

# Heritage Districts Work!

## Heritage Conservation District Study Summary Report 2009



THE ONTARIO  
TRILLIUM  
FOUNDATION



LA FONDATION  
TRILLIUM  
DE L'ONTARIO



# Heritage Conservation District Study 2009

Prepared By

## The Architectural Conservancy of Ontario

(North Waterloo and Hamilton Branches)

With the Assistance of

Heritage Ottawa, Huron County MHCs,  
St. Catharines MHC, Thunder Bay MHC

and

Robert Shipley

Kayla Jonas

Jason Kovacs

Beatrice Tam

Martha Fallis

of the

Heritage Resources Centre

Generous support provided by the Ontario Trillium Foundation

May 2009





## Heritage Conservation Districts Examined in this Report

Municipality	District Name
City of Kingston	Barriefield Village
Municipality of Bluewater	Bayfield
City of Brantford	Brant Avenue
City of Ottawa	Byward Market
City of Brampton	Churchville
City of Hamilton	Cross-Melville
Town of Oakville	First and Second Street
City of Cambridge	Galt
Town of Goderich	Goderich (Two districts)
Town of Cobourg	King Street East
City of Hamilton	MacNab-Charles
City of Kingston	Market Square
Town of Markham	Markham Village
City of Mississauga	Meadowvale Village
City of Ottawa	Minto Park
Wilmot Twp	New Hamburg
Town of Oakville	Old Oakville
Niagara-on-the-Lake	Queen and Picton Streets
City of St.Catharines	Queen Street
City of Ottawa	Sandy Hill (Five districts)
Municipality of Huron East	Seaforth
Town of Markham	Thornhill (east of Yonge)
Town of Vaughan	Thornhill (west of Yonge)
Loyalist Township	Town of Bath Main Street
City of Thunder Bay	Waverly Park
Town of Pickering	Whitevale
City of Toronto	Wychwood Park

<b>Residential</b>	
<b>Commercial</b>	
<b>Mixed</b>	

# Acknowledgements

This project was carried out by the Architectural Conservancy of Ontario (ACO) on behalf of the hundreds of volunteers in communities across Ontario who work hard to maintain the built culture of our province. The ACO partnered with several other volunteer groups including Heritage Ottawa and Community Heritage Ontario. The project was directed by a steering committee made up of representatives from these organizations. Particular thanks go to ACO Manager Rollo Myers, President Catherine Nasmith and ACO board member Richard Longley for their time, effort and guidance.

We would like to thank staff at the Ministry of Culture for providing information and advice about the project: Paul King, Chris Mahood and Bert Duclos. Gratitude is also owed to Paul King, President of Community Heritage Ontario for providing technical services.

The project was undertaken in support of the volunteer efforts of ACO branch presidents and members, Heritage Ottawa, members of the local Municipal Heritage Committees and interested citizens across Ontario. These dedicated volunteers surveyed residences in the Heritage Conservation Districts and provided energy and purpose to the project.

The efforts of the volunteers were assisted and coordinated through cooperation between the ACO and the Heritage Resources Centre (HRC) at the University of Waterloo. Professor Robert Shipley is the Director of the HRC. The Project Coordinator, report manager and principal volunteer facilitator was Kayla Jonas. Additional data collection and research analysis was conducted by Jason Kovacs, Beatrice Tam and Martha Fallis. Administration and help was also provided by Marg Rowell, Chelsey Tyers, Paul Dubniak and Kirsten Pries.

Recognition is deserved as well for Professor Rob Feick, Richard Pinnell and Scott MacFarlane at the University of Waterloo for their help obtaining and formatting the GIS maps and to Philip Carter and Paul Oberst for their advice. Thanks are extended to Dr. Susan Sykes at the Office of Research Ethics at the University of Waterloo for the thorough and timely approval of our research design.

**Thanks!**

# Executive Summary

## Introduction

- This study of Heritage Conservation Districts has been funded by the Ontario Trillium Foundation and is a joint effort among volunteers of the Architectural Conservancy of Ontario, the Heritage Resources Centre and volunteer historical societies across the province
- The *Ontario Heritage Act* enables municipalities to designate Heritage Conservation Districts (HCDs)
- Heritage Conservation Districts allow municipalities to guide future changes in these areas of special character
- 32 districts designated in or before 1992 were examined

## Study Approach

- 681 resident surveys were conducted door to door by local volunteers from Municipal Heritage Committees, historical societies, ACO branches and members of the Heritage Resources Centre
- Land use mapping and a streetscape evaluations were conducted
- Sales history trends for 431 properties were collected from GeoWarehouse™ and analyzed
- 67 key stakeholders were interviewed
- Data on requests for alterations was collected
- Districts were evaluated based on their performance

## Key Findings

- By-in-large the goals set for individual Heritage Conservation Districts have been achieved
- Satisfaction with living and owning property in districts is overwhelming
- It is not difficult or time consuming to make appropriate alterations to properties in districts but municipalities should keep better records
- Real estate values in Heritage Conservation Districts generally rise more consistently than surrounding areas
- Strong real estate performance and resident satisfaction are most pronounced where district guidelines are enforced
- There are issues in many districts such as the possibility for expansion and the need for clearer goals which provide the opportunity for improvements

## Recommendations

### *a) General*

- Create more districts because they are successful planning initiatives
- Continue monitoring and evaluating districts using this study as a baseline
- Publicize the confirmed OMB ruling that pre-2005 Heritage District Plans are valid and that District Plans take precedence over other municipal by-laws (OMB Decision PL060606 Feb 18, 2009)

#### *b) Plans and Goals*

- Districts should have plans – some older districts do not
- The Province should set up a special fund to assist municipalities to update Heritage Conservation District Plans but in the meantime the intent of district designation should be respected
- District Plans should have clear goals – some older district plans may need to be amended to add these goals

#### *c) Resident Satisfaction*

- Municipalities should recognize that there is strong support among residents for districts and expand their use
- Public relations efforts should be made to better inform residents of the benefits of District Designation and to ensure new residents understand district procedures
- Create a sub-committee for each district, or have a district representative on the Municipal Heritage Committee to address policy issues and provide education
- Clarify roles of the Municipal Heritage Committee and Heritage Staff

#### *d) Requests for Alterations*

- Track alteration requests in a comprehensive and easily accessible manner
- Delegate more authority to Heritage Staff to provide consistency and knowledge to the day-to-day operations of the district
- Municipal Heritage Committees should set policies not administer them

#### *e) Real Estate*

- Inform the public about the strength of real estate values in Heritage Conservation Districts
- Educate the Real Estate industry about the existence of districts and their market performance
- Ensure Real Estate Agents inform buyers about the existence of Heritage Conservation Districts and their procedures

#### *f) Issues*

- Strategic effort should be made to educate residents both inside and outside of the district, as well as councils about the benefits of districts
- Use examples for compatible development (Meadowvale Village, Mississauga and Queen Street, St. Catharines)
- Ministry of Culture should provide an updated and accurate list of Heritage Conservation Districts
- Municipalities should provide information about the district, including the district plan, a list of address and a map online
- Consider the expansion of districts to manage development pressure
- Ensure parks and open spaces are protected as part of districts
- Erect entrance signs or coordinated street signs to create place reference

# Table of Contents

## Executive Summary

### 1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 Heritage Act and Designation
- 1.2 Rationale for Heritage Conservation District Study

### 2.0 Study Approach

- 2.1 Resident Surveys
- 2.2 Townscape Survey
- 2.3 Real Estate Data
- 2.4 Key Stakeholder Interviews
- 2.5 Requests for Alterations
- 2.6 Evaluating the Districts

### 3.0 Analysis of Key Findings

- 3.1 Have the goals been met?
- 3.2 Are people content?
- 3.3 Is it difficult to make alterations?
- 3.4 Have property values been impacted?
- 3.5 What are the key issues in the district?

### 4.0 Conclusions

- 4.1 Conclusions
- 4.2 Recommendations

## Appendices

- A- Resident Survey Questionnaire
- B- Townscape Survey Description of Factors
- C- Executive Summaries of Individual HCD Studies
- D- Conclusions Matrix



# 1.0 Introduction

## 1.1 Heritage Act and Designation

The *Ontario Heritage Act* (Subsection 41. (1)) enables municipalities to designate Heritage Conservation Districts (HCDs). A Heritage Conservation District is an area with “a concentration of heritage resources with special character or historical association that distinguishes it from its surroundings”<sup>1</sup>. Districts can be areas that are residential, commercial, rural, industrial, institutional or mixed use. According to the Ministry of Culture “the significance of a HCD often extends beyond its built heritage, structures, streets, landscape and other physical and special elements to include important vistas and views between buildings and spaces within the district”<sup>2</sup>.

The designation of a Heritage Conservation District allows municipalities to protect the special character of an area by guiding future changes. The policies for guiding changes are outlined in a Heritage Conservation District Plan that can be prepared by city staff, local residents or heritage consultants. A Heritage Conservation District Plan must also include a statement of objectives and guidelines that outline how to achieve these objectives<sup>3</sup>.

## 1.2 Rationale for Heritage Conservation District Study

Many people now consider the Heritage Conservation District to be one of the most effective tools not only for historic conservation but for good urban design and sound planning. At least 92 HCDs are already in existence in Ontario with the earliest designations dating back to 1980. While more are being planned and proposed all the time there is also a residual resistance to HCDs from some members of the public. Typically this resistance centres on concerns about loss of control over one’s property, impact on property values and bureaucratic processes. On the other hand, the benefits of HCDs, establishing high standards of maintenance and design, allowing the development of and compliance with shared community values and the potential for increasing property values, are not as widely perceived as might be the case.

With funding from the Ontario Trillium Foundation, volunteers from branches of the Architectural Conservancy of Ontario (ACO) and Historical Societies were assisted by the Heritage Resources Centre (HRC) at the University of Waterloo to undertake a province wide research program to answer the question: have Heritage Conservation Districts in Ontario been successful heritage planning initiatives over a period of time?

Since it takes a period of time for the impacts of district designation to manifest this study concentrated on examining districts that are well established. Applying the criterion of residential, commercial or mixed use areas designated in 1992 or before there were 32 HCDs that the study examined. These districts are found in or near the following areas: Cobourg, Hamilton, Kingston, Ottawa, St. Catharines, Huron County, Brampton, Toronto, Ottawa, the Region of Waterloo and Thunder Bay (see page 3 for a complete list).

---

<sup>1</sup> Ontario Heritage Toolkit, Heritage Conservation Districts, Ministry of Culture (2006), Page 5

<sup>2</sup> Ontario Heritage Toolkit, Heritage Conservation Districts, Ministry of Culture (2006), Page 5

<sup>3</sup> Ontario Heritage Toolkit, Heritage Conservation Districts, Ministry of Culture (2006), Page 12

Figure 1 shows that the 32 districts have a wide geographic distribution and represent the various community sizes. The various types of districts which are part of the study are also evident.

Geographical Distribution		Community Size		Type	
Northern	1	Small Community	9 ~	Commercial	9~
Eastern	11 *	Medium Sized	11	Residential	18*
Central	12	Large City	12 *	Mixed	5
South Western	8 ~				
	32		32		32

\* 5 of these districts make up the HCD known as Sandy Hill  
 ~ 2 of these districts make up the HCD known as Goderich Square

*Figure 1: Distribution of Heritage Conservation Districts under Examination*

The study sought to answer the following specific questions in each of the 32 Heritage Conservation Districts:

- Have the goals or objectives set out in the District Plan been met?
- Are residents content living in the Heritage Conservation District?
- Is it difficult to make alterations to buildings in the Heritage Conservation District?
- Have property values been impacted by the designation of the district?
- What are the key issues in the district?

These questions were answered through the contributions of local volunteers from the Architectural Conservancy of Ontario branches, Historical Societies and local heritage committees as well as through communication with local municipal officials.

## 2.0 Study Approach

### 2.1 Resident Surveys

Residents of 31 of the 32 Heritage Conservation Districts were asked a series of questions relating to their experiences and satisfaction living in the district<sup>4</sup>. See Appendix A for a copy of the questionnaire. These surveys were conducted door to door by local volunteers, members of the Heritage Resources Centre or through mail outs. Overall, 681 of 1793 potential respondents answered surveys representing a 38% response rate.

### 2.2 Townscape Survey

Townscape Surveys in 30 of the 32 Heritage Conservation Districts were conducted between May 2008 and March 2009. The purpose of this survey is to provide an objective way to evaluate streetscapes. There are two elements to the survey; land use mapping and a streetscape evaluation. Land use maps, which represent the current use of buildings, were produced for each of the surveyed districts (see Figure 2). The streetscape evaluation involves the use of a view assessment pro forma which generates scores between one and five for 25 factors in view. See Appendix B for a full description of each factor.




Figure 2: Example of a Land Use Map from the Town of Goderich

<sup>4</sup> The five districts of Sandy Hill were considered together for the purposes of this study. The two districts in Goderich were also considered one district.

