

Pursuing a Historic Urban Landscape Approach to Heritage in Edmonton

A guiding document to the HUL approach in general and how it might apply to Edmonton

LAST UPDATED May 15, 2019.



Pursuing a Historic Urban Landscape Approach to Heritage in Edmonton¹

ABSTRACT

This project explores approaches to innovating urban heritage planning. Specifically, it provides an introduction and overview of emerging Historic Urban Landscape (HUL) perspectives, and explores their potential application to advancing heritage planning in Edmonton, Alberta Canada. The HUL approach addresses heritage as made up of the complex layering of the histories of people, cultures, places and physical artefacts (O'Donnell & Turner, 2012). This is often contrasted against the more dominant concerns of preservation, conservation and commemoration associated with traditional planning practices, and the designation and protection of heritage buildings in particular. HUL is, furthermore, advanced as a response to global urbanisation and the challenge of making heritage planning relevant in an era of widespread urban change, and where challenges of sustainable and prosperous city-building have risen as central concerns for planning today. Edmonton, experiencing a renewed wave of urbanisation and interest in city-building, faces many of the challenges of finding a place for heritage planning within a rapidly changing city. Success, this report advances, will involve doing so in ways which acknowledge and make meaningful the complex heritage and the diversity of cultures, narratives and histories which make up the city.

This guiding document is the outcome of a graduate student internship between the University of Alberta's City-Region Studies Centre, Edmonton Heritage Council and MITACS. It is based on a research project involving:

1. A brief literature review of the history of HUL and its core themes and concepts.
2. A selected overview of current heritage planning in Edmonton and a consideration of how HUL can identify areas of potential planning innovation.
3. A scan of current areas of the city which could be supportive of HUL concepts and practices.

The outcomes of this project suggest both opportunities and challenges for innovating heritage planning in Edmonton, and areas of potentially fruitful future research.

¹ Parts of this report have been published separately by the authors in Plan Canada, the magazine of the Canadian Institute of Planners. Jones, KE & V Zembal. 2017. Historical site of cultural hub? Reimagining heritage values in Old Strathcona. Plan Canada, 57 (4): 14-16.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	ii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	iii
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
2. THE HISTORIC URBAN LANDSCAPE APPROACH.....	3
CONCEPTUAL BACKGROUND	3
UNESCO'S HISTORIC URBAN LANDSCAPE APPROACH.....	6
3. DEVELOPING HUL IN PRACTICE.....	11
PARTICIPATORY PLANNING AND CONSULTATION ON VALUES.....	11
MAPPING.....	12
ASSESS VULNERABILITY TO SOCIO-ECONOMIC STRESSES AND CLIMATE CHANGE.....	13
INTEGRATING HUL VALUES WITHIN PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT.....	13
PRIORITIZING CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT ACTIONS.....	14
ESTABLISH PARTNERSHIPS AND FRAMEWORKS FOR CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS.....	14
4. FINDING INSPIRATION FOR HERITAGE PLANNING IN EDMONTON.....	15
THE ORGANISATION OF HERITAGE PLANNING IN EDMONTON.....	15
CITY OF EDMONTON'S EXTENDED HERITAGE RESOURCES.....	16
INNOVATIVE RESOURCES WITHIN THE COMMUNITY	18
POTENTIAL HUL CASE STUDIES.....	20
5. MOVING FORWARD.....	26
APPENDICES.....	278
APPENDIX A: CONCEPTUAL GLOSSARY	28
APPENDIX B: OTHER LANDSCAPE APPROACHES TO HERITAGE PLANNING.....	30
APPENDIX C: OTHER EDMONTON AREAS TO CONSIDER LANDSCAPE APPROACHES TO HERITAGE.....	32
REFERENCE LIST.....	34
FURTHER READING	39
ABOUT US.....	41

1. INTRODUCTION

Edmonton has often had an ambivalent relationship with its heritage, and cultural resources have not always been well integrated into the urban landscape. Cyclical growth, coupled with laissez-faire approaches to planning and development, have created a context in which the city is repeatedly being reshaped and rebuilt. Young and emergent, the landscapes and structures of the near past can easily be dismissed as no longer fit for purpose and readily replaced by development reflecting current trends in planning, architecture and design. As a result, there can be a sense of placelessness within the city and its urban forms representative of the ideas and iconography of elsewhere. Despite a rich and diverse heritage, it can be difficult to identify and access those urban spaces connecting place, culture and community in Edmonton.

Once again the City is in transition; growing, youthful and ambitious. Historically, a City shaped by uninhibited boosterism (Artibise, 1981) and outward suburban expansion has been slowly adopting and adapting the discourses of urbanist planning and there has been something of a resurgence of development in the City's established downtown and mature residential communities. It is wrong to assert that this amounts to a full-scale retreat from peri-urban development planning, but appropriate concerns about sustainability, resiliency and urban competitiveness are recasting priorities towards densification, redevelopment and contemporary forms of urban design. A new downtown bike network, a citywide infill strategy, the expansion of the City's LRT network, new arena and arts districts, all signal a desired shift to a more compact, metropolitan, and global city (see Jones et al., 2017; Ferbrache & Knowles, 2017).

In a city looking forward this report provides an exploration of the opportunities that exist for heritage planners and heritage communities to inform urbanisation and change within the city in ways which reconnect and promote greater sensitivity to the interaction between heritage and the creation of vibrant urban communities. Where cities, including Edmonton, have seen heritage planning focused around a relatively narrow focus on the preservation and conservation of the material fabric of the city (Poulios, 2014: 17-18) we explore innovations in Historic Urban Landscapes (HUL) as a means of innovation. Instead of positioning heritage planning in opposition to change, HUL supports synergies between heritage and the advancement of cities as centres of economic, social, and cultural activity (Bandarin & van Oers, 2012). Retaining, or building, a relationship to the past while allowing for dynamic growth and change can help cities create stronger identities and manage change and economic cycles as they happen (Roberts & Sykes cited in Bandarin & van Oers, 2012).

The HUL approach, stated differently, encourages a reorientation, or opening-up, of the concept of heritage and is rooted in an understanding of the dynamic and complex nature of cities. This is the time for Edmonton to take a leadership role in protecting what exists, uncovering what was lost, and creating an identity that looks to the past at the same time as it looks to the future.

In 2014 Dr. Ron van Oers, a champion for HUL within the UNESCO heritage system, hosted a workshop in Edmonton in partnership with the Old Strathcona Foundation (Buckle, 2015). "Whyte Space" introduced the HUL approach to Edmontonians through a walking tour and mapping exercise on Whyte Avenue. This workshop led to the development of a memorandum of understanding (MOU) between the City of Edmonton, the Old Strathcona Foundation, ICOMOS Canada and WHITRAP to cooperate and develop a strategy to implement HUL on Whyte Avenue. A year later, the second Whyte Space workshop was held at the same time as the ICOMOS Annual General meeting in Edmonton and people were able to participate or attend both. Participants conducted a SWOT (strengths, weakness, opportunities and threats) analysis to Whyte Avenue and the HUL approach, in addition to identifying stakeholders to ensure the process is inclusive and involves the community (Buckle, 2015). The SWOT analysis revealed some of the benefits and challenges to implementing

HUL approaches in Edmonton. Issues such as the abstract concept of HUL and the recent development in this approach emerged as challenges, as well as the ability to foster community participation.

The research reported in this guiding document seeks to pick up on this preliminary work and explore further how HUL might benefit current heritage and development thinking in Edmonton. It is the outcome of a graduate student internship hosted between the University of Alberta's City-Region Studies Centre (CRSC) and the Edmonton Heritage Council (EHC)². There is a shared interest in promoting local research into the connections between communities, places and urban change. This report is intended as a stepping stool to support further learning and research, as well as developments in practice.

The internship involved three primary activities:

1. A literature review and discussion of HUL and its implications for heritage planning, drawing on international cases and examples.
2. A brief introduction to the history of planning and heritage management in Edmonton and how HUL approaches might benefit these processes in the future.
3. A short series of brief environmental scans of proposed sites to suggest how HUL might be applied in Edmonton, and where further research might be beneficial.

² Financial support provided by EHC and Mitacs through the Accelerate granting program. Mentorship and hosting of the intern supported by EHC and CRSC, Faculty of Extension, University of Alberta. The Edmonton Heritage Council also acknowledges the support and interest of Alberta Culture and Tourism in this project, as that of the Edmonton Historical Board.

2. THE HISTORIC URBAN LANDSCAPE APPROACH

CONCEPTUAL BACKGROUND

In order to understand HUL and its contribution to heritage planning it is first necessary to briefly acknowledge the intellectual and social context out of which it emerges. Other sources offer much more complete accounts of the origins of the theory and conservation contexts leading up to the creation of HUL (see Bandarin & van Oers, 2012; or Sonkoly, 2017). However, to understand the potential of HUL, and the shift in heritage approaches it proposes, it is necessary to situate its' own development in relation to wider movements in the understanding of heritage and urbanisation.

Beyond Conservation

There is a growing realization that conservation is alone not an adequate strategy for responding to the challenges of making culture and heritage meaningful for communities. This is a point of departure for the HUL approach, but it is also indicative of wider concerns in scholarly studies of culture, history and communities. In part, critical studies of conservation note the narrow lens through which culture and heritage are viewed. Themes of diversity, inclusion and engagement come to the fore of disciplines which aim to broaden perspectives and open up thinking about heritage. Moreover, aside from critiques of the delimiting nature of conservation, concerns have also been raised about the counterproductive impacts conservation has had on heritage planning and management.

Greek heritage scholar Ioanis Poullos, for example, suggests that conservation is at its centre an attempt to satisfy the perceived need for communities to experience 'authentic' histories which are both familiar and predictable. Such stable histories, he argues, offer respite from the uncertainties and complexities of a rapidly changing present. We hold them sacred, as such (Poullos, 2010; 171-172). The preservation of a building or streetscape, in other words, is a nostalgic attempt to protect the past from the future and something akin to chasing a chimera. Here we should read the author's critique as a point of caution. It should not be read as an outright critique of conservation, or blanket permission for unfettered urban redevelopment. Simply Poullos is arguing that static and nostalgic preservation, as well as the narrow cultural representations they account for, fundamentally fail to acknowledge the evolution of communities and the evolution of heritage resources within those communities. Conservation can easily displace heritage from communities and neglect to understand, or provide opportunities, for change. Nostalgia prevents heritage advocates from creating the meaningful connections between histories, people and places they might aspire to. Bitingly, Poullos suggests that the past becomes the experience of a tourist, rather than that of a descendent or inhabitant and conservation the domain of heritage experts alone.

Poullos' perspective is only one of a growing number of critiques of the so-called "conventional" approach to heritage planning. Heritage, as Bandarin and Van Oers (2012) document, is a thoroughly modern idea associated with the urbanisation and modernization of cities during the 19th and 20th centuries (see also Sonkoly, 2017). Initially related to the preservation of monuments, heritage was envisioned as part of grand narratives of nation building, and is inseparable from the identities and powers, hierarchies and identities of the day. Conservation later grew as a concern in protecting elements of the 'historic-city' during the vast building and redevelopment projects that shaped the rise of the modern city, becoming institutionalized alongside planning at this time and supported by local and professional elites. It is in this sense that the roots of the long-standing conflict between development (often shaped by utopic planning rationales), and movements to conserve values associated with past urban forms and architecture took root. *"Some of the concepts that we find in*

modern [heritage] charters... were developed during this phase: the memory value of heritage, the right to aesthetic enjoyment, and collective responsibility for its conservation” (Bandarin and Van Oers, 2012: p.10)).

Such values certainly continue to resonate with concerns for heritage planning today and are shared within many contemporary heritage approaches; however the modernist roots of heritage have also attracted critical attention, mirroring wider postmodern shifts in social and political thought. A variety of alternates (see Appendix B) come forward in these critiques, drawing inspiration from cultural geography, cultural landscape approaches (Taylor, 2015), value-based accounts of heritage (Mason & Avrami, 2002), and studies of living-history (Poulios, 2010; 2012; 2014). While nuanced and not always compatible with one another, these emergent models provide alternates to what is perceived as the narrow values and attributes ascribed to heritage within institutional planning and governance. They also exhibit greater reflexivity and attention to issues of power, identity and participation. The following list describes some further characteristics of contemporary heritage approaches:

- An emphasis on the heterogeneity and contested nature of heritage values, contrasted against earlier attempts to create unified and authentic heritage narratives.
- A belief that contemporary heritage planning should support the inclusion of a wider range of community voices and heritage stakeholders than the systems of experts and society elites supported by the conservation movement (Sykes & Ludwig, 2015; Mason & Avrami, 2002).
- Heritage narratives are approached reflexively and in ways which are mindful of context, as opposed to being accepted as static, abstracted, or taken-for-granted.
- That heritage (including who and what is defined as significant) is a process and the consequence of social activity (see Taylor, 2015).
- That heritage has to be understood across the boundaries of past, present and future.
- That the conservation of the material past is best supported by linking conservation to social and cultural heritage values (Van Oers, 2014; Mason & Avrami, 2002).

