

Derelict Building Regulatory Framework Review

Presented To:	City Council
Meeting Date:	March 19, 2024
Type:	Managers' Reports
Prepared by:	Denise Clement Building Services
Recommended by:	General Manager of Growth and Infrastructure

Report Summary

This report provides recommendations regarding the regulatory frameworks used by the City of Greater Sudbury in the management of derelict properties and maintenance of designated heritage buildings. This report will also inform Council of municipal comparisons on process for the management of vacant buildings.

Resolutions

Resolution 1:

THAT the City of Greater Sudbury directs staff to bring forward a report in Q2 2025 to review the effectiveness of Vacant Building By-laws and Vacant Building Registries in Ontario municipalities as outlined in the report titled “Derelict Building Regulatory Framework Review”, from the General Manager of Growth & Infrastructure, presented at the City Council meeting on March 19, 2024.

Resolution 2:

THAT the City of Greater Sudbury direct staff to review language in the current Development Charges By-law 2019-100 to extend the redevelopment period to encourage the demolition of derelict buildings and provide sufficient time to encourage redevelopment as outlined in the report titled “Derelict Building Regulatory Framework Review”, from the General Manager of Growth & Infrastructure, presented at the City Council meeting on March 19, 2024.

Resolution 3:

THAT, the City of Greater Sudbury directs staff to review the Property Standards By-law 2007-109 and bring forward a report in Q2 2025 recommending amendments that would be appropriate to the level of service required to enforce standards for vacant derelict properties and add specific provisions for heritage-designated properties as outlined in the report entitled “Derelict Building Regulatory Framework Review”, from the General Manager of Growth & Infrastructure, presented at the City Council meeting on March 19, 2024

Relationship to the Strategic Plan, Health Impact Assessment and Community Energy & Emissions Plan (CEEP)

The information in this report supports Council's Strategic Plan in the area of Housing which reflects Council's desire for residents to have access to safe, affordable, attainable, and suitable housing options in the City of Greater Sudbury. The CEEP aims to achieve energy efficiency and reduce emissions, redevelopment of vacant and derelict buildings will result in a more energy-efficient building stock.

Financial Implications

There are no financial implications associated with this report.

Background

On October 3, 2022, Planning Committee passed resolution PL-2022-155-A1 which states:

WHEREAS there are several properties across the City of Greater Sudbury which were slated for renovations/construction and were issued building permits, but have been left in a state of disrepair or abandoned for extended periods of time with open permits;

AND WHEREAS property owners adjacent to or near the properties which have been abandoned or left in a state of disrepair are frustrated by the lack of action to have these properties complete the required construction or be demolished;

AND WHEREAS some of these properties may be designated heritage structures it would be important to modify the existing property standards by-law to address these buildings specifically;

AND WHEREAS as in creating by-laws to reduce these potential unsafe conditions and practices it is important to continue to maintain any “open for business” environment for the vast majority of our responsible development stakeholders;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED the City of Greater Sudbury directs that staff present a report to City Council in the second quarter of 2023 which would provide information on what other municipalities are doing to address the problems with abandoned or derelict properties, to address the maintenance of heritage properties in the property standards by-law, as well as options/suggestions to lobby the Province to have the language in the Building Code Act amended to provide the Chief Building Officials with clear direction regarding the revocation of building permits.

Executive Summary

Vacant buildings and abandoned construction projects can negatively impact the character of neighbourhoods by becoming derelict, hazardous, and unsightly, as well as attracting pests and allowing unauthorized entry. Where these neglected properties are heritage-designated, they have the potential to negatively impact the value of surrounding properties, detract from future community investments, and pose health and safety hazards when heritage attributes are not maintained.

Greater Sudbury is the largest city in Northern Ontario and acts as a regional hub for business, education, and culture. One component of ensuring that Greater Sudbury is a welcoming place to invest and do business is to ensure that a proper framework is in place to address vacant and derelict buildings and the maintenance of heritage properties.

This report provides a summary of the existing regulatory frameworks utilized by the City of Greater Sudbury in addressing derelict properties and advises on how the City supports the maintenance of Heritage-designated buildings.

Further, it describes the roles and responsibilities in the regulatory management of vacant derelict properties and advises on incentives available to support responsible development stakeholders and property owners to support the use of these properties and advance economic prosperity.

Lastly, this report will provide details on a comparison of municipal frameworks, a summary of practices currently undertaken by staff, and offer opportunities for improved standards that may reduce potential unsafe conditions.