## 2.3 Real Estate Data

Sales history trends for properties within each Heritage Conservation District under study were calculated and compared against non-designated properties in the immediate vicinity of each district. Sales records spanning an average 30 year period range were identified for individual district properties using GeoWarehouse™, an online subscription database commonly used by real estate professionals.

Properties with more than one record of sale were plotted on graphs and compared with the average sales figures for non-designated properties. A number of sales property averages were obtained for each “non-designated area” within a 1 km radius from the district. The mean selling price for these property averages, which were also obtained through GeoWarehouse™, were calculated and plotted against each district unit sales record<sup>5</sup>. It was expected that the use of average sales prices from the immediate vicinity of a district as opposed to the use of city-wide sales trends would provide a more accurate comparative record to show how the district designation status itself affects property values. Aside from the locational factor (*i.e.* properties located within an district), it must be recognized that this study did not take into account a variety of other issues that can also affect sales prices (*e.g.* architecture, lot size, *etc.*).

Each sales history trajectory was graphed and compared with the trajectory of properties within a 1km radius to determine if it was above the average, at average or below average (see Figures 3, 4 and 5). These graphs also indicated if the properties in the district resisted downturns in the market and if the average sale price was higher or lower than the surrounding area. A total of 431 properties sales histories were calculated as part of this study.




Figure 3: Above Average Sale History Trajectory

<sup>5</sup>The method for obtaining the average sales price for non-designated areas within the 1 km radius was adjusted according to the number of properties within a Heritage Conservation District. For example, to obtain figures on non-designated areas, average sales histories within a 1 km radius from the largest districts (201-600 properties) were obtained using every fiftieth district property as a basis for calculating each area sales record. The mean average of these sales records were subsequently calculated and used as the comparative sales history trend on each graph. Every fifth, tenth, and twenty-fifth property were used to find the immediate average sales histories within a 1 km radius for smaller districts with 1-10, 11-100 and 101-200 properties respectively.




Figure 4: Average Sale History Trajectory




Figure 5: Below Average Sales History Trajectory

## 2.4 Key Stakeholder Interviews

People who had special knowledge of each district were interviewed for their experiences and opinions. These stakeholders often included the local planner, the chair or a member of the Municipal Heritage Committee and members of the community association or BIA. A total of 67 interviews were conducted. Interviewees were not identified in accordance with the University of Waterloo policy on research ethics.

## 2.5 Requests for Alterations

In a Heritage Conservation District when a property owner wants to make a change, alteration or addition their plan must be presented to the municipal council for a decision on whether it should be allowed, allowed with modifications or rejected. The question is asked: does the proposed change enhance, detract from or not impact the heritage character of the district? The widespread practice in Ontario is to have these requests reviewed by the Municipal Heritage Committee who advise council on the matter. Typically additions to the rear of buildings are allowed, while alterations out of character with the district's architecture that are visible

from the street are not. This means that sky-lights in a Victorian cottage may be allowed on the rear slope of the roof but not on the side facing the street.

With respect to the requests for alterations within the Heritage Conservation Districts, the study wished to answer these questions in each district:

- How many applications for building alterations have been made?
- How many applications have been approved or rejected?
- How long did the application process take for individual properties?
- What type of changes were the applications for?

For each Heritage Conservation District, the information about the number of applications for alterations and their time for approval was available in various formats. Several municipalities had this information in a database and provided a list. Other municipalities had a copy of all their applications for the district in a file, in the building files or in the meeting minutes from the Municipal Heritage Committee. For these applications the information was collected by staff at the Heritage Resources Centre. Using the various forms of data a list was produced for each district that included the date the application was submitted, the approval date and type of alteration. Where appropriate, this data was graphed to show the average time of approval.

## 2.6 Evaluating the Districts

The primary intent of this study was to evaluate each district against its own goals and objectives, not to compare one area against the others. However, it is somewhat useful to compare the areas to recognise and reinforce what approaches have been successful. The comparative table (Figure 6) is not intended to discourage the places that have been less successful, but rather to show the range of successes. Each question in the study (e.g. Are people content?) was given a weight and the findings of each questions were scored to provide a percentage. For instance, in the first column "have the goals been met?" districts that met all their goals received the full 30 points, those that met some of their goals received 20 points and those that only met one goal gained 10 points. Likewise in the issues category, those district with issues that were considered positive such as the opportunity for expansion received five points, while issues perceived as negative had five points deducted.

The chart also represents the types of districts so that use might be compared with the areas of success. Districts highlighted in red are residential, blue represents commercial districts and green portrays districts with a mixed use. While the scores for most of the districts are very good and the mean at 70 is quite high, there are some differences when we compare the types of districts. The mean score for residential districts is 83 but for commercial districts is somewhat lower at 68 while the mean score for mixed use districts was 65. This indicates that there is more success among residential heritage districts but it should be noted that among commercial districts there were high scores, such as 85 for Bayfield and likewise there were good scores among mixed districts such as 85 for Thornhill-Markham. These places may have lessons for other districts which have not yet reached their potential.

Measure District	Have the goals been met? 30 points	Are people content? 20 points	Is it difficult to make alterations? 10 points	Have property values been impacted? 30 points	Are there critical issues? 10 points	Total
Barriefield Village – Kingston	30	20	5	30	-5	80
Bayfield – Bluewater	30	20	10	30	-5	85
Brant Avenue – Brantford	20	20	10	30	-10	70
Byward Market – Ottawa	30	15	10	20	-10	65
Churchville – Brampton	20	15	10	30	5	80
Cross-Melville – Hamilton	20	15	10	30	-10	65
First and Second Street – Oakville	20	20	10	30	0	80
Galt – Cambridge	20	15	5	30	-10	60
Goderich – Goderich	20	15	5	n/a	0	70
King Street East – Cobourg	10	10	5	20	-5	40
MacNab-Charles – Hamilton	20	20	10	30	-5	75
Market Square – Kingston	30	20	5	0	-5	70
Markham Village – Markham	30	10	10	20	-10	60
Meadowvale Village – Mississauga	30	20	5	30	10	95
Minto Park – Ottawa	30	20	5	30	5	90
New Hamburg – Wilmot	20	5	10	30	-5	60
Old Oakville – Oakville	30	20	10	30	0	90
Queen and Picton Streets – Niagara-on-the-Lake	20	20	5	30	-10	65
Queen Street – St. Catharines	30	20	5	30	5	90
Sandy Hill – Ottawa	30	20	10	10	-5	65
Seaforth – Huron East	20	20	10	20	0	70
Thornhill - Markham	30	20	10	30	-5	85
Thornhill - Vaughan	10	15	5	10	0	45
Town of Bath – Loyalist	30	20	n/a	30	0	90
Waverly Park – Thunder Bay	10	10	5	30	0	55
Whitevale – Pickering	30	20	5	20	n/a	85
Wychwood Park – Toronto	30	20	5	30	5	90
Mean	30	20	7.5	30	-5	70

Residential	
Commercial	
Mixed	

Figure 6: Comparative Measures of Success



## 3.0 Analysis of Key Findings

### 3.1 Have the goals or objectives been met?

The goals of Heritage Conservation Districts have been met. Fourteen of 27 districts met all their goals. Eight of 27 met most of their goals while five of the districts met at least one of their goals. All districts met at least some of their goals. When goals were more clearly articulated the overall score for the district was higher (see Figure 6). The more goals the district had the more clearly articulated the district's aspirations. Of the eleven districts that had clearly articulated goals, eight scored higher than 70% in the Comparative Measures of Success Matrix. Of the six districts that did not have clear goals, only three scored well.

According to the conclusions matrices (see Appendix D) several firms wrote more than one Heritage Conservation District Plan. However, based on the number of goals met there is no clear indication that one firm was more successful than another.

### 3.2 Are people content?

This study found that people are overwhelmingly satisfied with living or owning property in a district. When asked how satisfied they were with living in the district, 318 of the 681 people surveyed (almost half) said they were very satisfied (see Figure 7). An additional 193 people said they were satisfied. In total 511 people (75%) are happy living or owning property in a district. Only 34 people were dissatisfied and nine people very dissatisfied.




Figure 7: Residents' Satisfaction

There are some discernable trends with regard to levels of support found in different districts. Residential districts generally had a higher satisfaction than commercial districts. The level of satisfaction also correlated with how well the rules were applied. In districts where the rules were not applied consistently, the level of satisfaction among the residents was lower. For instance, in the New Hamburg and Cobourg districts inconsistency in the application of rules was cited as an issue. In New Hamburg only 58% of people were

satisfied with the district and in Cobourg only 66%. In contrast, the rules in Whitevale in Pickering appear to be applied constantly and 100% of people expressed that they were satisfied with the district.

In addition, most of these residents have a very high understanding of how the district works. Of the 681 people surveyed 228 cited protection as the purpose for the district. In contrast, only 137 mentioned restrictions as the main purpose of the district. There were many more complaints that the rules were not strict enough than there were complaints that rules were too strict. Inconsistencies in the application of the guidelines by the local committee were also mentioned frequently. Words such as favouritism and elitism were mentioned when referring to the Municipal Heritage Committees.

The contentment with the districts also came across in the Townscape Survey. Measures such as private planting, maintenance and cleanliness consistently scored well indicating people take pride in their property and their community.

### **3.3 Is it difficult to make alterations?**

Based on the amount of research that had to be conducted to collect the number of requests for alterations, it is clear that they are not being tracked in a comprehensive and easily accessible manner. The purpose of a district is to manage change, yet the changes being made are not being recorded as well as they could be.

However, where the applications are tracked and where there was feedback from the resident surveys, it is clear that alterations are not an issue. Almost all requests were approved; very few appear to be denied. The vast majority of applications are said to be approved within three months, with a large percentage approved within one month. There are only two districts where there was any indication that the process regularly takes longer than three months.

The districts where authority to approve changes is delegated to staff seemed to be able to approve their applications in the most timely manner, and those districts also received fewer complaints about the inconsistent application of the design guidelines. While the *Ontario Heritage Act* requires that applications for change be reviewed by Municipal Heritage Committees, where those committees exist, it seems that setting policies and criteria might be the suitable role for committees rather than the day-to-day administration of requests for alterations.

It can be speculated that one of the reasons why most applications for alterations are approved is that residents of districts tend not to ask for changes they know will be unacceptable to their neighbours.

### **3.4 Have property values been impacted?**

The data from GeoWarehouse™ indicated the real estate market in Heritage Conservation Districts is healthy. In total 2500 properties were examined for sales histories but only 431 properties had two or more sales. This small number of sales histories shows that districts are very stable areas.

Of the 431 properties in the districts that had sales histories, 190 showed above average sales history trajectories. One-hundred-forty-seven had average trajectories, while only 94 performed below average (see Figure 8). There was also an indication that in many cases properties in Heritage Conservation Districts resisted real estate downturns. While other properties in their cities were losing value, the properties in the district maintained their value.

It appears that better enforcement of the guidelines led to higher satisfaction. Consistent enforcement also results in higher property value increases. In the three districts where there was 100% satisfaction with living in the district and few complaints about enforcement, the sales histories were mostly above average. For instance in Queen Street in St. Catharines, where there was 100% satisfaction, eight of the nine properties performed above average and only one had a below average trajectory. In contrast, Cobourg's satisfaction was 66% and property values showed that five of eight properties had below average increases.




Figure 8: Sales History Trajectories

### 3.5 What are the key issues in the districts?

#### 1) Issues from the Conclusions Matrices

The key issues in each district were tracked and several issues emerged as very common (see Appendix D).

##### a) Compatible Development

There are several places that are good examples of compatible development. These places include Queen Street in St. Catharines and Meadowvale Village in Mississauga (see Figure 9). In these two districts the additions to the buildings have been so successful that they were not visible from the road and thus did not show up on the Townscape Survey. These places illustrate that it is possible to have development that is compatible with the heritage character of the area. Where compatible development happens, the districts were very successful overall. Queen Street scored a 90% in the Comparative Measures of Success Matrix and Meadowvale Village scored a 95%.



Figure 9: View in Meadowvale Village where additions have not negatively impacted the character of the village

In contrast, the places that had inappropriate and incompatible development scored lower overall. New Hamburg and Thornhill in Vaughn both had some buildings that did not compliment the heritage character and scored 60% and 45% respectively in the Comparative Measures of Success Matrix.

### *b) Education and Awareness*

The issue of better education and awareness was one of the most common points mentioned. Almost every district would benefit from some form of education. The lack of awareness for residents ranged from not knowing they lived in a district, to not having a complete understanding of the processes for management and a lack of understanding about the benefits of a district. The awareness of Heritage Conservation Districts might be a direct result of the lack of information available on municipal websites. Often the district plans and list of addresses or maps of the district were not posted. This is compounded by the fact that the Ministry of Culture's list of Heritage Conservation Districts was not accurate.

The other hole in knowledge about districts came from the real estate industry. It became clear that real estate agents and lawyers buy title search insurance rather than doing a title search for every property; this has resulted in people moving into districts without being aware that they were special areas.

