Cambridge Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee
No. 04 – 21

AGENDA
Thursday, April 15, 2021
7:30 p.m. via Zoom

Meeting Called to Order

Disclosure of Interest

Presentations

Delegations:

Agenda Item #1. Dale Wideman, Project Coordinator, WRDSB
    Ed Schuck, Project Coordinator, VG Architects

Agenda Item #3. Terry Polyak, Owner
    Jesse French, Architect, Martin Simmons

Agenda Item #4. Rachel Redshaw, Heritage Planner, MHBC Planning
    Dan Currie, Director of Heritage, MHBC Planning

Approval of March 18, 2021 Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee Minutes PP 005

THAT the Minutes of the March 18, 2021 meeting of the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee be considered for errors and omissions and be adopted.

Agenda Items:

1. Request to Alter a Part IV Designated Property – 200 Water Street North (Galt Collegiate Institute) PP 010

Should you wish to delegate regarding an item on this agenda, please register via email at planning@cambridge.ca by 12 noon of the day prior to the meeting. Be advised that only one person can delegate at a time and additional people cannot be invited to join due to technical limitations. Thank you.
THAT Report 21-007 (MHAC) – Request to Alter a Part IV Designated Property – 200 Water Street North (Galt Collegiate Institute) – be received;

AND THAT the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC) recommend Council approve replacement of the windows on the south elevation and east elevation of the Tassie Hall at 200 Water Street North as outlined in Report 21-007 (MHAC);

AND FURTHER THAT the MHAC recommend Council require a sample of the window for the south elevation of Tassie Hall be provided to the satisfaction of the Senior Planner Heritage prior to the manufacturing of the replacement windows.

2. Request to Alter a Part V Designated Property – 29 Main Street

THAT Report 21-010 (MHAC) – Request to Alter a Part V Designated Property – 29 Main Street – be received;

AND THAT the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC) recommend Council approve construction of an enclosure on the second storey level at the back of the property at 29 Main Street for a fire escape as outlined in Report 21-010 (MHAC).

3. Request to Alter a Part V Designated Property – 15 Main Street

THAT Report 21-011 (MHAC) – Request to Alter a Part V Designated Property – 15 Main Street – be received;

AND THAT the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC) recommend Council approve replacement of damaged window and door trim on the ground floor, replacement of all the upper level windows on the front facade with wood frame windows, enlargement of windows on the rear elevation and installation of aluminum frame windows, replacement of rear doors with aluminum and glass doors, installation of a new door opening on the ground floor of the rear elevation, removal of the rear fire escape, installation of steel guard rails on the rear doors, repointing where required and repair/replacement of sills where necessary, cleaning of the stone, repair and replacement of roof materials as necessary and construction of a new roof bulkhead for the elevator at 15 Main Street as outlined in Report 21-011 (MHAC);

AND THAT MHAC recommend that Council require a stone mason with demonstrated experience working with heritage buildings to the satisfaction of the Senior Planner Heritage, supervise the enlargement of the window openings on the rear elevation and the repointing of the stone with hand tools or a handheld rotary saw where appropriate;
AND THAT MHAC recommend that Council require that the repointing mortar be an appropriate lime-based mix and that a sample patch be completed to the satisfaction of the Senior Planner Heritage.

AND THAT MHAC recommend that Council require the stone cleaning to be completed with a sponge or soft steel brushes and that any power washing not exceed 300 psi;

AND FURTHER THAT MHAC recommend that Council require that the new wood windows on the upper levels of the front facade and east side elevation not be clad in aluminum.

4. 234 Eagle Street South Heritage Impact Assessment

THAT the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC) accepts the Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) and its findings as submitted by MHBC Planning dated January 5, 2021 for the development proposed for the listed property at 234 Eagle Street South;

AND THAT the MHAC recommends that the property owner salvage for reuse the interior tin ceiling tiles located in the property’s outbuilding;

AND THAT the MHAC recommends to the Committee of Adjustment that the design of the new dwelling be a two storey design with a gabled roof, covered front porch and garage to the rear of the streetscape which is keeping with the current character of the neighbourhood;

AND THAT the MHAC recommends to the Committee of Adjustment that the new construction use similar building materials and use design elements of the early Edwardian and Queen Anne periods, which are character defining elements of the neighbourhood;

AND THAT the MHAC recommends to the Committee of Adjustment that the colour palette be a neutral colour from a heritage palette from a major paint company such as Benjamin Moore;

AND FURTHER THAT the MHAC be circulated on the building permit application to review and comment on the building design of the new dwelling on the proposed new building lot.

Correspondence

Information Items

General Heritage Matters – Updates from MHAC Members
Other Business

a) Chair’s Comments  
b) Council Report/Comments  
c) Staff/Senior Planner - Heritage Comments

Next Meeting:

Date & Time: May 20, 2021, at 7 p.m.  
Via Zoom

Close of Meeting

THAT the MHAC meeting does now adjourn at ______p.m.

Distribution:

Committee Members in Attendance: Sue Brown, Nelson Cecilia, Michelle Goodridge, Mark Leclair, John Oldfield, Scott Roberts, Nancy Woodman and Councillor Pam Wolf with Amy Barnes in the Chair

Regrets: Kimberly Livingstone

Staff in Attendance: Laura Waldie, Senior Planner - Heritage, Abraham Plunkett-Latimer, Senior Planner - Heritage, Karin Stieg-Drobig, Recording Secretary and Ayesh Da Silva, IT Support

Meeting Called to Order

The meeting of the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee was held virtually via Microsoft Zoom and live streamed to the City of Cambridge website. Amy Barnes, MHAC Vice Chair, welcomed everyone present, introductions were made and she advised those present that in its advisory role, MHAC makes recommendations that then go to Council for a decision. The meeting was called to order at 7:04 p.m. and the meeting adjourned at 8:00 p.m.

Declarations of Interest - NIL

Presentation:

James Goodram, Director of Business Development, gave a Power Point Presentation on the Core Area Community Improvement Plan Programs offered by the City of Cambridge. A copy of the presentation is available by contacting the Planning Department. Information on the programs can be found on the City of Cambridge website at https://www.cambridge.ca/en/build-invest-grow/Incentives.aspx

Delegations:

Roger Agler, applicant for item 2, Request to Alter and for Funding from the Designated Heritage Property Grant Program – 50 Lansdowne Road South, was present to answer any questions of the Committee.

Minutes of Previous Meeting

Moved by: Susan Brown
Seconded by: Councillor Wolf

ECM\Planning Services\Committees\MHAC\MHAC Agendas and Minutes\Minutes\2020 Minutes\February\02_20_2020 MHAC Minutes
THAT the minutes of the February 18, 2021 meeting of the Cambridge Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee be considered for errors and omissions and be adopted.

CARRIED

1. 2021 Designated Heritage Property Grant Applications Summary

Moved by: Nelson Cecilia
Seconded by: John Oldfield

THAT the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee recommends Memo 2/2021 be received as information

CARRIED

2. Request to Alter and for Funding from the Designated Heritage Property Grant Program – 50 Lansdowne Road South

Moved by: Nancy Woodman
Seconded by: Michelle Goodridge

THAT Report 21-005 (MHAC) - Request to Alter and for Funding from the Designated Heritage Property Grant Program – 50 Lansdowne Road South – be received;

AND THAT the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC) recommend Council approve the replacement of the windows at 50 Lansdowne Road South as outlined in Report 21-005 (MHAC);

AND THAT the MHAC recommend Council direct staff to amend By-law 9-17, to correct the location of the bay window in the list of heritage attributes in accordance with Section 30.1 of the Ontario Heritage Act;

AND THAT the MHAC recommends the application for funding from the 2021 Operating Budget be approved by the Deputy City Manager of Community Development for the designated property municipally known as 50 Lansdowne Road South, for $2,500 for the replacement of the windows;

AND THAT the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC) recommends that City Council (Council) approve additional funding from the Heritage Conservation Reserve Fund for the designated property municipally known as 50 Lansdowne Road South to a maximum of $2,500 for the replacement of the windows in accordance with the recommendations in Report 21-005 (MHAC);

AND THAT the approved work must be completed by November 1, 2021;
AND FURTHER THAT the grant is conditional upon the inspection of the completed work to the satisfaction of MHAC or its designated representative.

CARRIED

3. Request for Funding from the Designated Heritage Property Grant Program – 29 Main Street

Moved by: Michelle Goodridge
Seconded by: John Oldfield

A question was raised by the Committee regarding the number of times this property owner has requested funds for this particular work. Staff advised the property owner received authorization to have this work completed in 2019, however, was not able to do so due to staffing turn over at his company and then because of COVID. He has indicated the work will be completed this year.

THAT Report 21-006 (MHAC) – Request for Funding from the Designated Heritage Property Grant Program – 29 Main Street – be received;

AND THAT the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC) recommends the application for funding from the 2021 Operating Budget be approved by the Deputy City Manager of Community Development for the designated property municipally known as 29 Main Street, for $2,500 for the replacement of the windows on the front and rear facades as set out in Report 21-006 (MHAC);

AND THAT the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC) recommends that City Council (Council) approve additional funding from the Heritage Conservation Reserve Fund for the designated property municipally known as 29 Main Street to a maximum of $2,500 for the replacement of the windows on the front and rear facades as set out in Report 21-006 (MHAC);

AND THAT the approved work must be completed by November 1, 2021;

AND FURTHER THAT the grant is conditional on the inspection of the completed work to the satisfaction of the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee or its designated representative.

CARRIED

4. 12 Highgrove Court – Request Request for Funding from the Designated Heritage Property Grant Program
Moved by: Nelson Cecilia
Seconded by: Nancy Woodman

A question was raised as to why this report came before MHAC as it was clear the project did not qualify for funding. Staff indicated that they do not have delegated authority through a heritage permit process administered by the Ontario Heritage Act.

**THAT** the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC) not approve the application for funding from the 2021 Operating Budget for the replacement of vinyl windows for the property municipally known as 12 Highgrove Court due to the proposal not meeting eligibility criteria for the Designated Heritage Property Grants Program.

**CARRIED**

**Correspondence - NIL**

**Other Business – NIL**

**Council Report/ Comments:**

Councillor Wolf was pleased to note that the motion she made to hire an additional Senior Planner Heritage was approved by Council. She also noted that while Council was not supportive of restoring the Heritage Grant budget to the previous amount of $30,000 this year, they will support recommendations from MHAC to top up approved grants from the Heritage Reserve Fund.

**Staff/Senior Planner- Heritage comments:**

Abraham Plunkett- Latimer advised he was contacted by Horst Wohlgemut of Central Presbyterian Church that the heritage plaques will be removed from the church building during construction to ensure they are not damaged. They will be reinstalled after the work has been completed.

Laura Waldie spoke about the revision of the strategic plan, Cambridge Connected, that was originally put into place in 2015. A meeting was held on March 10, 2021 with staff and advisory committee members, including Michelle Goodridge, Susan Brown and Amy Barnes from this committee. The discussions have been held to look at how the advisory committees can better engage the Community and work together to create a sense of place, maintain heritage and encourage a liveable community. It is hoped the recommendations gathered through this engagement can be brought to Council in May or June of this year.

Laura further noted that the Gore Fountain in Centennial Square is leaking and needs to
have the tub replaced and tiles repaired. There are no alterations required as it is a like for like repair, so there is no need for a report to MHAC. The City plans to begin the repairs by the beginning of April so that it is completed by the May long weekend.

General Heritage Matters – Updates by Committee Members:

Amy Barnes noted there are many interesting workshops and information sessions available at this time of year. Specifically she recommended Community Heritage Ontario that gave a free session giving an overview of changes through Bill 108. She will share links with the Committee after the meeting.

Chair’s Comments:

John Oldfield welcomed Laura Waldie back as Senior Planner- Heritage and noted the Committee members are happy to see her again. He further noted that if anyone has time to go see the scaffolding that has been erected around the Church at Queen’s Square, they should do so as the contractor’s have done an amazing job as they begin the replacement of roof tiles for this designated heritage building.

Next Meeting

Date & Time: April 15, 2021, 7:00 p.m.
Location: Virtually via Zoom

Close of Meeting

Moved by: Councillor Wolf
Seconded by: Nelson Cecilia

THAT the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee meeting does now adjourn at 8:00 p.m.

CARRIED

Chairperson
Amy Barnes

Recording Secretary
Karin Stieg-Drobig
Meeting Date: 04/15/2021
To: Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee
Report Date: 03/29/2021
Report Author: Chelsey Tyers, BES, Cultural Heritage Specialist, WSP Canada, Inc.
Department: Community Development
Division: Planning Services
Report Title: Request to Alter a Part IV Designated Property – 200 Water Street North (Galt Collegiate Institute)
File No: R01.01.20
Ward No: 4

RECOMMENDATIONS

THAT Report 21-007 (MHAC) – Request to Alter a Part IV Designated Property – 200 Water Street North (Galt Collegiate Institute) – be received;

AND THAT the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC) recommend Council approve replacement of the windows on the south elevation and east elevation of the Tassie Hall at 200 Water Street North as outlined in Report 21-007 (MHAC);

AND FURTHER THAT the MHAC recommend Council require a sample of the window for the south elevation of Tassie Hall be provided to the satisfaction of the Senior Planner Heritage prior to the manufacturing of the replacement windows.

SUMMARY

- The property located at 200 Water Street North (previously addressed as 210 Water Street North) is designated under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act by By-law 16-83.
The property owner is requesting permission to replace the windows on the south and east elevations of the Tassie Hall.

BACKGROUND

The subject property is designated under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act by By-law 16-83 (Attachment 1). The Galt Collegiate Institute, originally known as the Galt Grammar School was founded in 1852 by Michael C. Howe as a private school for boys. (Figure 1, Images 1). The oldest portion of the building was constructed in 1854, and additions of limestone were made in 1859, 1874, 1905 and 1923. Tassie Hall comprises the 1923 addition and reflects a Scottish Baronial style with architectural features such as crow step gables, crenellation and buttresses.

The property owner has submitted a building permit to replace windows on the south and east elevations of Tassie Hall, the southmost portion of the building (See Building Permit Plans in Attachment 2). The large windows on the south side of Tassie Hall were covered on the exterior and interior in the 1960s and have remained so until present. The interior of one of the windows has been revealed and the original steel frame window is present (See Photos provided by the applicant in Attachment 3). The applicant is seeking to replace the windows on the south and east elevations of Tassie Hall with aluminum frame windows. Heritage planning staff did not require a Heritage
Impact Assessment to accompany the subject application given the alterations are considered minor.

**ANALYSIS**

**Strategic Alignment:**
PLACE: To take care of, celebrate and share the great features in Cambridge that we love and mean the most to us.

Goal #3 - Arts, Culture, Heritage and Architecture

Objective 3.2 Conserve and make positive contributions to our heritage districts and buildings throughout the community.

**Existing Policy/By-Law:**
200 Water Street North is designated under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act by By-law 16-83. The reasons for designation in the by-law do not specifically identify the windows, but the by-law implies that the whole building except the 1963 and later additions are included in the by-law.

The 2012 Cambridge Official Plan identifies policies in Chapter 4 that support the conservation and restoration of built heritage resources.

Section 33 of the Ontario Heritage Act identifies the process for altering a Part IV designated property.

**Financial Impact:**
None.

**Public Input:**
MHAC meetings are open to the public.

**Internal/External Consultation:**
None.

**Comments/Analysis:**
The windows on the south elevation of Tassie Hall have been covered both on the exterior and interior of the building since the 1960s. The other windows on the east elevation of Tassie Hall do not appear to be original windows. To provide additional light into Tassie Hall, the applicant is seeking to install new windows in these openings.
In 2004, permission was granted by Council to replace all windows on the rear elevations (river side) with aluminum windows. None of the original wood windows were present along the rear elevation. The report to the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC) for this application (RMHAC 19-04) noted the proposed aluminum windows would match the size and design of those in place at the time. The report does not note when the aluminum windows in place at the time were replaced. A review of the exterior of the Galt Collegiate Institute suggests most if not all of the other windows on the building are now aluminum framed.

Only one of the windows on the south elevation of Tassie Hall has been revealed from the interior. It appears to be an original window to Tassie Hall which was constructed in 1923. The condition of all three windows on this elevation are presumed to be similar. The glass panes and steel appear to be in good condition, but the drywall was attached to the wood window frames directly as evident by the multiple nail holes in the wood frames. Additionally, there is a visible crack in one of the vertical members as well as some holes to accommodate an electrical plug. These windows cannot be opened and do not appear to have been designed to be opened. Given the drywall was adhered directly to the wood frames on the interior, the wood board covering the exterior part of the window may have similarly been adhered directly to the wood frame.

The applicant considered retaining the original windows and including a storm window for additional efficiency, but the condition of the wood frames was a concern and installing new units would provide operable units. The proposed windows will match the window pattern of the existing windows with thicker aluminum framing to imitate the wood frame and thinner aluminum to replicate the steel muntins on the original windows. While the original frames have yellow and clear glass in a seemingly random pattern, the proposed window will be all clear glass. The reasoning for the yellow glass on the existing windows is unknown.

The two larger windows on the east elevation do not appear to be early or original, and most of the smaller windows are boarded up. There are no concerns with replacement of these windows with similar aluminum frame windows.

Conclusion

Given the condition of the wood frames of the visible window and the desire for operable windows, the replacement of the windows on the south and east elevations of Tassie Hall is appropriate. As the majority of the windows on the building are already aluminum, the continued use of aluminum material is also acceptable. However, as the design of the original windows is known, greater effort to replicate the design of the original windows should be made. Particularly, the existing wood frame has a battered shape (the width recedes as it extends out). This shape should be replicated with the
aluminum frame and the steel muntin bars should be replicated with black painted aluminum located on the outside of the glass (exterior and interior).

Based on the above analysis, it is recommended that the application for window replacement on the south and east elevations of Tassie Hall be approved with a condition that a sample of the windows for the south elevation be provided to the satisfaction of planning staff.

This application aligns with the City’s Strategic Plan which encourages sympathetic alterations to designated heritage properties to celebrate our built heritage and create attractive, viable neighbourhoods.