Existing Regulatory Frameworks

Current municipal frameworks address:

- How the municipality regulates property standards for public safety.
- How property standards are enforced when the municipal standards are not met.
- How the municipality supports the maintenance or redevelopment of vacant properties.

In 2020, to streamline the service provision for monitoring and management of derelict buildings a regulatory partnership was formed comprised of, Building Services, By-law Services, and Greater Sudbury Fire Services. Through this coordinated effort, each partner enforces their respective Acts, By-laws, and regulations that support the health and safety of residents and properties.

The decision on which regulatory partner will take the lead on enforcement upon the investigation of a vacant derelict property is determined largely by three factors:

1. Is the building occupied?
2. Is the building structurally adequate?
3. Is the building currently under construction or alteration or demolition under an issued building permit?

However, depending on the severity, one or all regulatory partners may be involved to address the issues at hand. As a result, multiple regulatory frameworks can impact the decision-making process resulting in multiple steps until the property has been remediated. Outlined below are the frameworks utilized in Greater Sudbury.

Property Standards By-law 2011-277 and Standards for Vacant Buildings

The Property Standards By-law prescribes the minimum standards that all properties in the City of Greater Sudbury must adhere to, including provisions for the safety of the community and residents. It is comprehensive, with specific requirements for the maintenance of the interior and exterior of a building regardless of heritage designation.

Where a building is vacant, Part 7 of the By-law requires property owners to guard against the risk of fire, accident, or other hazards and prevent the entrance of all unauthorized persons.

Property owners are required to board up their vacant buildings and where a building remains vacant for more than ninety (90) days property owners are required to disconnect all utilities except where necessary for the safety and security of a building to prevent accidental or intentional damage to the building or neighboring properties.

Where buildings are damaged by fire, the building or damaged portions are required to be repaired or demolished.

When a complaint is received by By-law Services for a vacant or derelict building, an inspection is conducted by a By-law Officer often partnered with representatives from Building Services and Fire Services to address issues brought forward by the complainant and any other apparent safety or nuisance violations present.

Each partner enforces respective legislation that supports the health and safety of residents, structures, and properties, and where required, the partners may use an appropriate compliance tool (e.g., education, issuance of an Order, Administrative Monetary Penalty).

When an Order to Remedy is issued for violation of property standards under the Building Code Act, 1992, the Order defines the areas of deficiency, and the remediation required to bring the building or property into compliance. Additionally, the Order outlines the timeframes for appeal, compliance, and the penalty for non-compliance. The timeframe for compliance is 14 days, however, deadlines may be extended based on:

- a) Demonstrated intent by the property owner to comply with the Order.
- b) The length of time needed to obtain a building permit.
- c) The length of time needed to complete the repairs.

If compliance is not achieved, the City may proceed with the appropriate compliance tool as prescribed under the Building Code Act, 1992 such as;

- a) Issuance of an Administrative Monetary Penalty of \$235.00 as prescribed under the 2024 User Fee By-Law that may be repeated each time a By-law officer is required to attend the site due to an issued Order.
- b) Commence proceedings under the Provincial Offences Act, R.S.O. 1990, c, P.33 for non-compliance with the By-law (known as a Part III proceedings)
- c) Initiate remedial action to cause repair or demolition at the owner's expense with costs recovered by adding the amount due to the tax roll including all fees to administrate the service.

In 2023 By-law Services saw the application of over \$40,000.00 in User Fees associated with the Orders and more than \$204,000.00 in recovery applied to the tax roll for works completed on behalf of property owners. For this reason, the most effective mechanism to compel compliance is through the volition of an Order on the part of the property owner or by way of the City remediating the Order on their behalf.

The table below illustrates the comparison of the effectiveness of each enforcement tool.

Standards	Property Remediation	Part III Proceedings
Impact	Initiates action through an Order.	Initiates a legal proceeding
Efficiency	Initiated the day after the Order Compliance Date has passed.	May take years to receive a judgment with fines or orders.
Costs	Transferred to the Property Owner on the tax roll	Costs to the municipality for legal proceedings.
Outcomes	Remediation to the property is immediate.	Judgment may not be in favour of the municipality.

Through a general review of the Property Standards By-law 2011-277, it is recognized as generally effective in the management of property standards for all properties across the municipality but does not specifically address vacant derelict properties. Additionally, the current administrative fees do not reflect the level of service provided to manage properties. Lastly, the enforcement structure is administratively challenging when addressing property standards through Part III proceedings which are slow to impact and potentially costly to the municipality.

