

# Comments Received - Draft Plan

**Susan Schappert**

---

**From:**  
**Sent:**  
**To:**  
**Cc:**  
**Subject:**

Hi Susan,

I hope this email finds you well. I have reviewed the attached report, please find my comments below.

From pg. 19:

Sixteen Mile Creek and the surrounding area is part of the traditional territories of the Anishinaabe and Haudenosaunee peoples. The Anishinaabe people known to the settlers as 'Mississaugas' called the river Nanzuhzaugewazog meaning 'having two outlets', a reference to the shallow, gravelly mouth dividing the river in two. The Mississauga ceded their lands on the Sixteen Mile Creek under Treaty 22 on February 8, 1820, to the British Crown as part ongoing European colonization and settlement of Indigenous territories. The confluence at the mouth of Sixteen Mile Creek and Lake Ontario continues to hold significance for the Mississaugas of the Credit First Nation.

**I would revise the above paragraph as:**

Sixteen Mile Creek and the surrounding area is part of the treaty land and territory of the Mississaugas of the Credit First Nation as well as the traditional territory of the Huron-Wendat and the Haudenosaunee peoples. The Mississaugas called the river Nanzuhzaugewazog meaning 'having two outlets', a reference to the shallow, gravelly mouth dividing the river in two. The Mississaugas of the Credit ceded their lands on the Sixteen Mile Creek under Treaty 22 on February 8, 1820, to the British Crown as part ongoing European colonization and settlement of Indigenous territories. The confluence at the mouth of Sixteen Mile Creek and Lake Ontario continues to hold significance for the Mississaugas of the Credit First Nation.

**Rationale:**

1. the initial draft of the paragraph did not indicate that the land on which the study district is located did not fully indicate the First Nations that historically occupied, controlled, and exercised stewardship over the land.
2. Specifying the Mississaugas of the Credit First Nation reflects the actual First Nation that placed the land under treaty with the Crown in 1820. In the initial draft paragraph, the term "Mississauga" is used implying that all Mississauga Nations had a part in Treaty 22.

Sections 5.2.1-5.2.5 all contain an opening sentence akin to "... Area is layered over the traditional territories of the Anishinaabe and Haudenosaunee peoples." I would suggest a more accurate rendering would be "... Area is layered over the treaty lands and territory of the Mississaugas of the Credit First Nation and the traditional territories of the Huron Wendat and the Haudenosaunee.

**Rationale:**

1. The term “Anishinaabe” is often a broad term used to include culturally related First Nation groups such as the Odawa, Pottawatomie, Ojibway, Mississaugas, etc., including some that have not had any relationship with the Oakville lands in question. Mentioning specific First Nations is more accurate, and less confusing, when the former Indigenous inhabitants are well known to an area- as is the case for Oakville.

If you have any questions, please give me a call.

Darin

***Darin P. Wybenga (he/him)***  
**A/Manager of Culture**



**Mississaugas of the Credit First Nation**  
**Mailing: 2789 Mississauga Road, Hagersville, ON, N0A 1H0**  
**Physical: 4065 Hwy.#6, Hagersville, ON N0A 1H0**  
**Ph: 905- 768-4260 Ext: 1603**  
**Cell: 905-870-2073**

I choose to work flexibly and am sending this message now because it works for me. Feel free to read, act on or respond at a time that works for you.

#### Disclaimer

The Mississaugas of the Credit First Nation (MCFN) asserts the right to maintain stewardship on our ancestral homelands which includes the right to protect the lands and waters that sustain and support the life and health of all. Historically, and without our consent, MCFN homelands have been industrialized to the point where cumulative effects have already surpassed the point of a questionable future for coming generations. In this era of reconciliation, building a renewed relationship with First Nation peoples based on recognition of rights, respect and partnership, MCFN fully expect legal obligations with the body of the politic to adhere to National interests and engage MCFN in all future development taking place within our ancestral lands.