SIGNATURE

Prepared by:

Chelsey Tyers, BES, MCIP, RPP
Cultural Heritage Specialist, WSP

Departmental Approval:

Elaine Brunn Shaw
Chief Planner

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1  By-law 16-83: Designation of Galt Collegiate Institute and Vocational School
Attachment 2  Building Permit Plans for 200 Water Street North
Attachment 3  Photos provided by the applicant
BY-LAW NO. 16-83

OF THE

CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF CAMBRIDGE

Being a by-law to designate the frontal exterior of the Galt Collegiate Institute and Vocational School, 210 Water Street North, and the interior of the front entrance hall with memorial tablets, but excluding the north wing addition, for its historical and architectural significance.

WHEREAS the Ontario Heritage Act, R.S.O. 1980, c. 337 authorizes the Council of a municipality to enact by-laws to designate real property including all buildings and structures thereon, to be of historic or architectural value or interest;

AND WHEREAS Notices of Intention to so designate the Galt Collegiate Institute and Vocational School at 210 Water Street North, Cambridge, Ontario, have been duly published and served;

AND WHEREAS it is considered desirable to designate the property known as the Galt Collegiate Institute and Vocational School at 210 Water Street North;

NOW THEREFORE THE MUNICIPAL COUNCIL OF THE CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF CAMBRIDGE ENACTS AS FOLLOWS:

1. THAT there is designated as being of historical and architectural significance the frontal exterior and the interior of the front entrance hall with memorial tablets, but excluding the north wing addition, more particularly described in Schedule "A" attached hereto, known as the Galt Collegiate Institute and Vocational School, 210 Water Street North, Cambridge, Ontario. The reasons for designation are set out in Schedule "B" attached hereto.

2. THAT the City of Cambridge is hereby authorized to cause a copy of this by-law to be served upon the owner of the said property and upon the Ontario Heritage Foundation and to cause notice of this by-law to be published in a newspaper having general circulation in the City of Cambridge.

ENACTED AND PASSED THIS 8TH DAY OF FEBRUARY, A.D. 1983.

[Signature]

MAYOR

[Signature]

CLERK
SCHEDULE "A" TO BY-LAW NO. 16-83

OF THE

CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF CAMBRIDGE

ALL AND SINGULAR that certain parcel or tract of land and premises situate, lying and being in the City of Cambridge, in the Regional Municipality of Waterloo and Province of Ontario, (formerly in the City of Galt), and being composed of Blocks A and B, Registered Plan 448, known municipally as Galt Collegiate Institute and Vocational School, 210 Water Street North, Cambridge, Ontario.
SCHEDULE "B" TO BY-LAW NO. 16-83
OF THE
CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF CAMBRIDGE

The Galt Collegiate Institute and Vocational School is designated for historic and architectural reasons.

The Galt Grammar School was founded in 1852 by Michael C. Howe as a private school for boys and it attained continent wide distinction under his successor William Tassie, noted as a strict disciplinarian and classical scholar. Among its outstanding graduates were Sir Adam Beck and Canon the Hon. H. C. Cody. The name changed to the Galt High School in 1869 and then to Galt Collegiate Institute in 1872 when it headed the list of only six schools in Ontario on which were conferred the name and privileges of Collegiate Institutes (Local Colleges). Its students were often prominent in athletics and its Cadet Corps was much noted.

The plain, symmetrical building of 1854 with later additions - principally in 1859, 1914, 1905 and 1923 are of fossilized limestone quarried from the river banks, is of a style commonly called Scottish Baronial and incorporates many architectural features, including crow step gables, Romanesque arches, broken-arch pediment, crenellation and buttresses. The City skyline is dominated by two stone towers, and two decorative cupola-like ventilator hoods. The interior entrance Memorial Tablet of gray marble was erected in 1920 and was extended in 1954 to include casualties of World War II. The addition of 1963 and later changes are not included in the designation.
RECOMMENDATIONS

THAT Report 21-010 (MHAC) – Request to Alter a Part V Designated Property – 29 Main Street – be received;

AND THAT the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC) recommend Council approve construction of an enclosure on the second storey level at the back of the property at 29 Main Street for a fire escape as outlined in Report 21-010 (MHAC).

SUMMARY

- The property located at 29 Main Street is designated under Part V of the Ontario Heritage Act as part of the Main Street Heritage Conservation District (HCD).
- The property owner is requesting permission to construct an enclosure above the first storey at the back of the property abutting Imperial Lane to accommodate a fire escape.
BACKGROUND

The subject property is designated under Part V of the Ontario Heritage Act as part of the Main Street Heritage Conservation District (HCD) (Attachment 1). The three-storey building is part of the Granite Block constructed between 1851 and 1862 in the classical revival style (Figure 1, Images 1).

The property owner has submitted a building permit to construct a small enclosure on the second storey level at the back of the building abutting Imperial Lane for an internal fire escape (Attachment 2). Currently there is a small structure on the second storey level, but this does not satisfy current Ontario Building and Fire Code requirements and will be removed.

The enclosed fire escape structure will be one-storey in height and located on the second-floor level at the back of the building. The front portion of the building is three-storeys tall and the rear portion is one-storey tall. The building is also attached to adjacent buildings; therefore, the structure will not be visible from Main Street, but it will be visible from Imperial Lane. The original design of the proposed enclosure was for a
fully glass structure. However, heritage planning staff worked with the applicant and building staff to find a more appropriate material for the Main Street HCD. The revised design includes fibre cement siding in a board and batten pattern. Fibre cement siding was chosen instead of wood board and batten to satisfy the low combustion rate required by the Ontario Building and Fire Codes, but it will replicate the look of board and batten. There will also be windows along the east side of the enclosure to provide light to the stairwell in the fire escape. A Heritage Impact Assessment was not required for the proposed alterations given that the new enclosed fire escape is required to bring the building up to the Ontario Building Code requirements.

In addition to the proposed enclosed fire escape, the building permit application also includes internal renovations, which are not subject to review under the Ontario Heritage Act for the Main Street HCD, and replacement of all the windows. The Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC) reviewed the request to replace the windows in March 2019 and recommended that Council approve the alteration. The alteration was approved by Council on March 19, 2019. The MHAC also approved a $2500 grant under the Designated Heritage Property Grant Program at their meeting on March 18, 2021.

ANALYSIS

**Strategic Alignment:**

PLACE: To take care of, celebrate and share the great features in Cambridge that we love and mean the most to us.

Goal #3 - Arts, Culture, Heritage and Architecture

Objective 3.2 Conserve and make positive contributions to our heritage districts and buildings throughout the community.

**Existing Policy/By-Law:**

The Main Street Heritage Conservation District Plan identifies guidelines for appropriate alterations within the HCD. Attachment 1 provides relevant excerpts from the Plan.

The 2012 Cambridge Official Plan identifies policies in Chapter 4 that support the conservation and restoration of built heritage resources.

Section 42 of the Ontario Heritage Act identifies the process for altering a Part V designated property.

Section 4.2. of the Main Street Urban Design Guidelines provide the City with architectural guidelines and standards that guide heritage preservation.
Financial Impact:
The applicant has applied for funding for the renovations under the Building Revitalization Program and has been approved for a funding amount of $30,000.

Public Input:
MHAC meetings are open to the public.

Internal/External Consultation:
Heritage planning staff consulted with building staff to ensure Ontario Building and Fire Codes are satisfied.

Comments/Analysis:
The property at 29 Main Street has an existing enclosure on the second storey at the back of the building that is clad in asphalt shingles with a rectangular window opening on the east side. The applicants are proposing a new, larger enclosure for the fire escape to satisfy current Ontario Building and Fire Code Regulations. The new enclosure will service the second and third floor residential units (See Attachment 2).

The main recommendations in the Main Street Heritage Conservation District (HCD) Plan are to conserve the historic building stock, strengthen economic viability of the building stock, rehabilitate the upper floor apartments and offices and to foster excellence in building restoration work. Section 5.1.ii states that, “The rear facades…are a haphazard mixture of old and new buildings with little overall aesthetic appeal. Conservation and upgrading of the rear facade is however important in order to upgrade the economic viability of the block as a whole. It is not the intent to develop a wholly historic appearance to the rear facade but to encourage simply good and attractive design that blends the old and the new.” The conservation policy for the Granite block “is to retain and restore the historic fabric of the building.” Section 5.2 of the Main Street HCD Plan provides guidelines for new buildings within the district. This section recognizes that the rear of the block, along Imperial Lane, will be developed using modern construction techniques and that access to the upper floors will be mainly from the south side of the buildings. New buildings or additions should not seek to look old, but rather should complement the historic building character in its scale, texture, size and proportions.

The proposed enclosure for the fire escape will support the recommendations of the Main Street HCD. The new enclosure will have a minimal impact on the fabric of the building given it will only be attached to a small portion of the original fabric. Inside the enclosure, the metal door will be removed, but the stone construction will remain. Also, in keeping with the Main Street HCD guidelines, the new enclosure is of a vernacular
style using traditional looking materials in a simple design. Wood board and batten is not an appropriate material given the need for material with a low combustion rate. Fibre cement boards will provide the traditional look while satisfying current regulations. The windows on the enclosure will also reflect a similar shape and size to the window openings on the upper floors of the rear elevation. Finally, the Main Street HCD Plan recommends quiet, natural colours. A sample picture on the building plans (See A350, Attachment 1) shows a muted blue which is an appropriate choice for the district. Alternatively, many paint companies publish a range of historical paint colours and a choice from a mid-nineteenth century paint palette would also be appropriate.

The proposed enclosure is also consistent with the Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Culture Industries’ (MHSTCI) Eight Guiding Principles in the Conservation of Historic Properties that recommend new works be distinguishable from old. The enclosure is clearly distinct from the original structure, but is compatible in its massing, placement and material choice.

**Conclusion**

Given that the proposed fire escape enclosure is consistent with the Main Street HCD Plan and the MHSTCI’s Eight Guiding Principles in the Conservation of Historic Properties, there will be no adverse impacts to the Main Street HCD. Based on the above analysis, it is recommended that the application for the fire escape enclosure as outlined in this report and the building permit plans, be recommended for approval to City Council.

This application aligns with the City’s Strategic Plan which encourages sympathetic alterations designated heritage properties to celebrate our built heritage and create attractive, viable neighbourhoods.

**SIGNATURE**

Prepared by:

Chelsey Tyers, BES, MCIP, RPP
Cultural Heritage Specialist, WSP
Departmental Approval:

[Signature]

Elaine Brunn Shaw  
Chief Planner

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1  Relevant Excerpts from the Main Street HCD Plan
Attachment 2  Building Permit Plans for 29 Main Street
Cambridge (Galt)
a heritage conservation district plan

prepared by Nicholas Hill · architect planner · London
A
HERITAGE CONSERVATION DISTRICT PLAN
for the
CITY OF CAMBRIDGE (GALT)

prepared by
NICHOLAS HILL, ARCHITECT PLANNER
733 Waterloo St., London
September 1984
in association with
JEAN MONTEITH PLANNING CONSULTANTS
To the Residents of the Heritage Conservation District:

I welcome and appreciate your participation in the Heritage Conservation District Plan for Main Street in the City of Cambridge (Cbc).

Main Street is a special place in our city as both a business centre and an historic area. The continued prosperity and well-being of both, I believe, is necessary. This plan recognizes those attributes and is a guideline for economic growth and conservation of the historic building stock.

I take pride as your mayor, in joining with you to accomplish the worthwhile task ahead.

Sincerely,

Mayor of City of Cambridge
THE CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF CAMBRIDGE

BY-LAW NUMBER __________

The Council of the Corporation of the City of Cambridge hereby passes as follows:

1. A Heritage Conservation District Plan for Main Street in the City of Cambridge, being the attached text, is hereby adopted.

2. This By-Law shall not come into force until approved by the Ontario Municipal Board.

Enacted and passed this ............ day of ............, A.D., 1984.

.................................................. ..................................................

MAYOR CLERK

Certified that the above is a true copy of By-Law No........ as enacted and passed by Council of the Corporation of the City of Cambridge on the ........day of ......................... 1984.

..................................................

CLERK
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SECTION 1 - INTRODUCTION

The following text and map, noted as Schedule A, shall constitute the Heritage Conservation District Plan for Main Street in the City of Cambridge (Galt).

The policies in this Heritage Conservation District Plan are intended to operate within those already established in the official plan for the City of Cambridge. It is not the intention of this plan to alter the major policy directions of the official plan but to reinforce and refine the basic planning policies as they pertain to the Heritage Conservation District, designated under the Ontario Heritage Act. The limits of this plan are co-incident with the boundaries shown on Schedule A, and designated as a Heritage Conservation District by the City of Cambridge.

The Heritage Conservation District is located in the heart of the city of Galt and bounded by Main Street, Ainslie Street, Imperial Lane and Water Street. The district is distinguished by a block of commercial buildings that collectively form one of the outstanding historic streetscapes in Ontario. While the block exudes visual unity and strength there is a rich variety of architectural style and building age from the masculine stone Granite Block of 1862 to the flamboyant High Victorian Osborne Building of 1895. It is this subtle variation of detail and style within the discipline of the streetscape as a whole that makes the district worthy of long term conservation and enhancement.

The plan that follows is not an end in itself but one step of many to follow to secure the long term conservation of the subject district and others to follow. The plan is modest in ambition. It does not allude to grand new ideas but reaffirms that what exists is of architectural and historical value, and will be conserved by many small steps and activities with a full and profitable use of the building stock.

The main recommendations of the plan may be summarized as follows:

- to conserve the historic building stock;
- to strengthen the economic viability of the building stock;
- to rehabilitate the upper floors for apartments and offices;
- to obtain financial assistance for property owners who renovate;
- to foster excellence in building restoration work.
SECTION 5 - BUILDING PLAN

5.1 CONSERVATION OF THE HERITAGE BUILDING STOCK

i Introduction

This subsection is one of the most important parts of the plan. It addresses the subject of conserving and restoring the heritage building stock in the district. The guidelines that follow are guidelines only and, as proposals are developed for restoring properties, further detailed research and analysis is advised. However this subsection does provide a basis of the features to consider and the recommendations to follow.

The subject block is one of the most significant architectural compositions in the City of Cambridge. Its central location in the downtown, comparatively large size and architectural presence provides it with an unparalleled stature of architectural and historical importance. The block, above all, typifies the building history and character of Galt, with a visual unity and integrity in the streetscape and a diversity of architectural style and detail. The front and side elevations possess the finest building composition while the rear elevation is an assembly of old and new structures of varying heights, forms and shapes.

ii Conservation

The heritage building stock in the district may be divided into two areas – the upper facades and the lower facades. The upper facades display a remarkable uniformity of scale, composition and authenticity and the general conservation approach has been to preserve the original fabric and restore missing features. The lower facades which are the store fronts and sign fascias have undergone a very considerable change and most are now of a modern design. It is not the intent of this plan to turn the clock back 100 years and have period store fronts. Most store fronts are neat and crisp and provide good window display. However, the area of low design quality and incompatibility with the historic character of the district is the sign fascia. Most original sign fascias have been removed and replaced by bland austere fascias upon which is mounted the lettering case. The clash with the richly decorative facades above is unattractive. It is advised that the traditional sign fascia with overhead projecting cornice be reinstated. This would provide an effective border between the old upper and the new lower facades.
one of Ontario's finest historic streetscapes
The rear facades were considered the most unsightly aspect of the district. They are a haphazard mixture of old and new buildings with little overall aesthetic appeal. Conservation and upgrading of the rear facade is however important in order to upgrade the economic viability of the block as a whole. It is not the intent to develop a wholly historic appearance to the rear facade but to encourage simply good and attractive design that blends the old and the new.

Conservation of the architectural heritage of the block may be exercised most conveniently by a consideration of each of the five buildings that make up the block. Each building was constructed at a different time and according to the popular style of the time, but collectively they comprise a harmonious composition in the streetscape.

The Granite Block

This classical revival pre-confederation section of Main Street, known as the Granite Block is arguably the most significant building in downtown Galt. Professor Gordon Couling has written that “The south side of Main Street in Galt, with its continuous distinguished stone facades, is an impressive example of the well designed unity of the nineteenth century Ontario business street”. It identifies Galt as the granite city. In addition, the history of mercantile Galt can be traced back to this location as it was the site of Absalom Shade’s White store. The oldest portion of the Granite Block (#39) dates from 1851 having survived one of Galt’s major fires. The remainder was rebuilt after the fire in 1862.

The architectural composition of the Granite Block is one of clarity and fine proportions. The block is mainly three storeys high but with one higher four storey section. The wall material is granite and the windows, that are similar in size and proportion, form two continuous lines at second and third floors. The top line of windows at the fourth floor are arched. There is a slight variation in the treatment of the window lintels, roof cornices and wood detailing across the facade. The whole composition however is of fine visual unity and repose. The rear of the block comprises a series of stone facades of varying set back and height with new and old alterations.
The conservation policy is to retain and restore the historic fabric of the building, most of which is intact. Restoration should include the re-instatement of the original proportioned windows which have been replaced, the rebuilding of cornices and fascias to the original design and the repairing, sealing and painting of all woodwork.

The James Young Building

The James Young Building, though built only seventeen years after its neighbour, the Granite Block, shows the change in taste of early Victorian builders from Classical Revival to Italianate. This change occurred in the late 1840’s through to the 1850’s and resulted in the Honourable James Young choosing Italianate in 1878-79 for his new building in Galt. Employing brick rather than stone, it was probably considered quite "modern" at the time.

The building continues the heights and architectural composition of the Granite Block but exudes a more decorative and varied style of round arched second floor windows, elliptical arched upper windows, projecting brick piers and banding and elaborate keystones. The whole appearance is more feminine and fancy than the solid masculinity of the Granite Block. The rear of the Young building comprises an original three storey brick facade with a series of like-sized vertical sash windows at the second and third floors with a series of newer additions at first floor.

The conservation policy is to retain and restore the historic fabric of the building, most of which is intact. Restoration should include the cleaning of the brick by water treatment, the rebuilding of the original cornice and the repair, seal and repainting of all wood window frames and sash.

