

The Many Faces of Heritage:
Growing a Community of
Practice and Teaching
at the University of Waterloo

An Interdisciplinary Colloquium Convened by the
University of Waterloo Heritage Resources Centre

University of Waterloo
April 29, 2019

Colloquium Report

Prepared by Dr. Michael Drescher

July 2020

© Heritage Resources Centre

I. Executive Summary

This report covers the outcomes of ‘The Many Faces of Heritage’ – a heritage planning colloquium organized by the University of Waterloo Heritage Resources Centre. The colloquium was held on April 29, 2019, on the University of Waterloo campus, bringing together academics, practitioners and laypeople who share a general interest in heritage matters. The purpose of the colloquium was to highlight the latest interdisciplinary heritage research and ideas, explore collaborative opportunities, consider emerging challenges in heritage practice, and help foster the growth of a community of shared interest at the University of Waterloo.

Financially supported by the Faculty of Environment, the School of Planning, St. Jerome’s University, and Archaeological Services Inc., the colloquium consisted of presentations, small group work and a panel discussion addressing recent changes and emerging challenges in heritage research and education. In total, 76 individuals registered for the colloquium, making it a big success for the Heritage Resources Centre and the University of Waterloo.

The results from the colloquium sketch a picture of the heritage field as a dynamic and evolving discipline. The main themes emerging from the results are addressing Recent Challenges and Developments as well as Education. Theme 1 is the increasing over-regulation of heritage matters while at the same time political backing is decreasing. In response, many people are turned off of heritage matters while other groups weaponize heritage issues in pursuit of other interests. Theme 2 is a growing appreciation of the complexity and diversity of heritage objects including built, natural and intangible heritages that allows the addressing of heritage matters in a wide variety of contexts and from a variety of disciplines. Theme 3 is an increasing intertwining of heritage matters with urban and land development. This intertwining is reflected in growing interest in the conservation of cultural landscapes, the interactions between heritage and environmental sustainability issues such as climate change and biodiversity, and Indigenous reconciliation and land claims. Theme 4 speaks to the great interdisciplinarity of the heritage field. Heritage education needs to equip professionals with a wide practical skill set and a broad knowledge range; especially soft skills are increasingly important for the engagement of diverse communities and negotiations with an array of stakeholders and their various interests. Theme 5 addresses the specific heritage education needs of a wide range of heritage professionals and interested laypeople. Since the currently working heritage practitioners come from a wide range of backgrounds, they desire and require ongoing education to refine their knowledge and skill sets.

The heritage community can stand by passively or can more actively respond to these changes. Taking on an active role will require a concerted effort from the wider heritage community – especially to address societal engagement and educational needs. According to its mission, the Heritage Resources Centre stands ready to play a facilitative role in supporting the wider heritage community in taking on this challenge.

II. Acknowledgments

The Heritage Resources Centre is grateful to all financial supporters that contributed to making this event possible: the Faculty of Environment at the University of Waterloo, the School of Planning at the University of Waterloo, St. Jerome's University, and Archaeological Services Inc.

The Heritage Resources Centre also owes many thanks to all presenters: Dr. Janice Barry, Dr. Anne Bordeleau, Kayla Jonas Galvin, Kate Hagerman, Carolyn King, Dr. Marcus Letourneau, Laura Loney, Clara MacCallum-Fraser, Fred McGarry, Dr. Robert Park, and Dr. Robert Shipley. These individuals work at the forefront of academic and professional heritage matters and generously shared their time and insights for the benefit of the larger heritage community.

A big thanks to all volunteers: Amanda-Rose McCulley, Greg MacPherson, Mishaal Rizwan, Jacklyn Iezzi, Savonnae Street, and Siobhan Kelly. These individuals graciously have given of their time and effort in logistical support of this event; without them this event would not have been possible.

Last but not least, thank you to all participants who have contributed to making this event a great success.

Table of Contents

1. INTRODUCTION OF THE HERITAGE RESOURCES CENTRE	1
2. HERITAGE PLANNING COLLOQUIUM	2
2.1. PURPOSE OF THE HERITAGE PLANNING COLLOQUIUM.....	2
2.2. STRUCTURE OF THE HERITAGE PLANNING COLLOQUIUM.....	2
2.3. COLLOQUIUM PRESENTERS	3
2.4. COLLOQUIUM ATTENDEES	7
3. HERITAGE PLANNING COLLOQUIUM OUTCOMES	8
3.1. PRESENTATIONS	8
5.1.1. <i>Placemaking: Culture and Conservation – Kate Hagerman</i>	8
3.1.2. <i>Successes and Challenges of Heritage Conservation – Kayla Galvin</i>	8
3.1.3. <i>Erebus and Terror: Heritage as a Public/Private Commodity in the 21st Century – Dr. Robert Park</i>	9
3.1.4. <i>Monuments Today: Invisibility, Diversity and Indexicality – Dr. Anne Bordeleau</i>	9
3.1.5. <i>Change is the Law of Life: Musings on Future Challenges for Heritage Conservation Planning – Dr. Marcus Letourneau</i>	10
3.1.6. <i>Cultural Heritage Landscapes: Identification and Management – Laura Loney</i>	10
3.1.7. <i>Discovering our Commonwealth in Cultural Landscapes – Fred McGarry</i>	11
3.1.8. <i>Discovering our Commonwealth in Cultural Landscapes – Dr. Robert Shipley</i>	11
3.1.9. <i>Indigenous recognition, reconciliation and cultural heritage: Are we planning in "a good way"? – Dr. Janice Barry</i>	12
3.1.10. <i>Providing Support and Guidance through uncertain terrain - Let's talk about a Shared Path – Clara McCallum-Fraser and Carolyn King</i>	12
3.2. GROUP DISCUSSIONS.....	14
3.2.1. <i>Group Discussions Outcomes</i>	14
3.2.2. <i>Q1 - Path to the heritage field</i>	14
3.2.3. <i>Q2 - Qualification for work in the heritage field</i>	15
3.2.4. <i>Q3 - Facilitating entrance into the heritage field</i>	16
3.2.5. <i>Q4 - Increasing the draw of heritage education</i>	17
3.2.6. <i>Q5 - Interactions between heritage and the public interest</i>	18
3.2.7. <i>Q6 - Changes to the heritage field</i>	18
3.2.8. <i>Q7 - Recent challenges in the heritage field</i>	19
3.2.9. <i>Q8 - Effective preparation for work in the heritage field</i>	20
3.3. PANEL DISCUSSION	22
4. SYNTHESIS AND NEXT STEPS.....	24
4.1. MAIN THEMES.....	24
4.2. NEXT STEPS	25

1. Introduction of the Heritage Resources Centre

The Heritage Resources Centre is one of the oldest research institutes in the University, having been formed in the early 1980s. Originally created from an arrangement with Parks Canada in 1981 and a focus on natural heritage, the Heritage Resources Centre has developed a broad range of work with various federal and provincial agencies, private sector organizations, other universities, and groups in the heritage field. The Heritage Resources Centre takes a broad view of heritage as outlined in its original mission statement:

“The Heritage Resources Centre (HRC) encourages research, education, and information exchange activities among a wide range of groups and individuals. Participants come from university, government, and private groups in Ontario, elsewhere in Canada, and the international community. The word “heritage” is used in a broad sense involving both natural and cultural heritage. The HRC’s activities encompass geological, biological, archaeological, cultural, historical, marine and geographical aspects of heritage, as well as policies and institutions for heritage planning and management. The term goes beyond these more tangible things as well: to include the ideas, beliefs, and ways of life that people value and use when faced with change. To the extent that its resources permit, the HRC aims to serve those who wish to understand, conserve and use their heritage.”