## Susan Schappert

---

**From:** Peter Graham  
**Sent:**  
**To:**  
**Cc:** [EXTERNAL] RE: Draft Old Oakville Heritage Conservation District Plan and Guidelines  
**Subject:** for review

Hi Susan,

Great to e-meet you. I did a quick run through, so apologies if I've missed content relevant to my concerns.

p. 19-Re "Sixteen Mile Creek and the surrounding area is part of the traditional territories of the Anishinaabe and Haudenosaunee peoples. The Anishinaabe people known to the settlers as 'Mississaugas' called the river Nanzuhzaugewazog meaning 'having two outlets', a reference to the shallow, gravelly mouth dividing the river in two. The Mississauga ceded their lands on the Sixteen Mile Creek under Treaty 22 on February 8, 1820, to the British Crown as part ongoing European colonization and settlement of Indigenous territories. The confluence at the mouth of Sixteen Mile Creek and Lake Ontario continues to hold significance for the Mississaugas of the Credit First Nation."

Per above, please add something along these lines, suggested as the second sentence: The British Crown recognized this area as Haudenosaunee land in the 1701 Fort Albany Nanfan Treaty and Six Nations' rights to these lands have never been ceded.

Per final sentence in above, either equalize or add "special" significance for MCFN as it also continues to hold significance for SNGR.

Section 2, p. 21-I think it's beneficial moving the Indigenous inhabitants piece upwards, prior to the more colonialist heritage points. I always prefer naming when possible and, as it's pre-contact, Attawandaron make sense. To set the scene, a brief blurb about how First Nations in general used the land would be nice – i.e. activities described in the frontmatter of many archaeological reports.

Per p. 49, please ensure SNGR is involved in conversations to "Integrate historic and current Indigenous knowledge, traditions, activities and use into public open spaces" and similar like p. 115.

Overall, I'd like more green guidance, primarily as a nod towards the First Nation cultural heritage landscape, but also recognizing aesthetic restrictions for colonial architecture limit some environmentally-friendly practices like solar:

-There doesn't appear to be anything about break walls. Armour stone should be discouraged in favour of natural, or at least softer, solutions.

-native plants and trees should be encouraged

-enhanced protection for mature trees would be valuable. Cutting any in the area should require a permit, including the backyards of private properties.

Thank you, Peter

---

**From:** Susan Schappert <susan.schappert@oakville.ca>

**Subject:** [External] Draft Old Oakville Heritage Conservation District Plan and Guidelines for review

Hi Peter

Thanks very much for taking the time to review this. While you're welcome to review and provide comments on the entire document, I think the sections you would be most interested in are Sections 2 and the Character Areas in Section 5. The document is pretty large, even as a pdf, so I'm sending two separate emails – this email has the main body of the Plan and the second email will have the appendices.

Most of the wording we have regarding Indigenous history is taken from the Oakville Harbour Cultural Heritage Landscape reports from 2018-2019. Josh Dent from Timmins Martel Heritage Consultants worked with Joanne Thomas from Six Nations on those reports, just to give you a bit of background. We're always open for updated wording - so if anything has changed since then, that is completely fine and we would welcome the opportunity to include more appropriate language.

I look forward to working with you in the future!

Sincerely  
Susan

**Susan Schappert, (She/Her), CAHP, MCIP, RPP  
Heritage Planner, District West/East  
Planning & Development**

Town of Oakville | 905-845-6601, ext. 3870 | f: 905-338-4414 | [www.oakville.ca](http://www.oakville.ca)

**Vision: A vibrant and livable community for all**

Please consider the environment before printing this email.  
<http://www.oakville.ca/privacy.html>

## **OLRA Comments and Input re Old Oakville Heritage District Study, December 2024**

### **For Discussion with Sue Schappert, January 31**

Page 13      What is a Heritage Permit

*Consider adding “, whether contributing or non-contributing” to the end of the first paragraph*

Page 15      How to Use the Plan

*For Step 2 Understand Your Property – include reference to where they can find inventory sheet*

Review the inventory sheet for your property (Can be found in Appendix A, Revised Old Oakville Heritage Conservation District Study)

*For Step 5 – missing Table Number Table 2*

Page 17      Design and Physical Value

*Can we consider beef up reference to the Old Oakville vernacular style which is so prevalent in this District*

*Can we repeat paragraph #2 which is in Contextual Value here in Design and Physical Value*

Page 19      Contextual Value

*Typo in second paragraph last sentence – believe that it should be north-south streets ...*