### *c) Development Pressure*

Several Heritage Conservation Districts are under pressure from potential development either in or close to the district. For instance, Byward Market is a very popular area to live and this has resulted in many high rise buildings close to the edge of the district. Similarly, Thornhill will be under pressure from the new transit line along Yonge Street (see Figure 10). Districts in the centres of cities may also be targeted for higher density development.



*Figure 10: A view of Yonge Street in Vaughan that will be subject to development pressure*

It should be noted here that some developers have appeared before the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB) and attempted to portray Heritage Conservation Districts as an anomaly in the land planning process, as a roadblock to good planning, and as an obstacle to achieving the overall goals and policies of the *Provincial Policy Statement (PPS)* and the *Places to Grow Act*. In our opinion this is a misreading of the legislation which ignores the history of the development of the current planning regime and disregards the provisions of the Canadian Institute of Planners Statement of Values that charges members of the profession to conserve cultural heritage.

The Province of Ontario undertook a comprehensive consideration of all aspect of planning, and its effort resulted in a linked group of policy documents that were issued within a short space of time. These include the *PPS*, the *Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (GGH)*, the Greenbelt policies, the Oak Ridges Moraine polices, the 2005 amendments to the *Ontario Heritage Act*, and *Ontario Regulation 9-06*. This suite of policies is intended to be comprehensive, a concept very well stated in OMB Decision PL081345, issued of May 5, 2009.

Part of the *PPS* is entitled "Vision for Ontario's Land Use Planning System". It includes this sentence:

The Province's natural heritage resources, water, agricultural lands, mineral resources, and cultural heritage and archaeological resources provide important environmental, economic and social benefits. The wise use and management of these resources over the long term is a key provincial interest.

This is the only place in the *PPS* where a "key" provincial interest is identified.

There are 92 Heritage Conservation Districts, plus three pending, in all of Ontario. The Ministry of Culture estimates, and this study confirms, that half of them include fewer than 100 properties. Most districts are in villages, towns, and cities with ordinary lot-sizes. Thornhill-Vaughan, as an example, is close to the median

with 84 properties, and its area is only 0.29 sq km, and that includes two parks and a schoolyard. The Thornhill-Markham Heritage Conservation District has 136 properties and is 0.57 sq km, and that includes extensive parkland. We can estimate that the total area of Heritage Conservation Districts in the Greater Golden Horseshoe (GGH) does not surpass 20 or 30 sq km. The Greater Golden Horseshoe contains 31,000 sq km so something less than 1/10<sup>th</sup> of one percent of the GGH is subject to development control as a result of Heritage Conservation District designation. The percentage is even lower in the Province as a whole even leaving out the less populated areas of the North. As much as a quarter of Ontario's land is subject to various other land use restrictions.

Heritage Conservation District designation is not intended to prevent development. It "enables the council to manage and guide future change"<sup>6</sup>. This kind of guidance over 1/10<sup>th</sup> of one percent of the Province in the promotion of a "key provincial interest" is not an onerous burden on the land use planning process. The Province does not intend that a Heritage Conservation District Plans will preserve each detailed aspect within a district, as if it were a museum. But it does intend that a District Plan will control change so that it, contributes to and does not detract from the district's special character. The law intends that Heritage Conservation District Plans will conserve that character, forever, or until Council de-designates the District, whichever comes first. The Province does not intend that conservation comes with a sunset clause to be invoked when a developer sees the potential for profit.

A final note of clarification can be injected here. A 2009 OMB decision on a case in the Port Dalhousie section of St. Catharines caused considerable concern among proponents of Heritage Districts. Without going into the details of the case it can be said that the decision allowed a high rise development in an HCD that many felt was inappropriate. Of even greater concern was the notion that the decision might lead to similar insertions in other municipalities. The main points of heritage and planning law that are critical, dealt with whether Heritage Conservation District Plans from before 2005 are valid and whether, as stated clearly in the *Ontario Heritage Act* - Sections 41.2(1)(b) and 41.2(2) – Heritage Conservation District plans take precedence over other municipal by-laws. Whatever the details of the Port Dalhousie case may be, another OMB ruling on a case in Vaughan (OMB Decision PL060606 Feb 18, 2009) ruled that district plans from before 2005 have standing and that Heritage Conservation District Plans do take precedence. A clarification issued by the OMB Chair on May 4, 2009, reiterated that the February 18, 2009 decision was correct.

#### d) Parks

Formal parks are an integral part of several of the Heritage Conservation Districts and contribute to the cultural heritage value of the areas. Parks add to the character, but in several places such as the Town of Goderich there are tensions with the use of these public spaces. Beyond formal parks, several districts include large natural areas that also contribute to the value of the area. For instance Whitevale in Pickering has Duffins Creek that runs through the centre, Churchville in Brampton contains parts of the Credit River and its flood plain and Thornhill contains the Don River (see Figure 11). These formal and informal natural areas were recognized by residents in the surveys as being an important factor in drawing them to the area. It is important that these formal and informal parks are understood as an integral part of the



*Figure 11: A view of the Credit River in the Churchville Heritage Conservation District*

<sup>6</sup> Ontario Heritage Toolkit, Heritage Conservation Districts, Ministry of Culture (2006), Page 5

district. Applying the concept of a Cultural Heritage Landscape (CHL) in both describing and regulating these areas can be useful approach, especially since the CHL idea is referred to in the *Provincial Policy Statement* issued under the *Planning Act*.

#### *e) Funding*

Funding was a factor mentioned by many stakeholders. Residents stated that funding assistance to reduce the cost of maintaining their older homes would help to earn more support for district designation. While funding was not available to property owners in most places it is speculated that in areas such as Hamilton and Ottawa where there has been funding it has helped to enhance the districts.

#### *f) Community Involvement*

There is a need and an opportunity for community involvement. The lack of community involvement shows up in the amount of support in an area. For instance, in New Hamburg there seems to be very little community involvement which is reflected in the 58% satisfaction rate. In contrast, Wychwood Park has multiple levels of organization and involvement in the community including a rate payers association, a landscape committee, a tennis committee and three trustees who are responsible for the common land. Wychwood Park has 80% satisfaction.

#### *g) Expansion*

There is the opportunity in some areas where it would be appropriate to expand the districts. For instance, the Galt district is only one side of one city block, but the areas adjacent are very similar and could be added to the district (see Figure 12). Similarly, the five districts known as Sandy Hill could be connected by expanding the existing areas.



*Figure 12: A view the whole Galt Heritage Conservation District, which could be expanded*

## **2) Researcher Reflections**

#### *a) Cooperation*

There appears to be a correlation between the municipalities that take their district seriously and the districts that are doing well. Those municipalities with the lower overall scores are the same districts that had a demonstrated lack of interest in this study.

#### *b) Place Reference*

Many places scored very low in the place reference category of the Townscape Survey and were also hard to distinguish when walking around the district. A handful of places had marked entrances and coordinated street signs which seemed to increase the awareness of the district and provide a local identity (see Figure 13).



*Figure 13: Good example of place reference in Markham Village*

# 4.0 Conclusions

## 4.1 Conclusions

- By-in-large the goals set for individual Heritage Conservation Districts have been achieved
- Satisfaction with living and owning property in districts is overwhelming
- It is not difficult or time consuming to make appropriate alterations to properties in districts but municipalities should keep better records
- Real estate values in Heritage Conservation Districts generally rise more consistently than surrounding areas
- Strong real estate performance and resident satisfaction are most pronounced where district guidelines are enforced
- There are issues in many districts such as the possibility for expansion and the need for clearer goals which provide the opportunity for improvements

## 4.2 Recommendations

### *a) General*

- Create more districts because they are successful planning initiatives
- Continue monitoring and evaluating districts using this study as a baseline
- Publicize the confirmed OMB ruling that pre-2005 Heritage District Plans are valid and that District Plans take precedence over other municipal by-laws (OMB Decision PL060606 Feb 18, 2009)

### *b) Plans and Goals*

- Districts should have plans – some older districts do not
- The Province should set up a special fund to assist municipalities to update Heritage Conservation District Plans but in the meantime the intent of district designation should be respected
- District Plans should have clear goals – some older district plans may need to be amended to add these goals

### *c) Resident Satisfaction*

- Municipalities should recognize that there is strong support among residents for districts and expand their use
- Public relations efforts should be made to better inform residents of the benefits of District Designation and to ensure new residents understand district procedures
- Create a sub-committee for each district, or have a district representative on the Municipal Heritage Committee to address policy issues and provide education
- Clarify roles of the Municipal Heritage Committee and Heritage Staff

### *d) Requests for Alterations*

- Track alteration requests in a comprehensive and easily accessible manner
- Delegate more authority to Heritage Staff to provide consistency and knowledge to the day-to-day operations of the district

- Municipal Heritage Committees should set policies not administer them

*e) Real Estate*

- Inform the public about the strength of real estate values in Heritage Conservation Districts
- Educate the Real Estate industry about the existence of districts and their market performance
- Ensure Real Estate Agents inform buyers about the existence of Heritage Conservation Districts and their procedures

*f) Issues*

- Strategic effort should be made to educate residents both inside and outside of the district, as well as councils about the benefits of districts
- Use examples for compatible development (Meadowvale Village, Mississauga and Queen Street, St. Catharines)
- Ministry of Culture should provide an updated and accurate list of Heritage Conservation Districts
- Municipalities should provide information about the district, including the district plan, a list of address and a map online
- Consider the expansion of districts to manage development pressure
- Ensure parks and open spaces are protected as part of districts
- Erect entrance signs or coordinated street signs to create place reference

# Appendices



# Appendix A

## Resident Surveys Questionnaire



## Heritage Conservation District Study Residents Survey

Heritage Conservation District Name: \_\_\_\_\_

1. Are you the owner or the tenant of this property?

Owner	Tenant – Commercial	Tenant – Residential
-------	------------------------	-------------------------

2. Are you aware that you live within a heritage conservation district?

Yes	No
-----	----

3. Did you move here before or after the area was designated?

Before	After
--------	-------

4. If you lived here before designation how did you feel about it at the time?

5. If you came after the designation did the designation affect your decision to move here?

Yes	No
-----	----

6. What is your understanding of how the heritage conservation district works?

7. Have you made application(s) for building alterations?

Yes	No
-----	----

8. If so, were your applications for alterations approved?

Yes	No
-----	----

9. On average how long did the application take?

10. Overall, how satisfied are you with living in a heritage conservation district?

Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Do not know
----------------	-----------	--	--------------	----------------------	-------------

11. How do you think the HCD designation has affected the value of your property compared to similar non-designated districts?

Increased a lot	Increased	No Impact	Lowered	Lowered a lot	Do not know
-----------------	-----------	-----------	---------	---------------	-------------

12. Do you think the HCD designation will affect your ability to sell your property?

13. Comments:



## Appendix B

### Townscape Survey Descriptions of Factors



**TOWNSCAPE EVALUATION PRO-FORMA**

LOCATION:

DATE:

TIME:

REFERENCE:

WEATHER:

*Score between 0 (absent) and 5 (excellent) for each factor (Half marks may be used)  
Impression Score out of 10 (1=couldn't be worse, 10=couldn't be better)*

<b>A. STREETScape: QUALITY &amp; MAINTENANCE</b>			
A1 - Pedestrian Friendly	.....	A8 - Personal Safety: Traffic	.....
A2 - Cleanliness	.....	A9 - Planting: Public	.....
A3 - Coherence	.....	A10 - Vitality	.....
A4 - Edge Feature Quality	.....	A11 - Appropriate Resting Places	.....
A5 - Floorscape Quality	.....	A12 - Signage	.....
A6 - Legibility	.....	A13 - Street Furniture Quality	.....
A7 - Sense of Threat	.....	A14 - Traffic Flow Appropriateness	.....
		/70	
<b>B. PRIVATE SPACE IN VIEW</b>		<b>C. HERITAGE IN VIEW</b>	
B15 - Advertising, in keeping	.....	C20 - Conserved Elements Evident	.....
B16 - Dereliction, Absence of	.....	C21 - Historic Reference Seen	.....
B17 - Detailing Maintenance	.....	C22 - Nomenclature/Place Reference	.....
B18 - Facade Quality	.....	C23 - Quality of Conservation Work	.....
B19 - Planting : Private	.....	C24 - Quality of New Development	.....
/25		C25 - Neglected Historic Features	
		/30	

Impression Score:

Aggregate Score:

**Description of Elements**

**A. STREETScape: QUALITY & MAINTENANCE**

***A1 Pedestrian Friendly***

Reflecting on the concept of 'barrier free design' does the view suggest ease of access for the variously abled, and for those with pedestrian vehicles?

High: Absence of difficult slopes, steps, walls or curbs: evident facilities for the variously abled.

Low: Evident discontinuities in slope, barriers, unmarked drops, steep curbs and evidence of their impact on users.

### ***A2 Cleanliness***

Evidence of a high level of cleansing of all areas of public space - litter, visual obstructions such as road works in good order, graffiti, redundant signs, posters etc.

High: A clean and appropriately 'tidy' environment, bearing in mind that this is a most frequent concern of many street users.

Low: Longstanding litter, redundant public works debris, torn posters, overflowing litter bins, dumped black bags etc.

