Cambridge Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee
No. 05 – 21

AGENDA

Thursday, May 20, 2021
7:30 p.m. via Zoom

Meeting Called to Order

Disclosure of Interest

Presentations

Delegations:

Approval of April 15, 2021 Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee Minutes PP 004

THAT the Minutes of the April 15, 2021 meeting of the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee be considered for errors and omissions and be adopted.

Agenda Items:

1. River Road Secondary Plan and Servicing Agreement – Heritage Considerations PP 010

THAT the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee recommends Memo 3/2021 be received as information.

2. 16 Byng Avenue Heritage Impact Assessment PP 012

THAT Report 21-014 (MHAC) – 16 Byng Avenue Heritage Impact Assessment – be received;

AND THAT the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC) accept the Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) and its findings as submitted by Letourneau

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.
Heritage Consulting dated April 8, 2021 for the construction an addition to the dwelling on the listed property at 16 Byng Avenue;

AND FURTHER THAT the MHAC recommends to the Committee of Adjustment that:

1. The roofing material and colour of the addition should be both compatible and subordinate to the extant roof.
2. Removal of the original wooden posts supporting the wrap around covered porch be avoided. If this is not possible, it is recommended that the posts be retained and reused to replace missing posts along the south elevation.
3. Qualified professionals with experience working on heritage masonry and carpentry should plan and undertake the work directly involving the extant dwelling and its heritage attributes.
4. A Temporary Protection Plan be prepared to the satisfaction of the City’s Senior Planner Heritage prior to the issuance of a building permit to demonstrate how the extant dwelling and its heritage attributes will be protected through ongoing construction including a plan for site access, delivery, and staging of materials and machinery as well as a fire and security plan.

3. Request to Alter – 28 Fallbrook Lane

THAT Report 21-012 (MHAC) – Request to Alter – 28 Fallbrook Lane – be received;

AND THAT the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC) recommend Council approve the alterations to renovate 28 Fallbrook Lane as outlined in Report 21-012 (MHAC);

AND THAT MHAC accept the Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) and its findings as prepared by Robinson Heritage Consulting dated February 2021.

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: June 17, 2021, at 7 p.m.
Via Zoom

Close of Meeting

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

Distribution:

MINUTES
Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee
Meeting #04 - 21
April 15, 2021
Virtually via Zoom
7:30 p.m.

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

Regrets: Nancy Woodman

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

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 7:30 p.m. and the meeting adjourned at 8:46 p.m.

Declarations of Interest - NIL

Presentation:

Delegations:

It was noted the delegates attending this evening’s meeting were primarily present to answer the questions of the Committee regarding their applications.

Dale Wideman, Project Coordinator, WRDSB and Ed Schuck, Project Coordinator, VG Architects were present to answer questions of the Committee regarding the Request to Alter a Part IV Designated Property – 200 Water Street North (Galt Collegiate Institute).

Greg Mosiadz, Owner and Sev Palazov, Architect, were present to answer questions of the Committee regarding the Request to Alter a Part V Designated Property – 29 Main Street. There were no questions from the Committee.

Terry Polyak, Owner and Jesse French, Architect, Martin Simmons, were present to answer questions of the Committee regarding the Request to Alter a Part V Designated Property – 15 Main Street.

ECM\Planning Services\Committees\MHAC\MHAC Agendas and Minutes\Minutes\2021 Minutes\04_15_2021 MHAC Minutes 004
Rachel Redshaw, Heritage Planner, MHBC Planning was present to answer questions of the Committee regarding the 234 Eagle Street South Heritage Impact Assessment. She noted the proposed building is consistent with the neighbourhood and is not designated Part IV or Part V; therefore she requested, on behalf of the owner, that recommendations three to five be eliminated. The Committee thanked Ms. Redshaw for the thorough HIA and for noting the importance of the tin ceiling tiles. The Committee confirmed with Staff that the recommendations will go to the Committee of Adjustment and that the delegate will have an opportunity to speak to the items there.

**Minutes of Previous Meeting**

Moved by: Councillor Wolf
Seconded by: Michelle Goodridge

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

CARRIED

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

Moved by: Nelson Cecilia
Seconded by: Kimberly Livingstone

The Committee noted they are happy to see the boards covering the original openings will be gone and replaced with new windows.

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.

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

Moved by: John Oldfield
Seconded by: Scott Roberts

**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).

CARRIED

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

Moved by: Councillor Wolf
Seconded by: John Oldfield

The Committee noted they are pleased to see the building being restored and that adaptive reuse work will bring more tenants and shoppers to the Galt Core area.

**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.

CARRIED

4. 234 Eagle Street South Heritage Impact Assessment

Moved by: Kimberly Livingstone
Seconded by: John Oldfield

The Committee discussed the thoroughness of the HIA, the request by the delegate to eliminate the third, fourth and fifth recommendations and that the recommendations were based upon the findings within the HIA.

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.

After a fulsome discussion, an amendment was proposed.

Moved by: Councillor Wolf
Seconded by: Michelle Goodridge

AND THAT the MHAC recommends to the Committee of Adjustment that the colour palette be a neutral colour from a heritage palette.

CARRIED AS AMENDED

Correspondence - NIL

Other Business – NIL

Chair's Comments:

John Oldfield noted he has no comments specifically; only that he hopes everyone is careful and vigilant to stay safe as the Covid variants are spreading.

Council Report/ Comments:

Councillor Wolf echoed the Chair’s comments and added that she is pleased that Council passed the heritage grant requests at the last meeting.

Staff/Senior Planner- Heritage comments:

Abraham Plunkett- Latimer advised an informal public meeting on the Galt Core HCD study was held on April 12th and another is planned for April 20th to allow for any public engagement. He invited Committee members to reach out to community members that would be interested in contributing.

Laura Waldie did not have any comments this month.

General Heritage Matters – Updates by Committee Members:

Amy Barnes noted there are many interesting workshops and information sessions available at this time of year and she is happy to share the links for these.
Next Meeting

Date & Time: May 20, 2021, 7:00 p.m.
Location: Virtually via Zoom

Close of Meeting

Moved by: John Oldfield
Seconded by: Michelle Goodridge

THAT the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee meeting does now adjourn at 8:46 p.m.

CARRIED
The purpose of this memorandum is to provide a summary of the draft River Road secondary plan, zoning and servicing agreement study with reference to heritage considerations that have been identified and to provide some next steps.

In recent years the River Road neighbourhood has seen growth pressure through infill redevelopment of existing large residential lots. The City’s Official Plan identifies the area for urban development; however, the area is predominantly rural with limited municipal infrastructure to support the development permitted by the Official Plan.

Through the consultation process on site specific development applications, the City has heard concerns that new infill development needs to be considerate of the surrounding rural and lower density character and that the infrastructure (sanitary services, transportation etc.) needs to be properly planned to accommodate new growth.

In response to these concerns, the City enacted an interim control by-law in 2019 which was extended in 2020 until June 18, 2021. The purpose of the interim control by-law is to put a temporary freeze on development permissions within this area for the completion of a land use and servicing study (hereinafter referred to as the Study). The City then retained Fotenn Planning + Design, and a team of subconsultants, to complete the River Road Secondary Plan and Servicing Agreement Study.

A Cultural Heritage Resource Assessment was prepared by ASI, on behalf of Fotenn Planning + Design, as part of the secondary plan study. This assessed properties within the study area and identified properties that have potential cultural heritage value. The assessment recommends the following:

- The City of Cambridge should evaluate all properties identified as having potential cultural heritage resources under Ontario Regulation 9/06 and the
City’s Cultural Heritage Value Criteria to ensure that all potential heritage resources that merit designation are conserved.

- If the City is unable to evaluate potential heritage resources, any planning application on or adjacent to an identified heritage resource or any demolition should require a heritage impact assessment.

- River Rd. merits recognition as a City of Cambridge Scenic Heritage Road and as a potential cultural heritage landscape (CHL) under the Region of Waterloo’s evaluation criteria. This would require further evaluation and the Heritage report includes a proposed boundary which includes all properties within the secondary plan study area that have frontage on River Road.

Based on feedback received through the study process, the consultant has prepared draft secondary plan policies and zoning by-law regulations for this area. These policies are under review and subject to change based on feedback received and the finalization of technical studies. Because of the volume of these studies, they have not been included as attachment to this memorandum. However, these studies can be accessed on the City’s website at: https://www.cambridge.ca/en/build-invest-grow/current-development-applications.aspx# under River Road neighbourhood secondary plan, zoning and servicing study.

The draft secondary plan and technical studies were presented to Council during a statutory public meeting under the Planning Act held virtually on April 27, 2021. As a result of the public meeting, members of the River Road Secondary Plan Study Working Group, consisting of the Ward Councillor, area residents and City staff met to discuss possible next steps regarding protecting the area as a Cultural Heritage Landscape as referenced in the ASI cultural heritage resources assessment. Staff will provide some next steps to Council regarding pursuing a Cultural Heritage Landscape Technical Study for the River Road area in the recommendation report for the River road secondary plan study which has been tentatively scheduled for June 27, 2021. The members of MHAC will be notified when this report will be posted to the City’s Council agenda webpage.
RECOMMENDATIONS

THAT Report 21-014 (MHAC) – 16 Byng Avenue Heritage Impact Assessment – be received;

AND THAT the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC) accept the Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) and its findings as submitted by Letourneau Heritage Consulting dated April 8, 2021 for the construction an addition to the dwelling on the listed property at 16 Byng Avenue;

AND FURTHER THAT the MHAC recommends to the Committee of Adjustment that:

1. The roofing material and colour of the addition should be both compatible and subordinate to the extant roof.
2. Removal of the original wooden posts supporting the wrap around covered porch be avoided. If this is not possible, it is recommended that the posts be retained and reused to replace missing posts along the south elevation.
3. Qualified professionals with experience working on heritage masonry and carpentry should plan and undertake the work directly involving the extant dwelling and its heritage attributes.
4. A Temporary Protection Plan be prepared to the satisfaction of the City’s Senior Planner Heritage prior to the issuance of a building permit to demonstrate how the extant dwelling and its heritage attributes will be protected through ongoing construction including a plan for site access, delivery, and staging of materials and machinery as well as a fire and security plan.