First Osborne Building

The first Osborne building is one of the oldest buildings in the block, and like the Granite Block is built of granite in the Classical Revival style. Its completion is recorded in the Dumfries Reformer on October 29, 1856 and refers to a three storey stone building. The architectural composition and proportions follow closely those of the Granite Block with two rows of vertical sash windows at the second and third storeys surmounted by a projecting roof wood frieze. The rear of the building comprises a stone
wing that fronts to the property line. The side elevations are largely devoid of windows.
The back elevation has a number of fire escape doors and windows.

The conservation policy is to retain and restore the historic fabric of the building, most of which is intact. Restoration should include the cleaning off of paint from the stone lintels and banding and the repair, sealing and repainting of the wood window frames and sash, cornices, fascias and brackets. Further research should be carried out to determine the correct window glazing bar proportions.

Second Osborne Building

The second Osborne Building was built by the Osborne family in 1895 and is a good example of High Victorian eclectic styling. It has a random combination of picturesque features including oriel windows, Moorish balcony, parapets and details. The main material on the front elevation is stone while on the side and rear elevations it is brick. The front elevation comprises essentially three bays of which the two side bays with oriel windows enclose the centre open Moorish balcony with Romanesque columns. Although only three storeys in height its vertical proportions and peaked roof elevate it to a very much higher position than the neighbouring first Osborne Classical Revival building. The rear of the building is brick with six windows at each of the second and third storeys and a projecting wing at first floor of the same period.

The conservation policy is to retain and restore the existing historic fabric of the building, most of which is intact. Restoration should include the rehabilitation of the Moorish balcony and repair, sealing and repainting of all woodwork including the soffits, fascias, bay windows, balcony and window frames and sashes.

The Buchanan Building

This red brick three storey building of 1894 was designed by Toronto architect Mr. King in the Romanesque Revival style. The building front is in three bays with a heavy modulated brickwork resembling stone detailing rather than brick. The side bays comprise a large rectangular picture frame window at second floor with two round arched windows flanked by pairs of Ionic columns at the third floor. The centre bay is more restrained in its design comprising three vertical sash windows at the second and third floors with
round attic windows above. It is interesting to note that in 1889 when Mr. Buchanan was considering building he is reported as thinking of putting up a building with a granite stone front.

The rear of the building comprises a projecting two storey wing with various further additions of varying shapes and materials. The original structure is of the same red brick with vertical sash windows.

The conservation policy is to retain and restore the existing historic fabric of the building, most of which is intact. Restoration should include the repair, sealing and cleaning of the metal cornice and banding, window frames and sash, and iron beams. Broken glass in the windows should be repaired, and the large second floor east bay window should be restored to its original design and proportion. The sandstone window sills require repair where deteriorated.

5.2 GUIDELINES FOR NEW BUILDING

A major objective of this plan is to upgrade the economic viability of the block. While the front and side elevations are planned to be conserved in their original and historic state it is proposed that the rear of the block will be developed using modern construction techniques. At present the rear of the block is in an unkempt state of use and appearance and this is also considered detrimental to revitalizing the use of the upper floors for offices and apartments. As access is limited to the upper floors from Main Street it is expected that access will be mainly from the back or south side. The intent of this section is to ensure that new building compliments the historic character of the block. This does not infer that new building should look old but rather that the intrinsic scale, texture, size and proportions of the district should be strengthened and enhanced by new building. The guidelines that follow therefore are meant to sensitize and assist the owner, architect and builder in recognizing and understanding the context in which he or she is building. As those interviewed said in the research, Main Street is a special place with a special set of requirements. New building must respond to this special circumstance – a circumstance that includes one of the finest late nineteenth century streetscapes in Ontario.
ii Objective

The objective is to encourage new building and renovations at the rear of the district block which are compatible with the character of the district and the specific building.

iii Policies

Style – a vernacular style of building using traditional building material should be encouraged.

Height – the building height should compliment the average building height of the district.

Proportions – the proportions of the building facade, windows and door openings should be based on good design principles in keeping with the district as a whole.

Site Location – the building should be located in a manner that reinforces the building composition of the streetscape.

Materials – the predominant exterior building material should be brick and stone.

Texture – textured surfaces that compliment the human scale of the district such as wood and brick are encouraged as opposed to the metals and plastics.

Colour – quiet natural colours of the period are encouraged as opposed to brash conspicuous colours.

Details – period details including cornices, lintels, arches, quoins, brackets and fascias are encouraged.

Scale – building of a suitable scale is encouraged that compliments the scale of the historic street.
**Floor & Roof**

1. Level 1: Existing floor to be removed and replaced with new flooring.
2. Level 2: New floor to be installed.
3. Level 3: New floor to be installed.
4. Level 3 T/O Plate: New floor to be installed.

**Architectural Notes**

1. Remove existing partitions and plumbing pipes.
2. Provide new insulation and roof assembly.
3. Replace existing windows.
4. Replace existing doors.
5. Provide new exterior door unit.
6. Replace existing masonry openings.
7. Provide new masonry openings.
8. Provide new siding.
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RECOMMENDATIONS

THAT Report 21-011 (MHAC) – Request to Alter a Part V Designated Property – 15 Main Street – be received;

AND THAT the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC) recommend Council approve replacement of damaged window and door trim on the ground floor, replacement of all the upper level windows on the front facade with wood frame windows, enlargement of windows on the rear elevation and installation of aluminum frame windows, replacement of rear doors with aluminum and glass doors, installation of a new door opening on the ground floor of the rear elevation, removal of the rear fire escape, installation of steel guard rails on the rear doors, repointing where required and repair/replacement of sills where necessary, cleaning of the stone, repair and replacement of roof materials as necessary and construction of a new roof bulkhead for the elevator at 15 Main Street as outlined in Report 21-011 (MHAC);

AND THAT MHAC recommend that Council require a stone mason with demonstrated experience working with heritage buildings to the satisfaction of the Senior Planner.
Heritage, supervise the enlargement of the window openings on the rear elevation and the repointing of the stone with hand tools or a handheld rotary saw where appropriate;

**AND THAT** MHAC recommend that Council require that the repointing mortar be an appropriate lime-based mix and that a sample patch be completed to the satisfaction of the Senior Planner Heritage;

**AND THAT** MHAC recommend that Council require the stone cleaning to be completed with a sponge or soft steel brushes and that any power washing not exceed 300 psi;

**AND FURTHER THAT** MHAC recommend that Council require that the new wood windows on the upper levels of the front facade and east side elevation not be clad in aluminum.

**SUMMARY**

- The property located at 15 Main Street is designated under Part V of the Ontario Heritage Act as part of the Main Street Heritage Conservation District (HCD).
- The property owner is requesting permission to:
  - replace damaged window and door trim on the storefront in kind;
  - replace all the upper level windows on the front facade and east elevation with wood frame windows;
  - enlarge the windows on the rear elevation and install aluminum frame windows;
  - replace the rear doors with aluminum and glass doors;
  - install a new door opening on the rear elevation of the ground floor;
  - remove the rear fire escape and replacement with an internal fire escape;
  - install steel guard rails on the rear upper level doors;
  - repoint where required and repair/replace sills where necessary;
  - clean the stone elevations;
  - repair and replace roof materials; and,
  - construct a new roof bulkhead for the elevator.

**BACKGROUND**

The subject property is designated under Part V of the Ontario Heritage Act as part of the Main Street Heritage Conservation District (HCD) (Attachment 1). The three-storey building is part of the Granite Block constructed between 1851 and 1862 in the classical revival style (Figure 1, Images 1).
The property owner has submitted a building permit for interior and exterior renovations which will include renovation of the ground floor and introduction of 12 dwellings units on the upper level floors (See Building Permit Plans in Attachment 2). The building is currently vacant and most of the building has been vacant for more than 10 years. The proposed works will provide a modern function for the entire building (See Brief Overview in Attachment 3).

Proposed works to the whole building include cleaning and repointing the masonry on all elevations and repair or broken stone window sills or replacement if beyond means of repair. Details of how the building will be cleaned and repointed have not been included, therefore, best practices for these works are discussed in the Analysis Section.

The configuration of the ground floor will be maintained, but any damaged window or door trim will be replaced in-kind. The windows on the upper floor are one-over-one wood frame windows that are displaying rot and general deterioration. The applicant is proposing to replace these windows with new wood frame windows clad in aluminum that will match the configuration and profile of the existing windows.

On the rear elevation abutting Imperial Lane, the applicant is seeking to replace the rectangular window openings with larger window openings and to install multi-lit...
aluminum windows. The rear fire escape will also be removed and will be replaced with an additional interior staircase. The door openings along the rear elevation will remain but the doors will be replaced with black aluminum and glass doors and a steel guard rail will be installed for safety purposes given the fire escape will be removed.

Finally, the roof requires repair as severe leakage problems have occurred around the elevator shaft which has caused damage to the roof rafters and roof decking as well as some structural components on the inside around the elevator shaft. Heritage planning staff worked with Building Staff to issue a permit to make emergency repairs to secure the building from further rain damage. This included replacing rotten joists, removing the roof bulkhead for the elevator and sealing the elevator shaft opening. The current application includes bringing the roof structure up to the Ontario Building Code requirements which may require isolated reinforcing to address the structural conditions of the existing roof framing, replacement of roofing materials and construction of a new roof bulkhead for the elevator. The roof bulkhead for the elevator will match the previous bulkhead that was removed due to water damage.

Heritage planning staff did not require a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) to accompany the subject application as the proposed exterior alterations are largely remedial and do not warrant an HIA.

**ANALYSIS**

**Strategic Alignment:**

PLACE: To take care of, celebrate and share the great features in Cambridge that we love and mean the most to us.

Goal #3 - Arts, Culture, Heritage and Architecture

Objective 3.2 Conserve and make positive contributions to our heritage districts and buildings throughout the community.

**Existing Policy/By-Law:**

The Main Street Heritage Conservation District Plan identifies guidelines for appropriate alterations within the HCD. Attachment 1 provides relevant excerpts from the Plan.

The 2012 Cambridge Official Plan identifies policies in Chapter 4 that support the conservation and restoration of built heritage resources.

Section 42 of the Ontario Heritage Act identifies the process for altering a Part V designated property.
The Main Street Urban Design Guidelines provide the City architectural guidelines and standards that guide heritage preservation in Section 4.2.

**Financial Impact:**
The property owner has not submitted an application for funding under the Building Permit Revitalization Program at this time.

**Public Input:**
MHAC meetings are open to the public. This report is posted publicly as part of the agenda process.

**Internal/External Consultation:**
Heritage Planning Staff consulted with Building Staff to ensure Ontario Building and Fire Codes were satisfied.

**Comments/Analysis:**
The main recommendations in the Main Street Heritage Conservation District (HCD) Plan are to conserve the historic building stock, strengthen economic viability of the building stock, rehabilitate the upper floor apartments and offices and to foster excellence in building restoration work. For the Granite Block, Section 5.1.ii states that, “The upper facades display a remarkable uniformity of scale, composition and authenticity and the general conservation approach has been to preserve the original fabric and restore missing features. The lower facades which are the store front and sign fascias have undergone considerable change and most are now of modern design...The rear facades ... are a haphazard mixture of old and new buildings with little overall aesthetic appeal. Conservation and upgrading of the rear facade is however important in order to upgrade the economic vitality of the block as a whole. It is not the intent to develop a wholly historic appearance to the rear facade but to encourage simply good and attractive design that blends the old and new." The conservation policy for the Granite block “is to retain and restore the historic fabric of the building... Restoration should include the re-instatement of the original proportioned windows which have been replaced, the rebuilding of cornices and fascias to the original design and the repairing, sealing and painting of all woodwork.”

The Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Culture Industries’ (MHSTCI) Eight Guiding Principles in the Conservation of Historic Properties (2007) provides several guidelines that relate to heritage conservation projects such as the one for the subject property. Of these, the principles relevant to the subject property include basing restoration on documentary evidence, repairing and conserving building materials and...
replacing only when necessary, repairing with like materials, reversibility and ongoing maintenance.

Parks Canada’s Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada (Standards and Guidelines, 2010) also provides a benchmark for heritage restoration practice across Canada. The Standards and Guidelines encourage the repair and restoration of original features or replacement in kind when materials are beyond repair, and has specific recommendations for working with different materials such as masonry and wood.

The general intent to rehabilitate the lower level and introduce new residential units in the upper floors is consistent with the vision stated in the Main Street HCD Plan. Generally, the components of this work, which are discussed in more detail below, are also consistent with the intent of the Main Street HCD.

**Stone Repair, Cleaning and Repointing**

The intention to clean, repoint, and to the repair or replace the masonry, if necessary, is consistent with ongoing maintenance that is desirable for heritage structures. However, the application did not include details on how the stone will be cleaned or repointed. For cleaning stone, general sponging or scrubbing with soft steel brushes is appropriate and any street level power washing should not exceed 300 psi to prevent deterioration of the stone surfaces. Abrasive cleaning methods such as sandblasting should not be used. If the stone sills cannot be repaired and replacement is necessary they should be replaced with like stone material to match the existing sills.

For the repointing, mortar joints should be raked out using hand tools if only minor spot repair is required to the mortar joints. If large areas of the front facade need to be repointed, hand held rotary saws can be used for partial cutting of horizontal joints under the supervision of a qualified mason. Hand tools should be used for all final cutting out of mortar and all vertical mortar joints. Only hand tools should be used on the rear and side elevations given there is no defined horizontal joint. The mortar mix should be an appropriate lime based mortar and a test patch should be completed and reviewed by Planning Staff to ensure the correct colour. Furthermore, repointing should not be completed in temperatures below 4°C (unless the area is heated) or when the temperature is above 27°C (unless dampened burlap is applied to the mortar).

The removal of the fire escape is also a positive change. Any holes left by the removed fasteners should be repaired with a lime-based mortar.
Window and Door Replacement

Replacement of the deteriorated windows on the upper levels of the front facade and east elevation is consistent with previously noted best practices. The windows demonstrate rot and water damage, therefore replacement with wood windows that will match the design of the existing windows is appropriate. The Main Street HCD guidelines encourage replacement of windows with the historically appropriate window style, however, the earliest photograph of this property shows one-over-one windows (Attachment 3). Therefore, while the original windows may have been different, the proposed window pattern is consistent with the earliest documentary evidence available. While the application indicates that the windows will be replaced with wood frame windows, the exterior are proposed to be clad in aluminum. The aluminum cladding is inconsistent with the Main Street HCD Plan that states historical materials should be replaced in kind, as such, it is recommended that these new window frames be constructed of wood only (not clad in aluminum).

The intent to replace deteriorated door and window trim on the front facade’s ground floor is also consistent with best practice. While the woodwork on the storefront is not original to the building, the design was reviewed by MHAC and therefore, repair of this design is consistent with the intent of the Main Street HCD Plan.

No documentary evidence was found showing the back of the subject property abutting Imperial Lane; however, the windows on the rear elevation are likely not original to the building. The proposed works include enlarging these windows downwards. As the current window openings are approximately 1.98 m (6.5 ft) from the floor, the enlargement is proposed to provide additional light, a clear sightline out of the windows for residents and easy access to open the windows. The new windows will be approximately 0.91 m (3 ft) from the floor. This will result in the removal of some of the original fabric of the building, but it will also facilitate the conversion of the upper storeys into residential units which is one of the main recommendations in the Main Street HCD Plan. Given these windows are not proposed to replicate original windows and the Main Street HCD Plan notes the intent is not to require a wholly historic appearance on the rear elevations, the use of aluminum frame windows is acceptable.

The doors on the rear elevation will all be replaced with black painted aluminum and glass doors which will allow light into the residential units. There are no concerns with the proposed aluminum and glass doors given the existing doors are solid metal doors that are not original to the building. The fire escape will also be removed and as such a metal guard rail must be installed in front of the doors on the upper level. This type of metal guard rail that resembles a Juliette balcony is not found elsewhere in the HCD, but as a guard is required for safety purposes and as this is proposed on the rear
elevation, the guards are considered appropriate in this context. A new door opening will be cut out of the stone on the ground floor to provide access to a separate unit inside. This will result in the removal of some original fabric of the building, but this door will take better advantage of a window opening that has been boarded for an unknown function. Furthermore, there is no concern with the replacement of the existing doors and windows on the rear elevation’s ground floor given these are already aluminum frame doors and windows.

**Roof Repair**

Finally, the additional work required to repair the roof of 15 Main Street is also consistent with best heritage practices. Leakages around the elevator shaft have caused damage to some of the internal structural components around the elevator shaft and some roof joists. As previously noted, staff issued a building permit to address these emergency repairs. As part of this application, the applicant is seeking to finish the roof repairs which will require construction of a new roof bulkhead for the elevator which will match the configuration of the previous bulkhead that was removed and replacement of the roofing materials. Roof maintenance is critical to ensure no further damage occurs to the structural components of this building.

**Conclusion**

Combined, the proposed works will upgrade the vacant building to align with the recommendations expressed in the Main Street HCD Plan. There will be some loss of original fabric on the rear elevation abutting Imperial Lane with the introduction of larger windows on the upper levels and a new door opening on the ground floor, but the Main Street HCD Plan encourages attractive design for the rear elevations recognizing that the rear elevations are more utilitarian than the front facades. Based on the above analysis, it is recommended that the application for 15 Main Street as outlined in this report and the building permit plans be recommended for approval to City Council. To ensure that the proposed works are completed to high conservation standards, the following recommended conditions are:

- That a stone mason with demonstrated experience working with heritage buildings to the satisfaction of the Senior Planner Heritage, supervise the enlargement of the window openings on the rear elevation, and repointing of the stone with hand tools or a hand held rotary saw where appropriate;
- That the repointing mortar be an appropriate lime-based mix and that a sample patch be completed to the satisfaction of the Senior Planner Heritage;
- That the stone cleaning be completed with a sponge, or soft steel brushes and that any street level power washing not exceed 300 psi;
- That the wood windows frames on the upper levels of the front facade and east side elevation not be clad in aluminum.

This application aligns with the City’s Strategic Plan which encourages restoration and use of designated heritage properties to celebrate our built heritage and create attractive, viable neighbourhoods.
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SECTION 1 – INTRODUCTION

The following text and map, noted as Schedule A, shall constitute the Heritage Conservation District Plan for Main Street in the City of Cambridge (Galt).