Page 21      Attributes – last bullet point at bottom of page

*Instead of “the widening at corner intersections” – don’t we mean the openness of corner intersections*

Page 26/27      Map 3 and Table 1

*We had discussed putting an asterisk on the non-contributing properties that are viewed as good neighbours. We think that this is important information to include at this point in the Plan*

Page 33      Specific Objectives for the Plan – Point R

*We had discussed the importance of the openness of views and vistas at corners and feel it should be included here. Our suggestion:*

To conserve, maintain and protect the identified view and vistas and the openness of the corner intersections in Map 2

|             |  |
|-------------|--|
| Page 45     | <p><u>Introduction</u></p> <p><i>Typo in first paragraph second to last sentence -.... Immediately surrounding the a property. Remove the</i></p>  |
| Page 46     | <p><u>Figure 5 - How to Use the Plan</u></p> <p><i>Change to be consistent with Page 15</i></p> <p><i>For Step 2 Understand Your Property – include reference to where they can find inventory sheet</i></p> <p>Review the inventory sheet for your property (Can be found in Appendix A, Revised Old Oakville Heritage Conservation District Study)</p> <p><i>For Step 5 – missing Table Number Table 2</i></p>   |
| Pages 51,54 | <p><u>Guidance Points – Consistency consideration</u></p> <p><i>In Areas 4 &amp; 5 – there is a bullet point that suggests unifying materials. Should we not include a point like this for each of Areas 2 &amp; 3</i></p> <p><i>e.g. Area 2</i></p> <p><i>Support additions and development that reflect the early vernacular architectural styles with unifying materials that are found in contributing properties such as traditional stucco and brick</i></p> <p><i>e.g. Area 3 – Gully Landscape</i></p> <p><i>Support additions and development that reflect the mix of architectural styles with unifying materials that are found in contributing properties such as traditional stucco horizontal cladding and brick</i></p> |
| Page 55     | <p><u>Figure 8</u></p> <p><i>We had agreed to revise this figure to show a new build on the left side that was too tall and would have an X</i></p>  |
| Page 64     | <p><u>General Guidelines - Understanding</u></p> <p><i>Third paragraph starting with “The Inventory Sheets ...</i></p> <p>Include reference to Appendix A</p> <p><i>“The Inventory Sheets developed for each property as part of the District Study (Refer to Appendix A) shall be used ...</i></p>  |

Page 80

### Scale and Massing

*We think that all of point (6) should be moved to Page 81 to be second point and subpoint under Style and also incorporate Standard 11 from Appendix C (page 139)*

*As such – we suggest that the Style section on Page 81 should read as follows:*

- (1) The design of an addition should reflect or reference the architecture of the heritage building, in terms of roof form, massing, materials, windows and entrances
- (2) The addition should be physically and visually compatible with, subordinate to and distinguishable from the heritage building
  - a. An addition that is distinguishable is not required to be a different style of architecture. Cladding materials, differing rooflines, wall planes and paint colour can be used to create a distinguishable addition

Page 81

### Figure 10

*Under recommended options in middle and far right – add reference to heights being aligned*

Page 81

### Height

*This is a change from our previous discussions and represents a significant issue of concern. As worded in the draft – it puts significant risk to many of our contributing properties and does not reflect best practice*

*As such, we would suggest the following wording:*

1. Protect and maintain the historic low-rise scale of the District
  - a. The maximum height for heritage buildings, including additions shall be the maximum height permitted for the District under the Town of Oakville's Zoning by-law in effect subject to amendments and variances that may be approved
2. The overall scale, massing, design and height of the addition should be subordinate to and compatible with the heritage building, Character Area and District
3. Varying grades and elevation changes in the land shall be taken into account for additions. See the appropriate Character Area section in this Plan for additional guidance
4. An addition to a heritage building should not exceed the height of the heritage building on the property. In exceptional circumstances this will be considered on a case-by-case basis where there are demonstrated site constraints including the current building height and lot size

