prepared for that property. They are also responsible for the conservation of heritage resources throughout the development process. CPD staff will support this activity by advising and monitoring the proposal as it goes through the internal approval process.

It is understood that a minimal level of informal monitoring by CPD staff occurs throughout the process. The reviews described in the following section are formal reviews, in addition to the ongoing informal process.

3.4 Permitted Interventions in Existing Properties

Within this overall framework there must also be a sliding scale of interventions which are dependant upon the evaluation rating given to each heritage building and landscape. Heritage resources of higher value have more restrictions as to the types of interventions allowed, with progressively more latitude as the evaluation rating drops. Thus, the generic types of interventions permitted are as follows:

- *Excellent properties* are the best and should be treated accordingly. While minimal interventions are allowed, guided by the Character Defining Elements described in the Inventory and Evaluation, moderate interventions are to be guided in detail by a Conservation Report. This document, as described in Section 3.2, above, shall be prepared by a qualified heritage consultant prior to the commencement of any development proposal. CPD staff will guide the consultant. The Conservation Report should guide staff and future consultants by describing the property's heritage character, significance and condition and by providing intervention guidelines for each component identified as a Character Defining Element. Maximum interventions are to be considered only as a last resort (see Section 3.5 below for the detailed process).

  With proposals for moderate intervention (i.e. alteration or new development), CPD staff should review the proposal at the Concept Design and Design Development stages. The City should be consulted during this review (Planning Department and LACAC). CPD staff should prepare recommendations for approval by the Vice Principal (Operations and Finance) or the CPDC.

- *Very Good properties* are much better than average and merit long-term investment and care. As above, minimal interventions are permitted while moderate or maximum interventions require a proposal prepared by PPS/CPD staff, CPD staff review of the proposal at the Design Development Stage, and recommendations, for approval by the Vice Principal (Operations and Finance) or the CPDC . Preparation of a Conservation Report is recommended, rather than mandatory.

- *Good properties* are average, if not better. As such, they are worthy of care and enhancement. Due to their lower evaluation, however, moderate and maximum interventions may be permitted (provided that CPD staff monitor the work and review the proposal at the Design Development stage). Conservation Reports are not required, but are suggested for properties which the City intends to designate. Otherwise, guidance on interventions should come from the key features described in the Inventory and Evaluation. Maximum interventions require approval from the Vice Principal (Operations and Finance) or the CPDC.

- *Fair/Poor properties* are worse than average and thus merit only short-term investment by the University. All levels of intervention are permitted. CPD staff should monitor moderate interventions and be required to review the Design Development stage of proposals prior to allowing maximum interventions.

3.5 Obsolete Properties

The emphasis throughout the heritage policy and management process has been on the conservation of heritage resources. Inevitably, however, there will be times over the life of the University in which a heritage resource is no longer useful. To address such events, the University must have a specific process for dealing with obsolete properties.

As with an archival collection, the University's collection of properties should be governed by an accessioning and de-accessioning policy. The process for dealing with new properties acquired by the University is described in Section 4.2; the process for dealing with the disposal of property is described below. The following policy affects the best properties: it is mandatory for Excellent resources, and strongly recommended for Very Good resources. Lower-ranked properties may be demolished if so recommended by CPD staff, although demolition of Good properties must be approved by the Vice Principal (Operations and Finance).

De-accessioning should provide a range of options, with demolition as a last resort. Demolition is already permitted as a last resort under the *Ontario Heritage Act* and the University cannot be unduly bound by additional restrictions - its current fiscal and community context will not permit conservation to be paramount at all costs. In the future, it is hoped that the University and the City can agree on special policies which will allow the innovative management of resources valuable to both. These special policies are needed so that the University is not held perpetually responsible should the resources no longer be functional as University buildings or landscapes. It is in anticipation of this new approach that the following process is provided.

The range of options should begin with an assessment by CPD of potential alternative University uses. If one is found, then rehabilitation or renovation of the property can be recommended and the resource continues to be conserved. Should no viable University use be found, then the University should be in a position to assess possible transference of the property to another tenant or landowner, by lease or sale. Such a transfer should include with it the obligation on the part of the new tenant or owner to also conserve the property. Heritage easements (managed by the Ontario Heritage Foundation) or other covenants on title are the current legislative tools available to achieve this objective. Should lease or sale not be viable, and the University remains responsible for the resource, then a series of progressively greater interventions in the historic fabric will occur. Moving is one option, if in doing so the building is conserved and a new use found for it. If the building cannot be moved, or if the resource is a landscape, then fragmentation or partial demolition is another option. LACAC will be consulted informally during the assessment of these options. If none of these above options are viable, then it is only at this stage that demolition is recommended.

The review process would be as follows: CPD staff prepare a report providing the rationale for demolition; this report is presented to the Vice-Principal (Operations and Finance), who has the option of taking the matter to the CPDC (and Board of Trustees) for resolution. For properties designated under Part IV of the *Ontario Heritage Act*, the report would have to be presented to the City Council, who, if opposed, could use the terms of the *Act* to defer demolition, pending further discussions with the University. However, the *Act* still confers on the University the ultimate right to apply for a demolition permit from the City.