SUMMARY

- The property located at 16 Byng Avenue is listed on the City’s Heritage Properties Register. It is not designated under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act.
- The property is also located within the Dickson Hill Heritage Conservation District (HCD). However, the guidelines in the HCD Plan are not applicable to the subject property as the HCD Plan only regulates city-owned properties.
- A Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) was submitted to the City to support a minor variance application.
- The owner wishes to construct a rear addition.
- The dwelling on the subject property was constructed c.1830 and is associated with William Dickson Sr. who is credited with founding the Village of Galt and his son William Dickson Jr. who inherited a large tract of land from his father and was a prominent member of the early community in Galt.

BACKGROUND

The subject property is listed on the City of Cambridge’s Heritage Properties Register (Figure 1). The subject property is also within the Dickson Hill Heritage Conservation District (HCD), however, as this HCD only regulates city-owned land, the policies are not applicable to 16 Byng Avenue. The subject property consists of a one-and-a-half storey limestone Regency style dwelling constructed c. 1830 on behalf of William Dickson Sr. for his son, William Dickson Jr (Image 1). A Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) completed by Letourneau Heritage Consulting (LHC) dated April 8, 2021 for 16 Byng Avenue was submitted to accompany a minor variance application for the construction of a rear addition (Attachment 1).

The minor variance application (A01/21) will be considered by the Committee of Adjustment on June 7, 2021.
Image 1: View of the front (east) facade of 16 Byng Avenue (Photo courtesy of LHC, 2021).
The requirement for a minor variance application is triggered because the addition will not comply with the required rear yard setback.

A previous HIA completed by LHC dated February 2018 contains the full cultural heritage evaluation under Ontario Regulation 9/06 and the heritage evaluation criteria in policy 4.4 of the Official Plan. The previous HIA was reviewed and accepted by MHAC on April 19, 2018. The current HIA, dated April 8, 2021 builds upon these findings and responds to the proposed rear addition.

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:

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 4.10 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 MHAC for review and its recommendation forwarded to Council for consideration with the proposal; in this case, a minor variance from the zoning for the property 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 and Committee of Adjustment meetings are open to the public.
Internal/External Consultation:
The City’s Senior Heritage Planner was in contact with the City’s Recording Secretary of the Committee of Adjustment to clarify a discrepancy on the elevations provided in the Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment.

Comments/Analysis:
An HIA dated April 8, 2021 prepared by Letourneau Heritage Consulting was submitted to the City on April 8, 2021.

Cultural Heritage Value of the Current Building
The HIA dated April 8, 2021 builds upon a previous HIA completed by LHC in February 2018 for the severance application for the subject property. The previous HIA found that the property does have cultural heritage value or interest and a statement of cultural heritage value or interest was prepared. The Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC) reviewed the previous HIA on April 19, 2018 and accepted its findings.

The property is considered to have cultural heritage value or interest for the one-and-a-half storey limestone dwelling that is a representative example of a Regency style dwelling. In keeping with Regency style, the building has a symmetrical five-bay facade, large window openings, a low hipped roof, a tall chimney, a large verandah and a large central door with transom and sidelights. The property is also considered to have historical/associative value for its direct association with William Dickson Sr., who had the residence built for his son, William Dickson Jr. William Dickson Sr. is credited with founding the Village of Galt and was a large land owner that was instrumental in the commercial development on the west bank of the Grand River. William Dickson Jr. inherited his father’s land holdings and was a prominent member of the community in Galt. Finally, as the property pre-dates the plan of subdivision and the creation of Byng Avenue, it is considered to have contextual value given it was the earliest dwelling in the neighbourhood and shape the layout of the street patterns.

Proposed Development
The property owner is seeking to construct a one-storey addition to the rear of the existing dwelling. The addition’s footprint will be slightly smaller than the existing dwelling and situated behind the southwest corner of the house where it will provide a garage and additional living space. Approximately half the addition will be behind the house and the other half offset to the south. The addition will take advantage of the natural downward slope along the rear of the property that backs onto a laneway and will be connected to the main dwelling through a breezeway across the existing rear porch. The original stone walls under the breezeway will be kept and will become
internal walls. The breezeway will be enclosed on the north and south by a glass plane. The south elevation in the HIA mistakenly demonstrates a door opening where there will be a glass pane. The correct south elevation is in Attachment 2 and does not change the findings of the HIA discussed below.

The addition will have a low hipped roof clad in shingles and the walls will be clad in a combination of stone veneer along the bottom and vertical siding above. The windows in the addition will imitate the windows in the main dwelling and will be a two-over-two sash configuration with muntin barns.

**Assessment of Impact and Mitigation Measures**

The HIA found there will be impacts to some of the identified heritage attributes. Specifically, impacts to the dwelling’s limestone walls were identified as possible given the proposed addition will connect directly to the west elevation via a breezeway. While no impacts were identified to the low pitch of the existing dwelling’s roof, the HIA noted that LHC worked with the property owners to change the pitch of the roofline to a lower pitch to reduce visual impacts to the original roofline. Additionally, the HIA suggests that the colour of the roof on the addition should be compatible with the material of the existing roof and secondary to that of the main residence. Finally, the HIA notes there will be impacts to the wooden posts supporting the wrap around covered porch if they need to be removed to accommodate the breezeway connection.

The HIA considered the following alternative options to minimize impacts to the heritage attributes:

1. **Do Nothing**: This option would leave the property as is.
2. **Construction of the addition**: This option would see the construction of a one-storey rear addition with a medium pitched roof.
3. **Construction of the addition with a modified roof**: This option would see the construction of a one-storey rear addition with a low-pitched roof.

Based on the analysis of options, the HIA recommended Option 3 and the lower pitched roof was incorporated into the proposed design of the addition (see a comparison of the roof pitches on page 66 of Attachment 1). To address additional impacts that could not be addressed in the proposed alternatives, LHC recommends the following mitigation measures:

1. Where the original limestone walls meet the proposed addition, the anchors and joints should be carefully planned and should use compatible materials to avoid direct and irreversible alteration or damage to the masonry. A qualified
professional with demonstrated experience working with limestone masonry should be retained to complete the work.

2) The point of intersection of the old and new roofs should be carefully planned to ensure that water is not permitted to pool along this connection. A qualified professional with demonstrated experience working with heritage structures should be retained.

3) Efforts should be made to avoid the removal of original wooden posts supporting the wrap around covered porch. If this is not possible, post removal should be completed by a qualified professional with heritage carpentry experience and the posts should be retained and reused to replace missing posts along the south elevation.

4) To minimize the potential for unintended impacts during construction, a Temporary Protection Plan (TPP) is recommended. The TPP should provide an overview of the risks that are associated with construction and development activities and provide recommendations to avoid these risks. This will identify an access route for the delivery of materials and machinery, a fire and security plan, and staging location. Copies should be distributed to all contractors on site.

Conclusion

WSP concurs with the findings of the HIA and the recommendations to mitigate the negative impacts resulting from the proposed rear addition. With the understanding that the full evaluation of cultural heritage value or interest was included in a previous HIA completed in 2018 that was accepted by MHAC on April 19, 2018, the current HIA for 16 Byng Avenue satisfies the City of Cambridge’s Detailed Guidelines for the Preparation of Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment Under Policy 4.0 of the City of Cambridge Official Plan (2012).

To build upon the recommendation for the roof material it is also recommended that the roof material not be of the exact same material and colour as the existing roofline, so that there is visual distinction between the two rooflines and the symmetry of the original roofline remains prominent.

For the reasons above, WSP recommends that MHAC accept the HIA and recommend that the Committee of Adjustment include the recommended mitigation measures.
Prepared by:

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

Departmental Approval:

Elaine Brunn Shaw, MCIP, RPP
Chief Planner

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1  Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment: 16 Byng Avenue, Cambridge, ON (LHC, 2021)
Attachment 2  South Elevation, dated May 4, 2021
CULTURAL HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT

16 Byng Avenue, Cambridge, ON

8 April 2021
Project # LHC0238
This page has been left blank deliberately
RIGHT OF USE

The information, recommendations and opinions expressed in this report are for the sole benefit of ‘Owners’. Any other use of this report by others without permission is prohibited and is without responsibility to LHC. The report, all plans, data, drawings and other documents as well as all electronic media prepared by LHC are considered its professional work product and shall remain the copyright property of LHC, who authorizes only the Owners and approved users (including municipal review and approval bodies) to make copies of the report, but only in such quantities as are reasonably necessary for the use of the report by those parties. Unless otherwise stated, the suggestions, recommendations and opinions given in this report are intended only for the guidance of Owners and approved users.

REPORT LIMITATIONS

The qualifications of the heritage consultants who authored this report are provided in Appendix A Qualifications. All comments regarding the condition of any buildings on the Subject Property are based on a superficial visual inspection and are not a structural engineering assessment of the buildings unless directly quoted from an engineering report. The findings of this report do not address any structural or physical condition related issues associated with any buildings on the property or the condition of any heritage attributes.

Concerning historical research, the purpose of this report is to assess potential impacts of the proposed site alteration on the cultural heritage value or interest and heritage attributes of the Subject Property. The authors are fully aware that there may be additional historical information that has not been included. Nevertheless, the information collected, reviewed, and analyzed is sufficient to conduct this assessment. This report reflects the professional opinion of the authors and the requirements of their membership in various professional and licensing bodies.

The review of policy and legislation was limited to that information directly related to cultural heritage management and is not a comprehensive planning review. Additionally, soundscapes, cultural identity, and sense of place analyses were not integrated into this report. Archaeological potential has not been assessed as part of this CHIA.

