

CITY OF DAWSON

HERITAGE MANAGEMENT PLAN IMPLEMENTATION

| | |
|---------------------|---|
| BYLAW #09-02 | OFFICIAL COMMUNITY PLAN AMENDMENT #3 BYLAW |
| BYLAW #09-03 | ZONING AND HERITAGE MANAGEMENT BYLAW |
| BYLAW #09-04 | HERITAGE BYLAW |
| BYLAW #09-05 | HERITAGE FUND BYLAW |

PUBLIC CONSULTATION REPORT

APRIL 2009

PREPARED BY

ACROSS THE RIVER CONSULTING
P.O.BOX 1518
DAWSON CITY
YUKON TERRITORY
Y0B 1G0

1-867-993-5069
1-867-993-3416 (CELL)

MARK WICKHAM

ACROSSTHERIVER.MARK@GMAIL.COM

SUMMARY

In October 2008 City of Dawson Council announced the adoption of the new Dawson City Heritage Management Plan (the Plan) and its intention to move forward with implementation. The objective is to preserve the remaining inventory of historic buildings and landscapes and provide guidance to future development in the historic town using the following vision principles:

- 1) *Tell the entire human history of the Klondike Valley, with emphasis on the Gold Rush*
- 2) *Improve the quality of life for residents of the City and the region*
- 3) *Provide an enhanced destination attraction for international tourism*

The Plan requires amendments to the Official Community Plan and three new bylaws, the Zoning and Heritage Management Bylaw to replace the existing zoning bylaw and two further bylaws, the Heritage Bylaw and Heritage Fund Bylaw, to reform the regulation of development within the heritage districts of Dawson City. Council committed to further consultation with the community as Council considers each stage in the Plan.

Two questionnaires were distributed to the public by mail and open houses were held at City Hall on Thursday April 16th and 23rd, 12 noon to 6.30 p.m. A total of 23 questionnaires were completed and returned and 35 people attended the open houses. This report is a distillation of the feedback from the questionnaires and the open houses and the consultant recommendations for amendments to the proposals based on this public input.

In summary, the consultation confirmed overwhelming support for the proposals. The particular items referenced by Council for emphasis in the consultation were supported including a large majority in favour of the Downtown Heritage Management Area replication requirement and a comprehensive incentive program focused on design assistance and planning relaxations through variances in preference to grants and loans.

Minor amendments are proposed to address concerns in the Valley, the demolition restrictions, some several of the incentives and materials guidelines. These are detailed below. A mapping change to the Downtown/Residential boundary was also made.

PRIORITY RECOMMENDATION

The single most important factor in the success of the Plan will be a commitment to a significant investment in the capacity and skills of all concerned in the development process, owner, designer and regulator (Development Officer and Heritage Advisory Committee) and this must be provided as a priority.

Interesting feedback was received with regard to opening the possibility of Tr'ondek Hwech'in culture inspired architecture outside of the Settlement Lands. It is recommended that this be further studied in the future but not be adopted at this time due to its complexity and absence from consideration in the Heritage Management Plan or Tr'ondek Hwech'in consultations. Further feedback emphasized the need for residents to be free to be creative and innovative in architectural design. This is clearly intended by the Plan and facilitated by the proposals.

RECOMMENDATIONS

CONFIRMED PROPOSALS

- 1) The full history of the town should be conserved - before, during, and after the Gold Rush period - while retaining the dominant character as the Gold Rush period.
- 2) There should be separate distinctive heritage management areas with different regulations. The new *Dawson Style* architectural guidelines should be used in the Residential Heritage Management Area
- 3) There should be a heritage incentives program developed for property owners and this should include grants, loans, design assistance and planning relaxations.
- 4) Demolition of buildings should be discouraged and repair encouraged by incentives. Demolition of protected buildings and structures less than 40 years old should only be allowed if the proposed replacement improves the quality of the built environment.
- 5) In order to illustrate and tell the full history of Dawson, post-Gold Rush buildings should not be altered to look like Gold Rush buildings.

PROPOSED REQUIREMENT TO REPLICATE IN THE DOWNTOWN HERITAGE MANAGEMENT AREA

- 6) New buildings in this area should replicate the external design of a building that stood on the site during the Gold Rush period, 1897-1918. Replication refers only to size and exterior design as seen from the street. The footprint and the appearance may be altered towards the rear of the site.

Exception will be made when the height and/or size of the former building is either too large or too small to accommodate the building proposed. The owner and the City will work together to select another building that formerly stood nearby and that was the appropriate scale as an alternative model for replication.