### ***A3 Coherence***

Does the view 'hold together' as a pleasurable part of the urban scene?

High: Positive relationship between buildings and spaces at a human scale with harmony between buildings in view, helping to establish a 'sense of place'.

Low: Few or no observable design qualities, a fragmented and possibly disturbing view.

### ***A4 Edge Feature Quality***

Presence (where appropriate) of intermediate barriers and markers between private and public space - hedges, fences, rows of bollards (posts that control vehicle movement), planting, surface details etc.

High: Good quality, well maintained and in-keeping features where required.

Low: Stark edges where some making possible, use of standard or out-of-scale elements, damaged or poorly maintained elements.

### ***A5 Floorscape Quality***

Street surfaces, paved areas, mown grass etc. Appropriateness and quality of materials, design and maintenance.

High: Sound and fit surfaces of good and in keeping materials, in a well-maintained condition for expected levels of use.

Low: Worn, patched, broken, badly managed - note especially poor reinstatement of excavations.

### ***A6 Legibility***

Effective and uncluttered signs for traffic and pedestrians, clearly visible and unobstructed paths allowing ease of movement for pedestrians and traffic. Hierarchy of landmarks (e.g. signs to major highways, city landmarks and street landmarks) aids direction finding.

High: Clear signs and routes, together with informal hints as to routing with landmarks and detail at eye level.

Low: The opposite, signs absent or confused.

### ***A7 Sense of Threat***

Viewed environment reads as safe for walking or use, bearing in mind the different perceptions of age, and sex. Few areas lacking natural surveillance, few hiding places or dense unmanaged shrubberies, public use suggests casual monitoring.

High: Well lit, overlooked, spaces with no areas for hiding, loose dogs, threatening behaviour etc. in view.

Low: Poorly lit, decaying area with few signs of population, activity or concern.

### ***A8 Personal Safety: Traffic***

View which suggests clear demarcation between safely moving traffic and pedestrian spaces. Well marked crossings with adequate timing. No unmarked slip roads or blind views for emerging traffic.

High: Environment where pedestrian and traffic co-exist without conflict or hazardous behaviour on either part.

Low: Evident conflicts between traffic and pedestrians with frequent risk taking or anxiety on both parts.

### ***A9 Planting: Public***

Presence and quality of public trees, shrubs, grassed and bedded areas (note that there is a separate score for private planting).

High: Presence of some well-maintained and appropriate green space in the public realm. Species selected for urban scale and conditions. Supports and other had features in keeping. Evidence of occasional weeding and appropriate pruning.

Low: Little or no public greenspace or poorly maintained trees (dead or broken branches, overhanging pedestrian way etc.). Poor quality planting and/or planters. Excessive shrubberies, weeds dominating beds, overgrown or heavily eroded grass.

### ***A10 Vitality***

Street scene with individuals and activities which suggest a positive attitude towards community and environment, the basis of regard for the safety and condition of others.

High: Evidence of life being pursued at a variety of paces, using pedestrian space, generating active building fronts. Attitudes supportive.

Low: Few, or no activities on the street. Or activities which threaten or suggest lack of concern for others - blocked sidewalks, boisterous groups etc.

### ***A11 Appropriate Resting Places***

Availability of standing places for conversation or observation, and of formal or informal seating places for rest and relaxation.

High: Variety of sidewalk widths and setbacks for conversation grouping. Presence of appropriate and well-maintained formal or informal seating places, with well-maintained surrounds.

Low: Narrow sidewalks where conversation causes diversion for others. Absence of seating or resting places.

### ***A12 Signage***

Presence of official or good quality signage directing traffic and pedestrians to immediate and more distant destinations.

High: Sufficient visible and well-designed signs to meet obvious needs.

Low: The absence of signs where they should be available, or an ill-coordinated surplus of signs cluttering the view.

### ***A13 Street Furniture Quality***

Well designed and coordinated array of necessary street furniture - to include lighting, supports for planting and signs, bollards, seating and other expected elements.

High: Well maintained elements with some evidence of design co-ordination, possibly reinforcing local identity. In keeping with the period context and with levels of activity expected.

Low: Poorly maintained or damaged elements. Poorly coordinated array, out of keeping with context or levels of activity. Redundant elements.

### ***A14 Traffic Flow Appropriateness***

Traffic levels appropriate to the width and capacity of the street in view. Although tail backs (long lines of cars) might be expected in rush hours, frequent blockages or the use of a street as a 'rat run' suggest inappropriate provision.

High: Regular and easy traffic flow appropriate to both street and context.

Low: Conflicts between parking, passage and pedestrians. Hold ups out of rush hour. Evidence of 'rat running.'

## **B. PRIVATE SPACE IN VIEW**

The management of private space is a major element in the creation of streetscape. The following seven variables refer specifically to elements of private property which contribute to public space. In this context **private** refers to all buildings or spaces with limited or controlled access letting off the public realm, it may therefore include facilities which are regarded as **public** - retail units, hospitals, churches, libraries etc. For the present purpose each of these is regarded as having an ownership and management separate from that of the street space which is fronted.

### ***B15 Advertising, In Keeping***

Fascia, billboard, shop window and other advertising which enhances the character of the street, with different densities, styles and colours appropriate to the environment.

High: Appropriate size, colour, design and condition of commercial fascias, signs and other advertising visible from the street.

Low: Out of scale or inappropriately coloured advertising, though this is less likely to attract a low score than is damaged or neglected promotional material.

### ***B16 Dereliction, Absence of***

Absence of neglected or abandoned sites or buildings; sites in transition cleared and fenced with suggestion as to future use. **Note: - 'Vacancy' below applies to buildings or sites which are between owners or occupiers and show every sign of being re-used without major re-structuring or demolition.**

High: Empty buildings or sites remain well maintained with clean hoardings and information as to responsibility.

Low: Empty or abandoned buildings and sites with little or no security, signs of vandalism, dumping and destruction. No evidence of ownership responsibility.

### ***B17 Detailing Maintenance***

Evidence that building facades, rooflines and other visible areas are being regularly maintained.

High: View dominated by facades with maintained brick or stonework and pointing, plaster, paint and drainage goods. No evidence of damp or unmanaged settlement cracks etc.

Low: Neglect of all areas of building maintenance visible from the street.

### ***B18 Facade Quality***

A summary assessment of private facades in view reflecting on overall quality of design, maintenance and immediate presentation.

High: Well maintained facade, concerned presentation to the street.

Low: Poorly maintained and managed facade reflecting little concern for the street setting.

### ***B19 Planting: Private***

Refers to all plant materials located in the private realm as defined here, but visible from the street. Similar qualities to A9 above.

High: Well selected and located plant materials appropriate to the context. High level of maintenance with evident concern for public view.

Low: Poorly selected and maintained materials, designed and presented with little concern for the view from without.

## **C. HERITAGE IN VIEW**

While the heritage element in a town or streetscape should be well-integrated with the living place, historic buildings or sites should speak of their age in terms of conservation quality, signage and the opportunity to enjoy. The following variables approach this issue.

### **C20 Conserved Elements Evident**

The area should include a range of historic and conserved properties and spaces. While a dense supply of labels and signs would damage their image, investment in conservation in terms of building condition and integrated presentation might be expected.

High: Appropriate level of conservation concern evident in building and area presentation.

Low: Historic or feature buildings neglected, with little evidence of owner or community concern.

### ***C21 Historic Reference Seen***

Where appropriate integral, or additional, information alerting the viewer to the age, qualities or former function of the building or site is important.

High: Appropriately located, designed and maintained information or indication as to the significance of a building or site is available in situ. Signs which indicate the name of the Heritage Conservation District.

Low: No information or indication as to the significance of a building or site which is known to have an important role or key features.

### ***C22 Nomenclature/Place Reference***

Place, street and building names provide an informal web of historic locators within the urban system.

High: Traditional place, building, pub and other signs maintained.

Low: Signs removed or damaged, pub signs recently modified, church and other notice boards underused or unmaintained.

### ***C23 Quality of Conservation Work***

Although the standard of repair and restoration work may vary, the work should be carried out to an acceptable degree of competence and to the level recommended in such guidelines as those detailed in the Heritage Conservation District Plan.

High: Appropriate level of conservation concern evident in the standard of repair and restoration work.

Low: The work fails to meet standards appropriate to the status, era or style of the property.

### ***C24 Quality of New Development***

Incremental changes in a townscape may vary and over a period of time, cumulatively bring about a fundamental change in the appearance of the space. It is important, therefore, to monitor the individual changes that occur.

High: New development has an appropriate quality of design, use of materials, scaling and mass.

Low: New work is incompatible with existing and surrounding townscape features.

### ***C25 Historic Features, Maintained***

Some buildings of historic significance, either listed or at least part of the streetscape of conservation areas, may be in such poor repair that their future is not certain. Often these structures are vacant. It will be important to note the presence of such buildings.

High: No visible evidence of neglected historic buildings.

Low: Several historic buildings which appear to be in poor repair and may be in danger of eventual loss.

# Appendix C

## Executive Summaries



# Barriefield Executive Summary

## Introduction

- This study of Heritage Conservation Districts has been funded by the Ontario Trillium Foundation and is a joint effort among volunteers of the Architectural Conservancy of Ontario, the Heritage Resources Centre and volunteer historical societies across the province
- The Ontario Heritage Act enables municipalities to designate Heritage Conservation Districts (HCDs)
- Heritage Conservation Districts allow municipalities to guide future changes in these areas of special character
- 32 districts designated in or before 1992 were examined

## Background of Barriefield Heritage Conservation District

- Located in the City of Kingston
- Consists of 43 properties, 41 residential, one commercial and one church
- The district was designated in 1980
- Plan was written by Andre Scheinman Heritage and Preservation Consultant, Jedd Jones Architect Limited, Unterman McPhail Cuming Associates, Wendy Shearer Landscape Architect Limited

## Study Approach

- Resident surveys were conducted door to door by members of the Heritage Resources Centre
- Land-use mapping and a streetscape evaluation were conducted
- Sales history trends were collected from GeoWarehouse™ and analyzed
- Key stakeholders were interviewed
- Data on requests for alterations was collected

## Analysis of Key Findings

- The following objectives of the district plan have been met:
  - to maintain the character of Barriefield by maintaining existing low density, low rise residential profile
  - to conserve and restore heritage buildings wherever appropriate
  - to maintain and preserve natural features such as river banks, existing trees and tree lines
- 80% of the people surveyed are very satisfied with living in the district
- Most properties in the district had average or above sales history trajectories
- Properties in the district showed resistance to real estate downturns
- Overall, the Barriefield Heritage Conservation District has been successful planning initiative

## Recommendations

- Update the list of properties in the district and plan to reflect new development
- Track alteration requests in a comprehensive and easily accessible manner

# Bayfield Executive Summary

## Introduction

- This study of Heritage Conservation Districts has been funded by the Ontario Trillium Foundation and is a joint effort among volunteers of the Architectural Conservancy of Ontario, the Heritage Resources Centre and volunteer historical societies across the province
- The Ontario Heritage Act enables municipalities to designate Heritage Conservation Districts (HCDs)
- Heritage Conservation Districts allow municipalities to guide future changes in these areas of special character
- 32 districts designated in or before 1992 were examined

## Background of Bayfield Heritage Conservation District

- Located in the Village of Bayfield, now part of the Municipality of Bluewater
- Consists of 31 residential and commercial properties
- The district was designated in 1982
- The Bayfield Conservation District Plan was prepared for the Village of Bayfield by Architect and Planners Nick Hill and Chris Borgal

## Study Approach

- Resident surveys were conducted door to door by members of the Municipal Heritage Committee
- Land use mapping and a streetscape evaluation were conducted
- Sales history trends were collected from GeoWarehouse™ and analyzed
- Key stakeholders were interviewed
- Data on requests for alterations was collected

## Analysis of Key Findings

- The following objectives of the district plan have been met:
  - to maintain, conserve and restore buildings within the district
  - to remain a competitive and viable part of the community
  - to maintain a small village atmosphere and foster recognition
- 88% of people are very satisfied or satisfied with living or owning property in the district
- The process for completing alterations is not difficult or lengthy
- Most properties in the district had average or above sales history trajectories
- Properties in the district showed resistance to real estate downturns
- Overall, the Bayfield Heritage Conservation District has been a successful planning initiative

## Recommendations

- Track alteration requests in a comprehensive and easily accessible manner
- Improve the relationship between the Heritage Committee and the Municipality of Bluewater
- Conduct a study on accessibility within the district

# Brant Avenue Executive Summary

## Introduction

- This study of Heritage Conservation Districts has been funded by the Ontario Trillium Foundation and is a joint effort among volunteers of the Architectural Conservancy of Ontario, the Heritage Resources Centre and volunteer historical societies across the province
- The Ontario Heritage Act enables municipalities to designate Heritage Conservation Districts (HCDs)
- Heritage Conservation Districts allow municipalities to guide future changes in these areas of special character
- 32 districts designated in or before 1992 were examined

