

**Stopping the wrecking ball:
addressing demolition by neglect in Winnipeg, Manitoba**

by
Cheryl Mann

A Thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies of
The University of Manitoba
In partial fulfilment of the requirements of the degree of

MASTER OF CITY PLANNING

Department of City Planning
Faculty of Architecture
University of Manitoba
Winnipeg

Copyright © 2022 Cheryl Mann

Abstract

Winnipeg's built heritage is suffering from demolition by neglect, the lack of maintenance on designated heritage buildings which results in their demolition, often in the name of public safety. Although built heritage is a valuable community asset and the issue of demolition by neglect has been discussed for over two decades, little research has taken place to find solutions. This thesis explores the methods used for addressing demolition by neglect in Hamilton, Ontario; Ottawa, Ontario, and Edmonton, Alberta and seeks to understand if these methods would be effective in addressing the issue in Winnipeg, Manitoba. A document analysis and semi-structured interviews were used to uncover the methods for addressing demolition by neglect in the three cities while a focus group considered the applicability of the methods to Winnipeg. The result was a typology of strategies suggesting three recommendations for addressing demolition by neglect in Winnipeg: effective communication, supporting redevelopment and increased political will. When addressing a wicked problem like demolition by neglect, planners, policy makers, researchers and community groups need to take a customised, flexible approach that evaluates the individual context of each heritage building and work together to find solutions that will both stop the neglect and support a vibrant and sustainable community.

Acknowledgments

Completing this thesis has been a long and challenging journey which I could not have done without the support and encouragement of so many people. I would like to sincerely thank my advisor, Dr. Richard Milgrom, for sticking with me through the ups and down, and guiding me through this process. Thank you to my committee members, Dr. Rae Bridgman and Giles Bugailiskis, for being so accommodating and supportive of me completing this project. To everyone at Heritage Winnipeg, thank you for your kind words, resources and willingness to help over the past few years. Thank you to all the individuals who participated in the semi-structured interviews and focus group, this research would not have been possible without your generosity of time and knowledge. And to my friends and family, a heartfelt thank you for your continual encouragement, positive energy and endless patience – I could not have done this without you. Thank you!

Table of Contents

Abstract	i
Acknowledgments	ii
1.0 Introduction	1
1.1 Defining Demolition by Neglect	1
1.2 Purpose	2
1.3 Research Questions	4
1.4 Research Methods	5
1.4.1 Document Analysis.....	6
1.4.2 Semi-Structured Interviews	7
1.4.3 Focus Group	9
1.5 Biases and Limitations	10
1.6 Significance of Research	12
1.7 Overview	12
2.0 Theoretical Framework and Literature Review	13
2.1 Theoretical Framework	13
2.2 Literature Review	17
2.2.1 Tangible History	18
2.2.2 Sense of Place	20
2.2.3 Environmental Sustainability	22
2.2.4 Economics	24
2.2.5 Causes of Demolition by Neglect	27
2.2.6 Methods for Addressing Demolition by Neglect	29
2.2.7 Demolition by Neglect in Winnipeg	32
3.0 Document Analysis	35
3.1 Hamilton, Ontario	35

3.2 Ottawa, Ontario	38
3.3 Edmonton, Alberta	40
4.0 Semi-Structured Interviews.....	43
4.1 Research Methods	43
4.2 Coding Results and Discussion	44
4.2.1 Preventing Neglect	44
4.2.2 Rectifying Neglect	51
4.2.3 Punishing Neglect	55
4.2.4 Political Will	56
4.3 Summary	59
5.0 Focus Group	60
5.1 Research Methods	60
5.2 Coding Results and Discussion	61
5.2.1 Preventing Neglect	62
5.2.2 Effective Communication	65
5.2.3 Political Will	69
5.2.4 Challenges	72
5.3 Summary	75
6.0 Conclusions	76
6.1 Answering Research Questions	76
6.1.1 Question One	77
6.1.2 Question Two	79
6.2 Winnipeg Specific Recommendations	81
6.2.1 Effective Communication	82
6.2.2 Supporting Redevelopment	83
6.2.3 Increased Political Will	85
6.3 Implications for Planning Practice	86
6.4 Recommendations for Further Study	86

6.5 Summary 88

References..... 90

Appendices

A: Semi-Structured Interview Guide 99
B: Focus Group Guide 100
C: Email Script for Semi-Structured Interview Participants 103
D: Email Script for Focus Group Participants 105
E: Project Background Information for Prospective Participants 107
F: Statement of Informed Consent for Semi-Structured Interview Participants
..... 109
G: Statement of Informed Consent for Focus Group Participants 114
H: TCPS 2: CORE Certificate of Completion..... 119

1.0 Introduction

Winnipeg's built heritage is crumbling. Buildings that have stood for a century or more, weathering economic depression, redevelopment, harsh winters, floods and fires, are being brought to their knees by neglect. Time has certainly taken its toll, but most trials faced by these heritage buildings could be avoided if owners performed simple regular maintenance. It is all too often the crucial missing linchpin that sends grand centenarians to an early grave.

Despite protective legislation and programs intended to support the conservation of built heritage, too many heritage buildings are being left to fend for themselves, until they reach the point of collapse. It is only then that the local government is forced to intervene, and faced with a failing structure beyond repair, they cast the final blow, ordering demolition in the name of public safety. This is a slow and silent killer, thriving on apathy and stripping communities of their built heritage. This is *demolition by neglect*.

As these once proud heritage buildings are reduced to rubble, so too is the history they hold, the continuity they provide their community, their contributions to environmental sustainability, their bolstering of the local economy and more. Built heritage is an irreplaceable resource that should be cherished and celebrated, recognized for its important contributions to the quality of life for everyone in its orbit. What can Winnipeg do to better address demolition by neglect before all of its built heritage becomes history?

1.1 Defining Demolition by Neglect

Neglect of built heritage starts with a lack of maintenance and ends with the loss of a heritage building (Brazil, 2003, p. 83; Corbett Richardson, 2008, p. 5; Muratore, 2013, p. 3; Newman & Saginor, 2014, p. 623; Thompson, 2011, p. 11). How the built heritage is lost depends on the individual context. Some heritage buildings will have decayed quietly until one

day they simply fall down under their own weight (Albinger, 2014, p. 14). Others, having caught the attention of the community and, when inspected by experts, might be deemed a hazard to the public with problems that cannot be repaired. These heritage buildings are then demolished in the name of public safety (Albinger, 2014, p. 14; Miller, 2010, p. 1; Newman & Saginor, 2014, p. 624; Renz Swyers, 2013, p. 1). No matter how they meet their end, heritage buildings lost due to a chronic lack of maintenance all fall under the description of demolition by neglect.

For the purpose of this thesis, demolition by neglect will only be considered in the context of designated heritage buildings that cannot be legally demolished. For historic buildings without a designation, demolition by neglect is not such an issue as a demolition permit can be legally obtained. All references to “built heritage” or “heritage building” are made with the understanding that the building has an historical designation protecting it from demolition.

1.2 Purpose

The city of Winnipeg in Manitoba, Canada, has been struggling with demolition by neglect since it first introduced a heritage bylaw in 1977 (City of Winnipeg Historical Buildings Committee, 1979, p. 3). Unfortunately, despite this legislation, along with the best efforts of local government, nonprofits and the public, some heritage buildings were still being so badly neglected, they were eventually reduced to rubble. Over time, more bylaws were enacted with the hope that they would curb this trend, along with programs that supported built heritage conservation – but the losses continued. Frustration in the community has grown as people have come to understand that built heritage is a valuable and limited resource, which cannot be replaced once it is gone. Even today, demolition by neglect continues to rob Winnipeg of its built heritage.

Demolition by neglect in general is a problem with a lengthy history and few meaningful solutions. The term rose to popularity in the middle of the 1990s, putting a name to an issue that had long plagued built heritage (Newman & Saginor, 2014, p. 623). Over the two and a half decades since then, little progress has been made in solving the problem. Although there are many factors that contribute to the challenges faced in addressing demolition by neglect, likely the biggest obstacle is its being a wicked problem.

Wicked problems are those that are complex and complicated, greatly influenced by context, the effectiveness of solutions is subjective, outcomes of solutions cannot be definitively tested and there are no one-size-fits-all solutions (Rittel & Weber, 1973, pp. 162-163). This description perfectly describes the problem of demolition by neglect, where every heritage building has its own context and set of complications. Heritage advocates and heritage building owners often find themselves at odds when seeking solutions and even if one is settled on, the repercussions of tomorrow may invalidate the success of today. Further, a solution that is successful in one case is unlikely to work for the next heritage building in peril. For governments challenged with trying to build sustainable cities that support all citizens, stopping the loss of built heritage to demolition by neglect can seem like an impossible pursuit, especially when faced with many other pressing crises.

The objective of this research was to generate a typology of strategies to support the City of Winnipeg in its efforts to address demolition by neglect. Though not all ideas in this typological analysis will immediately be feasible due to legislative, political or fiscal restraints, they may still inspire planners to work within their means to find viable solutions. This was accomplished by establishing the importance of built heritage and the challenges associated with the problem of demolition by neglect, exploring the different methods used by three Canadian

cities to address demolition by neglect, and interviewing heritage professionals from these cities. The results were then compiled and presented to a focus group of Winnipeg heritage professionals, whose feedback was used to create a typological framework that planners, policy makers, researchers and community groups might use for inspiration when trying to better address demolition by neglect in Winnipeg and beyond.

1.3 Research Questions

The research for this thesis was guided by two main questions. The first is: *What methods have been used in other cities to address demolition by neglect and what have the results been?* These methods could include policies, regulations or partnerships. They could encompass top-down or bottom-up approaches, and range from heritage building owners being incentivised to maintain their property, to communities taking legal action to address non-compliance. Some methods could be used in isolation while others may be used in conjunction with other policies and regulations, creating an array of options when approaching the problem. Beyond understanding the approaches used by other cities, it is also important to understand their rate of success, based on the interviews with heritage professionals. This question also explores why approaches have been more or less successful, considering the challenges they faced and the strengths they bring to addressing the problem.

The second guiding question for this research is: *Would any of the methods for addressing demolition by neglect from other cities be potentially useful in Winnipeg, and what challenges would they face in implementation?* Context is of the utmost importance when considering if successful (or even unsuccessful) methods from other cities would be relevant in a Winnipeg context. At the same time, adaptability was also considered. New legislation could open the door to previously unimplementable methods, while fine-tuning approaches to better fit

the Winnipeg context was also an option. The pros and cons of each possible method were considered, so that the final recommendations would be meaningful to Winnipeg. Selected methods not only aimed to save heritage buildings but also took into consideration other important factors, such as respecting the rights of heritage building owners. This resulted in recommendations that will benefit Winnipeg's built heritage, the community and built heritage owners.

1.4 Research Methods

Research began by selecting three Canadian cities comparable to Winnipeg: Hamilton, Ontario; Ottawa, Ontario and Edmonton, Alberta. By staying within Canada and selecting cities with similar populations, economic backgrounds and built heritage resources, it was hoped that any of their methods for addressing demolition by neglect would be more relevant in the Winnipeg context. All three cities had both a dedicated heritage planner employed by the municipal government and a nonprofit built heritage advocacy organisation.

The nature of the research questions called for a qualitative approach to “uncover trends in thought and opinions and to dive deeper into a problem” (Byrne, 2017), in this case, demolition by neglect. A document analysis looking at material from the three chosen cities was the starting point for answering the first research question: What methods have been used in other cities to address demolition by neglect and what have the results been? Because what is written in policy is not always what is practised or does not produce the intended result, a series of semi-structured interviews was also used to answer the first research question. This created a more in-depth understanding of how the methods of addressing demolition by neglect in the three comparable cities function in practice, and provided opportunities for discovering methods that were unconventional or not documented. Finally, a focus group was used to answer the

second research question: Would any of the methods for addressing demolition by neglect from other cities be potentially useful in Winnipeg, and what challenges would they face in implementation? It generated a lively discussion on how to best address demolition by neglect in Winnipeg from a variety of perspectives. These results were then used to generate a typology of strategies for addressing demolition by neglect in Winnipeg.

1.4.1 Document Analysis

To understand what methods were already being used to address demolition by neglect in the three Canadian cities, a document analysis was undertaken. A document analysis allows for all types of documents, written and pictorial, official and casual, printed and digital, primary and secondary, to be systematically collected, analysed and interpreted (Frey, 2018, p. 545). It is a useful method when used in concert with another research method, as it can “corroborate or refute, elucidate, or expand on finding across other data sources” (Frey, 2018, p. 544). This method of triangulation is also effective at reducing bias (Frey, 2018, p. 544).

The analysis focused on official material produced by the municipal governments of the three cities, reviewing their policies that affect built heritage and any available statistics on demolition by neglect. The website of each city provided current documents on built heritage policy, and keyword searches on the websites were used to find documents that might not be built heritage specific but relevant to the issue. Keyword searches were also used on Google to find other documents that might relate to demolition by neglect in each city, including past methods for addressing demolition by neglect that may no longer be in use. Documents that discussed demolition by neglect but did not offer any solutions were not included in the analysis.

Once the documents were compiled, they were coded to find common themes. The analytical process of coding was approached in two steps, the first being open coding, followed

by selective coding. Open coding approaches the data “by identifying essential concepts and patterns that emerge in vivo from an initial, yet rigorous open reading and reflection upon raw data” (Mills, Durepos, & Wiebe, 2010, p. 155). Words and phrases were colour coded to identify them, resulting in a list of topics commonly featured in the documents. The coding process then proceeded to selective coding. In this step “previously identified discrete concepts and categories are further defined, developed, and refined and then brought together to tell a larger story” (Mills et al., 2010, p. 57).

1.4.2 Semi-Structured Interviews

The document analysis was followed by semi-structured interviews, which were also seeking to answer the first research question. In addition to helping remove bias from the research and corroborate information from the document analysis (Frey, 2018, p. 544), the semi-structured interviews were a particularly useful approach when creating a typological analysis (Given, 2008, p. 811), a version of which was required to move on to the next phase of research.

The heritage professionals that participated in the interviews were “informants” who helped “define and categorize” information while responding to the interview guide (see Appendix A). Their answers were unrestricted due to the open-ended nature of the questions (Harrell & Bradley, 2009, p. 4). This method of data collection ensured specific topics were addressed in the interviews while providing the flexibility to probe for additional information (Given, 2008, p. 810). It also allowed the researcher to establish a rapport with the participants, interpret the nuances in the conversation (Given, 2008, pp. 810-811) and clarify emphases that would have been lost with a less personal research technique (Harrell et al., 2009, p. 10).

The literature review and document analysis provided the basis for the development of an interview guide with several questions for the participants to answer. The interview guide began

with establishing each participant's involvement in built heritage before moving on to the topic of demolition by neglect. Beyond the initial questions, the interview was led by the participant, with the researcher interjecting with prompts and probes to ensure all topics were addressed and answers fully understood. The final question allowed space for the participant to speak on anything they felt might be relevant and was not addressed by the previous questions. The interview guide was shared with participants in advance of their interviews, ensuring they had time to review the questions that would be posed and prepare feedback. Additionally, participants receive basic background information on the project (see Appendix E) and a statement of informed consent to fill out (see Appendix F).

Potential participants were identified through Google searches and the researcher's professional network. It was hoped that the heritage planners from all three cities would participate, along with someone from a nonprofit built heritage advocacy group and a heritage professional from the private sector. This would give a more balanced perspective with participants having a variety of experiences in built heritage.

The interviews were 30 to 60 minutes in length, allowing the engagement level of the participant to determine when all questions had been sufficiently answered. The participants were also given the option to submit written responses to the interview questions should it be more convenient for them. While not ideal, allowing the option of written responses made it easier for some individuals to participate and ultimately provided more data to be interpreted.

Once an interview had been conducted, verbal interviews were transcribed. Transcriptions were then returned to the participants to give them the chance to make any adjustments they deemed necessary, deleting comments they did not want to share publicly or adding greater clarification. Edited transcriptions and written responses were then analysed

through coding, “searching for concepts, ideas, themes, and categories” (Given, 2008, p. 85) that ran throughout. Because of the complex nature of qualitative data, the categories used for coding developed as the data was analysed, with key themes emerging through the process. The two-step process used for coding in the document analysis was also employed for the semi-structured interviews; open coding followed by selective coding. This analysis, along with the literature review, helped generate a preliminary typology of methods and strategies for addressing demolition by neglect.

1.4.3 Focus Group

A focus group was used to answer the second research question and create a final typology of strategies for addressing demolition by neglect in Winnipeg. Focus groups are an effective means of “obtaining in-depth understandings of the numerous interpretations of a particular issue” (Liamputtong, 2011, p. 6). For this stage in research, the focus group offered an efficient means of understanding multiple perspectives on the effectiveness of various methods for addressing demolition by neglect in Winnipeg.

The focus group guide (see Appendix B) presented the preliminary typology of strategies created from the document analysis and semi-structured interviews, and included several questions for the focus group participants to consider. The questions were used as “stimulus material” (Liamputtong, 2011, p. 64) during the focus group in the form of a PowerPoint, encouraging the conversation to flow naturally among the participants without constant interjection by the researcher.

Once again, the questions were open ended with no right or wrong answers, intended to allow participants to answer freely (Harrell & Bradley, 2009, p. 4). The focus group guide was sent out to participants in advance of the event taking place, allowing for time to reflect on the

topics and the gathering of thoughts. Project background information (see Appendix E) and a statement of informed consent (see Appendix G) was also sent out with the focus group guide.

Potential participants were identified through Google searches and the researcher's professional network. It was hoped that four to six heritage professionals from a variety of backgrounds, all with expertise in Winnipeg's built heritage, would participate. The focus group was intended to take 60 minutes to complete, allowing enough time to address all the questions. The focus group conversation was then transcribed, with the transcription returned to the participants. Participants were free to make any modifications to the transcription they deemed necessary, from clarifications to omissions. The transcription was then coded, once again employing the same two-step technique. This coding was then used to create one final typology of strategies that could potentially be used to address demolition by neglect in Winnipeg.

1.5 Biases and Limitations

The research undertaken for this thesis was done with the best of intentions to ensure a thorough and fair evaluation of the information available and provide meaningful results. But despite these efforts, it certainly has biases and limitations. Firstly, there is the personal bias of the researcher. This topic was selected due to the researcher's personal interest in demolition by neglect and experience working in built heritage advocacy in Winnipeg. The research is based on the premise that built heritage should be conserved, and while research was done to support this perspective, no research was undertaken to explore if the demolition of built heritage could have a more positive outcome for a community.

This research was also constrained by the information available on demolition by neglect. Standard internet search engines were used to find information, which uncovered limited peer reviewed sources and missed materials that were not digitised. Few statistics on demolition by

neglect were available and provided little insight. Given more time and resources, directly reaching out to experts in the field could result in more sources to draw on.

A further limitation is the lack of information available on the emerging “Indigenous renaissance” (Bridgman & St. Clair Bridgman, 2019a) and how it intersects with built heritage, a product of colonialism. Acknowledging our past and finding a way to move forward that celebrates all histories, are important steps in reconciliation. This re-evaluation of what built heritage means and the most sensitive way to progress, be it reimagining heritage buildings or even demolishing them, it will undoubtedly have an impact on the future of built heritage conservation.

Both the semi-structured interviews and focus group were also impacted by biases and limitations. Participants were a key source of data for this thesis, but not all potential participants reached out to agreed to participate. Only people found through internet searches and the researcher’s professional network were approached, resulting in potentially valuable participants being left uncontacted. There were discussions about the benefit of including the perspective of a heritage building owner engaging in demolition by neglect, but it was deemed unlikely that any such individual would agree to take part in the research. Additionally, the materials about the project given to the participants was informed by what the researcher felt was important, and the conversations were led by the researcher’s prompts. The data collected from participants also reflected their personal biases and experiences. An effort was made to include as many participants as possible and to allow them to speak freely, providing a rich and diverse set of data to draw from with less personal biases prevailing.

1.6 Significance of Research

Demolition by neglect has been a concern for the heritage community since the mid-1990s (Newman & Saginor, 2014, p. 623), but the little research completed on the topic has yielded few significant results. No tried-and-true methods have emerged for negating demolition by neglect and many cities, including Winnipeg, have only recently begun to address the problem. As built heritage cannot be replaced once it is lost, it is imperative to find solutions to demolition by neglect before there is nothing left to save. Therefore, the main goal of this thesis was to explore practical, meaningful methods for addressing demolition by neglect that can be used to create a typology of strategies specific to Winnipeg. In doing so, this thesis also contributes to the scholarly body of literature on demolition by neglect and heritage planning knowledge in general.

1.7 Overview

Following Chapter One, the introduction, Chapter Two is the theoretical framework and literature review. This chapter is divided into three sections: Jane Jacobs' theory on the need for old buildings in cities, justifying why built heritage should be conserved, and exploring what the current literature tells us about demolition by neglect. Chapter Three features a document analysis to help understand what the three other Canadian cities are doing to address demolition by neglect. This research is supported by Chapter Four, a discussion of the results of the semi-structured interview with heritage professionals from the same three cities. Chapter Five discusses the results of the focus group, reviewing the feasibility of implementing the previously discovered methods for addressing demolition by neglect in Winnipeg. Chapter Six presents a final typology of strategies that could be used to address demolition by neglect in Winnipeg, along with recommendations, topics for further research and conclusions.

2.0 Theoretical Framework and Literature Review

This chapter examines the theory and literature pertinent to the topic of demolition by neglect. It begins with reviewing the writing of Jane Jacobs, an influential urbanist who argued ardently for the inclusion of old buildings in cities. Jacobs' work arose in response to zoning bylaws instituted in the middle of the 20th century that stripped cities of their diversity and crippled downtowns – with built heritage being part of this lost diversity. Future generations of planners took her pleas to heart, and the mixed used approach to planning we are familiar with today is the result (Kalman, 2014, pp. 66-67).

The literature review then establishes why conserving built heritage is important, reviews the current literature on demolition by neglect and examines the state of demolition by neglect in Winnipeg.

2.1 Theoretical Framework

Jane Jacobs' 1961 critique of city planning in her preeminent publication, *The Death and Life of Great American Cities*, is clear: "Cities need old buildings so badly it is probably impossible for vigorous streets and districts to grow without them" (p. 187). She presented two arguments in favour of old buildings; old buildings are more affordable to live and work in, and old buildings create diverse neighbourhoods that support sustainability.

A very limited number of people, organisations and business can afford the cost of occupying new buildings, which is expensive due to the cost of construction being passed on to the occupants (Jacobs, 1961, p. 187). Old buildings, including heritage buildings, cost far less to occupy as the upfront cost of their construction has long since been recovered (Jacobs, 1961, p. 188). This lower cost to rent or buy built heritage spaces creates opportunities for far more people, organisations and businesses – those with a smaller budget, those just starting out, those

that will never be profitable and those that will eventually fail (Jacobs, 1961, p. 188). Heritage buildings thus become incubators of talent and potential, the first steps on the path to success, success which a city relies on for growth and vibrancy (Jacobs, 1961, p. 188). As the cost of construction continues to rise, cities continue to have an even greater need for heritage buildings and the affordable spaces they provide (Jacobs, 1961, p. 190).

Not only are new buildings too expensive for many to occupy, Jacobs (1961) points out that the uses and people found in heritage buildings would not always be welcome in a newly constructed “Utopian dream city” (p. 193). Whether beliefs do not align or strict regulations in the new community do not allow for the adaptability of spaces or use by certain enterprises, new buildings tend to be far more limiting than their historic counterparts (Jacobs, 1961, p. 195).