Opening up the boundaries of heritage can be challenging as it suggests the need to address a greater degree of social and cultural complexity in the approaches of planners and heritage advocates. What might seem like a lack of cohesiveness, however, should not be taken to imply that evolving heritage approaches are less meaningful. Instead, the ideas above suggest that the robustness of heritage approaches is achieved through reflexivity³ as opposed to being inherent in heritage objects or narratives themselves. Simply, urban heritage is given meaning through struggles over definitions of value, and determining the practical means of making heritage meaningful for current and future communities of citizens.

Beyond the Rational City

Along similar trajectories, the origins of HUL reflect trends in urban studies and scholarly approaches to the social and cultural understanding of cities. Again, taking liberty with the immense depth of urban studies over the past half-century (at least), the shift follows a critique of modernist approaches to city-building and their emphasis on rational and progressive planning logics. From Haussmann’s attempt in the nineteenth century to “bludgeon” (Harvey, 2005: 3) medieval Paris into a modern city, through Le Corbusier’s and Moses’s early twentieth century attempted to design the modern city through utopic planned communities of skyscrapers, grand parks, and car-centric cities of expressways and suburbs. Modernist planning approached the city as a rational object requiring the shaping of professional administrators, engineers and developers. Architectural

³ Van Assche et al. (2016: p.230) define reflexivity as: “the habit and attitude to reflect on one’s actions, thoughts and positions, and to look for grounding assumptions, underlying discourses and their effects.”

historian and urban planner Stefano Bianca (2015: 84) describes the context in this way: *“development was born, as an aggressive, rationally produced and externally controlled activity that is alien to internally driven, evolutionary growth processes steered by local communities, and ignores traditional and spiritual concerns.”*

In a similar vein to Poullos’ evaluation of historical nostalgia, the French urban theorist and philosopher Henri Lefebvre, offers a similar perspective in his writing on the “right to the city.” Lefebvre, an outspoken critic of the predictable, functional and thoroughly planned cities of twentieth century urban modernism, expresses a similar degree of concern for the opposite impulse towards the protection of the “historic-city.” Neither modern utopic urbanism, nor nostalgia for the past are, from his perspective, able to account for the fundamental lived, contextual and emergent nature of urban life. Therefore neither offers much for informing urban development and planning, and instead the dual impulse leaves cities feeling fractured and alienated from their citizenry. The prescription, he advocates, involves finding new ways of making meaning, and new approaches to making sense of the past, in terms of the present and the future of the city:

“The city historically constructed is no longer lived and no longer understood practically. It is only an object of cultural consumption for tourists, for aestheticism, avid for spectacles and the picturesque. Even for those who seek to understand it with warmth, it is gone. The urban remains in a state of dispersed and alienated actuality, as kernel and virtuality. What the eyes and analysis perceive on the ground can at best pass for the shadow of a future object in the light of a rising sun. It is impossible envisage the reconstitution of the old city, only construction of a new one on new foundations, on another scale, and in other conditions, in another society. The prescription is: there cannot be a going back (towards the traditional city), nor a headlong flight, towards a colossal and shapeless agglomeration. In other words, for what concerns the city the object of science is not given. The past present the possible cannot be separated. What is being studied is a virtual object, which thought studies, which calls for new approaches” (Lefebvre, 1996: 148).

Contemporary accounts tend towards seeing cities as less rationally controlled entities, but as social and cultural spaces. Cities are diverse lived environments, reflecting multiple and divergent experiences and relations. The recent urban rallying cry of the “right to the city” expressed initially by Lefebvre (1996) and adapted by geographer David Harvey (2015), is both a call for greater inclusivity in cities (Brown and Kristiansen, 2009), but also a bold statement about the inseparability of human opportunity from the patterning and activity of urban life. Cities are places imbued with contested meanings and socio-cultural representations (Shields, 1991) beyond that encoded in rational planning or systems of governance. How we know a city, talk about it, sense it, experience it, or represent it are all vital concerns within contemporary urban studies and important in shaping contemporary planning practices, including place-making (see Jacobs, 1961), collaborative planning (Healey, 1997), place-branding (Eshuis & Edwards, 2013) and so on. The implications of the shift away from narrow modernist planning logics, is to accentuate the lived, connected, emergent, conflictual and cultural attributes of urban spaces, and the integral role of community(s) in shaping them.

Van Oers, by describing, HUL as a shift in thinking places the future of heritage in an urban world shaped less by the logics of modernity, but as characterised by the deep layering and intertwining of culture, the environment and urban life:

“Historic Urban Landscape is a mind-set, an understanding of the city, or parts of the city, as an outcome of natural, cultural or socioeconomic processes that construct it spatially, temporally, and experientially. It is as much about buildings and spaces, as about rituals and values that people bring into the city. This concept encompasses layers of symbolic significance, intangible heritage, perception of values, and interconnections between the composite elements of the historic urban landscape, as well as local knowledge including building practices and management of natural resources. Its

usefulness resides in the notion that it incorporates a capacity for change.” (van Oers cited in Taylor, 2012: 181).

UNESCO'S HISTORIC URBAN LANDSCAPE APPROACH

The HUL approach emerged in relation to conflicts between UNESCO's designated World Heritage Sites and the drive to urbanize and adapt to modern development pressures. World Heritage sites are recognised for the Outstanding Universal Value to all humanity transcending national borders (UNESCO, 2012). Sites with this recognition play an important role in tourism, identity, and pride for the city or country. However, the designation also poses challenges in dealing with urbanisation, globalization, local development, and international relationships between cities (Bandarin & van Oers, 2012). And as of 2008 more than half of the world's population lives in urban settings and rapidly growing urban populations are putting pressure to develop and accommodate the growing population on the historic areas of cities. Until HUL's unique approach to preservation was established, UNESCO interest in preservation meant that urbanisation was a potential threat to these sites. The designations of previously recognised World Heritage Sites, such as Vienna, Dresden⁴, and Cologne, came under threat of being considered as “in danger” due to development proposals (Sonkoly, 2012). As of May 2018, 54 UNESCO World Heritage Sites are “in danger” and 37 of those are cultural sites⁵. These cultural sites are often found in urban areas and often the communities grew due to the popularity of the site and the possibility of economic success due to tourism. While UNESCO previous preservation approach provides suggestions such as “buffer zones” or boundaries for the site and a strategy for sustainable preservation and development, height restrictions, there is little discussion beyond preserving districts and creating boundaries, either distinct or unclear, about how heritage can be represented in the future of the city.

Beyond the pressures of development and urbanisation, there are also issues surrounding the histories that are preserved and represented in preserving heritage buildings. Often the histories of one culture are favoured over others because of the presence of heritage buildings or preserved sites. While these built heritage narratives may be of value, they also define historic at a particular time and place, favour certain versions of history over others. They often fail to clearly represent whom is involved in the decision making around what is ‘historically significant’, or explore whom or what is missing from the preserved landscape (Veldpaus, 2015). Through opening up the conversation to alternative, often unheard and unseen histories living in the people rather than the buildings, there is an opportunity for congruent histories to live alongside one another.

The HUL approach provides a sense of hope to heritage preservationists, historian, planners, politicians, and members of the community to formally integrate the heritage and histories of a city into the changing, modern city that exists today and into the future. It illustrates UNESCO's attempt to reconsider the role of heritage in cities and the role of UNESCO in modern cities.

HUL Development over Time

After years in playing the role in opposition to development, UNESCO began discussing how to mitigate the conflict between urbanisation and preservation. In 2005, the Vienna Memorandum was the first outline of principles and guidelines for developing a relationship between conservation and development while maintaining the integrity of historic urban landscapes (van Oers, 2007). This memorandum signalled a change

⁴ Dresden eventually lost its World Heritage Site designation in 2009 due to a four lane bridge being built within the cultural site. Many urban areas with World Heritage Site designation are “in danger” due to development pressures. Oman's Arabian Oryx Sanctuary is the only other Former World Heritage Site and had its designation revoked in 2007.

⁵ <https://whc.unesco.org/en/danger/>

towards sustainable development and recognising the importance of the larger urban landscape as part of heritage and identity rather than the previously titled historic urban areas (UNESCO, 2005). The following years consisted of international meetings, debates, case studies, and workshops to determine what was necessary and what details were required to ensure the success of these recommendations. The *UNESCO Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape* was officially adopted in November 2011.

Because people are moving into cities at high rates, the cities able to adapt and manage change will provide the greatest chances of success (UNESCO, 2015). According to Bandarin and Van Oers (2012), a city's heritage is confronted with three different levels of change: i) the need to adapt and change and acknowledge the life cycle of a city; ii) different stakeholders who might be involved at different times and the resulting conflict resolution that should occur; iii) the values of heritage perception and appreciation based on the changing population, who develops the notion of what constitutes heritage. The *Recommendation* was intended as a “point of departure” for conversations around planning, heritage, history, culture, development, and the overall management of the city (UNESCO, 2015: 11).

According to UNESCO, the HUL approach “provides a basis of integration of urban conservation within an overall sustainable development framework through the application of a range of traditional and innovative tools adapted to local contexts” (UNESCO, 2015: 11). HUL involves new ways of thinking about heritage in our communities and understanding the role of heritage as socially constructed, multi-valued and layered (Sykes & Ludwig, 2015). It connects the preservation of heritage resources with the diversity of experiences, narratives and cultural traditions tied to a sense of place or community and focuses on enhancing values attached to the place and community. This includes creating or sustaining the emotional attachment to the past and improving the understanding in social relations, knowledge exchange, and community ownership (Wall, 2011).

However, this shift in perspective is still somewhat undefined and accompanied with confusion and misunderstanding making implementation a challenge (Sykes & Ludwig, 2015). The HUL Guidebook (see below), among other UNESCO developed resources, provides a toolkit for implementation. While many case studies have contributed to these documents, the actual implementation and integration steps often require specific consideration to the municipal policy processes that exist within the city. The best successes have been through relationship building with other cities going through a similar process. Since 2011, many cities around the globe have adopted HUL approaches into their planning. The World Heritage Institute of Training and Research for the Asia and the Pacific Region (WHITRAP) holds training sessions for cities currently implementing or interested in implementing HUL approaches. These types of forums and other conferences across the globe also provide the opportunity for communities to connect and learn from a strengthened and growing network of specialists to develop an international sense-of-community and create an overall stronger program.

Although HUL is a UNESCO promoted approach, its integration into cities has been somewhat slow, particularly since the two individuals (Ron van Oers and Francesco Bandarin) leading the charge in 2011 are no longer involved. As Rodwell (2015) notes, after 2011 HUL became orphaned within UNESCO, although HUL remains influential amongst a small number of trial cities. Critics argue that HUL does not provide a clear idea about best heritage practises or what UNESCO might consider ‘good’ heritage planning. There are toolkits for how to undertake similar processes, but the results are vague and there is not a clear idea of what is expected. As more cities take on the challenge of integrating heritage and urban change, it will be essential to capture and analyses their experiences, and to build a pool of knowledge and methods with which to inform HUL thought and practice.

KEY IDEAS FOR DEVELOPING A HUL APPROACH

In summary, to capture what is involved in the transition towards a HUL approach, we propose the following model contrasting traditional heritage conservation with a more integrated and complex perspective. This is intended as a heuristic exercise, and our intent is not to polarize the two approaches, or to dismiss conservation and its contribution to heritage planning. Rather, our model sets out some key ideas for creatively exploring and inspiring a dynamic conversation around HUL in Edmonton.

A Landscape Level Approach

Where traditional approaches have focused on narrow range of built form, HUL opens the idea of heritage to include not only physical structures, but a much wider range of urban attributes. This could include elements of the natural environment, the economy, or a cultural activity. Good practice implies integrating and balancing heritage attributes, and their values, in ways which support open and balanced forms of urban change.

Intersections of the Tangible and Intangible Aspects of Cities

Contemporary perspectives of heritage are often today more aware of heritage as a social construct are far more inclusive than ever before (Sykes & Ludwig, 2015). This includes the recognition of the values of intangible heritage to positive forms of heritage conservation and urban development. Intangibles are those traditions and living expressions of the past which have been passed into the present (Jigyasu, 2015) and shape our values of heritage in the present (Bandarin and van Oers, 2012: 49). These are the processes by which historical meanings are given to places, the stories we tell about them, and the ways in which we live and experience the city. Yet, intangibles have mostly been less sought after and poorly integrated within urban heritage planning. They are difficult to collect, manage and preserve, as well as being multiple and uncertain. The inability to touch, or physically recreate heritage narratives has made their value seem less than that of the built or material heritage. This is a particularly challenging proposition when, as Charles Landry (2006) describes, we have lost our ability to recognise or speak about them. By integrating intangible and tangible heritage values, there is an ability to determine what is required to collect the stories themselves or to support those people who collect and maintain the stories and memories that are attached to the built heritage. Paying attention to intangibles as Jigyasu (2015: 130-135) argues is essential to attending to the diversity of cultural heritage in cities, and necessary for fostering inclusiveness and mutual respect between communities.