## Background of Brant Avenue Heritage Conservation District

- Located in the City of Brantford
- Consists of 132 properties which include residential, commercial and public use buildings
- The district was designated in 1988
- Plan was written by Townpride

## Study Approach

- Resident surveys were conducted door to door by members of the Heritage Resources Centre
- Land use mapping and a streetscape evaluation were conducted
- Sales history trends were collected from GeoWarehouse™ and analyzed
- Key stakeholders were interviewed
- Data on requests for alterations was collected

## Analysis of Key Findings

- The following objectives of the district plan have been met:
  - to improve public boulevards
  - to increase awareness
- The objective of the district plan to enhance the existing streetscape has been less successful
- 82% of people surveyed are very satisfied or satisfied with living in the district
- Most requests for alterations were approved within two months
- Most properties (39 of 47) in the district had average or above sales history trajectories
- Overall, the Brant Avenue Heritage Conservation District has been a successful planning initiative

## Recommendations

- Coordinated street signs would make the historic reference more visible
- Track alteration requests in a comprehensive and easily accessible manner
- Provide financial incentives
- Provide education about compatible signage within the district

# Byward Market Executive Summary

## Introduction

- This study of Heritage Conservation Districts has been funded by the Ontario Trillium Foundation and is a joint effort among volunteers of the Architectural Conservancy of Ontario, the Heritage Resources Centre and volunteer historical societies across the province
- The Ontario Heritage Act enables municipalities to designate Heritage Conservation Districts (HCDs)
- Heritage Conservation Districts allow municipalities to guide future changes in these areas of special character
- 32 districts designated in or before 1992 were examined

## Background of Byward Market Heritage Conservation District

- Located in the City of Ottawa
- Consists of mainly commercial and service buildings
- The district was designated in 1991
- Plan was written by Julian S. Smith Architect, Cecelia Paine and Associates, Margaret Carter Heritage Preservation Research, Marilyn Hart Planning Consultant and Helmut Schade Photographer

## Study Approach

- Resident surveys were conducted door to door by volunteers from Heritage Ottawa
- Land use mapping and a streetscape evaluation were conducted
- Sales history trends were collected from GeoWarehouse™ and analyzed
- Key stakeholders were interviewed
- Data on requests for alterations was collected

## Analysis of Key Findings

- The district plan does not have clearly stated objectives
- The assumed objective to conserve historic buildings has been met
- 71% of the people surveyed are very satisfied or satisfied with living or owning a property in the district
- The designation has not influenced property values
- Alteration requests were approved within six weeks
- Overall, the Byward Market Heritage Conservation District has been a successful planning initiative

## Recommendation

- Track alteration requests in a comprehensive and easily accessible manner

# Churchville Executive Summary

## Introduction

- This study of Heritage Conservation Districts has been funded by the Ontario Trillium Foundation and is a joint effort among volunteers of the Architectural Conservancy of Ontario, the Heritage Resources Centre and volunteer historical societies across the province
- The Ontario Heritage Act enables municipalities to designate Heritage Conservation Districts (HCDs)
- Heritage Conservation Districts allow municipalities to guide future changes in these areas of special character
- 32 districts designated in or before 1992 were examined

## Background of Churchville Heritage Conservation District

- Located in the City of Brampton
- Consists of 84 single family dwellings as well as a large area belonging to the Credit Valley Conservation Area, a cemetery, a public building and a bridge
- The district was designated in 1990
- Plan was written by David Cuming and Associates, Unterman McPhail Heritage Resource Consultants and Wendy Shearer Landscape Architect Limited
- Plan review conducted in 2007 by Bousfields Inc., George Robb Architect, R.J. Burnside & Associates Ltd., Unterman McPhail Associates and Wendy Shearer Landscape Architect

## Study Approach

- Resident surveys were conducted door to door by members of the Heritage Resources Centre
- Land use mapping and a streetscape evaluation were conducted
- Sales history trends were collected from GeoWarehouse™ and analyzed
- Key stakeholders were interviewed
- Data on requests for alterations was collected

## Analysis of Key Findings

- The following objectives of the district plan have been met:
  - to maintain, conserve and restore buildings within the district
  - to maintain and protect the rural landscape character including the Credit River
  - to enhance public space with landscaping, and to maintain a stable residential environment
- The objective of the district plan to encourage compatible new development has been less successful
- The objective of the district plan to maintain a stable agricultural development is at risk
- 70% of the people surveyed are very satisfied or satisfied with living in the district
- Most properties in the district had average or above sales history trajectories
- Properties in the district showed resistance to real estate downturns
- The Heritage Conservation District approach has been successful in maintaining the distinct areas of the district as well as the overall rural character
- Overall, the Churchville Heritage Conservation District has been a successful planning initiative

## Recommendation

- Track alteration requests in a comprehensive and easily accessible manner

# Cross-Melville Executive Summary

## Introduction

- This study of Heritage Conservation Districts has been funded by the Ontario Trillium Foundation and is a joint effort among volunteers of the Architectural Conservancy of Ontario, the Heritage Resources Centre and volunteer historical societies across the province
- The Ontario Heritage Act enables municipalities to designate Heritage Conservation Districts (HCDs)
- Heritage Conservation Districts allow municipalities to guide future changes in these areas of special character
- 32 districts designated in or before 1992 were examined

## Background of Cross-Melville Heritage Conservation District

- Located in the former Town of Dundas, now the City of Hamilton
- Consists of 49 properties, 45 single family dwellings and three churches
- The district was designated in 1988
- Plan was written by David Cuming and Associates and Unterman McPhail Heritage Resource Consultants

## Study Approach

- Resident surveys were conducted door to door by local volunteers from the Hamilton Branch of the Architectural Conservancy of Ontario
- Land use mapping and a streetscape evaluation were conducted
- Sales history trends were collected from GeoWarehouse™ and analyzed
- Key stakeholders were interviewed
- Data on requests for alterations was collected

## Analysis of Key Findings

- The following objectives of the district plan have been met:
  - to maintain and conserve buildings
  - to maintain a stable residential environment
  - to conserve existing tree planting
- The objective of enhancing public spaces has been less successful
- 72% of people are very satisfied or satisfied with living in the district
- 86% of applications for alterations were approved within two months
- The processes for completing alterations to buildings is not difficult
- Properties in the district had average or above sales history trajectories
- Properties in the district showed resistance to real estate downturns
- Overall, the Cross-Melville Heritage Conservation District has been a successful planning initiative

## Recommendations

- Enhance public spaces by fixing roads
- Create a tree by-law or tree strategy to reduce the impact of losing older trees
- Provide better liaison between the city staff and the local Heritage Conservation District committee
- Provide a grant program

# First and Second Street Executive Summary

## Introduction

- This study of Heritage Conservation Districts has been funded by the Ontario Trillium Foundation and is a joint effort among volunteers of the Architectural Conservancy of Ontario, the Heritage Resources Centre and volunteer historical societies across the province
- The Ontario Heritage Act enables municipalities to designate Heritage Conservation Districts (HCDs)
- Heritage Conservation Districts allow municipalities to guide future changes in these areas of special character
- 32 districts designated in or before 1992 were examined

## Background of First and Second Street Heritage Conservation District

- Located in the Town of Oakville
- Consists of 69 single family dwellings
- The district was designated in 1987
- Plan was prepared by the Town of Oakville

## Study Approach

- Resident surveys were conducted door to door by student volunteers from the Heritage Resources Centre
- Land use mapping and a streetscape evaluation were conducted
- Sales history trends were collected from GeoWarehouse™ and analyzed
- Key stakeholders were interviewed
- Data on requests for alterations was collected

## Analysis of Key Findings

- The following objectives of the district plan have been met:
  - to maintain the scale and historic character of the area
  - to encourage local awareness
  - to have compatible infill
  - to maintain the residential quality of the area
- The objective of the Heritage Conservation District Plan to involve the community in decision making has been less successful
- 90% of people are very satisfied or satisfied with living in the district
- Most applications for alterations were approved within two months
- Most properties in the district had average or above sales history trajectories
- The Waterfront is accessible to all members of the public, not just local residents
- Overall, the First and Second Street Heritage Conservation District has been a successful planning initiative

## Recommendations

- Coordinated street signs or signs at the village entrance would make the historic reference more visible
- Continue to increase the opportunities for the community to be involved in the decisions (e.g more communication or a person from the district appointed to the Municipal Heritage Committee)
- Effort to enforce the guidelines should continue

# Galt Executive Summary

## Introduction

- This study of Heritage Conservation Districts has been funded by the Ontario Trillium Foundation and is a joint effort among volunteers of the Architectural Conservancy of Ontario, the Heritage Resources Centre and volunteer historical societies across the province
- The Ontario Heritage Act enables municipalities to designate Heritage Conservation Districts
- Heritage Conservation Districts allow municipalities to guide future changes in these areas of special character
- 32 districts designated in or before 1992 were examined

## Background of Galt Heritage Conservation District

- Located in the City of Cambridge
- Consists of five commercial buildings
- The district was designated in 1985
- Plan was written by Nicholas Hill, Architect and Planner

## Study Approach

- Resident surveys were conducted door to door by members of the North Waterloo Branch of the Architecture Conservancy of Ontario
- Land use mapping and a streetscape evaluation were conducted
- Sales history trends were collected from GeoWarehouse™ and analyzed
- Key stakeholders were interviewed
- Data on requests for alterations was collected

## Analysis of Key Findings

- The following objectives of the district plan have been met:
  - to economically remain a competitive and viable part of the working community
  - to retain a local atmosphere and a sense of human scale
- The objective of the district plan to aesthetically conserve and restore buildings in a compatible manner has been less successful
- 70% of the people surveyed are very satisfied or satisfied with working or owning property in the district
- Most properties in the district had above sales history trajectories
- Properties in the district showed resistance to real estate downturns
- Overall, the Galt Heritage Conservation District has been a successful planning initiative

## Recommendations

- To provide financial incentives for fabric improvements
- Consider expanding the district to include adjacent block
- Focus on relationships with landlords
- Track alteration requests in a comprehensive and easily accessible manner

# Goderich Executive Summary

## Introduction

- This study of Heritage Conservation Districts has been funded by the Ontario Trillium Foundation and is a joint effort among volunteers of the Architectural Conservancy of Ontario, the Heritage Resources Centre and volunteer historical societies across the province
- The Ontario Heritage Act enables municipalities to designate Heritage Conservation Districts (HCDs)
- Heritage Conservation Districts allow municipalities to guide future changes in these areas of special character
- 32 districts designated in or before 1992 were examined

## Background of Goderich Heritage Conservation District

- The Square and West Street Heritage Conservation Districts are located in the Town of Goderich
- The districts are contiguous and will be examined together
- The districts consist of 75 buildings and a park
- Plans were written by Nick Hill and Chris Borgal

## Study Approach

- Resident surveys were conducted door to door by local volunteers from the Municipal Heritage Committee
- Land use mapping and a streetscape evaluation were conducted
- Sales history trends were collected from GeoWarehouse™ and analyzed
- Key stakeholders were interviewed
- Data on requests for alterations was collected

## Analysis of Key Findings

- The following objectives of the district plan have been met:
  - to preserve, protect and enhance the buildings
  - to extend the area
  - to recognize and reinforce the area as a business centre and an historic area
- The objective of the Heritage Conservation District Plan to coordinate design and colours within individual blocks has been less successful
- 78% of people are very satisfied or satisfied with living and owning property in the district
- The process for completing alterations to buildings is not an issue in the district
- Most properties in the district had above average sales history trajectories
- The Square is an example of a district which scored high visually
- Overall, the Goderich Heritage Conservation Districts have been successful planning initiatives

## Recommendations

- Track alteration requests in a comprehensive and easily accessible manner
- At least 15 people need more information about the district and its designation
- Signage in the district could be to be managed better in order to achieve Heritage district goals
- The use and protection of the park need to be addressed

# King Street East Executive Summary

## Introduction

- This study of Heritage Conservation Districts has been funded by the Ontario Trillium Foundation and is a joint effort among volunteers of the Architectural Conservancy of Ontario, the Heritage Resources Centre and volunteer historical societies across the province
- The Ontario Heritage Act enables municipalities to designate Heritage Conservation Districts (HCDs)
- Heritage Conservation Districts allow municipalities to guide future changes in these areas of special character
- 32 districts designated in or before 1992 were examined

## Background of King Street East Heritage Conservation District

- Located in the Town of Cobourg
- Consists of 130 commercial properties
- The district was designated in 1990
- Plan was written by Robert D. Mikel with the assistance of Margaret Baily

## Study Approach

- Resident surveys were conducted door to door by members of the Heritage Resources Centre
- Land use mapping and a streetscape evaluation were conducted
- Sales history trends were collected from GeoWarehouse™ and analyzed
- A key stakeholder was interviewed

