

DRAFT

AMENDMENT NO. XX

MUNICIPALITY OF MEAFORD

DOWNTOWN MEAFORD HERITAGE CONSERVATION DISTRICT PLAN AND
GUIDELINES

AN AMENDMENT TO IMPLEMENT

THE UPDATE TO THE

**DOWNTOWN MEAFORD HERITAGE CONSERVATION DISTRICT PLAN
AND GUIDELINES**

DECLARATION

IN THE MATTER OF OFFICIAL PLAN AMENDMENT XX

IN THE MUNICIPALITY OF MEAFORD

I, Margaret Wilton-Siegel, in my capacity as Clerk for the Municipality of Meaford, hereby declare that the attached text and schedules constituting Amendment No. XX to the Downtown Meaford Heritage Conservation District Plan and Guidelines (DMHC DP) was adopted by Council for the Municipality of Meaford on **INSERT DATE**, as amended, in accordance with Section 41.1(1) of the *Ontario Heritage Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. O.18

Margaret Wilton-Siegel, Clerk
Municipality of Meaford

Date

Contents

THE CONSTITUTIONAL STATEMENT	4
PART A THE PREAMBLE	5
Purpose.....	5
Location	5
PART B THE AMENDMENT	6
Introductory Statement	6
Details of the Amendment.....	6
TABLE A – General Wording Amendments to the DMHCDP.....	7
TABLE B – Amendments to Section 1 of Part A of the DMHCDP	8
TABLE C – Amendments to Section 4 of Part A of the DMHCDP	17
TABLE D – Amendments to Section 6 of Part A of the DMHCDP.....	31
TABLE E – Amendments to Part B of the DMHCDP	33
TABLE F – Amendments to Figures and Appendices of the DMHCDP.....	42

THE CONSTITUTIONAL STATEMENT

Part A, The Preamble, does not constitute part of this Amendment.

Part B, The Amendment, consisting of XX items, constitutes Amendment No. XX to the Downtown Meaford Heritage Conservation District Plan and Guidelines (DMHCDP) for the Municipality of Meaford. The title of Amendment No. XX is "An Amendment to Update the Downtown Meaford Heritage Conservation District Plan and Guidelines".

PART A THE PREAMBLE

Purpose

The purpose of this Amendment is to update the Downtown Meaford Heritage Conservation District Plan and Guidelines (DMHCDP) for the Municipality of Meaford. This update was undertaken in accordance with Section 6.0 of the Downtown Meaford Heritage Conservation Plan and Guidelines which state as follows:

It is recommended that the Municipality of Meaford implement a 5-7 year review process related to the Heritage Conservation District Plan, in order to help ensure that the document remains up to date with current heritage planning best practices, and that it reflects the needs of the community.

This update has been completed in accordance with the review process outlined in the DMHCDP.

This update has also been undertaken to comply with any updates to the *Ontario Heritage Act*, and to be consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement (2020).

Prior to this review the Province had released draft updated Ontario Heritage Toolkit dated June 2021. This update has regard to the draft updated Ontario Heritage Toolkit.

Location

The area to which this Amendment applies to the Downtown Meaford Heritage Conservation District within the Municipality of Meaford, as approved by By-law 067-2014 and amended by the Ontario Municipal Board via oral decision dated January 28, 2015 (File No. MM140066).

PART B THE AMENDMENT

Introductory Statement

All of this part constitutes Amendment No. XX to the Downtown Meaford Heritage Conservation District Plan and Guidelines (DMHCDP) for the Municipality of Meaford.

Details of the Amendment

The Amendment consists of 33 items.

The DMHCDP are amended as follows:

1. Items a) through f) are changes to text and tables.

Specified sections of the Plan are amended as per the following tables of this Amendment:

- a) TABLE A – General Wording Amendments to the DMHCDP
- b) TABLE B – Amendments to Section 1 of Part A of the DMHCDP
- c) TABLE C – Amendments to Section 4 of Part A of the DMHCDP
- d) TABLE D – Amendments to Section 6 of Part A of the DMHCDP
- e) TABLE E – Amendments to Part B of the DMHCDP
- f) TABLE F – Amendments to Figures and Appendices of the DMHCDP

Items 29 through 33– changes to and addition of Figures – are found in Table F – Amendments to Figures and Appendices of the DMHCDP.

TABLE A – General Wording Amendments to the DMHCDP

The following changes are made throughout the entire DMHCDP.

Item No.	Policy Number	Details of the Amendment
1.	N/A	Delete “adverse effects” and replace with “negative impact”

TABLE B – Amendments to Section 1 of Part A of the DMHCDP

Item No.	Policy Number	Details of the Amendment
2.	1.1	Add the following after the last paragraph: The Downtown Meaford Heritage Conservation District Plan and Guidelines was adopted by Council on July 28, 2014 and approved by the Ontario Municipal Board on February 3, 2015. The lands are designated under Part V of the Ontario Heritage Act. In 2021 and 2022, the Municipality of Meaford undertook an initiative to update the Downtown Meaford Heritage Conservation District Plan and Guidelines.
3.	1.5	Delete: The Downtown Meaford Heritage Conservation District occupies an ideal settlement location on the southern shore of Georgian Bay within the Bighead Valley, an indentation in the Niagara Escarpment that formed prior to the glacial period. The District is distinguished by the Sykes Street corridor, the Nelson Street link between the downtown and the waterfront, the Bay Shore, the Big Head River and the harbour. These comprise components of the original settlement patterns developed by Charles Rankin. The growth and transformation of Meaford from wilderness to settled community over two centuries is accounted for by a variety of historical themes of human activity that when woven together provide a richly patterned cultural heritage resource and several key historical themes. Commercial enterprises began to concentrate along Sykes Street in the latter half of the 19th century, forming a downtown corridor in the village. Numerous fires in the latter 19th century and early 20th century resulted in two decades of building and re-building and created a downtown corridor with a relatively uniform character and materials palette. Fires and development changes between Sykes Street and the waterfront resulted in a more mixed appearance, with structures of varying dates, styles and alterations. The