Page 83

### Windows

*Still concerned that we have given up the battle regarding aluminum-clad*

|          |   |
|----------|---|
| Page 84  | <p><u>Figure 11 – Muntin Bars</u></p> <p><i>Add reference to what is acceptable and what is not acceptable</i></p>  |
| Page 91  | <p><u>Height – Non Contributing Properties</u></p> <p><i>Similar concerns for this section</i></p> <p><i>As such, we would suggest the following wording:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Protect and maintain the historic low-rise scale of the District <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The maximum height for non-heritage buildings, including additions shall be the maximum height permitted for the District under the Town of Oakville’s Zoning by-law in effect subject to amendments and variances that may be approved</li> </ol> </li> <li>2. The overall scale, massing, design and height of the addition should be subordinate to and compatible with the non-heritage building, Character Area and District</li> <li>3. Varying grades and elevation changes in the land shall be taken into account for additions. See the appropriate Character Area section in this Plan for additional guidance</li> <li>4. An addition to a non-heritage building should not exceed the height of the non-heritage building on the property. In exceptional circumstances this will be considered on a case-by-case basis where there are demonstrated site constraints including the current building height and lot size</li> </ol> |
| Page 101 | <p><u>Figure 14 Guidelines for Roof Forms</u></p> <p><i>Needs to be fixed</i></p>   |
| Page 102 | <p><u>Figure 15 Guidelines for Solid to Void Ratio</u></p> <p><i>Needs to be fixed – middle one 15-30%; bottom one greater than 30%</i></p>   |
| Page 115 | <p><u>Street Furniture, Lighting and Utilities</u></p> <p><i>Consider adding in point b.</i></p> <p><i>“Lighting fixtures’ material, scale and colour should be <u>unified</u>, compatible with the Character Area and District and <u>compliment the connection to traditional lighting fixtures in Oakville’s historic downtown</u>”</i></p>  |
| Page 121 | <p><u>Exempt Public Realm</u></p> <p><i>We think there is a need to add some things for reference that are consistent with expectations for private properties – paint colours, fencing and lighting</i></p>  |







Page 141      Good Neighbours

*We think there is a strong case for adding at least two more properties to the good neighbours section – 21 Dunn Street and 275 King Street. See attached.*

*We also think that consideration could be given to 23/25 Trafalgar Road*

Page 150      Photographic Examples

*The sizing of some of the pictures in this section need to be improved*

| Address         | Photo   | What Makes This Building a Good Neighbour?   |
|-----------------|---|--|
| 21 Dunn Street  |      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Historic ¼ acre lot associated with contributing property (Lightbourn family) to north</li> <li>- New traditional style that reflects historic cottage vernacular style</li> <li>- Use of traditional materials including wood cladding, multi framed wood windows</li> <li>- Mix of gable roof lines minimize height impact of this property on the hill</li> <li>- Detached garage setback to the rear of the property that emulates a carriage house</li> <li>- Open iron fencing along Waterfront Trail and Dunn Street allows views from the public realm into the property</li> </ul> |
| 275 King Street |   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Historic ¼ acre lot</li> <li>- Scale, height and massing is complementary to contributing properties to south on King Street and to east on Trafalgar Road</li> <li>- Setback on corner lot with low profile landscaping that enables open views along King Street as well as views north on Trafalgar Road towards contributing properties</li> <li>- Introduction of traditional materials including wood cladding and wood windows</li> </ul>  |

To: Susan Schappert

From: Jane Hawkrigg and Anita Mackey

Date: February 4, 2025

Re: Draft Old Oakville Heritage District Plan- additional OLRA comments for consideration related to height of additions

Sue,

After our discussions with you on Friday, January 31<sup>st</sup> and from a further review of best practices associated with the height of additions to contributing and non-contributing properties in other Heritage Districts (attached a couple to this document), we would recommend the following wording:

Page 81      Height

1. Protect and maintain the historic low-rise scale of the District
2. The overall scale, massing, design and height of the addition should be complementary to the heritage building and clearly secondary in terms of scale, massing and height
3. Varying grades and elevation changes in the land shall be taken into account for additions. See the appropriate Character Area section in this Plan for additional guidance
4. An addition to a heritage building should not exceed the height of the heritage building on the property and should preferably be lower to clearly distinguish it from the original building. In exceptional circumstances this will be considered on a case-by-case basis where there are demonstrated site constraints