- 7) Priority Incentive Programs:
 - a) Visual resources with potential sources for designs. (Please highlight those you would use)
 - b) Permitting temporary seasonal dwellings such as wall tents if sanitary facilities are addressed.
 - c) Permitting use of accessory buildings for habitation if sanitary facilities are addressed.
 - d) Design assistance from the City staff.
 - e) Access to private sector architects that provide free or discounted design advice
- 8) Financial Incentive Programs:
 - a) Small direct grants (under \$500) to assist property owners undertaking improvements using the required heritage materials and design.
 - b) Loans structured to carry low interest and/or be issued in relatively high-risk situations where other financing options would not be available to people making improvements to their heritage properties
 - c) Owners of historic properties that make improvements following the guidelines would be eligible for rebates on property taxes or service fees. These may be for a set period of years.

9) Further Planning Variance Incentive Programs:

- a) Relaxing height, density and floor area ratio by up to 10% at the discretion of the Development Officer and by 20% with the approval of the Board of Variance.
- b) Relaxing rear and side yard setbacks by up to 10% at the discretion of the Development Officer and by 20% with the approval of the Board of Variance.
- c) Permitting an otherwise disallowed duplex or second dwelling in a residential zone.
- d) Permitting additional commercial or residential uses in a commercial zone.
- e) Relaxing parking requirements.

AMENDED PROPOSALS

- 1) Structures over 40 years old should only be demolished in exceptional circumstances but due regard should be taken of building condition and location. The language of the proposed OCP Section B.9 HERITAGE MANAGEMENT AREAS 2.1. (1) Protection and Section B.9 HERITAGE MANAGEMENT AREAS 2.2 (1) Protection are hence amended:

From:

"Protected buildings and structures 40 or more years old will be demolished only in exceptional circumstances"

To:

"Protected buildings and structures 40 or more years old will be demolished only in exceptional circumstances but due regard should be given to the building condition and location"

- 2) Landscape features and historic equipment valued by the community should be protected but only within reason and a 'representative sample' approach should be taken especially with regard to the tailings and artifacts. The language of the proposed OCP Section C.9 HERITAGE MANAGEMENT 4. 1. (1) Protection (page C.3) and Section D.9 HERITAGE MANAGEMENT 4. 1. (1) Protection are hence amended:

From:

"An inventory of natural and historic landscape features of value will be maintained.

Council will consider the protection of all natural and historic landscape features valued by the community.

Alterations to inventoried natural and historic landscape may occur only in exceptional circumstances, where the proposed new development is clearly an enhancement to the community and the landscape.

The principal historic structures and equipment (including any moveable derelict equipment) that are identified in the heritage inventory will be eligible for designation.

Removal and alterations of these artifacts may occur only in exceptional circumstances."

To:

"An inventory of landscape features, historic structures and equipment (including any moveable derelict equipment) valued by the community will be maintained and Council will consider the designation and protection of representative samples of these.

Alterations to inventoried natural and historic landscapes or removal and alteration of inventoried artifacts may occur only in exceptional circumstances, where the proposed new development is clearly an enhancement to the community and the landscape."

3) The boundary of the proposed Downtown Heritage Management Area is amended to include the Blocks M and R of Ladue Estate due to their commercial character, density of heritage buildings and the important heritage value of King St and the 3rd and King intersection.

4) Under incentives:

'A source list of approved retailers selling appropriate building components for historic buildings'

Is amended to:

'A source list of retailers that sell appropriate building components for historic buildings'

'A source list of approved trades people who have the necessary knowledge and skills to meet the heritage requirements'

Is amended to:

'A source list of trades people who hold a business license and have the necessary knowledge and skills to meet the heritage requirements. Completion of relevant training and workshops may be required as a qualification for this list.'

5) Board and batten and corrugated iron siding will be allowed.

6) Standing seam roof material profiles will be allowed.

7) Steel roofing material is amended to tin roof material

CANCELLED PROPOSALS

1) Permitting an otherwise disallowed home occupation or B&B use in a residential zone.

2) Allowance of asphalt shingles

QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

1) Do you agree that Dawson should...?

- a) **Conserve the full history of the town - before, during, and after the Gold Rush period?**

Yes 13 No 3

- b) **Retain the dominant character as the Gold Rush period?**

Yes 14 No 3

- c) **Identify separate distinctive heritage management areas, (maps available by request and at www.cityofdawson.ca), with different regulations for each?**

Yes 16 No 4

2) Do you agree that there should be a heritage incentives program developed for property owners and if so, what should those incentives be? Yes 17 No 1

Grants 15 Loans 10 Design assistance 12 Planning relaxations 11

3) Do you agree that...?

- a) **Demolition of buildings should be discouraged and repair encouraged by incentives?**

Yes 17 No 1

- b) **Demolition of protected buildings and structures less than 40 years old should only be allowed if the proposed replacement would improve the quality of the built environment?**

Yes 10 No 4

- c) **Structures over 40 years old should only be demolished in exceptional circumstances?**

Yes 16 No 2

- d) **Post-Gold Rush buildings should not be altered to look like Gold Rush buildings in order to illustrate and tell the full history of Dawson?**

Yes 10 No 5

4) PROPOSED REQUIREMENT TO REPLICATE IN THE DOWNTOWN HERITAGE MANAGEMENT AREA

The Heritage Management Plan proposes that new buildings in this area should replicate the external design of the building that stood on the site during the Gold Rush period. Replication refers only to size and exterior design as seen from the street. The footprint and the appearance may be altered towards the rear of the site.