Item No.	Policy Number	Details of the Amendment
		remaining residential areas developed throughout the last two centuries, with houses spanning a wide range of construction dates and styles. The mixed character of the residential neighbourhoods reflects typical changes of southern Ontario village life over time. The landscape context and visual character of the study area are also contributing factors to the cultural heritage of Meaford. The harbour and development within the commercial core and along the river provide important historical context for the study area. Few historic elements of the streetscape exist, but the principles remain. These include: pedestrian environment; views to the water; linkages and access to the water; off-street parking behind/beside buildings; and the central square (former parade grounds) between Collingwood and Nelson Street. The cultural heritage value of the Downtown Meaford Heritage Conservation District is vested in historical associations with the development of mill and industrial sites. The harbour was not large enough to accommodate big ships; however, the Big Head River provided a good source of water power for the development of milling and factory sites. Historical associations with transportation, military and mercantile activities are also important: Nelson Street was envisioned as the primary commerce area and was designed as a wider street for military purposes; the commercial activity clustered on Nelson Street near the harbour indicated the importance of that location for shipping and transportation. Replace with:

Item No.	Policy Number	Details of the Amendment	
		Design/Physical value	The overall character of the area is an eclectic mix that includes commercial and residential buildings that range in date from the 1860s to the present. While North Sykes Street is almost entirely commercial, other streets exhibit a mix of residential and commercial buildings. Commercial enterprises began to concentrate along North Sykes Street in the latter half of the 19th century, forming a downtown corridor in the village. Numerous fires in the latter 19th century and early 20th century resulted in two decades of building and re-building and created a downtown corridor with a relatively uniform character and materials palette, generally characterized by red brick façades with Italianate influence in design. Fires and development changes between North Sykes Street and the waterfront resulted in a more mixed appearance, with structures of varying dates, styles and alterations. The remaining residential areas developed throughout the last two centuries, with houses spanning a wide range of construction dates and styles. The mixed character of the residential neighbourhoods reflects typical growth of southern

Item No.	Policy Number	Details of the Amendment	
			Ontario village life over time. Residential neighbourhoods within the study area contain houses in a variety of styles. There are many examples of vernacular construction with modifications such as alterations, window and entrance replacements and synthetic cladding. Even with the alterations, some buildings still demonstrate historic form and proportions. There are also a number of good examples of particular architectural styles, including Gothic Revival, Italianate, Second Empire, Queen Anne and Edwardian.
		Historical/Associative Value	The area of the Downtown Meaford Heritage Conservation District has a high potential for aboriginal activity sites due to the generally well-drained soil, potable water sources and navigation routes along the shoreline of Georgian Bay and the Bighead River. Pre-European settlement, the area was traveled by "Petun" natives (Algonquin and Hurons) who likely fished, hunted and camped in the area. There are minimal documented accounts or remnants of pre-European Settlement within the Downtown Meaford Heritage Conservation District. As such, the present cultural heritage value of the Downtown Meaford Heritage Conservation District is vested in historical

Item No.	Policy Number	Details of the Amendment	
			associations with the European settlement and the development of mill and industrial sites. The harbour was not large enough to accommodate big ships; however, the Big Head River provided a good source of waterpower for the development of milling and factory sites. Historical associations with transportation, military and mercantile activities are also important: Nelson Street was envisioned as the primary commerce area and was designed as a wider street for military purposes; the commercial activity clustered on Nelson Street near the harbour indicated the importance of that location for shipping and transportation.
		Contextual Value	The District is distinguished by the North Sykes Street corridor, the Nelson Street link between the downtown and the waterfront, the Bay Shore, the Big Head River and the harbour. These comprise components of the original settlement patterns developed by Charles Rankin. The landscape context and visual character of the study area are contributing factors to the cultural heritage of Meaford. The Downtown Meaford Heritage Conservation District occupies an ideal settlement location on the southern shore of Georgian Bay within the Bighead

Item No.	Policy Number	Details of the Amendment	
			Valley, an indentation in the Niagara Escarpment that formed prior to the glacial period. The harbour and development within the commercial core and along the river provide important historical context for the study area. Few historic elements of the streetscape exist, but the principles remain. These include: pedestrian environment; views to the water; linkages and access to the water; off-street parking behind/beside buildings; and the central square (former parade grounds) between Collingwood and Nelson Street.
4.	1.7	Delete: Adverse effects include those conditions resulting in the attrition of heritage properties and include: the destruction, loss, removal or incompatible alteration of all or part of a heritage property; the isolation of a heritage property from its surrounding streetscape or setting; or the introduction of physical, visual, audible or atmospheric elements that are not in character with a heritage property and/or its setting. Replace with: Negative impact in regard to cultural heritage resource includes, but is not limited to: • Destruction of any, or part of any, significant heritage attributes or features; • Alteration that is not sympathetic, or is incompatible, with the historic fabric and appearance;	