Page 91      Height – Non Contributing Properties

1. Protect and maintain the historic low-rise scale of the District
2. The overall scale, massing, design and height of the addition should be complementary to the heritage building and clearly secondary in terms of scale, massing and height
3. Varying grades and elevation changes in the land shall be taken into account for additions. See the appropriate Character Area section in this Plan for additional guidance
4. An addition to a non-heritage building should not exceed the height of the non-heritage building on the property. In exceptional circumstances this will be considered on a case-by-case basis where there are demonstrated site constraints including the current building height and lot size

We don't feel that it is appropriate to have a reference to zoning in the heritage guidelines. While we understand and support that the various municipal policies need to complement and support one another – we feel that the heritage guidelines need to stand on their own as evidenced by the best practice examples in other Heritage District Plans.

In addition, we found an interesting definition of what “complementary” means in the West Annex Heritage District Plan that we may want to consider

*Complementary additions and alterations will physically and visually conserve or enhance the cultural heritage value and heritage attributes of the District.*

*To be physically complementary refers to the use of materials and construction methods that do not detract from or damage heritage attributes.*

*To be visually complementary refers to the selection of materials and design, massing, proportions and details so as to conserve and enhance the District's cultural heritage value.*

## Rooflines – Wellington Heritage Conservation District Plan

[Wellington-HCD-FINAL.pdf](#)

**Adopted by Council in September 2022; OLT Approval in October 2024**

### Page 60

*In the introduction to Guidelines for Building Alteration and Additions, there is an interesting introduction that may merit consideration for the Old Oakville Plan*

Guidelines for alterations and additions are organized in two groups. “Contributing” properties make the direct contribution to the Heritage Character of the District as a whole. The second group comprises “non contributing” properties. The guidelines that apply to non-contributing properties are intended to ensure that they do not compromise the heritage character of the District as a whole by adding further inappropriate changes to the building, or to offer suggestions for their integration or ultimate replacement with a more compatible structure.

### Page 61

*The general guidelines for additions as written below apply to BOTH contributing and non-contributing properties. This aligns with our argument that the height guidelines for both contributing and non-contributing should be the same. Also, note that there is no reference to zoning bylaws -the guidelines for managing change are heritage focused as we believe they should be*

#### 7.2.2 General Guidelines for Additions

- **Additions should be complementary to the main building and clearly secondary in terms of scale, massing and height; they should also be clearly distinguishable in form and detail.**
- Additions should be located away from the main street-facing elevation, at the rear of the building.
- **The height of the addition should be no more than that of the main building and, preferably, lower, in order to clearly distinguish it from the original building. The roofline of a rear addition should not exceed the height of the existing building’s roof ridgeline or should be stepped back from the street elevation in order to reduce its visual impact when viewed from the street.** Where the existing roof is a mansard roof, the top of parapet will be considered as the ridgeline.
- Construction of additions should not entail removal, covering or other adverse impacts on the heritage attributes or other important architectural features of the original building.
- Additions should avoid causing irreversible changes to the original building.
- Where additions are visible from the street their design should consider the horizontal and vertical patterns of the existing and/or neighbouring buildings including overall proportions, alignment of windows and doors, as well as of cornice lines and rooflines.

- **Rear addition roof ridgeline height should not exceed the existing building roof ridgeline.**  
**In cases where additional height is permitted in the Wellington Secondary Plan, the rear addition should be stepped back from the main building roof ridgeline height.**
- If possible, during the alteration process, record the alteration and retain samples of earlier materials that have been replaced.

**West Annex Heritage District Plan – Dated May 2015; Land Tribunal Authorization 2019**

**Page 102**

*There did not appear to be a section on additions and alterations to non-contributing properties in this plan – it may be because there are few*

**8.7 Additions and Alterations A**

**Additions and alterations on a contributing property, as perceived from the public realm within the District, shall be physically and visually complementary with, subordinate to, distinguishable in terms of the form, appearance, materials and detailing and minimize the loss of District heritage attributes.**

Complementary additions and alterations will physically and visually conserve or enhance the cultural heritage value and heritage attributes of the District.

To be physically complementary refers to the use of materials and construction methods that do not detract from or damage heritage attributes.

To be visually complementary refers to the selection of materials and design, massing, proportions and details so as to conserve and enhance the District's cultural heritage value.