For these reasons, By-law 2011-277 should be reviewed to identify changes that reinforce provisions in areas such as vacant derelict properties, administrative fees, and enforcement ability.

Heritage Act Designated Properties

The Ontario Heritage Act ("the Act") allows municipalities to include standards for designated properties as part of the Property Standards By-law 2011-277 which is equipped to address heritage properties and does not permit derelict heritage buildings.

Further, the Act requires that properties that do not comply with the standards established in the property standards by law are to be repaired and maintained to conform with the standard. Currently, the City of Greater Sudbury oversees a registry of ten (10) heritage-designated properties and has ownership of three (3) of those registered properties. (See Appendix A)

Though Property Standards By-law 2011-277 lacks specific provisions on heritage designated properties, it is specific that where any other By-law, Act, or Regulation in force within the municipality establishes a higher standard, it will succeed the Property Standards By-law in protecting the health, safety, and well-being of residents.

As a result, the regulatory control over a heritage-designated property is dependent on what aspect of the building is non-compliant and may be addressed by one or more by-laws, Acts, or regulations in the protection of the heritage attributes and the interest of health, safety, and well-being of residents. Adding specific provisions for heritage-designated properties to By-law 2011-277 would help enhance the protection of heritage attributes.

Section 15.9 of the Building Code Act, 1992.

The Chief Building Official has limited ability to address property standards related to vacant and derelict buildings except through powers given under Section 15.9 of the Building Code Act ("the Act") which specifically addresses the management of unsafe buildings.

When a complaint is received by Building Services for a vacant or derelict building, an inspection is conducted by a Building Inspector often partnered with representatives from By-law Services and Fire Services to determine if the building is to be deemed unsafe as defined under Section 15.9 of the Act.

If the building is not deemed unsafe, then each partner enforces respective legislation that supports the health and safety of residents, structures, and properties, and where required, the partners may use appropriate compliance tools.

However, when a building is deemed unsafe, an Order to Remedy an Unsafe Building is issued under Section 15.9 of the Building Code Act, 1992.

The Order defines the areas of deficiency, and the remediation required to bring the building or property into compliance. Additionally, the Order outlines the timeframes for appeal, compliance, and the penalty for non-compliance. The timeframe for compliance can vary conditional on the severity of the issue, however, deadlines may be extended based on:

- a) Demonstrated intent by the property owner to comply with the Order.
- b) The length of time needed to obtain a building permit to complete repairs or demolition.
- c) The length of time needed to complete the remediation to protect the property.

If compliance is not achieved, the City may proceed with the appropriate compliance tool as prescribed under the Building Code Act, 1992 such as;

- a) Administering of a fine also known as Part 1 ticket under the Provincial Offences Act.
- b) Commence proceedings under the Provincial Offences Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. P.33 for non-compliance.
- c) Initiate remedial action to cause repair or demolition at the owner's expense with costs recovered by adding the amount due to the tax roll including all fees to administrate the service.

As a result, the most effective mechanism to compel compliance is through the volition of the Order to Remedy an Unsafe on the part of the property owner which, enables the City to remediate the Order on their behalf and apply the cost to the tax roll. In 2023 Building Services oversaw the management of (3) vacant derelict properties through the demolition of the buildings with a total cost applied to the tax roll of approximately \$116,000.00.

Overall, the administration of fines and the commencement of proceedings is not viewed as having an immediate impact on addressing derelict building because the movement to prosecution only initiates a legal proceeding but does not guarantee a timely judgment in favour of the municipality. Instead, proactive monitoring of properties through orders should be continued to support the maintenance or redevelopment of a property in compliance with the Building Code Act, 1992.

Building Code Act Section 8(10) - Revocation of a Building Permit

Through powers provided under Section 8(10) of the Building Code Act, S.O. 1992, c.23 the Chief Building Official may revoke a building permit issued under this Act:

- a) if it was issued on mistaken, false, or incorrect information.
- (b) if, after six months after its issuance, the construction or demolition in respect of which it was issued has not, in the opinion of the chief building official, been seriously commenced.
- (c) if the construction or demolition of the building is, in the opinion of the chief building official, substantially suspended or discontinued for a period of more than one year.
- (d) if it was issued in error.
- (e) if the holder requests in writing that it be revoked; or
- (f) if a term of the agreement under clause (3) (c) has not been complied with 1992, c. 23, s. 8 (10).