The policies in this Heritage Conservation District Plan are intended to operate within those already established in the official plan for the City of Cambridge. It is not the intention of this plan to alter the major policy directions of the official plan but to reinforce and refine the basic planning policies as they pertain to the Heritage Conservation District, designated under the Ontario Heritage Act. The limits of this plan are co-incident with the boundaries shown on Schedule A, and designated as a Heritage Conservation District by the City of Cambridge.

The Heritage Conservation District is located in the heart of the city of Galt and bounded by Main Street, Ainslie Street, Imperial Lane and Water Street. The district is distinguished by a block of commercial buildings that collectively form one of the outstanding historic streetscapes in Ontario. While the block exudes visual unity and strength there is a rich variety of architectural style and building age from the masculine stone Granite Block of 1862 to the flamboyant High Victorian Osborne Building of 1895. It is this subtle variation of detail and style within the discipline of the streetscape as a whole that makes the district worthy of long term conservation and enhancement.

The plan that follows is not an end in itself but one step of many to follow to secure the long term conservation of the subject district and others to follow. The plan is modest in ambition. It does not allude to grand new ideas but reaffirms that what exists is of architectural and historical value, and will be conserved by many small steps and activities with a full and profitable use of the building stock.

The main recommendations of the plan may be summarized as follows:

- to conserve the historic building stock;
- to strengthen the economic viability of the building stock;
- to rehabilitate the upper floors for apartments and offices;
- to obtain financial assistance for property owners who renovate;
- to foster excellence in building restoration work.
SECTION 5 - BUILDING PLAN

5.1 CONSERVATION OF THE HERITAGE BUILDING STOCK

i Introduction

This subsection is one of the most important parts of the plan. It addresses the subject of conserving and restoring the heritage building stock in the district. The guidelines that follow are guidelines only and, as proposals are developed for restoring properties, further detailed research and analysis is advised. However this subsection does provide a basis of the features to consider and the recommendations to follow.

The subject block is one of the most significant architectural compositions in the City of Cambridge. Its central location in the downtown, comparatively large size and architectural presence provides it with an unparalleled stature of architectural and historical importance. The block, above all, typifies the building history and character of Galt, with a visual unity and integrity in the streetscape and a diversity of architectural style and detail. The front and side elevations possess the finest building composition while the rear elevation is an assembly of old and new structures of varying heights, forms and shapes.

ii Conservation

The heritage building stock in the district may be divided into two areas - the upper facades and the lower facades. The upper facades display a remarkable uniformity of scale, composition and authenticity and the general conservation approach has been to preserve the original fabric and restore missing features. The lower facades which are the store fronts and sign fascias have undergone a very considerable change and most are now of a modern design. It is not the intent of this plan to turn the clock back 100 years and have period store fronts. Most store fronts are neat and crisp and provide good window display. However, the area of low design quality and incompatibility with the historic character of the district is the sign fascia. Most original sign fascias have been removed and replaced by bland austere fascias upon which is mounted the lettering case. The clash with the richly decorative facades above is unattractive. It is advised that the traditional sign fascia with overhead projecting cornice be reinstated. This would provide an effective border between the old upper and the new lower facades.
one of Ontario's finest historic streetscapes
The rear facades were considered the most unsightly aspect of the district. They are a haphazard mixture of old and new buildings with little overall aesthetic appeal. Conservation and upgrading of the rear facade is however important in order to upgrade the economic viability of the block as a whole. It is not the intent to develop a wholly historic appearance to the rear facade but to encourage simply good and attractive design that blends the old and the new.

Conservation of the architectural heritage of the block may be exercised most conveniently by a consideration of each of the five buildings that make up the block. Each building was constructed at a different time and according to the popular style of the time, but collectively they comprise a harmonious composition in the streetscape.

The Granite Block

This classical revival pre-confederation section of Main Street, known as the Granite Block is arguably the most significant building in downtown Galt. Professor Gordon Couling has written that "The south side of Main Street in Galt, with its continuous distinguished stone facades, is an impressive example of the well designed unity of the nineteenth century Ontario business street". It identifies Galt as the granite city. In addition, the history of mercantile Galt can be traced back to this location as it was the site of Absalom Shade's White store. The oldest portion of the Granite Block (#39) dates from 1851 having survived one of Galt's major fires. The remainder was rebuilt after the fire in 1862.

The architectural composition of the Granite Block is one of clarity and fine proportions. The block is mainly three storeys high but with one higher four storey section. The wall material is granite and the windows, that are similar in size and proportion, form two continuous lines at second and third floors. The top line of windows at the fourth floor are arched. There is a slight variation in the treatment of the window lintels, roof cornices and wood detailing across the facade. The whole composition however is of fine visual unity and repose. The rear of the block comprises a series of stone facades of varying set back and height with new and old alterations.
The conservation policy is to retain and restore the historic fabric of the building, most of which is intact. Restoration should include the re-instatement of the original proportioned windows which have been replaced, the rebuilding of cornices and fascias to the original design and the repairing, sealing and painting of all woodwork.

The James Young Building

The James Young Building, though built only seventeen years after its neighbour, the Granite Block, shows the change in taste of early Victorian builders from Classical Revival to Italianate. This change occurred in the late 1840's through to the 1850's and resulted in the Honourable James Young choosing Italianate in 1878-79 for his new building in Galt. Employing brick rather than stone, it was probably considered quite "modern" at the time.

The building continues the heights and architectural composition of the Granite Block but exudes a more decorative and varied style of round arched second floor windows, elliptical arched upper windows, projecting brick piers and banding and elaborate keystones. The whole appearance is more feminine and fancy than the solid masculinity of the Granite Block. The rear of the Young building comprises an original three storey brick facade with a series of like-sized vertical sash windows at the second and third floors with a series of newer additions at first floor.

The conservation policy is to retain and restore the historic fabric of the building, most of which is intact. Restoration should include the cleaning of the brick by water treatment, the rebuilding of the original cornice and the repair, seal and repainting of all wood window frames and sash.

First Osborne Building

The first Osborne building is one of the oldest buildings in the block, and like the Granite Block is built of granite in the Classical Revival style. Its completion is recorded in the Dumfries Reformer on October 29, 1850 and refers to a three storey stone building. The architectural composition and proportions follow closely those of the Granite Block with two rows of vertical sash windows at the second and third storeys surmounted by a projecting roof wood frieze. The rear of the building comprises a stone
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### Door Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Door Style</th>
<th>Width</th>
<th>Height</th>
<th>Opening Width</th>
<th>Opening Height</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>016</td>
<td>6'-0&quot;</td>
<td>8'-0&quot;</td>
<td>6'-0&quot;</td>
<td>8'-0&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>017</td>
<td>6'-0&quot;</td>
<td>8'-0&quot;</td>
<td>6'-0&quot;</td>
<td>8'-0&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>018</td>
<td>6'-0&quot;</td>
<td>8'-0&quot;</td>
<td>6'-0&quot;</td>
<td>8'-0&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>019</td>
<td>6'-0&quot;</td>
<td>8'-0&quot;</td>
<td>6'-0&quot;</td>
<td>8'-0&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>020</td>
<td>6'-0&quot;</td>
<td>8'-0&quot;</td>
<td>6'-0&quot;</td>
<td>8'-0&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Frames and Hardware**

#### Window Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Window Style</th>
<th>Width</th>
<th>Height</th>
<th>Opening Width</th>
<th>Opening Height</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W11</td>
<td>6'-0&quot;</td>
<td>8'-0&quot;</td>
<td>6'-0&quot;</td>
<td>8'-0&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W12</td>
<td>6'-0&quot;</td>
<td>8'-0&quot;</td>
<td>6'-0&quot;</td>
<td>8'-0&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W13</td>
<td>6'-0&quot;</td>
<td>8'-0&quot;</td>
<td>6'-0&quot;</td>
<td>8'-0&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W14</td>
<td>6'-0&quot;</td>
<td>8'-0&quot;</td>
<td>6'-0&quot;</td>
<td>8'-0&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W15</td>
<td>6'-0&quot;</td>
<td>8'-0&quot;</td>
<td>6'-0&quot;</td>
<td>8'-0&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General Notes**

- Barrier-free design requirements
- Barrier-free shower layout
- Service unit heights
- Lavatory clearances
- L-shaped grab bar

### Door Elevations

- Elevations A, B, C, D, E

### Frame Elevations

- Elevations A, B, C, D, E

---

*Note: This image contains detailed architectural drawings and schedules for doors, frames, windows, and general notes. The drawings illustrate specific dimensions, styles, and requirements for a building project.*
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M2.1
Brief Project Overview
At Last, 2021 will see the resurrection of the iconic 15 Main Street building in Downtown Galt!

This overview is not intended to be an in-depth historic overview, or a deep dive into the building plans, but rather a general orientation of the property, and the proposed renovation that will finally breathe new life into the structure, while enhancing the heart of the Downtown Core.

Through the years much if not all of 15 Main’s life has been serving the surrounding community as a department store. Prior to the addition of the 4th floor with the elegant arched windows, people would park their carriages on the barely paved street and shop at “Wilkinson’s”. Following that, Walkers, then Marks & Spenser with the façade seeing various entrance reconfigurations.

Very strange to see the missing 4th floor! Inside on the 3rd floor you can see the former vaulted roof line on the granite party walls of the adjacent buildings, almost like a ghost from the past...
A rather haunting look as well in this photo — note the change in the windows and door design, which may have been the inspiration to the front façade that you see today. The Marks & Spenser storefront below shows the entrance reconfiguration.
This appears to be a photo from the late 60’s/early 70’s — At one point the front entrance was “modernized” by cutting deeper into the building to provide window displays on either side of the doors. You can see the evidence of this today, where the floor and the ceiling inside were augmented. Sad actually, as the still existing elegant tin ceiling stops abruptly where the cut in was made, and the beautiful terrazzo floor at the front has been replaced by poured concrete. The terrazzo floor on the rest of the main floor plate may be salvageable…to be determined.

Note the 3 flag poles on the roof — they have been recovered and are resting peacefully inside!

**Interior**

While the exterior has changed very little over the years, with the exception of the store entrance and sign changes, the same cannot be said of the interior. In fact, save for the staircase and the elevator shaft, all is pretty much gone. Some remnants of old wallpaper is still visible, even pre-dating the decorative tin ceilings.
Taken from roughly the same position — not sure of the year the top photo was taken. Note the terrazzo floors that are still there today, although in need of some serious work.
As the images above and below show, all three of the upper floors were taken back to the raw base building in 2016. Gone are all the plaster walls and ceilings. Yet, there is beauty in the structure itself, and ample evidence of a “rock solid” building which is quite visible.
What is the next Chapter for 15 Main?

After being left derelict for more than 10 years, it will be exciting to see the transformation! The main floor will definitely stay true to its retail roots with a floor plate adaptable to work well as one, two or three suites. The rear suite that fronts Imperial Lane and the parking lot already has two large window openings which allows amazing light and great exposure.

However, the upper three floors will transform into 12 nicely sized one-bedroom apartments, all with very nice views, especially the rear apartments with the southern exposure. The elevator lobby will be appropriately renovated to service the upper floors, and the existing staircase will of course remain in place. Also, there will be an additional staircase added on the west interior wall that will provide an emergency exit for all apartments. This will exit through the existing single doorway at the rear.

What can you expect to see?

Front Façade — There actually will be little changing on the retail level front façade, as it is quite solid and functional. That said, the windows are single glaze, and will need to be updated to double glaze for efficiency. They are and will remain painted wood construction. I am looking into some archive images that show glass transoms along the top of the windows, however there was a narrower sign band then compared to today. Perhaps there is merit in looking at the windowpane in general to mimic an appropriate look.

There may be consideration to enhance the existing decorative woodwork somewhat, but using what is already there as a base. The colour will become more appropriate than the current “battleship grey”.

The upper windows are well beyond salvaging, and of course need replacement. There are 18 in total, with the top 6 arched. I have done a rendering depicting the new windows in black/dark charcoal, seen in the picture below. This was suggested by the architect in 2016. At this point, I am on the fence — it looks good, however for me it interrupts the “block” of building fronts that have the beige/grey windows. Naturally there may be some minor repointing of the mortar joints as well.
Rear Façade — There really are only two alterations to the rear façade. The current windows which are also beyond repair will need to be slightly enlarged, lowering the stone sill. This is due solely for the reason that when you are standing in what will be an apartment at the rear, the bottom of the window is well above a 6ft persons head, much like being in a basement not being able to see outside.

From the outside, the “slit-like” windows look more like a military compound or prison guard house, which is not a very appealing look. The result of lowering the sills by one pane in fact looks infinitely more pleasant and friendly, while at the same time enhancing the historic/heritage feel without losing any integrity whatsoever.

Seven of the ten smaller windows on the east elevation are currently blocked in and will likely remain so as the kitchen is on the opposite side, and the space is need for cupboards. However, they will be filled with inserts that appear to be windows from the outside, maintaining the original look.

A quick rendering to demonstrate the enhanced look with the slightly lowered windows. The old fire escape must be removed as they are currently attached and bolted through the granite block where the window enlargement occurs. The need for the fire escape is mitigated by the new stairwell that leads to the lower door on the left. But the fact is, people climb up that fire escape, and try to enter the building, breaking widows making it a liability.

Overall, the presence of the building will be impressive, while maintaining its aesthetic heritage look. That said, the terrible red brick that was chosen when the Boardwalk was created needs a good long look, in my opinion...
Conceptual of course, but the vision for the rear suite is to also enhance lifestyle in the Downtown Core. This would be a perfect spot for lunch, dinner and a beverage, something we need more of in the Core, and something I am told countless times.

Note the concept of the breezeway — I continue to be curious if there is an opportunity to reveal the original granite block wall, if it is in fact worthy. The original architect suggestion was to at minimum parge over the red brick to bring back an element of a historic look, similar to what was done in the alley way across the street. This might be complicated given the neighboring building is under different ownership.
This a detailed drawing from the permit set better showing the aesthetic balance of the windows. The lower sills will be new and matched to the existing, as it appears, they have been formed and poured on site when constructed.

Below is the second-floor plan showing the 4 apartments, which is the same for the third and fourth floors.

Looking forward to our kick-off discussion on Monday at 11am!

Terry Polyak
RECOMMENDATIONS

THAT the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC) accepts the Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) and its findings as submitted by MHBC Planning dated January 5, 2021 for the development proposed for the listed property at 234 Eagle Street South;

AND THAT the MHAC recommends that the property owner salvage for reuse the interior tin ceiling tiles located in the property’s outbuilding;

AND THAT the MHAC recommends to the Committee of Adjustment that the design of the new dwelling be a two storey design with a gabled roof, covered front porch and garage to the rear of the streetscape which is keeping with the current character of the neighbourhood;

AND THAT the MHAC recommends to the Committee of Adjustment that the new construction use similar building materials and use design elements of the early Edwardian and Queen Anne periods, which are character defining elements of the neighbourhood;

AND THAT the MHAC recommends to the Committee of Adjustment that the colour palette be a neutral colour from a heritage palette from a major paint company such as Benjamin Moore;
AND FURTHER THAT the MHAC be circulated on the building permit application to review and comment on the building design of the new dwelling on the proposed new building lot.

SUMMARY

- The subject property is listed as a property of cultural heritage significance on the City’s Heritage Properties Register. It is not designated.
- A Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) dated January 5, 2021 was submitted to the City to support a severance application.
- The owner wishes to construct a new dwelling and detached garage on the proposed new building lot.
- The c.1870-1896 dwelling is the only resource on the subject property deemed to have enough cultural heritage attributes to warrant its inclusion on the City’s Heritage Properties Register.

BACKGROUND

![Figure 1: Location Map](image-url)
The subject property is listed on the City of Cambridge Heritage Properties Register. A Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) completed by MHBC Planning dated January 5, 2021 for 234 Eagle Street South was submitted to accompany a severance application for the creation of a new building lot to the west of the subject property. The construction of a detached single family home and detached garage is proposed for the new building lot. The HIA is found as Attachment 1 to this report. The severance application B04/21 is scheduled to be heard at the April 20, 2021 Committee of Adjustment meeting.

ANALYSIS

Strategic Alignment:
PLACE: To take care of, celebrate and share the great features in Cambridge that we love and mean the most to us.

Goal #3 - Arts, Culture, Heritage and Architecture

Objective 3.2  Conserve and make positive contributions to our heritage districts and buildings throughout the community.

The dwelling on the subject property is being retained as a single detached home while the tin ceiling in the outbuilding is recommended for salvage to be reused elsewhere.

Existing Policy/By-Law:

Ontario Heritage Act

27 (1) The clerk of a municipality shall keep a register of property situated in the municipality that is of cultural heritage value or interest.

City of Cambridge Official Plan

Section 4.2.2 c) encourages the salvage and re-use of building materials from a cultural heritage resource to prevent those materials from ending up in the landfill.

Section 4.3.1 indicates that the City will encourage the conservation of cultural heritage resources by maintaining a Heritage Register of properties both listed and designated.

Section 4.4 outlines the criteria used to determine the cultural heritage significance of properties being considered for inclusion on the Heritage Properties Register as listed properties of interest.

Section 4.10 requires an HIA be submitted for a development proposal that includes or is adjacent to a designated property or cultural heritage landscape, or that includes a
non-designated resource on the Register. The completed HIA is to be submitted to the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC) for review and its recommendation forwarded to Council for consideration with the proposal; in this case, a severance application which will be heard by the Committee of Adjustment.

**Financial Impact:**
 Costs associated with the proposed development are the responsibility of the property owner.

**Public Input:**
 The Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC) meetings are open to the public.

**Internal/External Consultation:**
 The Senior Planner-Heritage liaised with the property owner in December 2020 on the process for reviewing a cultural heritage impact assessment.

**Comments/Analysis:**
 A Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) dated January 5, 2021 prepared by MHBC Planning was submitted to the City on January 5, 2021. However, the severance application was not submitted to the City until March 15, 2021. The Senior Planner-Heritage could not forward the HIA to the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC) for review until the City received the severance application and determined through review that it contained the same information as the HIA.