**Additions to contributing properties shall conserve the three-dimensional integrity of the contributing property and shall not exceed the height of the roof ridge of the primary structure.**

**The design, massing and placement of additions should conserve the roof form and profile of the contributing building, as viewed from the public realm.**

Alterations to restore documented lost heritage features are encouraged.

Additions and alterations to contributing properties, required to be carried out in accordance with current codes and standards pertaining to health, safety, security, accessibility and sustainability, shall strive to conserve the cultural heritage value and heritage attributes of the District and the integrity of the contributing property.

## Susan Schappert

---

**From:**

**Sent:**

**To:**

**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Re: NEW DRAFT! Old Oakville Heritage Conservation District Plan and Guidelines available online now

Hi Sue,

A monumental task.

I do have a couple of comments

110 King

The door on the north side is steel clad, rather than wood panel.

Under site features, the iron fence is on the north, King Street, side.

The cast iron fountain is actually cast aluminum. Mark and I move it in and out every spring and fall which we wouldn't be able to do if it were cast iron

It isn't really across from the Lawn Bowling Club.

Lakeside Park

The bandshell is really a

bandstand. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Shell\\_\(theater\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Shell_(theater)) <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bandstand>

Are you sure the bandstand was moved there in the 1950s? I have no recollection of it being there when I was a child/teenager. I think it was constructed new there. There was a very similar one in the middle of George's Square on the south side of the pathway when I was a kid but it eventually was demolished. We used to drag our tricycles up the steps and ride around on the wood floor. The current one is much smaller and pretty much on grade.

We have photos of the Thomas House on a trailer enroute to its current site.

Have a great Christmas and Happy Hogmanay.

George



## Susan Schappert

---

**From:**

**Sent:**

**To:**

**Cc:**

**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Old Oakville Heritage Plan draft December 2024

You don't often get email from dgall.60@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Good Morning Susan,

I have just completed reading the draft heritage plan for Old Oakville.

First - congratulations on an excellent piece of work.

I was disappointed however that our home at 275 King Street was not mentioned as a "good neighbour". As you may remember, the non-contributing property was originally definitely a "bad neighbour" (see picture 1 below). Then on our return from Europe in 2017 we reviewed our plans with you and renovated the exterior to a Georgian style, trying to be compatible with the neighbourhood while not changing the footprint, using wood siding and establishing a more traditional roof line, while adding windows into blank walls. (Picture 2 & 3).

Since then we have focused on landscape and flowers (rabbits permitting), establishing sight lines from front to rear and across from Trafalgar to King Street. Pictures 3,4.

As you can see, from 2017 quite a difference and we continue in our efforts to be a good neighbour from a heritage and landscape point of view.

Kind regards,

Duncan.

*Duncan Galloway*  
[dgall.60@gmail.com](mailto:dgall.60@gmail.com)  
905 616 4081



Above - the original horror





Immediately on completion of renovation in 2017.



In 2020



Permeable paving and front garden view





Sight line from Trafalgar to King Street.

**Susan Schappert**

---

**From:**

**Sent:**

**To:**

**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] RE: NEW DRAFT! Old Oakville Heritage Conservation District Plan  
and Guidelines available online now

Thank you, Susan, and Happy New year!

Congratulations on all the work.

They are two small, but I think important changes that should be made.

First, on page 60, St. Andrew's is not 150 years old but closer to 200 - to be accurate the building plan began in 1837 and was completed by 1840, so **188 years or 185** depending on which you want to use.

Second, the picture of 295/97 William Street (which is actually designated Area 4, third picture in the second row) does not belong here.

**Streetscape and Landscape  
Character Analysis Area 5 - St.  
Andrews Traditional**



**I would suggest replacing it with the stucco vernacular house at 339 William Street below.**





Thanks,  
Terry

---



**Susan Schappert**

---

**From:**

**Sent:**

**To:**

**Cc:**

**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Poor quality photo in HCD plan

Good morning,

I noticed a poor quality photo (stretched; 43 Trafalgar Rd) on page 175 of the Old Oakville HCD plan update and wanted to send a better example in case there is time to change it. Please see attached.