Community-Based and Engaged

Where traditional heritage planning has prefaced the role of experts and local elites (Sykes & Ludwig, 2015) in the designation and protection of urban heritage, HUL highlights the importance of engagement. Heritage projects should evolve within the community, as opposed to being developed for the community. Publics can be integral and knowledgeable partners, able to shape and place narratives as well as inform heritage sensitive development. HUL prompts the innovation of more active forms of engagement (see for example Healey, 1997). HUL suggests a need to create space for communities to actively contribute to the future of the city and through this process build positive relationships between communities and between past, present and future. Most communities are the culmination of layered identities that evolved over time. Empowering community

stakeholders to identify their own values, develop visions, set goals and agree on actions promotes community ownership and sustainability.

Multiplicity of Experiences and Representations

The designation of heritage resources -- what's valued, conserved, memorialized, or narrated -- is always selective. Much of Canada's urban heritage reflects narrow narratives of the past, dominated by colonial histories of European colonization. Good planning practice, HUL approaches suggest, ensures that history isn't limited to one voice, one map, one culture or one building. Creating space for contested histories and challenging the status quo, creates space for thinking about a city differently and supports inclusiveness in development and design.

As Amin (2002) has argued, paying critical attention to place can be a means of supporting intercultural exchange and equitable participation in everyday connections and contacts. Such places support a diversity of urban life and recognise the inherent heterogeneity of the city and its pasts, the complex ways in which identities and values are shaped within these contexts and the role of diversity in contributing to vibrant communities. HUL approaches may be seen as opportunities for fostering inclusiveness through the extension of what Lefebvre (1996) referred to as the 'right to the city' – this involves *“more than the individual liberty to access urban resources: it is a right to change ourselves by changing the city”* (Harvey 2008: 24).

HUL can make space for alternates and often displaced, cultural representations in the urban landscape and counter-spatializations that 'place' a locality in very different relations to values and other places (Shields 1991). For instance, recent initiatives to rename places and roads within Edmonton are indicative of attempts to encourage cultural integration and recognise Indigenous histories to renegotiate their current day status as continuing spatializations.

Linking Past, Present and Future

Rather than attempting to protect the past by isolating parts of the city, and selected heritage values, from development, HUL encourages ways of thinking about how heritage can support the evolving needs of the community now and into the future. Where heritage planners have often found themselves in opposition to development, HUL seeks to inform positive forms of urban change.

Contested

There are very few instances when current approaches to heritage have asked who or what is missing from the landscapes. And when certain histories, likely developed from experts or academics, become the accepted narrative, the complexity and multiple interpretations of history is lost (Li, 2015). The HUL approach encourages heritage planning beyond the privileged accounts of European settlement and looks beyond the development that reflects the overly simplified categories of culture and the city (Wall, 2011; Scherer & Davidson, 2010).

Place-Based

The adaptation of the HUL approach to the local context is an important feature of this approach (van Oers, 2007). In many cases, cities have expanded the definition of heritage to represent that which is inherited (City of Ballarat, 2016). It challenges communities to relate heritage planning to the future evolution of the city, build links within heritage and development, and challenges municipalities and communities to work beyond top-

down planning activities to include community driven practices (van Oers, 2007). Cities are dynamic and evolving and the planning should reflect this nature.

Summary: Contrasting Conservation and HUL Approaches

	CONSERVATION	HUL
SCALE	Conservation policies and preservation of heritage artefacts	Conservation integrated within landscape level awareness
OBJECT	Material preservation	Intersections of the tangible and intangible aspects of cities
KNOWLEDGE	Expert / Elite led	Distributed knowledge and engaged
REPRESENTATION	Narrow and Apolitical representations	Multiplicity of contested experiences and representations
TEMPORAL	Static	Linking the past, present and future
SPATIAL	Abstracted	Place-based

3. DEVELOPING HUL IN PRACTICE

The HUL approach, as we describe above, champions collaborative and community-based methods of information collection and knowledge sharing. HUL demands innovations in planning and policy practice which align with the concepts and values guiding its development. Innovation is a challenge for city administrations where planning and development decisions are guided by values, and instilled in practices, which are highly stable over time. The point to be made here is that developing HUL in practice involves more than the addition of new toolkits to pre-existing institutional practice. Successful innovation rather implies the need to create opportunities for institutional change, and re-imagining the relationships between experts/administrators and communities. The challenge for cities is not necessarily an issue of creating better engagement practices around heritage planning, but also challenging how public contributions are understood and made meaningful within the governance process. It will be the task for any community wishing to undertake a HUL approach to heritage and development planning to invest in innovating methods and creating the institutional space necessary for creating success.

Mindful of the problems of limiting adoption of HUL to a range of techniques, it is not necessary in each City to start from scratch. Inspiration can be taken from the innovations of other places, or indeed as we explore in the next section of this report, it can come from innovations which occur spontaneously within local communities. For the moment we highlight emerging HUL practice globally, providing a summary of what UNESCO (2015) has defined as a set of six critical steps for creating successful HUL practice.

PARTICIPATORY PLANNING AND CONSULTATION ON VALUES

Essential to the HUL method is the ability to capture and integrate the diverse ways in which citizens find value in a city, and how they see those values contributing to the future of their communities. Cities need to be innovative and creative in finding ways of exploring and communicating about these values, and participatory forms of heritage planning and citizen engagement are necessary elements of doing so. Communities who are involved will likely be more motivated to carry these values into the future and activate their community.

Cuenca, Ecuador: The city of Cuenca is the third largest city in Ecuador, located in the south of the country in the Andean mountains. The historic town centre of *Santa Ana de los Rios de Cuenca* was recognised in 1999 by UNESCO as being of Outstanding Universal Value on the basis of the City's preservation of its Spanish colonial town plan and its historic fusion of Latin American cultures⁶.

Upward population growth and associated development, led the University de Cuenca in partnership with WHITRAP to host a series of lectures and workshops in 2015 exploring the value of HUL approaches to managing development and heritage values. As part of this initiative, researchers conducted a series of engagement activities involving more than 150 citizens. Participants were encouraged to identify and value those important aspects of heritage in their communities (both tangible and intangible), but also to explore threats to these values and the challenges of protecting them. These engagements produced valuable descriptions of heritage in Cuento, and furthermore invited participation in the future oriented planning and management strategies of those heritage resources (Avila and Perez, 2016). In addition, researchers hosted a children's painting competition and a photography contest called "Visions of the City" adding a creative dimension to accessing heritage values, and widening participation to include youth and children⁷.

⁶ <https://whc.unesco.org/en/list/863>

⁷ <http://www.historicurbanlandscape.com/index.php?classid=6043&id=38&t=show>

MAPPING

Mapping can be an important means of relating culture narratives and experiences and the orientation and design of urban places. Traditionally we think of mapping in Cartesian terms, as two dimensional accurate representations of space. Maps, within this mode, might include street maps, land surveys or urban design plans. They give us the lay of the land, so to speak, allowing communities to orient their discussions to geographical points on a map, and can be important prompts for understanding and bounding heritage space. However, maps also provide opportunities for deeper engagement with citizens to explore, discuss and delineate the multiplicity of histories that exist within a community. Mapping, understood as a process instead of an object, is one way in which cities are innovating HUL approaches. Maps both engage communities in the production of space and provide a means of sharing that experience with others.

*Ballarat, Australia*⁸: Using the broadest definition of heritage, the City of Ballarat developed a collaborative mapping process to engage communities in identifying the natural, cultural and historical components of the City's heritage. This included aspects of Aboriginal heritage, built form, intangible values, and natural resources (City of Ballarat, 2015; 2103). Out of this process the City has developed a community plan for historic East Ballarat integrating the mapping project within governance. Exercises involved identifying the heritage boundaries of the area, and identifying diverse cultural and natural heritage values (as documented in the map below). These maps now help document this experience, but also invite ongoing involvement of the community with the urban landscape in its diversity, and in ways which are spatially nuanced as opposed to being abstracted to a series of general values or aims.



Ballarat East Community Mapping Exercise (Photo credit City of Ballarat)

⁸ To see a larger image of the East community map and find more out about Imagine Ballarat East please visit: <http://www.ballarat.vic.gov.au/pbs/city-strategy/strategic-projects-and-frameworks/current/imagine-ballarat-east.aspx>

ASSESS VULNERABILITY TO SOCIO-ECONOMIC STRESSES AND CLIMATE CHANGE

Heritage planning can often feel reactive and motivated by recurring crises as heritage resources are put under threat by development. As we have noted above, overcoming reactive planning, and the positioning of planning in a purely preservationist and negative mode of operation, is central to HUL. The HUL guidebook thus advocates for a holistic approach to horizon scanning which looks forward to explore the vulnerability of landscape values as designated by communities.

Liverpool, United Kingdom: Liverpool, a port city once connecting the United Kingdom to a global empire, is home to a wide array of mercantile, industrial, urban and cultural heritage resources. Long a city characterized by a diminishing population and urban degradation, recent decades have seen the city seek to redevelop and redefine its image. The city's extensive inland dock and warehouse systems are key elements of the city's historic downtown and were recognized by UNESCO in 2004. Development of an adjacent shopping centre, a new city museum, and plans to rebrand the city's image with the development of a modern skyline challenge the viability of UNESCO's designation within the current heritage regime. Liverpool is thus faced with the challenge of balancing heritage preservation against much-needed development and resiliency planning. Flexible approaches to heritage planning may be beneficial to proactively addressing these tensions and could involve an assessment of vulnerabilities against the benefits of redevelopment. As planning scholars Olivier Sykes and Catherine Ludwig (2015: 30) note:

“The extent to which the heritage sector is able to sustain the expansive role attributed to it in policy and theory rather than the narrow role it is often constrained playing and practice, and how far it can demonstrate synergies with and value to, wider place-based policy agendas, will be key questions in the field over coming years.”

INTEGRATING HUL VALUES WITHIN PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

While HUL prefaces engagement as a necessary constituent of heritage planning, city administrations and political leaders remain central. On the one hand, this implies integrating engagement outcomes, including value based landscape definitions, within heritage planning activities. On the other hand, it is also important to recognize the need to integrate heritage planning within the wider array of municipal and planning functions of the city.

Vienna, Austria: With their new urban development plan, Step 2025, the City of Vienna is committing to: a farsighted and holistic approach that unites policy areas, and which is oriented towards creating a liveable, resilient, participatory, and knowledge oriented city in a context of ongoing growth. Adopting a similar language to HUL governance is identified as a key factor for successful urban development and partnering with private and public sectors; promoting cooperation with districts and regions; valuing public participation, are all key to good planning⁹. The Austrian Council of Ministers further, through a review of guidelines for building culture, proposes an integrated approach to policy connecting ecological, economic, social and cultural factors, for instance in constructing, restoring its own properties. For instance, the retrofitting of heritage-protected buildings to be more energy efficient is valued both in terms of sustainability, as a means of protecting those resources, and as a source of innovation for the building industry¹⁰.

⁹ <https://www.wien.gv.at/stadtentwicklung/studien/pdf/b008379b.pdf>

¹⁰ https://www.kunstkultur.bka.gv.at/documents/340047/394470/Baukultur_Leitlinien_EN.pdf/ea8781a5-d550-45a5-8685-2a6c761cddf7

PRIORITIZING CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT ACTIONS

To ensure that projects move forward, actions need to be prioritized with all stakeholders involved in the decision-making process. The success relies on stakeholder involvement and a deep understanding of the values identified in engagement processes.

Zanzibar, Tanzania: Zanzibar's Stone Town has been about integration, reconnection, awareness, and education. Through developing a database for knowledge management, the assets and resources of the city are identified and available for discussion. There is also an interest in connecting best practices of HUL approaches and a HUL institution in Tanzania with this database via the web. Easily accessible information and a gathering of people and information through courses or conferences were identified as methods of increasing awareness and acceptance of HUL in Zanzibar (UNESCO, 2013).

ESTABLISH PARTNERSHIPS AND FRAMEWORKS FOR CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

To ensure the long-term success of HUL approaches, developing sustained and meaningful relationships is critical. Successful and multifaceted governance approaches require conscious reflection on the types of networks which exist in community, and in identifying where additional networks would be beneficial (see Van Assche et al., 2016). Reflexivity and the flexibility to adapt governance networks to local contexts are thus key skills for any community. This can include working within traditional networks of heritage organizations and government departments, but more holistic approaches to heritage planning require the diversification of networks within governments and with the wider community.

Ballarat, Australia: As a HUL pilot city, the City of Ballarat unanimously adopted the final strategy in 2015. Applying HUL strategies has required evolving from regulatory focussed approaches for conservation (protectionist) to more development friendly approaches. At the heart of their approach is localization: local identity, distinctiveness, values, and approaches. This relies on people-centred approaches, partnerships and collaborations, gaining new types of knowledge of the community and building a culture based framework for creative problem solving. Heritage is now part of any development conversation and has been integrated in the urban planning systems¹¹.