**Cultural Heritage Value of the Current Structures**

**Main Dwelling**

The Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) dated January 5, 2021 assessed the structures on the subject property using Ontario Regulation 9/06 of the Ontario Heritage Act as well as the Heritage Evaluation Criteria in Section 4.4 of the 2018 City of Cambridge Official Plan (OP). A property must meet one or more criteria of Ontario Regulation 9/06 in order to warrant designation under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act. The property also needs to meet a minimum of two criteria under Section 4.4 of the OP to warrant its inclusion on the Heritage Properties Register.

The dwelling at 234 Eagle Street South, consisting of a wood frame construction and clad in painted brick veneer, was built as a family home likely between 1870 and 1896 and satisfies the criteria under Ontario Regulation 9/06 for its physical/design value and contextual value. The property also met two criteria identified in the Heritage Evaluation Policy from Section 4.4 of the 2018 City of Cambridge OP. The HIA identified that the following criteria were met:
• (2) dates from an early period in the development of the city’s communities; and
• (7) It is a representative example of its architectural style or period of building.

Outbuilding

There is a wood and metal constructed, one and a half storey outbuilding on the west portion of the subject property. The Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) states that the outbuilding is proposed for demolition to facilitate the construction of the detached garage on the proposed severed building lot. The HIA goes on to demonstrate that the outbuilding structure is in a poor state of condition, it does recommend that the tin ceiling pieces found inside the ground floor of the outbuilding be salvaged and reused elsewhere. Heritage Planning staff agrees with this recommendation.

Assessment of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

The Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) identifies the mitigation measures to be incorporated into the design of the proposed new dwelling and detached garage for the new building lot as referenced in sections six and eight of the HIA. Mitigation measures included recommendations for the design of the new dwelling including a two storey design with a gabled roof, covered front porch and garage to the rear of the streetscape which is keeping with the current character of the neighbourhood. The HIA also recommends using a neutral colour palette, similar building materials as seen on the current streetscape and to consider design elements of the Late Victorian, early Edwardian and Queen Anne architectural styles which is a character defining element of the neighbourhood. The property owner has indicated willingness to accept these design recommendations mentioned in the HIA.

Finally, the HIA notes that the location of the proposed new dwelling will maintain the most significant sightline to the existing dwelling from the street and therefore will not significantly impact any current streetscape views.

Conclusion

Heritage Planning staff agrees with the findings of the Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA). The property satisfies two criteria outlined in Ontario Regulation 9/06 and two of the criteria in the Evaluation Criteria in Section 4.4 of the 2018 City of Cambridge Official Plan and is therefore a property of cultural heritage value or interest. The impact upon the cultural heritage value or interest has been identified and mitigated appropriately. As a result of proposed mitigation recommendations identified in the HIA, the proposed severance of the west portion of the existing lot, proposed new dwelling and detached garage will not impact the heritage attributes as identified in the HIA.
For the reasons noted above, Heritage Planning staff recommends that MHAC accept the HIA and the recommendations contained within this report.
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Attachment 1 Heritage Impact Assessment for 234 Eagle Street South by MHBC Planning dated January 5, 2021
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Disclaimers:

Maps and aerial photographs used in this document are for research purposes and not intended to be used for reproduction and/or sale. The use of these maps and aerial photographs are to be protected under the fair use of copyrighted work.

Due to the Covid-19 pandemic, in-person research has been limited and therefore, this report may not be able to reference relevant hard copy sources that are within collections that are temporarily closed to the public.
Acknowledgement of Indigenous Communities

This Heritage Impact Assessment acknowledges that the subject property is located at 234 Eagle Street South, City of Cambridge, is situated within territory of the Haudenosaunee, Anishinabewaki, Attiwonderonk (Neutral), Mississaugas of the Credit First Nation, Missisauga. These lands are acknowledged as being associated with the following treaties (accessed from www.native-land.ca):

- Haldimand Treaty
- The Simcoe Patent, Treaty 4, 1793

This document takes into consideration the cultural heritage of indigenous communities including their oral traditions and history when available and related to the scope of work.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In conclusion, the house located at 234 Eagle Street South has cultural heritage value or interest in its modest representation of an Ontario Cottage and the house and outbuilding support the character of the area. The subject property meets two of the City’s criteria to warrant designation as it dates from an early period in the development of the city’s communities and is a representative example of its architectural style or period of building (Ontario Cottage).

This report determined that there are no anticipated impacts to the heritage attributes of the existing house at 234 Eagle Street South and adjacent 248 Queenston Road, therefore mitigation measures and alternative development options are not necessary. However, as a precautionary the following is recommended for the mature coniferous tree to the rear of the property on the severed portion of Part of Lot 5 and existing cultural heritage resource on-site:

- Install temporary construction fence along the base perimeter of the tree;
- Any grade changes near the tree should not result in the severance of major roots; and,
- Material storage, grading and dumping of other materials is prohibited in the immediate area of the tree and along the foundation of the existing house at 234 Eagle Street South.

Also, although it was determined in this report that the outbuilding has no physical attributes and therefore there is no impact for the removal of the building fabric, it is encouraged that the interior tin ceiling tiles be salvaged for re-use.

Lastly, it is encouraged that the materials, colour, detail and ornamentation of the new building be sympathetic to the surrounding mature neighbourhood by using a neutral colour palette, similar building material and consider design elements of the Late Victorian, early Edwardian and Queen Anne architectural styles which is a character defining element of the neighbourhood.
1.0 INTRODUCTION

MHBC Planning, Urban Design and Landscape Architecture (“MHBC”) was retained in November 2020 by Urbe Developments Inc. to undertake Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) for the proposed redevelopment of 234 Eagle Street South, City of Cambridge, Ontario hereafter referred to as the ‘subject property’ (see Appendix ‘A’). The development proposal under evaluation includes the severance of the subject property and demolition of an existing outbuilding on-site to facilitate the construction of a two storey single family dwelling.

The subject property is a ‘listed’ (non-designated) property on the City of Cambridge’s Heritage Properties Register (2020). It is adjacent to the 248 Queenston Road which is also a ‘listed’ (non-designated) property on the Register. The subject property is not located within a Heritage Conservation District under Part V of the Ontario Heritage Act (OHA). The purpose of the HIA is to evaluate any potential impacts to these properties in accordance with Policy 4.19.1 of the City of Cambridge Official Plan.

1.1 LOCATION OF SUBJECT PROPERTY

The subject property is located at 234 Eagle Street South, City of Cambridge in the former Town of Preston (legal description is Pt Lt 5 N/s Hamilton St & W/s Eagle St Pl 522 Cambridge; Pt Lt 6 N/s Hamilton St & W/s Eagle St Pl 522, Cambridge As In Ws613615; Cambridge). It is south-east of Chopin Drive and the Speed River, north-east of Dover Street, south-west of Queenston Road and north-west of Hamilton Street (see Appendix ‘A’). The subject property is just south of the Preston Towne Centre community core area within the Queenston Road neighbourhood which is primarily residential.

Lot sizes in the immediate surrounding area vary in size. Buildings along Eagle Street are between one and two storeys in height. The majority date to the late 19th and early 20th century. The subject property is approximately 774m² in size and includes a one and half storey single family dwelling and one storey outbuilding to the west of the property.
Figures 1 & 2: (above) Aerial view of subject property and surrounding properties (Source: Waterloo Region GIS Locator, 2020); (below) Oblique aerial photograph of subject property and surrounding context; subject property is indicated by red circle (Source: Google Earth Pro, 2020)
1.2 SURROUNDING CONTEXT

The subject property is approximately 0.17 kilometres from King Street East, the arterial road through the Preston community and in particular, the Preston Towne Centre. To the north, residences transition to a variety of commercial and multi-residential uses. To the south, the Queeston Road neighbourhood consists of several mature residences. Buildings along the west side of Eagle Street south between Queenston and Hamilton Road are placed closely to the streetscape; this differs from the Queenston Road streetscape which allows for a greater front yard. The north side of Eagle Street South along this stretch is variable in lot sizes, setbacks and built form. Similar one and a half storey Ontario Cottages are located throughout the neighbourhood (see examples located on Queenston Road in Figures 3-5.

Figures 3, 4, & 5: (above left) View of Eagle Street South streetscape looking from south-west towards subject property; (above right) View of Eagle Street South looking north-west (below) View of 248 Queenston Road and streetscape looking south-east (Source: MHBC Pro, 2020)
1.3 HERITAGE STATUS

In order to confirm the presence of cultural heritage resources which have been previously identified, several databases were consulted. These databases include the City of Cambridge Register for Heritage Properties Register, the City of Cambridge Official Plan, Waterloo Region Public Building Inventory, the Ontario Heritage Act Register (Ontario Heritage Trust), the Canadian Register of Historic Places (CRHP), and the City of Cambridge Interactive Map.

The property located at 234 Eagle Street South is listed (non-designated) on the City of Cambridge’s Heritage Properties Register (2020) as well as adjacent property located at 248 Queenston Road. The description of these properties as in the Register are in Table 1.0 of this report. The subject property is not identified by the City of Cambridge as being part of a cultural heritage landscape or located in a heritage conservation district.

Figure 6: Excerpt of the City of Cambridge Interactive Map noting the location of the subject property (outlined in red), listed on the heritage register. Other listed properties in the vicinity of the subject property shaded in dark green. (Source: City of Cambridge Interactive Map, accessed 2020)
### Table 1.0 - Description of Listed Properties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Description from City of Cambridge Register of Heritage Properties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>234 Eagle Street S</td>
<td>1 ½ storey wood frame vernacular style with painted brick façade&quot;, dating c. 1870-1896.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>248 Queenston Road</td>
<td>2 ½ storey brick house with front roof gable, dating c.1915.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.4 LAND USE AND ZONING

The subject property is located in the just south of the Preston Towne Centre and is zoned R-5 as per Chapter 3 of the City of Cambridge Zoning By-law 150-85 (see Figure 7). The zoning provides for and regulates low to low-medium density residential development including a range of dwellings, such as single detached, semi-detached and duplex dwellings.

Figure 7: Excerpt of the City of Cambridge Interactive Map noting the location of the subject property (outlined in red), zoned R5 (Source: City of Cambridge, 2020)
2.0 POLICY CONTEXT

2.1 THE PLANNING ACT AND PPS 2020

The Planning Act makes a number of provisions respecting cultural heritage, either directly in Section 2 of the Act or Section 3 respecting policy statements and provincial plans. In Section 2, the Planning Act outlines 18 spheres of provincial interest that must be considered by appropriate authorities in the planning process. One of the intentions of The Planning Act is to “encourage the co-operation and co-ordination among the various interests”. Regarding cultural heritage, Subsection 2(d) of the Act provides that:

The Minister, the council of a municipality, a local board, a planning board and the Municipal Board, in carrying out their responsibilities under this Act, shall have regard to, among other matters, matters of provincial interest such as, ...

(d) the conservation of features of significant architectural, cultural, historical, archaeological or scientific interest;

The Planning Act therefore provides for the overall broad consideration of cultural heritage resources through the land use planning process.

In support of the provincial interest identified in Subsection 2 (d) of the Planning Act, and as provided for in Section 3, the Province has refined policy guidance for land use planning and development matters in the Provincial Policy Statement, 2020 (PPS). The PPS is “intended to be read in its entirety and the relevant policy areas are to be applied in each situation”. This provides a weighting and balancing of issues within the planning process. When addressing cultural heritage planning, the PPS provides for the following:

2.6.1 Significant built heritage resources and significant cultural heritage landscapes shall be conserved.

Significant: e) in regard to cultural heritage and archaeology, resources that have been determined to have cultural heritage value or interest. Processes and criteria for determining cultural heritage value or interest
2.6.3 Planning authorities shall not permit development and site alteration on adjacent lands to protected heritage property except where the proposed development and site alteration has been evaluated and it has been demonstrated that the heritage attributes of the protected heritage property will be conserved.

**Built Heritage Resource:** means a building, structure, monument, installation or any manufactured or constructed part or remnant that contributes to a property’s cultural heritage value or interest as identified by a community, including an Indigenous community. Built heritage resources are located on property that may be designated under Parts IV or V of the Ontario Heritage Act, or that may be included on local, provincial, federal and/or international registers.

**Protected Heritage Property:** means property designated under Parts IV, V or VI of the Ontario Heritage Act; property subject to a heritage conservation easement under Parts II or IV of the Ontario Heritage Act; property identified by the Province and prescribed public bodies as provincial heritage property under the Standards and Guidelines for Conservation of Provincial Heritage Properties; property protected under federal legislation, and UNESCO World Heritage Sites.

### 2.2 ONTARIO HERITAGE ACT

The *Ontario Heritage Act*, R.S.O, 1990, c.0.18 remains the guiding legislation for the conservation of significant cultural heritage resources in Ontario. This HIA has been guided by the criteria provided with *Regulation 9/06* of the *Ontario Heritage Act* outlines the mechanism for determining cultural heritage value or interest. The regulation sets forth categories of criteria and several sub-criteria.

### 2.3 REGION OF WATERLOO OFFICIAL PLAN

Chapter 3, Section 3.G of the Regional Official Plan provides policies regarding the conservation of cultural heritage resources stating that they are,

> -the inheritance of natural and cultural assets that give people a sense of place, community and personal identity. Continuity with the past promotes creativity and cultural diversity... These resources provide an important means of defining and confirming a regional identity, enhancing the quality of life of the community,
supporting social development and promoting economic prosperity. The Region is committed to the conservation of its cultural heritage. This responsibility is shared with the Federal and Provincial governments, Area Municipalities, other government agencies, the private sector, property owners and the community.

Pursuant to Chapter 3. G. 13, Cultural Heritage Impact Assessments policies have been outlined for the Municipality of the City of Cambridge for a proposed development that includes or is adjacent to a designated or listed property on the Municipal Heritage Register of the applicable municipality, in this case, the City of Cambridge. The CHIA guidelines outlined by the Region in Chapter 3 G. 17 are reflected in the guidelines used by the City of Cambridge defined in the beginning of Sub-section 2.1 of this report.

2.4 CITY OF CAMBRIDGE’S OFFICIAL PLAN (2018)

The City of Cambridge recognizes the importance of cultural heritage and provides policies regarding conservation in Chapter 4 of the Official Plan where it is encouraged to “support the conservation, restoration and prominence of the city’s heritage as a key identifying feature of the community;” and “promote built heritage as a key component of the city’s local tourism and quality of life for existing new residents”. Section 4.2 of the Official Plan encourages the conservation of heritage resources when development is proposed which encourages,

- Incorporation of cultural heritage resources and their surrounding context into development applications in a manner which does not conflict with the cultural heritage resource;

- Promotion of the use of scale and design which blends harmoniously with existing cultural heritage resources when development occurs;

The City of Cambridge Official Plan policies and objectives for the conservation of cultural heritage resources have been taken into consideration for the purpose of this Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment. Section 4.4 of the City of Cambridge Official Plan provides policies regarding Cultural Heritage Value Evaluation Criteria. A property shall be considered to have cultural heritage value or interest if the property has been designated by the Province to be of architectural or historical significance pursuant to the Ontario Heritage Act or, in the opinion of the City, satisfies at least two of the following criteria:

1. It dates from an early period in the development of the city’s communities;
2. It is a representative example of the work of an outstanding local, national or international architect, engineer, builder, designer, landscape architect,
interior designer, sculptor, or other artisan and is well preserved or may be rehabilitated;

3. *It is associated with a person who is recognized as having made an important contribution to the city’s social, cultural, political, economic, technological or physical development or as having materially influenced the course of local, regional, provincial, national or international history;*

4. *It is directly associated with an historic event which is recognized as having local, regional, provincial, national or international importance;*

5. *It is a representative example and illustration of the city’s social, cultural, political, economic or technological development history;*

6. *It is a representative example of a method of construction now rarely used;*

7. *It is a representative example of its architectural style or period of building;*

8. *It is a representative example of architectural design;*

9. *It terminates a view or otherwise makes an important contribution to the urban composition or streetscape of which it forms a part;*

10. *It is generally recognized as an important landmark;*

11. *It is a representative example of outstanding interior design; or*

12. *It is an example of a rare or otherwise important feature of good urban design or streetscaping.*


**2.5 THE CITY OF CAMBRIDGE HERITAGE MASTER PLAN (2008)**

The Cambridge Heritage Master Plan (CHMP) recognizes the importance of the City promoting “Heritage-friendly” development to protect character areas outlined in the plan (CHMP, p 194). Heritage-friendly development is listed as Objective 11 of the Plan and includes in Action 28-30 of the Plan. The subject property is located in Character Area 6 (see Figure 5) not located within any of the identified character areas on page 105 of the report.

The subject property is located in the character area defined as the “Neighbourhood of Queenston Road.” The neighbourhood is described as representing 19th and 20th century residential community with a ‘mature streetscape’ (CHMP, 117). Conservation and development concerns and opportunities include “urban design guidelines and advice on
suitable home improvements are both needed in order to conserve and enhance area character” (CHMP, 117).

Figure 8: Excerpt of the City of Cambridge Character Areas on page 105 of the City of Cambridge Heritage Master Plan; red star indicates approximate location of subject property.

The following lists the character defining elements of the neighbourhood as defined in the Plan:

- Similar to Dickson Hill in Galt, middle and upper class residential development;
- Large lots, mature streets, shared setbacks;
- Late Victorian, early Edwardian, Queen Anne architectural styles and skilled craftsmanship;
- Street oriented design including large porches and sidewalks;
- Format street grid;
- Brick construction; and,
- Close proximity to King Street.

The above character defining elements are considered in the overall evaluation of this report.

2.6 HIA TERMS OF REFERENCE

The City of Cambridge has a terms of reference for Heritage Impact Assessments entitled Detailed Guidelines for the Preparation of a Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment. These guidelines outline what is required within an HIA. Content required in an HIA as per these guidelines include:
• Identification and evaluation of the built heritage resource;
• Graphic and written inventory of the heritage resource;
• Assessment of the proposal's impact on the heritage resource;
• Means to mitigate negative impacts, in accordance with the heritage resources priorities established in Policy 4.2.1 of this plan;
• Alternatives to the proposal;
• Identification of and justification for the preferred option.