Due to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, documentation of the interior was not conducted and all photographs are taken from the exterior. For a detailed view and description of the interior, refer to the 2018 CHIA.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Executive Summary only provides key points from the report. The reader should examine the complete report including background, results as well as limitations.

LHC was retained, in January 2021, by Matthew Benoit and Colleen Bracken (the owners) to undertake a Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment (CHIA) for 16 Byng Avenue, Cambridge, Ontario (the Subject Property). The Subject Property is currently listed on the City of Cambridge’s Heritage Register as a non-designated property under Section 27, Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act (OHA).

A CHIA was previously prepared for Subject Property in 2018 to address a proposed severance and demolition of a garage and mudroom (LHC 2018). The 2018 CHIA determined the Subject Property has Cultural Heritage Value or Interest (CHVI) and a Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest was prepared.

The current owners proposed to build an addition to the back of the house and this CHIA has been prepared to provide a critical review of the proposed site alteration from a heritage conservation planning perspective.

This CHIA was completed in accordance with the City of Cambridge Heritage Impact Assessment Guidelines (2012) following best practices and drawing upon applicable frameworks, such as the Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Culture Industries’ (MHSTCI) Ontario Heritage Toolkit: Heritage Property Evaluation. This CHIA also considers the applicable planning framework and identifies if the project complies and/is consistent with the framework. Section 4.10 of the City’s Official Plan outlines requirements regarding Cultural Heritage Impact Assessments.

Several potential adverse impacts were identified with respect to the proposed rear addition; however, with careful planning and mitigation measures in place, these impacts can be lessened or avoided.

The following design considerations are recommended:

- Roofing material and colour should be both compatible with and subordinate to the extant roof.

The following mitigation measures are recommended:

- A qualified professional(s) with experience working on heritage masonry and carpentry should plan and undertake the work directly involving the extant residence and its heritage attributes.
- Anchors and joints should be carefully planned and materials that are compatible with the existing masonry should be selected to avoid direct and irreversible alteration or damage to the masonry.
- Any connection along which the two roofs meet should be planned to ensure that water is not allowed to pool along this connection.
• Every effort should be made to avoid the removal of any decorative wooden porch posts along the rear elevation; however, if this is not possible, the posts should be retained and, reused to replace missing posts along the south elevation.

A temporary protection plan (TPP) may be put in place to allow for consideration of how the stone residence and its heritage attributes will be protected. This TPP should include a plan for site access, delivery, and staging of materials and machinery as well as a fire and security plan.

Should detailed design plans vary significantly from those reviewed in this CHIA, another evaluation for potential adverse impacts is recommended.
**Table of Contents**

**RIGHT OF USE** ........................................ III
**REPORT LIMITATIONS** ................................. III
**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY** ............................... IV

1 **INTRODUCTION** .................................... 1
  1.1 Study Approach ........................................ 1
  1.1.1 Introduction to the Subject Property .......... 2
  1.1.2 Planning, Legal, and Regulatory Framework ... 2
  1.1.3 Background Research and Analysis ............. 2
  1.1.4 Site Visit ............................................ 2
  1.1.5 Evaluation ............................................ 3
  1.1.6 Description of the Site Alteration ............. 3
  1.1.7 Impact of the Project Proposal ................. 3
  1.1.8 Considered Alternatives and Mitigation Strategies 3
  1.1.9 Conclusion and Recommendations ............. 3

2 **INTRODUCTION TO THE SUBJECT PROPERTY** ..... 4
  2.1 Property Location ..................................... 4
  2.2 Heritage Recognition .................................. 4
  2.3 Existing Conditions .................................... 4
  2.4 Adjacent Heritage Properties ...................... 16

3 **POLICY AND LEGISLATION CONTEXT** ........ 29
  3.1 Provincial Context .................................... 29
  3.1.1 Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990 ....................... 29
  3.1.2 Provincial Policy Statement (2020) ............ 29
  3.1.3 Ontario Heritage Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. O.18 .... 30
  3.1.4 Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (2020) 30
  3.2 Region of Waterloo Context ....................... 31
  3.2.1 Regional Official Plan for the Region of Waterloo (2015) 31
  3.2.2 Region of Waterloo Arts, Culture, and Heritage Master Plan (2002) 33
  3.3 City of Cambridge Context ......................... 34
  3.3.1 City of Cambridge Official Plan (2012, consolidated 2018) 34
Figure 4: View north along Byng Avenue ................................................................. 7
Figure 5: View east overlooking the City of Cambridge .............................................. 8
Figure 6: View east, overlooking the City of Cambridge ............................................... 8
Figure 7: View north on Laneway 163 ......................................................................... 9
Figure 8: View south on Laneway 163 ......................................................................... 9
Figure 9: View west of Subject Property (red line, approximate boundary, added by LHC) .......................................................... 10
Figure 10: View west of Subject Property, original entrance of 16 Byng ....................... 10
Figure 11: View west, new driveway on Subject Property ............................................. 11
Figure 12: View west, garage, mudroom, and pool no longer present on Subject Property .......................................................... 11
Figure 13: View north of south elevation where the kitchen and bathroom have been removed ........................................................................ 12
Figure 14: View north of South elevation, evidence of former kitchen and bathroom walls ........................................................................ 12
Figure 15: View north of south elevation, former kitchen and bathroom walls ............... 13
Figure 16: View west of south elevation, new cement porch ........................................ 13
Figure 17: View north of new vinyl window, located on south elevation ....................... 14
Figure 18: Green wooden floor no longer present, west elevation .................................. 14
Figure 19: Changes to the Subject Property Subsequent to the 2018 CHIA ..................... 15
Figure 20: Heritage Properties within 150m of Subject Property ................................... 17
Figure 21: Dickson Hill Heritage Conservation District .................................................. 38
Figure 22: Portrait William Dickson. (Young 1880) ......................................................... 40
Figure 23: Portrait of Absalom Shade (City of Cambridge Archives) .............................. 40
Figure 24: Shade’s Mills (City of Cambridge Archives) .................................................. 40
Figure 25: Galt & Preston Street Railway 23 and several prominent citizens, including David Spiers, Hugh McCullock, and Martin Todd .................................................................. 42
Figure 26: Late nineteenth century Galt – Main Street looking East. Picturesque and Industrious Galt (Galt: Jaffray Brothers 1902) ................................. 43
Figure 27: Photograph of Florence Augusta Dickson. City of Cambridge Archives ........ 45
Figure 28: Subject Property overlaid historic maps .......................................................... 48
Figure 29: Birds-eye maps of Subject Property ............................................................... 49
Figure 30: 1919 aerial photo of Subject Property ............................................................ 50
Figure 31: Subject Property shown on historic maps ....................................................... 51
Figure 32: Dickson’s Hill residents’ occupations reflecting social geography north and south of Gladstone. Hagopian (1999), 33. ........................................................................ 52
Figure 33: Proposed addition, east elevation ................................................................. 56
Figure 34: Proposed addition, north elevation .............................................................. 56
Figure 35: Proposed addition, south elevation ............................................................... 58
Figure 36: Proposed addition, west elevation ............................................................... 59
Figure 37: Proposed addition, floorplan ...................................................................... 60
Figure 38: Comparison of roof pitch. Option 2 (top) and Option 3 (bottom) ................. 66

Tables

Table 1: Adjacent heritage properties ........................................................................... 18
Table 2: Potential Impacts from Alteration ................................................................. 61
1 INTRODUCTION

In January 2021, LHC was retained by Matthew Benoit and Colleen Bracken (the owners) to undertake a Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment (CHIA) for 16 Byng Avenue, Cambridge, Ontario (the Subject Property). The Subject Property is currently listed on the City of Cambridge’s Heritage Register as a non-designated property under Section 27, Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act (OHA). The City of Cambridge Heritage Properties Register is a Council endorsed Register which notes that listed properties “yield some cultural heritage value for possible future designation”. The property is also located within the Dickson Hill Heritage Conservation District. The policies established in the Dickson Hill Heritage Conservation District Plan for City Owned Lands apply only to City-owned lands.

A CHIA was previously prepared for the Subject Property in 2018 to address a proposed severance and demolition application:


The 2018 CHIA included an evaluation of the Subject Property against the criteria outlined in Ontario Regulation 9/06: Criteria for Determining the Cultural Heritage Value or Interest (O. Reg. 9/06) under the Ontario Heritage Act (OHA). A Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest (SCHVI) was prepared, and a list of heritage attributes was identified.

This CHIA builds on the background analysis undertaken as part of the 2018 CHIA and provides an updated impact assessment of the new proposed addition located to the rear of the stone residence.

The objective of a CHIA is to provide a critical review of a proposed development or site alteration from a heritage conservation planning perspective. This CHIA will also consider the applicable planning framework and identify if the project complies and/is consistent with the framework. Section 4.10 of the City’s Official Plan outlines requirements regarding Cultural Heritage Impact Assessments.

This CHIA was completed in accordance with the City of Cambridge Heritage Impact Assessment Guidelines (2012) following best practices and drawing upon applicable frameworks, such as the Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Culture Industries’ (MHSTCI) Ontario Heritage Toolkit.

1.1 Study Approach

LHC completed this CHIA following the City of Cambridge’s Detailed Guidelines for the Preparation of Cultural Heritage Impact Assessments under Policy 4.10 of the City of Cambridge Official Plan and the City of Cambridge Heritage Impact Assessment Guidelines (2012). The following outlines how this report addressed the City of Cambridge’s requirements for the...
preparation of CHIAs. LHC has also included a review of provincial and local legislation in Section 4 and has considered this information in its review of the proposal.