While the Heritage Resources Centre carries out its research in the traditional way through the efforts of individual researchers and research teams, including students, it also continues to conduct its research and learning activities through workshops, seminars and study tours. These offer interactive opportunities to bring the professional researchers together with concerned or affected citizens and organizations at the provincial, regional and local levels, and provide for the inclusion of their learning, experience and perspectives in the research.

2. Heritage Planning Colloquium

2.1. Purpose of the Heritage Planning Colloquium

The main driver of this event was the observation that the fields of heritage research, planning and management have changed dramatically over the last few decades and will have to continue evolving as societies around us are changing as well. For example, heritage has always been political but this aspect has come increasingly to the fore, maybe especially in this time of rapid societal change and political populism.

Heritage has evolved from a focus on the preservation of built and natural environments to an interdisciplinary field covering issues as wide as land-use planning, lived cultural expressions, architecture, natural areas conservation, archaeology, and digital media storytelling. Increasingly also, critical heritage approaches come to the fore, touching on questions such as politics and power relationships, social justice, race and contested narratives, as well as Indigenous reconciliation. The community of interest in heritage is thus spread far and wide.

Accordingly, the purpose of the Heritage Planning Colloquium was to bring together heritage professionals, academics and interested laypeople, to discover and share common interests in the study, teaching, and practice of all aspects of natural and cultural heritage conservation at the University of Waterloo and beyond.

Academics, professional practitioners and interested laypeople from across the greater University of Waterloo community were invited to come together and highlight the latest interdisciplinary heritage research and ideas, explore collaborative opportunities, consider emerging challenges in heritage practice, and help foster the growth of a community of shared interest at the University of Waterloo.

2.2. Structure of the Heritage Planning Colloquium

The colloquium was designed to consist of two series of presentations, with five presentations each, followed by group work and a panel discussion. Presenters were asked to briefly introduce their area of work, sketch how they saw their work relate to heritage research and planning, describe emerging challenges in their field, and suggest the knowledge, skills and capacities required to overcome these challenges. The group work had attendees brainstorm how necessary knowledge, skills and capacities could be acquired and how the next generation of academics and practitioners should be mentored and trained to overcome these challenges.

Structure of the Day

The day was organized around two blocks of presentations, the first in the morning and the second in the afternoon. Each block of presentations lasted approximately 1.25 hours and was followed by small group discussions of approximately 0.75 hours.

Between the morning and afternoon sessions, participants were invited to take part in an extensive lunch break to allow participants to mix and mingle, network and discuss. In addition, participants were invited to an afternoon coffee break preceding the final panel discussion. The panel discussion presented the findings of the day and provided the audience an opportunity to pose questions to the presenters.

The small group discussions in the morning and afternoon were initiated by guiding questions. The discussions were recorded by note takers at each table using markers and large flip chart paper provided. In addition, notes were taken by volunteers that were rotating among tables. Attendees were asked to change tables for the discussions and sit with people that they do not know well already to encourage new knowledge exchanges. At the end of the discussions, the notes were shared with volunteers who distilled the main points and provided them to Dr. Shipley, Past president of the Heritage Resources Centre, who provided feedback to the entire audience at the beginning of the panel discussion.

2.3. Colloquium Presenters

Dr. Janice Barry, Assistant Professor, University of Waterloo, School of Planning

Janice Barry held previous appointments at the University of Glasgow, University of Sheffield and most recently the University of Manitoba. Her expertise is in Indigenous planning where she explores the relationship between Indigenous peoples and state-based planning, most recently employing interpretive policy analysis to examine the establishment of Indigenous reserves in urban areas. Dr. Barry is a Registered Professional Planner with an academic background that includes degrees in Planning (Ph.D. University of British Columbia), Canadian Studies and Native Studies (MA, Trent University) and Environmental Science and Biology (B.Sc. Trent). She is co-author of “Planning for Coexistence? Recognizing Indigenous rights through land-use planning in Canada and Australia”, and has been recognized for her community outreach work and her innovative teaching among many other achievements.

Dr. Anne Bordeleau, O'Donovan Director & Associate Professor, University of Waterloo, School of Architecture

A registered architect in Quebec, Anne Bordeleau was awarded a PhD from the Bartlett School of Graduate Studies (University College London, UK) after receiving her professional degree and Masters in the history and theory of architecture from McGill University (Montreal). She is an architect and historian with publications on the temporal dimensions of casting, drawings, maps, buildings and architecture more generally. She is one of four principals who worked on The Evidence Room, an exhibition in the central pavilion of the 15th Venice Biennale in 2016, and Architecture as Evidence (Canadian Centre of Architecture, 2016).

Dr. Bordeleau's research interests include the epistemology of the architectural project, as well as the historiographical and practical bearing of investigating the relations between architecture and time. Her teaching, research and practice have covered many fields, from medieval to modern cultural history, nineteenth-century architectural history and theory, the question of the preservation and communication of culture through architecture, concerns pertaining to rural architecture in contemporary China, as well as historical and theoretical considerations of casting as a practice. She is fundamentally interested in architecture as a cultural act, a commitment that informs her research as much as her approach to education.

Kayla Jonas Galvin, Heritage Operations Manager, Archaeological Research Associates & Heritage Resources Centre

Kayla Jonas Galvin has extensive experience evaluating cultural heritage resources for private and public sector clients to fulfill the requirements of the Environmental Assessment Act, the Standards & Guidelines for the Conservation of Provincial Heritage Properties and municipal Official Plans. She served as Team Lead on the MTCS Historic Places Initiative which drafted over 850 Statements of Significance and for Heritage Districts Works, a study of 64 heritage districts. Kayla was an editor of Arch, Truss and Beam: The Grand River Watershed Heritage Bridge Inventory and has worked on Municipal Heritage Registers in several municipalities.

