

SNAPSHOT: Heritage

Creative City Network of Canada – Intermunicipal Comparative Framework Project

Heritage has been in the vanguard of cultural policy and legislation in municipalities across Canada since being given a welcome measure of credibility around the time of the country's centennial in 1967. One of the earlier pieces of legislation reported in the survey is the 1965 St. Catharines, Ontario By-law to Operate a Museum; in the 1970s there was a flurry of heritage- and archaeology-related legislation and policy.

Legislation, policies, and advisory groups

At least 23 responding municipalities have legislation, policies, and/or plans to address heritage generally or specifically and to include heritage in community plans or their equivalent (see Table 1). A similar proportion of municipalities have legislation and policy regarding incentives for heritage preservation, registration, and designation. In a quarter of the municipalities responding, both cultural tourism and archaeology are the next most common areas for legislation and policy.

All municipalities report Council-appointed committee, commission, or board with a heritage mandate. 66% of these include a member of Council on their governing or decision-making body.

Heritage incentives and registry

Grants or other forms of incentives (e.g., relaxation of development cost charges and reduced fees) are available to heritage resources not owned by the local government in 17 municipalities (see Table 2). Designation or another form of legal protection (e.g., conservation covenant, heritage revitalization, or easement agreement) is required before an incentive is approved in 15 municipalities. Four municipalities report limitations on this requirement. In Vancouver, if the incentive is minimal (e.g., one parking space waived), designation is not required; in Port Moody, before obtaining additional development rights, designation and a conservation covenant are required; in Toronto, a Heritage Easement Agreement is also required; and in St. John's, the City's designation of heritage buildings applies only to commercial buildings.

Types of heritage funding programs

Eighteen local governments fund non-profit heritage societies through a general grants program (see Table 2). This program is usually open to non-profit groups of various sectors, and is just one of a number of municipal programs or mechanisms through which heritage organizations are supported. Eleven municipalities

34 municipalities responded to the *Heritage* section of the survey.

Data years reflected in this report: 2003–2005

SNAPSHOT: Heritage

offer annual operating grants and three have developed a multi-year operating grant process. 12 municipalities provide heritage project funding, four provide grants in lieu of taxes, and three provide organizational development grants. 26 municipalities pay a fee-for-service to heritage organizations and 11 report a range of other non-grant forms of support. In 17 municipalities, funding support is provided to the private sector and individuals who own heritage resources (e.g. for exterior upgrades). In only two municipalities a portion of the municipal heritage budget is allocated to an arm's-length non-profit organization to administer, adjudicate, and dispense as grants.

Eleven municipalities offer annual operating grants and three have developed a multi-year operating grant process.

	Yes	In proc.	Total	Council members?	
Heritage					
Legislation	29	1	30		
Policy	23	4	27		
Cultural Plan/Strategy	16	7	23		
Goals/objectives in community plan	21	3	24		
Heritage Tourism					
Legislation	1	2	3		
Policy	4	2	5		
Cultural Plan/Strategy	6	0	6		
Heritage Registry and/or Designation					
Legislation	25	4	29		
Policy	20	3	23		
Cultural Plan/Strategy	16	14	30		
Archaeology					
Legislation	7	1	8		
Policy	7	2	9		
Cultural Plan/Strategy	2	6	8		
Goals/objectives in community plan	6	2	8		
Committees and agencies					
Council-appointed committees, commissions, boards, or advisory groups with heritage mandate	33		33	21	64%
Mandated arm's-length agency	12				
Key (non-mandated) organization	19				

Types of heritage organizations and activities funded

Heritage grant programs fund community museums and historic societies which are substantially volunteer-run operations in 16 municipalities (see Table 3). Funding is provided to private sector organizations or individuals who own heritage resources in 14 communities, with three additional respondents reporting that such a support program is under development. (See Table 2)

DEFINITIONS

Archaeology:

The science that deals with past human life and activities as shown by fossil relics and by the monuments and artefacts left by ancient or pre-literate peoples.

Cultural tourism:

The search for and participation in new cultural experiences. It incorporates a variety of cultural forms, including museums, galleries, festivals, architecture, historic sites, artistic performances, and heritage sites, as well as experiences that bring one culture in contact with another for the specific purpose of that contact.

TABLE 2
Types of heritage funding programs

Types of programs	Yes	Program in development	Total
Support to not-for-profit heritage organizations			
Through a general grants program	18		18
<i>Grant programs designed specifically for non-profit groups:</i>			
Funds delegated (mandated by Council) to community organization for disbursement	2		2
Annual operating grants	9	2	11
Multi-year operating grants	1	2	3
Project grants	12		12
Grants in lieu of taxes	4		4
Organizational development grants	3		3
Other *	2		2
Fee-for-service or purchase of services program	2	24	26
Other non-grant support program(s)	10	1	11
Support to private sector/individuals who own heritage resources **			
Funding support provided to private sector/individuals who own heritage resources	14	3	17
* Other programs: Gifts in kind, Capital			
** All heritage not-for-profits are eligible under community grants, only private owners are eligible under H-200 heritage incentives.			
Overall, 34 respondents indicated one or more of the options above.			

In addition to programs supporting heritage archives, exterior upgrades on designated properties, and creation of historical pieces of work such as books, films, or photography, municipalities report examples of innovative heritage projects they have funded, including:

- A heritage building material recycling program
- An awning and signage grant program for heritage buildings in the downtown
- Community loans from a Heritage Fund
- Matching grants (e.g., for exterior restoration)
- A tax incentive program for downtown commercial buildings that convert to residential, offering a tax holiday of up to ten years for conservation projects

Decision-making processes for municipal heritage funds

The two most common decision-making processes for heritage funds (each reported by 12 municipalities) are: (1) staff assessment and recommendations presented to Council for approval and (2) an advisory body, with or without a heritage specialist, to make a recommendation to Council (see Table 4).