The report must be completed by professionals in good standing with the Canadian Association of Heritage Professionals (CAHP) and is considered qualified to evaluate heritage resources. Appendix ‘D’ of this report includes the CVs of personnel that have produced this report.
3.0 HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

3.1 INDIGENOUS COMMUNITIES AND PRE-CONTACT HISTORY

Archaeological excavations completed in the area of the City of Cambridge prove that the Grand River Valley has a long history of occupation by indigenous communities (CHMP, 44). Campsites have been identified and documented from the Archaic and Woodland periods within the area Preston-Hespeler area dating from around 1,000 B.C. (CHMP, 44). The close proximity to the Speed River was influential in the location of these campsites as it provided a prime setting for hunting and fishing (Dilse, 3). During the 15th century, Iroquoian people from New York and Pennsylvania area immigrated to Southern Ontario; these people included: the Huron (Wendet), Neutrals (Attiwandaronks) and Petuns (CHMP, 44). In the late 17th and late 18th century, Tuscaroras joined these communities and together formed the Six Nations Confederacy who hunted, farmed and traded in semi-sedentary villages (CHMP, 44).

In 1784, General Haldimand, then Governor of Quebec, acquired six miles of land on each side of the Grand River from the Mississaugas (Bloomfield 19, 2006). A tract of land 12 miles wide along the course of the Grand River were granted to the Six Nations by the British in recognition of their support during the American Revolution. The land was later divided into four blocks; Block 2 later became Waterloo Township. Brant and the Six Nations drew up a deed for sale of Block 2 in November 1796. The deed was recorded at Newark (Niagara on the Lake) and in February 1798 the title was registered and a Crown Grant was drawn for this block (McLaughlin, 21 2007). The buyer was Colonel Richard Beasley, a Loyalist from New York, who had arrived in Canada in 1777. Beasley bought the 93, 160 acres of land along with his business partners, James Wilson and Jean-Baptiste Rousseaux (Bloomfield 20, 2006). The land was then surveyed by Richard Cockrell who divided the township into upper and lower blocks (Hayes 3, 1997). At this time, German Mennonite farmers from Pennsylvania were scouting out farmland in the area. Several of them went back to Pennsylvania and returned with their families the following year to buy and settle the land (Hayes 5, 1997).
3.2 HISTORICAL OVERVIEW OF TOWN OF PRESTON

In 1805, John Erb and his wife settled along the Speed River lands after acquiring 7,500 acres of land (City of Cambridge, 2020). In the following years, he would constructed a sawmill and a gristmill which locally known as “Erbs Mills” and later “Cambridge Mills” within Waterloo Township. Between 1815 and 1818, two stores were established and by the 1820s and 1830s a school, taverns, a brewery and warehouse were established (Bloomfield, 79). Mr. Erb was reluctant to sell his land to be developed and it is claimed that it was not until after two years after his death that in 1834 a portion of his lands was surveyed and divided into lots by William Scollick (City of Cambridge, 2020). Scollick was a native of Preston, England and it is due to this that the settlement received the name ‘Preston’. In 1835, a bridge was constructed over the Speed River and twenty houses were constructed within the village for 40 resident families (Bloomfield, 79).

The newly divided lots mainly attracted young German immigrants who were tradesmen, artisans and craftsmen; between 1836 and 1855 the population grew from 250 to 1600 inhabitants, most of which were of German descent (City of Cambridge, 2020). The settlement soon developed and included hotels and taverns for residents and travelers alike. The Town became infamous in the mid-19th century for its mineral springs which were said to have “remarkable curative powers in the treatment of a variety of ailments”; three major hotels were established in Preston offering access to these waters (City of Cambridge, 2020).

Figure 9: Excerpt of the 1861 Tremaine Map of the County of Waterloo (Courtesy of the University of Waterloo Geospatial Centre, 2020).
In 1852, Preston became the first incorporated village within the Township of Waterloo (Bloomfield, 146). In 1856, the Great Western Railway was established through the east half of the village (CHMP, 61). The village reached its greatest population during this century in 1866, however, began to decline in the late 19th century. Notwithstanding the Town’s popularity due to its mineral springs, its population was slow to grow which resulted in it being labelled a ‘sleepy German Town’. It was only by 1900 that the Town reached more than 2,000 persons which was likely influenced by the establishment of the electric railway system in 1894 that served the community (City of Cambridge, 2020).

**Figures 10 & 11:** (above) Excerpt of the 1879 Map of the County of Waterloo; (Courtesy of the University of Waterloo Geospatial Centre); (below) Excerpt of 1880 Illustrated historical atlas of the County of Waterloo (Courtesy of The Canadian County Atlas Digital Project).
The Town continued to grow supported by Preston’s industrial businesses, hotels and retail districts. In 1969, the neighbouring hamlet of Blair merged into Preston (CHMP, 66). On January 1, 1972, the Town of Preston was amalgamated into the City of Cambridge at which time the population was approximately 14,000 (Mika, 330).

3.3 234 EAGLE ST SOUTH

The subject property is within Joseph Erb’s (Sr) Survey completed in 1834 originally part of Lot 5 of the Broken Front Beasley Lower Block. The subject property includes part of Lot 5 and 6 of Plan 522. On May 20, 1863, Lot 5 of this survey, which consisted of 2 rods and 29 perches, was deeded to Abraham A. Erb, Cyrus Erb, Jacob K. Erb and Joseph Erb (Jr), relatives of Joseph Erb (Sr) from Jacob Erb (LRO, instrument no. 690 & 928). In 1868, Lot 5 was purchased from A.A, Cyrus, Joseph and Jacob Erb to Moses A. Abbey (LRO, instrument no. 1268). Moses A. Abbey was listed as a ‘hop grocer’ in the 1871 census (Library and Archives Canada). In 1879, the lot purchased by Lorenzo A. Barber, who sold the land to Amanda M. Abbey, Moses’ wife (LRO, instrument no. 1737, 1741). In 1881, Amanda M. Abbey sold the land to Thomas Todd who lived in Galt and was involved in the malt distillery business (LRO, instrument no. 1913). Part Lot 5 continued to be vacant upon its purchase in 1922 by Jacob Hartel from George, Agnes and John Moore who owned and operated the hop warehouse that was formerly located at 239-249 Hamilton Street.

Figure 12: Excerpt of the 1861 Tremaine Map of the County of Waterloo detailing Preston; red box indicates approximate location of subject property (Courtesy of the University of Waterloo Geospatial Centre).
On November 23rd, 1858, Henry Doerwald purchased Lot 6, which included 36 ½ perches, from Joseph Erb (Sr) for $200.00 (LRO, instrument no. 454). In 1861, no buildings appear in the location of the subject property (see Figure 12), however, in the 1861 census, which likely was completed following the publication of the map, Henry Doerwald is listed as having a one and half storey frame house on the property and identified as a ‘carpenter’; he is listed as a ‘joiner’ in the 1864 *Waterloo County and Gazetteer*. It is likely that he constructed the existing house.

In 1864, Lot 6 was purchased by Charles Larisch (also spelled Larish) (LRO, instrument 704). Mr. Larisch was born in Germany, immigrated to Detroit, Michigan, U.S.A. and later to Canada settling in Preston. He is listed in the 1861 census as a ‘cabinet maker.’ In 1874, Charles Larisch sold the lot to Heinrich ‘Henry’ Meyer (LRO, instrument no. 1408). Mr. Meyer had emigrated from Hanover, Germany and married Sophia Nolde, also a native of Germany. They settled in Preston and had children: Henry (Jr), Eddie, August and Wilhelmine ‘Winnie’ (Waterloo Generations, 2021). In the 1891 census, he is listed as a ‘stove moulder’; he passed away in 1893 (Library and Archives of Canada). In 1904, the estate of Sophia Meyer was sold to Frederick Seip listed as a ‘house carpenter’ in the 1891 census (LRO, instrument no. 4349, Library and Archives of Canada). In 1916, the estate of Frederick and Sarah Seip was sold to Jacob Hartel (LRO, instrument no. 8954).

In 1922, the remainder of the property (Lot 5) was granted to Jacob Richard Hartel (LRO, instrument no. 11318). Mr. Hartel lived on the property until his death in 1939; he is listed in his death certificate as being a “tinsmith” (Archives of Ontario). Both the outbuilding and house include tin ceiling tiles. Mr. Hartel was married to Frances McKie on June 18, 1912 and together they had Leonard, Alex and Florence who would have resided in the house on the subject property (Library and Archives of Canada).

The 1924 Fire Insurance Plan show that the lot fabric at the time extended to the south to the corner of Hamilton and Eagle Street (see Figure 13). The grey shading of the outbuilding indicated that it was identified as a ‘shed’ and it appears that there was a small addition to the south of the original outbuilding. By this year, neither the two adjacent houses to the south of the subject property or the existing building at 248 Queenston Road existed.
Figure 13: Excerpt of the 1910 (revised 1924) Fire Insurance Plan of Preston; subject property outlined by dotted red line (Courtesy of McMaster University).

In 1939, Jacob Hartel passed away and in 1941, the estate was given to Mary F. Hartel (LRO, instrument no. 16213). By 1945, the ‘hop’ warehouse to the south west no longer appears in the aerial photograph, however, the two adjacent buildings to the south of the subject property and 248 Queenston Road are present. In 1955, a house appears at the former location of the warehouse which was located approximately at current 239-249 Hamilton Street.
Figures 14 & 15: (above) Excerpt of 1945 aerial photograph; (below) Excerpt of 1955 aerial photograph; red boxes indicate approximate location of subject property (Courtesy of University of Waterloo Geospatial Centre).
In 1963, the property was acquired by Mary Hartel, relative of Jacob Hartel. In 1972, executors of the estate of Mary Hartel granted the subject property to Gordon England and his wife Glenys (LRO, instrument no. 508011). Mr. England was listed as a ‘Production Manager’ and his wife was listed as a ‘secretary’ in the 1974 Voter’s List (Library and Archives of Canada).
4.0 DETAILED DESCRIPTION
OF POTENTIAL CULTURAL HERITAGE RESOURCES

4.1 DESCRIPTION OF SUBJECT PROPERTY

The property includes a one and a half storey, wood frame house with brick veneer and wood frame wing to the rear fronting Eagle Street south. There is a one and a half storey wood frame outbuilding to the south of the property, an open green space to the rear of the property, mature trees in the vicinity of the outbuilding, and two contemporary sheds to the rear of the property. A driveway to the south of the house leads to the wood outbuilding. A site visit occurred on December 13th and 22nd, 2020 to document the existing buildings and structures on-site.

Figure 16: Aerial photograph of 234 Eagle Street South (Source: Google Earth Pro, 2020)
4.2 DESCRIPTION OF BUILT FEATURES

4.2.1 234 Eagle Street South

*House*

The house is constructed with a wood frame including the rear wing. The main building envelope has a painted brick veneer. The house has a rubble stone foundation and cross hipped roof with asphalt shingles and a chimney shaft along the south elevation.

The front elevation includes typical elements of an Ontario Cottage including the one and half storey massing, window openings on either side of the front entrance and gabled dormer centred above the main entryway. The window and door openings have brick voussoirs which continues on the north and south elevation. There is some cracking of masonry on the south side of the front elevation. An open gable roof dormer sits centred on the roof.

The south elevation includes two window openings and chimney shaft. This elevation includes the rear addition with one door and window opening. The rear elevation displays the rear addition and its attachment to the rear wing; the open gabled roofline can be seen above the roofline of the addition. A porch has been added to the rear addition with two window openings and door opening. The north elevation has two centrally placed window openings and a boarded window opening. There is one window opening along this elevation on the rear addition.
Figures 17, 18, 19, 20 & 21: (above left) View of front façade of the house; (above right) View of East (front) and south elevation of the house including view of rear addition; (middle left) View of north elevation of house with view of rear addition; (middle right) View of south elevation and rear addition; (below) View of west (rear) elevation (Source: MHBC, 2020)
Outbuilding

Exterior:

The one and half storey outbuilding on the subject land is a wood frame construction with a combination of a metal sheathing and asphalt shingled open gabled roof. There is a later addition to the right of the front elevation to facilitate an auto garage. The front elevation includes a pair of larger doors with triple pane windows to the left of the façade, an opening which has been boarded central to the façade and human door opening to the right of the original frame structure. To the right of this building is a one storey addition with garage door opening. The north elevation includes the sloped roof of the garage addition and open gable roofline which transitions into a sloped roofline of a rear addition to the original structure which is covered in metal sheathing. There is a brick chimney shaft on the north end of the original wood frame structure. The rear elevation consists of several boards of plywood nailed to the existing wall. The exterior appears to be in poor condition as the exterior walls have significantly deteriorated and the roof structure is sloping.

Figures 22, 23 & 24: (above) View of front façade of outbuilding from west side of Eagle Street South; (below left) View of north elevation of outbuilding including subsequent garage addition; (below right) View of west (rear) elevation of outbuilding showing brick chimney shaft and sloping roofline (Source: MHBC, 2020)
Interior:

The interior of the outbuilding includes a variety of materials and applications. There is wood post centred in the building. The walls are either exposed wood or otherwise covered by other materials likely for insulation and are in poor condition. The interior of the front elevation includes the large door openings, the centred window opening with original window frame which has been insulated and boarded into place. The building includes narrow wood flooring which appears to be warped. A tin ceiling is installed at the one storey level along with conventional lighting fixtures; several of the tiles are in poor condition and some have been removed. The north end of this structure includes a furnace. Overall, the building has been altered significantly in the interior and is in poor condition.

Figures 25, 26 & 27: (above left) View of interior front façade of outbuilding (above right) View of exiting wood flooring; (below left) View of interior of outbuilding looking south-west towards the rear addition (below right) View of installed furnace on north elevation of original structure (Source: MHBC, 2020)
Landscape Features

A chain link fence is along the rear half of the southern property line and continues along the rear (western) property line. A wood board fence lines the rear half of the northern property line. There is a large open space at the rear of the property. The rear property line is dominated by brush. There is a large mature coniferous tree located behind the outbuilding. There is also another coniferous tree to north-east of the outbuilding.

Figures 28, 29, 30 & 31: (above left) View of rear open space looking northwards towards 248 Queenston Road; (above right) View rear of subject property looking southwards; (below left) View of mature coniferous trees on-site; (below right) View of large, mature coniferous tree behind outbuilding (Source: MHBC, 2020)
4.2.2 248 Queenston Road

The property includes a two storey brick house with open gabled roof with extended eaves. The open gable is featured as it is enclosed by a portion of roof and cornicing of the roof line and the fascia of the gable creating a pseudo pediment which has been clad in siding. The front entrance is asymmetrical and is contained with a covered porch which is supported by rusticated brick columns with stone caps and decorative metal supports. The porch has a flat roof line with modest cornicing. There is a window opening at each storey and another within the open gable of the roof. There is an addition door opening on the second level presumably formerly to facilitate a walkout to a balcony. The rear elevation includes a brick chimney shaft and a modern one storey addition. There are two sheds located centrally on the deep lot. The property is surrounded by wood fencing.

Figures 32, 33, 34 & 35: (above left) View of front elevation looking southwards (above right) View rear of property looking northwards; (below left) View of north and east elevation of the house; (below right) View of north and west elevation of the house (Source: MHBC, 2020)
5.0 EVALUATION OF CULTURAL HERITAGE RESOURCES

5.1 EVALUATION CRITERIA

The following sub-sections of this report will provide an analysis of the cultural heritage value of the subject property as per Ontario Regulation 9/06, which is the legislated criteria for determining cultural heritage value or interest. This criteria is related to design/physical, historical/associative and historical values as follows:

1. The property has design or physical value because it:
   a. Is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, expression, material or construction method,
   b. Displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit, or
   c. Demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement.

2. The property has historical value or associative value because it,
   a. Has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization or institution that is significant to a community,
   b. Yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of a community or culture, or
   c. Demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer or theorist who is significant to a community.

3. The property has contextual value because it,
   a. Is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an area,
   b. Is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings, or
   c. Is a landmark.
5.2 EVALUATION OF 234 EAGLE STREET S (House)

5.2.1 Design/Physical Value

The house is representative of an Ontario Cottage which was commonly built throughout Ontario in the 19th century in rural and small town areas. The symmetry of window openings on either side of the entryway, centre hall plan and single gable dormer above the door in the centre of the building are indicative of this architectural style.

5.2.2 Historical/Associative Value

The house was constructed in 1861 around the time that the Preston reached its greatest population in the 19th century in 1866. It was constructed by Henry Doerwald who was a carpenter by trade.

5.2.3 Contextual Value

Eagle Street South and the surrounding community has changed over the years. Today, the size of lots varies from lot to lot resulting in a variable character. The house supports the historical character of the neighbourhood.

5.2.4 List of Heritage Attributes

- Original massing and scale;
- Centre hall plan including centred entryway and symmetrical windows on main façade;
- Original brick veneer on main building envelope including segmental arched brick voussoirs above window and door openings;
- Original window and door openings including original windows and doors;
- Original roofline;
- Medium-pitched gable dormer above main entryway;
- Rubble stone foundation; and,
- Location on Eagle Street South.
5.2.5 O-REG 9/06 EVALUATION

**Table 2.0**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ontario Regulation 9/06</th>
<th>234 Eagle Street S (House)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Design/Physical Value</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, expression, material or construction method</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Displays high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Demonstrates high degree of technical or scientific achievement</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Historical/Associative value</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. Direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization, institution that is significant</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. Yields, or has potential to yield information that contributes to an understanding of a community or culture</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi. Demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer, or theorist who is significant to the community.</td>
<td>Unknown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Contextual Value</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii. Important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an area</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viii. Physically, functionally, visually, or historically linked to its surroundings</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ix. Is a landmark</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In summary, the cultural heritage value or interest of the house located at 234 Eagle Street South is vested in its modest representation of an Ontario Cottage and supports and maintains the character of the area.
5.3 EVALUATION OF 234 EAGLE STREET S (Outbuilding)

5.3.1 Design/Physical Value

The outbuilding is not representative of a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, expression, and material or construction method but rather utilitarian in nature. Furthermore, it does not display a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit. As a result, no physical heritage attributes are identified.