However, in considering permit revocation for a construction project that has stalled or stopped, the decision of the Chief Building Official is subject to several external forces including:

1. Market forces out of the control of the municipality such as market demand, cost of construction, interest rates, supply-chain availability, and weather which all have significant impacts on development.
2. The level of public interest and the obligation of the municipality to cautiously use public funds to manage repairs, acquire derelict properties, and remove derelict/vacant buildings.

Through consultation with the Ontario Large Municipality of Chief Building Officials (OLMCBO) group, there was little support for amending the language in Section 8(10) under the Building Code Act since the language is viewed as providing latitude to the Chief Building Officials to avoid issues out of the control of the municipality.

Generally, members of OLMCBO reasoned:

1. Strong enforcement of clause (c) under Section 8(10) would see the removal of judgment given to the Chief Building Official to incentivize compliance and bring about good development.
2. Revocation of the building permit would ultimately prolong the repair period or halt the construction or repair period.
3. Forced revocation would remove some of the stronger enforcement mechanisms held by government agencies that would monitor an active construction site.

In consultation with the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing, amending the language in the Ontario Building Code Act would require the majority approval of four-hundred and forty-four (444) Ontario Municipalities with a broad range of powers and responsibilities under the Municipal Act, 2001, the City of Toronto Act, 2006 (Toronto only) and over 100 separate provincial acts. In consultation with members of the OLMCBO group, whose mandate is to promote regulatory compliance and safety of building construction through legislation, building code leadership, and expertise there is little support for this initiative. The OLMCBO is a team of Building Code professionals who advocate with the Ministry for safer communities and oversee 80% of Ontario's construction and economic activity blanketed over 45 municipalities province wide. Greater Sudbury is a member in good standing with this organization.

Fire Prevention and Protection Act and the Ontario Fire Code

When a complaint is received by the Fire Prevention Section on a derelict building, a joint inspection is coordinated with Building Services and Bylaw Services to address matters of concern and determine the best course of action to resolve the issue through department-specific legislation.

When a derelict building is occupied, Fire Services will act in the interest of the public for all matters of fire and life safety under the Fire Prevention and Protection Act (FPPA, “the Act”) and Ontario Fire Code (OFC, “the Code”). However, Fire Services has limited ability to address vacant derelict buildings under the authority of the Act and the Code except through the issuance of a Fire Marshal Order under Section 21 which requires the property owner to ensure a vacant building is secured against unauthorized entry and may require the owner to remove buildings or structures. If the owner fails to secure the building, the owner may be prosecuted.

When a Sec 21 FPPA Fire Marshal order is issued, there are very specific criteria that are required to be met and usually pertain specifically to occupied buildings. However, once the building is unoccupied, the fire and life safety risk is usually eliminated. In such cases, it is normally no longer considered reasonable to have the building removed, therefore the limit of enforcement through the Fire Prevention and Protection Act has been reached.

As a result, the management of the vacant derelict building would return to the regulatory authority given to Building Services and By-law Services under the Property Standards By-law and the Ontario Building Code Act.

Municipal Comparison

Except for known municipalities with established vacant building by-laws, many municipalities, (e.g. Kitchener, Oshawa,) utilize municipal frameworks, similar to the City of Greater Sudbury with vacant derelict buildings and heritage-designated properties being regulated under a Property Standards By-law.

Only recently have there been changes to frameworks for our Northern Ontario comparators. With North Bay enacting a Vacant Building By-law and Registry in 2022 and Sault Ste. Marie following with a Vacant Building By-law in 2023 and a Vacant Building Registry to be implemented in 2024. Unfortunately, due to the recent enactment of their respective By-laws and Registries, neither municipality was able to provide statistical data to show the level of impact of this implementation.

Vacant Complaint History

From 2018 to 2023, Greater Sudbury staff received approximately two hundred and fifty-three (253) property standards complaints relating to vacant properties and vacant buildings. Of the two hundred and fifty-three (253) complaints, fifty-nine (59) were specific to vacant derelict buildings, averaging 9.8 complaints per year. Comparably, two hundred fifty-nine (259) cases were registered in 2023 specific to Building with Unsafe Conditions and from those investigations, Building Services issued eight (8) Orders to Remedy Unsafe Buildings, with four (4) orders being rectified by property remediation or building demolition as of the writing of this report. The cases noted above are complaints only and do not include cases where By-law Officers or Building Inspectors proactively came across properties while investigating other files or properties.

Vacant Building By-laws and Registries

As of 2023 seventeen (17) Ontario municipalities have publicly reported the implementation of a Vacant Building Bylaw or Vacant Building Registry to manage or otherwise address vacant buildings and properties.