Jacobs recognized that cities are full of all different kinds of people which require all different kinds of spaces to suit their needs, wants and budgets. A homogeneous new development could never provide the desired variety of options, while a neighbourhood with a diverse collection of buildings, including heritage buildings, is much more likely to have a space for everyone and everything (Jacobs, 1961, p. 194). This mix of people, organisations and businesses found in heritage buildings in turn contributes to a more stable community, where there is no great reliance on one group of people or industry. Today, Kalman (2014) notes that diversity is understood as a key component of vibrant cities with planning policies being written to support it (p. 110).

In an ideal situation, Jacobs (1961) imagined the success of people, organisations and businesses in low cost heritage buildings would lead to funds being invested in the conservation of the heritage buildings, essentially making them new again, and also initiating the construction of new buildings in the surrounding area (p. 189). This aspect of Jacobs’ theory has been

criticised for opening the door to gentrification, when people can no longer afford their space after improvements have made the neighbourhood more desirable (Kalman, 2014, p. 89). When heritage buildings are made “new” again, they often cater to higher income tenants that quickly displace the people, organisations and businesses that once occupied them and nurtured their vitality. Unfortunately, efforts to prevent gentrification in successfully redeveloped heritage buildings have generally failed without the implementation of robust policies protecting the original occupants (Kalman, 2014, pp. 89-99).

Alternately, some heritage buildings do not seem to be able to move past providing affordable space to nurture the beginnings of success, and are never reinvested in. Jacobs (1961) believed it was not the buildings that needed to be changed in these situations, but the amenities around them (p. 198). Jacobs (1961) suggested this is the eventual problem of neighbourhoods where all buildings were constructed at the same time (p. 198). The new buildings will eventually become old, and with no amenities around them to support diversification, people leave, and the buildings become empty and neglected (Jacobs, 1961, p. 198). People are inherently resistant to change, and it is our refusal to allow buildings to change that causes their demise. The unfortunate solution to this problem has been to replace entire neighbourhoods that have fallen into disrepair because they were unable to adapt with great swaths of new buildings, once again, all constructed at the same time. And so the cycle begins again, with buildings “incapable of the constant adjustments, adaptations and permutations that make up the process of life” (Jacobs, 1961, p. 199), sentenced to a premature demolition before they were even built.

Yet for all their virtues, Jacobs recognized that heritage buildings were not without their challenges. Despite the low cost to occupy, some heritage buildings never seem to foster success. The reasons for this happening can be simple or complex, unique to each building’s context and

often beyond the owner's control. With no increasing vibrancy over time and no money being reinvested into them, these heritage buildings quickly transform into neglected buildings. Jacobs (1961) describes such neglected heritage buildings as becoming "nothing but old age" (p. 189), and causing harm to their community.

At the same time, Jacobs (1961) was optimistic that neglected heritage buildings never truly reached a point where they could not be revitalised (p. 191). Over time, circumstances can change, amenities can be added to the surroundings and once bleak communities can be transformed into vibrant and desirable districts. Someone will always be willing to invest in the worst heritage building, simply because of the location, not seeing a neglected has-been but a hidden gem. As Jacobs (1961) put it, "Time makes the high building cost of one generation the bargains of the following generation" (p. 189). And so the process of reversing neglect begins, "filter[ing] up" (Jacobs, 1961, p. 193) a heritage building, and making it "new" once again.

Over half a century after Jacobs' (1961) influential treatise on "[t]he need for aged buildings" (p. 187) was published, research suggests that the insights were correct and are still relevant in the 21st century. A large study published by the National Trust for Historic Preservation in 2014 examined the role of small, older buildings in three major American cities. The statistical analysis revealed that "neighbourhoods with a mix of older, smaller buildings performed better than districts with larger, newer structures when tested against a range of economic, social, and environmental outcome measures" (Preservation Green Lab, 2014, p. 1). As much as this was a confirmation of Jacobs' theory, like Jacobs, the study also noted that there are often exterior factors beyond the control of a building that can ultimately lead to its success or demise (Preservation Green Lab, 2014, p. 103).

Theory from Jacobs' 1961 *The Death and Life of Great American Cities* continues to influence planners to this day, with including a diversity of building types and building uses being seen as a priority (Kalman, 2014, p. 71). Therefore, planners should strive to meaningfully address the problem of demolition by neglect so all built heritage is conserved, the small and the large, the grand and the ordinary, for the benefit of everyone.

2.2 Literature Review

Unfortunately, demolition by neglect is not a popular topic in academic research. Of the little research that has been done on the topic, most is focused on places outside of Canada. Majority of the information available comes from grey literature, in the form of theses, papers from conferences, publications from nonprofit groups and reports from governments. These sources are not always unbiased or peer reviewed, but they provide an interesting collection of insights and snapshots of the fight against demolition by neglect. When taken as a whole, these works begin to illuminate commonalities that transcend personal opinion or geographic location. Although it is not an extensive or in-depth body of work to explore, it provides a firm footing for research further into the issue.

This literature review is divided into two parts, the first exploring the value of built heritage and the second addressing the problem of demolition by neglect, including the Winnipeg situation. For anyone who has studied or worked in the field of built heritage, it may be obvious why historical buildings are worth saving. For those without this experience, demolition by neglect may not even be seen as a problem because built heritage is not recognized as something valuable that should be protected. Thus, to fully understand the horrors of demolition by neglect, it must first be clearly established what exactly is being lost, not just by the individuals that own and inhabit built heritage but also by the community at large.

The second part of this literature review then examines the problem of demolition by neglect. The review looks at what methods have been used to address the problem of demolition by neglect, from the conventional to creative, successful to dismal. With much of this literature being written outside of Canada, some of the solutions being presented are not applicable to Winnipeg, as government structure and legislative capacity are different. But these approaches should not be disregarded as they could provide inspiration for imaginative solutions that might work in a Winnipeg context. When seeking solutions to a wicked problem such as demolition by neglect, no stone should be left unturned, not possibility left unpursued. Finally, the literature review concludes with an examination of the state of demolition by neglect in Winnipeg.

2.2.1 Tangible History

Historical knowledge must be communicated to the public for its enjoyment and education. Words and pictures convey much, but real things make the deepest impression. (Lynch, 1972, pp. 51-52)

Why is tangible history important? Is a standing building of any greater historical value than a photograph of the same building? All history, tangible and intangible, is important in its own way. Tangible history is important because it is “concrete” (Hamilton, p. 1), a source of indisputable proof of the past that cannot be dismissed or misrepresented. A physical object, it is far less likely to change as it is passed from one generation to the next or from person to person. Modifications can be made, but there is likely some sort of evidence of this change left on the object, such as raw edges or fluctuations in material. This is unlike intangible history, such as oral traditions or rituals, which can easily evolve every time they are shared, with no record of the changes being made. This does not make intangible history an inferior historical resource, just one that is more representative of the adaptability of culture.

Tangible history instead captures a specific moment and makes notes of the changes over time, creating a far more permanent record of history that authenticates our past. With tangible history memories become reality, no longer fleeting thoughts but something that most definitely happened, with the solid evidence of that memory in front of you (Cultural Heritage Agency, 2016, p. 41). It allows us to create “reference points” (Edson, 2004, p. 341) in our mental timeline, and gives context to our view of the past. We better understand when events happened and how we fit into that history, as both actors and the result of.

Tangible history also records our past in a way that is visible and more easily accessed. It is not a story or a theory, a collection of dates or names of things long lost. Tangible history is the past set out in front of you as a solid object which you can connect with and form memories of. It allows people to “conceptualize” (Allison & Allison, 2008, pp. 29-30) the past, bond with it and carry those memories with them. It illuminates the story of our past, which heightens our awareness of it and strengthens our connections to it (Cultural Heritage Agency, 2016, p. 41).

Tangible history also shows the ways in which history has both shaped and impacts our modern lives. We can see our past successes and failures, using them as a starting point for a better future, learning from our past mistakes (Allison & Allison, 2008, pp. 29-30; Shipley & McKernan, 2001, p. 86). It is also widely agreed that tangible heritage helps us form our collective identity, as it is something we can all see, a common reference point (Allison & Allison, 2008, pp. 29-30; Cultural Heritage Agency, 2016, p. 41; Bassa & Kiss, 2009, p. 1; Edson, 2004, p. 342; Hassan, 2014, p. 7214). It is a grounding force that we can all relate to, regardless of our background.

Built heritage, a form of tangible history, allows us to time travel, “entering into or living in the past” (Edson, 2004, p. 337), literally putting history within our grasp. Hall (2014) would

call this form of tangible heritage a “third thing”, something apart from us that functions as a community’s “site of joint rapture or contentment” (p. 114). Third things are the things that bind relationships. They are an exterior object, activity, experience or interest that connects us in our shared curiosity and enjoyment. For communities composed of diverse individuals from all walks of life, each faced with their own challenges, dreams and responsibilities, built heritage can be the common ground that brings everyone together.

Built heritage is public, substantial and intended to last. It costs nothing to stand on the street and admire its stature, and requires no special skills or knowledge to interpret. A community can rally around built heritage without ever setting foot inside, taking comfort in a landmark that may have stood for generations. Architecture is a language that requires no words, the feelings it inspires transcend cultures and yet can be exceptionally personal. Built heritage creates a place in both time and space that cannot be hidden behind doors or forgotten in an archive. It embodies all the positive features of tangible history that makes it worth saving from demolition by neglect.

2.2.2 Sense of Place

Sense of place is a complex topic, and while it is a commonly used term, there is no standard definition (Cross, 2001). Every field that uses the term defines it slightly differently, in a way that best relates to their content. It is an intangible concept that describes a feeling unique to each individual. At the same time, there is the universal understanding of its existence and a recognition of the important role it plays in our lives, having a positive effect on our mental health (Martin, 2007, p. 1). The “place” can be built or natural, physical or imagined, grand or small, and can conjure a wide range of emotions. A simple definition that sums up much of the complexity described by the myriad of descriptions is: “sense of place describes our relationship

with places” (Adams et al., 2017, p. 69). For better or worse, our surroundings are a part of who we are, shaping us as individuals and as communities.

Built heritage goes beyond having an ordinary relationship with the people it interacts with, as it has a “special and unique character that sets it apart” (Kalman, 2014, p. 21). Not only have heritage buildings stood for many decades becoming familiar landmarks, their departure from current architectural styles makes them stand out on the streetscape. They provide continuity that resonates positively in our minds, for “the past is known, familiar, a possession in which we may feel secure” (Lynch, 1972, p. 27). More than bricks and stone, steel and wood, heritage buildings have an indisputable impact on the people that encounter them, a clear indication that they are creating a sense of place (Corbett Richardson, 2008, p. 8; Heritage Toronto, 2019, p. 31; Parks Canada, n.d.).

Beyond creating a sense of place for individuals, heritage buildings create a unifying experience of a sense of place that draws a community together. They can become a community’s identity, create a sense of togetherness, provide a centre point around which generations can resonate with and rally around (Martin, 2007, p. 1; Thompson, 2011, p. 8). Having stood tall through a community’s joys and sorrows, heritage buildings provide reassurance and continuity. As they are figuratively or literally passed from one generation to the next, become the invisible glue that holds a community together (Edson, 2004, p. 334; Thompson, 2011, p. 8). Heritage buildings become part of the collective memory of a community, a place that everyone has a story about. We go to them to celebrate special events, take photographs to capture cherished moments, proudly bring tourists to admire, and mention in casual conversation with strangers (Allison & Allison, 2008, p. 38). To be a part of a community is to know its heritage buildings and the sense of place they inspire.

When we lose heritage buildings to demolition by neglect, we are losing one of the cornerstones of our sense of place. Feelings can change from happy memories to ones of loss and sadness as individuals cannot recognize the place they once felt so connected with. Communities suffer as well, no longer grounded in a shared relationship with a heritage building, their common identity is lost and individuals go their separate ways. As sense of place is hard to quantify, its significance is often ignored until the built heritage that created it is already lost (Thompson, 2011, p. 8). In understanding the role built heritage plays in creating a sense of place, it is clear that addressing demolition by neglect is an important aspect in supporting a happy, healthy, unified community.

2.2.3 Environmental Sustainability

We live in a world where everything seems to be disposable, we simply put the things we no longer want in the garbage or recycling and never have to see them or think about them again. But the reality is our disposable lifestyle has major consequences, even if we do not see them immediately. The Great Pacific Ocean Patch is growing as our wetlands are drying up, and the Arctic is melting as our forests disappear (Dauvergne, 2010, p. 1). Our garbage ends up in developing countries, seeping into the most fragile ecosystems and raining down over landscapes thousands of miles away from where it originated (Dauvergne, 2010, p. 3). We are abusing the world in which we live with little regard for the consequences, even when we are told the situation is dire.

Carl Elefante, former president of the American Institute of Architects, is attributed to having said “the greenest building is the one that is already built” (cited in Bull, 2019). Heritage buildings, built to last and sometimes hundreds of years old, certainly fits into this category of green buildings. Heritage buildings are constructed once and potentially never end up in a

landfill, playing an important role in slowing the destructive cycle of consumerism and pollution. For this reason and more, it is acknowledged that heritage buildings contribute to environmental sustainability (Newman & Saginor, 2014, p. 624).

Additionally, the loss of a heritage building leads to a cascade of negative environmental impacts. First, when a heritage building is demolished, all of its embodied energy, that which was required to build and maintain it, is immediately lost (Gilderbloom et al., 2009, p. 96; Shipley & McKernan, 2001, p. 86). The rubble of the demolished heritage building is then most often taken to a landfill, with precious and often irreplaceable resources being cast aside (Albinger, 2014; Corbett Richardson, 2008, p. 7; Gilderbloom et al., 2009, p. 95; Heritage Toronto, 2019, p. 22; Newman & Saginor, 2014, p. 624; Thompson, 2011, p. 7). Then there is the energy required to replace the demolished building, creating new building materials, transporting and assembling them – all using limited resources and often causing harm to the environment in the process (Corbett Richardson, 2008, p. 5). Research suggests that even if a new building is energy efficient, it can take up to 80 years before the environmental costs of the new construction are negated (Preservation Green Lab, 2011, p. VI).

Alternatively, conserving a heritage building can further improve its sustainability while little, if anything goes to waste and the demand for new materials is lessened (Heritage Toronto, 2019, pp. 22-23). Many of the materials heritage buildings are constructed with, if properly maintained, have no expiry date. This is in stark contrast to material used in new buildings, which can have life spans as short as a decade (Heritage Toronto, 2019, p. 23). Research shows that conserving a heritage building is nearly always the more environmentally sustainable option, particularly when looking at replacing it with a similar building and being thoughtful about the materials used in conservation (Preservation Green Lab, 2011, p. VI).

Built heritage also is also environmentally sustainable because historic neighbourhoods tend to be more pedestrian friendly and have better access to public transportation, as they were often built before society's dependence on pollutant-spewing personal vehicles (Gilderbloom et al, 2009, p. 95; Parks Canada, n.d.). This allows for people surrounded by built heritage to walk to wherever they may need to go, be it school, work or the grocery store, and forgo driving a personal vehicle that contributes to climate change through the emission of greenhouse gases (National Geographic Society, 2018).

In understanding the environmental benefits of conserving built heritage, demolition by neglect becomes a serious contributor to the destruction of our environment. If we wish to have a future on this planet, we must take all actions possible to preserve its health – our lives depend on it. Stopping demolition by neglect is a pressing environmental issue that cannot be ignored.

2.2.4 Economics

Whether we care to admit it or not, money is a major driver behind most urban development decisions. Spend less money, earn more money – everyone wants some and there is never enough to go around. Built heritage is often looked at through this lens, with cost being the deciding factor as to whether a heritage building is demolished or conserved. Shrouded in misconceptions and often frowned upon for just being old, heritage buildings are still poised to rise above and contribute to a vibrant economy.

All buildings, old or new, require some maintenance. Heritage buildings, with fixtures, fittings and finishes from decades past, often require special parts and special skills to maintain. To fulfil these needs, all sorts of skilled, local jobs are created, from design and manufacturing to installation and more. And compared to doing maintenance with cheap materials manufactured overseas, far more of the maintenance dollars from built heritage are reinvested back into the

local economy (Albinger, 2014, p. 11; Corbett Richardson, 2008, p. 7; Gilderbloom et al., 2009, p. 85; Greffe, 2004, pp. 301-302; Heritage Toronto, 2019, p. 13; Parks Canada, n.d.; Thompson, 2011, p. 6).

Despite how expensive maintaining a heritage building might sound and contrary to popular belief, owning a heritage building can be financially advantageous. Redevelopment of a heritage building can be cheaper than new construction, taking less time to complete and costing less to operate once operational (Newman & Saginor, 2014, p. 624; Parks Canada, n.d). As heritage buildings were constructed before the advent of inexpensive and plentiful energy, their systems are often designed to operate passively, making them more affordable to run when well maintained (Albinger, 2014, p. 14).

Research in Canada shows that heritage buildings “performed much better than average in the marketplace,” (Thompson, 2011, p. 7) outshining their modern counterparts, with property values that can be nearly 60% higher than that of other buildings in the area (Heritage Toronto, 2019, p. 19). Heritage buildings are also becoming increasingly popular as office space, with redeveloped spaces being able to charge higher rent than modern office buildings (Heritage Toronto, 2019, p. 20). Heritage homes specifically have outperformed modern homes, retaining their value through the highs and lows of the market (Thompson, 2011, p. 7). And unexpectedly, despite higher property values, built heritage also contributes to affordable housing because the spaces tend to come in all shapes and sizes, with something that fits everyone’s budget (Corbett Richardson, 2008, pp. 7-8; Newman & Saginor, 2014, p. 624). Though there have been some studies that have found a negative correlation between heritage designation and property values, these studies are in the minority (Gilderbloom et al., 2009, p. 88).

Conserving a heritage building can also have a positive ripple effect in its community, acting as the catalyst for more revitalization within a neighbourhood (Corbett Richardson, 2008, p. 7; Newman & Saginor, 2014, p. 624). Local governments feel the benefit of conserved heritage buildings, as they gently increase density and reduce sprawl, requiring less costly new infrastructure. Additionally, conserving a heritage building instead of replacing it with a much larger modern building limits densification and prevents the need for the capacity to be increased in current infrastructure (Albinger, 2014, p. 9). Heritage buildings, especially conserved and maintained ones, can contribute to an increased tax base due to their increased value (Newman & Saginor, 2014, p. 624; Parks Canada, n.d). Built heritage is also a draw for tourists, bringing new funds into the local economy (Allison & Allison., 2008, p. 38; Bassa & Kiss., 2009, p. 1; Corbett Richardson, 2008, p. 7; Cultural Heritage Agency, 2016, p. 41; Gilderbloom, et al., 2009, p. 85; Greffe, 2004, p. 302; Newman & Saginor, 2014, p. 624).

When built heritage is lost to demolition by neglect, not only are all the positive economic effects that come from conserving built heritage gone, it can also be costly for the local government. If the owner of the demolished building was not intentionally neglecting their heritage building with plans to redevelop the site, the local government can end up covering the cost of demolition and creating a vacant lot. Instead of an admirable heritage building increasing the desirability and value of the neighbourhood, the vacant lot does the opposite, driving down property values and driving people away (Brazil, 2003, pp. 9-10).

All too often today, the upfront cost of demolishing a heritage building and replacing it with new construction is less than conserving the heritage building. But this is because we live at a time when we do not have to cover the cost of pollution – and pollution is not free. If the cost of pollution were added to demotion and new construction costs, built heritage conservation

would likely become a far more economically appealing choice for heritage building owners. Until such legislation is enacted and people come to recognize the economic benefits of conserving built heritage, making it the obvious choice, demolition by neglect must be stopped. Otherwise, there will be no heritage buildings for us to benefit from in the future.

2.2.5 Causes of Demolition by Neglect

Demolition by neglect is often characterised as a deliberate evil act, undertaken by a greedy owner that wants nothing more than to demolish their heritage building so the land can be redeveloped with something bigger and more profitable. This can certainly be the case, when an owner engages in demolition by neglect to subvert a heritage designation that will not let their heritage building be demolished (Albinger, 2014, p. 1; Brazil, 2003, p. 83; Corbett Richardson, 2008, pp. 5, 17; Hildebrandt, 2012, pp. 1-2; Martin, 2007, p. 3; Miller, 2010, p. 6; Muratore, 2013, p. 3; Newman & Saginor, 2014, p. 624; Renz Swyers, 2013, p. 1; Thompson, 2011, p. 11). But contrary to popular belief, not every owner intentionally destroys their heritage building through a lack of maintenance (Weiss, 2012, p. 316). This is one of the reasons why demolition by neglect is a wicked problem; every heritage building has an individual set of circumstances that leads to its neglect.

Finances, or lack of them, often plays a big role in the neglect of a heritage building (Albinger, 2014, pp. 1, 16; Corbett Richardson, 2008, p. 6; Muratore, 2013, p. 3; Newman & Saginor, 2014, p. 624; Thompson, 2011, p. 11). An owner might truly care about their heritage building, but for one reason or another lacks the funds to maintain it. The maintenance of historic elements that was too costly from the onset only becomes further out of reach as decay continues over time. As costs mount and conservation becomes a financial impossibility, neglect can lay waste to the most robust of heritage buildings.

Other heritage building owners have the necessary funds to maintain their building, but circumstances get in the way. Some owners simply do not have the knowledge to properly maintain their heritage building (Albinger, 2014, p. 16; Muratore, 2013, p. 4). They may think they are doing a good job taking care of their heritage building without realising the decay that is quietly taking place. It is a sad way for a heritage building to be lost, with the best of intentions ending in the worst result. Illness, both physical and mental, can prevent an owner from visiting their building, recognizing the maintenance needs or being able to undertake them (Muratore, 2013, p. 3; Renz Swyers, 2013, p. 1; Weiss, 2012, p. 316). Absent owners are in a similar situation, potentially living hundreds of miles away, having no idea their heritage building is crumbling due to lack of maintenance (Brazil, 2003, p. 7; Corbett Richardson, 2008, p. 6; Muratore, 2013, p. 4; Newman & Saginor, 2014, p. 324; Thompson, 2011, p. 11). Out of sight and out of mind, a heritage building could be long gone before the owner realises anything is wrong. Lastly, some owners are simply uninterested in their heritage building and consequently do not maintain it (Albinger, 2014, p. 16; Hildebrandt, 2012, p. 75; Thompson, 2011, p. 11). Maybe the heritage building was an unwanted inheritance or an investment that did not turn out as intended. Whatever the reason, some owners just lose interest in their heritage building over time and leave it to fend for itself.

The diversity of reasons behind owners failing to maintain their heritage buildings shows once again what a wicked problem demolition by neglect is. How can we find a solution when the problem needs to be defined differently for each heritage building? The many causes of demolition by neglect speaks to a need for a myriad of flexible approaches when seeking a solution, solutions that can be adapted and combined to find what works best for every different heritage building in need.

2.2.6 Methods for Addressing Demolition by Neglect

Demolition by neglect is not a new problem, with local governments already taking a variety of approaches to address it. Some solutions have worked better than others, and all depend greatly on their context. An examination of the bylaws in most cities would suggest that demolition by neglect should never even be a problem. Property standards bylaws are commonplace, dictating how all buildings, new and old, must be maintained for the benefit of all (Albinger, 2014, p. 41; Brazil, 2003, pp. 40-43; Kalman, 2014, p. 259; Martin, 2007, p. 3; Thompson, 2011, p. 12). Heritage buildings also fall under maintenance bylaws and vacant building bylaws, which require the basic upkeep of buildings, interior temperature to be maintained and some ventilation system functioning (Thompson, 2011, p. 20).