## Analysis of Key Findings

- The following objective of the district plan has been met:
  - to promote and enhance distinct historic areas
- The following objectives of the district plan have been less successful:
  - to ensure through guidelines, increased cohesion and compatibility with existing built form
  - to provide comprehensive administration which is simple and efficient
- 66% of the people surveyed are very satisfied or satisfied with living or owning property in the district
- Four of nine properties had average or above average sales history trajectories while five performed below average
- Designation is not a factor in property values
- Overall, the King Street East Heritage Conservation District has been a successful planning initiative

## Recommendations

- Track alteration requests in a comprehensive and easily accessible manner
- Sell the benefits of the Heritage Conservation District as an advantage to business owners and tenants
- Transfer more responsibility for the district to the Heritage Staff

# MacNab-Charles Executive Summary

## Introduction

- This study of Heritage Conservation Districts has been funded by the Ontario Trillium Foundation and is a joint effort among volunteers of the Architectural Conservancy of Ontario, the Heritage Resources Centre and volunteer historical societies across the province
- The Ontario Heritage Act enables municipalities to designate Heritage Conservation Districts (HCDs)
- Heritage Conservation Districts allow municipalities to guide future changes in these areas of special character
- 32 districts designated in or before 1992 were examined

## Background of MacNab-Charles Heritage Conservation District

- Located in the City of Hamilton
- The district consists of seven properties, two multi-unit residences, a church and manse, two residential properties and an office
- The district was designated in 1990
- The plan was written by the Local Planning Branch, Planning and Development Department and the Hamilton-Wentworth Region

## Study Approach

- The original designation documents were analyzed
- Land use mapping and a streetscape evaluation were conducted
- Sales history trends were analyzed using GeoWarehouse™
- Key stakeholders were interviewed
- Data on requests for alterations was collected

## Analysis of Key Findings

- The following objectives of the district plan have been met:
  - to provide long-term coordinated plan development
  - to maintain the area's unique character
  - to increase revenues and improve building stock
- The Heritage Conservation District Plan objectives intended to create neighbourhood revitalization and engage the public have been less successful
- Based on the appearance of the district people seem to be satisfied with living in the district
- Eight weeks was the longest period it took for an application for change to be approved
- Most properties (three of four) in the district had above average sales history trajectories
- Properties in the district show resistance to downturns in the real estate market
- Overall, the MacNab-Charles Heritage Conservation District has been a successful planning initiative

## Recommendations

- Provide an opportunity for increased public participation by property owners
- Consider expanding the district to include the block to the southeast

# Market Square Executive Summary

## Introduction

- This study of Heritage Conservation Districts has been funded by the Ontario Trillium Foundation and is a joint effort among volunteers of the Architectural Conservancy of Ontario, the Heritage Resources Centre and volunteer historical societies across the province
- The Ontario Heritage Act enables municipalities to designate Heritage Conservation Districts (HCDs)
- Heritage Conservation Districts (HCDs) allow municipalities to guide future changes in these areas of special character
- 32 districts designated in or before 1992 were examined

## Background of Market Square Heritage Conservation District

- Located in the City of Kingston
- Consists of 19 properties; two public buildings, seven eating and drinking establishments, three service providers, two retail stores, one leisure facility, one office and three vacant properties
- The district was designated in 1984
- Study was conducted by Lily Inglis and Harold D. Kalman

## Study Approach

- Resident surveys were conducted door to door by members of the Heritage Resources Centre
- Land use mapping and a streetscape evaluation were conducted
- Key stakeholders were interviewed
- Data on requests for alterations was unavailable

## Analysis of Key Findings

- The following objectives of the district plan have been met:
  - to ensure alterations, additions and renovations are compatible with the character of the district
  - to ensure that new building are compatible with the character of the district
  - to ensure that signage, landscaping and street furniture is compatible with the character of the district
  - to ensure that land uses are compatible with the heritage and commercial character of the district
- Those surveyed seemed to be moderately satisfied with running a business in this district
- Those surveyed did not consider the applications for alterations process too complicated or lengthy
- District has a high proportion of vacant properties given its location in a thriving downtown core
- Overall, Market Square Heritage Conservation District has been a successful planning initiative

## Recommendations

- Create an education guide for property owners to ensure they understand their role in the success of the district
- Track alteration requests in a comprehensive and easily accessible manner

# Markham Village Executive Summary

## Introduction

- This study of Heritage Conservation Districts has been funded by the Ontario Trillium Foundation and is a joint effort among volunteers of the Architectural Conservancy of Ontario, the Heritage Resources Centre and volunteer historical societies across the province
- The Ontario Heritage Act enables municipalities to designate Heritage Conservation Districts (HCDs)
- Heritage Conservation Districts allow municipalities to guide future changes in these areas of special character
- 32 districts designated in or before 1992 were examined

## Background of Markham Village Heritage Conservation District

- Located in the City of Markham
- Consists 548 residential and commercial buildings
- The district was designated in 1990
- Plan was written by Project Planning Limited

## Study Approach

- Resident surveys were conducted through a mail out
- Land use mapping and a streetscape evaluation were conducted
- Sales history trends were collected from GeoWarehouse™ and analyzed
- Key stakeholders were interviewed
- Data on requests for alterations was collected

## Analysis of Key Findings

- The district plan does not have clearly stated objectives
- The implied objective of the Heritage Conservation District Plan to maintain and conserve buildings has been met
- 60% of the people surveyed are very satisfied or satisfied with living in the district
- All requests for alterations were approved within six weeks
- The designation is not a factor in the real estate values of the area
- The Heritage Conservation District approach has been successful in maintaining the distinct areas of the district, as well as the overall heritage character
- Overall, the Markham Village Heritage Conservation District has been a successful planning initiative

## Recommendations

- Track alteration requests in a comprehensive and easily accessible manner
- Create a policy to manage future traffic in the area

# Meadowvale Village Executive Summary

## Introduction

- This study of Heritage Conservation Districts has been funded by the Ontario Trillium Foundation and is a joint effort among volunteers of the Architectural Conservancy of Ontario, the Heritage Resources Centre and volunteer historical societies across the province
- The Ontario Heritage Act enables municipalities to designate Heritage Conservation Districts (HCDs)
- Heritage Conservation Districts allow municipalities to guide future changes in these areas of special character
- 32 districts designated in or before 1992 were examined

## Background of Meadowvale Village Heritage Conservation District

- Located in the City of Mississauga
- Consists of 53 residential properties, a church and a Town Hall
- The district was designated in 1980 as the first district in the province
- Plan was prepared by the City of Mississauga

## Study Approach

- Resident surveys were conducted door to door by members of the Heritage Resources Centre
- Land use mapping and a streetscape evaluation were conducted
- Sales history trends were collected from GeoWarehouse™ and analyzed
- Key stakeholders were interviewed
- Data on requests for alterations was collected

## Analysis of Key Findings

- The following objectives of the district plan have been met:
  - to maintain and conserve buildings
  - to increase residents' awareness
  - to maintain the village-like atmosphere
- 86% of people are very satisfied or satisfied with living in the district
- Major additions have not negatively affected the character of the village
- The processes for completing alterations to buildings is neither difficult nor lengthy
- Properties in the district had average sales history trajectories
- One property in the district showed resistance to real estate downturns
- The district has influenced the urban planning of the surrounding area
- Overall, the Meadowvale Village Heritage Conservation District has been a successful planning initiative

## Recommendations

- Coordinated street signs or signs at the village entrance would make historic reference more visible
- Expand the district to include a buffer and the natural ridge
- Track alteration requests in a comprehensive and easily accessible manner

# Minto Park Executive Summary

## Introduction

- This study of Heritage Conservation Districts has been funded by the Ontario Trillium Foundation and is a joint effort among volunteers of the Architectural Conservancy of Ontario, the Heritage Resources Centre and volunteer historical societies across the province
- The Ontario Heritage Act enables municipalities to designate Heritage Conservation Districts (HCDs)
- Heritage Conservation Districts allow municipalities to guide future changes in these areas of special character
- 32 districts designated in or before 1992 were examined

## Background of Minto Park Heritage Conservation District

- Located in the City of Ottawa
- Consists of 24 residential properties
- The district was designated in 1988

## Study Approach

- Resident surveys were conducted door to door by volunteers from Heritage Ottawa
- Land use mapping and a streetscape evaluation were conducted
- Sales history trends were collected from GeoWarehouse™ and analyzed
- Key stakeholders were interviewed
- Data on requests for alterations was collected

## Analysis of Key Findings

- The district does not have clearly stated objectives
- The assumed objective to conserve historic buildings has been met
- 85% of the people surveyed are very satisfied or satisfied with living in the district
- All of the properties in the district had average or above sales history trajectories
- Properties in the district showed resistance to real estate market downturns
- The district's park has a community function and a clear purpose
- Overall, the Minto Park Heritage Conservation District has been a successful planning initiative

## Recommendations

- Track alteration requests in a comprehensive and easily accessible manner
- Implement a study to produce a Heritage Conservation District Plan that includes clear goals and objectives

# New Hamburg Executive Summary

## Introduction

- This study of Heritage Conservation Districts has been funded by the Ontario Trillium Foundation and is a joint effort among volunteers of the Architectural Conservancy of Ontario, the Heritage Resources Centre and volunteer historical societies across the province
- The Ontario Heritage Act enables municipalities to designate Heritage Conservation Districts (HCDs)
- Heritage Conservation Districts allow municipalities to guide future changes in these areas of special character
- 32 districts designated in or before 1992 were examined

## Background of New Hamburg Heritage Conservation District

- Located in the Township of Wilmot
- The district consists of 31 properties that are predominantly commercial and institutional buildings as well as a portion of the Nith River flood plain
- The district was designated in 1992
- The plan was written by Project Planning Limited

## Study Approach

- Resident surveys were conducted door to door by volunteers from the North Waterloo Branch of the Architectural Conservancy of Ontario
- Land use mapping and a streetscape evaluation were conducted
- Sales history trends were collected from GeoWarehouse™ and analyzed
- A key stakeholder was interviewed
- Data on requests for alterations was collected

## Analysis of Key Findings

- The following objectives of the district plan have been met:
  - to attract more business investment and achieve better retail sales
  - to increase the value of the properties to increase the municipal tax base
  - to preserve, restore and generally improve the heritage resources
- The following objective of the district plan has been less successful:
  - to encourage compatible new development
- 58% of people are very satisfied or satisfied with owning property in the district
- Most applications for alterations were approved within two months
- Most (four of five) properties in the district had average or above sales history trajectories
- Residents have not embraced the idea of the Heritage Conservation District
- Overall, the New Hamburg Heritage Conservation District has been a successful planning initiative

## Recommendations

- Track alteration requests in a comprehensive and easily accessible manner
- Provide residents with more information about the benefits of the district
- Provide a seat on the Municipal Heritage Committee for a business owner from the district

# Old Oakville Executive Summary

## Introduction

- This study of Heritage Conservation Districts has been funded by the Ontario Trillium Foundation and is a joint effort among volunteers of the Architectural Conservancy of Ontario, the Heritage Resources Centre and volunteer historical societies across the province
- The Ontario Heritage Act enables municipalities to designate Heritage Conservation Districts (HCDs)
- Heritage Conservation Districts allow municipalities to guide future changes in these areas of special character
- 32 districts designated in or before 1992 were examined

## Background of Old Oakville Heritage Conservation District

- Located in the Town of Oakville
- Consists of 162 primarily single family one and two-storey residences
- The district was designated in 1981
- Plan was prepared by the Town of Oakville

## Study Approach

- Resident surveys were conducted door to door by student volunteers from the Heritage Resources Centre
- Land use mapping and a streetscape evaluation were conducted
- Sales history trends were collected from GeoWarehouse™ and analyzed
- Key stakeholders were interviewed
- Data on requests for alterations was collected

## Analysis of Key Findings

- The district plan does not have clearly stated objectives
- The assumed objective of the Heritage Conservation District Plan to maintain and conserve buildings has been met
- 89 %of people are very satisfied or satisfied with living in the district
- Most requests for alterations were approved within two months
- Most properties in the district had average or above sales history trajectories
- The Waterfront is accessible to all members of the public, not just local residents
- Overall, the Old Oakville Heritage Conservation District has been a successful planning initiative

## Recommendations

- Update the district plan to include goals and objectives
- Track alteration requests in a comprehensive and easily accessible manner

# Queen and Picton Streets Executive Summary

## Introduction

- This study of Heritage Conservation Districts has been funded by the Ontario Trillium Foundation and is a joint effort among volunteers of the Architectural Conservancy of Ontario, the Heritage Resources Centre and volunteer historical societies across the province
- The Ontario Heritage Act enables municipalities to designate Heritage Conservation Districts (HCDs)
- Heritage Conservation Districts allow municipalities to guide future changes in these areas of special character
- 32 districts designated in or before 1992 were examined

## Background of Queen and Picton Streets Heritage Conservation District

- Located in the Town of Niagara-on-the-Lake
- Consists of 140 properties; residential and commercial with a few public and service buildings
- The district was designated in 1986
- Plan was written by Nicholas Hill

## Study Approach

- Resident surveys were conducted door to door by students from Willowbank School of Restoration Arts and members of the Heritage Resources Centre
- Land use mapping and a streetscape evaluation was conducted
- Sales history trends were collected from GeoWarehouse™ and analyzed
- Key stakeholders were interviewed

## Analysis of Key Findings

- The following objectives of the district plan have been met:
  - to conserve and maintain the visible history of Queen and Picton Streets
  - to remain a competitive and progressive business environment
- The following objective of the district plan has been less successful:
  - to foster a small town atmosphere, enhance community pride and to involve local community in major issues
- 80% of the people surveyed are very satisfied or satisfied with living or owning a property in the district
- 70% of the properties in the district had average or above sales history trajectories
- Overall, the Queen and Picton Streets Heritage Conservation District has been a successful planning initiative

## Recommendations

- Create a balance between heritage and tourism
- Track alteration requests in a comprehensive and easily accessible manner

# Queen Street Executive Summary

## Introduction

- This study of Heritage Conservation Districts has been funded by the Ontario Trillium Foundation and is a joint effort among volunteers of the Architectural Conservancy of Ontario, the Heritage Resources Centre and volunteer historical societies across the province
- The Ontario Heritage Act enables municipalities to designate Heritage Conservation Districts (HCDs)
- Heritage Conservation Districts allow municipalities to guide future changes in these areas of special character
- 32 districts designated in or before 1992 were examined

## Background of Queen Street Heritage Conservation District

- Located in the City of St. Catharines
- Consists of 34 residential properties, a school and a large park
- The district was designated in 1991
- The Plan was written by David Cuming and Associates, Unterman McPhail Heritage Resource Consultants and Wendy Shearer Landscape Architect Limited.