When a municipality elects to establish a Vacant Building By-law and/or Registry, the decision of approach is largely dependent on the focus of the municipality. The table below sets out some of the opportunities and challenges of establishing a vacant building by-law and/or registry.

Generally, municipalities that have established Vacant Building By-laws transfer existing property standards provisions and focus on enforcement through a combination of powers under the Ontario Building Code Act, Ontario Fire Code, and Property Standards By-laws. The City of Greater Sudbury currently adheres to this practice in the monitoring and management of vacant derelict buildings and properties.

However, some municipalities have opted more simply to adopt a Vacant Building Registry, which tends to be focused on the ongoing monitoring of vacant buildings and compliance under the registry. Registered properties are subject to an annual fee or permit application.

Table 1 below sets out general opportunities and challenges with the implementation of a vacant building by-law.

Opportunities	Challenges
Establishes standards for the specific management of vacant buildings or properties	The approach is reactive - this cannot prevent buildings from becoming vacant.
Provides a method to monitor the number and status of vacant buildings in a municipality.	Requires additional resources to implement, administrate, and enforce the by-law and registry.
Sets clear expectations for property owners for the maintenance of vacant buildings and properties.	Does not offer additional regulatory enforcement tools.
Establishes that an annual fee or permit is required for registration and compliance.	Registration fees often represent less than 0.01% of the assessed value of the property and do not reflect the cost associated with the management of the property.

The establishment of a Vacant Building By-law or Registry would be governed under the Ontario Municipal Act and would establish requirements such as registration, property owner responsibility, inspection by municipal by-law enforcement staff, and associated penalties.

Table 2 below sets out some of the provisions currently used in vacant building bylaws or registries in five Ontario municipalities.

Municipality	Trigger Date	Registration Fee	Annual Fee	Inspections
Brantford	60 days after the building becomes vacant	\$270	\$600	Inspected once per month
Hamilton	90 days after a building becomes vacant, or within 30 days after notice from the city	\$1,115 initial fee	\$729	Monitored every two weeks and a municipal law enforcement officer inspection at least four times per year.
Ottawa	after a property is unoccupied for 120 days	\$57 admin fee	\$1,450 annual permit fee	Inspected at least once every two weeks.
St. Catharines	After 30 days of a property becoming vacant,	\$350 one-time administrative fee	\$800 annual registration fee	The property condition is monitored every two weeks.
Welland	after 90 days of a property becoming vacant	\$200 registration fee	\$282 inspection fee.	The property is inspected at least once per month by a person or qualified company, and twice per year by a municipal law enforcement officer.

Supporting Maintenance and Redevelopment

Development Charges By-law 2019-100

To encourage the redevelopment of a property, the City provides a Development Charge credit for sixty (60) months at 100% of the value of credit applied on the day a demolition permit is issued.

To manage derelict/vacant buildings, some municipalities have made specific provisions within their Development Charges By-laws to extend the redevelopment period to facilitate the redevelopment of properties. For example, York Region, the Town of Aurora, and the City of Richmond Hill provide a development charge credit for up to 120 months from the date of demolition permit issuance. The value of credit is determined by how soon a building permit for redevelopment is issued.

The table below shows the credit structure currently used by the York Region, the Town of Aurora, and the City of Richmond Hill for derelict buildings.

Number of Months from the Date of Demolition Permit Issuance to Date of Building Permit Issuance	Credit Provided (%)
Up to and including 48 months	100%
Greater than 48 months up to and including 72 months	75%
Greater than 72 months up to and including 96 months	50%
Greater than 96 months up to and including 120 months	25%
Greater than 120 months	0%

Community Improvement Plans and Incentive Programs

Community Improvement Plans (CIPs) are a community planning tool used by municipalities to revitalize areas of a city or community through programs, grants, and incentives.

CIPs identify a vision for the community and ensure that development is well-planned with the intent to attract investment and support economic development. CIPs also:

- address the reuse and restoration of lands, buildings, and infrastructure
- address growth management challenges
- plan for rehabilitation, development, and changes to land use.

As part of the Community Improvement Plans, the City of Greater Sudbury also provides financial incentives for the development or redevelopment of specific properties or areas. These incentives may include tax grants, loans, and rebate programs.

Where the application is eligible, CIPs and incentive programs can be a useful tool for the management of vacant derelict buildings and properties when combined with other municipal and provincial incentives. Outreach and education on these initiatives in support of community investment and economic development would be encouraged for the redevelopment of properties in the targeted CIP areas.