Item No.	Policy Number	Details of the Amendment
		• Shadows created that alter the appearance of a heritage attribute or change the viability of a natural feature or plantings, such as a garden; • Isolation of a heritage attribute from its surrounding environment, context or a significant relationship; • Direct or indirect obstruction of significant views or vistas within, from, or of built and natural features; • A change in land use such as rezoning a battlefield from open space to residential use, allowing new development or site alteration to fill in the formerly open spaces; • Land disturbances such as a change in grade that alters soils, and drainage patterns that adversely affect an archaeological resource.
5.	1.7	Delete: Cultural heritage landscape means a defined geographical area of heritage significance which has been modified by human activities and is valued by a community. It involves a grouping(s) of individual heritage features such as structures, spaces, archaeological site and natural elements, which together form a significant type of heritage form, distinctive from that of its constituent elements or parts. Replace with: Cultural heritage landscape means a defined geographical area that may have been modified by human activity and is identified as having cultural heritage value or interest by a community, including an Indigenous community. The area may include features such as buildings, structures, spaces, views, archaeological sites or natural elements that are valued together for their interrelationship, meaning or

Item No.	Policy Number	Details of the Amendment
		association. Cultural heritage landscapes may be properties that have been determined to have cultural heritage value or interest under the <i>Ontario Heritage Act</i> or have been included on federal and/or international registers, and/or protected through official plan, zoning by-law, or other land use planning mechanisms.
6.	1.7	Delete: Conserved, (also conserve) means the identification, protection, use and/or management of cultural heritage and archaeological resources in such a way that their heritage values, attributes and integrity are retained. Replace with: Conserved means the identification, protection, management and use of built heritage resources, cultural heritage landscapes and archaeological resources in a manner that ensures their cultural heritage value or interest is retained. This may be achieved by the implementation of recommendations set out in a conservation plan, archaeological assessment, and/or heritage impact assessment that has been approved, accepted or adopted by the relevant planning authority and/or decision- maker. Mitigative measures and/or alternative development approaches can be included in these plans and assessments.
7.	1.7	Add after the concluding sentence to the definition of "Heritage Attribute": Heritage Attributes may include the built, constructed, or manufactured elements, as well as natural landforms, vegetation, water features, and its visual setting (e.g. significant views or vistas to or from a protected heritage property).
8.	1.7	Delete:

Item No.	Policy Number	Details of the Amendment
		Restoration means to return a heritage property to a known earlier form, by reassembly and reinstatement of lost features or attributes, and/or by the removal of features that detract from its heritage values, attributes and integrity. Replace with: Restoration means the action or process of accurately revealing, recovering or representing the state of a historic place or of an individual component, as it appeared at a particular period in its history, while protecting its heritage value.

TABLE C – Amendments to Section 4 of Part A of the DMHCDP

Item No.	Policy Number	Details of the Amendment
9.	4.0.3	Add after the third bullet: • Members of the Municipal Heritage Committee
10.	4.2.3	Delete: 4.2.3 Height of additions Existing commercial building heights are predominately two to three storeys in the District. The maximum building height in the C1 zone, which covers the commercial core area of the District, is 11.0 m (36'). a) The maximum building height permitted for properties facing Sykes Street will be maintained at 11.0 m. An additional storey (to a maximum of four) may be considered in accordance with the Municipality of Meaford Official Plan density bonusing provisions where applicable criteria are met. b) Throughout the remainder of the Downtown Meaford Heritage Conservation District, the maximum height allowed will be the maximum height allowed within the Downtown Commercial area as defined by the Municipality of Meaford Zoning By-law, or as later permitted in accordance with the Municipality of Meaford Official Plan bonusing provisions. c) In order to maintain the existing street wall, there will be a presumption that any multi-storey proposal to increase the height of any building beyond its original roof line shall be stepped back from the existing front wall plane in order to be unobtrusive in the streetscape and to differentiate the addition from the older structure, unless the applicant can clearly demonstrate that a step back is not required to meet these objectives. Replace with: 4.2.3 Height of additions

Item No.	Policy Number	Details of the Amendment
		Existing commercial building heights are predominately two to three storeys in the District. However, building heights appear to vary on a block-by-block basis. The heights of buildings on these blocks should be conserved. The lands along east side of North Sykes Street between East Collingwood Street and East Nelson Street are primarily vacant. It is recommended that buildings be permitted to be constructed to a maximum height of four-storeys along this stretch in order to encourage redevelopment, as the visual impact of these parking areas adversely impacts the pedestrian character of the District. In this regard, the following policies apply: a) The maximum permitted height for properties along Sykes Street will be as per Schedule B – Recommended Building Heights Along Sykes Street. One additional storey may be permitted beyond the heights identified in Schedule B, provided that such addition is appropriately setback from the front façade or other special design considerations are made, such as a change in materials that ensures that such addition is visually distinguishable and subordinate to the existing commercial building. b) Throughout the remainder of the Downtown Meaford Heritage Conservation District, the maximum height allowed will be the maximum height allowed within the Downtown Commercial area as shall be directed by the Municipality of Meaford Zoning By-law. Applications to amend changes to the zoning by-law shall be accompanied by a Heritage Impact Assessment and be required to demonstrate that significant impacts to adjacent cultural heritage resources are appropriately mitigated.

Item No.	Policy Number	Details of the Amendment
		c) In order to maintain the existing street wall, there will be a presumption that any multi-storey proposal to increase the height of any building beyond its original roof line shall be stepped back from the existing front wall plane or provide for a change in material that ensures that such addition is visually distinguishable and subordinate to the existing commercial building in order to be unobtrusive in the streetscape and to differentiate the addition from the older structure. d) Applications proposing additions to existing commercial building shall only be approved if it is demonstrated that the structural integrity of the heritage building is maintained.
11.	4.3.2	Add to the end of this section: The maximum permitted height for properties along Sykes Street will be as per Schedule B – Recommended Building Heights Along Sykes Street.” One additional storey may be permitted beyond the heights identified in Schedule B, provided that such addition is appropriately setback from the front façade, or other special design considerations are made, such as a change in materials that ensures that any excess in height visually distinguishable and subordinate to the storeys below.
12.	4.5.9	Add new section: 4.5.9 Additional Residential Units Sections 16(3) and 35.1 (1) of the <i>Planning Act</i> require municipalities to contain Official Plan policies and Zoning By-law provisions that authorize the use of additional residential units by authorizing, a) the use of two residential units in a detached house, semi-detached house or rowhouse; and