Kate Hagerman, Manager - Environmental Planning and Stewardship, Regional Municipality of Waterloo

Kate Hagerman is Manager, Environmental Planning and Stewardship at the Regional Municipality of Waterloo. Previously, she has worked as Cultural Heritage Supervisor at the Region of Waterloo and worked collaboratively with municipal partners and community stakeholders to support local cultural development and to conserve cultural heritage resources throughout the Region. Her professional work as a cultural heritage planner has focused on strategic planning and policy development, cultural mapping, public art commissioning, heritage bridge recognition, scenic road preservation, identification of regionally significant heritage resources, cultural heritage landscape conservation, and protection of archaeological resources. Kate Hagerman has a Bachelor of Environmental Studies from the University of Waterloo, a Master of Science in Rural Planning from University of Guelph, and worked previously in the non-profit sector promoting heritage appreciation and education.

Carolyn King, Chair and Co-Founder, Shared Path Consultation Initiative

Carolyn King is the Chair and co-Founder of the Shared Path Consultation Initiative. She is the first woman to have been elected as Chief of the Mississaugas of the New Credit First

Nation (MNCFN) (December 1997 to December 1999). She has over 25 years of work experience in the field of First Nations community development, and extensive experience in public relations, economic development, the development of environmental planning policies and procedures, and establishing community radio. She is a Board member on numerous local community-based organizations and has served in municipal, regional, and national levels. She has been given numerous awards, including the Queen Elizabeth II Diamond Jubilee Medal (2012) in recognition of her support for First Nation history and the advancement of Aboriginal Peoples.

Dr. Marcus Letourneau, Managing Principal & Senior Heritage Planner, Letourneau Heritage Consulting Inc.

Marcus Letourneau is recognized both as a practitioner specializing in policy and process, and as an award-winning educator. As the Managing Principal of Letourneau Heritage Consulting Inc., he has experience working with a variety of heritage resources types and heritage organizations including the public, private, non-profit, and academic sectors. He is also a Senior Associate with Bray Heritage; an Adjunct Assistant Professor in the Department of Geography and Planning at Queen's University; and, a Contributing Associate for the Heritage Resources Centre at the University of Waterloo. He is also an instructor for the Willowbank School of Restorative Arts and the Ontario Museum Association and has been commissioned by Routledge to co-author with Dr. Hal Kalman on the second edition of the textbook "Heritage Planning." Dr. Letourneau served as Past President of the Ontario Association of Heritage Professionals, Past President of the Kingston Historical Society, on the Board of the Friends of the Rideau, and on the Interim Board of Directors for the Heritage Resources Centre at the University of Waterloo. He is a professional member of the Canadian Institute of Planners (MCIP), a Registered Professional Planner (RPP) and a full Canadian Association of Heritage Professionals (CAHP) member.

Laura Loney, Project Manager and Team Coordinator, Archaeological Services Inc.

Laura Loney holds a Master of Planning degree (MPlan) from the University of Waterloo, a post-graduate certificate in Museum Management and Curatorship from Sir Sanford Fleming College, and a BA (Hon) in History and English from Redeemer University. Laura Loney is a professional member of CAHP in good standing and has over eight years of experience as a heritage professional in both public and private sectors.

Clara MacCallum-Fraser, Executive Director, Shared Path Consultation Initiative

Clara MacCallum Fraser is the Executive Director and co-Founder of the Shared Path Consultation Initiative, a non-profit organization focused on the intersection of land use planning and Indigenous rights. She holds a BA in Political Science & Arabic Studies from Concordia University, a Masters in Urban Planning from Ryerson University. She is currently conducting a CGS-SSHRC funded Doctorate in Environmental Studies at York

University. The focus of her research is on the intersection of land use planning and Aboriginal & Treaty rights, exploring the issues in particular in southern Ontario. With the Shared Path, Fraser was a 2017-2018 Partner at the City Institute at York (CITY).

Fred McGarry, Executive Director, Centre for Community Mapping

Fred McGarry is a founding partner responsible for the marketing of the Web Informatics Development Environment (WIDE) software and founder of the Centre for Community Mapping (COMAP). WIDE is an initiative of the Computer Systems Group (CSG) at the University of Waterloo under the direction of Dr. Donald Cowan. In support of ongoing WIDE research at CSG, COMAP, a not-for-profit research corporation, investigates the adequacy of current versions of WIDE architecture, meta-models and technologies by discovering, designing, building, serving and maintaining operational applications for a broad client base. In this pursuit, COMAP creates and deploys strategies for socio-economic, cultural and environmental resilience. COMAP's web-based applications use collaborative geomatics, social media and customized applications to support networks among communities whose goal is strengthening civil society.

**Dr. Robert Park, Associate Dean of Arts - Cooperative Education and Planning,
Professor, University of Waterloo, Department of Anthropology**

Robert W. Park is an archaeological anthropologist with an interest in the cultures of the Far North (the Canadian Northwest Territories, Nunavut, Greenland and Alaska) and Northeastern North America. He received his BA from the University of Toronto in 1981, his MA from McMaster University in 1984, and his PhD from the University of Alberta in 1989. He has participated in archaeological fieldwork in Southern Ontario, Yukon, the Northwest Territories, and Nunavut.

Since 1977 Dr. Park has participated in archaeological fieldwork in Southern Ontario, Yukon, Northwest Territories, and especially Nunavut. Most of his research over the past 30 years has focused on the Inuit of Canada's Arctic, exploring the development of their way of life over the past 5,000 years. More recently he has become involved in archaeological research studying the early European exploration of that region, including searching for the last remains of Sir John Franklin's catastrophic 1845 expedition to traverse the Northwest Passage.

Dr. Robert Shipley, Past Director - Heritage Resources Centre, University of Waterloo

Robert Shipley, Associate Professor (retired) in the School of Planning at the University of Waterloo, is Past Director of the Heritage Resources Centre and former Research Fellow at Oxford Brookes University in Oxford, England.

Dr. Shipley is recognized as a leading international expert in the area of culture, heritage and tourism and particularly in the economics of heritage development. It has been said that his studies on building demolition, the economics of adaptive reuse, the real estate values of heritage properties and the success of heritage conservation districts have revolutionized heritage planning in Canada. Robert Shipley is particularly interested in heritage and tourism in smaller cities such as Stratford. He was part of a team that studied the impact of urban regeneration in towns and cities in the UK over a decade from 2001 to 2012. He is a Registered Professional Planner and member of the Writers Union of Canada. In 2012 he was awarded the Queen's Diamond Jubilee Medal for his contribution to Canadian scholarship. Robert Shipley was also a Project Evaluator for the European Science Council and the Norwegian Science Council.

2.4. Colloquium Attendees

In total, 76 individuals registered for the Heritage Planning Colloquium, including nine presenters. The presenters consisted to equal parts of academics and professionals with whose work stands in relation to the wider heritage field. The audience consisted mainly of heritage professionals and interested lay people, plus a smaller group of academics mainly from the University of Waterloo.

