
Queen's University
Heritage Study

HERITAGE POLICY



H

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 of which form the basis for widely accepted heritage doctrines.

¹ The Venice Charter, prepared by the International Council on Monuments 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 Venice Charter to a wider variety of resources 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,

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

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.

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**

HERITAGE POLICY

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*.

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 *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

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

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.

H