Item No.	Policy Number	Details of the Amendment
		b) the use of a residential unit in a building or structure ancillary to a detached house, semi-detached house or rowhouse. 2019, c. 9, Sched. 12, s. 2 (1). In this regard, additional residential units are permitted that are “physically and visually compatible with, subordinate to, heritage attributes within the District.” The following policies apply: a) Additional residential units to heritage buildings are encouraged to be located in an accessory building at the rear of the Subject Lands or within the existing building. b) Extensions to heritage buildings for additional residential units is generally discouraged, but if required, shall be located to the rear of the existing building. c) Additions to heritage buildings for additional residential units shall comply with Section 4.5 and 4.6 of this Plan.
13.	4.8.1	Delete: b) Building heights along Sykes Street shall be no more than three storeys or 11.0 m. The remainder of the Downtown Meaford Heritage Conservation District may build to the acceptable limits of the Municipality of Meaford Zoning By-law. As outlined in the Municipality of Meaford Official Plan, additional heights may be permitted in accordance with applicable bonusing provisions (four storeys total along Sykes Street and five storeys total elsewhere). Replace with: b) Building heights along Sykes Street shall be in accordance with Schedule B – Recommended Building Heights Along Sykes Street. The remainder of the Downtown Meaford Heritage

Item No.	Policy Number	Details of the Amendment
		Conservation District may build to the acceptable limits of the Municipality of Meaford Zoning By-law Add the following: h) It is the intent of this plan that a commercial street wall be maintained and enhanced along North Sykes Street from Berry Street to Collingwood Street. In this regard any new or redevelopment along this corridor shall be required to face and provide pedestrian access from North Sykes Street. i) Long stretches of building fronts can make the pedestrian experience monotonous. Development or redevelopment outside of the Commercial Street wall along North Sykes Street from Berry Street to Collingwood Street shall incorporate architectural detailing elements that help break down their massing, such as fenestration patterns or pilasters. These elements should be provided at 4 to 7 metre internals.
14.	4.8.3	Add new section: 4.8.3 Vacant and Underutilized Sites Policies Vacant and underutilized sites have been identified within the Downtown Meaford Heritage Conservation District. These sites are generally shown on Appendix B attached to the DMHCDP. The Municipality will encourage compatible development of these sites by: a) Continuing to provide grant funding which would encourage remediation of these sites (e.g., environmental study grants and brownfield assistance programs) and removing financial barriers to redevelopment (e.g. parkland dedication fee equivalent grants, commercial development charge grant & tax incremental equivalent grant);

Item No.	Policy Number	Details of the Amendment
		b) Consider relaxing regulatory requirements including Zoning By-laws that pose barriers to development, pertaining to the following: i. Uses; ii. Minor Increases to height provided that the proposed redevelopment is compatible with the heritage and character of the District and consistent with the Official Plan. c) Consider undertaking a Comprehensive Vacant Lands Redevelopment Study and Strategy for the Downtown Meaford Heritage Conservation District.
15.	4.9.1	Delete: 4.9.1 Demolition of heritage buildings and structures a) The demolition of heritage buildings and structures shall not be permitted, except in extenuating circumstances such as natural disasters (e.g. fire, flood, tornado, and earthquake). b) Other extenuating circumstances shall generally constitute those situations where public health and safety is considered to be compromised and the Municipality of Meaford's Chief Building Official has received structural assessment advising that a building or structure is beyond repair and has been determined to be unsafe. The economic feasibility of undertaking building repair may also be considered by staff and Council in determining whether demolition should be permitted. The assessment must be prepared by a professional engineer with expertise and experience in heritage buildings and structures.

Item No.	Policy Number	Details of the Amendment
		c) Where time is of the essence, the requirements for a heritage permit may be waived but it will be expected that in lieu of a heritage permit, the property owner shall retain an appropriately qualified heritage professional to record the building or the remains of the building through photography and/or measured drawings. Such recording shall be guided by existing structural conditions and the level of access that is considered by the Chief Building Official (or appropriate Emergency Responders) to be safe. d) Where the property owner is unable to retain a heritage professional, heritage staff of the Municipality of Meaford shall be accorded reasonable access to the property by the property owner to undertake appropriate recording. e) It shall be required that once a building has been demolished and the property is considered to be in a stable and safe state the property owner shall submit a heritage permit application for a new building within six months of site clearance. Within two years of that submission, or as mutually agreed upon by the property owner and the Municipality of Meaford, new construction has not been completed, the provisions of the Ontario Heritage Act shall apply with respect to contraventions of the Act. Replace with: 4.9.1 Demolition of heritage buildings and structures a) The demolition of heritage buildings and structures shall not be permitted, except in extenuating circumstances such as natural disasters (e.g. fire, flood, tornado, and earthquake), or situations where public health and safety is considered to be

Item No.	Policy Number	Details of the Amendment
		compromised, as determined by the Chief Building Official. b) Notice of intention to demolish or remove a building or structure from a designated property is made by the applicant, by completing an application form for a Heritage Permit and provided to a Heritage Planner. c) A Heritage Permit application may not be required where the Chief Building Official required a building to be demolished in accordance with the Building Code Act, 1992, S.O. 1992, c. 23. d) A Heritage Permit application shall be accompanied by the following at the discretion of Municipal Staff: - i.Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment; - ii.Photographs of the existing building or structure; - iii.Measured drawings of the existing site; - iv.A title search; - v.Structural assessment, and/or engineering reports; and - vi.Site plan and architectural elevations of a replacement building. e) A notice of intention to demolish for a heritage property will not be deemed to be received or complete unless/until it is accompanied by any plans or information required by Municipal Staff. f) Any assessment shall be guided by existing structural conditions and the level of access that is considered