Regulatory Tools Summary

The table below outlines all of the current tools utilized by the City of Greater Sudbury in the monitoring and management of vacant derelict buildings and offers opportunities for improvement.

Regulatory Tool	Active Use	Comment
Property Standards By-law	Yes	Opportunities to enhance vacant/derelict property provisions and sensibly increase fees. ¹
Vacant Buildings By-law or Vacant Building Registry	No	There is no evidence to support the effectiveness of these tools currently.
Heritage Act Designated Property Registry	Yes	This is a proven effective tool for the monitoring of the 10 designated heritage sites in the municipality.
Development Charges	Yes	Opportunities to enhance the redevelopment period and provide terms of condition. ²
Fire Prevention and Protection Act and Ontario Fire Code	Yes	This tool has limited powers in the management of vacant/derelict properties.
Building Code Act – Section 15.9	Yes	This is a proven effective tool in the management of vacant/derelict properties with powers to act where applicable.
Building Code Act – Section 8(10) Revocation	No	Chief Building Officials do not view this as an effective tool to manage vacant/derelict properties.
Community Improvement Plans & Incentive Programs	Yes	This is a proven effective tool for the monitoring and redevelopment of properties in Greater Sudbury.

¹ Any amendments to the current service levels would result in the need to increase resources and would directly impact council-approved budgets for the 2024/2025 cycle.

² The Development Charges By-law is currently under review providing the opportunity to complete this work with existing resources.

Conclusion

Despite the number of regulatory tools available through the Property Standards By-law 2011-177, the Ontario Building Code Act, 1992, the Ontario Heritage Act and the Fire Protection and Prevention Act, there remain a limited number of opportunities to compel property owners to proceed with development that has stalled or stopped.

Revocation of permits under the Ontario Building Code Act is unlikely to incentivize developers to proceed with construction when market forces out of the control of municipalities are more likely to be responsible for construction delays.

Vacant Building By-laws and/or Vacant Building Registries are too few and too recent to determine the impact of these efforts. Equally, proactive initiatives under existing frameworks have proven to be as effective without impacting current service levels or the requirement for additional resources.

Through the review of By-laws 2011-177 and 2019-100, there are presented opportunities to address and encourage the management of vacant and derelict buildings through the enhancement of provisions, the sensible increase of administrative fees, and a focused view of heritage-designated properties.

Next Steps

In collaboration with partners in By-law Services who have undertaken a proactive review of all wards, staff will establish a case type specific to vacant and/or derelict buildings to monitor the number of properties impacted by vacant derelict buildings and assess the need for any additional enforcement measures. Staff will continue to monitor progress in other municipalities and report back to Council on the possible cost and effectiveness of a vacant building registry by Q3 of 2025.

Staff will be consulting with Planning Services and Finance as part of the review of the Development Charges By-law which is expected to provide a report to Council in Q2 of 2024. And provide feedback on the extension of the redevelopment period in By-law 2019-100 to encourage the demolition of vacant derelict buildings.

Staff will undertake a review of the Property Standards By-law 2007-109 to determine where amendments can be made appropriate to the level of service required to enforce property standards for vacant derelict properties. And determine if specific provisions for heritage-designated properties are required to better protect our heritage attributes. Staff will provide a report detailing suggested amendments by the end of Q4 2024.

Resources Cited

1. Ontario Building Code Act 8(10) Building Code Act, 1992, S.O. 1992, c. 23
<https://www.ontario.ca/laws/statute/92b23/v26#BK17>
2. City of Greater Sudbury Property Standards [By-law 2011-277](#)
3. City of North Bay Property Standards [By-law 2022-27](#)
4. City of North Bay Vacant Buildings [By-law 2022-29](#)
5. City of Sault Ste Marie Property Standards [By-law 2012-9](#)
6. City of Sault Ste Marie Vacant Buildings [By-law 2023-110](#)
7. City of Kitchener Municipal Code [Section 10, Chapters 642, 665, 694](#)
8. City of Ottawa Vacant Property By-law [By-law 2022-197](#)
9. Development Charges By-laws for:
 - a. York Region [Development Charges Bylaw 2022-31](#)
 - b. Town of Aurora [Development Charges By-law 6166-19](#)
 - c. City of Richmond Hill [Development Charges By-law 47-19](#)
10. Fire Prevention and Protection Act, 1997, S.O. 1997, c.4 <https://www.ontario.ca/laws/statute/97f04>
11. Ontario Heritage Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. O.18 <https://www.ontario.ca/laws/statute/90o18>