The structure of the foregoing policy and process puts the burden of proof on the University to show that demolition is the only viable solution. The University must prove the case for demolition after considering all other options. In examining these options, staff will be guided by the Campus Plan and by a Conservation Report for the property, if one has been prepared. The staff report should take into account the following issues: economic viability of alternative uses; building or landscape condition; building or landscape's suitability for conversion to other uses; potential conflicts with Campus Plan policies; and the potential impact of the loss on the University's image, both within the University community and in the community at large.

Even with demolition as the chosen option, there are still conservation policies which should be followed. International best practice advocates the recording and salvaging of heritage resources prior to demolition, so that at least a record of the resource is retained. Such recording and salvage processes may be too costly to be routinely undertaken by the University. However, they are the types of activities which lend themselves to volunteer involvements by students or local heritage organizations.

3.6 New Development

New development (or infill) is an intervention when heritage buildings or landscapes are part of the area to be included in the proposed development.

It should be understood that both *Excellent* and *Very Good* heritage resources are the primary subject of discussion. However, because the development site may be large, involving a range of University properties which are in the *Good* and *Fair/ Poor* categories, the discussions can include them if they are deemed to have streetscape or ensemble value. The evaluation descriptions prepared during the documentation process (and described in this document) will provide the necessary guidance to determine site specific policies for these lower priority properties.

In practice, the process would work as follows: new development should be guided by the Campus Plan and then by the Inventory and Evaluation. Suggestions for compatible new development are found in the Inventory and

Evaluation text: by major street (Residential, with context in Landscape); by district (Institutional buildings in Landscape contexts); and by setting (Landscape). PPS and CPD staff should administer the development process throughout and any new development proposed to be attached or placed adjacent to a heritage building, or placed within a heritage landscape should be reviewed at the Concept Design and Design Development stages using the Inventory and Evaluation. Any *Excellent* or *Very Good* properties affected by proposed new development should have Conservation Reports prepared for them. Approval for any proposed development directly affecting an *Excellent* or *Very Good* building or landscape must come from CPDC via recommendations from CPD staff.

There is also a second way to address large-scale infill, intended to address instances where more than one heritage building or landscape is involved, such as the redevelopment of a large site for a major new campus facility.

This approach to new development in a heritage context uses a precedent from the University of Toronto. The University has identified a number of potential development sites on its properties. On each of these sites, the University has prepared development guidelines which include site-specific heritage policies in instances where heritage resources are affected. Once the University has decided to proceed with development on one of these sites, the University and the City of Toronto begin detailed discussions leading to site specific planning policies for the proposed development site, including specific heritage policies. In these discussions, the City is usually represented by the Planning and Development Department and the Toronto Historical Board.

As applied to Queen's, this process would require a close relationship between the development proposals of the Campus Plan and the Heritage Policy and Process. It would be the responsibility of the Campus Planning and Development Office and the planning and heritage consultants, to agree on development guidelines for the chosen sites. These guidelines should be discussed with the City of Kingston to assure integration with the Official Plan, Zoning Bylaws and the Site Plan Control policies. The City would most likely involve both the Planning Department and the LACAC in these discussions. These discussions are intended to produce a set of site-specific planning policies agreeable to both University and City.

4. ONGOING MAINTENANCE & STEWARDSHIP

4.1 Conservation and Enhancement

In the long term, the University should consider further improvements to the heritage policy and process. One such action would be preparation of a Management Manual for all of its properties, with specific sections for heritage properties where the detailed guidelines for each level of intervention would be elaborated, as well as normal maintenance practices. This additional level of detail would guide management and maintenance staff in the actual techniques of intervention, so that every action, from repairing a door to designing infill development, is covered.

As a general principle, however, all properties worth long-term investment by Queen's should have their heritage character conserved and enhanced. This means that unsympathetic alterations should, if possible, be removed and sympathetic replacements made. On residential properties, this might involve replacement of metal storm windows and vinyl siding with units matching the original materials. On institutional properties, this might eventually mean the removal or major renovation of unsympathetic additions and replacement with more compatible designs. In landscapes, this may entail upgrading streetscapes and/or reconstructing former spaces, such as quadrangles, using the Campus Plan as a guide.

In the near future, Conservation Reports should be prepared for all *Excellent* and *Very Good* properties which are known to be affected by imminent development proposals and for *Good* properties proposed for designation by the City under the *Ontario Heritage Act*. Having these reports in hand will inform the planning process and assist both the City and the University in the evaluation of proposed development plans.

4.2 Future Updates to the Inventory and Evaluation

The Inventory and Evaluation text, along with the History and Methodology, has been prepared and reviewed by Queen's and the City, with every effort to ensure its accuracy. It should remain as the fundamental document guiding future management of campus heritage buildings and landscapes.

Should new properties be acquired by Queen's, then CPD staff, with the aid of a professional heritage consultant, should record and assess the properties following the same methodology as was used to compile the Inventory and Evaluation. This new information should be appended to the existing document, not inserted in the existing text.

Similarly, any properties removed from Queen's ownership should be noted in an appendix to the main document. Revisions to heritage policies can be made as part of the ongoing development of these policies. (This Heritage Policy provides a basic guideline for the University and represents the state of discussions with the City at the time this final report was submitted.)