But neglect continues to persist despite these bylaws. Why? A lack of enforcement. The best bylaws in the world for addressing demolition by neglect are completely useless if they are not enforced. Stopping demolition by neglect means not only telling heritage building owners that they are required to maintain their buildings, but ensuring they follow through (Albinger, 2014, p. 48; Brazil, 2003, p. 8; Corbett Richardson, 2008, pp. 26, 89; Martin, 2007, pp. 3, 12; Miller, 2010, p. 1; Renz Swyers, 2013, p. 64). Not only do inspectors need to go out and visit heritage buildings on a regular basis, they need to be able to access the interior of the buildings. A small leak in the roof can do a tremendous amount of serious damage to a building with no visible problem from the sidewalk. And when problems are found, authorities need to be able to take action immediately, either having the owner do repairs or doing them on the owner's behalf. The cost of emergency repairs is then recouped through a lien on the property or taxes (Brazil, 2003, pp. 11, 22; Corbett Richardson, 2008, pp. 20, 27; Kalman, 2014, p. 259; Miller, 2010, p. 12; Muratore, 2013, p. 5; Thompson, 2011).

Another approach to preventing demolition by neglect is incentivising owners to redevelop and/or maintain their heritage buildings. This is commonly done through grants and tax concessions, providing a monetary benefit to the heritage building owner, making built heritage a far more attractive investment opportunity (Albinger, 2014, pp. 41, 60-62; Corbett Richardson, 2008, p. 29; Hildebrandt, 2012, p. 62; Kalman, 2014, p. 265; Muratore, 2013, p. 5; Parks Canada, n.d.; Renz Swyers, 2013, p. 8). Such incentives have been proven to be the most successful in fighting demolition by neglect, and come in a variety of forms (Newman & Saginor, 2014, p. 629). Grants can offset the perceived added expense of owning a heritage building, and even a small amount can boost morale, making an owner feel positive about doing what is perceived to be a public good (Kalman, 2014, pp. 260-261). Although tax concessions can be successful at encouraging the redevelopment of built heritage, they provide no direct return to the local government that administers them, and are often financially unsustainable in the long term (Kalman, 2014, p. 265).

Another method for addressing demolition by neglect is providing special loans for owners to fund maintenance and conservation work on their heritage buildings. With low interest rates and some forgivability, loans can help stop demolition by neglect when a lack of finances is the problem (Kalman, 2014, p. 262; Muratore, 2013, p. 5).

In the United States, revolving funds are a popular means of funding built heritage conservation and ensuring heritage buildings are not neglected. A fund is established to purchase and conserve a heritage building, which is then sold. The sale of such a building usually includes some legal reassurance that the new owner will maintain it. The money from the sale of the conserved heritage building is then returned to the fund, ready to be used again for the next

heritage building conservation project (Corbett Richardson, 2008, p. 29; Hildebrandt, 2012, p. 64; Kalman, 2014, p. 264; Muratore, 2013, p. 5; Renz Swyers, 2013, p. 8).

Beyond some kind of financial solution to demolition by neglect, incentives that reward owners for redeveloping built heritage in other ways have also been used. In cities where zoning regulations make development challenging, rewarding redeveloping built heritage with loosened regulations, such as removing parking requirements, can make projects much easier to undertake. In cities where development pressure is high, being rewarded with density bonuses or density transfers can make a heritage building very attractive for redevelopment. Additionally, local governments can offer technical support to built heritage redevelopment projects, helping tackle the challenges that arise when adapting an old building for a modern world (Albinger, 2014, p. 88; Kalman, 2014, pp. 271, 274, 276; Muratore, 2013, p. 6; Newman & Saginor, 2014, p. 626).

When all the incentives fail to halt demolition by neglect, the next course of action is punitive. Fines are a common choice of action when owners are letting their heritage buildings decay. But in order for fines to be effective, they must be substantial and accumulate quickly. For an owner set on neglecting their heritage building to the point of demolition so they can replace it with a profitable new build, small fines can too easily be brushed aside as part of the cost of doing business (Brazil, 2003, p. 46; Corbett Richardson, 2008, p. 26; Hildebrandt, 2012, p. 75; Weiss, 2012, p. 314).

Even stronger approaches to punishing demolition by neglect and in turn discouraging anyone else from trying it, are expropriation and scorched earth policies. Expropriation legislation gives the government the right to take a property, with compensation, for the public good. If built heritage conservation is a public good and the owner is neglecting it, although extreme, expropriation could be a reasonable course of action when nothing else has worked

(Brazil, 2003, p. 49; Corbett Richardson, 2008, pp. 20, 25; Hildebrandt, 2012, pp. 75-76; Martin, 2007, p. 22). And when a heritage building is lost to demolition by neglect, the last recourse a local government has to punish and dissuade others is a scorched earth policy. This type of policy prevents the owner from profiting from constructing a new building where the heritage building was lost, by preventing any new development in that spot for a set period of time (Corbett Richardson, 2008, pp. 27-28; Miller, 2010, p. 15).

While this is by no means an exhaustive list of all the methods used to address demolition by neglect, it does show that despite the many options currently being employed, the problem persists. There is a definite focus on preventing neglect before it begins, with options becoming more limited and more extreme as neglect turns to demolition. No doubt some of these solutions are already in place in Winnipeg, while others might not even be feasible – regardless, they all must be considered.

2.2.7 Demolition by Neglect in Winnipeg

Winnipeg is a small city on the Canadian prairies with a long history. Archaeological evidence shows Indigenous people living at the junction of the Red and Assiniboine Rivers 6,000 years ago, long before the first Europeans arrived in 1738 to trade furs and build forts (Artibise, 2019). The first permanent European settlement was established in 1812 (Bumsted, 2013), with Winnipeg officially becoming a city in 1873 (Artibise, 2019). After a tremendous boom period at the beginning of the 20th century fueled by the arrival of the transcontinental railway, Winnipeg's economy would fall into a recession and take decades to recover (Artibise, 2019). As of 2022, the population of Winnipeg is forecasted to be just over 780,000 people (City of Winnipeg, 2021b) and the diversified economy continues to slowly expand (Artibise, 2019). Often attributed to Winnipeg's slow growth, an abundance of Winnipeg's early architecture remains

standing over a century later with the oldest building in the city being the Grey Nuns' Convent, constructed between 1846 and 1851 (Goldsborough, 2020). Along with the Convent, there are now over 350 designated heritage buildings and one heritage conservation district in the city (City of Winnipeg, 2022).

Despite this vast collection of architecture, all of these heritage buildings are remnants of a colonial past that tends to ignore the city's Indigenous history. This has led to a reckoning between the once celebrated colonial past and the modern desire for reconciliation. Heritage buildings with names and stories connected to colonial figures and events are being re-examined, now seen as part of difficult chapters in history. While some people want these heritage buildings demolished to erase an unhappy past and will use neglect as an excuse, when they remain standing, heritage buildings present the opportunity to engage in reconciliation and "the co-existence of cultural values" (Bridgman & St. Clair Bridgman, 2019b). As ideas about what heritage is important and who should be the decision makers, how Winnipeg goes about conserving its built heritage will certainly change in the future.

Heritage buildings in Winnipeg today are afforded protection through three bylaws, the Historical Resources By-law No. 55/2014, the Vacant Buildings By-law No. 79/2010 and the Neighbourhood Liveability By-law No. 1/2008. The Historic Resources By-law lays out how buildings can be added to the City of Winnipeg's List of Historic Resources. These designated buildings cannot be demolished, altered or have "any action that would have the effect of destroying, removing or dismantling [the] listed resource" (City of Winnipeg, 2016b, p. 4). The Vacant Buildings By-law lays out the minimum standard to which a vacant building must be maintained, allows for an enforcement officer to inspect the property and notes that basements or crawlspaces of listed resources must be heated to ten degrees Celsius (City of Winnipeg, 2021c,

p. 18). The Neighbourhood Liveability By-law lays out basic maintenance standards for occupied buildings, with penalties possible for those contravening the bylaw (City of Winnipeg, 2017). Winnipeg has used both grant and tax incentive programs to support the conservation of its built heritage, with the Gail Parvin Hammerquist Fund being the main program providing grants today (City of Winnipeg, 2021a).

Despite these efforts, Winnipeg's heritage is struggling. A 2016 report by the City of Winnipeg found that about 30 heritage buildings in Winnipeg were at risk of demolition by neglect (City of Winnipeg, 2016c, p. 6), or approximately 7% (Glowacki, 2016). Although not a direct comparison, a 2007 report found less than 1% of New York City's built heritage was at risk of demolition by neglect (Albinger, 2014, p. 24; Newman & Saginor, 2014, p. 630) and a 1999 study found only 3.4% of buildings on the Canadian Inventory of Heritage Buildings were at risk (Albinger, 2014, p. 23). These reports make Winnipeg's 7% of built heritage at risk of demolition by neglect (Glowacki, 2016) seem frightfully high. The 2014, 2015 and 2016 annual reports from the City of Winnipeg Historical Resources Committee all mention demolition by neglect, citing it as an "on-going concern for our city's heritage resources...that leads to no other viable option but demolition, and as a result, a depletion of our heritage resources" (City of Winnipeg, 2016a, p. 49). It would seem that the Winnipeg situation is crying out for new and innovative solutions to rectify this ongoing problem.

3.0 Document Analysis

Three Canadian cities were selected for examination of their approach to demolition by neglect. By choosing cities in Canada, it was hoped that their legislative capacity would be similar to that of Winnipeg, requiring less adjustments if solutions were to be implemented. Although no city is identical to Winnipeg, each city of the three cities were able to provide some insight on how to address demolition by neglect. Along with a brief introduction to each city to give context, documents from each city were gathered and coded to identify the main methods used to address demolition by neglect within them. Although statistics on demolition by neglect were hard to come by and there are likely other circumstances and methods being used to address demolition by neglect in these cities, this document analysis does provide a point of comparison for Winnipeg and some suggestions discussed later in the focus group.

3.1 Hamilton, Ontario

Hamilton is located in the province of Ontario, on the western tip of Lake Ontario, close to both the City of Toronto and the border with the United States. It was settled by Indigenous people over 650 years ago (Weaver, 2019), followed by loyalists from the United States who moved into the area starting in 1778 (Editors of Encyclopaedia Britannica). Nearly seven decades later in 1846, Hamilton was incorporated as a city and expanded its boundaries in 2001 to include five neighbouring areas (Weaver, 2019). Hamilton was home to over half a million people by 2016 (Statistics Canada, 2017) and is one of the largest industrial centres in the country (Editors of Encyclopaedia Britannica).

As of 2021, Hamilton had 281 individually designated heritage properties and seven heritage conservation districts which contained another 349 designated properties (City of Hamilton, 2021a). A report from 2007 by the City of Hamilton found that of the approximately

600 designated heritage buildings at the time, only two, or 0.33%, were actively being neglected (House, 2007, p. 7). Hamilton only has two buildings on the National Trust for Canada's Worst Losses Archive¹, the Century Theatre and the Balfour Building, which are both described as being lost to neglect. The neglect and eventual loss of both buildings was attributed to property standards bylaws not being enforced (National Trust for Canada, n.d.-j). Hamilton also has three buildings on the National Trust Endangered Places List² (National Trust for Canada, n.d.-g). Since being added to the list, the Hamilton Education Centre was demolished to make way for new development (National Trust for Canada, n.d.-d), a plan has been submitted to save the facades of 24 and 28 King Street East while redeveloping the space behind them (National Trust for Canada, n.d.-a), and the Lister Block was conserved and redeveloped (National Trust for Canada, n.d.-f).

Built heritage in Hamilton is designated under the power of the *Ontario Heritage Act*. It allows individual properties or areas to be designated without the consent of the owner or compensation (Ontario Heritage Trust, n.d.). A heritage designation allows the City to control any changes to the building that will impact its heritage value and requires permission from Council for demolition (City of Hamilton, 2021a). The City of Hamilton uses their minimum property standards bylaw, which includes vacant and damaged buildings, to help prevent demolition by neglect. It includes several sections specific to designated heritage buildings, requiring the maintenance of heritage attributes and replacement with close replicas only as a last resort, maintaining the temperature and humidity in vacant and damaged designated heritage

¹ The National Trust for Canada is a national nonprofit charitable organisation that supports the conservation and revitalization of historic places (National Trust for Canada, n.d.-c). Their Worst Losses Archive is a small collection of some of the historic buildings lost in Canada over 30 years.

² The National Trust for Canada's Endangered Places List "shines a national spotlight on heritage places at risk" (National Trust for Canada, n.d.-g) in an effort to help save them.

buildings, securing vacant and damaged heritage buildings in a way that does not do further damage or “detracts from the building’s aesthetics” (House, 2007, p. 9), and only allowing for demolition under the *Ontario Heritage Act* (House, 2007, p. 9).

Violations of the City’s bylaw can result in an order to repair or demolish a heritage building, in accordance with the *Ontario Heritage Act*. Any work done by the City to resolve the problem is recovered through taxes, with a lien on the property until the taxes are paid (House, 2007, p. 49). To ensure bylaws are being followed, inspectors are permitted to enter heritage buildings (House, 2007, p. 50), with some vacant heritage buildings being visited every three months, although inspectors are not always going inside (Carter, 2015). Individuals owning a heritage building in violation of the bylaws can be fined \$25,000 for their first offence, with fines going to up to \$100,000 for subsequent offences by corporations (House, 2007, p. 53).

The City of Hamilton currently offers three main incentive programs to support the conservation of designated built heritage. The Hamilton Heritage Property Grant Program will pay up to \$150,000 to cover 25% of an eligible conservation project in a Community Improvement Area, and the Hamilton Heritage Conservation Grant Program will provide matching grants between \$1000 and \$5000 for conservation projects not covered by the previous program (City of Hamilton, 2021a). In the past, the City has offered grants over \$1 million in return for an owner choosing to designate and conserve an important heritage building (Carter, 2015). The Hamilton Community Heritage Fund is a different funding model that provides “an interest-free loan for up to \$50,000 and repayable over 10 years for eligible conservation work on designated properties” (City of Hamilton, 2021a). Designated heritage buildings are also exempt from development fees when undergoing adaptive reuse. A variety of other programs, not specifically intended for designated built heritage, can also be used to encourage

conservation, which include grants, tax and fee reductions or exemptions, and loans (Golden & Hazel, 2013, p. 9).

In addition to designating buildings, the City of Hamilton has a Municipal Heritage Register that includes both designated and non-designated heritage buildings. The Register provides educational material on and celebrates the city's built heritage, and is a guide for what buildings should be designated in the future. Most importantly, the Register provides temporary 60 day protection for any undesignated heritage building on it which the owner wants to demolish, allowing for alternative solutions to be found (City of Hamilton, 2021b). Finally, the City of Hamilton is also working on a Built Heritage Inventory, a comprehensive list of all the built heritage in the city. Being on this list offers a building no protection, but these buildings may be reviewed by the City in the future to determine if they should be designated (City of Hamilton Tourism and Culture Division, 2021).

3.2 Ottawa, Ontario

The City of Ottawa became the capital of Canada in 1857, only two years after it was incorporated (Taylor, 2019). Located in the province of Ontario just across the Ottawa River from Gatineau, Quebec, Indigenous people first inhabited the area approximately 8,500 years ago, with Europeans starting to settle permanently at the beginning of the 19th century (Taylor, 2019). In 2001, 11 neighbouring municipalities amalgamated with Ottawa (Taylor, 2019), creating a much larger city that had a population just over 900,000 in 2016 (Statistics Canada, 2021). Today, Ottawa is well known for its outstanding historic architecture, much of which is related to the city's role as the home of the Canadian government (Taylor, 2019).

There is only one entry for Ottawa on the National Trust for Canada's Worst Losses Archive, the houses of the Nicholas-Waller Triangle, one of which was neglected until it

collapsed, and another which was illegally demolished (National Trust for Canada, n.d.-j). Ottawa has two buildings on the National Trust for Canada's Endangered Places List, Somerset House and Lansdowne Park (National Trust for Canada, n.d.-g). Somerset House is described as a "high-profile example of demolition by neglect" (National Trust for Canada, n.d.-i) that has already started to collapse. The neglected Lansdowne Park is facing a contentious redevelopment plan involving moving a designated heritage building (National Trust for Canada, n.d.-e). Despite no statistics being available, the City of Ottawa themselves took action in 2013 due to "ongoing issues of demolition by neglect" (City of Ottawa, n.d.-c), suggesting it was a serious problem.

The designation of built heritage in Ottawa is governed by the *Ontario Heritage Act*, once again empowering the City to protect buildings deemed to be of cultural heritage value (City of Ottawa, n.d.-c). Ottawa has over 300 designated heritage buildings and 20 heritage conservation districts (City of Ottawa, n.d.-c) that are estimated to include over 3000 more properties (Flemming, 2018). Ottawa's property standards bylaw includes specific legislation for designated heritage buildings, including vacant ones. It requires basic building maintenance, heritage features to be sensitively repaired instead of replaced if at all possible, vacant buildings to be securely sealed against damage (although not by bricking up windows or doors), having adequate ventilation, and water systems drained in the absence of a functioning heating system (City of Ottawa, n.d.-f). The City can order an owner to do work on their heritage building to comply with the property standards bylaw, with fines starting at \$25,000 for an individual's first offence, up to \$100,000 for a corporation's subsequent offences (City of Ottawa, n.d.-f). In extreme situations, the City is able to make repairs on the owner's behalf to bring a heritage building into compliance (Heritage Ottawa, 2016).

Working in conjunction with the list of designated heritage buildings in Ottawa is the Heritage Watch List. All vacant designated heritage buildings and occupied designated heritage buildings that are at risk of neglect are on the list, getting inspected on a quarterly basis to ensure property standards are being maintained (City of Ottawa, n.d.-c). Ottawa also has a Heritage Register with approximately 3800 properties on it. This Register grants the City 60 days to work with a building owner and consider designation before a building is demolished (City of Ottawa, n.d.-d).

Ottawa provides incentives for the conservation of built heritage through its Heritage Grant Program for Building Restoration, offering matching grants up to \$25,000 for large restoration projects on designated heritage buildings (City of Ottawa, n.d.-b). The *Heritage Community Improvement Plan* focused on incentivising restoration and adaptive reuse of heritage buildings through tax increment equivalent grants (City of Ottawa, n.d.-b). The City of Ottawa runs an awards program recognizing efforts in conservation and installs plaques on some designated heritage buildings, both of which can be seen as incentivising built heritage conservation (City of Ottawa, n.d.-a). Ottawa also offers relaxed parking requirements for designated heritage buildings (City of Ottawa, n.d.-e).

3.3 Edmonton, Alberta

Edmonton was established in 1904 in a valley along the banks of the North Saskatchewan River in the province of Alberta (Smith, 2019). Indigenous activity in the area dates back to the Middle Prehistoric period, with European settlement not starting until 1795 (Smith, 2019). Once an agricultural city, Edmonton's focus shifted to energy production (Smith, 2019), which had driven the expansion of its population to nearly one million inhabitants by 2019 (City of Edmonton, n.d.-a). Located near the centre of Alberta, Edmonton has worked hard to embrace its

northerly location and celebrate its distinctive winter weather (City of Edmonton, n.d.-f). Although rich with culture, Edmonton is also noted for its limited collection of built heritage, with most buildings having been demolished and replaced over the course of the 20th century (Smith, 2019).

Surprisingly, despite a lack of historical buildings remaining, Edmonton has five buildings listed on the National Trust for Canada's Worst Loses Archive (National Trust for Canada, n.d.-j). None of the buildings were lost to demolition by neglect, instead they were valuable historic buildings with no protection, intentionally demolished to make way for new development (National Trust for Canada, n.d.-j). Edmonton also has nine listings on the National Trust for Canada's Endangered Places list (National Trust for Canada, n.d.-g). Again, neglect is not what is putting these buildings at risk, but a lack of protection. If an historic building is not protected from demolition by a heritage designation, then there is no need to engage in demolition by neglect when legal demotion is a far more direct method.

In Edmonton, heritage designation is governed by the *Alberta Historic Resources Act* (National Trust for Canada, n.d.-b). This legislation is particularly restrictive for the City, which has to financially compensate an unwilling owner the full market value of their building to designate it (National Trust for Canada, n.d.-j). Additionally, neither the municipal or provincial governments are allowed to designate buildings on post secondary campuses (National Trust for Canada, n.d.-h). Despite this, Edmonton does have a Register, which is a list of designated buildings protected from alteration or demolition and an Inventory, which is a list of historic buildings that are not protected but are taking their first step to being added to the Register (City of Edmonton, n.d.-e). There are 100 designated heritage buildings protected by Edmonton's Register (City of Edmonton, n.d.-b).

The City of Edmonton offers a variety of incentives to conserve and maintain designated heritage buildings. Grants, tax incentives and non-monetary incentives such as density transfers and relaxed parking regulations are all used to encourage the rehabilitation of designated heritage buildings (City of Edmonton Planning and Development, 2008, p. 5). Financial incentives can never be more than 50% of the cost of a rehabilitation project or exceed \$75,000 (City of Edmonton, n.d.-c). Non-monetary incentives are not limited to a specific list but can be suggested by the developer and approved if they are deemed reasonable (City of Edmonton Planning and Development, 2008, p. 12). To benefit from such incentives, along with the building being designated, the owner is required to enter into a maintenance agreement with the City (City of Edmonton, n.d.-c).

The City of Edmonton also provides maintenance grants and tax incentives to encourage the continued maintenance of designated heritage buildings, which cannot amount to more than 33% of the maintenance costs or \$10,000 in five years (City of Edmonton, n.d.-c). Finally, Edmonton has heritage areas with development regulations designed to maintain each area's historical character. While not directly incentivising the maintenance or redevelopment of built heritage, the inability to construct large, unsympathetic projects makes demolishing heritage buildings a less worthwhile endeavour (City of Edmonton, n.d.-d).

In addition to built heritage specific legislation and programs, the City of Edmonton also has a Community Standards Bylaw that instructs how buildings, including built heritage, occupied or vacant, must be maintained (City of Edmonton, 2021, pp. 9-10). The City is able to carry out inspections on buildings to ensure the bylaw is being respected and take enforcement action through fines (City of Edmonton, 2021, pp. 24-27).

4.0 Semi-Structured Interviews

With background research complete, the next step in the process was to conduct semi-structured interviews with heritage professionals from the three Canadian cities, Hamilton, Ottawa and Edmonton. The interviews addressed the first research question: What methods have been used in other cities to address demolition by neglect and what have the results been? Four themes arose from the interviews looking at different suggestions on how to address demolition by neglect: *preventing neglect*, *rectifying neglect*, *punishing neglect* and *political will*. The fourth theme, political will, was seen as the linchpin for successfully implementing all other strategies discussed.

4.1 Research Methods

In an effort to gather a broad scope of responses with different perspectives on the issue of demolition by neglect, the intention was to interview three heritage professionals from each city: the city's heritage planner, someone from the private/development sector and someone from the nonprofit sector who advocates for built heritage. Potential participants were identified through Google searches and the researcher's professional network.