### 1.1.1 Introduction to the Subject Property

Section 2 provides a basic overview of the property, including a plan of the existing conditions, area/size, general topography and physical description, and a description of the cultural heritage resources on the Subject Property. The Subject Property is clearly and precisely defined using the municipal address and legal description. The physical context of the property, including its immediate neighbourhood, adjacent properties, adjacent heritage interests, and physical features is described. As part of the 2018 CHIA, an evaluation was undertaken and a Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest and list of heritage attributes was prepared. Section 5 provides an Understanding of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest based on this previous work. This addresses 4.10 (1)(a) of the OP.

Visual documentation to address 4.10 (1)(b) of the OP is presented in the 2018 CHIA³ and in Section 2 of this document.

### 1.1.2 Planning, Legal, and Regulatory Framework

A review of applicable legislation and policy is provided in Section 3 of this report. In addition to the municipal policies/bylaws, the analysis also considered regional and provincial legislation/policy. This review does not address all policies/legislation, but instead focuses on applicable policies/legislation as they apply to heritage conservation. This was done to ensure the heritage planning and policy requirements are clear, to determine if any of these documents specifically identifies any cultural heritage resources, and finally to ensure that the project will not violate any heritage planning requirements.

### 1.1.3 Background Research and Analysis

Section 4 of this report is a review of the historical background of the surrounding area, the property and associated building. This review is reproduced from the 2018 CHIA and was undertaken using available archival materials. This included: historical atlases, historical maps, census records, land registry documents, city directories, historical photographs, and textual materials.

### 1.1.4 Site Visit

In the MHSTCI’s guide *Heritage Property Evaluation, Chapter 3: The Importance of Research and Site Visit* notes that a property should be evaluated at least twice.

A site visit was undertaken by Cultural Heritage Specialist, Colin Yu on 28 January 2021. This site visit was deemed sufficient to understand and document changes to the property since the 2018 CHIA and, taking into consideration COVID-19 recommendations at the time of writing, a second site visit was not undertaken.

---

³ As-built drawings were not prepared as part of this CHIA. Measured drawings are included in Appendix B of the 2018 CHIA.
1.1.5 Evaluation

An evaluation of the built heritage resource has been carried out in accordance with Ontario Regulation 9/06 of the Ontario Heritage Act and the City of Cambridge Heritage Evaluation Criteria in Policy 4.4 of the OP. The evaluation was completed in 2018 and the results are presented in Section 5 of this document.

1.1.6 Description of the Site Alteration

A description of the proposed changes to the property is outlined in Section 6.

1.1.7 Impact of the Project Proposal

As defined by MHSTCI policies and City of Cambridge Heritage Impact Assessment Guidelines (2012), impacts of the proposed alterations of the property are described in Section 7. This section addresses Policy 4.10 (1)(c) of the OP.

1.1.8 Considered Alternatives and Mitigation Strategies

The report has provided a detailed discussion and description of alternative conservation options that have been considered for the Subject Property as well as which option is chosen and why. Section 9 lists Alternatives to the Proposal and Section 10 of this report outlines Mitigation Measures. This section addresses Policy 4.10 (1)(d), (e), and (f) of the OP.

1.1.9 Conclusion and Recommendations

The report provides recommendations and considerations for work on the property going forward in Section 10.
2 INTRODUCTION TO THE SUBJECT PROPERTY

2.1 Property Location

The Subject Property at 16 Byng Avenue is located in Ward 5, in the City of Cambridge (Figure 1). The legal address description is Plan 291 Pt Lot 19 RP 58R20441, Part 1 IRREG 25742.75SF 111.33FR D. The Subject Property is located on the west side of the street; Byng Avenue runs in a north-south direction. The Subject Property is found east of Lansdowne Road South, west of George Street North (on the upper plateau), and north of St. Andrews Street. Laneway 163 is located directly west of the stone residence.

2.2 Heritage Recognition

The Subject Property is listed in the City of Cambridge Heritage Properties Register.

2.3 Existing Conditions

The Subject Property falls within the Dickson Hill Heritage Conservation District (HCD). The Dickson Hill HCD Plan provides heritage conservation strategies for City-owned public spaces. This includes policies for conserving public spaces, street trees, streetlights, signage, and public parking areas. Byng Avenue is a two-way dead-end street with curbed sides and a sidewalk along the west side only (Figure 3 and Figure 4); there are no streetlights on the west side and large streetlights on the east side. The ‘globe’ style streetlights outlined as a distinctive feature in the Dickson Hill HCD are not present on Byng Avenue. The Subject Property overlooks St. Andrews Park towards the Grand River and City of Cambridge (Figure 5 and Figure 6).

The Subject Property has a one-and-a-half-storey stone residence and one-storey shed (Figure 2). The structures on the Subject Property have a large setback from Byng Street with a large front lawn. There are several mature trees located on the western and northern limits of the property. Access onto the Subject Property is via Byng Avenue and Laneway 163 located to the rear (Figure 7 and Figure 8). Detached one-storey garages, situated at the backs of surrounding properties, are found along Laneway 163.

The property is currently zoned as R4-Low Density Residential.

A site visit on 28 January 2021 was conducted by Colin Yu in order to document the current conditions and whether alterations were made to the current Subject Property. For a complete description of the interior and exterior, as observed in 2018, refer to the 2018 CHIA.

The following changes were documented in 2021 (Figure 19):

- Severance of lot (Figure 9 and Figure 10);
- New driveway with roundabout (Figure 11);
- Demolition of garage and mudroom (Figure 12);
- Demolition of south elevation kitchen and bathroom addition (Figure 13 and Figure 14);
- Porch, constructed of cement extends south elevation porch (Figure 15 and Figure 16);
- Addition of two new vinyl windows on south elevation (Figure 17);
- Green wooden floor, transition between pool room and main residence removed (Figure 18).

As-built elevations are provided in Appendix C.
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Figure 3: View south along Byng Avenue

Figure 4: View north along Byng Avenue
Figure 5: View east overlooking the City of Cambridge

Figure 6: View east, overlooking the City of Cambridge
Figure 7: View north on Laneway 163

Figure 8: View south on Laneway 163
Figure 9: View west of Subject Property (red line, approximate boundary, added by LHC)

Figure 10: View west of Subject Property, original entrance of 16 Byng
Figure 11: View west, new driveway on Subject Property

Figure 12: View west, garage, mudroom, and pool no longer present on Subject Property
Figure 13: View north of south elevation where the kitchen and bathroom have been removed

Figure 14: View north of South elevation, evidence of former kitchen and bathroom walls
Figure 15: View north of south elevation, former kitchen and bathroom walls

Figure 16: View west of south elevation, new cement porch
Figure 17: View north of new vinyl window, located on south elevation

Figure 18: Green wooden floor no longer present, west elevation
Figure 19: Changes to the Subject Property Subsequent to the 2018 CHIA.
2.4 Adjacent Heritage Properties

The City of Cambridge Official Plan defines adjacent as ‘those lands contiguous to a cultural heritage resource’. According to the City of Cambridge Heritage Properties Register (last updated August 2020), there are no Section 27 listed or Section 29, Part IV “designated” properties adjacent to 16 Byng Avenue. The City-owned public spaces (Byng Avenue) are contiguous to the property and are designated under Part V of the OHA under the Dickson Hill Heritage Conservation District.