3. Heritage Planning Colloquium Outcomes

3. 1. Presentations

5.1.1. Placemaking: Culture and Conservation – Kate Hagerman

Kate Hagerman asked what heritage and culture we conserve. In the past, we tended to think of heritage and cultural objects as individual components and used sets of criteria to guide their conservation. However, now we are moving towards a systems approach of "placemaking" with functioning elements within a complex and evolving system. This is a collaborative process of shaping our public realm in order to maximize shared value. It is a creative process that pays particular attention to physical, cultural and social identities that define a place and supports its ongoing evolution. In doing so, it strengthens the connection between people and places. The process has to work with the resources that exists within a community including places to learn and engage, to experience and express, to live and connect. This process confronts the shared challenge of placelessness or the "geography of nowhere" that inflicts many Canadian cities that are indistinguishable from each other, that are impersonal and isolating, that are consumer driven and car-oriented. Opportunities to work on this process stem from working across many sectors including health and wellbeing, environmental sustainability and natural heritage conservation, Indigenous reconciliation, culture (diversity, localism, tourism) and arts (inspiration, makers, craftsmanship).

3.1.2. Successes and Challenges of Heritage Conservation – Kayla Galvin

Kayla Galvin reported on the interactions of professionals and volunteers in heritage work. The heritage field attracts many dedicated advocates and volunteers that contribute much time and effort to this work. The work produced is very valuable but uneven in its representation of communities and data types. How do and should professional heritage workers interact with such non-professional heritage workers? This question was addressed with reporting on two case studies: The first case was a project in the Weston Heritage Conservation District. Archaeological Research Associates were hired to support volunteer efforts and those of Conestoga College students. Archaeological Research Associates provided training, developed data collection methods, reviewed materials and delivered administrative support. The second case was a project for the Mohawk Institute. This reconciliation project was jointly led by the Ontario Archaeological Society and Archaeological Research Associates, in partnership with the Woodland Cultural Centre, Save the Evidence Campaign and Mohawk Village Memorial Park. The project is being conducted on the grounds of the Mohawk Institute former residential school. The professional partners provided information regarding volunteer field work and artifact processing opportunities, project updates and information. In working with community members great care has to be taken to engage in genuine dialogue, also involving open times for sharing of important artefacts and stories, and facilitated by interviews, surveys, mind mapping and other methods. These community interactions can help identification of

gaps and biases in the existing, official narratives, such as the role of previously unacknowledged actors and significant histories before the onset of the official narrative.

3.1.3. Erebus and Terror: Heritage as a Public/Private Commodity in the 21st Century – Dr. Robert Park

Robert Park narrated on the process of the discovery of the doomed Franklin Expedition for the Northwest Passage. Topics covered were the expedition itself, prior searches for the lost ships and crew, the most recent search that led to the discovery of the HMS Terror in 2014, and the commoditization and politicization of the discovery. The HMS Erebus and HMS Terror were both lost during the failed search for the Northwest Passage in 1845-1846. Already in the 19th century Inuit reports gave the approximate location of the ships. Early searches came up empty, but the wrecks of the HMS Erebus and HMS Terror were discovered in 2014 and 2016. Involved in the last search were Parks Canada, Canadian Coast Guard, academic archeologists, commercial operators and others. Douglas Stenton and Robert Park were charged with land-based surveys that delivered discoveries of ship hardware. This led to the changing of the search area by Parks Canada discovery of the HMS Erebus. Of interest is the commoditizing of the credit for discovery of the ship wrecks. Immediately after discovery of the 2014 wreck, communications were shut down onsite but led to a press conference with the then Prime Minister Stephen Harper. The Royal Canadian Geographic Society and politicians took credit for the discovery but public media produced articles critiquing the appropriation of the credit. Subsequently public media revealed that the government and lawyers began challenging the credit. Questions were raised about the role of Inuit in the wrecks' discoveries. It was known since long that Inuit had some knowledge about the ships' locations and the narrative became that Inuit "found the ship". At present, the ownership of the artifacts still is in flux. The main question coming out of this may be: If our goal is to preserve or promote more heritage, then how can we leverage 'credit' to get more heritage work done.

3.1.4. Monuments Today: Invisibility, Diversity and Indexicality – Dr. Anne Bordeleau

Anne Bordeleau invited the audience to consider the diversity of categories and functions of urban monuments. Reflection on urban monuments is of growing importance because of the shifting social attitudes with regard to monuments such as of Confederate generals in the USA or historic figures involved in the slave trade. Increasingly, parts of the public demand the removal or destruction of these monuments but destroying monuments does not destroy the history. So what does it mean to remember or to forget? There is a relationship between the forgotten and the unforgettable as well as between the visible and the invisible. Increasingly, a diverse range of actors are involved in debates around monuments giving rise to different categories of monuments, including intentional monuments meant to elevate historical figures and institutions of power, unintentional monuments that gradually become symbols and whose meaning is fluid in history, and incidental monuments that may have a smaller physical presence. However, monuments

can shifts between categories, move from unintentional to intentional, from visible to invisible, from high status to low status. Additional considerations are how 'museification' of objects creates monuments of something not originally created as such and the existence of codified symbols on the landscape that are only seen and understood by knowledgeable viewers. The purposeful creation of monuments has strengths but also limitations and bears complex entanglements with respect to their intended purpose.

3.1.5. Change is the Law of Life: Musings on Future Challenges for Heritage Conservation Planning – Dr. Marcus Letourneau

Marcus Letourneau asked the audience to consider the process of academic and professional planning for heritage conservation. He stated that heritage planning is not just about history but is political (and can therefore be abused) and a social construction that increasingly is moving toward more inclusive bottom-up approaches. Heritage planning also is not just about physical objects but includes a wide variety of 'heritage resources' that are part of sustainable, viable and healthy communities. Heritage programs should be about community value, but is this what we are we doing? At present, heritage is more about regulations and the use of heritage as a weapon to pursue other objectives. The heritage regulation framework is becoming increasingly complicated and difficult to follow. This may exclude large part of the community from the heritage planning process and focus on an elite who has the resources required to participate and influence the process. This raises the concern that heritage planners may not work toward heritage valued by communities and may lose community support for this work. The first step in addressing the problems of heritage planning is to understand how communities think about heritage and what they value. All our work in planning and then executing heritage plans has to flow forth from this understanding.

3.1.6. Cultural Heritage Landscapes: Identification and Management – Laura Loney

Laura Loney addressed the processes involved in the management of cultural heritage landscapes. She drew on the case of a cultural heritage landscape study in the City of Mississauga that was based on a review of provincial and international best practices. The reviewed materials provided information on identification and protection of cultural heritage landscapes with lots of information on identification processes but virtually no information about the implementation of protection processes. In the City of Mississauga, ten cultural heritage landscapes of many different kinds were identified that were arranged in a complex array including evolving aspects, such as brought about by natural heritage values. Challenges encountered involved issues of community engagement. For example, sometimes a community does no longer connect with historical features or events in an area. In such circumstances, does historical importance necessarily have to lead to conservation of the features? Other issues involve the most appropriate tools for the management of a cultural heritage landscape; this does not always have to be a powerful yet restrictive tool such as heritage conservation district. The simultaneous use of several

less restrictive tools can be effective such as tree management by-laws, heritage designation under the Ontario Heritage Act, and fostering support from the local community. Use of such a combination of tools can produce a much more adaptive and nuanced approach to urban cultural heritage landscape management. Upcoming developments involve an urban cultural heritage landscape study of Exhibition Place in the City of Toronto that will test cultural heritage landscape policy development in Ontario.