Finding heritage professionals knowledgeable in demolition by neglect and willing to be interviewed proved to be a difficult task. After extensive efforts to find three heritage professionals from each city, only eight individuals participated in the semi-structured interviews. Four planners were interviewed along with two developers, an advocate and an architect. They represented diverse experiences in working with built heritage, spanning many years and settings. The participants were:

- Interviewee 1: a planner from Hamilton who works the public sector
- Interviewee 2: a developer from Hamilton who works in the private sector

- Interviewee 3: a planner from Ottawa who works in the public sector
- Interviewee 4: an advocate from Ottawa who worked in the nonprofit sector
- Interviewee 5: an architect from Ottawa who works in the private sector
- Interviewee 6: a planner from Edmonton who works the public sector
- Interviewee 7: a planner from Edmonton who works in the private sector
- Interviewee 8: a developer from Edmonton who works in the private sector

Although the final list of interviewees was not exactly as planned, it still resulted in rich conversations about the challenges other cities face and strategies they have applied when addressing demolition by neglect, with clear themes emerging and complimenting the information found in the literature review.

4.2 Coding Results and Discussion

Four distinct categories arose from the coding of the semi-structured interview transcripts. They were preventing neglect, rectifying neglect, punishing neglect and political will. Within the first three themes there were a variety of suggestions, based on experience and personal insight, as to how demolition by neglect could be addressed. The final theme, political will, was an overarching theme that affected all of those prior and held a level of significance that warranted individual attention.

4.2.1 Preventing Neglect

Preventing neglect was the topic that received the most attention from all participants. If a heritage building is never neglected, logic follows that it would never be at risk of demolition by neglect. The emphasis on this topic suggested participants viewed it as the most effective means of addressing demolition by neglect. Preventing neglect was also seen as advantageous because it would be easier and more cost effective for cities rather than correcting neglect.

Research supports this assumption, suggesting that regular, incremental investment in maintaining a heritage building is more cost effective than taking on a large conservation project after many years of neglect (Kutasi & Vidovszky, 2010, p. 61). Interviewee 2 reinforced this sentiment, noting that small “cheap fixes” addressed in a timely manner can go a long way in conserving important built heritage as opposed to letting neglect continue until repairs become too cost prohibitive. Interviewee 1 was in agreement:

The goal isn't just to prevent damage while change is waiting to happen to a property, it is to make sure that they're not further deteriorating the building and setting it up for failure for when it is rehabilitated. (December 19, 2019)

Interviewee 8 went one step further, suggesting a proactive approach to prevent neglect must be taken before buildings are designated as heritage structures if they are to be conserved for the long term. “If we don't value them before they reach heritage status, we are fighting a losing battle” (May 4, 2021) wrote Interviewee 8.

In addition to the increased cost of conserving a neglected heritage building, Interviewee 2 pointed out the ripple effect they can have on their surrounding community. A neglected heritage building can bring down the property value of the surrounding buildings, reducing a city's tax base and resulting in fewer resources to address the problem in the future. Interviewee 2 compared a neglected heritage building to a disease infecting a community, emboldening other building owners to neglect their properties and eventually resulting in the entire neighbourhood having fallen into disrepair. Interviewee 8 pointed out that a neglected heritage building that gets demolished makes these problems even worse, further reducing the tax base and “creat[ing] a hole in the urban fabric” (May 4, 2021).

To prevent neglect from taking place, the primary solution suggested by the participants was to encourage the redevelopment of heritage buildings, both directly or indirectly.

Interviewee 4 spoke passionately about the need to support “good” redevelopment, not just stand up against “bad” redevelopment. Unfortunately, despite best efforts and incentives, Interviewee 3 noted that a City cannot force a heritage building owner to redevelop their property. It becomes a frustrating situation when no matter how much a City would like to see redevelopment or how upset a community may be, the ultimate decision to take action lies within the control of the heritage building owner.

Participants identified risk as a major reason why heritage buildings are not redeveloped. Interviewee 5 noted that banks are reluctant to fund built heritage redevelopment projects and suggested that Cities could step in to help with financing such undertakings. Interviewee 7 echoed this sentiment, suggesting that from an accounting perspective, heritage buildings themselves are often seen as being worthless, with all the value of a heritage building being in the land it is sitting on. Interviewee 7 did express some optimism, believing that if you were willing to take the time to talk to lenders and educate them about the value of built heritage, you may be able to persuade them to fund your built heritage redevelopment project. But at the same time, Interviewee 7 pointed out that the income generated from redeveloped heritage buildings is often limited compared to new builds, once again increasing the level of risk for the redeveloper.

Interviewee 5 pointed out that heritage buildings are not always seen as valuable by their owners, not for the history they hold, their redevelopment potential or for the land they sit on. Maintaining such an unused heritage building then becomes a financial burden with little chance of ever seeing any return on investment. In these situations, Interviewee 5 explained, a grant to fix the unwanted heritage building is not a meaningful incentive. This speaks to the creativity needed in finding ways to address demolition by neglect – money is often not available and even when it is, it does not always solve the problem. Finances were also brought up by Interviewee 2

and Interviewee 8 as a common reason for why the redevelopment of built heritage is impossible. Speaking from their experience in the field, Interviewee 2 emphasised the importance of the timely redevelopment of built heritage and seeing it as an investment in the future. Construction costs continue to go up every year, making the most affordable time to redevelop now. And in the future, a well executed built heritage redevelopment project will increase in value, showing return on investment.

It's not impossible, it's been done over and over again. All sorts of different organisations have done it successfully. When people say, it can't be done, it's prohibitive economically, it's too expensive, that's nonsense. Because at that time, even though it seemed expensive to do the renovation, right now it is laughable what we paid for everything. It is so much more expensive 21 years later. And the property is worth a lot more now than it was back then. When you look at it that way, it is an investment. (Interviewee 2, May 19, 2021)

Grants, as a means of encouraging the redevelopment of heritage buildings, were seen as an important tool in all cities, described by Interviewee 7 as a “linchpin in the success of repositioning” (May 10, 2021). Interviewee 8 was sceptical about the effectiveness of grants, noting that even with grant monies, redevelopment projects can still cost more than new construction. Interviewee 6 and Interviewee 7 both pointed out that in Edmonton, grants are not only used as an incentive to redevelop heritage buildings but also to encourage their designation, as grants are only available to such protected buildings. In this way grants become a dual-purpose tool, making designation a more enticing option and supporting redevelopment. Interviewee 1 also identified grants as a useful method in incentivising the redevelopment of built heritage, potentially when used in combination with other incentive programs. Interviewee 2 saw grants as encouraging the timely redevelopment of built heritage, and inspiring creativity and innovation when solutions previously seemed impossible to find. Interviewee 7 also spoke about the importance of maintenance grants, helping owners with sometimes costly heritage

related maintenance of their building once a redevelopment project has been completed, preventing future neglect.

Grants were also seen as an important tool in stimulating the economy during tough times. Interviewee 2 noted that many issues surrounding demolition by neglect are greatly lessened when the economy is strong. But when the economy is poor, a generous grant program can function as the key that makes the redevelopment of a heritage building possible and creates a positive domino effect in the community. From jobs to mental health, Interviewee 2 saw the redevelopment of a heritage building as an invaluable resource in a struggling community.

For all the good grants could do in addressing demolition by neglect through incentivising redevelopment, Interviewee 2 was also quick to point out that they needed to be “substantive” to be effective. Interviewee 2 suggested that context, including the scope and quality of the redevelopment project, needed to be considered when grants were handed out. Interviewee 5 reiterated this point; small grants are ineffective when redevelopment projects cost millions of dollars. In Ottawa, Interviewee 4 noted that one major drawback of the City’s grant system was that it only offered matching grants, but at the same time, one heritage building could apply for grants multiple times.

Another tactic suggested by Interviewee 7 was to incentivise the redevelopment of heritage buildings by offering developers bonus development rights in exchange for the conservation of a heritage building. Interviewee 8 suggested this could come in the form of leniency in the redevelopment of the heritage building, such as relaxed parking requirements, or they could be rights to be used on a different project, such as being allowed to build additional storeys on a new construction project or even sell those rights. Interviewee 8 did stipulate for a scheme involving heritage buildings selling excess density for a profit to address demolition by

neglect, it would have to be legislated that some of the proceeds were specifically set aside to cover the maintenance costs of the heritage buildings.

The importance of cooperation within the City departments was brought up by both Interviewee 1 and Interviewee 3. Successfully maintaining a heritage building involves nearly every department in a City according to Interviewee 1, such as “heritage, bylaw, building code, [and] legal” (September 25, 2019). Working together to create an efficient system when tackling a challenging problem like demolition by neglect better leverages limited resources and creates a more seamless experience for the heritage building owner, which Interviewee 7 pointed out as being vital to the successful redevelopment of a heritage building.

The idea of the City working effectively with heritage building owners was further expanded on. From their experience in the private sector, Interviewee 2 was familiar with the all too common perception of the municipal government and “heritage folks” being viewed as standing in opposition to development, the “enemy” of progress. Interviewee 7 expressed the importance of a City being willing to work with heritage building owners to find solutions and make compromises, allowing for redevelopment while still conserving the heritage building, as the projects are often complicated and full of unexpected surprises. The sentiment was shared by Interviewee 6, as they explained the City of Edmonton’s approach:

We encourage them to designate, inform them of incentives available should they choose to designate. Whenever possible, we will work on solutions where they might be able to get what they want while still retaining the property and incorporating it into a new development. (September 5, 2019)

Even with the incentive of grant money, Interviewee 7 felt that poor relations between developers and the City can easily be the death of an already inherently risky built heritage redevelopment project. Good cooperation between developers and the City goes beyond personal

relationships, as Interviewee 1 noted, it also includes the City having policies that are supportive of built heritage redevelopment.

Another incentive that was suggested as a means of preventing neglect was the provision of maintenance grants. Interviewee 7 pointed out that heritage buildings were not just costly to redevelop, but many of their historic characteristics require ongoing maintenance. While modern metal frame windows are described as being “almost maintenance free”, the wood frame windows that would be found in a heritage building are described as needing “regular maintenance” (U.S. Department of Energy, n.d.). Maintenance grants could help offset this additional cost incurred in the maintenance of heritage buildings, making heritage buildings owners more likely to engage in it regularly, stopping neglect before it even started.

Vacancy was a topic that often came up in interviews, being viewed as the first step on the road to neglect. Interviewee 1 saw this as a particularly big problem for heritage buildings that were not visible from the road, being allowed to crumble as they are out of sight and out of mind. The proposed solution was not to incentivise the occupancy of heritage buildings, but to stop the practice of incentivising vacancy. Interviewee 1 and Interviewee 4 both felt that it was a positive step forward in the fight against demolition by neglect when the cities of Ottawa and Hamilton decided to do away with a reduced tax rate for vacant buildings. A reduced tax rate was seen as encouraging heritage building owners to hold onto vacant heritage buildings for speculative reasons, which Interviewee 1 saw as a serious problem in Hamilton, detracting from the community and potentially leading to demolition by neglect. Interviewee 2 also suggested that after a heritage building had been vacant for a set period of time, the City should be inquiring as to what the owner’s intentions were, as vacant, neglected buildings diminish a city’s tax base. Finding the resources to support the redevelopment of a vacant building sooner, rather

than later, would not only save the heritage building, but also support the wellbeing of the surrounding neighbourhood while maintaining the tax base. Alternatively, Interviewee 8 suggested that a tax relief program for the redevelopment of heritage buildings would be a good incentive. Not only would it prevent neglect, but the savings could be passed on to the tenants, giving it a “competitive advantage in the marketplace” (Interviewee 8, May 4, 2021).

But perhaps incentives are not needed to stop heritage buildings from being neglected as much as a shift in public attitudes towards built heritage is required. Interviewee 6 mentioned that a shift is already taking place in Edmonton, where a younger, more “savvy” public is becoming involved in built heritage conservation. Interviewee 1 and Interviewee 7 similarly observed the growing desire for “authenticity” in spaces, which heritage buildings provide plenty of with their storied histories and spaces filled with character. This increase in public interest and involvement has continued to build momentum, effectively drawing further attention and support to the issue of built heritage conservation. Interviewee 3 also felt that public interest in conserving heritage buildings was an important part of addressing demolition by neglect while Interviewee 8 suggested that having a School of Architecture in a city goes a long way in “advancing a local appreciation for good architecture whether current or heritage” (May 4, 2021).

4.2.2 Rectifying Neglect

According to Interviewee 3 and Interviewee 5, heritage buildings can have their maintenance legislated through property standards bylaws and maintenance bylaws, which can be used to both prevent neglect from taking place or correct neglect once it has started. Good bylaws can effectively address neglect taking place in heritage buildings, while Interviewee 2 saw “solid” bylaws as “avoiding all of this from happening in the first place” (May 19, 2021).

But writing pro-heritage bylaws and enforcing them are two different things. Bylaws need to be written in a way that is legally enforceable, otherwise, Interviewee 4 felt that a City would be hesitant to pursue them.

Having the resources to adequately enforce maintenance bylaws was seen as a widespread problem by Interviewee 1, Interviewee 6 and Interviewee 8. Maintenance bylaws often cover much more than just heritage buildings, further stretching already limited enforcement resources and according to Interviewee 6, this results in enforcement only taking place when there is a complaint. Interviewee 1 suggested that fees associated with owning a vacant building could be a good means of funding regular inspections. A lack of inspection can result in the neglect of a heritage building being allowed to quietly take place until the situation is so dire, the only solution is demolition. And when inspectors finally do get out to a heritage building, they are often unable to enter the building to thoroughly inspect it. Interviewee 4 recounted the enormous amount of damage a leak in a roof caused to a heritage building while remaining completely undetectable from the building's exterior. Interviewee 2 expressed frustration at the neglect suffered by heritage buildings:

How did these buildings get to the point where they're at? They were allowed to get to that deteriorated point because of a lack of strong property standards in municipalities... The big question is where are the municipalities in all of this? They are letting this happen. (May 19, 2021)

Even designated heritage buildings are not necessarily afforded better enforcement of maintenance bylaws. Interviewee 6 noted that although the list of designated buildings in Edmonton keeps growing, the numbers of people entrusted to regularly inspect them remains the same. Alternatively, Interviewee 3 spoke of how effective it was to have a dedicated bylaw officer in Ottawa specifically assigned to monitor heritage buildings and work with City heritage staff to appropriately rectify problems before they became insurmountable.

Fines were suggested as a tool to help enforce property standard and maintenance bylaws. There was an emphasis on fines being substantial, as pointed out by Interviewee 2, if someone owns millions of dollars worth of real estate, a fine of a few thousand dollars is just the cost of doing business and is unlikely to inspire any action. Interviewee 2 even went so far as to suggest bylaws should go beyond fining offenders that neglect heritage buildings, and apply penalties to their future projects as well. But Interviewee 4 pointed out the fines can be appealed, and without the cooperation of multiple departments and well worded bylaws, enforcement can fall through. Interviewee 5 also suggested adding fees to the tax bill of neglected heritage buildings to recover the costs of the City stepping in to do emergency maintenance work.

An inventory of historic buildings, or a “watch list” was identified as an important tool in rectifying neglect by Interviewee 3. Because designating every building with some historical significance in a city would be an overwhelming task requiring vast amounts of resources, an inventory was seen as a useful alternative. With no limiting legal ramifications, Interviewee 6 presented the inventory as a list of buildings with potential heritage value that a City should be aware of, including both vacant buildings and those at risk of demolition by neglect. Interviewee 6 spoke positively about Edmonton’s inventory, with approximately 1000 buildings on it, which helps the City identify which building owners they should strive to work with to encourage the conservation of their buildings. In Ottawa, Interviewee 4 felt that the City’s system of pausing for 60 days to review a building on the inventory list if a demolition permit was applied for, was effective. Not all buildings on these lists ultimately end up being designated or even remained standing, but it was seen as a step in the right direction, for how can a City save its built heritage if it does not even know it exists?

Unfortunately, participants agreed that if a heritage building owner is determined to demolish their building, there is ultimately very little that can be done to stop them. Interviewee 2 recounted one occasion when a building owner quickly demolished their structure on a Sunday morning to avoid resistance and ensure the building was lost before it could be designated. This was described as an extreme example, but it was not the only time Interviewee 2 could recall such actions being taken. Interviewee 6 shared a similar sentiment: “I would say the vast majority of the time, by the time someone has decided that they are going to submit a permit to demolish a building, it’s over” (September 5, 2019). Interviewee 7 noted that without the interjection of the province, which was uncommon, there was little that could be done in Edmonton if the owner had no interest in saving their building.

Some participants went so far as to suggest that when all else fails, the appropriate course of action for stopping the neglect of a heritage building is expropriation, when the government purchases a property for public use with or without the consent of the owner (Kalman, 2014, p. 50). Interviewee 4 spoke of the cycle of neglectful heritage building owners being fined, and then the fines being appealed, only for the City to fine them again, with the end result being the heritage building continued to deteriorate. In these situations, which Interviewee 4 deemed “most egregious” (August 15, 2019), expropriation by the City was presented as the ultimate solution. Interviewee 5 pointed out that while some members of the public would be supportive of such extreme measures, others would be adamantly against it. As a result of its controversial nature, Interviewee 5 said that cities which already have the power to expropriate neglected heritage buildings are very hesitant to make use of it, while Interviewee 7 was certain the City of Edmonton would expropriate if the situation justified it.

4.2.3 Punishing Neglect

What are cities to do when all their efforts to save a heritage building have failed and demolition by neglect has been achieved? How do cities punish the perpetrator and deter others from going down the same path? This is a complicated problem, because as previously mentioned in this thesis, there are many different causes of demolition by neglect. While punishing a greedy developer who intentionally let a heritage building crumble so the land could be redeveloped may feel justified, the same can not be said for an owner with good intentions but without the resources to properly care for their heritage building. Perhaps this is the reason that punishing neglect was the least discussed topic in the interviews? Or perhaps it was hoped that an emphasis on the effective prevention and rectification of neglect would result in no need for punitive measures to be taken.

In addition to using fines to persuade heritage building owners to maintain their structure, these same fines could be used to punish those who succeeded in having their heritage building demolished, the ultimate act of neglect. As previously mentioned by Interviewee 2, fines would have to be substantial for them to make an impact. A few thousand dollars in fines would have little impact on a developer embarking on a lucrative, multi-million dollar development project.

The second suggestion for punishing successful demolition by neglect was instating some sort of scorched earth policy. Such a policy would prevent a new development on the land if the historic building that had previously stood on it was lost to demolition by neglect. This would prevent someone who had willfully and successfully engaged in demolition by neglect from being able to profit from the destruction of community heritage. Interviewee 2 felt that this would not only be a reasonable punishment for the willful neglect and destruction of a heritage building, but would also act as an effective deterrent to anyone else considering neglecting their

heritage building in the hopes of being allowed to demolish it. This would seem to be the most extreme method for addressing demolition by neglect, and would likely hurt the community left with a vacant lot more than it would hurt the perpetrator.

4.2.4 Political Will

Through every interview, it was clear that no matter what the topic, political will was key to any approach being successful in addressing demolition by neglect. Interviewee 4 noted it was a hard lesson once learned by the Mayor of Ottawa, that it was ultimately the City's lack of political will that was resulting in the vacant, deteriorating buildings which he so loathed. Interviewee 6 agreed that the City needs to be a leader, setting an example of what good stewardship of built heritage looks like, while Interviewee 7 felt that ultimately most councillors already understood the value of heritage buildings. Interviewee 1 explained that if a City takes exemplary care of their municipally owned built heritage, it sets the tone for the community, indicating that heritage buildings are a valuable asset that should be conserved. "Internal leadership is important, heritage planning is good planning" (December 19, 2019), said Interviewee 1.

But the opposite is more often the case. A lack of political will to support built heritage or even political will in opposition to built heritage can be fatal to the conservation cause, with Interviewee 8 alluding to a lack of political will resulting in maintenance bylaws not being enforced. This is a complicated issue though, with councillors representing various wards with different issues, resulting in "differing opinions" on how to address built heritage issues, according to Interviewee 5. Interviewee 2 suggested that councillors were not above giving directives to City administrators to purposely avoid addressing the willful neglect of specific heritage buildings, with the intention of currying favour with the owner. While administrators

likely recognized this type of request is unethical, Interviewee 2 felt they were likely more concerned about keeping their job than going against the wishes of a councillor in the name of built heritage conservation.

To Interviewee 7, political will in favour of the conservation of built heritage often means allocating funds to the cause, be it in the form of funding or personal resources. Interviewee 6 felt that it was the willingness of politicians in Edmonton to dig deep into the City's pockets and find funding that resulted in successful built heritage conservation. At the same time, Interviewee 2 pointed out that politicians' willingness to support built heritage conservation is often unequally distributed, with some projects receiving tremendous support while others receive very little. It is an indication of the fickle nature of politics, that even a pro-heritage government may not share the same values as the heritage community or the public.

The discussion of expropriation highlighted not only the need for politicians to be leaders in the conservation of heritage, but to be willing to do the right thing even when it is not always popular. Alternatively, Interviewee 5 saw the City's lack of action in the conservation of built heritage as being the "unpopular approach", which makes one wonder why the City would choose that path. Interviewee 5 felt that although "they want to do what's right for the building and the community, but they also don't want to step on too many toes" (April 22, 2021). Perhaps it is because in the examples discussed by Interviewee 5, doing the right thing would mean expropriation, which seems to be even more unpopular than doing nothing and letting heritage buildings crumble.

Participants identified the public as having an important role to play in the level of political support built heritage conservation receives. As politicians are elected officials, Interviewee 1 and Interviewee 7 believed that if the public is vocal about caring about heritage

buildings, politicians looking to appease their voters will also support the conservation of heritage buildings. Interviewee 4 gave the example of 60 members of the public coming out to speak in favour of built heritage conservation and it having a substantial impact on politicians' willingness to take action.

The more the general public is astute to the importance of these assets, the more pressure they can put on their elected officials or bureaucrats to do the right things and to try to save them, which also pressures the development community. (Interviewee 7, May 10, 2021)

Interviewee 6 believed that it was pressure on politicians, particularly by millennials, that was making a difference in Edmonton, "pushing the needle now in terms of the City's commitment to built heritage preservation" (September 5, 2019). Interviewee 1 also cited the public's growing concerns about sustainability and resiliency as driving their concern for the conservation of built heritage. The importance of public interest in the conservation of built heritage, pushing politicians to take action against demolition by neglect, was also echoed by Interviewee 3.

Interviewee 2 recognized the need for political will in the fight against demolition by neglect, but felt it was sorely lacking, with Cities citing a long list of other pressing issues as a reason to not addressing the problem. But Interviewee 2 felt this was a greatly missed opportunity on the part of the City, as the redevelopment of a heritage building can have a "regenerative effect" on a community facing hard times, just as a neglected heritage building can make a bad situation worse. While Interviewee 5 saw the public in Ottawa having expectations of the City when it came to conserving built heritage, they did not necessarily see this translating into politicians taking action.

4.3 Summary

Just as there are many causes of demolition by neglect, there is no one-size-fits-all solution. The results of the semi-structured interviews clearly favoured a proactive approach to addressing demolition by neglect, encouraging the redevelopment of heritage buildings so they never fall into a state of disrepair. There were various suggestions as to how to go about this, as each city has a unique set of circumstances to navigate in terms of context, resources and priorities. Additionally, the situation of each heritage building is different, again requiring individualised solutions. Throughout, most of the approaches proposed for addressing demolition by neglect involved incentivising heritage buildings owners to maintain their structure, with less suggestions for punitive approaches. Also, the importance of political will was highlighted, as no approach to addressing demolition by neglect would be effective without the support of the local government. Fiscal support, good policies, a willingness to take action and leading by example were all seen as key in the fight against demolition by neglect, and none are possible without politicians being pro-heritage conservation. Perhaps with more political will, the one final sad conclusion would not have been realised: if a heritage building owner really wants to achieve demolition by neglect, there is ultimately very little that can be done to stop the wrecking ball.