Exception will be made when the height and/or size of the former building is either too large or too small to accommodate the building proposed. The owner and the City will work together to select another building that formerly stood nearby and that was the appropriate scale as an alternative model for replication.

Do you agree? Yes 20 No 3

5) **New and different architectural guidelines, the Dawson Style, have been proposed for the Residential Heritage Management Area. Do you agree with this?**

Yes 12 No 5

6) **Do you think landscape features valued by the community should be protected?**

Yes 15 No 1

7) **Do you think historic equipment in the Valley should be protected?**

Yes 14 No 2

ADDITIONAL WRITTEN COMMENTS

Supporting current proposals

- 1) Replication is most important for the "look and feel" of 1900 history but not for residences
- 2) Replication is good, as need more quality authentic buildings. Westmark is a fake eyesore.
- 3) Everything visible from river should be replicated at a minimum.
- 4) Property owners should be allowed to replicate smaller buildings to suit living needs
- 5) Replication should be financially assisted
- 6) Replication supported in certain cases
- 7) Replication well supported when demolitions take place
- 8) Yes to replication
- 9) Dawson should not be fake like Ontario Upper Canada villages, too neat and unreal
- 10) Management guidelines should be strict
- 11) Make sure new guidelines happen
- 12) Everything below hill should be heritage including North End, East Slope and view from river
- 13) All areas should be historic except Dome and Valley etc
- 14) Regulation should not be based on subjective 'taste'
- 15) Conserve not every 2*4 but all the important stuff
- 16) Dawson needs housing more than it needs to look pretty
- 17) Wall tents would enhance the streetscape
- 18) Accessory buildings are used anyway so may as well get a handle on it
- 19) Vinyl or aluminum siding not to be allowed

Supporting amendments to proposal

- 1) Care required on historical equipment definition as not every pick and shovel but all the big stuff, dredges, draglines, boilers etc should be protected.
- 2) Partial landscape protection, only so much needed
- 3) Demolition decisions should take regard of building condition and location
- 4) Older structures should be sold to government or NGO so they can care for them
- 5) Retain total gold rush look in Downtown area
- 6) Period restoration decision of post Gold Rush buildings should be left up to owner
- 7) FN and art should also be part of the character
- 8) Replication area should be expanded to include south end
- 9) Sufficient oversight of staff
- 10) Need to build as green and efficient as possible

Opposing current proposal

- 1) No replication requirement, historic look should be good enough
- 2) More FN architecture should be allowed
- 3) More artistic designs should be allowed to reflect living community
- 4) Heritage management should only be in the Downtown area
- 5) Do not wish to pay more tax to ensure private citizens structures fit the heritage guidelines
- 6) No HardiePlank (same as vinyl or aluminum siding)

APPENDIX 1

Official Community Plan Amendment Process

| <u>Week</u> | <u>Action</u> |
|--------------------|--|
| 1 | Bylaw presented to Council agenda for first reading. |
| 1 | Notice of the OCP amendment is prepared describing: (a) area affected by the proposed OCP amendment (b) date, time and place for the public hearing respecting the OCP amendment (c) statement of the reasons for the amendment and an explanation for it |
| 1 | Prior to publication of the notice a copy is provided to the Minister of Community Services and the Yukon Municipal Board. |
| 2,3 | Notice of the OCP amendments is published at least once a week for two consecutive weeks in a local newspaper. |
| 7 | <u>PUBLIC HEARING</u> to hear and consider all submissions respecting the amendment. Not earlier than 21 days from last publication of notice. |
| 10 | Bylaw presented to Council agenda for second reading. |
| 10 | Prior to third reading, the bylaw is presented to the Minister of Community Services for approval. |
| 16 | Bylaw for amendment is approved or returned for amendment by Minister within 45 days. |
| 18 | Bylaw presented to Council agenda for third and final reading. |

APPENDIX 2

Zoning Bylaw Amendment Process

| <u>Week</u> | <u>Action</u> |
|--------------------|---|
| 3 | Bylaw presented to Council agenda for first reading. |
| 3 | Notice of the zoning bylaw amendment is prepared describing: (a) area affected by the proposed zoning bylaw amendment (b) date, time and place for the public hearing respecting the zoning bylaw amendment (c) statement of the reasons for the amendment and an explanation for it |
| 4,5 | Notice of the zoning bylaw amendments is published at least once a week for two consecutive weeks in a local newspaper. |
| 7 | <u>PUBLIC HEARING</u> to hear and consider all submissions respecting the amendment. Not earlier than 7 days from last publication of notice. |
| 12 | Bylaw presented to Council agenda for second reading. |
| 20 | Bylaw presented to Council agenda for third and final reading. |