¹¹ <http://www.hulballarat.org.au/>

4. FINDING INSPIRATION FOR HERITAGE PLANNING IN EDMONTON

In 2015, the City of Edmonton, the Old Strathcona Foundation and international HUL partners signed a memorandum of understanding outlining a desire to cooperate and mutually support the development of HUL approaches in Edmonton. With this relationship, the city has access to international resources and a community of supportive believers in the value of recognising the multi-layered existence of heritage. As the first North American municipality piloting HUL ideas, Edmonton can potentially play a leading role in exploring and implementing HUL approaches.

In this section of the report we will provide an overview of heritage planning as it is organized in Edmonton, as well as look at resources with municipal government and civic society which share useful synergies in innovating HUL approaches.

THE ORGANISATION OF HERITAGE PLANNING IN EDMONTON

Heritage planning within the City of Edmonton is organised around the protection of historic resources. A historic resource describes any building, structure, fragment, landscape or feature that is recognized by the City for its heritage value, and therefore is subject of a number of protections. In partnership with Canada's Historic Places – a federal registry of historic resources – heritage values are defined as follows:

“Heritage Value: the aesthetic, historic, scientific, cultural, social or spiritual importance or significance for past, present and future generations. The heritage value of an historic place is embodied in its character-defining materials, forms, location, spatial configurations, uses and cultural associations or meanings” (Canada's Historic Places, 2010: 5).

The City describes a wide array of integrated benefits associated with heritage preservation for the City and for Edmontonians: These include¹²:

- A strengthened tax base as a consequence of the retention, enhancement and adaptation of existing heritage structures for new uses.
- The creation of jobs for people who can provide a wide range of skills, services and materials for restoration projects.
- Supports for tourism and economic development in relations to perceived heritage values and character enhancements within the city.
- Sustaining property values.
- Rewarding owners with financial support and recognition for positive roles in maintaining heritage;
- Contributes to the pride of property owners and tenant business.
- Supports the creating a sense of place.
- Advances sustainability by decreasing the waste and material costs associated with new development; landfill volumes and the need to develop new materials.
- Offering free professional heritage advice and a development process liaison.

¹² For details please refer to the City of Edmonton website:

https://www.edmonton.ca/city_government/edmonton_archives/benefits-of-heritage-planning.aspx

To do this, the city provides promotion and incentive programs targeting historical buildings or areas. Rather than: “creating museum-like buildings, the program offers opportunities for buildings to expand and change while maintaining the key defining features of the historic resource’s period.” (City of Edmonton, 2017a). To support these values heritage planners with the City of Edmonton work closely with two arm’s length heritage bodies.

1. Established by City Bylaw, the Edmonton Historical Board plays a key role in safeguarding of historical resources within the City. The Board is a voluntary, but nominated, group of concerned citizens and heritage experts with a strong interest and appreciation for the built heritage of the community. It provides advice to City Council on both specific heritage cases, as well as on the development of heritage policy. It functions to promote awareness through outreach in the community, to advance knowledge on urban heritage by engaging local experts, and to support recognition of heritage contributions through the provision of awards and awarding of plaques¹³.
2. The Edmonton Heritage Council is not-for-profit organization which aims in the abstract to connect citizens with their city, and more specifically provides leadership to the City in delivering its cultural plan: The Art of Living 2008-2018. EHC is also an important provider of financial grants through the Heritage Community Investment Project. This project, funded by the City of Edmonton, targets operational costs, travel costs, and large and small-scale projects to encourage innovation and continued support of heritage in Edmonton for Edmontonians.

CITY OF EDMONTON'S EXTENDED HERITAGE RESOURCES

Beyond the organization of discrete heritage planning within the City, the issue is referenced in a variety of different areas of planning and development. There are particular programs developed to ensure heritage and history is a central part of the decisions in particular areas or policies in the city. These programs or policies are areas represent the City’s commitment to heritage discussions and importantly areas where HUL approaches may be integrated within wider planning and administration.¹⁴

River Crossing Heritage Interpretive Plan

The River Crossing Heritage Interpretive Plan (HIP) illustrates the City of Edmonton’s initiative to include a more layered and landscape approach to heritage planning. The HIP includes a history of the River Crossing (West Rosedale in Edmonton) area and provides a guide for how heritage and culture are reflected and communicated throughout the area as it evolved over time (City of Edmonton, 2017b). The development of the HIP is suggestive of HUL approaches in other cities. Public engagement was important to the process and the guiding questions were not limited to the built heritage. The plan developed out of the question “why is this place important?” (City of Edmonton, 2017b). And, during a visioning workshop in fall 2016, participants were asked “what should people understand about the heritage and culture of the area after they visit River Crossing?” (City of Edmonton, 2017b). These questions spurred conversations and developed into the themes that would guide the rest of the plan. The River Crossing Heritage Interpretive Plan illustrates the City of Edmonton’s interest in layered discussions about heritage. *A Historic Urban Landscape approach would ensure that these layered discussions are integrated into all community development plans, rather than a separate step in the process and reserved for those areas with long and complex histories, such as the River Crossing.*

¹³ https://www.edmonton.ca/city_government/edmonton_archives/edmonton-historical-board-about.aspx

¹⁴ In addition to the material covered here, an Environmental scan of heritage resources in Edmonton was conducted in 2007 for the Edmonton Art’s Council in advance of the foundation of the Edmonton Heritage Council, while somewhat dated, it remains a useful resource: https://edmontonheritage.ca/wp-content/uploads/2014/05/Ross_heritage_scan.pdf.

Evolving Infill Project

The average household in Edmonton is 2.5 people per dwelling, with larger families living in newer neighbourhoods¹⁵. The Evolving Infill Project is the City of Edmonton's attempt to build community involvement and consultation into an infill strategy aimed towards densification and redevelopment in the City's mature neighbourhoods. The conversations began in 2014-2015 which led to the development of Edmonton's Infill Roadmap. This Roadmap provides a solid foundation for infill projects in mature and established neighbourhoods. The current Evolving Infill Project (Phase 2) continues this conversation as infill becomes a reality for many communities around Edmonton (Evolving Infill, 2017). Community members are asked for their opinions regarding regulations and restrictions for developers and what communities might need to thrive with larger populations. Consultation sessions often involve different perspectives discussing various issues and either presenting their views or coming to consensus around certain issues. The consultation sessions are meant to provide the background for reports and recommendations for the City to consider when developing policies or design plans for communities.

Edmonton Heritage Council, in collaboration with Edmonton's former historian Laureate Shirley Lowe, produced a report in 2017 documenting the history of neighbourhood and housing evolutions in the city. Supporting the implementation of the city's evolving infill policy, the report provides an account of the "economic, social and cultural issues that have shaped housing in Edmonton" (EHC, 2017: vi). The report is most useful as a supporting document, and is intended to support conversations about infill, heritage, housing and the city. However, while opening doors to a wider cultural and community centred understanding of heritage, the report is largely descriptive in outlining trends in historical development. In other words, *it will be important for the city to address wider landscape thinking in their engagements with citizens, particularly on topics related to neighbourhood character and values.*

Infill challenges how heritage can fit into the modern city. There is a public interest in preserving character, while increasing density and diversity and providing opportunities for socially inclusive neighbourhoods. Rethinking how heritage is interpreted in communities through built heritage, but also intangible features, can lead to a stronger, more sustainable identity, or character, for a community as social and cultural dynamics change over time.

Art of Living

With 2008's Art of Living's ten-year plan to strengthen the heritage profile in Edmonton, the Edmonton Heritage Council, Historian-in-Residence, and nine other heritage related recommendations were established. The development of this cultural plan was the first time that heritage gained its own recognition from the City of Edmonton, separate from the arts and planning. With the ten year completion of this plan coming in 2018 and a new plan in development, the timing is appropriate to establish historic urban landscape approaches within the city planning and solidify the processes for integrating heritage with future development.

Mature Neighbourhoods Overlay

First introduced in 2001 and amended as recently as February 2017, the Mature Neighbourhood Overlay (MNO) ensures that new development in mature neighbourhoods is sensitive to scale and character of the

¹⁵ City of Edmonton (2017). Evolving Infill Website Homepage. Accessed May 3, 2017 from: <http://www.cityofedmontoninfill.ca/>.

existing properties. This includes, for example, maintaining the traditional character, a pedestrian-friendly streetscape, privacy, and sunlight penetration for adjacent properties. As an area of policy and planning which connects development with heritage and the cultural values of communities, the MNO is an area of current practice which might benefit from HUL perspectives, particularly in relationship to engagement with communities and the discernment of ‘character’.

INNOVATIVE RESOURCES WITHIN THE COMMUNITY

Within Edmonton there are plenty of opportunities to develop HUL approaches by learning from and supporting innovations within the community. Above we have argued that HUL is best understood as a widening of the values and approaches to heritage planning, and not as a set of discrete tools or practices. Activities, in other words, don’t need to be labelled as HUL or linked to UNESCO policies to support landscape approaches. The following list of initiatives illustrates Edmontonians’ wide-spread interest of recognising and maintaining the city’s heritage (and there are likely many others which we missed). Each, we suggest, shares synergies with HUL, and would be useful sources of inspiration for adapting formal heritage planning.

Edmonton City as a Museum Project (ECAMP)

ECAMP “tells the stories of people, places, things, and moments that make the city of Edmonton what it is” (ECAMP, 2018). It is a platform for Edmontonians to tell their personal stories about Edmonton. Created on the basis of giving these stories a home, the virtual museum is a collection of written stories or podcasts that visitors can explore, learn, and contribute their own stories¹⁶.

Jane’s Walks #YEG

Jane’s Walks are free, locally organized walking tours for people to gather and explore, talk about and celebrate their neighbourhoods. It is a walking conversation where leaders share information and encourage conversation among walkers. In May 2017, Edmonton had 18 registered walks covering topics such as sustainable food, heritage, neighbourhoods, and public art¹⁷.

The past, present and future of Whyte Ave - A Jane’s Walk

In the spring of 2017 we led a Jane’s Walk which invited the public to collectively explore how heritage and culture inform their experiences of the street. This was considered against a backdrop of current development in the area. Along the way participants learned about heritage and development in the area and stopped to hear the perspectives and values of a number of guest speakers. Pictured here is Kim Petrin, Senior Associate at Stantec, speaking about the values of development in supporting a vibrant metropolitan streetscape.



¹⁶ <http://citymuseumedmonton.ca/>

¹⁷ <https://janeswalk.org/canada/edmonton/>

Amiskwaciy History Series

The Amiskwaciy History Series is an example of a community-led initiative that promotes learning and sharing about the indigenous peoples of the Edmonton and their deep histories within the area. In the series first season, sessions explored Cree language, stories of survival and reconciliation, the history of local indigenous organizations, and more. These are available for viewing on the Series YouTube channel¹⁸. The series presents history from the perspectives and experiences of the indigenous communities, and in a moment of reconciliation challenges the representation and historical narratives within Edmonton's colonial context. The series, supported by the City of Edmonton, is an opportunity to not only reshape historical narratives of the City, but can build support for the inclusion of indigenous heritage within urban planning and development, and build reconciliation into the future fabric of the city¹⁹.

Reconciliation in Solidarity Edmonton (RISE)

Founded in 2015 in response to the TRC National Event in Edmonton, RISE is made up of people committed to moving reconciliation forward. The group focuses on developing conversations and relationships between communities of Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples through sharing stories, celebrations, and opportunities to come together²⁰.

Edmonton & District Historical Society

The Edmonton and District Historical Society is a chapter of the Historical Society of Alberta (HSA) which connects museums, libraries and other history related organisations across Alberta. The EDHS organises a monthly speaker series, a variety of programs available for students and schools or the general public, including bus tours and a historic Christmas Dinner. This group is also responsible for the annual Historic Festival and Open Doors Edmonton event which partners with museums, historic sites and community groups in and around Edmonton to open their doors for a week or hold special events or tours for the public. In 2017, this festival is celebrating its 21st year²¹.

Edmonton Living Rooms Project

Coinciding with Canada's 150th birthday, the Edmonton Heritage Council and Multicultural Health Brokers Co-Op partnered to explore Edmonton's diversity through universal themes of humanity. Edmonton Living Rooms brought together natural leaders and animators from seven lesser known immigrant communities to share their stories. Their stories were collected and transformed into a mobile, interactive exhibit that toured the city. Their personal stories spoke to the challenges and opportunities they face in Edmonton, how assumptions about what it means to be immigrants shape their experiences, and the difficulties they face in making their stories visible²². As an innovative exercise in collecting, curating and sharing and communicating culture and heritage, the experience of the Living Rooms Project is of considerable value in building approaches to intangible heritage planning amongst diverse communities. Here is how the project lead describes the interactions she was part of during the project, and her responsibility as curator of these stories:

¹⁸ <https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCpX39TGNOgZvrhTMOrrilIg/feed>

¹⁹ https://www.edmonton.ca/programs_services/for_communities/amiskwaciy-history-series.aspx

²⁰ <http://risedmonton.ca/about-rise/>, or <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mKfj28gJGPo>

²¹ <http://www.historicedmonton.ca/>

²² <https://edmontonheritage.ca/tag/edmonton-living-rooms/>

“These gatherings have been a grand sensory experience, one of expansion and contraction, with questions storming after every interaction. The weight of responsibility felt by the trust of another’s story often feels daunting and immeasurable; what does one do with this trust?” (Rahman, 2017).