5.0 Focus Group

After the semi-structured interviews were complete, transcribed and coded with themes extracted, efforts were shifted to the focus group stage of the research. The intention of the focus group was to answer the second research question: Would any of the methods for addressing demolition by neglect from other cities be potentially useful in Winnipeg, and what challenges would they face in implementation? Although several themes did arise from the focus group, the end result was clear – there is no easy solution for addressing demolition by neglect.

5.1 Research Methods

Six heritage professionals participated in the focus group. Potential participants were identified through Google searches and the researcher's professional network. The intention was to include only heritage professionals residing in Winnipeg so they would have intimate knowledge of the local conditions. While reaching out to potential participants for the semi-structured interviews, an individual who was not from the three cities being studied but was knowledgeable about Winnipeg and demolition by neglect was identified. In an effort to make the best use of their expertise, it was decided to include them in the focus group.

The participants included heritage professionals from a diverse array of backgrounds with many years of experience. The participants were:

- Participant 1: a planner from Winnipeg who works in the public sector
- Participant 2: an historian from Winnipeg who works in the public sector
- Participant 3: a advocate from Winnipeg who works in the nonprofit sector
- Participant 4: a planner from Winnipeg who worked in the public and private sectors
- Participant 5: a developer from Winnipeg who works in the private sector

- Participant 6: an architect from Toronto who works in the private sector and has a strong knowledge of Winnipeg

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic which made safely meeting in person a challenge, the focus group was held with the use of an online video communication program. This allowed for the equal participation of all participants regardless of their location. Unfortunately, two participants, Participant 1 and Participant 5, were unable to participate on the date set for the focus group. Not wanting to miss out on their valuable insights, these participants responded to the focus group guide individually through phone conversation and an online video communication program. Participant 5 responded two days prior to the focus group, while Participant 1 responded a week after the focus group. Relevant points from Participant 5's responses were shared with the focus group, while relevant points from both Participant 5 and the focus group were shared with Participant 1.

5.2 Coding Results and Discussion

Through coding the focus groups transcripts, a distinct narrative on how to best address demolition by neglect in Winnipeg arose. Although specifics on how ideas should be implemented were not discussed and at times participants expressed different perspectives, it was clear that there was consensus on the big ideas, along with the challenges faced by Winnipeg. *Preventing neglect* was a prevailing theme, with *effective communication* seen as a means of resolving many issues without having to expend limited funds or take punitive action. *Political will* was seen as key in moving from wishful thinking to taking action. Yet all the while, participants acknowledged that addressing demolition by neglect in Winnipeg faces some challenges to which there are no easy solutions.

5.2.1 Preventing Neglect

Firstly, participants were in agreement that preventing demolition by neglect was of the utmost importance, because “once the building is on fire, you are in trouble” (Participant 6, June 30, 2021). Whatever methods Winnipeg might use to address demolition by neglect, if they are to be effective, they will need to be proactive, not reactive. Redevelopment of a heritage building was generally seen as the most effective means of preventing neglect, as when a building is being used to its fullest and succeeding financially, the incentives and resources to maintain it are more readily available. How does Winnipeg go about encouraging the redevelopment of its heritage buildings?

Participant 5 felt that all levels of government need to be proactive leaders, providing incentives to the private sector to redevelop built heritage instead of waiting for the private sector to come forward with a proposal first. With the belief that most of the public sees the value in built heritage and would like for it to be redeveloped, it would only make sense for government to support its taking place. Participant 5 framed redeveloping built heritage as a “public good” and as such all levels of government should be investing in it one way or another, helping mitigate the risk. Participant 3 agreed that financing programs were a viable option for supporting the redevelopment of built heritage. But according to Participant 1, the City of Winnipeg has no means of providing loans to help support the redevelopment of built heritage when banks are unwilling to take on the risk of these projects.

Participant 1 spoke about a “robust” tax incentive program that Winnipeg used instead to encourage the redevelopment of built heritage in the past. Under the program, heritage buildings which were not generating much in the way of tax revenue for the City of Winnipeg could be redeveloped following best practises. If the City’s tax revenue from the building increased at

least by a multiple of five, the building could be granted a municipal tax holiday for up to 21 years. Participant 1 noted that although the program was very successful in encouraging the redevelopment of vacant or underused heritage buildings, it was deemed to be not financially viable for the City. A new pilot project was tested, only returning 80% of municipal taxes for 12 years, but it has not been implemented as a permanent solution, despite the support of some City councillors, according to Participant 2. Participant 4 agreed that tax incentives can be the tipping point when it comes to making a project viable.

Another successful tax incentive program was mentioned by Participant 5, which froze a building's taxes at pre-redevelopment levels for 15 to 20 years. Although this program was targeted at the development of rentable properties downtown, heritage buildings benefited from it. Participant 3, on the other hand, was critical of the small scope of the City's tax programs, noting they were limited to the downtown area, leaving built heritage beyond the heart of the city without that financial support.

Participant 1 added that the City also has a matching grant program that is geared towards restoring character defining elements instead of the complete redevelopment of a heritage building. Although the program can offer grants up to \$50,000, a continually shrinking budget means grants are more often around \$20,000. Participant 1 felt these types of grants can go a long way in making the maintenance of built heritage more affordable. Participant 5 felt that grants could be an important tool in the redevelopment of built heritage, but the size of the grant would need to be relative to the amount being invested in the project to be effective.

Participant 5 touched on another type of incentive program that has been successful in some cities – density bonuses. In cities where every extra storey you can build is extremely valuable, being allowed extra square footage on a built heritage redevelopment project or on

your next new build project as a reward for redeveloping built heritage, can be very motivating. But in Winnipeg, where a “developer can generally build whatever they really want” (June 28, 2021) according to Participant 5, density bonuses are of little value.

As successful as financial programs may be for some heritage buildings, Participant 3 was quick to point out that some heritage building owners simply have no interest in redeveloping or even selling. Participant 3’s suspicion was that these owners do not have the knowledge or resources to effectively redevelop their building like a development company. Instead, they believe that if they succeed in demolition by neglect, they will be able to save themselves the hassle of redevelopment and sell the land for a profit. For these owners, “financing programs are useless” (Participant 3, June 30, 2021). And unless fines for infractions are thousands of dollars and assessed continually until the issues are resolved, Participant 5 did not think punitive action was particularly effective either. Another challenge pointed out by Participant 1 was the ever-growing list of needs competing for the limited City funds, meaning there are fewer resources to support heritage buildings every year.

Participant 4 was also concerned that Winnipeg’s tax structure could be unintentionally financially supporting demolition by neglect instead of encouraging redevelopment. Participant 3 shared this concern, believing that a lower tax rate for vacant buildings is making it more financially viable to demolish instead of redevelop built heritage. Participant 2 pointed out that it is not “free” to own a vacant building in Winnipeg, there is a fee associated with owning a building while it is vacant. From their experience, Participant 3 believed that the savings from a lower tax rate coupled with income from renting out the adjacent parking lot still makes it profitable to sit on an empty heritage building, even after paying any fees. Participant 3 also felt that the legislation around the City’s vacant building fee is not clear as to when it is enforced and

how much it is. Participant 5 questioned the fairness and legality of assessing higher taxes on vacant buildings, but was in support of making owning a vacant building less affordable.

According to Participant 6, there is a similar problem in Toronto, where tenants are being evicted because the taxes on vacant buildings are so much lower. Participant 6 felt that Winnipeg needs to recognize that this policy is counter productive, keeping heritage buildings empty and neglected instead of encouraging redevelopment. Participant 1 agreed that taxation could be used as a tool for discouraging the continued vacancy of heritage buildings instead of encouraging it, but how such a system would work was beyond their expertise. Participant 5 questioned the legality of adjusting the tax rate on vacant heritage buildings and expressed concern about owners who were doing their best with meagre resources being unfairly punished. At the same time, Participant 5 did see taxation as a useful tool in forcing continually neglectful heritage building owners to take action.

Participant 6 suggested that financing programs are not always the right tool for supporting the redevelopment of built heritage. Instead, Participant 6 felt it is important to understand what makes a community vibrant and economically viable without being continually propped up by external support. When the inner workings of a thriving community are understood, incentives can be tailored to effectively support the continued success, which might not be in the form of a financial program. The belief then follows that in a prosperous community where people are proud to live and work, and buildings are being used to capacity, built heritage will be maintained without further interventions from the city.

5.2.2 Effective Communication

Effective communication was a recurring topic within the focus group. Communication with heritage building owners, politicians and the public. This could help stakeholders move

away from the “us versus them” (Participant 6, June 30, 2021) mentality and build up a sense of pride in owning a heritage building. There are two equally important facets to effective communication – speaking and listening. Speaking involves advocates and professionals educating heritage building owners, politicians and the public on why saving built heritage is important and how to go about it most effectively. Listening gives building owners, politicians and the public a chance to respond to advocates and professionals, ensuring that all sides of the issues are heard without anyone being villainized. The end result is a constructive and respectful conversation that hopefully leads to an agreement on the importance of conserving built heritage and a practical plan to go about it.

From their experience, Participant 6 felt that many of the “problematic” heritage building owners were simply misunderstood due to poor communication. A personal conflict in the past, a misinterpreted policy, a situation that was deemed unfair – they all resulted in heritage building owners with long held grudges against anyone who they perceived to be pro-heritage conservation. With hard feelings and an unwillingness to come to the table, it is a situation where everyone loses, including the heritage building. Relating one story, Participant 6 noted that

...many of the property owners that were the grumpiest were actually the most caring about their building. It was a very funny situation. I don't know whether there is anything to learn from that. I think we found the lock was not talking to people, taking sides too strongly and not really listening to other people. And I mean really listening, why would you have a building and let it fall apart? Because all that deferred maintenance just ends up becoming much more expensive if you want to rehabilitate the building, so you are cutting your arm off to save your whatever. It is not a smart move. It is an emotional move, driven by the fact that they don't think anyone understands their larger ambitions. (June 30, 2021)

Participant 1 felt the City worked hard to communicate with and support developers in the heritage redevelopment projects, ensuring processes happened in the most efficient manner. Participant 5 saw it differently, feeling there were too many “hoops to jump through” (June 28,

2021) on heritage redevelopment projects and too many people involved in decision making. Where Participant 1 saw Winnipeg's panel of experts reviewing redevelopment plans as an asset to developers, Participant 5 saw it as making for a long and costly project, trying to please so many different people. Although Participant 1 understood this point of view, they felt that it often came from developers that were not interested in following the best practises in heritage conservation. Participant 5 felt the system would be much more efficient if developers could go to one person who could give them all the information needed in a clear and concise manner, ensuring the project would move forward without wasting time.

In addition to effective communication with heritage building owners, Participant 1, Participant 3 and Participant 6 all felt that there needs to be better public education on why saving heritage buildings is important. Heritage building owners, the public and City councillors all need to understand why saving built heritage is important, and not just the outstanding heritage buildings, but all the lesser ones which play an important role in contributing to sustainability and affordable spaces. Participant 3 and Participant 6 believed that educating the public on the connection between conserving built heritage and environmental sustainability is key in getting more people to support built heritage conservation. Participant 1 felt that the City was trying its best, but limited resources were hindering its efforts. Participant 2 also felt communication with the public needed to be improved, but so they better understood the tools available for conserving built heritage. Participant 2 was frustrated with the public's misunderstanding of heritage conservation in Winnipeg, commenting "if you need a hammer, don't ask for a screwdriver" (June 30, 2021).

The lack of effective communication in Winnipeg was highlighted by the discussion on Winnipeg's heritage inventory. A heritage inventory is simply a list of historical buildings in a

given jurisdiction. There are no restrictions placed on these buildings, but they may be afforded extra attention by the municipality. This extra attention could come in a variety of forms, including increased monitoring, special funding opportunities, or an evaluation of their heritage value if a permit was applied for. Championed by many of the participants in the semi-structured interviews, a heritage inventory was implemented in Winnipeg until 2014. It was then deemed illegal and converted to the Commemorative List, where buildings can be altered or demolished, although Participant 2 said the City makes a point of documenting buildings in pictures before they are lost.

Participant 1 said the problem was most heritage building owners were not aware that their building was on the inventory, just as now, according to Participant 3, many heritage building owners do not know the inventory is gone. Participant 1 believed that the new bylaw and subsequent lists have better communicated with the heritage buildings owners, with clearer explanations about the ramifications of what heritage building designation means. But Participant 3 saw the new bylaw letting many buildings that were formerly listed on the inventory fall through the cracks, and even if owners with buildings once on the inventory now want to designate their building, the expensive nomination processes often dissuades them. Participant 1 saw this as a trade off: “there is the positive of having clarity and there is also the reduction of protection that this also created” (July 8, 2021).

Participant 6 noted that Winnipeg is not alone in being told their heritage inventory was illegal. Hamilton was also told they could not have a heritage inventory but worked to find a solution so it could remain. Digging into the situation, it had become clear that heritage building owners and the public did not understand the difference between the designated list and inventory list. Hamilton wanted to support buildings on the inventory, but without the “heavy

hand of designation” (Participant 6, June 30, 2021). Problems arose when there was poor communication between the City of Hamilton and heritage buildings owners. Talking to heritage building owners and finding out what the real problem was ultimately was the solution and resulted in the inventory still existing in Hamilton today.

Unfortunately, Participant 2 pointed out a flaw in the ambition for effective communication leading to great education around built heritage conservation: “education is great as long as people want to be educated” (June 30, 2021). As much as Participant 6 saw communication and education as a means of breaking down barriers and getting everyone on the same page, Participant 2 and Participant 3 agreed that some people just have no interest in engaging.

5.2.3 Political Will

Participants were in agreement that Winnipeg’s politicians need to have strong convictions on conserving built heritage and be willing to back them up with action. Without political will, the best policies will end up underfunded and under enforced, with built heritage being left to decay. “Political will drives decision making at the top” (July 8, 2021) said Participant 1. Participant 6 was very much on the same page, stating that “[b]uilt heritage needs to have a champion within City Hall” (June 30, 2021). Participant 3 and Participant 6 both felt that if a City had strong convictions on built heritage from the onset, owners and developers would understand that conserving built heritage is just part of doing business in that city.

The first step to increased political will is making the public aware of the issue. An educated public can inform the platform of public officials according to Participant 1. Participant 4 agreed with Participant 1 that educated constituents making their voices heard is a good way to get City councillors to support built heritage conservation and drive political will. Especially

when going into an election, it is important that councillors are aware that built heritage conservation is an issue the community wants to see addressed. Getting the community on board with conserving heritage buildings is effective “because there is nothing a councillor loves better than to stand up for something that the community supports,” (June 30, 2021) said Participant 4.

Participant 3 felt that along with public education, grassroots advocacy is also important when it comes to stopping demolition by neglect. The communities affected by neglected buildings need to be on board with saving them. Public pressure stops councillors from making bad decisions, holds them accountable, and “spurs or catalyses action” (Participant 5, June 28, 2021). Participant 1 agreed, noting that along with large advocacy groups like Heritage Winnipeg that support built heritage throughout Winnipeg, small local advocacy groups see the details larger organisations miss.

As to whether or not Winnipeg has the political will to address demolition by neglect, the responses were mixed. Participant 5 saw Winnipeg’s struggle with demolition by neglect as more of a lack of resources problem than a lack of political will. Resources are stretched thin making sufficiently addressing demolition by neglect an impossible task, regardless of how much politicians may want to. Even if there were endless resources, Participant 5 did not see the City rushing to get involved in what they perceived to be a public relations nightmare, arising from taking a strong pro-heritage approach. Participant 4 agreed that a lack of resources was at the heart of the lack of political will problem in Winnipeg. They felt that although there has always been general support for heritage conservation in the City, a lack of resources meant no action could be taken.

Participant 3 felt that City councillors were interested in revenue, not saving built heritage and that the big issue was a lack of leadership coming from the Mayor. This was in line

with Participant 5's view on Winnipeg's hands-off approach to built heritage redevelopment. It seems the City believes that if the public values built heritage, that should be enough to encourage its redevelopment so "developers will kind of just take care of those issues naturally and the City doesn't have to get involved" (Participant 5, June 28, 2021).

Participant 2 felt that the City of Winnipeg is trying, but there simply are not enough resources given the amount of built heritage in the municipality. With so few resources, the City needs to be very thoughtful about what it designates. Participant 2 pointed out that the more heritage buildings that get designated, the fewer resources that can be put into maintaining each of them. Making matters worse, apparently for at least the past five years, there has been a real lack of interest in built heritage conservation by the chairperson of the Historical Buildings and Resources Committee, despite best efforts to educate.

A great level of political will would be needed to take extreme action against demolition by neglect, such as expropriation. According to Participant 1, the City of Winnipeg does have the ability to take title without consent, but it is a complicated process not handled by the planning department. On a positive note, Participant 1 did say that the City had made use of the policy in the past, citing a particular case in the recent past where the City took possession of a building on the Commemorative List. Participant 3 said they were a "strong advocate of expropriation," while Participant 4 and Participant 6 were more hesitant, seeing the process as being politically unpopular, lengthy and legally challenging. Participant 5 was hesitant to support the City taking possession of heritage buildings, but recognized that in some situations when neglect persists for years with no sign of change, it was a reasonable option.

5.2.4 Challenges

Development in Winnipeg in general is a challenge, as the success of one project often leads to “killing the coolness in another neighbourhood” (Participant 6, June 30, 2021). Built heritage redevelopment is no exception, and can come with over 100 years of baggage. It seems that Winnipeg’s biggest challenge in addressing demolition by neglect is owners that simply have no intention of doing anything with their heritage buildings. When no carrots or sticks work, what do you do next?

Participants acknowledged that some heritage building owners are a lost cause; no amount of effective communication, incentives or punishments would make them interested in maintaining their building. Participant 2 put it bluntly, “if a building owner really doesn't want to do anything with his building, they are really not going to do anything with the building and there is nothing you can do... that is just a fact of life” (June 30, 2021). As disheartening as this may be, participants did not feel this voided all efforts to conserve built heritage. There was an optimism that this only represented a small number of heritage building owners, meaning that the vast majority of heritage building owners were genuinely interested in working cooperatively to do what was best for their heritage building and the community.

In Winnipeg, such unmotivated heritage building owners were seen as particularly problematic in the historic Exchange District. Participant 3 suggested there are three or four owners of multiple heritage buildings in the Exchange District with no interest in redevelopment or selling their properties. Participant 3 felt that it is in these cases, when owners of vacant heritage buildings continue to neglect their building and degrade the surrounding community despite viable opportunities to sell the building, it was time for the City to step in and expropriate the heritage building.

Participant 4 felt that there should be serious financial consequences for neglecting a heritage building. Participant 2 noted that there are bylaws requiring vacant buildings be maintained, but a lack of resources means few personnel to monitor the buildings. Participant 2 suggested that a potential means of addressing the lack of heritage resources in Winnipeg was to designate fewer buildings. Designated buildings could then receive the attention and resources they deserve, while other solutions, like grassroots movements such as housing cooperatives, could be used to save undesignated heritage buildings. Participant 6 agreed that something like a land trust could be a viable option. The goal of the organisation would be providing affordable housing for a community, and in using heritage buildings to do so, the secondary benefit would be saving a heritage building.

According to Participant 3, it is these problematic built heritage owners that believe a vacant piece of land where their heritage building was demolished is more valuable than the same piece of land with their heritage building still standing. Participant 4 felt that the tax structure could be used to ensure neglectful built heritage owners were not wildly rewarded with a profitable new build project, thus disincentivizing their bad behaviour.

The unfortunate reality is that there are few effective methods to deter a heritage building owner that is committed to succeeding in demolition by neglect. A scorched earth policy that stops the profitable redevelopment of a site where a heritage building was demolished only hurts the community, according to Participant 3. Participant 1 agreed, suggesting that redevelopment is much more beneficial to all than leaving the site vacant:

I think that it is in the City's best interest to have that site rebuilt with a building or an amenity space that contributes to a complete community, like the vision of the city in the City's development plan, *Complete Communities*, as opposed to having a vacant site which doesn't really benefit streetscape, the neighbourhood, or the adjacent buildings. It is not contributing in any way to a pedestrian-friendly, walkable community and there are CPTED issues there. It can be an

instigator for crime, having a vacant site that is unkept. The other thing is that a vacant site does not generate much taxes. What are they going to use it for? We do not want to incentivize service parking. (July 8, 2021)

Participant 5 felt that fining heritage building owners as a means of punishing them for achieving demolition by neglect was also an arduous path. Fines would have to be in the hundreds of thousands of dollars to be impactful, and Participant 5 felt that any heritage building owner facing such punishment would “fight tooth and nail to get out of it,” (June 28, 2021) costing the City valuable time and resources in legal action, that may eventually amount to nothing. Participant 4 suggested the tax structure could be used to make the redevelopment of a heritage building more financially viable than demolition. Participant 5 instead proposed that sites of heritage buildings lost to neglect should be redeveloped, but with the new development’s square footage capped at that of the heritage building that was lost. This would mean a five-storey heritage building could not be replaced by a 20-storey new building. For cities where development pressure is exceptionally high, Participant 5 thought this would be a good punitive strategy, but unlikely to be effective in Winnipeg where development pressure is low.

Along with problematic built heritage owners, Participant 2 was also wary of giving too much attention or praise to development companies that redevelop built heritage. The concern was that development companies are always focused on making the most profit from their projects, not doing what is best for the heritage building. More often than not, what is good for the developer’s bottom line is not good for the conservation of built heritage. This highlighted a real challenge in the prevention of neglect, how does a City effectively support profitable redevelopment projects while ensuring its built heritage is meaningfully conserved?

Finally, Participant 1 touched on the future of built heritage in relation to Indigenous history. With a growing understanding of the importance of Indigenous history, what does the

future hold for heritage buildings with a colonial past? Participant 1 believed that there is a large part of the story of our built heritage that is currently missing. As to whether it will result in more resources directed to built heritage conservation or ultimately is the demise of built heritage, it has yet to be seen.

5.3 Summary

There is no one policy that will effectively address demolition by neglect in Winnipeg. The focus group made it clear that it is a collective, pro-heritage attitude that will make the difference, a willingness to understand the context of each situation and work to find solutions. Although opinions were generally similar, there were some differences. This was highlighted in the discussion on the effectiveness of punitive measures. Participant 2 was quick to point out that as the City, “[w]e do have sticks” (June 30, 2021). From Participant 3’s perspective as a built heritage advocate, they felt “we need those sticks to be bigger” (June 30, 2021). Participant 4 offered a more introspective opinion on the topic, believing “there has to be a balance of carrots and sticks in this” (June 30, 2021). Carrots cannot be costing the City money because the City cannot afford to fund things that are not of the highest priority, and sticks need to be strong, more than just a slap on the wrist. Everyone saw the need for sticks, but how to effectively administer them depended on who you asked. For Winnipeg to successfully address demolition by neglect, it will likely be on a case by case basis, finding creative solutions that fit the individual context of each heritage building.