Item No.	Policy Number	Details of the Amendment
		by the Chief Building Official (or appropriate Emergency Responders) to be safe. g) Any information submitted with a Heritage Permit for demolition may be subject to a peer review at the Applicant's expense. h) Permits pertaining to the demolition of heritage buildings and structures may be subject to the following conditions: i. That prior to demolition, a salvage plan prepared to record and document the building proposed to be demolished and to identify items that should be considered for salvaging, and to identify which, if any materials are to be incorporated into the redevelopment of the lands; and that demolition and redevelopment proceed in accordance with the approved salvage plan; ii. That a heritage permit application for a new building be submitted within six (6) months of site clearance, and that within two years of that submission, or as mutually agreed upon by the property owner and the Municipality of Meaford, new construction has not been completed, the provisions of the Ontario Heritage Act shall apply with respect to contraventions of the Act. iii. That prior to demolition, or a redevelopment of the lands, the applicant prepare a commemoration plan which may identify the reuse of salvaged materials, placement of plaques, or naming of features in the redevelopment.

Item No.	Policy Number	Details of the Amendment
16.	4.9.2	Delete: 4.9.2 Removal of heritage buildings and structures a) The removal of heritage buildings and structures may be permitted with the submission and approval of a heritage permit application by Municipal Council. b) The removal of heritage buildings and structures shall be considered as an extraordinary and temporary measure and it shall be expected that any building façade (as part of a commercial property) included as part of a submitted heritage permit application shall be recorded, disassembled, stored in a climatically controlled and secure storage facility until such time that it is reassembled on-site in its original location. c) The Municipality shall require notification of the location of the storage facility or any changes in the location, access to the location if required by Municipal staff and shall require these as part of any conditions of approval. Replace with: 4.9.2 Temporary Removal of heritage buildings and structures a) The temporary removal of heritage buildings and structures may be permitted with the submission and approval of a heritage permit application by Municipal Council. b) The temporary removal of heritage buildings and structures shall be considered as an extraordinary and temporary measure and it shall be expected that any building façade (as part of a commercial property) included as part of a submitted heritage

Item No.	Policy Number	Details of the Amendment
		permit application shall be recorded, disassembled, stored in a climatically controlled and secure storage facility until such time that it is reassembled on-site in its original location. c) A Heritage Permit application for the temporary removal of heritage buildings and structures shall be accompanied by the following at the discretion of Municipal Staff: i. Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment; ii. Photographs of the existing building or structure; iii. Measured drawings of the existing site; iv. A title search; v. Conservation Plan; vi. Structural assessment, and/or engineering reports; and vii. Site plan and architectural elevations of a replacement building. d) The Municipality shall require notification of the location of the storage facility or any changes in the location, access to the location if required by Municipal staff and shall require these as part of any conditions of approval.
17.	4.11.4	Delete: 4.11.4 Parking areas

Item No.	Policy Number	Details of the Amendment
		a) Parking lots should be well lit with fixtures that are full cut off and night sky friendly. Edges of parking lots should be clearly defined with hedges or low walls. Any additions to parking lots should consider introduction of pedestrian routes through the lot where a visitor can be collected after exiting their car and walk safely to the nearest sidewalk. b) As parking lots are improved in the future, the addition of sustainable design features should be considered, including infiltration beds and water quality improvements such as stormwater settlement chambers (storm scepters). c) Bicycle parking may be accommodated in the future, in locations where they are not intrusive to the pedestrian environment. If bicycle shelters are proposed, they would be better-suited to side streets or parking lots, due to their space requirements. Replace with: 4.11.4 Municipal and Public Parking Areas a) It is recognized that much of the development in the District pre-dates common use of automobiles. In this regard, the District was designed to be pedestrian oriented. The establishment of large-scale parking areas is anticipated to impact this character-defining elements of the District. Parking demand management should be prioritized as an alternative to establishing new parking areas. Parking demand management focuses on reducing the need for automobiles by encouraging shared parking, active modes of transportation such as walking and cycling, adjusting parking standards to accurately reflect demand in a particular situation, encouraging a mix

Item No.	Policy Number	Details of the Amendment
		of-uses, and charging motorists for parking in the Downtown. b) It is the intent of this Plan that the street-wall along North Sykes Street between Berry Street and Collingwood Street be maintained and enhanced. To meet this objective, it is the intent that parking areas along Sykes Street be redeveloped over time to “fill-in” the street-wall. New parking areas shall not be established along Sykes Street. c) Parking lots are discouraged from being constructed at grade. Surface parking lots will be appropriately screened and may be constructed to the rear of buildings. d) Parking lots shall be well-designed and complement the character of the District. Parking lots should be well lit with fixtures that are full cut off to ensure that light is directed downwards, and facilitates a night sky friendly. Edges of parking lots should be clearly defined with hedges or low walls. Any additions to parking lots should include introduction of pedestrian routes through the lot where a visitor can be collected after exiting their car and walk safely to the nearest sidewalk. e) As parking lots are improved in the future, the addition of sustainable design features should be included, including infiltration beds and water quality improvements such as stormwater settlement chambers (storm sceptors). f) Bicycle parking shall be accommodated in the future, in locations where they are not intrusive to the pedestrian environment. If bicycle shelters are proposed, they would be better-suited to side streets or parking lots, due to their space requirements.

Item No.	Policy Number	Details of the Amendment
		g) Buildings shall not be demolished for the purpose of extending or constructing new parking lots.