Thanks,

Liam Rondeau



## Susan Schappert

---

**From:**

**Sent:**

**To:**

**Cc:**

Re: [EXTERNAL] Old Oakville Heritage Conservation District – Statutory Public Meeting

**Subject:**

Hi Susan,

That all makes sense; my concern is more about rights for either classification following any sort of tragic situation / devastation.

I remember when we bought our (non-contributing) home we ended up briefly meeting with the past owners on closing, and of all the conversation topics that could have come up from their living here since the '60s, they shared their experience of having had a house fire and dealing with heritage for repairs.

Covering this type of scenario while still maintaining a distinction between preservation and appropriate development would go a long way.

Rather than a call, could I pop in and meet with you sometime?

Friday is hard, but could do:

[redacted]

Julian

On Tue, Feb 4, 2025, 9:35 AM Susan Schappert <[susan.schappert@oakville.ca](mailto:susan.schappert@oakville.ca)> wrote:

Hi Julian

Thank you for sharing your comments with us, they will be included in the consolidation of all feedback that we have received on the draft Plan.

While we can definitely discuss your comments, I did want to take the opportunity to provide a bit more information about demolition.

There are different policies for the demolition of contributing (heritage) and non-contributing (non-heritage) buildings in the Draft Plan. You are entirely correct, we would only permit the demolition of contributing (heritage) buildings within a set of exceptional circumstances. They would not be required to rebuild to match, but the new building would be subject to the New Development guidelines to ensure that what goes up in its place is appropriate for the neighborhood.

As for non-contributing (non-heritage buildings), the demolition guidelines are set out in Section 5.4.1.3. Non-contributing properties can be demolished without exceptional circumstances. Because they are not historic, they do not contribute to the heritage value of the District and can be removed without having a negative impact on the District. Essentially, the ability to demolish existing non-contributing properties exists as of right within the District Plan. The only thing required is the heritage permit for the new building. Again, this is to make sure that what is constructed in its place is appropriate for the District. We have never had anyone request to rebuild a non-contributing property to match exactly what exists. While there may be similarities between the previous non-contributing building and the new building, there are always improvements and changes to meet contemporary needs.

I am happy to schedule a phone call with you to discuss your feedback, but I do hope that this explanation helps with one of your concerns. Would you have time on Thursday or Friday for a chat?

Sincerely

Susan

**Susan Schappert, (She/Her), CAHP, MCIP, RPP**  
**Heritage Planner, District West/East**  
**Planning & Development**

Town of Oakville | 905-845-6601, ext. 3870 | f: 905-338-4414 | [www.oakville.ca](http://www.oakville.ca)

**Vision: A vibrant and livable community for all**

Please consider the environment before printing this email.

<http://www.oakville.ca/privacy.html>

---

**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Old Oakville Heritage Conservation District – Statutory Public Meeting

---

Greetings,

Further to your mailing, I am writing to provide comment on the new Old Oakville Heritage Conservation District plan and guidelines being brought forward to the Planning & Development Committee this week.

I greatly appreciate the effort the Town has undertaken to consult with the community on the development of the plan, however I would like to respectfully offer a few concerns to consider before finalizing a new by-law,

The guidelines include an exemption to permit demolition of certain heritage buildings under a defined set of "exceptional circumstances", however there is no permission whatsoever granting the right to repair or replace non-heritage buildings within the district that are damaged or destroyed by exceptional circumstances. This seems grossly unfair.

It appears that if a family's house is damaged or destroyed by say a fire, they would need permission through a full permit process in order rebuild the very same home they lost...meaning they could even be denied such right. This is not reasonable; repair / replacement of anything under "exceptional circumstances" should be exempt from HCD requirements entirely, under a broader definition that includes all foreseeable perils such as wind, rain, fire, american invasion, etc.

Language around permissions for ongoing repairs and maintenance should be broader. The homes in the neighborhood are well kept and cared for; permissions need to be general enough to ensure that upkeep and pride of ownership can flourish without deflating the existing sense of community through over-regulation of normal upkeep.

There are also several new construction requirements that are oddly prescriptive, seemingly more so than what is seen on any heritage properties in the district. I would hope the character to be maintained is only that of OOHCD, not a generalized heritage district.

If there is further opportunity to discuss, please let me know.

Thanks,

Julian Novick