6.0 Conclusions

Built heritage is a valuable, irreplaceable community asset that benefits all when conserved. Unfortunately, demolition by neglect is a wicked problem that is slowly destroying our built heritage right before our eyes. Planners have understood the role of built heritage in creating vibrant cities since Jacobs' work in the 1960s, while the issue of demolition by neglect has been formally discussed since the mid-1990s. Despite this, there is limited research into solutions for addressing demolition by neglect and the effectiveness of solutions is unreliable.

It is challenging to recommend any one specific policy for Winnipeg to implement to address demolition by neglect as each heritage building has its own unique set of circumstances, legislation restricts what kind of policies can be implemented and City resources are limited. Solutions that are proactive, low cost, easily customised and supported by politicians appear to be the best options, but what these specifically would look like is hard to say. Addressing demolition by neglect will require patience, creativity, flexibility, collaboration and perseverance by Winnipeg's planners. It will also require the backing of politicians and a willingness to trust the expertise of the planners. Although the task may seem daunting, every step that planners can take towards effectively addressing demolition by neglect is important, as the future of our cities is depending on it.

6.1 Answering Research Questions

This thesis was guided by two research questions, both which were answered in previous chapters. A surprising number of methods for addressing demolition by neglect were proposed in answering the questions, but all of them faced challenges. Finances were the biggest issue, with a need for legislation changes and unclear directions also being problematic. The result was no stand out solution for addressing demolition by neglect in Winnipeg, but a collection of

suggestions which planners, policy makers, researchers and community groups could draw inspiration from.

6.1.1 Question One

The first research question was: What methods have been used in other cities to address demolition by neglect and what have the results been? It was answered by both the literature review in Chapter Two, the document analysis in Chapter Three and the semi-structured interviews in Chapter Four. The results were an unexpectedly extensive list of methods that ranged from preventative to punitive, with some being specific courses of actions and others being general goals. As to the level of effectiveness of each method, all information was anecdotal. There were no statistical studies to gauge the level of success of any one method, just overall impressions from individuals. And while one person may have felt a method was extremely effective, another may have felt it was completely ineffective. This potentially speaks to the complexity of the problem of demolition by neglect; each heritage building has a completely different context that requires an individualised approach.

The most common methods used for addressing demolition by neglect were property standards bylaws. Sometimes this legislation was built heritage specific, sometimes it included maintenance expectations, sometimes it also encompassed vacant buildings. Regardless of the specifics in each city, this type of legislation spelled out how a heritage building must be taken care of. In a perfect world, this type of legislation would eliminate demolition by neglect. But we do not live in a perfect world and so another important method for addressing demolition by neglect is ensuring property standards bylaws are enforced. This could mean both regular inspections and fining building owners that violate the legislation. Having a built heritage

inventory was seen as another key method, ensuring a City knows what historical buildings it actually has and should be regularly monitoring.

Incentivising the redevelopment of built heritage was seen as another important method for addressing demolition by neglect. Incentives could come in the form of grant, tax or financing programs, all aimed at helping offset the cost of redevelopment projects, reducing the level of risk for the developer and making maintenance more affordable. Beyond financial support, cities can also offer development bonuses and technical expertise to make redevelopment projects more attractive undertakings and ensure they progress smoothly. Redevelopment can also be incentivised by disincentivizing owning vacant heritage buildings. This would be done by ensuring vacant heritage buildings do not benefit from a lower tax rate.

Expropriating a heritage building when nothing else has worked and the owner refuses to perform maintenance was seen as an unpopular but necessary method for addressing demolition by neglect. Similarly contentious was a scorched earth policy, meant to punish heritage building owners who had succeeded in demolition by neglect and to discourage others from also letting their heritage building fall down due to lack of maintenance. A substantial fine could have a similar effect and be less harmful to the surrounding community.

The final method for addressing demolition by neglect revolves around people's attitudes. The attitudes of built heritage owners, built heritage advocates, city employees, politicians and the public; towards built heritage and towards one another. To effectively address demolition by neglect, all stakeholders involved in built heritage need to come to the agreement that built heritage is a public good worth saving. Then, everyone needs to be willing to work cooperatively towards that goal. This shift in attitude is likely the most challenging method of addressing

demolition by neglect to implement, but could be very effective without requiring new legislation, extensive funding, enforcement or punitive action.

6.1.2 Question Two

The second question guiding the research of this thesis was: Would any of the methods for addressing demolition by neglect from other cities be potentially useful in Winnipeg, and what challenges would they face in implementation? This question was answered by the focus group, as discussed in Chapter Five. Many of the methods discussed by the focus group were already in use (or had been tried in the past) in Winnipeg, with varying levels of success. The main challenge faced by these methods is a lack of resources – the City does not have the funds to implement them more effectively. A lack of development pressure is another problem in Winnipeg, making new methods that seem to be effective in other cities completely useless in Winnipeg. Finally, the focus group acknowledged that there are some owners that just have no interest in maintaining their heritage building, regardless of incentives or punitive action. Unwilling to even sell for a fair price, these owners were seen as being in the minority but are also a lost cause that the City really can not stop from neglecting their heritage buildings.

The focus group agreed that a proactive approach, stopping demolition by neglect before it started, was the most desirable. This could be achieved through a financing program to encourage the redevelopment of built heritage. Such a program could help offset the risk of redevelopment projects and provide funds when the banks are unwilling. This would require some type of new legislation to set up and a source of funds, of which the City has few. Redevelopment also faces the challenge of profitability – developers are in the business of making money, which is hard to do when undertaking sensitive built heritage redevelopment. Built heritage redevelopment too often is unprofitable and no one is willing to undertake such a

project, or the quality of the conservation work has been compromised to ensure the developer makes a profit.

To avoid the problem of developers focused on their bottom line instead of good conservation practises, land trusts could be used to address demolition by neglect. This would not only save built heritage but could also be used to address other issues like affordable housing. While such projects do already exist in Winnipeg, they require a major source of funding, which the City is unlikely to provide, and a shift in focus to built heritage.

Another proactive approach to addressing demolition by neglect in Winnipeg is ensuring owning a vacant heritage building is not profitable due to lower property tax rates on vacant buildings. But this would require Winnipeg to change its tax legislation and could result in further hardship for heritage building owners that are already struggling with the cost of maintenance.

Having a heritage inventory was also championed as an effective proactive method for addressing demolition by neglect. It is much easier for a City to save its built heritage when it knows what it has. This again would require a change in legislation as Winnipeg's previous inventory was deemed illegal in 2014.

Instead of focusing efforts on redeveloping built heritage, a different approach to addressing demolition by neglect is to stimulate vibrant communities that will in turn encourage owners to redevelop built heritage because people want to live and work in these buildings. This might require policy changes or funding projects beyond the scope of built heritage, but could be more popular with politicians as it is less focused on built heritage conservation. It would also likely require some level of funding and the original residents could be forced out of their community by gentrification.

When efforts to prevent demolition by neglect fail, large fines or a scorched earth policy could be used to punish such owners and discourage others from doing the same. This would likely require some new legislation and could be extremely challenging to enforce. When faced with an enormous fine or restrictions on development, owners would likely take the matter to court to prove that it was something other than demolition by neglect that caused their heritage building to collapse. For a City short on resources, the time and money required to engage in such a legal battle may not be worthwhile. Additionally, scorched earth policies tend to punish the surrounding community that is left to live with the blight of an empty lot for a prolonged period.

The focus group also suggested two other methods for addressing demolition by neglect in Winnipeg, effective communication and political will. Effective communication between all stakeholders involved in the conservation of built heritage could result in better relationships and finding creative solutions. But this would likely require more resources from the City that they do not have, and not everyone is interested in engaging. Increased political will towards built heritage conservation could help set the tone for developers and redirect resources to the cause. But it would require an educated public making built heritage conservation a top priority for politicians, and a mayor willing to support and lead the cause.

6.2 Winnipeg Specific Recommendations

From the results of the focus group, three categories of recommendations for addressing demolition by neglect in Winnipeg arose: effective communication, supporting redevelopment and increasing political will. The categories focus on suggestions that have not been used, past or present, in Winnipeg. Eliminating past and present methods resulted in the broad discussion on preventing neglect in Chapter Five becoming the more specifically focused category of

supporting redevelopment. These recommendations also take into account the challenges faced in Winnipeg, including limited resources and lack of development pressure, eliminating solutions that are far beyond the City's means or deemed unlikely to be effective. The result is recommendations that are generalised and advocated for more of a shift in attitude than the implementation of any specific policy. This creates space for planners to use these recommendations in a way which best fits their situation, but is also challenging as there are no prescriptive steps to follow.

6.2.1 Effective Communication

Effective communication is important in many facets of life. To achieve satisfying personal and professional relationships, to effectively engage with people from all walks of life, to meaningfully resolve disagreements and to successfully solve problems, good communication is imperative (Morreale et al., 2000, pp. 1-2). Using effective communication to build positive working relationships between all stakeholders who would be impacted by demolition by neglect is a low tech, low cost, flexible approach that can be used to address the issue, potentially before it even begins.

Planners can benefit from engaging in effective communication with heritage building owners, built heritage advocates, politicians and the public, not only accurately sharing information but also taking the time to listen to feedback. Using effective communication to build respectful relationships can allow the root of demolition by neglect to be understood, effectively addressed before it becomes a crisis and help ensure resources are not wasted on solutions that will be ineffective. It was clear from the focus group that most people involved in heritage conservation have good intentions; it is rare to find a heritage building owner truly maliciously neglecting their property. Instead, misunderstanding and mistrust led to an “us

versus them” mentality with no one willing to work cooperatively towards a solution and built heritage being left to suffer.

Building positive working relationships through effective communication requires a willingness to put preconceived notions and past conflicts to the side, and be open to other people’s perspectives. It is potentially a humbling and time-consuming process, but allows for the context of each heritage building to be understood and custom solutions found, which is necessary when addressing a wicked problem. At a time when the City of Winnipeg is facing a funding shortfall and drawing from its stabilisation fund to balance the budget (MacLean, 2021), it is unlikely that any new funding will be allotted to heritage conservation. Although effective communication does require an investment of staff time, this cost is likely to be far lower than the cost of built heritage financing programs, litigious action against delinquent heritage building owners, undertaking emergency repairs of heritage buildings or the potential lost revenue when a heritage building is demolished.

6.2.2 Supporting Redevelopment

Instead of waiting for a heritage building to be on the brink of collapse to take action, supporting redevelopment was viewed by the focus group as a cost effective, proactive solution to addressing demolition by neglect. Regardless of the type of program Winnipeg uses to support redevelopment, it was clear that it needs to be both substantial and not costly for the City. These two requirements seem to be at odds – how do you provide a large and meaningful benefit to a developer, without spending money? The City of Winnipeg has already tried grant and tax incentive programs, implemented with a varying degree of effectiveness. But without an influx of funding, the grant programs are too small to have a substantial impact on redevelopment

projects costing millions of dollars and effective tax incentives are unsustainable, costing the City too much in lost revenues.

Instead, the City could find a way to help offset the risk of built heritage redevelopment projects, which was seen as a major barrier to these projects being undertaken. Built heritage grants could be pooled into a revolving fund, able to provide a substantial amount to one project instead of dividing it amongst many. Successful in other cities, a revolving fund could provide the loans which redevelopment projects so desperately need, but banks are often unwilling to give due to the high level of perceived risk. The loan would have to be repaid eventually and the funds could then be reinvested into a new project. As ideal as this approach may sound, it would likely require a one-by-one approach to redeveloping heritage buildings, which would not be fast enough to save them all. Additionally, there would likely need to be some change in legislation to make this kind of program possible. Before undertaking such a major change in approach to built heritage conservation, the City would need to seriously consider the pros and cons of such a program and weigh it against the effectiveness of the programs currently in use. It is a complicated, costly and long term approach to addressing demolition by neglect, but could ultimately be very effective.

In lieu of a dramatic increase in funding or change in approach, supporting the redevelopment of built heritage could also be a shift in attitude from the City. Choosing to prioritise the approval of built heritage redevelopment projects and support them with public funds instead of new construction projects would represent a major change. Not approving demolition permits for historical buildings, regardless of their designation status and being lenient on building codes for built heritage redevelopment projects could send a clear message to developers that Winnipeg is a pro-heritage city, all without spending a dime. Normalising built

heritage conservation with a united approach from the City could also inspire current heritage building owners to value and take pride in their property. Although changing attitudes is a low tech and low cost approach to addressing demolition by neglect, it is a particularly challenging one as people are all too often set in their ways. Planners can work to educate and advocate for built heritage conservation within the City, but it is the politicians that need to undergo a change of heart.

6.2.3 Increased Political Will

This overarching theme is by far the most important, and yet the most difficult to implement. How does one convince politicians, the people who set the tone and the budget for a city, that built heritage conservation is important? Ultimately, politicians serve their constituents, advocating for policies that will make their voters happy. A loud outcry from the public can inspire a politician to take action, but in a city filled with pressing issues such as crime and poverty, built heritage conservation is unlikely to be the public's top priority.

Good communication by planners and advocacy groups can help the public better understand that built heritage conservation can help address social problems. But for politicians that face re-election every few years, the long term benefits of built heritage conservation are not tangible or quick enough to garner the vote of a public facing crisis on a daily basis. It will take truly visionary politicians to be willing to prioritise the conservation of built heritage, knowing that the full benefits will only materialise long after they have left office. This is not to say that all hope is lost for built heritage conservation, as there are most definitely politicians who support the cause. Planners can do their best to educate politicians and the public, make use of low cost solutions for addressing demolition by neglect that will not further strain the city's

resources, and provide concrete evidence for the short and long term benefits of built heritage conservation beyond saving an old building.

6.3 Implications for Planning Practice

Although traditional solutions to demolition by neglect, such as grant programs and maintenance bylaws can be effective, this wicked problem requires a more creative approach by planners. Due to the complexity and individuality of each case of demolition by neglect, rigid legislation is unlikely to solve the problem. Although funds could solve the problem in the short term, without addressing the root of the problem or providing ongoing funding, demolition by neglect is likely to rear its ugly head once again. As most cities do not have endless funds to use for built heritage conservations, short term funding becomes another band-aid solution.

Instead, planners have to be willing to uncover the true cause of each case of demolition by neglect and understand how to effectively address it with minimal funds. Planners need to recognize the role built heritage plays in fostering thriving communities and ensure all legislation encourages built heritage conservation as a basic tenet of good planning, not a special interest project that can be pushed aside. Heritage buildings do not exist in isolation, they are part of the interwoven fabric of a community. Although the successful redevelopment of a heritage building can be a catalyst for change that inspires the renewal of the adjacent community, no built heritage redevelopment project will thrive in the long term when its surroundings are suffering.

6.4 Recommendations for Further Study

Throughout this thesis, several areas beyond the scope of the research, that could benefit from further study, were identified. The field could benefit greatly from some statistics on the effectiveness of different methods of addressing demolition by neglect. Although it was acknowledged that demolition by neglect is a very context-dependent problem, it would be

challenging to implement any policy change or justify an increase in funding when all evidence for the effectiveness of methods for addressing it is anecdotal. Such research could be used to identify trends and guide future decisions, helping planners make hard choices about how to best make use of limited resources. Similarly, a cost benefit analysis of the economic effectiveness of conserving built heritage could also be useful in increasing political support, which was identified as key in the fight against demolition by neglect.

Research could be further expanded to include lessons learned in successful “rescues” of heritage buildings that were at risk of demolition by neglect, which would also be useful in guiding planners towards the most effective methods for addressing demolition by neglect. This type of research could include input from building owners, who may not be heritage professionals but are at the heart of the issue of demolition by neglect and could provide valuable insights.

With supporting the redevelopment of built heritage being championed as the best method for addressing demolition by neglect in Winnipeg, more research into this topic is warranted. While current incentives being used could be improved, exploring the details of some kind of loan system operated by the City could offer a new and more effective solution. Land trusts were also suggested as a means of addressing demolition by neglect. Although there were discounted as a recommendation for this thesis because they already exist in Winnipeg and are cost prohibitive, they seem to be an unexplored method for supporting the redevelopment heritage buildings

This research focused on the role that the municipal government plays in addressing demolition by neglect. In Winnipeg, only a heritage designation by the municipal government has legal implications and does not allow for a building to be demolished. Consequently, the

municipal government is then the most invested in saving these heritage buildings. But this does not mean the federal and provincial government have no role to play in built heritage conservation. It is an issue with far reaching implications, such as environmental sustainability, that impact all levels of government. Further study into how the federal and provincial governments could help address demolition by neglect, be it through policy or resources, would be extremely beneficial. All levels of government working together towards a common goal is far more effective than governments working in isolation and potentially thwarting one another's efforts.

Finally, future research should reflect on how built heritage can play a role in reconciliation, and what guidance Indigenous people might provide to better support the appropriate redevelopment of built heritage. Built heritage needs to represent the history, values and culture of all people to create truly inclusive communities.

Given the limited research that has been done on demolition by neglect, any further study will help fill in the many gaps and guide planners, policy makers, researchers and community groups in making better decisions.

6.5 Summary

This thesis created a typology of strategies for addressing demolition by neglect in the City of Winnipeg. Although not easily implementable, the suggestions can help guide planners towards better solutions. Demolition by neglect is a complex issue that is about more than saving old buildings, it is about ensuring the quality of life for all people, today and tomorrow. Little research has been done on the topic and built heritage conservation is often considered a low priority by Cities. But time is running out for our built heritage, if we do not take action today, there will be nothing left to save in the future. Hopefully, more research into the benefits of built

heritage conservation can lead to a shift in attitudes and an integrated approach to city planning that consistently includes heritage buildings as integral elements in vibrant and sustainable communities.

References

- Adams, J., Greenwood, D., Thomashow, M., & Russ, A. (2017). Sense of Place. In A. Russ, & M. E. Krasny (Eds.), *Urban environmental education review* (pp. 68-75). Ithaca: Comstock Publishing Associates, an imprint of Cornell University Press. Retrieved August 4, 2021
- Albinger, S. M. (2014). *Preserving built heritage in Canada: Best practices in preventing demolition by neglect*. Master's Thesis, McGill University, Montreal.
- Allison, E. W., & Allison, M. A. (2008). Preserving Tangible Cultural Assets: A Framework for a New dialog in Preservation. *Preservation Education & Research, 1*, 29-40. Retrieved from <http://ncpe.us/wp-content/uploads/2012/06/3ALLISONpaper.pdf>
- Artibise, A. F. (2019, March 13). *Winnipeg*. Retrieved May 14, 2020, from The Canadian Encyclopedia: <https://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/winnipeg>
- Bassa, L., & Kiss, F. (2009). *Preserving Tangible and Intangible Heritage Shared Heritage - Common Responsibility*. Budapest, Hungary: Foundation for Information Society INFOTA Research Institute. Retrieved May 13, 2020, from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/236862018_Preserving_Tangible_and_Intangible_Heritage_Shared_Heritage_-_Common_Responsibility
- Brazil, B. G. (2003). *Non-Traditional Remedies to Demolition-by-Neglect: Private Sector Incentives, Public Sector Municipal Abatement, and Other Approaches*. Master's Thesis, University of Georgia in Partial.
- Bridgman, W., & St. Clair Bridgman, R. (2019a, April 22). *Reimagining Point Douglas: How the historic district could become a model for a changing Winnipeg*. Retrieved February 9, 2022, from CBC News: <https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/manitoba/opinion-winnipeg-point-douglas-1.5105569>
- Bridgman, W., & St. Clair Bridgman, R. (2019b, March 31). *Winnipeg's Bay building presents an opportunity to rethink connections between heritage, reconciliation*. Retrieved February 9, 2022, from CBC News: <https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/manitoba/opinion-winnipeg-downtown-the-bay-reconciliation-1.5076212>
- Bull, N. (2019, October 3). *Landmarks, not landfill*. Retrieved February 2, 2022, from National Trust for Canada: <https://nationaltrustcanada.ca/online-stories/making-landmarks-not-landfill>
- Bumsted, J. M. (2013, August 6). *Red River Colony*. Retrieved May 14, 2020, from The Canadian Encyclopedia: <https://thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/red-river-colony>
- Byrne, D. (2017). *Philosophy of Research*. Retrieved August 3, 2021, from SAGE Research Methods: <https://methods-sagepub-com.uml.idm.oclc.org/project-planner/philosophy-of-research/i112?fromsearch=true>

- Carter, A. (2015, April 13). *'Demolition by neglect': Gore buildings rotting away*. Retrieved June 17, 2021, from CBC News: <https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/hamilton/headlines/demolition-by-neglect-gore-buildings-rotting-away-1.3028584>
- City of Edmonton. (n.d.-a). *2019 Municipal Census Results*. Retrieved June 17, 2021, from Edmonton: https://www.edmonton.ca/city_government/facts_figures/municipal-census-results
- City of Edmonton. (n.d.-b). *City of Edmonton Historic Resources Program*. Retrieved June 17, 2021, from Edmonton: https://www.edmonton.ca/city_government/edmonton_archives/emwalker-historic-resources-program
- City of Edmonton. (n.d.-c). *Financial Incentives*. Retrieved June 17, 2021, from Edmonton: https://www.edmonton.ca/city_government/edmonton_archives/financial-rehabilitation-incentives
- City of Edmonton. (n.d.-d). *Heritage Areas*. Retrieved June 17, 2021, from Edmonton: https://www.edmonton.ca/city_government/edmonton_archives/heritage-areas
- City of Edmonton. (n.d.-e). *Register and Inventory*. Retrieved June 17, 2021, from Edmonton: https://www.edmonton.ca/city_government/edmonton_archives/historic-resources-inventory-register
- City of Edmonton. (n.d.-f). *WinterCity Strategy*. Retrieved June 17, 2021, from Edmonton: https://www.edmonton.ca/city_government/initiatives_innovation/wintercity-strategy
- City of Edmonton. (2021). *City of Edmonton Bylaw 14600 Community Standards Bylaw*. Edmonton: City of Edmonton. Retrieved June 17, 2021, from <https://www.edmonton.ca/sites/default/files/public-files/C14600.pdf>
- City of Edmonton Planning and Development. (2008). *Policy to Encourage the Designation and Rehabilitation of Municipal Historic Resources in Edmonton*. Edmonton: City of Edmonton. Retrieved June 17, 2021, from <https://www.edmonton.ca/sites/default/files/public-files/assets/PoliciesDirectives/C450B.pdf>
- City of Hamilton. (2021a, September 20). *Heritage Designation Process*. Retrieved December 16, 2021, from Hamilton: <https://www.hamilton.ca/city-planning/heritage-properties/heritage-designation-process>
- City of Hamilton. (2021b, April 22). *Municipal Heritage Register*. Retrieved June 17, 2021, from Hamilton: <https://www.hamilton.ca/city-planning/heritage-properties/municipal-heritage-register>