A jury and/or peer assessment process is arm’s-length, binding, and not subject to Council approval in only three.

DEFINITIONS

Heritage register:

Significant objects, landscapes, resources, and structures are evaluated against an established set of heritage criteria, to determine whether they merit addition to a heritage register and to be listed as a heritage resource. Inclusion on a heritage register does not protect the resource but notes it as having historic value and as eligible for incentives that may be offered under a heritage program.

Heritage resources:

Includes artefacts and architecture, historic and prehistoric resources, and archival and interpretive material and activity. Significant objects and structures are protected by legislation which distinguishes that which is merely old from that which is deemed valuable according to notable public aesthetic, educational, or social consensus.

Historic site (park or building):

Refers to a publicly owned and managed historic facility that is preserved according to standard principles and practices, and where there is some form of regular public access.

TABLE 3

Types of heritage organizations and activities funded

	Yes	
Heritage grants programs fund:		
Smaller community museums and historic societies (i.e., substantially volunteer-run organizations)	16	
Heritage program(s) and/or project(s)	13	*
Privately owned heritage buildings/sites	12	
Publicly owned historic sites	12	
Major heritage institutions and museums	8	
Heritage service organizations	8	
Archives	9	
Other	6	**
Archeological program(s) and/or project(s)	4	
Type(s) of support offered to private sector/individuals who own heritage resources:		
Project grants	9	
Grants in lieu of taxes	6	
Annual operating grants	6	
Multi-year operating grants		
Fee-for-service		
Other:	12	***

* **Heritage programs and/or projects funded by Heritage Grants Programs:** e.g., Tour Booklet; Plaque Program; Heritage Built Material Recycling Program

** **Heritage grants programs fund – Other:** e.g., Exterior upgrades; heritage weekend/week events; plaquing; tour brochures; photo/drawings of heritage properties; annual funding to Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee for programs

***** Types of support to private sector/individuals – Other:**

\$1,000 grant for exterior upgrades on designated properties
 Awning and Signage grant program for heritage bldgs in the downtown - up to \$10,000 per project
 Capital
 Community Heritage Fund (loans)
 Individuals creating historical pieces of work i.e., books, films, photography etc.
 In-kind
 Market Square Heritage District Fund (grants)
 Matching grants for Built Heritage (exterior restoration)
 Mentorship
 Research (title, historic significance)
 Tax exemptions
 Tax incentive program for downtown commercial buildings that convert to residential/tax holiday up to 10 yrs for conservation projects

Overall, 24 respondents indicated one or more of the options above.

TABLE 4
Decision-making and adjudication processes for municipal heritage funding programs

Decision-making process	Process used
Staff assessment, approved by Council	10
Jury or Advisory Committee process which includes community non-heritage representatives and heritage representatives. Recommendations to Council or Council Committee for approval	7
Advisory Committee (community based, no designated heritage representative), recommendations to Council or Council Committee for approval	5
Direct submission by heritage groups to Council, and decision by Council	3
Other *	12
<i>In the adjudication of heritage grants:</i>	
All decisions are subject to approval by Council	12
Jury and/or peer assessment process is arm's-length, binding, and not subject to Council approval	3
Staff assessment process, not subject to Council approval	0
<p>* Other responses: Both staff and MHAC are making recommendations to Council Heritage Foundation Selection process for the Heritage Foundation is established by Council. Foundation has final word on distribution on \$. Heritage committee makes recommendations to Council. Jury process by community granting agency with input from culture staff and final approval by community Services Directorate. Council preapproves a specific amount during budget process. Staff assessment limited to historical societies. Comment: recommendations do not go to Council for approval Formula funding Tax incentive program</p> <p>Overall, 16 respondents indicated one or more of the options above.</p>	

Snapshot: Public Art has been updated from the Creative City Network of Canada's *Intermunicipal Comparative Framework Project (Phase One Pilot)* to incorporate additional responses that followed the pilot group of respondents.

The full Phase One Pilot Report is available at www.creativecity.ca/framework

Respondents: Banff, AB; Brantford, ON; Camrose, AB; City of Kitchener, ON; City of Windsor, ON; County of Oxford, ON; District of Saanich, BC; Edmonton, BC; Fredericton, NB; Grand Prairie, AB; Halifax Regional Municipality, NS; Hamilton, ON; Highlands, BC; Kelowna, BC; Kingston, ON; Mississauga, ON; Moncton, NB; Nanaimo, BC; New Westminster, BC; North Vancouver (City & District), BC; Ottawa, ON; Port Coquitlam, BC; Port Hope, ON; Port Moody, BC; Portage la Prairie, MB; Prince George, BC; Red Deer, AB; Regina, SK; Richmond, BC; Saskatoon, SK; Sooke, BC; St. Catharines, ON; St. John's, NL; Strathcona County, AB; Toronto, ON; Township of Esquimalt, BC; Vancouver, BC; West Vancouver, BC.

Published by Creative City Network of Canada

#408 – 402 West Pender Street
 Vancouver BC V6B 1T6 Canada
 604-688-2489

Project contact: Nancy Duxbury, PhD – nancy@creativecity.ca
 Data Analysis: Sonja Bichsel, M.A.

© March 2007 Creative City Network of Canada

The Intermunicipal Comparative Framework is a project of the Creative City Network of Canada, supported through a contribution from the Department of Canadian Heritage and with the collaboration of municipal staff from across Canada.



Patrimoine
canadien

Canadian
Heritage

creativecity.ca