POTENTIAL HUL CASE STUDIES

As part of our emerging research work, two areas of the city are being considered as potential opportunities for exploring HUL concepts and practices. These are: i. the area of Old Strathcona and its surrounding retail and residential communities; and ii. the area of River Crossing downtown in the North Saskatchewan River valley. In each case these locales are unique and essential parts of the city’s historical, natural and cultural heritage. Moreover, each is experiencing significant development pressure as a consequence of rapid growth and re-urbanisation of the city’s mature areas. Concerns for the cultural and physical integrity of those places, their complex and diverse cultural reference points, and emerging contestations over their future mean that they may also benefit from HUL approaches. The following descriptions are intended to provide a general overview of these areas and their current heritage planning contexts so as to facilitate further investigation and research.

Old Strathcona

An early rival of Edmonton, the area of Old Strathcona is indicative of early 20th century municipal growth in the Western Canadian Prairie region. The town grew and developed alongside the establishment of a Canadian Pacific Railway line and Depot connecting the Edmonton area with Calgary and transcontinental trade routes to the South. Geographically situated in South Edmonton, the area has always been an essential hub connecting East-West (Whyte Ave.) and North-South corridors (104 St. and 105 St.) in the City. To the north the community is bracketed by the North Saskatchewan River and river valley greenspaces. To the East, the commercial area extends several blocks across the decommissioned Canadian Pacific rail line and related station yards. And, to the West Whyte Avenue connects various residential communities and links the area to the University of Alberta campus.

Who Lives in Strathcona?

Being a neighbour to the University of Alberta, over 70% of properties in Strathcona are rentals targeting the 30,000 students who attending the University. The housing stock includes many well maintained, older homes, including many with Historical designations, and an increasing number of walk-up and high-rise apartment buildings. This infill in the area has allowed 3000 more people to move into the area between 2011 and 2016.

Part of Old Strathcona is designated as a Provincial Heritage Area is made-up of a roughly five block area along Whyte Avenue. The area includes a commercial zone comprised of small scale retail properties, early hotels, a farmers market, civic buildings, and a CPR railway depot. In addition, surrounding this district are a number of compact elm lined residential streets containing several heritage homes. Architecturally a series of late 19th century wood frame buildings and later early 20th century stone brick architecture including more ornate structures stand out in what is otherwise a very contemporary city. Character-defining elements of the Area combine reference to this architectural history, and the development of material use and style in the area, as well as referring to the street layout, grid plan, and establishment of those transportation routes described above. The City of Edmonton currently lists six protected heritage buildings on and off of Whyte Avenue include: Bark Residence, Strathcona Public Library, Thomas Scott Residence, Roy Gerolamy Residence, Ed Milling Co. (Ritchie Mill), and the George Durrand Residence.

The Alberta Register of Historical Places²³ describes the architectural history and significance of the area in the following terms:

“Early constructions in Strathcona’s commercial core were simple wood-frame buildings like the Strathcona Hotel and the Orange Hall... The buildings erected in the Old Strathcona District after the turn of the century differed from their predecessors not only in materials, but also in style. The false-fronted frontier architecture of the 1890s gave way after the turn of the century to more ornate constructions, a reflection of the growth of business capital and entrepreneurial confidence within Strathcona. Commercial buildings often exhibited a strong classical influence to project an image of stability, permanence, and prestige. Examples of the increasing sophistication of architecture in the Strathcona district are the elegant Princess Theatre, which boasted the first marble-fronted facade west of Winnipeg, and the Douglas Block, which featured a diachromatic design of brick and stone and a crowning cornice, parapet, and pediment. Non-commercial buildings like the South Side Post Office and the Strathcona Public Library also reflected the increasing sophistication of architecture in the community in the post-1900 period while also embodying the success and importance of the district.”

Old Strathcona and Whyte Avenue have often been the source of debate and political mobilization around issues of growth, redevelopment and protection. The early 20thC was characterised by rapid urban growth in both Strathcona and Edmonton, and early politics in the region were focussed around the ability to attract growth and development. At its inception Strathcona was created as an overt attempt to establish the south side of the river, and its links to the CPR, as the economic centre of the region. This was a struggle of elites, railway companies and landholders on each side of the river, each boosting their own municipality in bids to out compete each other to capture the development of what was already becoming a booming metropolis (Gilpin, 1981). Edmonton, led by an organised and active collection of city boosters (see also Kilpatrick, 1980), eventually won this tussle having solidified itself as the preeminent commercial hub in the region, and having gained status as the Provincial Capital in 1904. Strathcona’s eventual amalgamation in 1912 saw growth slow as Edmonton continued to attract both investment and people, leaving Strathcona to survive as a suburban community.

Recurring patterns of boom & bust, housing speculation and housing crises (see Edmonton Heritage Council, 2017), meant that during most of the 20thC the community became overtaken by increasingly outward suburban development. City council began to think of the neighbourhood as a thoroughfare and the demolition of a local tram service and the move towards modernist and car centred planning put the area in the crosshairs as a site for freeway development at the end of the 1960s. With a development study in hand the City of Edmonton began purchasing properties along 104 Street to create space for this new North-South artery. The proposed development was deemed a threat to the physical heritage and character of the area eventually leading to the establishment of grass roots movement in opposition.

Karen Wall (2002) provides a thorough account of the ups and downs of the preservation movement in Old Strathcona over this time, while also addressing the interaction between heritage character and the retail function of the area. With concern spreading about the freeway development, and no doubt inspired by the Jane Jacobs political movement towards human scale urban development beginning in New York in the 1950s, the Old Strathcona Foundation (OSF) was created. The organisation created a strong and influential voice advocating for heritage protection, and furthermore linked heritage to a wider mandate for rethinking urban planning in South Edmonton which was very much opposition to the rationalist planning and redevelopment efforts which were in vogue at the time. Involving partnerships between government and an emerging network of concerned citizens and stakeholders, the OSF fostered a number of parallel political projects included

²³ <https://hermis.alberta.ca/ARHP/Details.aspx?DeptID=1&ObjectID=4665-1350>

successful advocacy for the construction of a light rail system and the preservation of the North Saskatchewan River valley and Mill Creek Ravine from large scale motorway construction²⁴.

As Wall (2002) documents the period of the OSFs influence was not without significant bumps in the road, as the foundation managed a substantial public budget, negotiated land deals, navigated through wavering public support, and ran into conflicts over the determination of what heritage mattered and deserved conservation. In many ways the preservation of Old Strathcona has been imperfect and the suggestion is that this might be for the better. Here, reflecting the arguments of Poullos and Lefebvre (above), Wall states:

“When an entire urban district is given the label of heritage, it too is packaged as a product – a Ghost Town attraction without the ticket gate. Whatever their results, heritage conservation movements have served as a medium for statements about the nature of community. The development of Old Strathcona is one way that a community is imagined and expressed through the resources at hand. Whether or not it defines some essential heritage of that community is less important than its ongoing role in the selective process of community life” (ibid: p. 38).

Old buildings are an essential aspect of successful neighbourhoods (Jacobs, 1961: 187-199), but only when they contribute to a diversity of urban experience and are responsive to human needs. In this sense, the adapted and flexible evolution of the street offer citizens experiencing Whyte Avenue both a sense of continuity and vitality. The value of the area is thus not limited to its tangible elements, but the intersection of communities, commerce and its built form, supported by a scale of development conducive to everyday life.

The successes of Whyte Avenue and Old Strathcona, and the sense of place arrived at as a consequence of sensitive heritage planning, have made them attractive for developers. Today a series of large condominium developments are underway at the edges of the heritage area. These offer potential benefits in terms of increased density, good design and economic investment. Yet, the prospect of redevelopment once again in the area raises some important questions for planners going forward: What aspects of urban life contribute to the character of the area, and what needs to be protected and planned for? How are heritage values being defined, and by whom? What forms of development support heritage values in Old Strathcona, and what forms challenge those values?

To address these questions, a HUL perspective might suggest the following planning priorities:

Firstly, it is likely going to be important to open-up the narratives which inform heritage planning. Old Strathcona is partly a story of a precocious prairie town at the end of the rail line with its proud commercial and civic architecture. However, Whyte Avenue is a backdrop for many other lived histories. The celebration of Old Strathcona as a frontier railway town, for instance, obscures the continuing impact of colonization on the experiences of the city’s diverse indigenous communities. Space is needed to address alternate, and at times conflicting, urban experiences and histories. This is essential knowledge for building more robust historical accounts of the area, but also for building the types of inclusive communities we want for the future.

Secondly, planners likewise will have a role to play in uncovering and communicating layered heritage narratives. Planners could, for example, investigate the vernacular histories behind the buzz of the nightclubs, the pace of retail browsing, the roar of cruising motorcycles, or the creative engagements characterizing the

²⁴ University of Alberta, Faculty of Extension Professor Gerry Wright was instrumental in these wider movements and was a founding member of the Old Strathcona Foundation. Posthumously recognising his contribution towards citizenship and the creation of a vibrant and accessible city, the City of Edmonton recently announced that a new operations and maintenance facility (part of the City’s new Valley Line LRT) would be named in his honour. https://www.edmonton.ca/city_government/documents/PDF/GerryWrightOfficialPkg.pdf

local arts community. Such histories inform both our understanding of the past, but also of the ways in which the area is valued today, and what might need protection looking ahead. As new developments alter the skyline will they also change Old Strathcona's dynamic character? Nuanced approaches to heritage and the planning of future urban spaces are needed which directly address the homogenizing and gentrifying pressures of development. We need to build conversations about how diversity is being planned for, and how inclusiveness can be maintained as an essential aspect of the areas vibrancy and success. Could HUL offer some inspiration for avoiding processes of gentrification experienced in other parts of the city (Granzow & Dean, 2007), and which is an increasingly familiar aspect of regeneration and urban planning priorities today.

Thirdly, adopting a HUL approach in Old Strathcona may suggest the need for innovative forms of community engagement. This is beginning to happen. The most recent update of land use planning involves a recurrent and progressive engagement. Yet, beyond these policies, strong community leadership is required to nurture and steward change over time and across the landscape. Collaborative forms of design, heritage interpretation and heritage management are all important means of carrying engagement forward. It is notable that the success of the area today is partly attributable to those communities, beginning in the 1960s, that advocated for a different type of city than the modernist planning they saw evolving around them (see above). It is not difficult to think that the future success of the area will similarly rely on the energy and capacity of a broad community.

West Rossdale at River Crossing

Designated River Crossing by the City of Edmonton, this area of the North Saskatchewan River Valley nestled below the City Centre, has been established as a development priority. As the City's website describes: "*River Crossing is a long-term city building initiative that will work to transform the western area of the Rossdale neighbourhood.*"²⁵ Currently, the area is poorly utilized from the perspective of municipal strategy to support the development of a vibrant and robust City Centre. It is also an area of very significant historical, cultural and ecological importance for the City, and in particular is central to understanding indigenous-settler relations in Edmonton. Municipal leaders and planners involved in revitalising the area will be required to sensitively and effectively negotiate the diverse values and histories attached to the area, and indeed as is already evident, political challenges to development and planning orthodoxy. In many ways River Crossing is a test case assessing the City's ability to manage planning and development from the perspectives of inclusion, sustainability and an engaged cultural approach. It is in this sense that planning River Crossing may be benefited by the flexibility, breadth and sensitivity of a HUL approach.

West Rossdale consists of the area north of the North Saskatchewan River and south of 97Ave (with the exception of the HBS Stables and Ortona Armory) between the Legislature grounds on 106st and 101st as the east boundary. Geographically this area is one of three communities located on a floodplain in Edmonton (the others being Riverdale and Cloverdale). There is only limited development in the area today, with significant buildings including the Rossdale Power Plant (decommissioned), the Rossdale Water Treatment Plant, the Edmonton Ballpark (largely unutilised), the Ortona Armoury, and the former HBC Stables. Rossdale is framed on three sides by the congruence of several thoroughfares exiting downtown and leading across the river to the south along several routes. The newly opened Walterdale Bridge implies a long term commitment to road infrastructure in the area. East Rossdale is tucked alongside the river and Irene Parlby Park, and is a very low density community of 504, mostly single family, dwellings.