3.1.7. Discovering our Commonwealth in Cultural Landscapes – Fred McGarry

Fred McGarry shared with the audience a variety of digital heritage projects by the Centre for Community Mapping. The first project, called 'Mennonite Heritage Portrait', is based on 16 years of research working with the Mennonite community of the larger Waterloo region, documenting the rich Mennonite cultural heritage landscape of the region. The second project, 'Caledon Community Map', celebrates the natural and cultural heritage of the Town of Caledon. Both of these projects have created interactive digital archives of the heritage values of their communities. Several other projects involve Indigenous heritage. These projects include 'Dreamcatcher', an online application used to enable cultural resources mapping in support of community-based land use planning in the territory of the Mississaugas of the Credit First Nation, and 'First Story', an online application for the keeping and sharing of the Indigenous presence in the area of today's City of Toronto. The final project reported about is called 'Driftscape'. Driftscape is an application that serves as a platform for the collaborative publication and discovery of cultural landscapes. The platform is bringing together curated content from multiple communities including from Indigenous, LGBTQ+, heritage and arts. The advantages of this social enterprise platform relative to commercial applications include municipal support, freedom from intrusive ads, and the interaction of multiple community layers, as well as interest from the local business community. Planned extensions to the application include the addition of interior spaces (e.g., museum spaces) and an augmented reality experience that will deliver immersive visual and audio experiences.

3.1.8. Discovering our Commonwealth in Cultural Landscapes – Dr. Robert Shipley

Robert Shipley challenged the audience to examine the historic and current experience of North America in a colonial context. The dominating narrative of the Americas largely is that they have been discovered by the Italian explorer Christopher Columbus. However, this narrative brushes aside prior settlement of North America by Norse sailors and the millennia old, pre-existing Indigenous cultures of the Americas. In this context, the recently concluded Truth and Reconciliation Commission has challenged Canadian society to change and re-examine the Canadian narrative. While the British Commonwealth painted the Colonies as empty, wonderful places for Europeans to settle, the history of these countries is one of settler-Indigenous relationships. Instead of being a threat, the Truth and Reconciliation Commission therefore provides an opportunity for Canadian society to rectify and re-balance the historic narrative. Of course, language is important through the

meaning carried by its symbols. Accordingly, false expressions such as “Canada is a young country” should be re-examined and possibly avoided. The explicit expression of Indigenous territories is a start but not sufficient. The attribution of the name of an Italian explorer, Amerigo Vespucci, to the ‘New World’ is perpetuating the false narrative of the discovery of these lands by Europeans, driven mainly by an ideology promoted by the geopolitical interests of the USA. A discussion of the re-naming of North America to Turtle Island could be a continuation of reclaiming the historic narratives of the peoples of the ‘New World’.

3.1.9. Indigenous recognition, reconciliation and cultural heritage: Are we planning in "a good way"? – Dr. Janice Barry

Janice Barry explained to participants how planning can be a catalyst for changing relations between settlers and Indigenous peoples. The Indigenous concept of planning in “a good way” recognized Indigenous interests, respects indigenous knowledge, shares resources and authority, commits to rectifying harm, and privileges the building of relationships. The Canadian Institute of Planners’ new policy document calls for recognizing and upholding Indigenous planning approaches, advocating for tools that ensure the rights knowledge etc of Indigenous peoples, supporting opportunities for Indigenous people to enter the planning profession, and respecting the diversity of Indigenous peoples. How would these principles work in practice? The Australian experience of the Wurundjeri Country – reported in Janice Barry’s book with Libby Porter – might provide inspiration for the Canadian situation. In the Wurundjeri Country, Aboriginal groups have been able to make use of cultural heritage issues to modify a restrictive planning context and make it work better in their interest. Lessons for Canada include that planning has to start with relationship building, offer clear recognition of Indigenous authority and law, and proceed to examine issues of mutual interest.

3.1.10. Providing Support and Guidance through uncertain terrain - Let's talk about a Shared Path – Clara McCallum-Fraser and Carolyn King

Clara McCallum-Fraser and Carolyn King explained to participants that often a lack of knowledge, both of municipal planners and Indigenous communities, has hindered the development of coordinated Indigenous planning processes. The creation of the Shared Path Consultation Initiative has been driven particularly by the experiences of the Mississaugas of the Credit First Nation. These experiences highlighted challenges faced by Indigenous officials and planners, for example, surrounding land claims and land management. Today, the Mississaugas of the Credit First Nation is the only First Nation in Canada that has comprehensive planning requirements, such as by-laws, using the Ontario planning process as a guide. To address these challenges and support communities beyond the Mississaugas of the Credit First Nation, the Shared Path Consultation Initiative has been developing online resources to serve as an information hub about land development processes, holding workshops to provide professional development opportunities, working

to promote support from municipal councils, and providing an institutional memory to ensure knowledge continuity within municipal planning departments. Additional concerns explored considered planning for invisible cultural heritage. A starting point can be the creation of visible symbols on the landscape that refer to the invisible cultural heritage. An example is the Moccasin identifier project. Moccasins are traditionally worn footwear of Indigenous peoples with specific design characteristics that identified the tribe or culture of the wearer. This project is intended to encourage creating visible monuments on the landscape, such as by painting moccasins on the ground, denoting the specific Indigenous people that traditionally resided in the area. Combined with educational experiences, these visible monuments would serve to preserve knowledge of Indigenous cultures.

3.2. Group Discussions

Groups were asked to discuss a number of questions and record their answers through an assigned recorder (one of the group members) on provided poster sized paper.

Questions were organized in two rounds. The first round was focused on questions regarding heritage education, while the second round was focused on questions regarding changes and challenges to heritage as a discipline. The following questions were asked:

Round 1

- Q1. What was the path that has led you to become involved in the heritage field?
- Q2. What part of your professional work or education qualified you for working in the heritage field?
- Q3. What would you have liked to learn to facilitate your entry into the heritage field?
- Q4. In your experience, is heritage training sought after? What types of education could be improved? (education can take many forms, including continuing education, experiential learning, formal learning at college or university level)

Round 2

- Q5. How have you experienced heritage interacting with other matters of public interest (at municipal, provincial or general society level)?
- Q6. How has the heritage field changed since you began working or learning in this field?
- Q7. What recent challenges have you encountered or do you see emerging in the heritage field?
- Q8. Given recent and emerging changes and challenges, how could heritage education change to effectively prepare people for work in this field?

3.2.1. Group Discussions Outcomes

Group discussion results were transcribed and analyzed with qualitative data analysis software. The group discussion results were coded by themes and amalgamated across groups. The following themed results were recorded.