## Study Approach

- Resident surveys were conducted door to door by members of the Municipal Heritage Committee
- Land use mapping and a streetscape evaluation were conducted
- Sales history trends were collected from GeoWarehouse™ and analyzed
- Key stakeholders were interviewed

## Analysis of Key Findings

- The following objectives of the district plan have been met:
  - to encourage the ongoing maintenance and repair of individual buildings
  - to maintain and protect the urban landscape including trees and grass boulevards
  - to maintain a stable residential environment
  - to ensure compatible development
- 100% of the people surveyed are very satisfied or satisfied with living in the district
- Most properties (eight of nine) in the district had above average sales history trajectories
- Properties in the district showed resistance to real estate downturns
- Events in Montebello Park cause noise and traffic
- The district could be expanded
- Young people serve on the Municipal Heritage Committee
- Overall, the Queen Street Heritage Conservation District has been a successful planning initiative

## Recommendations

- Track alteration requests in a comprehensive and easily accessible manner
- Provide an opportunity for the community to meet to address the use of Montebello Park
- Consider expanding the area

# Thornhill Executive Summary

## Introduction

- This study of Heritage Conservation Districts has been funded by the Ontario Trillium Foundation and is a joint effort among volunteers of the Architectural Conservancy of Ontario, the Heritage Resources Centre and volunteer historical societies across the province
- The Ontario Heritage Act enables municipalities to designate Heritage Conservation Districts (HCDs)
- Heritage Conservation Districts allow municipalities to guide future changes in these areas of special character
- 32 districts designated in or before 1992 were examined

## Background of Thornhill Heritage Conservation Districts

- Located in the Cities of Markham and Vaughan
- Consists of 138 and 82 properties respectively
- Predominantly residential with retail buildings along Yonge Street
- The districts were both designated in 1986
- Plans were written by Phillip Carter

## Study Approach

- Resident surveys were conducted door to door by members of the Heritage Resources Centre
- Land use mapping and streetscape evaluations were conducted
- Sales history trends were collected from GeoWarehouse™ and analyzed
- Key stakeholders were interviewed
- Data on requests for alterations was collected

## Analysis of Key Findings

- Each side has been managed differently and this is reflected in their success
- City of Markham has been more consistent in applying the rules of the district which has resulted in a higher level of satisfaction among residents and a strong performance in the area of real estate values
- City of Vaughan on the other hand has not applied the rules as consistently and as a result residents are less satisfied, and property values have suffered

## Recommendations

### *Thornhill – Markham*

- Provide better liaison between the committee and the residents of the district
- Create a sign by-law that regulates advertising within the district

### *Thornhill – Vaughan*

- Track alteration requests in a comprehensive and easily accessible manner
- Enforce the District Guidelines
- Create a awareness campaign that fosters community support
- Create a sign by-law that regulates advertising within the district

# Sandy Hill Executive Summary

## Introduction

- This study of Heritage Conservation Districts has been funded by the Ontario Trillium Foundation and is a joint effort among volunteers of the Architectural Conservancy of Ontario, the Heritage Resources Centre and volunteer historical societies across the province
- The Ontario Heritage Act enables municipalities to designate Heritage Conservation Districts (HCDs)
- Heritage Conservation Districts allow municipalities to guide future changes in these areas of special character
- 32 districts designated in or before 1992 were examined

## Background of Sandy Hill Heritage Conservation District

- Located in City of Ottawa
- Consists of five small districts with 227 properties
- The districts were designated in 1982

## Study Approach

- Resident surveys were conducted door to door by volunteers from Heritage Ottawa
- Land use mapping and a streetscape evaluation were conducted
- Sales history trends were collected from GeoWarehouse™ and analyzed
- Key stakeholders were interviewed
- Data on requests for alterations was collected

## Analysis of Key Findings

- The district plan does not have clearly stated objectives
- The implied objective of the Heritage Conservation District Plan to maintain and conserve buildings has been met
- Most of people surveyed are very satisfied or satisfied with living in the district
- The process for completing alterations to buildings is neither difficult nor lengthy
- Two-thirds of the properties in the district had average or above sales history trajectories
- Overall, the Sandy Hill Heritage Conservation District has been a successful planning initiative

## Recommendations

- Create a district plan including goals and objectives as well as design guidelines
- Track alteration requests in a comprehensive and easily accessible manner
- The encroachment of the University of Ottawa needs to be addressed by the community
- Continue to pursue the designation of the areas between the five districts

# Seaforth Executive Summary

## Introduction

- This study of Heritage Conservation Districts has been funded by the Ontario Trillium Foundation and is a joint effort among volunteers of the Architectural Conservancy of Ontario, the Heritage Resources Centre and volunteer historical societies across the province
- The Ontario Heritage Act enables municipalities to designate Heritage Conservation Districts
- Heritage Conservation Districts allow municipalities to guide future changes in these areas of special character
- 32 districts designated in or before 1992 were examined

## Background of Seaforth Heritage Conservation District

- Located in the former Town of Seaforth now the Municipality of Huron East
- Consists of 62 properties all commercial
- The district was designated in 1984
- Plan was written by Nick Hill and Chris Borgal Planners and Architects

## Study Approach

- Resident surveys were conducted door to door by Jan Hawley and Dianne Smith
- Land use mapping and a streetscape evaluation were conducted
- Sales history trends were collected from GeoWarehouse™ and analyzed
- Key stakeholders were interviewed
- Data on requests for alterations was collected

## Analysis of Key Findings

- The following objectives of the district plan have been met:
  - to retain and restore heritage elements and to eliminate detrimental elements has been successfully met
  - to maintain a small town atmosphere, foster recognition and preserve a sense of human scale has successfully been met
- The objective of the district plan to remain a competitive and viable part of the community has been less successful
- 80% of the people surveyed are very satisfied or satisfied with living in the district
- 88% of alteration requests were approved within two months
- Properties in the district have equal sales history trajectories as surrounding area
- Overall, the Seaforth Heritage Conservation District has been a successful planning initiative

## Recommendations

- Better marketing for tax incentives
- Track alteration requests in a comprehensive and easily accessible manner

# Town of Bath Executive Summary

## Introduction

- This study of Heritage Conservation Districts has been funded by the Ontario Trillium Foundation and is a joint effort among volunteers of the Architectural Conservancy of Ontario, the Heritage Resources Centre and volunteer historical societies across the province
- The Ontario Heritage Act enables municipalities to designate Heritage Conservation Districts (HCDs)
- Heritage Conservation Districts allow municipalities to guide future changes in these areas of special character
- 32 districts designated in or before 1992 were examined

## Background of Bath Heritage Conservation District

- Located in the former Village of Bath, now Loyalist Township
- District includes seven residential buildings, a former Town Hall, now a museum, and a meeting hall
- The district was designated in 1983

## Study Approach

- Resident surveys were conducted door to door by members of the Heritage Resources Centre
- Land use mapping and a streetscape evaluation were conducted
- Sales history trends were collected from GeoWarehouse™ and analyzed
- A key stakeholder was interviewed

## Analysis of Key Findings

- The Bath Heritage Conservation District Plan does not have clearly stated objectives
- The assumed objective to conserve historic buildings has been met
- 100% of people are very satisfied with living in the district
- The one property with a sales history had an above average trajectory
- There has not been a need to call on the Heritage Conservation District processes
- The protection and processes afforded by Heritage Conservation District designation is proactive and will be in place when decisions about the future use of the area are needed
- Overall, the Bath Heritage Conservation District has been a successful planning initiative

## Recommendations

- Update the district plan including a statement of cultural heritage value for the district as well as goals and objectives
- Track future alteration requests in a comprehensive and easily accessible manner

# Waverly Park Executive Summary

## Introduction

- The Ontario Heritage Act enables municipalities to designate Heritage Conservation Districts (HCDs)
- Heritage Conservation Districts allow municipalities to guide future changes in these areas of special character
- This study of Heritage Conservation Districts has been funded by the Ontario Trillium Foundation and is a joint effort among volunteers of the Architectural Conservancy of Ontario, the Heritage Resources Centre and volunteer historical societies across the province
- 32 districts designated in or before 1992 were examined

## Background of Waverly Park Heritage Conservation District

- Located in the City of Thunder Bay
- Consists of 60 properties, which are predominantly residential with several institutional and public buildings and a centrally located park
- The district was designated in 1986
- Plan was written by DeLCan Consulting Engineers and Planners

## Study Approach

- Resident surveys were delivered through the mail and were returned to the City of Thunder Bay
- Sales history trends were collected from GeoWarehouse™ and analyzed
- Key stakeholders were interviewed

## Analysis of Key Findings

- The following objective of the district plan has been met:
  - to protect and enhance the heritage character of the area
- The following objectives of the district plan have been less successful:
  - to strengthen the identity of the area and enhance its image as an important heritage area within the City of Thunder Bay
  - to encourage public and private participation in the protection and improvement of the district
- 63% of the people surveyed are very satisfied or satisfied with living in the district
- Most properties (six of eight) in the district had average or above sales history trajectories
- Overall, the Waverly Park Heritage Conservation District has been a successful planning initiative

## Recommendations

- Track alteration requests in a comprehensive and easily accessible manner
- Provide opportunities for public and private involvement in the district
- Make information about the district more accessible
- Provide a grant program

# Whitevale Executive Summary

## Introduction

- This study of Heritage Conservation Districts has been funded by the Ontario Trillium Foundation and is a joint effort among volunteers of the Architectural Conservancy of Ontario, the Heritage Resources Centre and volunteer historical societies across the province
- The Ontario Heritage Act enables municipalities to designate Heritage Conservation Districts
- Heritage Conservation Districts allow municipalities to guide future changes in these areas of special character
- 32 districts designated in or before 1992 were examined

## Background of Whitevale Heritage Conservation District

- Located in the City of Pickering
- Consists of 35 properties mainly residential, two retail and three public
- The district designation process began in 1992 and it was designated in 1993

## Study Approach

- Resident surveys were conducted door to door by members of the Heritage Resources Centre
- Land use mapping and a streetscape evaluation were conducted
- Sales history trends were collected from GeoWarehouse™ and analyzed
- Data on requests for alterations was collected

## Analysis of Key Findings

- The following objectives of the district plan have been met:
  - to encourage the maintenance and conservation of heritage buildings
  - to encourage new development which respects existing building stock
  - to maintain the rural character of Whitevale
- 100% of the people surveyed are very satisfied or satisfied with living in the district
- Most properties in the district had average or above sales history trajectories
- Alteration requests are neither difficult or lengthy
- Overall, the Whitevale Heritage conservation District Plan is a successful planning initiative

## Recommendation

- Track alteration requests in a comprehensive and easily accessible manner

# Wychwood Park Executive Summary

## Introduction

- This study of Heritage Conservation Districts has been funded by the Ontario Trillium Foundation and is a joint effort among volunteers of the Architectural Conservancy of Ontario, the Heritage Resources Centre and volunteer historical societies across the province
- The Ontario Heritage Act enables municipalities to designate Heritage Conservation Districts (HCDs)
- Heritage Conservation Districts allow municipalities to guide future changes in these areas of special character
- 32 districts designated in or before 1992 were examined

## Background of Wychwood Park Heritage Conservation District

- Located in the City of Toronto
- Consists of 64 residential properties
- The district was designated in 1985
- Plan was written Keith Wagland, Truman and Jennings, Harold Klamon and John Stewart

## Study Approach

- Resident surveys were conducted door to door by local citizens
- Land use mapping and a streetscape evaluation were conducted
- Sales history trends were collected from GeoWarehouse™ and analyzed
- Key stakeholders were interviewed
- Data on requests for alterations was collected