As per Section 3 of the Heritage Impact Assessment Guidelines, there are several properties located in the general area (150 meters from the subject property) listed on the City of Cambridge Heritage Properties Register or designated under Part IV of the OHA. Figure 20 shows their location in relation to 16 Byng Avenue and demonstrates that none of these properties are considered adjacent. Table 1 provides further details.
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### Table 1: Adjacent heritage properties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Heritage Recognition</th>
<th>Reasons for Designation or Listing⁴</th>
<th>Image (all images sourced from Google Earth)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15-17 Salisbury Avenue</td>
<td>Listed on the City of Cambridge Properties Register</td>
<td>Francis Black House, double semi-detached, Gothic Revival, one-and-a-half-storey, limestone, central gable with arched window. Constructed 1863.</td>
<td><img src="image_url" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Salisbury Avenue</td>
<td>Listed on the City of Cambridge Properties Register</td>
<td>Two-storey stone house.</td>
<td><img src="image_url" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⁴ Information provided are found in the City of Cambridge Heritage Register
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Heritage Recognition</th>
<th>Reasons for Designation or Listing</th>
<th>Image (all images sourced from Google Earth)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33 Salisbury Avenue</td>
<td>Listed on the City of Cambridge Properties Register</td>
<td>Constructed of red brick in the Georgian Revival style. One of the early owners was Walter McCormick, owner of Riverside Silkmills located on Melville Street. Constructed in 1928.</td>
<td><img src="image1.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 Salisbury Avenue (previously 2 Crescent Place)</td>
<td>Designated under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act (By-Law 47-97)</td>
<td>The house, constructed in 1888, is an excellent example of the Queen Anne style of architecture which is characterized by an irregular silhouette, consisting of towers, broad gables or pediments, projecting two storey bays, multi-sloped roof and tall decorated chimneys. While there are other examples of the Queen Anne style on Dickson Hill, this is unique to the area because it is constructed of Limestone. The limestone itself is heavily fossilized.</td>
<td><img src="image2.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Heritage Recognition</td>
<td>Reasons for Designation or Listing</td>
<td>Image (all images sourced from Google Earth)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Byng Avenue</td>
<td>Designated under part IV of the OHA (By-law 214-97)</td>
<td>The residence is described by local Architect, C. Ross Anderson, as a well-preserved example of a cottage style, stuccoed frame dwelling from the early 20th century with many finishes and most details being intact. The residence is located in an area of the City commonly referred to as &quot;Dickson Hill&quot;. The residence, believed to have been constructed in 1930, was first owned by Edith Perry and stayed in the Perry family until 1964. Windows and doors throughout the residence are original and operational. All have original hardware.</td>
<td><img src="image1.jpg" alt="Image of 10 Byng Avenue" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Lansdowne Road North</td>
<td>Listed on the City of Cambridge Properties Register</td>
<td>Italianate red brick residence.</td>
<td><img src="image2.jpg" alt="Image of 1 Lansdowne Road North" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Heritage Recognition</td>
<td>Reasons for Designation or Listing</td>
<td>Image (all images sourced from Google Earth)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Lansdowne Road North</td>
<td>Listed on the City of Cambridge Properties Register</td>
<td>House built by Robert Struthers, Classical Revival style.</td>
<td><img src="image1.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Lansdowne Road North</td>
<td>Listed on the City of Cambridge Properties Register</td>
<td>Mellish House, Romanesque Revival, red brick, 2½ storeys, oriel window, date on turret with top floor porch with conical roof.</td>
<td><img src="image2.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Heritage Recognition</td>
<td>Reasons for Designation or Listing⁴</td>
<td>Image (all images sourced from Google Earth)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Lansdowne Road South</td>
<td>Listed on the City of Cambridge Properties Register</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Lansdowne Road South</td>
<td>Listed on the City of Cambridge Properties Register</td>
<td>None</td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Heritage Recognition</td>
<td>Reasons for Designation or Listing</td>
<td>Image (all images sourced from Google Earth)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Lansdowne Road South</td>
<td>Listed on the City of Cambridge Properties Register</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td><img src="image1.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 Lansdowne Road South - St. Andrews Park</td>
<td>Designated under Part IV of the OHA (By-law 95-84) Designated under Part V of the OHA as part of the Dickson Hill HCD (By-law 150-05)</td>
<td>The Pioneer Pergola is designated as being of historical significance because it incorporates a collection of gravestones of some of the earliest settlers of the Town of Galt. Built for that purpose by the Waterloo Chapter of the Imperial Order of Daughters of the Empire in 1907, it is the only monument to the pioneers which exists in the former City of Galt. The names and dates of birth and death of 207 people are recorded in this small structure.</td>
<td><img src="image2.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Heritage Recognition</td>
<td>Reasons for Designation or Listing</td>
<td>Image (all images sourced from Google Earth)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 Lansdowne Road South</td>
<td>Designated under Part IV of the OHA (By-law 9-17)</td>
<td>This residence was constructed in 1906 of buff coloured brick in a vernacular expression of the Italianate and Queen Anne styles. True to the Queen Anne architecture style, 50 Lansdowne Road South is an L-shaped, two storey house with a simple hipped roof. The structure sits on a grey, quarry-faced, broken course limestone foundation. The main construction materials are stretcher-laid yellow brick which form voussoirs over most of the doors and windows on the structure, including the basement level windows. The front façade has a half porch with a mansard style roof that supports a second-floor balcony deck. The front porch also has two large turned, wooden support columns. The property at 50 Lansdowne Road South is believed to have been constructed shortly after the street was surveyed in 1906 by Florence Dickson who, at one point, owned much of the land that now makes up the area of Dickson Hill in west Galt. George Last, a machinist with the Goldie and McCulloch Company Limited, bought this lot from Florence Dickson for $200 in August 1906 and constructed the house.</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Image of 50 Lansdowne Road South" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Heritage Recognition</td>
<td>Reasons for Designation or Listing</td>
<td>Image (all images sourced from Google Earth)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-12 St. Andrews Street</td>
<td>Listed on City of Cambridge Heritage Property Register</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td>![Image 1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 St. Andrews Street</td>
<td>Listed on City of Cambridge Heritage Property Register</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td>![Image 2]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Heritage Recognition</td>
<td>Reasons for Designation or Listing</td>
<td>Image (all images sourced from Google Earth)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-18 St. Andrews Street</td>
<td>Listed on City of Cambridge Heritage Property Register</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td><img src="https://via.placeholder.com/150" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58-76 St. Andrews Street – St. Andrews Terrace (58, 60, 62, 64, 66, 68, 70, 72, 74, 76 St. Andrews Street)</td>
<td>Designated under part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act (By-law 12-89)</td>
<td>Historical Value of Interest</td>
<td><img src="https://via.placeholder.com/150" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• it dates from an early period in the development of the City's communities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• it is a well-preserved example and illustration of the City's social and economic development history</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Architectural Value or Interest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• it is a good, well preserved and representative example of its architectural style or period of building</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• it makes an important contribution to the urban composition or streetscape of which if forms part of.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Heritage Recognition</td>
<td>Reasons for Designation or Listing</td>
<td>Image (all images sourced from Google Earth)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 65 St. Andrews Street – Dickson Public School | Designated under part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act (By-law 17-83)                   | This building is prominently sited overlooking the river valley and south end of Cambridge. It is an outstanding example of 19th century stone school and public building in the Italianate style with vernacular Scottish Georgian features.  
  
  Built in 1876-77 of coursed local limestone with rock-faced limestone quoins, the building is symmetrical in window placement and is noted for its projecting stone porch, projecting front is pieces on three sides, all with triangular pediments, and octagonal belfry.  
  
  Dickson School was the first public school on the west side of Galt and bears the name of the town's founding family. | ![Image](image_url) |
<p>| 5-7 George Street South                      | Listed on City of Cambridge Heritage Property Register                                | None.                                                                                              | <img src="image_url" alt="Image" /> |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Heritage Recognition</th>
<th>Reasons for Designation or Listing⁴</th>
<th>Image (all images sourced from Google Earth)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9 Brant Road South</td>
<td>Listed on City of Cambridge Heritage Property Register</td>
<td>Constructed by local architect Ray Hall for Frank Landreth. The house is constructed of sandstone in a vernacular expression of the Tudor Revival style. Distinctive features include topped voussoirs over the casement windows, leaded glass in the sidelights and transom and steeply pitched rooflines.</td>
<td><img src="image-url" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3 POLICY AND LEGISLATION CONTEXT

3.1 Provincial Context

In Ontario, cultural heritage is considered a matter of provincial interest and cultural heritage resources are managed under Provincial legislation, policy, regulations, and guidelines. Cultural heritage is established as a key provincial interest directly through the provisions of the Planning Act, the Ontario Heritage Act (OHA), the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS), and A Place to Grow: Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (the Growth Plan). Other provincial legislation deals with cultural heritage indirectly or in specific cases. These various acts and the policies under these acts indicate broad support for the protection of cultural heritage by the Province. They also provide a legal framework through which minimum standards for heritage evaluation are established. What follows is an analysis of the applicable legislation and policy regarding the identification and evaluation of cultural heritage.

3.1.1 Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990

The Planning Act is the primary document for municipal and provincial land use planning in Ontario. This Act sets the context for provincial interest in heritage. It states under Part I (2, d):

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…the conservation of features of significant architectural, cultural, historical, archaeological or scientific interest.5

Details about provincial interest as it relates to land use planning and development in the province are outlined in the PPS which is used under the authority of Part 1 (3).

3.1.2 Provincial Policy Statement (2020)

The PPS is issued under the authority of Section 3 of The Planning Act and provides further direction for municipalities regarding provincial requirements. Land use planning decisions made by municipalities, planning boards, the Province, or a commission or agency of the government must be consistent with the PPS. The PPS makes the consideration of cultural heritage equal to all other considerations in relation to planning and development within the province. The PPS addresses cultural heritage in Sections 1.7.1d and 2.6.

Section 1.7 of the PPS on long-term economic prosperity encourages cultural heritage as a tool for economic prosperity by “encouraging a sense of place, by promoting well-designed built form and cultural planning, and by conserving features that help define character, including built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes” (Section 1.7.1d).

Section 2.6 of the PPS articulates provincial policy regarding cultural heritage and archaeology. Subsections state:

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

2.6.2 Development and site alteration shall not be permitted on lands containing archaeological resources or areas of archaeological potential unless significant archaeological resources have been conserved.

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.

2.6.4 Planning authorities should consider and promote archaeological management plans and cultural plans in conserving cultural heritage and archaeological resources.

2.6.5 Planning authorities shall engage with Indigenous communities and consider their interests when identifying, protecting and managing cultural heritage and archaeological resources.6

3.1.3 Ontario Heritage Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. O.18

The OHA and associated regulations establish the protection of cultural heritage resources as a key consideration in the land-use planning process, set minimum standards for the evaluation of heritage resources in the province, and give municipalities power to identify and conserve individual properties, districts, or landscapes of cultural heritage value or interest. Individual heritage properties are designated by municipalities under Part IV, Section 29 and heritage conservation districts are designated by municipalities under Part V, Section 29 of the OHA. An OHA designation applies to real property rather than individual structures.

O. Reg. 9/06 identifies the criteria for determining cultural heritage value or interest under Section 29 of the OHA and is used to create a Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest. These criteria are used in determining if an individual property has cultural heritage value or interest.

Assessment of a property involves research, site assessment, and evaluation. Results from site visits and historical research are evaluated against the criteria of O. Reg. 9/06. Only one of the criteria must be met for a property to have cultural heritage value or interest. In many cases, multiple criteria are met.

3.1.4 Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (2020)

The City of Cambridge is located within the area regulated by A Place to Grow: Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (the Growth Plan) which came into effect on 16 May 2019. In Section 1.2.1 (Guiding Principles), the Growth Plan states that the policies of the Plan are based on key principles. This includes the following:

Conserve and promote cultural heritage resources to support the social, economic, and cultural well-being of all communities, including First Nations and Métis communities.7

Within Section 4.1 Context, the Growth Plan notes that the area it covers “contains a broad array of important hydrologic and natural heritage features and areas, a vibrant and diverse agricultural land base, irreplaceable cultural heritage resources, and valuable renewable and non-renewable resources” (38). It notes that this also contains important cultural heritage resources. As this Section states:

The GGH also contains important cultural heritage resources that contribute to a sense of identity, support a vibrant tourism industry, and attract investment based on cultural amenities. Accommodating growth can put pressure on these resources through development and site alteration. It is necessary to plan in a way that protects and maximizes the benefits of these resources that make our communities unique and attractive places to live.8

Section 4.2.7 (Cultural Heritage Resources) states:

1. Cultural heritage resources will be conserved in order to foster a sense of place and benefit communities, particularly in strategic growth areas;
2. Municipalities will work with stakeholders, as well as First Nations and Métis communities, in developing and implementing official plan policies and strategies for the identification, wise use and management of cultural heritage resources; and,
3. Municipalities are encouraged to prepare archaeological management plans and municipal cultural plans and consider them in their decision-making.9

Amendment 1 to the Growth Plan (Approved August 28, 2020) aligns the definitions of the Growth Plan with PPS 2020.

