

Demolitions Rating System Sub-Committee

Minutes

Thursday, December 05, 2019

Burgoyne Woods Room at 3:00pm

Attendance:

Brian Narhi
David Bergen
Peter Connolly

Staff Liaison:

Chloe Richer, Heritage Planner, Planning and Building Services
Sydney DiTomaso, Student Planner, Planning and Building Services

1. **Call meeting to order (Staff Liaison)**
3:05pm
2. **Recognition of Traditional Territories**
3. **Additions / Deletions to the Agenda**
None.
4. **Motion to approve the agenda**
None.
5. **Motion to adopt the minutes of the previous meeting**
None.
6. **Business**
 - 6.1 Review of Demolitions Rating Systems Versions 1-4

Member Comments on the Rating System Preamble:

- The Preamble should begin with what it means for a property to be designated under Parts IV and/or V of the *Ontario Heritage Act*, and how demolition is discouraged.

Member Comments on Rating Systems:

- Option 1: Numerical format (On. Reg. 9/06 criteria)

- Favoured by two members in combination with the ABCD format (structural assessment) example from the City of London; see Option 3.
- Option 2: ABCD format (On. Reg. 9/06 criteria)
 - Members felt indifferent towards this option.
- Option 3: ABCD format (structural assessment)
 - City of London example.
 - Favoured by one member who suggested changing the following:
 - A Ranking: Rather than a built heritage resource having “any combination of the following attributes”, it has “2 or more of the following attributes”; and
 - B Ranking: Rather than a built heritage resource having “any combination of the following attributes”, it has “1 or 2 or more of the following attributes”.
- Option 4: Contributing vs. Non-contributing format (On. Reg. 9/06 criteria)
 - Members felt this format would be difficult to understand.
 - Members felt it is too subjective and would not assist well in making decisions regarding demolitions; note, the criteria are the same as with Options 1 and 2.
 - Chloe Richer noted this is the system currently used in the City’s most recently approved Heritage Conservation District Plan and feedback from municipal heritage planners has suggested it is a superior approach to a numerical or ABCD system.

7. Date of next meeting
TBD.

8. Motion to Adjourn
None.