5.3.2 Historical/Associative Value

The outbuilding was constructed circa 1922 and was used as an ancillary building used as a workshop for the length of its existence. The building is not directly associated with a significant theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization, institution, or yield significant information as it relates to the community. It does not demonstrate the work or ideas of an architect, artist, building, designer, or theorist who is significant in the community.

5.3.3 Contextual Value

Ancillary buildings are not uncommon in the Queenston Road Neighbourhood and is consistent with the overall character of the area, however, the building is not significant to defining, maintaining the character of the area but rather takes on a supportive role. The building is not physically or visually linked to its surroundings and no longer has a functional role to the surrounding community.
### 5.3.4 O-REG 9/06 EVALUATION

**Table 3.0**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ontario Regulation 9/06</th>
<th>234 Eagle Street S (Outbuilding)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Design/Physical Value</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, expression, material or construction method</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Displays high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Demonstrates high degree of technical or scientific achievement</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Historical/Associative value</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x. Direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization, institution that is significant</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xi. Yields, or has potential to yield information that contributes to an understanding of a community or culture</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xii. Demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer, or theorist who is significant to the community.</td>
<td>Unknown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Contextual Value</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xiii. Important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an area</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xiv. Physically, functionally, visually, or historically linked to its surroundings</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xv. Is a landmark</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In summary, the cultural heritage value or interest of the ancillary building located at 234 Eagle Street South and supports the character of the area.
5.4 EVALUATION OF 248 QUEENSTON ROAD

5.4.1 Design/Physical Value

The house is vernacular in design with limited classical elements of the Edwardian architectural style. It does not display a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit.

5.4.2 Historical/Associative Value

The house is not directly associated with a significant theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization, institution, or have potential to yield information regarding the community. It does not demonstrate the work or ideas of an architect, artist, building, designer, or theorist who is significant in the community.

5.4.3 Contextual Value

Similar brick vernacular houses are found throughout the Queenston Road Neighbourhood and it is therefore, supportive of the character of the area. The building is not physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings, nor is it a landmark.

5.4.4 List of Heritage Attributes

- Original brick exterior;
- Original window and door openings including original windows and doors;
- Original roofline;
- Medium-pitched gable on front elevation; and,
- Covered front porch.
### 5.4.5 O-REG 9/06 EVALUATION

**Table 4.0**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ontario Regulation 9/06</th>
<th>248 Queenston Road</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Design/Physical Value</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, expression, material or construction method</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Displays high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Demonstrates high degree of technical or scientific achievement</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Historical/Associative value</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. Direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization, institution that is significant</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. Yields, or has potential to yield information that contributes to an understanding of a community or culture</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi. Demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer, or theorist who is significant to the community.</td>
<td>Unknown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Contextual Value</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii. Important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an area</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viii. Physically, functionally, visually, or historically linked to its surroundings</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ix. Is a landmark</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In summary, the cultural heritage value or interest of the house is vested in its modest representation of the Edwardian architectural style and its importance in supporting the character of the area.
5.5 CITY OF CAMBRIDGE CULTURAL HERITAGE EVALUATION CRITERIA

In addition to the Ontario Regulation 9/06, the City of Cambridge outlines criteria in Section 4.4 of the Official Plan which the City utilizes to determine Cultural Heritage Value or Interest (CHVI). Meeting at least two (2) of the following criteria would deem the property to have CHVI.

5.5.1 234 Eagle Street South

The following Table 4.0 evaluates the house and outbuilding under this criteria.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.0- Evaluation of House</th>
<th>Yes/ No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. It dates from an early period in the development of the city's communities;</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. It is a representative example of the work of an outstanding local, national or international architect, engineer, builder, designer, landscape architect, interior designer, sculptor, or other artisan and is well preserved or may be rehabilitated;</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. It is associated with a person who is recognized as having made an important contribution to the city's social, cultural, political, economic, technological or physical development or as having materially influenced the course of local, regional, provincial, national or international history;</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. It is directly associated with an historic event which is recognized as having local, regional, provincial, national or international importance;</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. It is a representative example and illustration of the city's social, cultural, political, economic or technological development history;</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. It is a representative example of a method of construction now rarely used;</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. It is a representative example of its architectural style or period of building; Yes.
8. It is a representative example of architectural design; No.
9. It terminates a view or otherwise makes an important contribution to the urban composition or streetscape of which it forms a part; No.
10. It is generally recognized as an important landmark; No.
11. It is a representative example of outstanding interior design; or No.
12. It is an example of a rare or otherwise important feature of good urban design or streetscaping. No.

In conclusion, the house on the subject property meets two (2) of the criteria as it dates from an early period in the development of the city’s communities and is a representative example of its architectural style or period of building (Ontario Cottage).

5.5.2 248 Queenston Road

The property qualifies for no.7 as a representative example of its architectural style or period of building, that being the Edwardian architectural style. This property only meets one (1) of the criteria and therefore does not warrant designation as per Section 4.4.of the City’s Official Plan.
6.0 DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

The proposed development of the property consists of severing the existing lot to create a new lot to the west. The portion to be severed is proposed to be 364sqm and the retained area will be 402sqm. The development will also result in a new detached, two storey single family dwelling (76.7sqm footprint) on the new lot and detached garage (22.3sqm) which will require the removal of the existing outbuilding on-site. The existing house at 234 Eagle Street South will be retained and conserved (see Appendix ‘B’ for detailed site plan).

Figure 36 – Excerpt of severance sketch; red line indicates proposed severance (Source: MacDonald, Tamblyn, Lord Surveying, 2020)
The proposed design of the new two storey single detached dwelling includes a gabled roof with covered front porch and garage to the rear of the streetscape. The garage will be accessed by a gravel driveway in similar location as existing.

![Image of proposed architectural design]

**Figure 37** – Example of proposed architectural design (Source: Urbe Developments Inc. 2020)

The following chart outlines the proposed setbacks:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Setback</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Front Yard Setback</td>
<td>1.5metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior side yard setback (south)</td>
<td>1.34metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior side yard setback (north)</td>
<td>3.05metres</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proposed frontage is 10.86 metres resulting in a reduction of the existing property’s parcel to 12.00 metres. The redevelopment of the severed parcel proposes 27% of the property to consist of built form.
7.0 IMPACT ANALYSIS

7.1 INTRODUCTION

There are three classifications of impacts a proposed development may have on an identified cultural heritage resource: beneficial, neutral or adverse. Beneficial effects may include such actions as retaining a property of cultural heritage value, protecting it from loss or removal, maintaining restoring or repairing heritage attributes, or making sympathetic additions or alterations that allow for a continued long-term use and retain heritage building fabric. Neutral effects have neither a markedly positive or negative impact on a cultural heritage resource. Adverse effects may include the loss or removal of a cultural heritage resource, unsympathetic alterations or additions that remove or obstruct heritage attributes, the isolation of a cultural heritage resource from its setting or context, or the addition of other elements that are unsympathetic to the character or heritage attributes of a cultural heritage resource. Adverse effects may require strategies to mitigate their impact on cultural heritage resources.

The impacts of a proposed development or change to a cultural heritage resource may be direct or indirect. They may occur over a short term or long term duration, and may occur during a pre-construction phase, construction phase or post-construction phase. Impacts to a cultural heritage resource may also be site specific or widespread, and may have low, moderate or high levels of physical impact.

The following sub-sections of this report provide an analysis of the impacts which may occur as a result of the proposed development.

- **Destruction**: of any, or part of any *significant heritage attributes* or features;
- **Alteration**: that is not sympathetic, or is incompatible, with the historic fabric and appearance;
- **Shadows**: created that alter the appearance of a *heritage attribute* or change the viability of a natural feature or plantings, such as a garden;
- **Isolation**: of a *heritage attribute* from its surrounding environment, context or a significant relationship;
- **Direct or Indirect Obstruction**: of significant views or vistas within, from, or of built and natural features;
- **A change in land use**: such as rezoning a battlefield from open space to residential use, allowing new development or site alteration to fill in the formerly open spaces;
- **Land disturbances**: such as a change in grade that alters soils, and drainage patterns that adversely affect a cultural heritage resource.

### 7.2 IMPACT ANALYSIS:

The following charts evaluate the impact of 1) the severance of subject property and, 2) the construction of a new single family dwelling on the severed lot. The evaluation is based on the criteria mentioned in sub-section 7.1.

#### 7.2.1 234 EAGLE ST SOUTH

Table 6.0 below will account for the house on the subject property. The outbuilding on-site was determined in Section 5.0 of this report to not have Cultural Heritage Interest or Value equally under Ontario Regulation 9/06 and the City’s criteria in Section 4.4. of the Official Plan, thus it is not required to be included in this assessment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Impact ((Potential, No, Minor, Moderate or Major)</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Destruction or alteration of heritage attributes</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>The alteration of the lot size is not a significant impact as the original lot fabric had been previously altered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There will be no alteration or destruction to identified heritage attributes of the existing built heritage and existing mature tree which will be retained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadows</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Proposed development will not result in shadows that negatively impact heritage attributes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolation</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The relationship the house has with the streetscape including other historic buildings along Eagle Street South will not change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The conservation of the mature streetscape and character defining elements of the Queenston Road neighbourhood character area is reviewed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
in Section 8.0 of this report to avoid isolation from the surrounding properties.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direct or Indirect Obstruction of Views</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>There will be no direct or indirect obstruction of significant views of the house (front façade) as there is a reasonable setback consistent with the streetscape.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Change in Land Use</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>There will be no change in land use. It will be used for residential purposes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Disturbance</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>There are no expected land disturbances if the proper protocol is followed (i.e. drainage and grading plan).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In conclusion, it has been determined that there are no impacts to the existing cultural heritage resource on the subject land.

7.2.2 248 QUEENSTON ROAD

The property located at 248 Queenston Road including a two storey, Edwardian house fronts on Queenston Road. The proposed development will *not* destruct/ alter any heritage attributes, cause adverse shadowing, isolate, directly or indirectly obstruct significant views of the house, or cause land disturbances particularly due to its location on the property, its fronting on Queenston Road and approximately 53 metre distance from the proposed development.
8.0 MITIGATION AND CONSERVATION RECOMMENDATIONS

8.1 MITIGATION MEASURES

Section 7.0 impact analysis has demonstrated that there are no anticipated impacts to the heritage attributes of the existing house at 234 Eagle Street South and adjacent 248 Queenston Road, therefore mitigation measures and alternative development options are not necessary.

However, as a precautionary measure the following is recommended for the mature Douglas Fir tree to the rear of the property on the severed portion of Part of Lot 5 and existing cultural heritage resource on-site:

- Install temporary construction fence along the base perimeter of the tree;
- Any grade changes near the tree should not result in the severance of major roots; and,
- Material storage, grading and dumping of other materials is prohibited in the immediate area of the tree and along the foundation of the existing house at 234 Eagle Street South.

Also, although it was determined in this report that the outbuilding has no physical attributes and therefore there is no impact for the removal of the building fabric, it is encouraged that the interior tin ceiling tiles be salvaged for re-use (see Figure 38).
8.2 CONSERVATION RECOMMENDATIONS

The Ontario Heritage Tool Kit outlines acceptable infill designs within a cultural heritage landscape (see Figure 39). It is important to note that the current streetscape of Eagle Street South is not a designated cultural heritage landscape. According to the OHTK, infills in designated cultural heritage landscapes are to fit in the immediate context, be of the same scale and similar setback, maintain proportions of windows and entrances similar to other cultural heritage resources and be of similar colour and material.

Figure 39: Appropriate Infill Examples in Cultural Heritage Landscape (Source: Ontario Heritage Tool Kit, 2018)
Although, the subject property is not included in a designated cultural heritage landscape, it is acknowledged that it is a part of a mature neighbourhood and is an identified “Character Area” entitled “Queenston Road Neighbourhood” in the City of Cambridge Heritage Master Plan (2008). The CHMP identifies the following as this neighbourhood’s character defining elements:

- Similar to Dickson Hill in Galt, middle and upper class residential development;
- Large lots, mature streets, shared setbacks;
- Late Victorian, early Edwardian, Queen Anne architectural styles and skilled craftsmanship;
- Street oriented design including large porches and sidewalks;
- Format street grid;
- Brick construction; and,
- Close proximity to King Street.


Using this framework, it can be determined whether the proposed development is considered a “successful infill” and consistent with the character defining elements of the neighbourhood.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 8.0 Elements of Successful Infill</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Setback &amp; Orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale, Proportion, Rhythm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massing and Height</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Materials, Colour, Roof Shape, Detail and Ornamentation

Materials and colours as well details and ornamentation of the proposed development is not yet confirmed, however, it is likely that the material will be brick which is consistent with the material of the majority of existing houses in the neighbourhood.

Landscape Features, Secondary Buildings, Parking

The existing mature trees will be retained on the severed parcel of land. A detached garage is proposed to the rear of the property which is consistent with adjacent and surrounding properties. The location of the proposed garage to the rear of the property screens it from view from the public realm.

Figure 40: Site plan overlay on the subject property (Source: MHBC, 2020)
In conclusion, the proposed development is considered 'successful infill' within the framework of the Region of Waterloo’s conservation guide, “Elements of Successful Infill” in *Infill: New Construction in Heritage Neighbourhoods*. It is encourage that the materials, colour, detail and ornamentation be sympathetic to the surrounding mature neighbourhood by using a neutral colour palette, similar building material and consider design elements of the Late Victorian, early Edwardian and Queen Anne architectural styles which is a character defining element of the neighbourhood.
9.0 CONCLUSIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS

In conclusion, the house located at 234 Eagle Street South has cultural heritage value or interest in its modest representation of an Ontario Cottage and the house and outbuilding support the character of the area. The subject property meets two of the City’s criteria to warrant designation as it dates from an early period in the development of the city’s communities and is a representative example of its architectural style or period of building (Ontario Cottage).

This report determined that there are no anticipated impacts to the heritage attributes of the existing house at 234 Eagle Street South and adjacent 248 Queenston Road, therefore mitigation measures and alternative development options are not necessary. However, as a precautionary the following is recommended for the mature coniferous tree to the rear of the property on the severed portion of Part of Lot 5 and existing cultural heritage resource on-site:

- Install temporary construction fence along the base perimeter of the tree;
- Any grade changes near the tree should not result in the severance of major roots; and,
- Material storage, grading and dumping of other materials is prohibited in the immediate area of the tree and along the foundation of the existing house at 234 Eagle Street South.

Also, although it was determined in this report that the outbuilding has no physical attributes and therefore there is no impact for the removal of the building fabric, it is encouraged that the interior tin ceiling tiles be salvaged for re-use.

Lastly, it is encouraged that the materials, colour, detail and ornamentation of the new building be sympathetic to the surrounding mature neighbourhood by using a neutral colour palette, similar building material and consider design elements of the Late Victorian, early Edwardian and Queen Anne architectural styles which is a character defining element of the neighbourhood.
Respectfully submitted,

Rachel Redshaw, MA, HE Dipl., CAHP  
*Heritage Planner, MHBC*

Dan Currie, MA, MCIP, RPP, CAHP  
*Partner, MHBC*
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1. INTRODUCTION

Policy 4.10.1 of the City of Cambridge Official Plan states that a “Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment shall be required when a development¹ proposal or Community Plan² potentially impacts a cultural heritage resource³. The potential impacts could be direct, such as demolishing or altering a structure on a designated property, or indirect, such as changes to the streetscape of lands adjacent to a cultural heritage resource.”

The Cambridge Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC) has the mandate to advise Council on matters relating to the preservation of the City’s cultural heritage resources. It is this Advisory Committee that will first review Heritage Impact Assessments. It is important for the proponent to advise the MHAC early on in the process because it is possible that the requirement for a Heritage Impact Assessment may be scoped or waived. A site inspection by MHAC is also the recommended component of any Heritage Impact Assessment process.

2. CULTURAL HERITAGE RESOURCES

The City of Cambridge Official Plan broadly defines cultural heritage resources. As a starting point, MHAC strongly encourages owners/developers to refer to the Heritage Properties Registry for the addresses of significant heritage properties and to consult with the Heritage Planner regarding known cultural heritage resources in the area of the proposed development. The Heritage Properties Registry is endorsed and regularly updated by Cambridge Council.

¹ Development means the creation of a new lot, a change in land use, or the construction of a building(s) or structure(s), requiring approval under the Planning Act, but does not include activities that create or maintain infrastructure authorized under an environmental assessment process or works subject to the Drainage Act. (Planning Act, revised)
² Community Plan is a plan which is prepared for a specific geographic area of residential designated land containing detailed policies to guide future development. (New)
³ Cultural heritage resource means physical remains which include, but are not limited to: buildings (residential, commercial, institutional, industrial and agricultural); cultural heritage landscapes (designed, organic/evolved); structures (water tower, bridge, fence and dam): monuments (cenotaph, statue, cairn); archaeological resources; cemeteries; scenic roads; vistas/views; culturally significant natural features (tree and landforms); movable objects (archival records and artifacts); and cultural traditions (language, stories, music, dance, food, celebrations, arts and crafts. (ROP, revised).
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The City will make available any other relevant information that it maintains, including archival records.

The MHAC is available for consultation with the owner/developer and should be accessed for its expertise. A sub-committee of MHAC has been established to work with owners/developers through the assessment process.

3. CONTENTS OF HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENTS

Under the City's Official Plan, a Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment may include the following elements to address these policies:

**Policy:** identification and evaluation of the built heritage resource:

**Guideline:** A map of the subject area to identify the location of the property and properties within 150m of the subject site. Municipal street address, legal description and current owner's address are also required. An evaluation of the property from a cultural heritage perspective will be conducted. The property will be assessed in accordance with the Heritage Evaluation Criteria in Policy 4.4 of the Official Plan.

**Policy:** graphic and written inventory of the heritage resource:

**Guideline:** Measured architectural drawings and photographic documentation of the subject property will be provided along with a written description. The measured architectural drawings will be of all built structures on the site such as fences, statues, barns, and residences. The drawings will be accurate measurements that provide enough information so that the building could be re-created. Measured drawings will include dimensions for building footprint, height, window and door openings, and roof details. The photographs will provide a visual documentation of the site and the structures. Photographs of both the interior and exterior of structures will form part of the inventory.