TABLE D – Amendments to Section 6 of Part A of the DMHCDP

Item No.	Policy Number	Details of the Amendment
17.	6.1	Add new section: 6.1 Complete Applications for Heritage Permits a) All proposals for new construction or to alter the exterior appearance of properties within a Heritage Conservation District must be approved by Municipal Council or Municipal Staff in accordance with By-laws approved under the Ontario Heritage Act, and a permit must be issued before any work may begin, provided that such work is not exempt under Section 5.0 of this Plan. b) Prior to an application, a property owner shall arrange with a preliminary meeting with Municipal Staff and determine requirements for a complete application. c) All proposals shall be accompanied by a completed Heritage Permit Application Form including: • Current Photograph(s) of the Property / Building • Drawings/Sketches of the Proposed Alternations to the Existing Property / Building d) Council may require the following additional technical cultural heritage studies in support of a Heritage Permit Application: • Heritage Impact Assessment; • Measured drawings of the existing site; • A title search; • Conservation Plan; • Assessment of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest (9/06 assessment); and • Structural assessment, and/or engineering reports. e) The scope of any required study shall be completed in consultation with Municipal Staff and shall be guided

Item No.	Policy Number	Details of the Amendment
		by adopted Municipal Terms of Reference when available, the Ontario Heritage Toolkit, and best practices in heritage conservation.

TABLE E – Amendments to Part B of the DMHCDP

Item No.	Policy Number	Details of the Amendment
18.	2.5	Add new section: Recommendation 1b: Reduce the maximum front yard setback in Zoning By-law to maintain the street wall One of the characteristics of the street wall along Sykes Street is that commercial buildings are built out to the street frontage. This provides for the appearance of a continuous wall. Section 7.2 of the Zoning By-law provides for a minimum and maximum front yard setbacks for lots zoned Commercial (C1) and along Sykes Street of zero (0) metres and three (3) metres, respectively. Allowing for this range in setbacks may facilitate development that is inconsistent with the existing street wall. It is recommended that the maximum front yard setback for lots zoned C1 that are abutting Sykes Street be reduced to one (1) metres to ensure that the street wall is maintained, while allowing enough flexibility for building articulation.
19.	2.6	Add new section: 2.6 Recommendation 1c: eliminating barriers to achieving residential development within the Downtown Meaford Heritage Conservation District. Many of the applications for Zoning By-law Amendments since the adoption of the District Plan were to facilitate the development of residential units. The Planning approvals process for Zoning By-law Amendments can be onerous for property owners, and also may result in decisions that are adverse to the overall character of the District. The significance of the District primarily lies in its built form and character. As such, when the Municipality reviews its comprehensive Zoning By-law or pursues another course of action such as amendments to the existing Zoning By-law, it is recommended that the Municipality consider opportunities to eliminate barriers to achieving residential development

Item No.	Policy Number	Details of the Amendment
		within the Downtown Meaford Heritage Conservation District (e.g., outdated zoning regulations).
20.	4.1	Add: “as amended” after “By-law 26-2009” Delete: The following classes of development require site plan approval: (a) All residential buildings containing 25 or more units, and all retrofit apartments added to such development; (b) All non-residential development in residential zones; (c) All development in commercial zones; (d) All development in employment or industrial zones; (e) All bed and breakfast uses established in any residential, rural or agricultural zone. (f) All non-municipal development in an Institutional zone. Council is also permitted to require site plan control for the following types of uses by the Municipality of Meaford Official Plan, as amended: (a) A residential care facility established in any residential zone; (b) A home industry established in any rural or agricultural zone; (c) Small scale commercial development in any rural or agricultural zone; (d) Residential development of less than 25 units where such development occurs in the Urban Area, as established by Section E1.4 (o) of the Municipality of Meaford Official Plan, as amended.

Item No.	Policy Number	Details of the Amendment
		Accordingly, properties and buildings within the study area that contain commercial uses, institutional uses, or residential uses that are not single-detached dwellings are already subject to Site Plan Control. It should also be noted that the site plan control process within the CIP area (study area) currently has control related to architectural details. Add as last sentence: Site Plan control will continue to apply to lands identified in the Municipality's Site Plan Control By-law 26-2009, as amended.
21.	5.1	Delete the following text: The Municipality of Meaford has recently completed preparation and adoption of a new Sign By-law (Bylaw 022-2014), which contains information and regulations related to the installation of signs. The Sign Bylaw addresses various types of signs, and describes what signs are permitted to be installed within the various zones within the Municipality. The new Sign By-law also contains a reference to encouraging signs that are compatible with the heritage character of the community. Replace with: The Municipality of Meaford Sign By-law By-law 2018-62) regulates the size, use, location and maintenance of signs within the Municipality. The purpose of the By-law shall be to coordinate the type, placement and scale of signs within the different land-use zones to recognize and regulate the residential, commercial, industrial and institutional requirements of all sectors of the community. Among other matters, the Sign By-law encourages signs which are compatible with the heritage and unique characteristics of the community; No sign is permitted as a main or accessory

Item No.	Policy Number	Details of the Amendment
		use except in accordance with the provisions of the Municipal Sign By-law.
22.	8.3	Delete: It is recommended that the Municipality of Meaford continue to monitor the success of the Façade Improvement Grant Program, and consider expanding grants programs to other building / project types in the future. The future grants program could include a schedule, level of funding, eligibility criteria, and evaluation criteria. Replace with: To ensure CIP programs are effective, the Municipality should develop a monitoring program on the success to improve and preserve Heritage in the district. The municipality may consider increasing the amount grant funding for projects to keep pace with increasing costs to complete renovations. Council may consider implementing a larger grants program applicable to heritage buildings that are at risk of being demolished for structural works that are in keeping with best practices in Heritage Conservation.
23.	8.4	Add new section: 8.4 Recommendation 7b: Heritage Property Tax Relief Program The Municipality may consider implementing a Heritage Property Tax Relief program. The Heritage Property Tax Relief Program is a financial tool for municipalities to help owners maintain and restore their properties. The program requires that a property owner enter into a heritage conservation agreement or easement with the municipality or the Ontario Heritage Trust. One of the three agreement