3.2.2. Q1 - Path to the heritage field

The majority of participants were introduced to the heritage field through the planning discipline. Several participants studied planning at university and learned about heritage through coursework, while other participants were exposed to heritage work through internships or co-op placements. A few individuals also mentioned that their work in development planning exposed them to issues around heritage.

In addition, many participants connected with heritage issues as a lay interest. These individuals were interested in heritage for a variety of reasons such as personal experience

of different cultures through travel, family traditions – sometimes passed on through story telling –, having been raised in a heritage community, interest in community dynamics and politics, and purchase of a heritage property. At times, family backgrounds related to heritage – being raised in a heritage community or being exposed by the family to heritage questions at young age – later translated into a professional occupation with heritage.

Several participants mentioned that archeology was an entry point to the heritage field. These individuals have received university education in archeology, worked as archeologists, or experienced the use of archeology as a tool to influence planning and development outcomes.

Several other participants indicated that architecture was their path to heritage. Mostly these individuals have studied architecture in university, while some also worked as architects. Other participants had contact with architects at work and were introduced to heritage in that indirect way.

History as a field of study or private interest was also mentioned as a reason for their attention given to heritage issues. At times, an interest in history at young age developed into a professional interest in later life.

Other participants narrated that work on municipal heritage committees or other committees exposed them to heritage issues and some participants encountered heritage questions as part of work in environmental conservation. A few additional participants mentioned that their work on Indigenous culture and rights brought them into contact with heritage issues.

Just a few participants mentioned that their introduction to heritage was through museum studies, genealogy, work as an archivist or economic development.

3.2.3. Q2 - Qualification for work in the heritage field

A large diversity of educational and professional backgrounds were suggested as qualifications for heritage work. Several participants mentioned the interdisciplinary aspect of heritage work. A combination of different experiences or qualifications can be brought by individuals to the heritage work or by a combination of individuals working in a team. In contrast, participants expressed that actual heritage course work at institutions of higher learning was very limited.

A large group of participants suggested that their prior work and education in the planning discipline qualified them to also work in the heritage field. One participant specifically added that planners' skills in facilitation are a great asset for work in heritage matters. 'Soft skills', including negotiation and communication, were brought up by several participants as an essential qualification for work on heritage issues. Having said this, numerous

participants expressed that many of the qualifications required for heritage work are acquired by practical experiences in the heritage field, i.e., through work in this sector.

Another large group of participants narrated that community experiences, personal interests and story telling by family members served as the qualification to work on heritage matters. Related to this, several participants expressed that their volunteer contributions – often as municipal heritage committee member – qualified them. Interestingly, one participant brought up familiar relationships (in this case: lack of a relationship) as a barrier to entry into heritage work. Two participants narrated that the heritage community was a closed profession that one can only enter when one has a familiar legacy or tie to the community.

A few participants highlighted how they saw their work in architecture provided the required qualification to work on heritage matters, especially built heritage. Related to this, a few participants mentioned their background in engineering as their qualification for heritage work.

For just a few participants their qualification for the heritage field stemmed from their background in environmental conservation. A few additional participants reported their qualification was based on their knowledge of municipal governance, legislation and politics.

Additional individual participants mentioned their employment and studies in archeology, museum studies, history, world heritage studies, as archivist, and economic development officer as something that qualified them to work also in the heritage field.

3.2.4. Q3 - Facilitating entrance into the heritage field

Several participants emphasized the interdisciplinary nature of heritage. They stressed that a heritage education program facilitating entrance to this discipline ideally would draw on a variety of other disciplines such as planning, archeology and architecture, as well as environmental and Indigenous studies instead of defining itself as its own 'field'. However, the suggestion not to define heritage studies as their own field might stand in contrast to the notion voiced by another participant that heritage is a fuzzy concept that is not well understood in the public's mind. In connection to this issue, some participants wondered about the definition of heritage: what it is, who defines it, and how it could be made more inclusive.

Broad heritage training would differ from the current approach where most heritage workers are becoming especially qualified in just one area and then have to learn other areas through experience as they have practical exposure to the heritage sector. It has been noted that heritage knowledge appears to occur in two (2) tiers: 1. foundational, basic, or general, and 2. specialized. The foundational knowledge can be provided by related

disciplines such as planning or architecture; the acquisition of specialized knowledge has not been discussed.

Seemingly in contrast to an emphasis on formal heritage education, several participants focused on the importance of practical skills that need to be acquired through the actual experience of doing heritage work. They noted that no course work can replace these experiences but emphasized that networking opportunities and mentoring are important. This could include increasing access to the living memory of heritage matters in municipal governments or creation of accessible archives of heritage issues.

Since many individuals working in the heritage field have arrived there from other disciplines, continuing education opportunities would be welcome and important. However, if continuing education is provided by universities perceived access barriers to universities would have to be reduced.

Several participants emphasized the importance of the “love of old” for heritage education and work. However, this “love of old” stands in contrast to notions of other participants who stressed that heritage is not about the past but about the present. Questions arose about how and why we learn about the past, and what meaning we give these learnings in the present. Several participants found it important to give heritage a higher profile, emphasize its connection to livability and to celebrate heritage. These perceptions could be driven by diverse sources such as teachers or community members and increase inspiration to work on heritage matters.

The importance of “soft skills” training such as communication, facilitation conflict resolution was emphasized again as well as organizational processes such as leading effective meetings. Several participants also mentioned the importance of learning about the politics and policy processes, including legislation and governance, which affect heritage matters.

3.2.5. Q4 - Increasing the draw of heritage education

Several participants emphasized the multi- or inter-disciplinary nature of heritage work. It brings to together several other fields such as planning, architecture and archeology, and should be embraced as a cross-disciplinary program or stream that enables a variety of ways to obtain the required education.

To increase interest in heritage, participants suggested to teach history early on in the school system, to bridge the divide between academia and non-academic communities, and to address access and other concerns of the local communities. A few participants added that community members could get involved in heritage work in informal ways. Participants explained that heritage education and training are wanted by volunteers and community members but preferably would be delivered in informal ways and not as credit

or degree programs. Continuing education would be sought after, for example in the form of workshops such as delivered in the past by the Heritage Resources Centre.

3.2.6. Q5 - Interactions between heritage and the public interest

Several participants described how the public might lack interest in heritage matters because they are not educated about them and not made aware of them. They also mentioned that new Canadians might show less interest in local heritage and that heritage might be perceived to conflict with private property rights.

On the other hand, some participants referred to an increased public interest in Indigenous heritage. This could be addressed in several ways such as inclusion of Indigenous heritage in the Waterloo Region museum, increased general awareness of Indigenous issues, and greater efforts across levels in the pursuit of reconciliation. In this context, addressing heritage matters provides an opportunity to address historic narratives and re-evaluate them for current perspectives.