- City of Hamilton Tourism and Culture Division. (2021, February 5). *Hamilton's Built Heritage Inventory*. Retrieved June 17, 2021, from Hamilton:
<https://storymaps.arcgis.com/stories/162d67fa21aa43ff80e1a8ab78ff5b90>
- City of Ottawa. (n.d.-a). *Awards and Recognition*. Retrieved June 16, 2021, from Ottawa:
<https://ottawa.ca/en/planning-development-and-construction/heritage-conservation/awards-and-recognition>
- City of Ottawa. (n.d.-b). *Built Heritage Funding Programs*. Retrieved June 16, 2021, from Ottawa: <https://ottawa.ca/en/planning-development-and-construction/heritage-conservation/built-heritage-funding-programs>
- City of Ottawa. (n.d.-c). *Heritage Conservation*. Retrieved June 17, 2021, from Ottawa:
<https://ottawa.ca/en/planning-development-and-construction/heritage-conservation>
- City of Ottawa. (n.d.-d). *Heritage Properties*. Retrieved June 16, 2021, from Ottawa:
<https://ottawa.ca/en/planning-development-and-construction/heritage-conservation/heritage-properties>
- City of Ottawa. (n.d.-e). *Part 2 - General Provisions (Sections 55 to 75)*. Retrieved June 17, 2021, from Ottawa: <https://ottawa.ca/en/living-ottawa/laws-licences-and-permits/laws/law-z/planning-development-and-construction/maps-and-zoning/zoning-law-no-2008-250/zoning-law-2008-250-consolidation/part-2-general-provisions-sections-55-74#section-60-heritage-overlay>
- City of Ottawa. (n.d.-f). *Property Standards (By-law No. 2013-416, as amended by By-laws No. 2017-256, 2018-113, 2018-127, 2018-302, 2019-170, 2019-426, 2019-428, 2020-202, 2020-256, 2020-306)*. Retrieved June 16, 2021, from Ottawa: <https://ottawa.ca/en/living-ottawa/laws-licences-and-permits/laws/laws-z/property-standards-law-no-2013-416-amended-laws-no-2017-256-2018-113-2018-127-2018-302-2019-170-2019-426-2019-428-2020-202-2020-256-2020-306#part-vi-standards-part-iv-and-part-v-heri>
- City of Winnipeg. (2016a). *Annual Report of the City of Winnipeg Historical Buildings and Resources Committee: The Year Past 2016*. Retrieved January 26, 2022, from City of Winnipeg: <http://winnipeg.ca/ppd/Documents/Heritage/YearPast/The-Year-Past-2016.pdf>
- City of Winnipeg. (2016b, July 13). *By-law 55/2014*. Retrieved January 26, 2022, from Winnipeg:
<https://clkapps.winnipeg.ca/dmis/docext/ViewDoc.asp?DocumentTypeId=1&DocId=6228>
- City of Winnipeg. (2016c, May 11). *May 11, 2016 Executive Policy Committee Regular Meeting Minutes (Adopted)*. Retrieved January 26, 2022, from Winnipeg:
<https://clkapps.winnipeg.ca/DMIS/ViewDoc.asp?DocId=15294&SectionId=432889&InitUrl=/DMIS/Documents/epc/2016/m15294>
- City of Winnipeg. (2017, July 19). *Neighbourhood Liveability By-law No. 1/2008*. Retrieved January 26, 2022, from Winnipeg:

- <http://clkapps.winnipeg.ca/DMIS/DocExt/ViewDoc.asp?DocumentTypeId=1&DocId=3996&DocType=C>
- City of Winnipeg. (2021a, June 4). *Incentive Programs*. Retrieved January 26, 2022, from Winnipeg: <https://winnipeg.ca/ppd/Heritage/IncentivePrograms.stm#2>
- City of Winnipeg. (2021b, April). *Population of Winnipeg*. Retrieved January 26, 2022, from Winnipeg: <https://winnipeg.ca/cao/pdfs/population.pdf>
- City of Winnipeg. (2021c, September 29). *Vacant Buildings By-law No. 79/2010*. Retrieved January 26, 2022, from Winnipeg: <http://clkapps.winnipeg.ca/DMIS/DocExt/ViewDoc.asp?DocumentTypeId=1&DocId=5239&DocType=C>
- City of Winnipeg. (2022, January 31). *List of Historical Resources*. Retrieved February 2, 2022, from City of Winnipeg: <https://winnipeg.ca/ppd/Heritage/ListHistoricalResources.stm>
- City of Winnipeg Historical Buildings Committee. (1979). *The Year Past 1979*. Retrieved from City of Winnipeg: <https://winnipeg.ca/ppd/Documents/Heritage/YearPast/The-Year-Past-1979.pdf>
- Corbett Richardson, M. (2008). *Demolition by Neglect: An Examination of Charleston's Ordinance*. Master's Thesis, Clemson University, Clemson.
- Cross, J. E. (2001, November 2-4). *What is Sense of Place?* [Paper presentation]. 12th Headwaters Conference, Gunnison, Colorado. Retrieved August 4, 2021, from <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/282980896>
- Cultural Heritage Agency. (2016, January 1). *Heritage Act 2016*. Retrieved July 25, 2019, from Cultural Heritage Agency: <https://english.cultureelerfgoed.nl/publications/publications/2016/01/01/heritage-act-2016>
- Dauvergne, P. (2010, May 1). The problem of consumption. *Global Environmental Politics*, 10(2), 1-10. doi:10.1162/glep.2010.10.2.1
- Editors of Encyclopaedia Britannica. (n.d.). *Hamilton*. Retrieved June 17, 2021, from Encyclopedia Britannica: <https://www.britannica.com/place/Hamilton-Ontario>
- Edson, G. (2004). Heritage: Pride or passion, product or service? *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 10(4), 333-348. Retrieved July 25, 2019, from <https://doi.org/10.1080/1352725042000257366>
- Flemming, D. B. (2018, August 4). Fleming: Ottawa needs more robust rules to preserve its heritage buildings. *Ottawa Citizen*. Retrieved June 17, 2021, from <https://ottawacitizen.com/opinion/columnists/flemming-ottawa-needs-more-robust-rules-to-preserve-its-heritage-buildings>
- Frey, B. B. (Ed.). (2018). *The SAGE encyclopedia of educational research, measurement, and evaluation* (Vols. 1-4). Thousand Oaks, California: SAGE Publications, Inc.

- Gilderbloom, J. I., Hanka, M. J., & Ambrosius, J. D. (2009). Historic preservation's impact on job creation, property values, and environmental sustainability. *Journal of Urbanism*, 2(2), 83-101. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1080/17549170903056821>
- Given, L. M. (Ed.). (2008). *The SAGE encyclopedia of qualitative research methods* (Vols. 1-0). Thousand Oaks, California: SAGE Publications.
- Glowacki, L. (2016, May 10). *Bylaw changes recommended to protect Winnipeg heritage buildings*. Retrieved from CBC: <http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/manitoba/bylaw-changes-recommended-to-protect-winnipeg-heritage-buildings-1.3575997>
- Golden, A., & Hazel, M. (2013). *Financial Incentives for Protected Heritage Properties (PED13098) (City Wide) (Outstanding Business List Item)*. Hamilton: City of Hamilton. Retrieved June 17, 2021, from http://www2.hamilton.ca/NR/rdonlyres/29687DF6-8FE7-4FBC-BE4B-F1C45373C876/0/Jun0452_PED13098.pdf
- Goldsborough, G. (2020, July 21). *Historic Sites of Manitoba: Grey Nuns Convent / Le Musée de Saint-Boniface Museum (494 Tache Avenue, Winnipeg)*. Retrieved January 26, 2022, from Manitoba Historical Society: <http://www.mhs.mb.ca/docs/sites/stbonifacemuseum.shtml>
- Grefe, X. (2004). Is heritage an asset or a liability? *Journal of Cultural Heritage*, 5, 301-309.
- Hall, D. (2004, November). The Third Thing. *Poetry*, 113-121. Retrieved May 14, 2020, from <https://www.poetryfoundation.org/poetrymagazine/browse?volume=185&issue=2&page=39>
- Hamilton, F. (n.d.). *Tangible and Intangible Cultural Heritage*. Retrieved May 13, 2020, from Design Online: <http://designonline.org.au/wp-content/uploads/2018/05/Cultural-Heritage.pdf>
- Harrell, M. C., & Bradley, M. A. (2009). *Data Collection Methods: Semi-Structured Interviews and Focus Groups*. RAND Corporation. Retrieved August 3, 2021, from file:///C:/Users/Cheryl/AppData/Local/Temp/RAND_TR718.pdf
- Hassan, F. (2014). Tangible Heritage in Archaeology. In C. Smith (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Global Archaeology* (pp. 7213-7215). New York, NY: Springer. Retrieved May 13, 2020, from https://link.springer.com/content/pdf/10.1007%2F978-1-4419-0465-2_1141.pdf
- Heritage Ottawa. (2016, June 30). *Heritage Ottawa opposes demolition-by-neglect of Somerset House*. Retrieved June 16, 2021, from Heritage Ottawa: <https://heritageottawa.org/news/heritage-ottawa-opposes-demolition-neglect-somerset-house>
- Heritage Toronto. (2019). *Changing the Narrative: State of Heritage Report 2019*. Toronto: Heritage Toronto. Retrieved July 11, 2019, from https://www.heritagetoronto.org/wp-content/uploads/PDFs/SOH_Reports/State_of_Heritage_Report_2019.pdf

- Hildebrandt, R. A. (2012). *Demolition-By-Neglect: Where Are We Now?* Master's Thesis, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.
- House, M. (2007). *Minimum Property Standards for the Maintenance of Heritage Attributes of Designated Heritage Properties Under Parts IV and V of the Ontario Heritage Act (PED07239) (City Wide)*. Planning and Economic Development: Planning Division. Hamilton: City of Hamilton. Retrieved June 17, 2021, from <http://www2.hamilton.ca/NR/rdonlyres/61396A33-12DB-4E27-BEFC-404CC63DF23E/0/Sep04PED07239.pdf>
- Jacobs, J. (1961). *The Death and Life of Great America Cities*. New York: Random House.
- Kalman, H. (2014). *Heritage Planning: Principles and Process*. New York: Routledge.
- Kutasi, D., & Vidovszky, I. (2010, January). The cost effectiveness of continuous maintenance for monuments and historic buildings. *Periodica Polytechnica Architecture*, 41(2), 57-61. doi:10.3311/pp.ar.2010-2.03
- Liamputtong, P. (2011). *Focus Group Methodology: Principles and Practice*. Thousand Oaks, California: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Lynch, K. (1972). *What time is this place?* Cambridge: The MIT Press.
- MacLean, C. (2021, December 15). *City of Winnipeg passes budget despite protests from some councillors over process*. Retrieved January 26, 2022, from CBC News: <https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/manitoba/winnipeg-budget-passes-city-council-1.6287460>
- Martin, A. (2007). Demolition by Neglect: Repairing Buildings by Repairing Legislation. *Georgetown Law Historic Preservation Papers Series*(17). Retrieved from http://scholarship.law.georgetown.edu/hpps_papers/17
- Miller, J. (2010). *Doing Away With Demolition-by-Neglect*. Washington: National Trust for Historic Preservation. Retrieved from <https://forum.savingplaces.org/HigherLogic/System/DownloadDocumentFile.ashx?DocumentFileKey=d14f259d-2652-bfcb-333f-521361d652db>
- Mills, A. J., Durepos, G., & Wiebe, E. (Eds.). (2010). *Encyclopedia of case study research* (Vols. 1-0). Thousand Oaks, California: SAGE Publications. doi:10.4135/9781412957397
- Morreale, S. P., Osborn, M. M., & Pearson, J. C. (2000, January). Why Communication is Important: A Rationale for the Centrality of the Study of Communication. *Journal of the Association for Communication Administration*, 29, 1-25. Retrieved January 26, 2022, from https://d1wqtxts1xzle7.cloudfront.net/49426190/PDF-ATD-JACA-Why_Communication_is_Important__Rationale_for_Centrality_of_the_Study_of_Communication-with-cover-page-v2.pdf?Expires=1643878820&Signature=P1CuF5y7RrRR7MvZu5mdU~x1UurCMOvZRFy2XiPdMH-YhTR1zm848mCu

- Muratore, R. (2013). *Demolition by Neglect - Report & Policy on Places in the Heritage Overlay*. Victoria: National Trust of Australia. Retrieved from <http://docplayer.net/41358365-Demolition-by-neglect-report-policy-on-places-in-the-heritage-overlay-renee-muratore.html>
- National Geographic Society. (2018). *Car Buying Guide*. Retrieved from National Geographic: <https://www.nationalgeographic.com/environment/green-guide/buying-guides/car/environmental-impact/>
- National Trust for Canada. (n.d.-a). *24 and 28 King Street East, Gore Park*. Retrieved June 17, 2021, from National Trust for Canada: <https://nationaltrustcanada.ca/nt-endangered-places/24-and-28-king-street-east-gore-park>
- National Trust for Canada. (n.d.-b). *A. Minchau Blacksmith Shop*. Retrieved June 17, 2021, from National Trust for Canada: <https://nationaltrustcanada.ca/nt-endangered-places/a-minchau-blacksmith-shop>
- National Trust for Canada. (n.d.-c). *About Us*. Retrieved from National Trust for Canada: <http://www.nationaltrustcanada.ca/about-us/vision>
- National Trust for Canada. (n.d.-d). *Hamilton Education Centre*. Retrieved June 17, 2021, from National Trust for Canada: <https://nationaltrustcanada.ca/nt-endangered-places/hamilton-education-centre>
- National Trust for Canada. (n.d.-e). *Lansdowne Park*. Retrieved June 17, 2021, from National Trust for Canada: <https://nationaltrustcanada.ca/nt-endangered-places/lansdowne-park>
- National Trust for Canada. (n.d.-f). *Lister Block*. Retrieved December 16, 2021, from National Trust for Canada: <https://nationaltrustcanada.ca/nt-endangered-places/lister-block>
- National Trust for Canada. (n.d.-g). *National Trust Endangered Places List*. Retrieved June 17, 2021, from National Trust for Canada: <https://nationaltrustcanada.ca/what-we-offer/endangered-places>
- National Trust for Canada. (n.d.-h). *Ring Houses (University of Alberta)*. Retrieved June 17, 2021, from National Trust for Canada: <https://nationaltrustcanada.ca/nt-endangered-places/ring-houses-university-of-alberta>
- National Trust for Canada. (n.d.-i). *Somerset House*. Retrieved June 17, 2021, from National Trust for Canada: <https://nationaltrustcanada.ca/nt-endangered-places/somerset-house>
- National Trust for Canada. (n.d.-j). *Worst Losses Archive*. Retrieved June 17, 2021, from National Trust for Canada: <https://archive.nationaltrustcanada.ca/issues-campaigns/top-ten-endangered/worst-losses-archive>
- Newman, G., & Saginor, J. (2014). Four Imperatives for Preventing Demolition by Neglect. *Journal of Urban Design*, 19(5), 622-637. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13574809.2014.943705>

- Ontario Heritage Trust. (n.d.). *Benefits of heritage designation under the Ontario Heritage Act*. Retrieved June 17, 2021, from Ontario Heritage Trust: <https://www.heritagetrust.on.ca/en/pages/tools/tools-for-conservation/benefits-of-heritage-designation-under-the-ontario-heritage-act>
- Parks Canada. (n.d.). *Conservation and Parks Canada: Keeping our Historic Places Vibrant*. Retrieved May 14, 2020, from Canada's Historic Places: https://www.historicplaces.ca/en/pages/31_conservation_protection.aspx
- Preservation Green Lab. (2011). *The Greenest Building: Quantifying the Environmental Value of Building Reuse*. National Trust for Historic Preservation. Retrieved December 4, 2021, from https://living-future.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/11/The_Greenest_Building.pdf
- Preservation Green Lab. (2014). *Older, Smaller, Better: Measuring how the character of buildings and blocks influences urban vitality*. National Trust for Historic Preservation. Retrieved December 8, 2021, from https://dillonm.io/articles/NTHP_PGL_OlderSmallerBetter_ReportOnly.pdf
- Renz Swyers, L. (2013). *Demolition by Neglect of New York City Individual and Historical District Landmarks*. Master's Thesis, Columbia University.
- Rittel, H. W., & Weber, M. M. (1973, June). Dilemmas in a general theory of planning. *Policy Sciences*, 4, 155-169. Retrieved May 14, 2020, from <http://www.ask-force.org/web/Discourse/Rittel-Dilemmas-General-Theory-Planning-1973.pdf>
- Shiple, R., & McKernan, N. (2001). A Shocking Degree of Ignorance Threatens Canada's Architectural Heritage: The Case for Better Education to Stem the Tide of Destruction. *Journal of the Society for the Study of Architecture in Canada*, 36(1), 83-91. Retrieved from <http://env-web2.uwaterloo.ca/hrcresearch/attachments/519fb954c75074.98308437.pdf>
- Smith, P. J. (2019, March 6). *Edmonton*. Retrieved June 17, 2021, from The Canadian Encyclopedia: <https://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/edmonton>
- Statistics Canada. (2017). *Hamilton, C [Census subdivision], Ontario and Hamilton, CDR [Census division], Ontario (table)*. Retrieved December 16, 2021, from 2016 Census: <https://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2016/dp-pd/prof/details/page.cfm?Lang=E&Geo1=CSD&Code1=3525005&Geo2=CD&Code2=3525&SearchText=hamilton&SearchType=Begins&SearchPR=01&B1=All&TABID=1&type=0>
- Statistics Canada. (2021, October 27). *Ottawa, CV [Census subdivision], Ontario and Canada [Country] (table)*. Retrieved December 16, 2021, from 2016 Census: <https://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2016/dp-pd/prof/details/page.cfm?Lang=E&Geo1=CSD&Geo2=PR&Code2=01&SearchType=Begins&SearchPR=01&TABID=1&B1=All&type=0&Code1=3506008&SearchText=ottawa>

- Taylor, J. (2019, March 11). *Ottawa*. Retrieved June 17, 2021, from The Canadian Encyclopedia: <https://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/ottawa-ont>
- Thompson, K. (2011). *Can Municipal Property Standards By-laws Protect Heritage Properties in Pickering from Demolition by Neglect?* Municipal Management Diploma Research Report, Association of Municipal Managers, Clerks and Treasurers of Ontario, Pickering. Retrieved January 22, 2020
- U.S. Department of Energy. (n.d.). *Window Types and Technologies*. Retrieved August 3, 2021, from Energy.gov: <https://www.energy.gov/energysaver/window-types-and-technologies>
- Weaver, J. C. (2019, March 11). *Hamilton*. Retrieved June 17, 2021, from The Canadian Encyclopedia: <https://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/hamilton>
- Weiss, J. M. (2012). Protecting Landmarks from Demolition by Neglect: New York City's Experience. *Widener Law Review*, 18, 309-322.

Appendix A: Semi-Structured Interview Guide

STOPPING THE WRECKING BALL: ADDRESSING DEMOLITION BY NEGLECT IN WINNIPEG, MANITOBA

Interview Questions

The purpose of this interview is to explore methods, both conventional and creative, used by your city to address demolition by neglect, that could potentially be applied to Winnipeg, Manitoba. You can refuse to answer any question and may provide as much or as little information as you feel comfortable with.

- How are you involved in built heritage conservation in your city?
- What challenges does your city face in addressing demolition by neglect?
- Are there any specific policies (could be in progress) in your city addressing demolition by neglect?
- Are there any unplanned or unregulated factors mitigating demolition by neglect in your city?
- What factors contribute to the success or failure of addressing demolition by neglect in your city?
- How could your city's approach to demolition by neglect be improved?
- Is there anything further on the topic of demolition by neglect you wish to share?

Appendix B: Focus Group Guide

Focus Group Guide:

STOPPING THE WRECKING BALL

Addressing Demolition By Neglect In Winnipeg



THANK YOU for taking part in this focus group. This guide will prepare you for participating with a brief overview of the project, findings from the key informant interviews and questions to lead the focus group discussion. Out of respect for all of the participants' time, please review this guide prior to the focus group taking place.

The **OBJECTIVE** of this focus group is to consider if any of the methods from other cities are potentially useful in Winnipeg, and what challenges would they face in implementation.

DEMOLITION BY NEGLECT is the demolition of a heritage building because it has been unmaintained to the point of becoming a public safety issue (Albinger, 2014, p. 1; Brazil, 2003, p. 83; Corbett Richardson, 2008, p. 5; Miller, 2010, p. 1 & 5; Newman & Saginor, 2014, p. 623; Renz Swyers, 2013, p. 1). A 2016 report by the City of Winnipeg found that 7% of heritage buildings in Winnipeg are at risk of demolition by neglect

(Glowacki, 2016). With over 350 buildings on the City of Winnipeg's (2021) *List of Historical Resources*, if this statistic is still correct, it suggests approximately 25 irreplaceable historic buildings are currently at risk of being lost forever.

This **PROJECT** seeks to create a typology of methods for addressing demolition by neglect in Winnipeg. A literature review and background research has already taken place. Interviews were completed with key informants in Edmonton, Hamilton and Ottawa, investigating what methods have been used in these cities to address demolition by neglect and what have the results been. From the interviews four major themes arose, each offering a variety of solutions. While some of the solutions have been or are currently used in Winnipeg, others are new and innovative approaches. As demolition by neglect is a complicated problem not easily solved, it is important to keep an open mind and consider all possible solutions, regardless of if the legal framework exists to implement them currently.

Please consider the following **QUESTIONS FOR DISCUSSION** when reviewing the methods for addressing demolition by neglect proposed during the key informant interviews.

- What are the strengths of the methods for addressing demolition by neglect seen in the three selected cities?
- What are the weaknesses of the methods for addressing demolition by neglect seen in the three selected cities?
- What are the potential challenges faced by the methods for addressing demolition by neglect seen in the three selected cities when applied to Winnipeg?
- What changes could be made to make the methods for addressing demolition by neglect seen in the three selected cities more applicable to Winnipeg?
- Do you think Winnipeg has the political will to address demolition by neglect?
- What could be done to improve Winnipeg's political will towards addressing demolition by neglect?
- Is there anything further on the topic of demolition by neglect you wish to discuss?

The **RESULTS** of the key informant interviews are divided into four themes: preventing neglect, rectifying neglect, punishing neglect and political will. Under each theme is a variety of solutions, some currently being successfully implemented and some hypothetical. Solutions will be expanded upon during the focus group discussion.

Theme One: **PREVENTING NEGLECT**

Informants suggested it would be easier and more cost effective for cities to prevent demolition by neglect rather than correct it. It was noted that heritage buildings tend to have a ripple effect on their surrounding community, with those being neglected bringing down property values, reducing the municipality's tax base and resulting in less resources to address the problem. To prevent neglect from taking place, the primary solution was to encourage the redevelopment of heritage buildings. This can be supported in several ways:

- Reducing the risk for developers through a

municipal financing program. If the developer defaults on the loan, the municipality then repossesses the building.

- Offering substantial grants (hundreds of thousands of dollars, if not millions) to developers for redeveloping heritage buildings.
- Negotiating "buildings bonuses" to developers for redeveloping heritage buildings.
- Interdepartmental cooperation within the municipality to ensure everyone is working towards the same goals and not inadvertently contradicting one another.
- Ensuring the ease of process for developers when working with the city on heritage building redevelopment projects as to not discourage developers with red tape.
- Providing maintenance grants to heritage building owners to offset the higher cost involved with taking care of heritage features.
- Making it cost prohibitive to own a vacant heritage building.
- Public support for the conservation of heritage buildings through outreach and education.

Theme Two: **RECTIFYING NEGLECT**

Suggestions for rectifying neglect ranged from the tame to the extreme, with several informants acknowledging that most municipalities would prefer to cordially work with building owners than take punitive action. Ultimately it was acknowledged that if a building owner refused to do any maintenance, there is very little a municipality can do to force their hand. Suggested methods for correcting neglect include:

- Enforcing maintenance bylaws though regular, thorough inspections and handing out substantial fines to offenders.
- Ensuring necessary repairs are being made to buildings with the municipality doing the work in emergency situations and adding the cost to the building's tax bill.
- Having an inventory of non designated heritage buildings that will flag any permits pulled on the buildings from the list.
- When all else fails and the neglected building is

causing the demise of the surrounding community, expropriation.