Item No.	Policy Number	Details of the Amendment
		options is required because municipal designation alone does not oblige owners to maintain their properties on an ongoing basis. As the purpose of the tax relief measure is to offer an incentive for heritage property conservation, relief will only be made available to those owners who have made a long-term commitment to conserve their heritage properties. This program allows for property tax relief within the 10% to 40% range.
24.	9.4	Delete: To date, Council of the Municipality of Meaford has not established a formal municipal heritage committee. It is likely that there has not been a need to formally establish a committee due to the relatively small number of properties designated under the <i>Ontario Heritage Act</i>. There are several methods that the Municipality could undertake related to the review of heritage permits: - A formal municipality heritage committee could be established with membership approved by Council. The membership of such committees typically includes municipal staff, Council members, and members of the public, and may include representatives from organizations such as a BIA. Municipalities typically request interested residents to apply for a position on the committee following municipal elections. Using this approach, applications would be submitted to the Municipality and then circulated to the municipal heritage committee for comment and recommendation. The recommendations would then be endorsed by staff / Council. - Municipal staff could be responsible for the review and approval recommendation for heritage permit applications. As Meaford does not currently employ a Heritage Planner, responsibility for review and

Item No.	Policy Number	Details of the Amendment
		recommendation would fall to Planning or Building staff. Applications would be reviewed internally, and a recommendation made by staff regarding approval. - Council could retain the services of a professional heritage consultant to review applications for a heritage permit, and provide a recommendation to staff and Council. This approach would reduce workload requirements for Municipal staff, while providing for review by consultants more familiar with the heritage permit process. The Municipality should formalize the review process for heritage permit applications, given that the number of properties designated under the <i>Ontario Heritage Act</i> is set to increase dramatically as a result of the recommended approval and designation of the Downtown Meaford Heritage Conservation District. Replace with: In 2015, Council of the Municipality of Meaford established a formal municipal heritage committee. The term and membership of the committee is by Council Appointment. Heritage Permit applications submitted to the Municipality are first reviewed by staff and then circulated to the municipal heritage committee for comment and recommendation. The recommendations would then be endorsed by staff / Council.
25.	9.5	Delete section
26.	9.6	Delete: The Municipality of Meaford has not enacted such a by-law. Replace with: The Municipality has adopted By-law 34-2015 to delegate the approval for Minor Permits under the Heritage

Item No.	Policy Number	Details of the Amendment
		Conservation District Plan to the Director of Development Services.
25.	9.7	Delete: 9.7 Recommendation 10: Enacting a delegation by-law for heritage permit approvals It is recommended that the Municipality of Meaford enact a delegation by-law under the Ontario Heritage Act. Replace with: 9.7 Recommendation 10: Enact and Monitor Standard Operating Procedures for Implementing the Municipal Delegation By-law By-law 40-2014 delegates minor heritage permit approvals to the Director of Planning and Building Services. As per Section 1.1 of the By-law the Director of Planning and Building Services shall determine the minor status of a heritage permit involving the alteration of a property or building in the designated heritage district. To ensure consistent implementation of the delegation by-law, the Municipality may prepare and adopt a standard operating procedure. (DENISE ADDED) Suggested change: 9.7 Recommendation 10: Update the Municipal Delegation By-law By-law 40-2014 delegates minor heritage permit approvals to the Director of Planning and Building Services. As per Section 1.1 of the By-law the Director of Planning and Building Services shall determine the minor status of a heritage permit involving the alteration of a property or building in the designated heritage district. To ensure a consistent approach in implementing the by-law, the Municipality may update the Delegation By-law to include criteria to be used by the Director when determining a proposal is considered minor.

Item No.	Policy Number	Details of the Amendment
		As required by the Delegation By-law, the Heritage Committee and Council will receive information updates on what permits have been issued under this authority.
26.	10.0	Add new section: 10.0 Community Planning Permit Systems: Land Use within Heritage Conservation Districts may be best regulated through the adoption of a Community Planning Permit System because it allows a municipality to prescribe conditions or criteria that must be met before a development permit may be issued as well as conditions that must be included in a Community Planning Permit. One of the benefits to residents is that development permits are a permissive system rather than a prescriptive one. Heritage Permits, which are currently issued by the Municipality, are similar to Development Permits, because they allow the Municipality to prescribe conditions for approval. Community Planning Permit Systems combine zoning, site plan and minor variance processes into one application and approval process. This approach would recognize frequent site-specific and situations that occurs in the Downtown Meaford Heritage Conservation District. Additionally, impacts to the Downtown Meaford Heritage Conservation District and the conservation of heritage attributes may form criteria or conditions of approval. Recommendation 11: Consider the adoption of a Community Planning Permit System To streamline and enhance the development approvals process in the district, the Municipality of Meaford may develop a Community Planning Permit System by adopting policies in the Official Plan and pass a Community Planning Permit System By-law.
27.	11.0	Add new section:

Item No.	Policy Number	Details of the Amendment
		11.0: Monitoring The District Plan anticipates that Municipal staff will be monitoring activity within the District over the next five years. The District Plan further provides categories of activity that are anticipated to be monitored. Following the end of the monitoring period the District Plan provides that the Municipality should embark on a full-scale review of the Downtown Meaford Heritage Conservation District Plan. Despite these policies, an on-going monitoring program has not been established. Recommendation 12: Develop indicators for monitoring activity within the District. The Municipality may, in consultation with the Municipal Heritage Committee develop a series of indicators for monitoring activity within the Downtown Meaford Heritage Conservation District. These indicators should be the basis for on-going monitoring within the Downtown Meaford Heritage Conservation District.
28.	12.0	Add new section: 12.0 Secondary Plan As found as part of the challenges and opportunities report, there are a large number of vacant and underutilized sites within the Downtown Meaford Heritage Conservation District. Maintaining sites as vacant and underutilized does not benefit the intent of the Downtown Meaford Heritage Conservation District, and in fact, adversely impacts the overall visual character of the District. A strategy should be considered to intensifying vacant and underutilized sites that ensures that adverse impacts to the character of the District are mitigated.

Item No.	Policy Number	Details of the Amendment
		Recommendation 13: Develop a Secondary Plan for areas within the District Plan where redevelopment is appropriate. In consultation with the Municipal Heritage Committee, the Municipality may consider areas in which redevelopment should be prioritized. For these areas, a secondary plan may be adopted. Such a secondary plan should identify opportunities to facilitate compatible redevelopment, without compromising the integrity of the District. At such time that a Secondary Plan is approved, the District Plan may be amended to determine that development that falls within the boundaries of and is in accordance with an approved secondary plan is considered to be minor in nature and may be carried out without a heritage permit in accordance with Section 41.1(5)(e) of the <i>Ontario Heritage Act</i>. As an alternative, the Municipality may develop a Master Plan for the Downtown and Harbour Area to achieve the same results outlined above.

TABLE F – Amendments to Figures and Appendices of the DMHCDP

Item No.	Policy Number	Details of the Amendment																																
29.	Figure 1	Remove: 7 Boucher Street East																																
30.	Schedule A	Add Schedule A: Character Area Mapping																																
31.	Schedule B	Add Schedule B: Recommended Building Heights Along Sykes Street																																
32.	Appendix A	Add the following buildings to the Appendix <table><tr><td>Boucher</td><td>west</td><td>18</td><td>1</td><td>Hip/Combination</td><td>Synthetic Brick</td><td>Vernacular</td><td>Not Heritage</td></tr><tr><td>Boucher</td><td>West</td><td>24</td><td>2</td><td>Mansard with gable addition</td><td>Brick/Sythetic</td><td>Second Empire – modified</td><td>Heritage</td></tr><tr><td>Boucher</td><td>West</td><td>34</td><td>2</td><td>Hip</td><td>Brick</td><td>Italianate/Edwardian</td><td>Heritage</td></tr><tr><td>Nelson</td><td>West</td><td>19</td><td>2</td><td>Hip</td><td>Brick</td><td>Neoclassical/Georgian</td><td>Heritage</td></tr></table>	Boucher	west	18	1	Hip/Combination	Synthetic Brick	Vernacular	Not Heritage	Boucher	West	24	2	Mansard with gable addition	Brick/Sythetic	Second Empire – modified	Heritage	Boucher	West	34	2	Hip	Brick	Italianate/Edwardian	Heritage	Nelson	West	19	2	Hip	Brick	Neoclassical/Georgian	Heritage
Boucher	west	18	1	Hip/Combination	Synthetic Brick	Vernacular	Not Heritage																											
Boucher	West	24	2	Mansard with gable addition	Brick/Sythetic	Second Empire – modified	Heritage																											
Boucher	West	34	2	Hip	Brick	Italianate/Edwardian	Heritage																											
Nelson	West	19	2	Hip	Brick	Neoclassical/Georgian	Heritage																											

Item No.	Policy Number	Details of the Amendment																																																								
		Reclassify the following properties as "Not Heritage" and update the table: <table><tr><td>Collingwood</td><td>East</td><td>22</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>vacant</td><td>Not heritage</td></tr><tr><td>Collingwood</td><td>East</td><td>24</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>vacant</td><td>Not heritage</td></tr><tr><td>Collingwood</td><td>East</td><td>28</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>vacant</td><td>Not heritage</td></tr><tr><td>Collingwood</td><td>East</td><td>53</td><td>2</td><td>Hip</td><td>Synthetic</td><td>contemporary</td><td>Not heritage</td></tr><tr><td>Nelson</td><td>East</td><td>47</td><td>2</td><td>Gable/Dormers</td><td>Shaker</td><td></td><td>Not Heritage</td></tr></table> Reclassify the following properties as "Heritage" <table><tr><td>Sykes</td><td>South</td><td>40</td><td>2</td><td>Flat</td><td>Brick</td><td>Italianate</td><td>Heritage</td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr></table> Delete: 7 Boucher Street East	Collingwood	East	22				vacant	Not heritage	Collingwood	East	24				vacant	Not heritage	Collingwood	East	28				vacant	Not heritage	Collingwood	East	53	2	Hip	Synthetic	contemporary	Not heritage	Nelson	East	47	2	Gable/Dormers	Shaker		Not Heritage	Sykes	South	40	2	Flat	Brick	Italianate	Heritage								
Collingwood	East	22				vacant	Not heritage																																																			
Collingwood	East	24				vacant	Not heritage																																																			
Collingwood	East	28				vacant	Not heritage																																																			
Collingwood	East	53	2	Hip	Synthetic	contemporary	Not heritage																																																			
Nelson	East	47	2	Gable/Dormers	Shaker		Not Heritage																																																			
Sykes	South	40	2	Flat	Brick	Italianate	Heritage																																																			
33.	Appendix B	Add Appendix B regarding Vacant and Underutilized Sites Policies																																																								