²⁵ https://www.edmonton.ca/projects_plans/communities_neighbourhoods/west-rossdale-river-crossing.aspx

The West Rosedale area is an area with deep cultural and political roots and social and economic power for the future. The diversity in the physical landscape and also the contrast between the past and present uses of the area make it a complex planning landscape. The area's history is intimately associated with the river, its ecology, and the peoples that have travelled and subsisted alongside it. The river is a mode of transportation, a natural boundary, a resource, an ecosystem, and a place for recreation.

The history settlement and development in the area is extensively covered in a City of Edmonton Rosedale Historical Land Use Study²⁶ (commissioned in 2004) which also contains an excellent bibliography of source material. This is complimented by Linda Goyette and Carolina Roemmich's (2004) collection of narrative histories of the River Valley in "*Edmonton in Our Own Words*". The recently completed City of Edmonton (2017b) *River Crossing Heritage Interpretive Plan*²⁷ also provides a useful account of the multiple values and uses of the area. For now, several aspects of the history and current development context may make River Crossing a useful case study for exploring HUL approaches:

1. River Crossing has been a natural meeting place and site of economic activity along an important travel route. The area is part of the "traditional territories of the ancestors of numerous First Nations still present in Alberta today. These include the Dene, Blackfoot, Cree, Saulteaux, and Nakota Sioux Peoples" (ibid: p.20). For thousands of years then the area has supported the movement, trade, welfare and cultural lives of these groups. Later with the arrival of the fur trade, the area became a site of intense economic activity and trade organized around the establishment of important trading forts within the River Valley. It is at this time that the area supported an emerging Metis culture and now falls within what are considered the broad homelands of the Metis people. It is also a period characterized by the colonial expansion of the Hudson Bay Company and the overt management of lands, species, peoples and economies related to the fur trade (Binnema & Ens, 2016). Eventually, the foundations of modern Edmonton were laid when agriculture and industry were developed, transforming both the landscape and ecology of the River Valley. The area remains within Treaty Six territory.
2. This history highlights both the multiple communities and cultures which have come together in the area, but also a period of colonial transformation characterized by the domination of Indigenous peoples and the landscape reflected in the institutions, histories, and built environment of the City (Shields et al., 2018). Partly, this is to say that the heritage of River Crossing is contested and experienced unequally by different groups. But, just as importantly is that the City is itself inextricable from that history and current development and planning (including around heritage) cannot be understood without addressing the ongoing legacies of colonialism.
3. The area includes both a traditional indigenous burial ground and the Fort Edmonton cemetery. This has been a site of contestation and concern over treatment of the burial grounds by the City and by EPCOR the municipality's utility provider. This is an area of significant social and cultural importance to the communities of Edmonton.
4. The area is being considered for redevelopment by the City, and is attracting widespread interest from the development industry. To facilitate regeneration of the area the City completed and approved a long term design plan in 2011²⁸ and the aforementioned Interpretive Heritage Plan. The upcoming River Crossing Business Plan will advise on appropriate and economically beneficial development for the area. Much attention will be paid to the ways in which the forthcoming business plan will relate to previous planning activities, and

²⁶ https://www.edmonton.ca/documents/PDF/Rosedale_Historical_Land_Use_Study_Feb_2004.pdf

²⁷ https://www.edmonton.ca/documents/PDF/Approved_River_Crossing_Heritage_Interpretive_Plan.pdf

²⁸ https://www.edmonton.ca/projects_plans/communities_neighbourhoods/west_rossdale/west-rossdale-urban-design-plan.aspx

the important natural and cultural heritage of area. As we cite earlier, the Heritage Interpretive plan embodies many of the principles of HUL, including a commitment to engagement and the co-production of heritage values. HUL may offer a useful lens to explore how these values are brought forward and maintained through development.

Here the words of poet and scholar Marilyn Dumont very aptly and evocatively sum up the challenge of developing this area as more than a problem of heritage commemoration and storytelling, but a longer term challenge of decolonization. In doing so, she raises the essential question of how the area might be imagined for future indigenous use and occupation:

“Without economic leverage, Indigenous history is dependent on the awareness and goodwill of an industry that has the power to further wipe it out with the very instruments that colonized Edmonton.

Instead of a tourist-seeking canal that’s been proposed by some in the private sector and celebrated by high-profile boosters, I want a culturally appropriate facility for local Indigenous Peoples to gather here and continue the tradition of sharing knowledge, language and arts. A piece on land significant to not only Indigenous history, but to the very origins of this city” (Dumont, 2015).



*Facing north Rossdale comprises of vacant land, residential units and some large scale buildings, such as the Rossdale Power Plant and baseball park. <https://rossdaleregeneration.ca/our-vision/recommendations/>
Photo credit: Jack Clark KJC Photography.



*Design proposals for the West Rossdale site in 2010.
Photo credit: Dialog Design.
For a larger image of this map, visit:
<http://www.dialogdesign.ca/projects/west-rossdale-urban-plan/>

5. MOVING FORWARD

As mentioned at the outset, this document is intended as foundation for the development of future research and practice development around HUL approaches in Edmonton. Moving forward with the HUL concept will require that particular attention be paid to the following elements of practice.

1. Developing a HUL approach which is appropriate to Edmonton requires building broad, enduring and meaningful partnerships. These relations should connect scholarly and professional expertise with municipal administration and local communities. HUL requires sustained energy and trust between parties which is generative of robust communities of practice existing beyond any single heritage case of controversy.
2. Traditional heritage planning, and its separation from contemporary urban development and city-building, is deeply integrated within institutional cultures and practices in Edmonton. There are, in other words, strong path dependencies which make creative change and adaptation difficult. Benefits may be achieved by supporting learning and capacity building opportunities for planners, municipal leadership, and administration.
3. Further benefits may be considered in fostering HUL inspired heritage activities within and amongst communities beyond those invited, formal and tightly controlled spaces of the municipal government. It is important to support communities develop the ability to collect and narrate their own heritage stories, and to integrate this knowledge with their own visions for future development in the city. HUL, stated differently, is an opportunity to build wide communities of knowledgeable publics which are resources for planners and municipal governments.
4. Use the resources that already exist. While not labelled as HUL, we have accounted for a number of emerging local projects and resources that support heritage planning along landscape lines. Further research and development activities should learn from, partner with and support these resources to further establish innovation and integrate these approaches within current planning and development.
5. Getting people out of their boxes takes time: The ability to recognise the value of different perspectives and acknowledge the larger context is difficult. Helping people to see the value takes encouragement by the people already invested and time for everyone to understand the benefits on their own. When people make their own decisions about why an approach is beneficial, they become more motivated to put energy towards it and see it develop into a success. Sustain activity!

Project Activities and Outputs (to date)

1. Final Report: Pursuing a Historic Urban Landscape Approach to Heritage in Edmonton.
2. Magazine Article: Jones, KE and V Zembal. 2017. Historical site or cultural hub? Reimagining heritage values in Old Strathcona. Plan Canada, 57 (4) 14-16.
3. Public Presentation: Jones, KE “Building Prosperity / Building Communities: exploring landscape level approaches to heritage & diversity.” Edmonton Heritage Council, September 2017.
4. Panel Event: “Let’s Talk Heritage: Connecting Narratives Through Place-making” Regional Planning Speakers Series & Let’s Talk. City of Edmonton, November 2016.
5. Workshop: “Inclusive City-Building” with Jay Pitter. November 2016.
6. Jane’s Walk: Exploring the Past Present and Future of Whyte Avenue in Old Strathcona. Spring 2017.
7. Academic Presentation: Jones, K.E. Prairie Urbanism? The virtues of reflexivity and engagement in support urban transformations. UK and Ireland Planning Research Conference. Sheffield, Sept. 2018.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: CONCEPTUAL GLOSSARY

Authenticity (in relationship to heritage): the term has many connotations often relating to the inherent value of a certain culture, place, or artefact. Authenticity, however, can also be viewed as a cultural construct, for instance in relation to the promotion of heritage tourism.

Boosterism: a characteristic of development in Western Canadian Prairie cities, including Strathcona and Edmonton. It is a utilitarian state of mind equating urban growth and development with socio-economic betterment and material success in particular. As a characteristic shared widely by commercial and civic classes in the prairies, boosterism became a motivating force guiding inter-municipal competition, place marketing, and urban planning. Refer to Artibise (1981) for an excellent account of boosterism on the prairies.

Context: the circumstances that form the setting. Context often determines how a person recognises a situation and can be very broad and entire community or nation based or specifically address the small details.

Heritage Conservation: the desire to protect or restore and mitigate further deterioration.

Heritage Preservation: the desire to not develop or maintain certain features in their current state.

Inclusive city building: Often refers to economic, social, and cultural inclusiveness and providing equal treatment and opportunity to eliminate discrimination. Modern communities are a heterogeneous mix of cultures, economic status and ability, promoting respectful community with opportunities illustrates the community's value of diversity.

Heritage Purity: the degree to which an individual accepts heritage from the original, completely authentic structure to newly constructed replicas of original buildings.

Historical Urban Landscape (HUL): 1. “a mind-set, and understanding of the city, or parts of the city, as an outcome of natural, cultural and socio-economic processes that construct it spatially, temporally, and experientially. It is as much about buildings and spaces, as about rituals and values that people bring into to the city. This concept encompasses layers of symbolic significance, intangible heritage, perception of values, and interconnections between the composite elements of the historic urban landscape, as well as local knowledge including building practices and management of natural resources. Its usefulness resides in the notion that it incorporates a capacity for change.” (Van Oers cited in Taylor, 2015: 181). 2. “The historic urban landscape is the urban area understood as the result of a historic layering of cultural and natural values and attributes, extending beyond the notion of ‘historic centre’ or ‘ensemble’ to include the broader urban context and its geographical setting. This wider context includes notably the site’s topography, geomorphology, hydrology and natural features, its built environment, both historic and contemporary, its infrastructures above and below ground, its open spaces and gardens, its land use patterns and spatial organization, perceptions and visual relationships, as well as all other elements of the urban structure. It also includes social and cultural practices and values, economic processes and the intangible dimensions of heritage as related to diversity and identity... It integrates the goals of urban heritage conservation and those of social and economic development. It is rooted in a balanced and sustainable relationship between the urban and natural environment, between the needs of present and future generations and the legacy from the past. The historic urban landscape approach considers cultural diversity and creativity as key assets for human, social and economic development, and

provides tools to manage physical and social transformations and to ensure that contemporary interventions are harmoniously integrated with heritage in a historic setting and take into account regional contexts” (UNESCO, 2011).

Landscape: a holistic perspective to planning that incorporates everything that can be seen, touched, or experienced. Viewpoints and skylines are considered (similar to the idea of a landscape painting), but also the complexities of heritage including the ecosystems of politics, social and environmental factors. Landscape level planning comes from ecological planning and refers to a similar situation that considers animate and inanimate features of ecosystems, including humans. The landscape is as narrow or broad as necessary for the project. The implication for culture and heritage is that these attributes must be understood and acted upon in relationship to the wider urban land-scape, or urban eco-system.

Placelessness: a reference to the loss of meaning, or more precisely the loss of the ability to give meaning to local places. Arefi (1999), for example, ‘defines placelessness’ in opposition to ‘rootedness’ which connects places to ‘belonging’, ‘destiny’ and ‘volition’. Within contemporary cities concerns are raised about placelessness in relation to patterns of inauthentic and homogenous culture and development. West Edmonton Mall, for example, is written about by Hopkins (1990) as a placeless realm of myths and elsewhere-ness.

Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada (TRC): is part of an overall holistic and comprehensive response to the Indian Residential School legacy in Canada. It is a sincere indication and acknowledgement of the injustices and harms experienced by the Aboriginal people and a commitment by the Government of Canada to establish relationships and respect that contribute to the need for continued healing (Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada, 2017)

UNESCO: United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. UNESCO is an international organization seeking to build peace and support sustainable development through education, science and culture. Since 1972 the organization has been active in protecting cultural and natural heritage globally for the benefit of humanity²⁹.

WHITRAP: World Heritage Institute of Training and Research for the Asian and the Pacific Region under the auspices of UNESCO. A not-for-profit organization directed towards the advancement and promotion of heritage conservation in the Asia and Pacific region³⁰.

World Heritage Site: a landmark which has been recognised by UNESCO as being important to the collective interests of humanity.

²⁹ <https://whc.unesco.org/en/about/>

³⁰ <http://www.whitr-ap.org/index.php?classid=1471>

APPENDIX B: OTHER LANDSCAPE APPROACHES TO HERITAGE PLANNING

Townscape Heritage Initiatives (THI)

As an initiative of the Heritage Lottery Fund in the United Kingdom, Townscape Heritage Initiatives were established in 1998 to address the issues around deteriorating historic buildings (Shiple, 2004). The aim was to provide grants to repair buildings and structures, fund re-use or re-occupation efforts of historic buildings and engage the community to learn about their heritage and find job opportunities in historic environments (Falkirk THI, 2015).