A few participants referred to the role of heritage in economic development, such as through rising property values and heritage tourism, as well as the link between heritage and environmental conservation. However, it was also questioned by several participants whether the political will was always present to pursue heritage matters. These problems might also be related to policy issues such as opposing policy priorities – requiring the skill to balance interests –, conflicting jurisdictions of various review agencies, and generally cumbersome legislative processes. All of this might also pose challenges for the meaningful engagement of a variety of stakeholders.

While it was questioned what the ‘public interest’ really is, many participants referred to possible conflicts between heritage with issues such as housing affordability, ‘workable’ neighborhoods, municipal (tax base) growth, and public transit (and other infrastructure) improvements. These conflicting municipal priorities require constant balancing of stakeholder priorities. The land development industry has come to see heritage as a necessary ‘nuisance’, undervaluing heritage right from the start of any negotiation of development proposals. Local communities, on the other hand, increasingly use ‘heritage’ as an argument in opposition of undesired land development. Either way, heritage matters can be a useful stimulation for community dialogue. In addition, ‘heritage’ can be a vital component of conservation in the built and natural environment, for example through avoiding the tear down of existing buildings (‘the greenest building is one that is built already’) and protection of open and green spaces.

3.2.7. Q6 - Changes to the heritage field

Participants mentioned changes such as a shift from top-down approaches to more community-based actions. This required more work with local communities whose support

for heritage matters is needed. However, given the geographic mobility of present-day people, a growing group of residents might be unattached to their local community and support for local heritage matters might be more difficult to come by. Community-based work for heritage matters also carries the risk that support is not provided thus weakening political backing for heritage legislation. In particular, if local support for heritage regulations is lacking, enforcement will lead to blow-back and undesirable over-regulation.

Heritage matters have been introduced and strengthened in provincial planning legislation, much of it through larger-scale, strategic plans and the introduction of new tools such as heritage conservation districts. However, provincial government support for the execution of legislation by municipalities is weakening. Much heritage work is strongly affected by land use planning and development. Accordingly, conflicts about these matters increasingly lead to litigation and end up at land use tribunals. To avoid legal conflicts, whether between competing stakeholder interests or between competing regulations, creative approaches to heritage management are needed instead of just regulations. This also includes working with willing developers that have grown an understanding of heritage matters.

Several participants mentioned a shift in heritage interests from buildings to include other matters such as landscapes and intangible heritage. This broadening perspective, also includes increasing interest and openness to Indigenous matters. In terms of tangible heritage, an increasing diversity of properties is being designated as heritage properties, providing for a wider representation of heritage. More frequently, however, conservation and adaptive re-use of built heritage now is being weighed against other concerns regarding building stock functionality such as accessibility and energy efficiency. In addition, the connection between heritage and economic development is now much more appreciated.

The general message is that heritage work has become more complex requiring sophisticated approaches and more communication through networking, conferences and informal discussions.

3.2.8. Q7 - Recent challenges in the heritage field

Many participants referred to the increasingly important political, regulatory and administrative context of heritage issues. Heritage work is uncertain as the regulatory framework is changing (e.g., LPAT), political backing seems to weaken, and funding is limited. At the same time, legislation governing heritage issues is becoming more complex, conflicting and cumbersome to navigate. Some planning legislation such as the growth plan is creating a conflict between increasing urban density and heritage preservation in historic downtowns. Driven by economic competitiveness thinking ingrained in municipal approaches, additional challenges include short-term economic plans that trump the benefits of heritage preservation.

Some participants worried that anticipated re-workings of provincial planning legislation would weaken heritage protections and that municipalities are too close to the ground to provide solutions. Instead, calls were made for an update on the Ontario Heritage Act (e.g., to clarify matters of “significance” or “context” as stated in Ontario regulation 9/06) and stronger federal leadership in unifying fragmented heritage policy. It was mentioned that the tools available for heritage management have not kept pace with the changing questions and contexts, as well as acknowledgment of the value of newer heritage (i.e., post World War II).

Heritage work is also increasingly difficult because of its intertwining with environmental questions such as climate change mitigation (e.g., energy efficiency and building stock replacement) and climate change adaptation (e.g., floods and fire), as well as species-at-risk, for example where heritage properties are habitat for an endangered species requiring protection. Related also are growing questions about the role of Indigenous reconciliation and heritage. Questions were raised about how to engage with the heritage of “others” and about the uncovering and meaningful integration of Indigenous heritage – including Indigenous heritage landscapes – in the land use planning framework. The requirements for Indigenous consultation and engagement have increased tremendously over the last few decades, providing challenges and opportunities for development of this field.

Mentioned challenges also include an apparent lack of saliency to “ordinary people” and a difficulty to connect diverse communities of new Canadians to local heritage matters. This emphasizes also the increasing importance of soft skills especially for negotiation and facilitation, and an evidence-based approach that avoids confrontations with and between communities and different stakeholders. On a more practical level, engagement of younger people and workforce renewal have been mentioned as challenges.

A few participants stated that definitions of heritage need to be updated and need to speak to context and significance. Mentioned challenges include the interdisciplinarity of the heritage field, sacrificing a clear direction for increasing breadth.

3.2.9. Q8 - Effective preparation for work in the heritage field

It was mentioned that all planners should be exposed to heritage planning as part of a fully rounded planning education. The importance of exposure to practical work was emphasized by various participants. This practical experience could be acquired through positions such as on volunteering on municipal heritage communities, internships and apprenticeships. Participants remarked that heritage requires a tangible approach, i.e., concrete, direct exposure to physical heritage objects. This would be more important than a mere focus on heritage legislation.

Participants stated that “saving a place” requires a multidisciplinary approach. This has to include the economics of this approach but also training in soft skills such as face-to-face interactions, active listening, and multiple ways of communication, including storytelling

and the development of compelling narratives. Heritage planners need to be educated about the importance of inclusivity and how to engage diverse perspectives. Such a broad skill set could be acquired through a broad portfolio of positions or tasks.

Several participants lamented the lack of a heritage planning degree in Ontario. They emphasized that this education cannot simply be covered by a general planning degree: A planner is not equivalent to a heritage planner. However, participants wondered who would offer and finance such a program.

Several participants emphasized the value of heritage training through continuing education. This would require a reduction of barriers to education and an embrace of education forms with low access thresholds such as through webinars. Including requirements for continuing professional development would serve as motivation to participate in this education and would help justify participants' investment of time and money. Federal or provincial organizations such as the Canadian Association of Heritage Professionals or the Ontario Professional Planners Institute could offer such education and guarantee a high level of quality.

Because of the relation of heritage planning to land development planning – and therefore its link with colonization – and because of the importance Indigenous reconciliation efforts, Indigenous perspectives should be addressed in heritage education.

3.3. Panel Discussion

The panel discussion was started with a summary reading of the notes collected from the small group discussions. These notes, in addition to the previous presentations, were meant as an inspiration for the formulation of questions to the workshop presenters.