3.2 Region of Waterloo Context
3.2.1 Regional Official Plan for the Region of Waterloo (2015)

The Regional Official Plan for the Region of Waterloo (ROP) was approved with Regional Council on June 16, 2009 and approved with modifications by the Ontario Municipal Board on June 18, 2015, when it went into effect.10 The ROP provides goals, objectives, and policies to help guide physical change within the region to 2031.11

---

9 Province of Ontario, “Growth Plan, 2020, 47.
The ROP asserts that land use planning is a shared responsibility between the Region and Area Municipalities rooted in the idea that citizens are best served by effective Regional and Area municipal partnerships and collaboration, including the development and review of official plans.  

All relevant policies related to cultural heritage resources contained within the ROP were reviewed for this report, with key sections and policies provided below for reference.

Section 3.G of the ROP deals with Cultural Heritage, stating that:

The region has a rich and diverse heritage, including distinctive cultures, traditions, festivals, artisans and craftspeople, landmarks, landscapes, properties, structures, burial sites, cemeteries, natural features and archaeological resources. 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.  

Policies regarding CHIA’s including the follow:

3.G.13 Area Municipalities will establish policies in their official plans to require the submission of a Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment in support of a proposed development that includes or is adjacent to a designated property, or includes a non-designated resource of cultural heritage value or interest listed on the Municipal Heritage Register.

3.G.14 Where a Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment required under Policy 3.G.13 relates to a cultural heritage resource of Regional interest, the Area Municipality will ensure that a copy of the assessment is circulated to the Region for review. In this situation, the Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment submitted by the owner/applicant will be completed to the satisfaction of both the Region and the Area Municipality.

3.G.15 Where a development application includes, or is adjacent to, a cultural heritage resource of Regional interest which is not listed on a Municipal Heritage Register, the owner/applicant will be required to submit a Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment to the satisfaction of the Region.

3.G.16 The Region will undertake a Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment and consult with the affected Area Municipality and the Regional Heritage Planning Advisory Committee prior to planning, designing or altering Regional buildings or infrastructure that may affect a cultural heritage resource listed on the region-wide inventory described in Policy 3.G.4. The Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment will be reviewed and approved in accordance with the policies in this Plan.

3.G.17 Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment will include, but not be limited to the following:

(a) historical research, site analysis and evaluation;
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(b) identification of the significance and heritage attributes of the cultural heritage resource;
(c) description of the proposed development or site alteration;
(d) assessment of development or site alteration impacts;
(e) consideration of alternatives, mitigation and conservation methods;
(f) schedule and reporting structure for implementation and monitoring; and
(g) a summary statement and conservation recommendations.

3.G.18 Where a Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment required in this Plan relates to a cultural heritage resource of Regional interest, the conservation recommendations will, wherever feasible, aim to conserve cultural heritage resources intact by:

(a) recognizing and incorporating heritage resources and their surrounding context into the proposed development in a manner that does not compromise or destroy the heritage resource;
(b) protecting and stabilizing built heritage resources that may be underutilized, derelict, or vacant; and
(c) designing development to be physically and visually compatible with, and distinguishable from, the heritage resource.

3.G.19 Where it is not feasible to conserve a cultural heritage resource intact in accordance with Policy 3.G.18, the conservation recommendations will:

(a) promote the reuse or adaptive reuse of the resource, building, or building elements to preserve the resource and the handiwork of past artisans; and
(b) require the owner/applicant to provide measured drawings, a land use history, photographs and other available documentation of the cultural heritage resource in its surrounding context.

3.G.20 Cultural Heritage Impact Assessments may be scoped or waived by the Region or the Area Municipality as applicable.

3.2.2 Region of Waterloo Arts, Culture, and Heritage Master Plan (2002)

The Region of Waterloo Arts, Culture, and Heritage Master Plan (Master Plan) includes recommendations and implementation strategies for identification, protection, promotion, and investment cultural resources in the region. The Master Plan was created as:

Arts, culture, and heritage initiatives make a significant contribution to the well-being and quality of life of the residents of Waterloo Region. They reflect and enhance the community’s unique identity and diversity, contribute to economic vitality, and shape future growth. Accordingly, the Region of Waterloo, alone or in partnership, will identify, protect, promote, and invest in existing resources;
implement strategies to support existing and additional arts, culture, and heritage initiatives; and ensure their long-term prosperity and sustainability.\textsuperscript{14}

The goals of the \textit{Master Plan} are to achieve the following: \textsuperscript{15}

1. \textbf{Community Identity and Character}
   Develop a stronger cultural heritage identity for the region, one that celebrates its diversity, the character of its multiple towns and cities and the differing traditions of their founders; its natural features; and the richness of its arts, culture and heritage assets.

2. \textbf{Education and Awareness}
   Build a stronger foundation for arts, culture, and heritage within the community.

3. \textbf{Coordination and Partnership Formation}
   Encourage a greater degree of collaboration across all sectors and disciplines.

4. \textbf{Resources}
   Support opportunities for the development and sustainability of existing arts, culture, and heritage organizations.

5. \textbf{Accessibility}
   Maximize accessibility to arts, culture, and heritage opportunities and information.

The \textit{Master Plan} provides guidance and direction for the region for protecting, identifying, and enhancing cultural heritage aspects for communities, and in serving as a primary document to help develop new policies and implementation strategies.

3.3 \textbf{City of Cambridge Context}

3.3.1 \textbf{City of Cambridge Official Plan (2012, consolidated 2018)}

The \textit{City of Cambridge’s Official Plan (OP)} was approved with modifications by the Region of Waterloo on November 21, 2012 and is undergoing appeals but not of cultural heritage policies. The \textit{OP} was most recent consolidated in September 2018.\textsuperscript{16} The \textit{OP} provides a long-range strategy to guide land use decisions for the next 20 years.

Chapter 4 deals with Cultural Heritage Resources and provides relevant policies and objectives for cultural heritage resources throughout the municipality. All relevant policies related to cultural heritage resources contained within the \textit{OP} were reviewed for this report, with key sections and policies provided below for reference.

Chapter 4 states that:

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{15} Region of Waterloo, “Arts, Culture and Heritage Master Plan,” last modified October 2002, IV.
\end{flushleft}
The City recognizes and benefits from a variety of cultural heritage resources which are focal to community identity and economic prosperity and inherited from past generations. Cultural heritage resources throughout the municipality are used for such activities as industry, tourism and other commercial uses and residences.\(^{17}\)

Section 4.1 of the OP provides a series of objectives for cultural heritage resources with relevant objectives including:

a) support the conservation, restoration and prominence of the city’s built heritage as a key identifying feature of the community; 

b) co-ordinate the City’s heritage interests with property owners, local business improvement areas and other special interests; 

d) support the designation of cultural heritage resources under the Ontario Heritage Act and the conservation of cultural heritage resources through the Planning Act, the Environmental Assessment Act, the Cemeteries Act and the Municipal Act; and 

e) maintain and support the rehabilitation of the Heritage Conservation Districts, located in the Galt City Centre, Blair Village and the City-owned lands in West Galt and to consider the establishment of additional districts\(^{18}\)

Section 4.2 of the OP outlines policies for cultural heritage resources, which are of interest for this assessment. Relevant policies include:

1. When development is proposed, the City will encourage the conservation of cultural heritage resources in the following order of preference:

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

   b) promotion of the use of scale and design which blends harmoniously with existing cultural heritage resources when development occurs; and 

   c) preservation and adaptive re-use of buildings of cultural heritage significance for compatible residential intensification and/or for other appropriate and compatible uses is encouraged. 

2. Where the priority conservation actions of Policy 4.2.1 cannot be achieved, the City will implement the following measures in order of preference:

   a) promote the re-use of the resource, building, or building elements where a cultural heritage resource cannot be conserved intact; 

   b) require, prior to approving a development application which would result in the destruction of a cultural heritage resource, that the proponent provide to the City architectural measured drawings, a land


history, photographs and other available documentation of the cultural heritage resource in its surrounding context and, if feasible, relocate the cultural heritage resource; and

c) promote the salvaging and reuse of building materials where a cultural heritage resource cannot be conserved intact to discourage construction materials from entering landfill sites and incorporation of building materials in the new development or redevelopment.

Section 4.10 of the OP outlines requirements for Cultural Heritage Impact Assessments. Relevant policies including the follow:

1. A Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment shall be required for a development proposal or Community Plan that includes or is adjacent to a designated property or cultural heritage landscape, or that includes a non-designated resource of cultural heritage value or interest listed on the Municipal Heritage Register. 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. A Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment may include the following elements:

   a) identification and evaluation of the cultural heritage resource;

   b) graphic and written inventory of the cultural heritage resource;

   c) assessment of the proposal’s impact on the cultural heritage resource;

   d) means to mitigate impacts, in accordance with the cultural heritage resources priorities established in Policy 4.2.1 of this Plan;

   e) alternatives to the proposal; and

   f) identification of and justification for the preferred option.

2. The City will determine the need for a Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment in consultation with the owner/applicant. The City will refer the completed Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment to MHAC when the development is major in nature or where the City believes there will be a detrimental impact to the cultural heritage resource.

3. A Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment shall be undertaken by a professional who is qualified to evaluate the cultural heritage resource under review.