Culturally Sensitive Narrative Approach (CSNA)

A CSNA balances the competing values of whose past is represented, whose memory is interpreted and which versions of history are remembered or neglected. It focuses on the intangible, immeasurable aspects of communities and often works best in communities with an evolving and diverse social history. Adopting a narrative approach to heritage, Li (2016) advocates a community engaged approach which is both cognitively aware of diverse stories connecting culture and place within a community, as well as emotionally sensitive to the disparities in power between narratives. As the author states: “In this process, the value of preservation increases as places elicit emotions, fragile and often difficult histories, and the relationships between communities and landscapes” (ibid: p.139).

For example, Na Li has written about history and the urban landscape at the Kensington Market in Toronto (2015). This analysis understands sense of place as both the mapping of factual descriptions and the oral histories of people who have immigrated into the area (Li, 2015). This approach considers the collective memory as imperative to the urban landscape. While it does not reference historic urban landscapes directly, Li’s narrative analysis of Kensington Market is a start towards acknowledging the complexity of landscapes and preserving the intangible values held within the built environment.

Indigenous Cultural Landscape³¹

In Canada, an Indigenous cultural landscape is a living landscape that gathers value because of the enduring relationship with place and the continuing importance to a group’s cultural identity. These landscapes are often characterized by networks of places, intimate knowledge of the physical environment and reciprocal relationships with animals, plants and spirits of the area. On-going, oral story sharing provides the basis for information and these landscapes are intertwined with the historical survival and identity of people.

“Main Street” Approach

The Main Street Approach “harnesses the social, economic, physical, and cultural assets that set a place apart and ultimately lead to tangible outcomes that can benefit the entire community” (Mainstreet.org, 2017). It relies on communities learning about the economy and how it fits into the larger regional context, while also understanding the ‘sense of place’ that exists through narratives, engagement and historical built environments. Its effectiveness relies on community member involvement and emotional, social and civic connection. The

³¹ <http://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/aboriginal-cultural-landscape/>

results from Main Street successes are a strong social community, sustainable economic opportunities, and a place where people with different perspectives can come together and shape the future.

The Main Street Four Points are the guiding framework and refer to: Economic Vitality, Design (of the physical elements), Promotion, and Organisation. The Main Street Approach uses visioning type exercises for communities to develop a common understanding of how their future will reflect the past, present and future people living there.

In 2015, the City of Edmonton developed a guideline for designating Main Streets. For Edmonton, Main Streets prioritize pedestrians, support a mix of street-oriented uses, and act as a strong community place³².

³² https://www.edmonton.ca/city_government/documents/MainStreet_Guidelines_Feb2016.pdf.

APPENDIX C: OTHER EDMONTON AREAS TO CONSIDER LANDSCAPE APPROACHES TO HERITAGE

107 Avenue/Avenue of Nations

The strip along 107 Avenue is home to people from all over the world including Africa, Middle Eastern countries, Cambodia, China, Indigenous, Italy, Japan, Latin America, Poland, and Ukraine. Often considered a rougher, more dangerous part of Edmonton, this community has had to deal with a harsh reputation and a lot of negative media attention. While the built environment may not illustrate a community with rich heritage and historical roots, the intangible, human stories are a hidden treasure in Edmonton. Through understanding how these stories link to the places and spaces people have created, whether spontaneously or designed, we can value the entanglement of story and place and acknowledge the necessity for both in a dynamic, authentic urban experience.

Beverly Heights

With the river framing the community on the southwest, the Beverly Heights neighbourhood also has ties to the river and a longstanding, active history. The current history of the community starts with the European settlers who came for the prospects of good soil and open space. Soon, coal was discovered and the removal of earth under the farmland began. The community grew on coal mining in the winter and farming in the summer with population booms and busts following the risky successes and failures of the coal mines. After the war, people from Edmonton were attracted to the community because of low housing prices and proximity to the city. The second bridge crossing the river and the Highway 16 helped connect the community and helped move people to and from Edmonton and Strathcona. Incorporated as a village in 1913, the community eventually amalgamated with Edmonton in 1961. The current neighbourhood sits between Rundle Park and Ada Boulevard and is well connected to the river and green spaces left from abandoned mining sites. While the coal mining history is rich in the area and still remains a memory for many community members today, the population is aging and changing. Ensuring that this history remains in the community is as important as reflecting the community that exists and recognising the diversity of histories that can be told of the same place.

Mill Creek

An oasis in the middle of the city is a thriving ecosystem of plants, animals and people. Initial plans in the 1960s called for the ravine to be turned into a thoroughfare similar to that currently at Groat Road. The combination of 3000 signatures on a petition against development, at the same time as a looming election eventually led to ravine development being taken off the agenda in 1964. In the 70s, the ravine was full of litter, eroding due to the roads above, and polluted. Finally in 1971, the freeway proposal was denied and the people have it back. Eventually the city connected this path system with paths along the North Saskatchewan River valley. While this history only goes back 50 years, there is a longer history of Cree people using and naming the Creek which is less known. The European histories are remembered through the naming of the Mill Creek reflecting the grist mill that was once operational at the end of the creek. The diverse histories of personal stories are remembered in City Archives, but less obvious in the ravine. The area is active with people moving through and taking advantage of the closeness to nature that exists here. Is there space in an already well used natural landscape to incorporate historical references or would bringing attention to the complexities that exist take away from the natural landscape that is well used today?

Griesbach

The Canadian Forces Base Griesbach was developed in the 1950s and became available for new uses in the early 2000s. This 250ha space was already developed with arterial roads and partially occupied with commercial and industrial buildings. Existing trees, recreational and school sites were planned into the initial developments of the area as residential units began to fill the vacant land. As an area with military and federal government ties, there is an opportunity to integrate the culture and histories of the people who lived and worked in the area. While the existing roads may have new uses connecting communities, acknowledging the places roads connected in the past can provide a link to the past. As a new community designed under new urbanist ideals, the community lacks a connection to culture and history and an identity beyond that of the larger Edmonton community. As a secluded space between main thoroughfares and in the heart of older developments, there is an opportunity for Griesbach to find an identity that is their own through the connecting the culture that exists today with that of the past.

104th Street/City Market

104th Street just north of Jasper Avenue has experienced the sort of urban renewal that can inspire other streets around the city. What started as a desolate strip of parking lots and vacant warehouses is now a premier street for retail and restaurants in Edmonton's downtown. A \$3.1 million project lead by Edmonton planners to widen sidewalks, add benches and light posts and make the area friendlier to pedestrians was completed in 1999. This redevelopment along with tax discounts for the first 1000 residential units developed from converted warehouses led to people coming into the area to live. The Cecil Hotel on Jasper and 104 St. was a problem spot and eventually closed due to health violations. The community that moved in became more active in fighting proposals that didn't fit the character of the street and City Council established new guidelines for new developments to reflect the historical elements of the warehouse district. While some developers may argue the guidelines are restrictive, the overall street appeal is necessary to maintain and a guideline approach may be the push that developers need to design their structures to benefit the entire community.

Urban renewal has also been helped by closing of 104st for the Edmonton City Market on Saturday mornings throughout the summer. A Market that was strife with difficulty from permitting and location to lack of pedestrian traffic has a longstanding history in the lives of Edmontonians. However, the Market was also questioned as being antiquated and a reminder of the rural past that (very likely) didn't reflect the City Beautiful Movement that city planners wanted. Where other towns and cities saw the farmers' markets as central to their commercial areas and local economy, Edmonton pushed against the market. Eventually, the Market found a home on the newly revitalized 104st and remains there today. It is a hub of activity and brings the much needed food traffic to vendors and retailers along the Street.

REFERENCE LIST

- Amin, A. (2002) Ethnicity and the multicultural city: living with diversity. *Environment and Planning*, 34(6), 959–980.
- Arefi, M. (1999) Non-place and placelessness as narratives of loss: Rethinking the notion of place. *Journal of Urban Design*, 4(2): 179-193.
- Artibise, A. (1981) Boosterism and the Development of Prairie Cities 1871-1913, pp. 209-236 in A. Artibise (ed.) *Town and City: aspects of Western Canadian urban development*. Regina: Canadian Plains Research Centre.
- Bandarin, F. & van Oers, R. (2012) *The Historic Urban Landscape: Managing Heritage in an Urban Century*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell
- Barber, L.B. (2013) Making meaning of heritage landscapes: The politics of redevelopment in Halifax, Nova Scotia. *The Canadian Geographer/le Geographe canadien*, 57, 90-112.
- Bianca, S. (2015) Morphology as the Study of City Form and Layering, pp. 85-102 in F. Bandarin & R. van Oers (eds.) *Reconnecting the City: The Historic Urban Landscape Approach and the Future of Urban Heritage*. Oxford: John Wiley and Sons.
- Binnema, T. & G. J. Ens (eds.) (2016) *The Hudson's Bay Company Edmonton House Journals: Reports from the Saskatchewan District Including the Bow River Expedition, 1821-1826*. Calgary: Historical Society of Alberta.
- Brown, A. and Kristiansen, A. (2009) *Urban Policies and the Right to the City: Rights, responsibilities and citizenship*. Paris, UNESCO.
- Buckle, B. (2015) *DRAFT Whyte Space Workshop Report and Recommendations*. Edmonton, AB: Heritage Collaborative.
- Canada's Historic Places (2010) *Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada*. Gatineau QC, Canada's Historic Places.
- Cardinal, N. (2006) The exclusive city: Identifying, measuring, and drawing attention to Aboriginal and Indigenous experiences in an urban context. *Cities*, 23(3), 217–228.
- City of Ballarat. (2013) *Ballarat and UNESCO's historic urban landscape approach*. Victoria, AU: City of Ballarat. Retrieved from <http://historicurbanlandscape.com/themes/196/userfiles/download/2014/5/16/pinx8xzux8svscr.pdf>
- City of Ballarat. (2015) *A Greener More Vibrant and Connected Ballarat (Final Report)* (p. 17). Victoria: City of Ballarat.
- City of Ballarat. (2016) *The HUL Guidebook: Managing heritage in dynamic and constantly changing urban environments*. Victoria, AU: City of Ballarat.
- City of Edmonton (2017a) *Historic Resources Management and Plan Website*. Edmonton, AB: City of Edmonton. Retrieved from: https://www.edmonton.ca/city_government/edmonton_archives/historic-resources-program-plan.aspx

- City of Edmonton (2017b) *River Crossing Heritage Interpretive Plan*. Edmonton, AB: City of Edmonton. Retrieved from: https://www.edmonton.ca/projects_plans/communities_neighbourhoods/west_rossdale/heritage-interpretive-plan.aspx
- Dumont, M. (2015) Rossdale & Reconciliation: can the flats development truly commemorate our indigenous history? *The Yards*, Fall Issue. <http://www.theyardsyeg.ca/rossdale-reconciliation> .
- Edmonton City as Museum Project (ECAMP) (2018) *Edmonton City as Museum Project homepage*. Retrieved from <http://citymuseumedmonton.ca/>
- Edmonton Heritage Council (2017). Edmonton's Urban Planning, Neighbourhood and Housing Evolution (DRAFT). Retrieved from: <https://www.cityofedmontoninfill.ca/public/download/documents/46666> .
- Eshuis, J. & Edwards, A., (2013) Branding the city: The democratic legitimacy of a new mode of governance. *Urban Studies*, 50(5), pp.1066-1082.
- Evolving Infill (2017) *Next Steps: Report to Urban Planning Committee*. Edmonton, AB: City of Edmonton. Retrieved from: <http://www.cityofedmontoninfill.ca/public/download/documents/39762>
- Falkirk THI (2015) *What is Falkirk THI?* Retrieved from: <http://falkirkthi.com/>
- Fawcett, B., Walker, R., & Greene, J. (2015) Indigenizing City Planning Processes in Saskatoon, Canada. *Canadian Journal of Urban Research*, 24(2), 158–175.
- Ferbrache, F. and Knowles, R.D., (2017) City boosterism and place-making with light rail transit: A critical review of light rail impacts on city image and quality. *Geoforum*, 80, pp.103-113.
- Gilpin, J. (1981) Failed Metropolis: The City of Strathcona, 1891-1912, pp.259-288 in A. Artibise (ed.) *Town and City: aspects of Western Canadian urban development*. Regina: Canadian Plains Research Centre.
- Goyette, L. & Roemmich, C.J. (2004) *Edmonton in our own words*. Edmonton: University of Alberta Press.
- Granzow, K., & Dean, A. (2007) Revanchism in the Canadian West: Gentrification and Resettlement in a Prairie City. *TOPLA*, 10(18), 89–106.
- Harvey, D. (2008) The right to the city. *New Left Review*, 53(2), 23–40.
- Harvey, D. (2005) *Paris, Capital of Modernity*. London, Routledge.
- Healey, P. (1997) *Collaborative Planning: Shaping Places in Fragmented Societies*. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Hopkins, J.S.P. (1990) West Edmonton Mall: Landscape of Myths and Elsewhere-ness. *The Canadian Geographer*, 34(1): 2-17.
- Jacobs, J. (1961) *The Death and Life of Great American Cities*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Jigyasu, R. (2015) The Intangible Dimension of Urban Heritage, pp. 129-160 in Bandarin, F. and van Oers, R. (eds.) *Reconnecting the City: The Historic Urban Landscape Approach and the Future of Urban Heritage*. Hoboken NJ: Wiley-Blackwee.