Future heritage work

The first question from the floor aimed at how we can prepare ourselves for the heritage work demands of the future. Specifically, it was asked how we can anticipate what future heritage values are going to be. Marcus Letourneau answered that it will be difficult to anticipate future heritage values but suggested that engagement with youth would help connecting future generations with heritage issues. Carolyn King narrated an experience from a community consultation meeting where the ethnic diversity of the community was not represented by the community members that actually visited the meeting. Increasing attention to equitably engaging all parts of the community will be very important for future heritage work. Anne Bordeleau added that our society appears increasingly short-sighted. Going forward, it will be necessary to seek more common ground, instead of just satisfying current needs and desires. A final comment was made stating the responsibility of heritage professionals to inform the community as well as to solicit community input in an effort to ensure that informed opinions are obtained that can define community heritage values.

Planning for a diverse society

A second set of questions aimed at the “fit” of the current land use planning framework to the complex and diverse values of society. Specifically, it was asked whether we have the necessary tools to address these complex and diverse values and if not, how the current planning framework should be changed? Robert Shipley answered that cultural heritage landscapes that can speak to diverse community values fill a gap in the heritage regulation framework. He emphasized that the Heritage Resources Centre always has been at the forefront of defining best practices such as these. Michael Drescher emphasized new cultural heritage landscape work by the Heritage Resources Centre that starts with bottom-up community engagement and then goes out to do fieldwork. This is the reverse of the usual expert-driven process. Adding to the cultural heritage landscape theme, Kayla Galvin narrated the case of cedar trees that were defined as part of the cultural heritage landscape at a school of the blind since they had a particular scent and attracted birds that appealed to and helped orient blind students. Marcus Letourneau added that Newfoundland is a Canadian leader in intangible cultural heritage, but local professionals considered it to still be a work in progress. He stated that heritage professionals tend to lean on heritage legislation but need to look at heritage more holistically and consider other options than just regulation. For example, the Metis Nation considered certain artifacts present at Sault Ste. Marie to be properties that have “cultural heritage value or interest”, whereas the Ontario Heritage Act considers artifacts as chattels, which required the creation of a work around the Ontario Heritage Act to achieve the heritage conservation objective. Carolyn

King mentioned that engagement of First Nations usually involves a notification about what municipalities are planning to do. However, engagement cannot just be sending a letter but has to be earlier and much more extensive. Historically engagement has been very poorly executed. Fred McGarry reported on students in Cambridge that have created a database of the Blair cemetery. This project involved teachers in mathematics, geography, and history, and led to a high level of youth engagement in this heritage project.

Natural and cultural heritage

The third question aimed at understanding how natural and cultural heritage can be brought into closer alignment. Laura Loney reported that the majority of cultural heritage landscapes are dominated by natural heritage and that municipalities have tools in place to protect cultural heritage landscapes (e.g. tree bylaws). These tools can be applied creatively to protect cultural heritage landscapes. Janice Barry added that the differentiation between nature and culture is a false dichotomy and that there needs to be greater acknowledgment of Indigenous laws and ways of knowing. Michael Drescher noted the different perspective on cultural landscapes in North America compared to Europe. Virtually all European landscapes are known as cultural landscapes in their various forms. Carolyn King reminded the audience of the predominant view that undeveloped land was wasted land. She also emphasized that taxing land even when it is not producing revenue is a structural problem that works against natural heritage conservation. Marcus Letourneau referred back to Carl Sauer, emphasizing that culture works with and on nature to create ways-of-life. The original ideas of cultural heritage landscapes are derived from Sauer's work but a through engagement with these original ideas has not occurred since long.

Species-at-risk and cultural heritage

The fourth and last question aimed at the relationship between and cultural heritage conservation and species-at-risk protection, such as in cases involving chimney swifts and barn swallows. Kate Hagerman noted that the interaction of cultural heritage conservation and species-at-risk is complex and needs to be addressed on a case-by-case basis.

4. Synthesis and Next Steps

The Heritage Planning Colloquium has brought together academics, professionals and interested laypeople to learn about and discuss the latest interdisciplinary heritage research and ideas, explore collaborative opportunities, consider emerging challenges in heritage practice, and help foster the growth of a community of shared interest. Out of the presentations, group work and discussions several main themes emerged that are of interest to the wider heritage community.

4.1. Main Themes

Recent Challenges and Developments

The first main theme emerging from the colloquium is the increasing over-regulation of heritage matters. Heritage legislation is of growing complexity making heritage matters inaccessible to many ordinary citizens, while at the same time political backing is decreasing. In response, many people are turned off of heritage matters while other groups weaponize heritage issues in pursuit of other interests. It may often be better to pursue heritage interests with other means than heavy-handed regulations. Making heritage issues matter to young people and diverse communities requires genuine engagement instead of top-down approaches.

The second theme that emerged is a growing appreciation of the complexity and diversity of heritage objects including built, natural and intangible heritages. This diversification of heritage matters seems to be a more inclusive approach to heritage and allows the addressing of heritage matters in a wide variety of contexts and from a variety of disciplines. However, this heritage diversification also leads to an increasing complexity for the definition of heritage and a possible vagueness of the field as a whole. A reinserting of a public dialogue about Canadian heritage matters is required to come to a new understanding of the meaning and role of heritage in modern-day Canadian society.

The third emerging theme is an increasing intertwining of heritage matters with urban and land development. This intertwining is reflected in growing interest in the conservation of cultural landscapes, the interactions between heritage and environmental sustainability issues such as climate change and biodiversity, and Indigenous reconciliation and land claims. Driving these interactions is the consumptive resource extraction of European settler societies that fundamentally transforms landscapes, cultural identities and the very nature of human interactions with the environment. It is necessary to observe heritage matters as embedded in the larger framework of global environmental and social change to understand better how heritage is affected and affects these dynamics.

Education

The fourth theme that emerged speaks to the great interdisciplinarity of the heritage field. Heritage education needs to equip professionals with a wide practical skill set and a broad knowledge range, covering legislation, community relations, sustainability issues, economic development, and so forth. Especially soft skills are increasingly important for the engagement of diverse communities and negotiations with an array of stakeholders and their various interests. While many heritage professionals come to the heritage field from other professions, a dedicated heritage education covering theory and practice would be much sought after.

The last emerging theme addresses the specific heritage education needs of a wide range of heritage professionals and interested laypeople. Since the currently working heritage practitioners come from a wide range of backgrounds, they desire and require ongoing education to refine their knowledge and skill sets. Additional continuing education opportunities next to formal certificate or degree programs would lower access limitations for these populations and provide for a better connection between the academic and practicing heritage sectors.

4.2. Next Steps

The Heritage Planning Colloquium has highlighted a number of recent developments and challenges for research and education in the heritage field. The heritage community can stand by passively and be swept along by these changes or can take a more active role in responding to these changes. Taking on such an active role will require a concerted effort from the wider heritage community – especially with regard to addressing societal engagement and educational needs.

According to its mission, the Heritage Resources Centre is prepared to play a facilitative role in supporting the wider heritage community in taking on this challenge.