4. Additional information may be required by the City, particularly depending on the nature and location of the proposal. The City shall make available any relevant information that it maintains, including archival records.

5. A completed Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment will first be submitted to the MHAC for review and the recommendation of MHAC will be forwarded to Council for consideration with the proposal. A Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment may bescoped or waived by either Council or MHAC.

7. A Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment will be conducted in accordance to Council approved guidelines.

### 3.3.2 Dickson Hill Heritage Conservation District Plan for City Owned Lands (2005)

The Dickson Hill Heritage Conservation District Plan for City Owned Lands (HCD Plan) prepared in 2005, was prepared pursuant to Part V of the OHA. It provides a heritage conservation strategy to conserve and enhance one of the most historic parts of the city by designating the public City-owned lands in this area. for City-owned public spaces in Dickson Hill.19

The HCD Plan recognizes and promotes the cultural heritage significance of Dickson Hill, and show Council’s commitment to the long-term conservation and enhancement of the cultural heritage features of City-owned public spaces in Dickson Hill.

Dickson Hill HCD’s statement of significance reads as follows:

Dickson Hill is one of the most unique communities in the City of Cambridge. Dickson Hill is named for the Honourable William Dickson, a prominent Galt settler who arrived to the area in 1816. Dickson is credited with founding the Village of Galt due to his considerable land holdings and was responsible for much of the commercial development on the west bank of the Grand River.

His son, William Dickson Jr., acquired most of the lands that currently make up the residential area of Dickson Hill. His own residence, located at 16 Byng Avenue was constructed in 1832. The development of the residential component occurred over several decades and by a series of developers. Florence Dickson, niece to William Dickson Jr., and his heir, controlled the development of this area until the 1890’s.

Dickson Hill features an extremely high concentration of significant buildings of various types: residential, institutional, commercial and manufacturing. In addition to the buildings, key elements that define the character of Dickson Hill are:

- Tree-lined streets;
- Distinctive globe street lights; and
- Prominent urban public spaces and landscape features.20

Implementation policies in the HCD Plan only apply to City-owned public land. As private property, the Property is not beholden to the HCD Plan’s policies and implementation requirements. Development on privately owned land within Dickson HCD will require a CHIA as per the OP.21

---


20 City of Cambridge, Dickson Hill Heritage Conservation District Plan for City Owned Lands, prepared by GSP Group and Nicole and Margate Hill, 2005, 2.

21 City of Cambridge, Dickson Hill Heritage Conservation District Plan for City Owned Lands, prepared by GSP Group and Nicole and Margate Hill, 2005, 8.
3.4 Summary and Analysis of Policy and Legislative Context

It is LHC’s opinion that the Project conforms/complies with the applicable policy and legislative framework.

Figure 21: Dickson Hill Heritage Conservation District
4 HISTORIC CONTEXT

The following historic context of the Subject Property was presented in the 2018 CHIA and is reproduced here, edited and supplemented for clarity, to provide additional historical context for the reader.

4.1 History of Dumfries and Galt

While Galt, Hespeler and Preston amalgamated on 1 January 1973 and became known as the City of Cambridge, their histories are deep and distinct. The land the City of Cambridge currently occupies was part of a large tract that the Crown granted to the Six Nations confederacy in 1784 to replace their traditional lands forfeited during the American Revolution. Through a series of treaties, much of the original Six Nations lands came into the hands of Euro-Canadians.

The area was first surveyed in 1791. In 1816 William Dickson (Figure 22) acquired 90,000 acres along the Grand River. Including the land that became Galt.22

Dickson’s land was much of the Township of Dumfries and cost him about £24,000.23 Absalom Shade, an American, founded the village of Galt in 1816 following a meeting with Dickson in Niagara (Figure 23). Dickson convinced Shade of his plan to found a village along the banks of the Grand and grow it by erecting saw and grist mills, as well as shops for new settlers.24 Shade and Dickson hired an Indigenous guide and “…engaged for a few weeks in prospecting”. Shade combined his resources with Dickson and they committed to thoroughly survey the area in 1816 for the purpose of founding the town.25 In 1817, 38 families lived in Dumfries Township and present-day Galt was known as Shade’s Mills (Figure 24).26 Shade’s Mills acquired the name of Galt after a visit from Commissioner John Galt in 1817 (an old associate of Dickson’s from Scotland). Galt planned to open a roadway from the area to the lands of the Canada Company and the present City of Guelph.27 Eventually further developments that opened the village to trade with Dundas, Hamilton and Toronto (Highway 8).

---

24 Picturesque and Industrial Galt. (Galt: Jaffray Brothers,1902), 9-10.
25 Picturesque and Industrial Galt. (Galt: Jaffray Brothers,1902), 10-11.
26 Picturesque and Industrial Galt. (Galt: Jaffray Brothers,1902), 11.
27 Picturesque and Industrial Galt. (Galt: Jaffray Brothers,1902), 12.
Figure 22: Portrait William Dickson. (Young 1880)

Figure 23: Portrait of Absalom Shade (City of Cambridge Archives).

Figure 24: Shade’s Mills (City of Cambridge Archives).
Settlers to the community of Galt built mills, stores and schools. The community began growing substantially not long after Shade and Dickson began executing their plans. The first bridge across the Grand River was built in 1819.\textsuperscript{28} Like many villages, the township’s industry centered around agriculture (key products were wheat, grains, flour, wines, and furs). This helped grow Galt’s economy as it began to export to neighbouring communities.\textsuperscript{29} By 1820 the village had ten buildings, including a distillery and blacksmith.

James Young, a historian who lived through and catalogued much of the early history of Galt, described the first ten years following Galt’s founding as the “trading period”; money was rare and the barter system prevailed within the region’s booming agricultural economy.\textsuperscript{30} He also referred to Galt, in its early days, as “hemmed in”, since it was difficult to export its surplus of goods and produce to the east because of what Young referred to as the Beverly swamplands. These swamplands, located outside of Galt on the way to Lake Ontario, inhibited land access to Dundas and Hamilton; Shade attempted once to resolve this in 1834 with a small trade fleet.\textsuperscript{31} Shade commissioned the construction of several barges to begin shipping Galt’s large surplus of goods down the Grand, but his plan ultimately failed when his own ship ran aground and he had to turn back.

Early developments in the community included the first frame building (a tavern) built by Morgan L. Hermonts in 1821, a post office in 1827, a wooden church in 1828, a schoolhouse in 1832, St. Andrew’s Presbyterian Church 1833, and a subscription library in 1836.\textsuperscript{32}

By the mid-1840s, Galt had a booming manufacturing sector. Early industries included Duncan Fisher’s Galt Foundry and Machineworks (1842), James Cowan’s Dumfries Foundry (1844), and a large and flourishing industrial textile market.\textsuperscript{33} Around that time, Galt saw the introduction of a newspaper, the \textit{Dumfries Courier} and a fire engine company.\textsuperscript{34} In the 1840s, Galt’s streets were well-developed, and the village saw the construction of many stone buildings. Its large skilled Scottish population brought masonry techniques from their home country, leaving a clear mark on the village’s streetscape. Galt also benefitted through its daily stagecoach connection to Hamilton, Guelph, and Goderich.\textsuperscript{35}

The 1850s and 1860s were significant decades in Galt; this period saw three major fires (1851, 1856, 1862), population growth, and the arrival of the steam locomotive, which created further opportunities for economic growth and prosperity.\textsuperscript{36} On January 21st, 1850 Galt incorporated as a Village with a population of 2,250, and a year later a city directory included 118 business and

\textsuperscript{29} Quantrell, 4.
\textsuperscript{31} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{34} Ibid. (2008). \textit{Cambridge Heritage Master Plan}, 55
\textsuperscript{35} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{36} Ibid.
professionals in the village. By 1857 the population had grown to almost 3,000 people. In the later nineteenth century the town had become one of Ontario’s most important manufacturing communities.

Important developments occurred in Galt in the last decades of the nineteenth century. The arrival of the Galt, Preston, and Hespeler Street Railway in the 1890s connected the three locations by electric rail; it would run until 1961 (Figure 25). However, Galt's topography also began shifting alongside other Central Canadian communities. The economy was qualitatively changing the nature of work and swelling the middle class, resulting in socio-economic stratification that ordered entire cities. This was a major factor that led to the rise of ‘elite’ neighbourhoods (Figure 26).  

Figure 25: Galt & Preston Street Railway 23 and several prominent citizens, including David Spiers, Hugh McCulloch, and Martin Todd.  

---

37 Ibid.
4.2 Historic Context of Dickson’s Hill

The area of Dickson’s Hill (Dickson’s Bush, before the 1880s) went largely undeveloped for most of the nineteenth century. Notable development of Dickson Hill included the construction of: St. Andrew’s Church in the 1830, an Anglican cemetery and manse on the north side of Blenheim in the early 1840s, John Miller’s manse at the corner of Blenheim and Blair in 1857, a large public cemetery in 1867, and Dickson Park just east of Park Avenue in 1871.41

The rural nature of Dickson Hill may have been deliberate. The Dicksons kept the land almost undeveloped and refused to develop their estate and its countryside, beyond some basic landscaping, which is reflected in every map until the later nineteenth century. It appears the Dicksons planned the construction of a larger estate as the existing 1832 stone cottage, now known as 16 Byng Avenue, was planned as a gatehouse for a larger and more elaborate manse that was never built.42 The cottage appears on Smith’s 1851 topographical map (Figure 28) in

---

addition to some adjacent outbuildings on the property; the cottage became the Dicksons’ primary residence for a few generations. They referred to the estate as Kirkmichael.