**Policy:** assessment of the proposal’s impact on the heritage resource;

**Guideline:** The proposal will be described and its impact on the heritage resource assessed. Changes to the heritage resource such as additions, alterations or demolition will be described. Changes to the landscape and streetscape will be described. New construction shall be evaluated in such terms as orientation, massing, scale,
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**Policy:** means to mitigate negative impacts, in accordance with the heritage resources priorities established in Policy 4.2.1 of this plan.

**Guideline:** The priority is to preserve and be compatible with the heritage resource and surrounding lands into the proposed development in a manner that respects the cultural heritage attributes of the subject property. Describe how the proposed new development will incorporate the existing built heritage resources into the proposal. Describe what measures are being taken to ensure the integration of the existing with the new. Mitigation may include, but is not limited to, landscaping, lighting, and signage.

The scale and design of the development should complement the heritage resource in terms of its orientation, massing, materials and scale. Signage will meet the requirements of the City of Cambridge Sign By-law for Heritage Conservation Districts and Designated Buildings. The Senior Planner - Heritage will be consulted for additional information concerning the sign application.

**Policy:** alternatives to the proposal

**Guideline:** This is the key element of the Heritage Impact Assessment because it identifies more than one alternative and explores the possibilities of the site. At least three options will be submitted and will range from a “do-nothing” approach through to a complete redevelopment of the subject property.

**Policy:** identification of and justification for the preferred option

The proponent will identify the preferred option and provide the rationale for seeking its approval. The preferred option cannot be based solely on the economics of the site. The preferred option may also include natural and cultural heritage issues, streetscaping considerations and revitalization opportunities.

4. **QUALIFICATIONS**

A professional in good standing with the Canadian Association of Heritage Professionals (CAHP) is considered qualified to evaluate the heritage resource and shall complete the Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment. A curriculum vitae must be included in the Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment.
As a starting point, the Canadian Association of Professionals Heritage Consultants is a source of qualified individuals. The website is www.caphc.ca.

The Assessment will include a listing of previously completed Heritage Impact Assessments and contact list.

5. FORMAT

- The HIA will be formatted to be printed on 8 ½” by 11” paper. The HIA will be submitted electronically to the City.
- Maps or drawings 11” by 17” will be bound into the report. Larger maps or drawings shall be inserted in a pocket inside the back cover of the report.
- The HIA will include a title page listing the name of the proponent, the owner of the subject property, address of the subject property, and list the principal author and the date the report was completed.
- The HIA will contain an executive summary following the title page.
- The HIA will include a C.V. of the principal author (s).

6. PROCESS

- Contact the Senior Planner - Heritage to discuss proposal at earliest stage possible.
- Discuss Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment including whether scoping or waiving the requirement should be considered. A Heritage Impact Assessment may be scoped or waived by either Council or MHAC.
- Retain expertise to complete the Heritage Impact Assessment.
- Submit draft to the Senior Planner - Heritage for circulation to the MHAC sub-committee.
- Review comments received from the MHAC sub-committee and revise accordingly.
- Submit final report to the Senior Planner - Heritage for circulation to the MHAC.
- The Senior Planner – Heritage will advise of the meeting date at which the Committee will review the HIA and the proponent will have an opportunity to address the Committee.
- MHAC can approve the HIA, request additional information or not support the HIA.
- The completed Heritage Impact Assessment shall first be submitted to the Cambridge MHAC and the recommendation of MHAC will be forwarded to Council for consideration with the associated development proposal.
7. **QUESTIONS**

Should you have any questions about these guidelines please contact:

Senior Planner - Heritage

50 Dickson Street, P.O. Box 669
Cambridge, Ontario N1R 5W8
(519) 621-0740 ext. 4788
ATTACHMENTS

1. City of Cambridge Official Plan – Chapter 5: Built Heritage Resources
2. City of Cambridge Sign By-Law for Heritage Conservation Districts
CURRICULUM VITAE

Dan Currie, MA, MCIP, RPP, CAHP

Dan Currie, a Partner and Managing Director of MHBC’s Cultural Heritage Division, joined MHBC Planning in 2009, after having worked in various positions in the public sector since 1997 including the Director of Policy Planning for the City of Cambridge and Senior Policy Planner for the City of Waterloo.

Dan provides a variety of planning services for public and private sector clients including a wide range of cultural heritage policy and planning work including strategic planning, heritage policy, heritage conservation district studies and plans, heritage master plans, heritage impact assessments and cultural heritage landscape studies.

PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS

Full Member, Canadian Institute of Planners
Full Member, Ontario Professional Planners Institute
Professional Member, Canadian Association of Heritage Professionals

SELECTED PROJECT EXPERIENCE

Heritage Conservation District Studies and Plans
Alton Heritage Conservation District Study, Caledon (underway)
Port Stanley Heritage Conservation District Plan (underway)
Port Credit Heritage Conservation District Plan, Mississauga
Town of Cobourg Heritage Conservation District Plan updates
Rondeau Heritage Conservation District Study & Plan, Chatham Kent,
Barriefield Heritage Conservation District Plan Update, Kingston
Victoria Square Heritage Conservation District Study, Markham
Bala Heritage Conservation District Study and Plan, Township of Muskoka Lakes
Downtown Meaford Heritage Conservation District Study and Plan
Brooklyn and College Hill Heritage Conservation District Plan, Guelph
Garden District Heritage Conservation District Study and Plan, Toronto

Heritage Master Plans and Management Plans
City of Guelph Cultural Heritage Action Plan
Town of Cobourg Heritage Master Plan
Burlington Heights Heritage Lands Management Plan
City of London Western Counties Cultural Heritage Plan
CURRICULUM VITAE

Dan Currie, MA, MCIP, RPP, CAHP

Cultural Heritage Evaluations
MacDonald Mowatt House, University of Toronto
City of Kitchener Heritage Property Inventory Update
Niagara Parks Commission Queen Victoria Park Cultural Heritage Evaluation
Designation of Main Street Presbyterian Church, Town of Erin
Designation of St Johns Anglican Church, Norwich
Cultural Heritage Landscape evaluation, former Burlingham Farmstead, Prince Edward County

Heritage Impact Assessments
Heritage Impact Assessment for Pier 8, Hamilton
Homer Watson House Heritage Impact Assessment, Kitchener
Expansion of Schneider Haus National Historic Site, Kitchener
Redevelopment of former industrial facility, 57 Lakeport Road, Port Dalhousie
Redevelopment of former amusement park, Boblo Island
Redevelopment of historic Waterloo Post Office
Redevelopment of former Brick Brewery, Waterloo
Redevelopment of former American Standard factory, Cambridge
Redevelopment of former Goldie and McCullough factory, Cambridge
Mount Pleasant Islamic Centre, Brampton
Demolition of former farmhouse at 10536 McCowan Road, Markham

Heritage Assessments for Infrastructure Projects and Environmental Assessments
Heritage Assessment of 10 Bridges within Rockcliffe Special Policy Area, Toronto
Blenheim Road Realignment Collector Road EA, Cambridge
Badley Bridge EA, Elora
Black Bridge Road EA, Cambridge
Heritage and Cultural Heritage Landscape Assessment of Twenty Mile Creek Arch Bridge, Town of Lincoln
Heritage Evaluation of Deer River, Girven, Burnt Dam and MacIntosh Bridges, Peterborough County

Conservation Plans
Black Bridge Strategic Conservation Plan, Cambridge
Conservation Plan for Log house, Beurgetz Ave, Kitchener
Conservation and Construction Protection Plan - 54 Margaret Avenue, Kitchener
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Tribunal Hearings: Local Planning Appeal Tribunal & Conservation Review Board
Port Credit Heritage Conservation District (LPAT)
Demolition 174 St Paul Street (Collingwood Heritage District) (LPAT)
Brooklyn and College Hill HCD Plan (LPAT)
Rondeau HCD Plan (LPAT)
Designation of 108 Moore Street, Bradford (CRB)
Redevelopment of property at 64 Grand Ave, Cambridge (LPAT)
Youngblood subdivision, Elora (LPAT)
Designation of St Johns Church, Norwich (CRB - underway)
Designation of 27 Prideaux Street, Niagara on the Lake (CRB – underway)

MASTER PLANS, GROWTH MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES AND POLICY STUDIES

Town of Frontenac Islands Marysville Secondary Plan
Niagara-on-the-Lake Corridor Design Guidelines
Cambridge West Master Environmental Servicing Plan
Township of West Lincoln Settlement Area Expansion Analysis
Ministry of Infrastructure Review of Performance Indicators for the Growth Plan
Township of Tiny Residential Land Use Study
Port Severn Settlement Area Boundary Review
City of Cambridge Green Building Policy
Township of West Lincoln Intensification Study & Employment Land Strategy
Ministry of the Environment Review of the D-Series Land Use Guidelines
Meadowlands Conservation Area Management Plan
City of Cambridge Trails Master Plan
City of Kawartha Lakes Growth Management Strategy

DEVELOPMENT PLANNING

Provide consulting services and prepare planning applications for private sector clients for:
- Draft plans of subdivision
- Consent
- Official Plan Amendment
- Zoning By-law Amendment
- Minor Variance
- Site Plan
Rachel Redshaw, MA, H.E. Dipl.

Rachel Redshaw, a Heritage Planner with MHBC, joined the firm in 2018. Ms. Redshaw has a Bachelor of Arts in Anthropology and Celtic Studies and a Master of Arts in World Heritage and Cultural Projects for Development. Ms. Redshaw completed her Master’s in Turin, Italy; the Master’s program was established by UNESCO in conjunction with the University of Turin and the International Training Centre of the ILO. Rachel is member of the Canadian Association of Heritage Professionals.

Ms. Redshaw provides a variety of heritage planning services for public and private sector clients. Ms. Redshaw has worked for years completing cultural heritage planning in a municipal setting. She has worked in municipal building and planning departments and for the private sector to gain a diverse knowledge of building and planning in respect to how they apply to cultural heritage. Rachel enjoys being involved in the local community and has been involved in the collection of oral history, in English and Gaelic, and local records for their protection and conservation and occasionally lecturers on related topics. Her passion for history and experience in archives, museums, municipal building and planning departments supports her ability to provide exceptional cultural heritage services.

PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS
Intern Member, Canadian Association of Heritage Professionals (CAHP)

EDUCATION
2011
Higher Education Diploma Cultural Development/ Gaelic Studies Sabhal Mòr Ostaig, University of the Highlands and Islands

2012
Bachelor of Arts Joint Advanced Major in Celtic Studies and Anthropology Saint Francis Xavier University

2014
Master of Arts World Heritage and Cultural Projects for Development The International Training Centre of the ILO in partnership with the University of Turin, Politecnico di Torino, University of Paris 1 Panthéon-Sorbonne, UNESCO, ICCROM, Macquarie University

PROFESSIONAL HISTORY
2018 - Present Heritage Planner, MacNaughton Hermsen Briton Clarkson Planning Limited

2018 Building Permit Coordinator, (Contract) Township of Wellesley

2018 Building Permit Coordinator (Contract) RSM Building Consultants

2017 Deputy Clerk, Township of North Dumfries

2015-2016 Building/ Planning Clerk Township of North Dumfries
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2009-2014  Historical Researcher & Planner
            Township of North Dumfries

2012  Translator, Archives of Ontario

2012  Cultural Heritage Events Facilitator (Reminiscence Journey) and Executive Assistant, Waterloo Region Plowing Match and Rural Expo

2011  Curatorial Research Assistant
            Highland Village Museum/ Baile nan Gàidheal

PROFESSIONAL/COMMUNITY ASSOCIATIONS

2019-2020  Intern Member, Canadian Association of Heritage Professionals

2017-2020  Member, AMCTO

2018-2019  Member of Publications Committee, Waterloo Historical Society

2018  Member, Architectural Conservancy of Ontario- Cambridge

2018 - 2019  Secretary, Toronto Gaelic Society

2012 -2017  Member (Former Co-Chair & Co-Founder), North Dumfries Historical Preservation Society

2011 - 2014  Member, North Dumfries Municipal Heritage Committee

2013  Greenfield Heritage Village Sub-committee, Doors Open Waterloo Region

2012  Volunteer Historical Interpreter, Doon Heritage Village, Ken Seiling Waterloo Region Museum

2008-2012  Member, Celtic Collections, Angus L. Macdonald Library

2012-2013  Member (Public Relations), Mill Race Folk Society

2011  Member, University of Waterloo Sub-steering Committee for HCD Study, Village of Ayr, North Dumfries

2010-2011  Member (volunteer archivist), Antigonish Heritage Museum

AWARDS / PUBLICATIONS / RECOGNITION

2019  Waterloo Historical Society Publication, Old Shaw: The Story of a Kindly Waterloo County Roamer

2014  Master’s Dissertation, The Rise of the City: Social Business Incubation in the City of Hamilton

2014  Lecture, A Scot’s Nirvana, Homer Watson House and Gallery
CURRICULUM VITAE

Rachel Redshaw, MA, H.E. Dipl.

2013    Lecture, The Virtual Voice of the Past: The Use of Online Oral Accounts for a Holistic Understanding of History, University of Guelph Spring Colloquium

2012-2013    Gaelic Events Facilitator, University of Guelph

2012-2015    Intermediate Gaelic Facilitator, St. Michael’s College, University of Toronto


2012    Waterloo Historical Society Publication, Harvesting Bees and Feasting Tables: Fit for the Men, Women and Children of Dickie Settlement and Area, Township of North Dumfries

2007-2012    25 historical publications in the Ayr News (access to some articles http://ayrnews.ca/recent)

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT COURSES

2020    Condo Director Training Certificate (CAO)

2018    Building Officials and the Law (OBOA Course)

2017-2018    AMCTO Training (MAP 1)

2017    AODA Training

2010    Irish Archaeological Field School Certificate

COMPUTER SKILLS

- Microsoft Word Office
- Bluebeam Revu 2017
- ArcGIS
- Keystone (PRINSYS)
- Municipal Connect
- Adobe Photoshop
- Illustrator
- ABBYY Fine Reader 11
- Book Drive
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SELECT PROJECT EXPERIENCE 2018-2020

CULTURAL HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENTS

- Peterborough Lift Lock and Trent-Severn Waterway (TSW), National Historic Sites, Development for 380 Armour Road, City of Peterborough
- City of Waterloo Former Post Office, Development for 35-41 King Street North, City of Waterloo, Phase II
- Consumers’ Gas Station B, Development for 450 Eastern Avenue, City of Toronto
- 82 Weber Street East, City of Kitchener
- 87 Scott Street, City of Kitchener
- 2348 Sovereign Street, Town of Oakville (Phase I)
- Carriage House Restaurant, 2107-2119 Old Lakeshore Road, City of Burlington
- 34 Manley Street, Village of Ayr, Township of North Dumfries
- Quinte’s Isle Campark, 558 Welbanks Road, Prince Edward County (LPAT)
- 174 St. Paul Street, Town of Collingwood (LPAT)
- 30-40 Margaret Avenue, City of Kitchener
- McDougall Cottage and Historic Site, Development for 93 Grand Avenue South, City of Kitchener
- 60 Broadway, Town of Orangeville
- 45 Duke Street, City of Kitchener
- 383-385 Pearl Street, City of Burlington
- Old Kent Brewery, 197 Ann Street, City of London
- St. Patrick’s Catholic Elementary School, (SPCES), 20 East Avenue South, City of Hamilton
- 2325 Sunningdale Road, City of London
- 250 Allendale Road, City of Cambridge
- 110 Deane Avenue, Town of Oakville
- 249 Clarence Street, City of Vaughan
- 2-16 Queen Street West, City of Cambridge (Hespeler)

Specific for Relocation of Heritage Buildings

- 1395 Main Street, City of Kitchener
- 10379 & 10411 Kennedy Road, City of Markham
- 50-56 Weber Street West & 107 Young Street, City of Kitchener (temporary relocation of 107 Young St)
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CULTURAL HERITAGE SCREENING REPORT
· Kelso Conservation Area, Halton County

CULTURAL HERITAGE EVALUATION REPORTS
· 52 King Street North, City of Kitchener
· Sarnia Collegiate Institute and Technical School (SCITS), 275 Wellington, City of Sarnia (Municipal contingency study)
· 10536 McCowan Road, City of Markham
· Former Burns Presbyterian Church, 155 Main Street, Town of Erin (Designation Report)
· Former St. Paul’s Anglican Church, 23 Dover Street, Town of Otterville, Norwich Township (CRB)
· 6170 Fallsview Boulevard, City of Niagara Falls

CONSERVATION PLANS
· City of Waterloo Former Post Office, 35-41 King Street North, City of Waterloo
· 82 Weber Street East, City of Kitchener
· 87 Scott Street, City of Kitchener
· 107 Young Street, City of Kitchener (Temporary relocation)
· 1395 Main Street, City of Kitchener (Relocation)
· 10379 & 10411 Kennedy Road, City of Markham (Relocation)

Cultural Heritage Conservation Protection Plans (Temporary protection for heritage building during construction)
· 12 & 54 Margaret Avenue, City of Kitchener
· 45 Duke Street, City of Kitchener
· 82 Weber Street West and 87 Scott Street, City of Kitchener

DOCUMENTATION AND SALVAGE REPORTS
· 57 Lakeport Road City of St. Catharines
· Gaslight District, 64 Grand Avenue South, City of Cambridge
· 242-262 Queen Street South, City of Kitchener (Photographic Documentation Report)
· 721 Franklin Boulevard, City of Cambridge

HERITAGE PERMIT APPLICATIONS
· 35-41 King Street North, City of Waterloo (Old Post Office), Phase II (alteration to building with a municipal heritage easement, Section 37, OHA)
CURRICULUM VITAE

Rachel Redshaw, MA, H.E. Dipl.

- 50-56 Weber Street West & 107 Young Street, City of Kitchener (demolition and new construction within HCD)
- 30-40 Margaret Avenue, City of Kitchener (new construction within HCD)
- 249 Clarence Street, City of Vaughan (alteration within HCD)
- 174 St. Paul Street, Town of Collingwood (demolition within HCD)

MASTER PLANS/ HERITAGE CHARACTER STUDY

- Elgin, Central and Memorial Neighbourhoods, Municipality of Clarington