Theme Three: **PUNISHING NEGLECT**

Despite the best efforts of the municipality and sometimes even the building owner, some heritage buildings are lost to demolition by neglect. When this happens, a punitive approach was suggested to discourage other building owners from consciously engaging in demolition by neglect. The two courses of action suggested were:

- Fining the building owner, ensuring the amount was substantial enough to hurt them financially.
- Instituting a scorched earth policy that would prevent redevelopment of the site for a set period of time.

Theme Four: **POLITICAL WILL**

All the best policies in the world are useless unless politicians support them. Informants from one city suggested that lack of political will was a major reason demolition by neglect continued to be a problem there, while informants from another city felt political will was a major reason it was not a problem for them. Informants suggested that political will could prevent demolition by neglect in several ways:

- Setting the tone for the development community as pro heritage.
- Prioritizing providing adequate funding for resources that support the conservation of heritage buildings.
- Ensuring legislating is enforced even when it is not the popular thing to do.
- Public pressure on politicians to prioritize the conservation of heritage buildings.

REFERENCES

- Albinger, S. M. (2014). Preserving built heritage in Canada: Best practices in preventing demolition by neglect. Master's Thesis, McGill University, Montreal.
- Brazil, B. G. (2003). Non-Traditional Remedies to Demolition-by-Neglect: Private Sector Incentives, Public Sector Municipal Abatement, and Other Approaches. Master's Thesis, University of Georgia in Partial.
- City of Winnipeg. (2021, June 21). List of Historical Resources. Retrieved from Winnipeg: <http://www.winnipeg.ca/ppd/Heritage/ListHistoricalResources.stm#1>
- Corbett Richardson, M. (2008). Demolition by Neglect: An Examination of Charleston's Ordinance. Master's Thesis, Clemson University, Clemson.
- Glowacki, L. (2016, May 10). Bylaw changes recommended to protect Winnipeg heritage buildings. Retrieved from CBC: <http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/manitoba/bylaw-changes-recommended-to-protect-winnipeg-heritage-buildings-1.3575997>
- Miller, J. (2010). Doing Away With Demolition-by-Neglect. Washington: National Trust for Historic Preservation.
- Newman, G., & Saginor, J. (2014). Four Imperatives for Preventing Demolition by Neglect. *Journal of Urban Design*, 19(5), 622-637. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13574809.2014.943705>
- Renz Swyers, L. (2013). Demolition by Neglect of New York City Individual and Historical District Landmarks. Master's Thesis, Columbia University.



Appendix C: Email Script for Semi-Structured Interview Participants



City Planning
201 Russell Building
84 Curry Place
Winnipeg, Manitoba
R3T 2N2
Tel: (204) 474-9458
Fax: (204) 474-7532

[Salutation],

My name is Cheryl Mann, I am a student in the Master of City Planning program at the University of Manitoba. I am currently completing my thesis, which seeks to create a typology of methods for addressing demolition by neglect in Winnipeg, Manitoba. Attached is a Project Background Information Sheet which will provide you with more information about this project. This research is being supervised by Dr. Richard Milgrom in the Department of City Planning and the project has been approved by the Joint-Faculty Research Ethics Board.

I would greatly appreciate your participation in an interview (by phone, Zoom or written response) related to this research. The interview will include seven questions, should take approximately 30 minutes to complete, and can take place at a time and method of your choosing. If you choose to participate you are free to withdraw from the study at any time, and or refrain from answering any questions you prefer to omit. As principal investigator, I am available to answer any questions or provide clarification or new information throughout your participation.

If you have any questions or concerns about this project or regarding your participation, you may contact any of the following persons:

Student (principal researcher):

Cheryl Mann

Graduate Student, Department of City Planning, Faculty of Architecture, University of Manitoba

Phone: *****

Email: *****

Research Supervisor:

Richard Milgrom

Head and Associate Professor, Department of City Planning, Faculty of Architecture, University of Manitoba

Phone: *****

Email: *****

Joint-Faculty Research Ethics Board:

Human Ethics Coordinator

Office of the Vice- President (Research and International)

Phone: *****

Email: *****

Fax: *****

Appendix D: Email Script for Focus Group Participants



City Planning
201 Russell Building
84 Curry Place
Winnipeg, Manitoba
R3T 2N2
Tel: (204) 474-9458
Fax: (204) 474-7532

[Salutation],

My name is Cheryl Mann, I am a student in the Master of City Planning program at the University of Manitoba. I am currently completing my thesis, which seeks to create a typology of methods for addressing demolition by neglect in Winnipeg, Manitoba. Attached is a Project Background Information Sheet which will provide you with more information about this project. This research is being supervised by Dr. Richard Milgrom in the Department of City Planning and the project has been approved by the Joint-Faculty Research Ethics Board.

I would greatly appreciate your participation in a virtual focus group related to this research on June 30th, 2021 at 6:00 pm, CDT. The focus group will include roughly seven questions, and should take approximately 60 minutes to complete. If you choose to participate you are free to withdraw from the study at any time, and or refrain from answering any questions you prefer to omit. As principal investigator, I am available to answer any questions or provide clarification or new information throughout your participation.

If you have any questions or concerns about this project or regarding your participation, you may contact any of the following persons:

Student (principal researcher):

Cheryl Mann

Graduate Student, Department of City Planning, Faculty of Architecture, University of Manitoba

Phone: *****

Email: *****

Research Supervisor:

Richard Milgrom

Head and Associate Professor, Department of City Planning, Faculty of Architecture, University of Manitoba

Phone: *****

Email: *****

Joint-Faculty Research Ethics Board:

Human Ethics Coordinator

Office of the Vice- President (Research and International)

Phone: *****

Email: *****

Fax: *****

Appendix E: Project Background Information for Prospective Participants



City Planning
201 Russell Building
84 Curry Place
Winnipeg, Manitoba
R3T 2N2
Tel: (204) 474-9458
Fax: (204) 474-7532

Faculty of Architecture

Project Background Information for Prospective Participants

You have been asked to participate in my research on creating a typology of methods to address demolition by neglect in Winnipeg. This research is required as part of my Master of City Planning thesis at the University of Manitoba. It is supervised by Dr. Richard Milgrom from the Department of City Planning and has been approved by the Joint-Faculty Research Ethics Board.

The proposed research will explore strategies used by three Canadian cities comparable to Winnipeg, to address demolition by neglect, and how these strategies could be applied to Winnipeg. The end result will be a typology of strategies that could potentially be used to address demolition by neglect in Winnipeg. A literature review will first explore why built heritage should be conserved, Winnipeg's policies on built heritage and the causes of demolition by neglect. Policy precedents for the three Canadian cities will be reviewed. This will be followed by semi-structured interviews with key informants from the three Canadian cities and conclude with a focus group made up of key informants from Winnipeg.

The research will be guided by two main questions. The first is: What methods have been used in other cities to address demolition by neglect and what have the results been? These may include policies, regulations or partnerships. The success of initiative will be examined through available, statistics and anecdotes from interviewees who were involved. This question will also explore why approaches have been more or less successful, and consider the challenges they faced and the opportunities they bring to addressing the problem.

The second guiding question is: Would any of the methods from other cities be potentially useful in Winnipeg, and what challenges would they face in implementation? Context is of the utmost importance when considering if successful (or even unsuccessful) methods from other cities would be relevant in a different – in this case, Winnipeg – context. At the same time, adaptability must also be considered. New legislation could open the door to previously unimplementable changes, while fine-tuning approaches to better fit the Winnipeg context is also an option. The pros and cons of each possible method will be considered, with the hope that final

recommendations be balanced. potentially create a boon for Winnipeg. They should not only aim to save heritage building but should also take into consideration other important factor such as fiscal responsibilities.

As built heritage cannot be replaced once it is lost, it is imperative to find solutions to demolition by neglect before there is nothing left to save. Therefore, the main goal of this thesis is to explore practical, meaningful methods that could be useful in Winnipeg. In doing so, this thesis will also contribute to the scholarly body of literature on demolition by neglect and heritage planning knowledge in general.

Included is a statement of informed consent that includes more details on risks and benefits of participating in this research.

Appendix F: Statement of Informed Consent for Semi-Structured Interview

Participants



City Planning
201 Russell Building
84 Curry Place
Winnipeg, Manitoba
R3T 2N2
Tel: (204) 474-9458
Fax: (204) 474-7532

Faculty of Architecture

Statement of Informed Consent

Research Project Title:

Stopping the Wrecking Ball: Addressing Demolition by Neglect in Winnipeg, Manitoba

Principal Investigator:

Cheryl Mann
Graduate Student, Master of City Planning, Faculty of Architecture, University of Manitoba
Phone: *****
Email: *****

Research Supervisor:

Richard Milgrom
Head and Associate Professor, Department of City Planning, Faculty of Architecture, University of Manitoba
Phone: *****
Email: *****

Introduction

You are invited to take part in a research study. This consent form, a copy of which will be left with you for your records and reference, is only part of the process of informed consent. It should give you the basic idea of what the research is about and what your participation will involve. If you would like more detail about something mentioned here, or information not

included here, you should feel free to ask. Please take the time to read this carefully and to understand any accompanying information.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the proposed research is to create a typology of methods to address demolition by neglect in Winnipeg, Manitoba through the exploration of methods used by three comparable Canadian cities. A literature review will first explore why built heritage should be conserved, Winnipeg's policies on conserving built heritage and the causes of demolition by neglect. Three Canadian cities that are comparable to Winnipeg will then be selected for a policy review, to understand how they are addressing demolition by neglect. Semi structured interviews with three heritage professionals from each of the three selected cities will then provide insight into the effectiveness of policies addressing demolition by neglect. The results of these interviews will be analysed through coding to understand the main themes emerging from the three cities, what is and what is not working to address demolition by neglect. These results will be used to guide the discussion of a focus group of four or more heritage professionals from Winnipeg. This focus group will explore whether or not the methods for addressing demolition by neglect in the three cities would be effective in Winnipeg. The data gathered from the focus group will be analysed through coding and used to create the typology of methods that could be used to address demolition by neglect in Winnipeg. This research will also contribute to the scholarly body of literature on demolition by neglect and heritage planning knowledge in general.

This research project is a requirement of the Master of City Planning program at the University of Manitoba.

Study Procedures

If you participate in this study, you will be asked a series of questions pertaining to methods used to address demolition by neglect in your city. The interview will be approximately 30 minutes long with seven questions. You can refuse to answer any questions, and may end the interview at any time. The interview may be done by phone, Zoom or written response. Audio interviews will be recorded and transcribed. You will have the option to choose to see the transcription prior to the publication of this project. You may be contacted to follow up regarding your response to a question. You will also be sent an emailed copy of the completed Master Degree Project within three months of final approval or no later than March 2022, whichever occurs first.

Recording Devices

Upon your consent, the interview will be recorded using a digital device (cell phone or computer). If you do not consent to being recorded, handwritten notes will be taken.

Participant Benefits

The benefit for you is the opportunity to share knowledge and insights on addressing demolition by neglect for future planners and policymakers, potentially having a positive impact of the future of heritage buildings.

Participant Risks

The risks to you is minimal but include potentially damage professional reputations. This risk will be mitigated by only recruiting heritage professionals who are experts in their respective fields and they will only be asked to reflect on strategies for addressing demolition by neglect. You will also have the opportunity to review their input and make changes to ensure all data is an accurate representation of their professional opinion and does not include anything regrettable. Additionally, only an identifier (title, sector) that has been agreed upon by both the principal investigator and you will be used to identify you in all the project material.

Confidentiality

All written and recorded data for this research project will be confidential. Preferably, your city, position (planner, elected official, advocate, etc.) and sector (private, public, nonprofit, etc.) will be used as an identifier for the entirety of the project, including note taking, transcripts and the final thesis, unless you consent to the use of your name. Identifiers will be agreed upon with the principal investigator and you prior to any research taking place. The use of these identifiers provides context for the information being gathered and adds additional data that can be taken into account when analysing the results of the research. Information from you will be presented as themes that arose from the data analysis, with the potential for particularly significant quotes to be included.

All data will be stored on my personal, locked computer which is stored in a locked drawer in my home, and will only include identifiers, not names. No one, other than myself and my thesis supervisor, will have access to the data to avoid identifying anyone based on their responses. All potentially identifying information, including audio recordings, hand written notes and interview transcripts, will be permanently destroyed one year after the final submission of this thesis or no later than March 2023, whichever occurs first. Audio recordings will be permanently destroyed as soon as the transcript is produced and approved.

Credit and Remuneration

You will receive no credit or remuneration for participating.

Withdrawal from the Research

Your decision to take part in this study is voluntary. You can refuse participation or to withdraw from the research study at any time before January 2022, when this project will be submitted to my thesis committee for review. Your withdrawal will result in no negative consequences to you and all data pertaining to you will be permanently destroyed. If you decide to participate, you have the right to refuse to answer any question or to refuse participation in any activity, at any time.

Debriefing

Within two weeks of completing the interview, I will provide you with an interview transcript giving you one week to verify the information and remove or modify any comments that you no longer feel are appropriate for the public domain. The interview transcript will be provided by email.

Dissemination of Results

Results from the study will be disseminated as a hard copy at the University of Manitoba Architecture/Fine Arts Library, an online digital copy housed through the University of Manitoba's M Space, and in the defence of this thesis. Participants will be emailed a copy of the completed thesis within three months of final approval or no later than March 2022, whichever occurs first. It is possible that conference presentations or articles could arise from the research.

Summary of Results

You will be provided with a summary of results within a month of the focus group by phone, email or mail to ensure the information collected from the interview is accurate. You will also be provided with a digital copy of the completed thesis within three months of final approval or no later than March 2022, whichever occurs first.

Destruction of Confidential Information

All data collected, including hand written notes and interview transcripts, will be permanently destroyed one year after the final submission of this thesis or no later than March 2023, whichever occurs first. Audio recordings will be permanently destroyed as soon as the transcript is produced and approved.

Statement of Consent

Your signature on this form indicates that you have understood to your satisfaction the information regarding participation in the research project and agree to participate as a subject. In no way does this waive your legal rights nor release the researchers, sponsors, or involved institutions from their legal and professional responsibilities. You are free to withdraw from the study at any time, and /or refrain from answering any questions you prefer to omit, without prejudice or consequence. Your continued participation should be as informed as your initial consent, so you should feel free to ask for clarification or new information throughout your participation.

The University of Manitoba may look at your research records to see that the research is being done in a safe and proper way.

This research has been approved by the Joint-Faculty Research Ethics Board. If you have any concerns or complaints about this project you may contact any of the above-named persons or the Human Ethics Coordinator at 204-474-7122 or humanethics@umanitoba.ca. A copy of this consent form has been given to you to keep for your records and reference.

If you agree to each of the following, please place a check mark in the corresponding box.

I have read or it has been read to me the details of this consent form. Yes No

My questions have been addressed. Yes No

I, _____ (print name), agree to participate in this study. Yes No

I agree to my name being used in any presentation materials or reports arising from this research. Yes No

I agree to have the interview audio-recorded and transcribed.
If you do not consent to being recorded, handwritten notes will be taken. Yes No

I agree to be contacted by phone or e-mail if further information is required after the interview. Yes No

I agree to have the findings (which may include quotations) from this project published or presented in a manner that does not reveal my identity. Yes No

Do you wish to receive a summary of the findings? Yes No

How do you wish to receive the summary? Email Mail

Address _____

Participant's Signature _____ Date _____

Researcher's Signature _____ Date _____

Appendix G: Statement of Informed Consent for Focus Group Participants



City Planning
201 Russell Building
84 Curry Place
Winnipeg, Manitoba
R3T 2N2
Tel: (204) 474-9458
Fax: (204) 474-7532

Faculty of Architecture

Statement of Informed Consent

Research Project Title:

Stopping the Wrecking Ball: Addressing Demolition by Neglect in Winnipeg, Manitoba

Principal Investigator:

Cheryl Mann
Graduate Student, Master of City Planning, Faculty of Architecture, University of Manitoba
Phone: *****
Email: *****

Research Supervisor:

Richard Milgrom
Head and Associate Professor, Department of City Planning, Faculty of Architecture, University of Manitoba
Phone: *****
Email: *****

Introduction

You are invited to take part in a research study. This consent form, a copy of which will be left with you for your records and reference, is only part of the process of informed consent. It should give you the basic idea of what the research is about and what your participation will involve. If you would like more detail about something mentioned here, or information not included here, you should feel free to ask. Please take the time to read this carefully and to understand any accompanying information.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the proposed research is to create a typology of methods to address demolition by neglect in Winnipeg, Manitoba through the exploration of methods used by three comparable Canadian cities. A literature review will first explore why built heritage should be conserved, Winnipeg's policies on conserving built heritage and the causes of demolition by neglect. Three Canadian cities that are comparable to Winnipeg will then be selected for a policy review, to understand how they are addressing demolition by neglect. Semi structured interviews with three heritage professionals from each of the three selected cities will then provide insight into the effectiveness of policies addressing demolition by neglect. The results of these interviews will be analysed through coding to understand the main themes emerging from the three cities, what is and what is not working to address demolition by neglect. These results will be used to guide the discussion of a focus group of four or more heritage professionals from Winnipeg. This focus group will explore whether or not the methods for addressing demolition by neglect in the three cities would be effective in Winnipeg. The data gathered from the focus group will be analysed through coding and used to create the typology of methods that could be used to address demolition by neglect in Winnipeg. This research will also contribute to the scholarly body of literature on demolition by neglect and heritage planning knowledge in general.

This research project is a requirement of the Master of City Planning program at the University of Manitoba.

Study Procedures

If you participate in this study, you will be asked to participate in a focus group where a series of questions will be used to generate discussion on the applicability of methods that could be used to address demolition by neglect in Winnipeg. An information sheet on the methods to be discussed will be sent out no later than one week prior to the focus group. The focus group will be approximately one hour long with approximately five questions. You can refuse to answer any questions, and may leave the focus group at any time. The focus group will take place at a time that is most convenient for all the participants. The focus group discussion will be recorded and transcribed. You will have the option to choose to see the transcription prior to the publication of this project. You may be contacted to follow up regarding your response to a question. You will also be sent an emailed copy of the completed Master Degree Project within three months of final approval or no later than March 2022, whichever occurs first.

Recording Devices

Upon your consent, the focus group will be recorded using a digital device (cell phone or computer). If you do not consent to being recorded, handwritten notes will be taken.

Participant Benefits

The benefit for you is the opportunity to share knowledge and insights on addressing demolition by neglect for future planners and policymakers, potentially having a positive impact on the future of heritage buildings.

Participant Risks

The risks to you is minimal but include potentially damage professional reputations. This risk will be mitigated by only recruiting heritage professionals who are experts in their respective fields and they will only be asked to reflect on strategies for addressing demolition by neglect. You will also have the opportunity to review their input and make changes to ensure all data is an accurate representation of their professional opinion and does not include anything regrettable. Additionally, only an identifier (title, sector) that has been agreed upon by both the principal investigator and you will be use to identify you in all the project material.

Confidentiality

Confidentiality cannot be guaranteed, as all participants of the focus group will be present at the same time, exposing both their identities and insights. All members of the focus group will be asked to not reveal the identities of the participants as part of this Statement of Informed Consent.

All written and recorded data for this research project will be confidential. Preferably, your city, position (planner, elected official, advocate, etc.) and sector (private, public, nonprofit, etc.) will be used as an identifier for the entirety of the project, including note taking, transcripts and the final thesis, unless you consent to the use of your name. Identifiers will be agreed upon with the principal investigator and you prior to any research taking place. The use of these identifiers provides context for the information being gathered and adds additional data that can be taken into account when analysing the results of the research. Information from you will be presented as themes that arose from the data analysis, with the potential for particularly significant quotes to be included.

All data will be stored on my personal, locked computer which is stored in a locked drawer in my home, and will only include identifiers, not names. No one, other than myself and my thesis supervisor, will have access to the data to avoid identifying anyone based on their responses. All potentially identifying information, including audio recordings, hand written notes and interview transcripts, will be permanently destroyed one year after the final submission of this thesis or no later than March 2023, whichever occurs first.

Credit and Remuneration

You will receive no credit or remuneration for participating.

Withdrawal from the Research

Your decision to take part in this study is voluntary. You can refuse participation or to withdraw from the research study at any time before January 2022, when this project will be submitted to my thesis committee for review. Your withdrawal will result in no negative consequences to you and all data pertaining to you will be permanently destroyed. If you decide to participate, you

have the right to refuse to answer any question or to refuse participation in any activity, at any time.

Debriefing

Within two weeks of completing the focus group, I will provide you with a transcript, giving you one week to verify the information and remove or modify any comments that you no longer feel are appropriate for the public domain. The transcript will be provided by email.

Dissemination of Results

Results from the study will be disseminated as a hard copy at the University of Manitoba Architecture/Fine Arts Library, an online digital copy housed through the University of Manitoba's M Space, and in the defence of this thesis. Participants will be emailed a copy of the completed thesis within three months of final approval or no later than March 2022, whichever occurs first. It is possible that conference presentations or articles could arise from the research.

Summary of Results

You will be provided with a summary of results within a month of the focus group by phone, email or mail to ensure the information collected from the interview is accurate. You will also be provided with a digital copy of the completed thesis within three months of final approval or no later than March 2022, whichever occurs first.

Destruction of Confidential Information

All data collected, including hand written notes and focus group transcripts, will be permanently destroyed one year after the final submission of this thesis or no later than March 2023, whichever occurs first. Audio recordings will be permanently destroyed as soon as the transcript is produced and approved.

Statement of Consent

Your signature on this form indicates that you have understood to your satisfaction the information regarding participation in the research project and agree to participate as a subject. In no way does this waive your legal rights nor release the researchers, sponsors, or involved institutions from their legal and professional responsibilities. You are free to withdraw from the study at any time, and /or refrain from answering any questions you prefer to omit, without prejudice or consequence. Your continued participation should be as informed as your initial consent, so you should feel free to ask for clarification or new information throughout your participation.

The University of Manitoba may look at your research records to see that the research is being done in a safe and proper way.

This research has been approved by the Joint-Faculty Research Ethics Board. If you have any concerns or complaints about this project you may contact any of the above-named persons or the Human Ethics Coordinator at 204-474-7122 or humanethics@umanitoba.ca. A copy of this consent form has been given to you to keep for your records and reference.

If you agree to each of the following, please place a check mark in the corresponding box.

I have read or it has been read to me the details of this consent form. Yes No

My questions have been addressed. Yes No

I, _____ (print name), agree to participate in this study. Yes No

I agree to my name being used in any presentation materials or reports arising from this research. Yes No

I agree to have the interview audio-recorded and transcribed.
If you do not consent to being recorded, handwritten notes will be taken. Yes No

I agree to maintain the confidentiality of all the participants in the focus group. Yes No

I agree to be contacted by phone or e-mail if further information is required after the interview Yes No

I agree to have the findings (which may include quotations) from this project published or presented in a manner that does not reveal my identity. Yes No

Do you wish to receive a summary of the findings? Yes No

How do you wish to receive the summary? Email Mail

Address _____

Participant's Signature _____ Date _____

Researcher's Signature _____ Date _____

Appendix H: TCPS 2: CORE Certificate of Completion

PANEL ON
RESEARCH ETHICS

Navigating the ethics of human research

TCPS 2: CORE



Certificate of Completion

This document certifies that

Cheryl Mann

*has completed the Tri-Council Policy Statement:
Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans
Course on Research Ethics (TCPS 2: CORE)*

Date of Issue: **16 April, 2017**