## Analysis of Key Findings

- The following objectives of the district plan have been met:
  - to maintain park-like ambience including trees
  - to maintain low density residential quality of the area
- 80% of the people surveyed are very satisfied or satisfied with living in the district
- All of the properties with sales histories in the district had average or above sales history trajectories
- The area has multiple levels of organization which supports the heritage of the area
- There is unfounded concern that new residents do not accept the heritage of the area
- Overall, the Wychwood Park Heritage Conservation District has been a successful planning initiative

## Recommendation

- Track alteration requests in a comprehensive and easily accessible manner

## Appendix D

### Conclusions Matrices



## Conclusions Matrices

### Part A: Common Issues (More than three districts)

Municipality	District Name	Funding	Tracking Alterations	Education	Park	Community Involvement	Expansion	Compatible Development	Development Pressure	No Goals and/or Plan
City of Kingston	Barriefield Village							Positive		
Municipality of Bluewater	Bayfield									
City of Brantford	Brant Avenue									
City of Ottawa	Byward Market									No Goals
City of Brampton	Churchville									
City of Hamilton	Cross-Melville									
Town of Oakville	First and Second Street				Positive					
City of Cambridge	Galt									
Town of Goderich	Goderich									
Town of Cobourg	King Street East									
City of Hamilton	MacNab-Charles									
City of Kingston	Market Square									
Town of Markham	Markham Village									No Goals
City of Mississauga	Meadowvale Village							Positive		
City of Ottawa	Minto Park				Positive					No Plan

## Part A: Common Issues (More than three districts) - continued

Municipality	District Name	Funding	Tracking Alterations	Education	Park	Community Involvement	Expansion	Compatible Development	Development Pressure	No Goals and/or Plan
Wilmot Twp	New Hamburg									No Plan
Town of Oakville	Old Oakville				Positive					No Goals
Niagara-on-the-Lake	Queen and Picton Streets									
City of St.Catharines	Queen Street							Positive		
City of Ottawa	Sandy Hill									No Plan
Municipality of Huron East	Seaforth			Positive						
Town of Markham	Thornhill (east of Yonge)									
Town of Vaughan	Thornhill (west of Yonge)									
Loyalist Township	Town of Bath									No Plan
City of Thunder Bay	Waverly Park									
Town of Pickering	Whitevale									
City of Toronto	Wychwood Park					Positive				
	<b>TOTAL</b>	5	23	6	5	5	4	9	5	7



**Part B: Secondary Issues (Two to three districts) - continued**

Municipality	District Name	Place Reference	Amalgamation	Not Embraced Heritage	Tourism	Parking/Traffic	Levels of Organization	Absentee Land Lords	Updated Plan
Niagara-on-the-Lake	Queen and Picton Streets						Positive		
City of St. Catharines	Queen Street								
City of Ottawa	Sandy Hill								
Municipality of Huron East	Seaforth								
Town of Markham	Thornhill (east of Yonge)								
Town of Vaughan	Thornhill (west of Yonge)								
Loyalist Township	Town of Bath								
City of Thunder Bay	Waverly Park								
Town of Pickering	Whitevale								
City of Toronto	Wychwood Park						Positive		
	<b>TOTAL</b>	3	2	2	2	2	2	3	3

### Part C: Site Specific Issues (One district)

Municipality	District Name	Commercial Signage	Accessibility	Vacancies	Urban Planning of other areas	Young People	Taxes	Enforcement
City of Kingston	Barriefield Village							
Municipality of Bluewater	Bayfield							
City of Brantford	Brant Avenue							
City of Ottawa	Byward Market							
City of Brampton	Churchville							
City of Hamilton	Cross-Melville							
Town of Oakville	First and Second Street							
City of Cambridge	Galt							
Town of Goderich	Goderich							
Town of Cobourg	King Street East							
City of Hamilton	MacNab-Charles							
City of Kingston	Market Square							
Town of Markham	Markham Village							
City of Mississauga	Meadowvale Village				Positive			
City of Ottawa	Minto Park							
Wilmot Twp	New Hamburg							
Town of Oakville	Old Oakville							

### Part C: Site Specific Issues (One district) – continued

Municipality	District Name	Commercial Signage	Accessibility	Vacancies	Urban Planning of other areas	Young People	Taxes	Enforcement
Niagara-on-the-Lake	Queen and Picton Streets							
City of St. Catharines	Queen Street					Positive		
City of Ottawa	Sandy Hill							
Municipality of Huron East	Seaforth							
Town of Markham	Thornhill (east of Yonge)							
Town of Vaughan	Thornhill (west of Yonge)							
Loyalist Township	Town of Bath							
City of Thunder Bay	Waverly Park							
Town of Pickering	Whitevale							
City of Toronto	Wychwood Park							

## Part D: Property Values, Interviews, Requests for Alterations

Municipality	District Name	Property Values Above	Property Values Average	Property Values Below	Resist	# of Interviews	Applications Approved within
City of Kingston	Barriefield Village	3	4	1	No	1	- Less than three months
Municipality of Bluewater	Bayfield	3	1	0	Yes	5	- All under 3 months
City of Brantford	Brant Avenue	21	18	8	No	2	- Majority done within 7 weeks
City of Ottawa	Byward Market	15	6	4	No	1	- Within six weeks
City of Brampton	Churchville	8	2	2	Yes	3	- Within 5 weeks
City of Hamilton	Cross-Melville	8	6	0	Yes	3	- 86% took less than two months
Town of Oakville	First and Second Street	6	6	4	No	4	- Within 8 weeks
City of Cambridge	Galt	1	0	0	No	1	- Residents- less than three months
Town of Goderich	Goderich	3	1	1	No	4	-Residents – 1-3 months
Town of Cobourg	King Street East	3	1	5	No	2	- Residents - Less than three months
City of Hamilton	MacNab-Charles	3	0	1	Yes	5	- All approved within eight weeks
City of Kingston	Market Square	0	0	0	No	1	- Residents – within three months
Town of Markham	Markham Village	16	21	11	No	1	- Within four weeks
City of Mississauga	Meadowvale Village	2	5	1	Yes	2	- Residents – six to 12 months
City of Ottawa	Minto Park	2	4	0	Yes	2	- No recent applications
Wilmot Twp	New Hamburg	2	2	1	No	1	- Most within four weeks
Town of Oakville	Old Oakville	15	13	8	No	3	- Most within 8 weeks

## Part D: Property Values, Interviews, Requests for Alterations - continued

Municipality	District Name	Property Values Above	Property Values Average	Property Values Below	Resist	# of Interviews	Applications Approved within
Niagara-on-the-Lake	Queen and Picton Streets	9	5	6	No	2	- Residents – within three months
City of St.Catharines	Queen Street	8	0	1	Yes	3	- Residents – less than one month
City of Ottawa	Sandy Hill	20	23	24	No	3	- All approved within five weeks
Municipality of Huron East	Seaforth	2	2	2	No	3	-74% within one month
Town of Markham	Thornhill (east of Yonge)	4	5	5	No	5	- Most in five weeks
Town of Vaughan	Thornhill (west of Yonge)	20	16	6	No	5	- Unknown
Loyalist Township	Town of Bath	1	0	0	No	1	- No recent applications
City of Thunder Bay	Waverly Park	5	1	2	No	2	- Within three months
Town of Pickering	Whitevale	5	2	1	No	0	n/a
City of Toronto	Wychwood Park	5	3	0	No	2	- Residents- over four months
	<b>TOTAL</b>	190	147	94	---	67	-----

## Part E: Resident Surveys

Municipality	District Name	# surveys completed	# of properties in the district	# of answers – protection	# of answers – restrictions	# people very satisfied	# people satisfied	# people neutral	# people dissatisfied	# people very dissatisfied
City of Kingston	Barriefield Village	17	41	11	2	13	1	1	1	0
Municipality of Bluewater	Bayfield	55	31	33	3	28	17	5	1	0
City of Brantford	Brant Avenue	12*	54*	4	6	3	6	1	1	0
City of Ottawa	Byward Market	36*	82*	21	8	10	15	4	3	1
City of Brampton	Churchville	22	84	2	4	12	3	6	1	0
City of Hamilton	Cross-Melville	25	49	9	4	13	5	3	3	1
Town of Oakville	First and Second Street	31	68	11	4	25	3	2	1	0
City of Cambridge	Galt	10	24	2	5	4	3	2	1	0
Town of Goderich	Goderich	55	75	20	3	20	21	9	3	0
Town of Cobourg	King Street East	39	130	17	11	13	13	8	3	2
City of Hamilton	MacNab-Charles	---	7	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
City of Kingston	Market Square	6	16	1	1	3	2	1	0	0
Town of Markham	Markham Village	72	271	n/a	n/a	41		23	6	
City of Mississauga	Meadowvale Village	22	53	5	5	12	7	1	2	0
City of Ottawa	Minto Park	13	24	2	2	5	6	2	0	0
Wilmot Twp	New Hamburg	20	31	8	10	6	4	5	1	1

## Part E: Resident Surveys – continued

Municipality	District Name	# surveys completed	# of properties in the district	# of answers – protection	# of answers – restrictions	# people very satisfied	# people satisfied	# people neutral	# people dissatisfied	# people very dissatisfied
Town of Oakville	Old Oakville	28	130	3	4	19	6	3	0	0
Niagara-on-the-Lake	Queen and Picton Streets	26*	70*	6	17	9	12	2	3	0
City of St.Catharines	Queen Street	17	34	8	4	11	5	0	0	0
City of Ottawa	Sandy Hill	13*	70*	6	4	6	5	0	0	1
Municipality of Huron East	Seaforth	50	62	18	5	13	25	8	0	1
Town of Markham	Thornhill (east of Yonge)	30	138	15	14	10	13	5	1	0
Town of Vaughan	Thornhill (west of Yonge)	25	82	10	7	15	4	3	2	1
Loyalist Township	Town of Bath	3	8	1	2	3	0	0	0	0
City of Thunder Bay	Waverly Park	27	60	12	6	5	12	8	1	1
Town of Pickering	Whitevale	13	35	8	4	12	1	0	0	0
City of Toronto	Wychwood Park	14	64	7	4	7	4	3	0	0
	<b>TOTAL</b>	681	1793	228	137	318	193	105	34	9

\* Due to the large size of the district these numbers are based on taking a selection from the district using a random sample of addresses

## Part F: Heritage Conservation District Plan

Municipality	District Name	Number of Goals Met	Who Wrote the Plan
City of Kingston	Barriefield Village	3/3	David Cuming and Associates, Unterman McPhail Heritage Resource Consultants and Wendy Shearer Landscape Architect Limited
Municipality of Bluewater	Bayfield	4/4	Nick Hill and Chris Borgal
City of Brantford	Brant Avenue	3/4	Townpride
City of Ottawa	By Ward Market	1/1	Julian Smith ect.
City of Brampton	Churchville	4/5	David Cuming and Associates, Unterman McPhail Heritage Resource Consultants and Wendy Shearer Landscape Architect Limited
City of Hamilton	Cross-Melville	3/4	David Cuming and Associates, Unterman McPhail Heritage Resource Consultants and Wendy Shearer Landscape Architect Limited
Town of Oakville	First and Second Street	4/5	Town of Oakville
City of Cambridge	Galt Downtown	2/3	Nick Hill
Town of Goderich	Goderich	3/4	Nick Hill and Chris Borgal
Town of Cobourg	King Street East	1/3	Robert D. Mikel
City of Hamilton	MacNab-Charles Street	4/6	City of Hamilton
City of Kingston	Market Square	4/4	Lily Inglis and Harold D. Kalman
Town of Markham	Markham Village	1/1	Project Planning Limited
City of Mississauga	Meadowvale Village	3/3	City of Mississauga
City of Ottawa	Minto Park	1/1	No Plan
Wilmot Twp	New Hamburg Core Area	3/4	Project Planning Limited
Town of Oakville	Old Oakville	1/1	Town of Oakville

## Part F: Heritage Conservation District Plan – continued

Municipality	District Name	Number of Goals Met	Who Wrote the Plan
Niagara-on-the-Lake	Queen and Picton Streets	2/3	Nick Hill
City of St.Catharines	Queen Street	4/4	David Cuming and Associates, Unterman McPhail Heritage Resource Consultants and Wendy Shearer Landscape Architect Limited
City of Ottawa	Sandy Hill	1/1	No Plan
Municipality of Huron East	Seaforth	2/3	Nick Hill and Chris Borgal
Town of Markham	Thornhill (east of Yonge)	5/5	Phillip H. Carter
Town of Vaughan	Thornhill (west of Yonge)	2/5	Phillip H. Carter
Loyalist Township	Town of Bath Main Street	1/1	Unknown
City of Thunder Bay	Waverly Park	1/3	DeCLan Engineers and Planners
Town of Pickering	Whitevale	3/3	Unknown
City of Toronto	Wychwood Park	2/2	Keith Wagland, Truman and Jennings, Harold Klamon, John Stewart