- Jones KE, Granzow M & Shields R. (2017) Urban virtues and the innovative city: An experiment in placing innovation in Edmonton, Canada. *Urban Studies*, online first, 1-17.
- Jones, KE and Zembal, V. (2017) Historical site or cultural hub? Reimagining heritage values in Old Strathcona. *Plan Canada*, 57 (4), 14-16.
- Lefebvre, H. (1996) *Writing on Cities*. London, Blackwell.
- Li, N. (2016) Whose History, Whose Memory? A Culturally Sensitive Narrative Approach, pp. 136-139 in Miller, M. R., & Page, M. (eds.) *Bending the Future : Fifty Ideas for the Next Fifty Years of Historic Preservation in the United States*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.
- Li, N. (2015) *Kensington Market: Collective memory, public history, and Toronto's urban landscape*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Mason, R. and Avrami, E. (2002) Heritage values and challenges of conservation planning, pp.13-26 in G. Palumbo and JM Teutonico (eds.) *Management planning for archaeological sites, proceedings of the Getty Conservation Institute Symposium*. Los Angeles: Getty Institute.
- O'Donnell, P. & Turner, M. (2012) *The Historic Urban Landscape Recommendation: A New UNESCO Tool for a Sustainable Future*. Cape Town: IFLA.
- Poulios, I. (2014) Discussing strategy in heritage conservation: living heritage approach as an example of strategic innovation. *Journal of Cultural Heritage Management and Sustainable Development*, 4(1), pp.16-34.
- Poulios, I. (2012) Renewable Energy Plant Development, Historic Environments, and Local Communities: Lessons from the Greek Experience, *The Historic Environment: Policy & Practice*, 3(2), 127-142.
- Poulios, I. (2010) Moving beyond a values-based approach to heritage conservation. *Conservation and Management of Archaeological Sites*, 12(2), pp.170-185.
- Rahman, A. 2017. *Edmonton Living Rooms: The Gatherings [Blog Post]*. Retrieved from: <https://edmontonheritage.ca/2017/05/18/edmonton-living-rooms-the-gatherings/>
- Rao, F. & Summers, R. (2016) Planning for retail resilience: Comparing Edmonton and Portland. *Cities*, 58, 97–106.
- Rodwell, D. (2015) Book Review: Reconnecting the city: the historic landscape approach and the future of urban heritage by F. Bandarin and R. Van Oers. *Journal of Architectural Conservation*,
- Scherer, J. & Davidson, J. (2010) Promoting the “arriviste” city: Producing neoliberal urban identity and communities of consumption during the Edmonton Oilers’ 2006 playoff campaign. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 46(2), 157–180.
- Shields, R. (1991) *Places on the margin: alternative geographies of modernity*. London: Routledge.
- Shields, R. Gillespie D & Moran K. (2018) *'Edmonton, Amiskwaciy: Suburbs for Settlers'* in J. Nijman (ed) *North American Suburbs*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

- Shiple, R. (2004) Townscape Heritage Initiatives Evaluation: methodology for assessing the effectiveness of Heritage Lottery Fund projects in the United Kingdom. *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy*, 22(4), 523–542.
- Sonkoly, G. (2017) *Historical Urban Landscape*. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Sonkoly, G. (2012) *The meanings of historic urban landscape*. French Network of Institutes for Advanced Study, Retrieved from <http://rfica.fr/articles/meanings-historic-urban-landscape>.
- Sykes, O. & Ludwig, C. (2015) Defining and managing the historic urban landscape: Reflections on the English experience and some stories from Liverpool. *European Spatial Research and Policy*. 22 (2): 9-35.
- Taylor, K. (2015) Cities as Cultural Landscapes, pp. 179-202 in in F. Bandarin and R. van Oers (eds.) *Reconnecting the City: The Historic Urban Landscape Approach and the Future of Urban Heritage*. Oxford: John Wiley and Sons.
- Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada (2017) *Calls to Action*. Winnipeg, Canada: National Centre for Truth and Reconciliation.
- UNESCO (2017) Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention. Paris: UNESCO.
- UNESCO (2015) The HUL Guidebook: Managing heritage in dynamic and constantly changing urban environments. Paris: UNESCO.
- UNESCO (2013) Swahili Historic Urban Landscapes: Report on the Historic Urban Landscape Workshops and Field Activities on the Swahili Coast of East Africa 2011-2012. Paris: UNESCO.
- UNESCO (2011) Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape. Paris: UNESCO.
- UNESCO (2005) Vienna Memorandum on World Heritage and Contemporary Architecture - Managing the Historic Urban Landscape. Paris: UNESCO.
- Van Assche, K., L. Deacon, M. Gruzmacher, B. Summers, S. Lavoie, K.E. Jones, M. Granzow, L. Hallstrom & J. Parkins (2016) *Boom & Bust: managing ups & downs in communities A Guide*. Edmonton: CRSC.
- Van Oers, R. (2014) Conclusion: The Way Forward: An Agenda for Reconnecting the City, pp. 317-332 in Bandarin F. and Van Oers, R. (eds.) *Reconnecting the City: The Historic Urban Landscape Approach and the Future of Urban Heritage*. Hoboken NJ: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Van Oers, R. (2007) Towards new international guidelines for the conservation of Historic Urban Landscapes (HUL). *City & Time*, 3(3), 43–51.
- Veldpauw, L. (2015) *Historic urban landscapes : framing the integration of urban and heritage planning in multilevel governance*. (Doctoral Thesis). Eindhoven University of Technology, Eindhoven, Netherlands. Retrieved from: <https://pure.tue.nl/ws/files/3914913/798291.pdf>
- Walker, R., Jojola, T., & Natcher, D. (2013) *Reclaiming Indigenous Planning*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press

Wall, K. (2002) Old Strathcona: Building character and commerce in a preservation district. *Urban History Review*. 30 (2): 28-40.

Wall, K. (2011) “A sliver of the true fort”: imagining Fort Edmonton, 1911–2011. *Journal of Heritage Tourism*, 6(2), 109–128.

WHITRAP. (2014) *Zanzibar HUL Initiative*. International Expert Workshop & Stakeholder Conference. Retrieved from:

<http://www.heritagelandscapes.com/SiteImages/file/HUL%20Zanzibar%202014%20Conference%20Recommendation.pdf>

FURTHER READING

- Agisheva, S. (2015) Historic Urban Landscape: Dreaming, Drawing, Design. *Furnace Journal*, 1(2), 84–89.
- Bahrami, B. & Samani, F. (2015) Reconnecting the Landscape in Historical Cities, Conceptual Analysis of Historic Urban Landscape Approach in Iran. *Current World Environment*, 10(2), 456–466.
- Bandarin, F. & van Oers, R. (2015) *Reconnecting the City: the Historic Urban Landscape Approach and the Future of Urban Heritage*. Oxford: John Wiley and Sons.
- Centre for eResearch and Digital Innovation. (2015) *Historic Urban Landscape and Visualising Ballarat Impact Analysis (Final Report)*.
- City of Ballarat. (2013) *Ballarat and UNESCO’s historic urban landscape approach*. Presented at the Ballarat and UNESCO’s Historic Urban Landscape Approach, Victoria. Retrieved from <http://historicurbanlandscape.com/themes/196/userfiles/download/2014/5/16/pinx8xzux8vsucr.pdf>
- City of Edmonton. (2015) *Our growing city, Annual Growth Monitoring Report*. Edmonton: City of Edmonton. Retrieved from https://www.edmonton.ca/city_government/documents/2015-Growth-Monitoring-Report.pdf
- City of Edmonton. (2009) *Historic Resource Management Plan - Planning and Development (report)*. Edmonton, AB: City of Edmonton. Retrieved from https://www.edmonton.ca/city_government/documents/PDF/HistoricResourcePlanMay2009.pdf
- Folin-Calabi, L. (2011) *UNESCO’s Historic Urban Landscape recommendation and its early application*. Presented at the Urban Sector Week 2011, World Bank HQ, Washington, D.C. Retrieved from <http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTCHD/Resources/430063-1297460666003/Folin-Calabi.pdf>
- Girard, L. F. (2013) *Toward a Smart Sustainable Development of Port Cities/Areas: The Role of the “Historic Urban Landscape” Approach*. *Sustainability*, 17(5), 4329–4348
- Guoping, W. (2014) *Conserving Historic Urban Landscape and Beautifying the city by means of its history*. *Conservation Science in Cultural Heritage*, 14(2), 13–32.
- Hayden, D. (1997) *The Power of Place: Urban Landscapes as Public History* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press)
- Jones KE, Lord A & Shields R. (2015) *City-regions in prospect: Exploring the meeting points between place and practice*. Montreal: MQUP.
- Jones, S. (2009) *Experiencing Authenticity at Heritage Sites: Some Implications for Management and Conservation*. *Conservation and Management of Archaeological Sites*, 11(2), 133-147.
- Kovacs, J., Shipley, R., Snyder, M., & Copeland, S. (2008) *Do Heritage Conservation Districts Work? The Case of Kitchener’s Upper Doon District*. *Canadian Journal of Urban Research*, 17(2), 125–141.
- Landry, C. (2006) *The Art of City Making*. London: Earthscan.
- Martini, V. (2013) *The conservation of Historic Urban Landscapes: an approach (Dissertation)*. University of Nova Gorica Graduate School Venice.

- Miller, M. R., and Page, M. (2016) *Bending the Future : Fifty Ideas for the Next Fifty Years of Historic Preservation in the United States*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.
- Shields, R. (2013) *Spatial Questions: Cultural Topologies and Social Spatialisation*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Shiple, R. (2000) Heritage Designation and Property Values: is there an effect? *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 6(1), 83–100.
- Shiple, R. (2008) Do Heritage conservation districts work? The case of Kitchener’s Upper Doon District. *Canadian Journal of Urban Research*. 17(2). 125-141.
- Shiple, R., & Snyder, M. (2012) The role of heritage conservation districts in achieving community economic development goals. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 19(3), 304–321.
- Shiple, R., Utz, S., & Parsons, M. (2006) Does Adaptive Reuse Pay? A Study of the Business of Building Renovation in Ontario, Canada. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 12(6), 505–520.
- UN Habitat. (2013) *State of the world’s cities 2012/2013 Prosperity of cities*. Nairobi: UN-HABITAT. Retrieved from <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/content/documents/745habitat.pdf>
- UNESCO. (2013) *New life for historic cities: the Historic Urban Landscape approach explained*. UNESCO.
- Van Oers, R. (2013) Road map for application of the HUL approach in China. *Journal of Cultural Heritage Management and Sustainable Development*, 3(1), 4–17.
- Veldpaus, L., & Roders, P. (2013) *Historic Urban Landscapes: An Assessment Framework*. Eindhoven University of Technology. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/260124111_Historic_Urban_Landscapes_An_Assessment_Framework

ABOUT US

Both the City-Region Studies Centre and the Edmonton Heritage Council have experience with creative, community engaged research methods, including urban touring, neighbourhood conversations, community planning charrettes and the use of collaborative mapping. These methods lead to the type of narrative collection and story sharing that is central to all HUL approaches.

City-Region Studies Centre (CRSC): Part of the Faculty of Extension at the University of Alberta, CRSC is an innovative research and community engagement center dedicated to encouraging meaningful conversation and community action. We engage people interested in city-region planning, community development, governance and placemaking. They are known for our engaged research that relies on participatory approach to. Through community engagement, public lectures, neighbourhood tours, and workshops, CRSC creates connections and builds relationships between community expertise and action and academic knowledge in Edmonton and globally.

Edmonton Heritage Council (EHC): Edmonton Heritage Council connects people with the stories of their city. Through leadership, support, and programs, EHC embraces the diverse heritage of Edmonton, inclusive of all people, communities and cultures on Treaty Six territory to engage with the past and create a vibrant future.

MITACS Accelerate: As a matching funder to internships like the one that supported this work, MITACS supports partnerships between academia, industry, government and community partners. It is a Canadian non-profit organisation and has supported over 10,000 internships over the past 15 years. The focus of their partnership is to strengthen connections, improve economic performance and create jobs for students at over 60 universities across the country. This is done through providing half of the funding necessary for internships that require students to spend time outside of academia, such as this one, online and in-class training courses

Project Contact Information:

City-Region Studies Centre, Faculty of Extension
University of Alberta
Dr. Kevin E. Jones and Dr. Rob Shields
T: 780-492-9957
E: kjones4@ualberta.ca / rshields@ualberta.ca
www.ualberta.ca/city-region-studies-centre

Edmonton Heritage Council
David Ridley, Executive Director
T: 780-429-0166
E: info@edmontonheritage.ca
www.edmontonheritage.ca

This document was prepared by Kevin E. Jones and Vanessa Zembal, with input from Rob Shields and David Ridley.