Early plans and maps of Galt prior to the 1880s (Figure 28) show only Kirkmichael’s initial buildings. A town plan from 1836, surveyed for William Dickson (senior), ignores the Dickson lands west of George Street, later Dickson Hill, as being part of the town of Galt. There were few qualitative differences in the layout of the property until the later nineteenth century, but the most detailed map, drawn by Marcus Smith in 1851 shows the topography of Dickson Hill, including Kirkmichael. According to the map, much of the estate was landscaped, including a fishpond, a large garden, and treelined exits and paths. Circumstances in ‘Dickson’s Bush’ barely changed in the following decades. Smith’s topography, James Pollock’s 1867 map and an 1875 Birdseye drawing confirm this (Figure 29). Between 1851 and 1867, the Dickson family added several smaller outbuildings adjacent to the earlier buildings south of the cottage. While the lands around Kirkmichael remained in the ownership of William Junior, there was no evidence of significant changes to the Dickson lands or estate.

Dickson’s Hill became a neighbourhood beginning in the 1880s. William Dickson Junior died in the 1870s during a recession, and his will specified that his property could not be sold for five years, but by the early 1880s his beneficiaries sold the remaining lands.

On 29 October 1884, Florence Dickson purchased a 178-acre tract of the Dickson Estate and dramatically developed the lands. John Hagopian’s “History of Dickson’s Hill” details how Florence owned the land until 1915, and registered a total of seven subdivision plans. Her first subdivision was in 1884 (Plan 473 in the Waterloo land registry), and through it she determined the future street layout (a grid in ordinal directions) and social geography of the neighbourhood. That is, there were soon areas of Dickson’s Hill dominated by working class and middle-upper class, respectively. Figure 31 presents a layout of the neighbourhood’s subdivisions over time by year, block, and plan number.

Florence sold small lots at affordable rates for working class families, while she sold larger lots in better locations at higher rates to the middle-upper class. Later, the prices of houses set by Florence reflected the difference in the initial values of lots. The 1893 Birdseye view of Galt shows significant development occurred in that time, and many larger and wealthier structures appear in the larger subdivisions north and northwest of Kirkmichael. The social geography of Dickson’s Hill is apparent, wherein the working class bought and rented south of Gladstone while the middle to upper class bought into subdivisions north of Gladstone. John Hagopian’s research into several city directories demonstrates this thoroughly up to the 1940s (Figure 32). This trend continued throughout the subdivision process in the twentieth century.

44 Hagopian, 28.
45 Hagopian, 29.
46 Hagopian, 29.
47 Hagopian, 32.
4.3 Property History – Dickson Family and Kirkmichael

William Dickson acquired the land at 16 Byng Avenue as part of a large amount of unsettled ‘bushland’ when he bought his 90,000 acres that composed the Township of Dumfries from Thomas Clark.

In 1825, Dickson relocated to Galt and stayed for nine years before he moved back to Niagara. He officially retired in 1837, leaving the administration of his lands to his sons. Of his three sons, William and Walter played significant roles in his estate. Walter was a barrister and represented Niagara in the Assembly from 1841-1851 and later became a Legislative Councillor in 1855. In contrast, William lived in Galt at the stone cottage now known as 16 Byng Avenue.

![Figure 27: Photograph of Florence Augusta Dickson. City of Cambridge Archives.](image)

William Dickson Junior was born in 1799 in Niagara, Welland County, Ontario (and died January 1, 1877 in Galt). Dickson acquired most of what is now Dickson’s Hill from his father between 1830 and 1835, and he built the stone, Regency-style house at 16 Byng between 1830 and 1832. William Jr. died without any children or a spouse so the executors of his estate sold much of it throughout the 1880s to other family members, including Walter Hamilton Dickson’s (his brother) daughter, Florence Dickson, who bought much of the Dickson Homestead tract for the

---

The sum of $35,000.53. The lands pertaining to the Dickson estate and Kirkmichael cost $10,000 for 178 acres. Florence Augusta Dickson, born in Niagara in 1846 was a wealthy heiress who never married. She lived at Kirkmichael with her uncle William Hamilton Dickson beginning in 1860. She maintained Kirkmichael throughout her life as her primary home after the death of her uncle, but also maintained secondary residences in Toronto (1898-1912) and St. Catherine’s (1921), leaving the affairs of her estate to be managed largely by her brother Walter. She was a prominent socialite in Niagara, Galt, and Toronto. Florence died in 1924 just a year after the death of her two brothers, but before that time she had sold off almost all of the land she previously owned. John J. Kingsmill (born 1839, died 1900), Florence’s brother-in-law, purchased much of Florence’s land. His daughter Pauline (born 1867, died 1914) was in a position of inheritance by age 33.

Pauline Kingsmill married Eugene Langdon Wilks (born 1855 in New York, died 1934) and lived with him for some time at Langdon Hall estate before moving to Tours, France, where they spent the rest of their lives. Pauline purchased the Kirkmichael residence in 1896 (11 ¾ acres) before leasing it back to Florence that same year. Throughout the later 19th and early 20th century the Kirkmichael estate did not undergo drastic change, as can be seen in a 1919 aerial photograph (Figure 30). Pauline Wilks’ estate, long after her death, put an end to the larger Dickinson lands in 1922. This subdivision plan meant that the once-substantial family estate was reduced to only include Lot 19 of the City of Galt; it is at this time that it seems the Subject Property became part of Galt proper.

Kirkmichael soon passed from the Dickson family following the death of Florence. Arthur Pringle, executor of the Pauline Wilks Estate, granted Julia D. McGibbons (a widow) Lot 19 on 8 October 1924 (Registered March 1932). By the 1930s, the stone cottage had become a duplex; according to voters list, two families lived there from that time. In 1935, 16 Byng Avenue’s residents were Mr. and Mrs. William Dooley and Mr. and Mrs. Rufus Savage. Julia McGibbons

55 May have been 1847.
59 Hagopian, 29.
owned and rented the home during that time to the two families, but in 1941 she granted it to Rufus and Ruth Savage for the sum of $4,500. By this time, 16 Byng appears in detail on a 1941 fire insurance plan (Figure 31) with two corridor-attached western sections and an outbuilding.

The Rufus’ lived in and owned 16 Byng for only three more years, and sold it in 1944 to J. Audrey Vale for $9,000. The Vale family carried out extensive renovation c.1945, adding the kitchen and garage. The Vale family lived there until 1970, when J. Audrey Vale granted the property to Miriam A. Barrett for $2, who sold it in 1971 to Jai M. Goel. The Goel family added the pool house addition. Jai Goel granted the property to Jai Narain Goel and Shashi Narain Goel as joint tenants in 1987. Subsequent owners include G. Bartlett (2000-2003) and Alex Krajewski (2003-2017); the Wright family purchased the property in 2017. The current owners are Matthew Benoit and Colleen Bracken, who purchased it August 16, 2019.

---

66 Ontario, Town of Galt, Land Registry Abstracts, Lot 19, Plan 291, Archives of Ontario, Toronto
67 Ontario, Town of Galt, Land Registry Abstracts, Lot 19, Plan 291, Archives of Ontario, Toronto
68 Ontario, Town of Galt, Land Registry Abstracts, Lot 19, Plan 291, Archives of Ontario, Toronto
69 Ontario, Town of Galt, Land Registry Abstracts, Lot 19, Plan 291, Archives of Ontario, Toronto
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Table 3: Occupations of Dickson’s Hill Residents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation Category</th>
<th>1902 North</th>
<th>1902 South</th>
<th>1919 North</th>
<th>1919 South</th>
<th>1941 North</th>
<th>1941 South</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Unskilled Labourers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Semi-skilled and Skilled Labourers</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Foremen</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Spinsters/Widows</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Gentlemen/Farmers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Manufacturers</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Merchants</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Professionals and Government Officials</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Agents, Managers and Salesmen</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Clerks</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary

| Number of Working-Class Residents (Occupational Categories 1 plus 2) | 10 | 34 | 18 | 136 | 15 | 151 |
| Percentage of Working-Class Residents in this Section          | 23.8% | 77.3% | 16.8% | 72.0% | 9.1% | 64.0% |
| Number of Spinsters, Widows, Gentlemen, and Farmers (Occupational Categories) | 12 | 5 | 21 | 17 | 39 | 33 |
| Percentage of Spinsters, Widows, Gentlemen and Farmers in this Section | 28.6% | 11.4% | 19.6% | 9.0% | 23.6% | 14.0% |
| Number of White-Collar Residents (Occupational Categories 3 plus 6 to 10) | 20 | 5 | 68 | 36 | 111 | 52 |
| Percentage of White-Collar Residents in this Section            | 47.6% | 11.4% | 63.6% | 19.0% | 67.3% | 22.0% |

Figure 32: Dickson’s Hill residents’ occupations reflecting social geography north and south of Gladstone. Hagopian (1999), 33.

4.4 Property Morphology

The stone residence was built c.1830 by the Dickson family. The stone residence remained relatively unchanged until 1930, when it was converted to a duplex. A 1941 fire insurance plan (Figure 31) shows the addition of a two corridor-attached western sections and an outbuilding to the Subject Property. Around 1945, the interior was heavily modified and the garage and kitchen were added by the Vale family.\(^70\) In 1971, Jai M. Goel purchased the Subject Property and added a pool.\(^71\)

In 2018, as part of the severance of the Subject Property, the garage, mudroom, and pool were removed. The removal of the garage, mudroom, and pool were confirmed during the Site Visit on 28 January 2021.

---

70 Murdy, J. 1983
71 Ontario, Town of Galt, Land Registry Abstracts, Lot 19, Plan 291, Archives of Ontario, Toronto
5 UNDERSTANDING OF CULTURAL HERITAGE VALUE OR INTEREST

The Subject Property is listed in the City of Cambridge Heritage Properties Register with the following description:

“Kirkmichael” – Considered to be one of the most significant residential properties in Cambridge, this Regency style limestone cottage was constructed for William Dickson Jr., the son of Galt founder William Dickson. Dickson lived here until his death in 1877. It was intended to be the gatehouse for a larger home that was never constructed.\(^7^2\)

The Subject Property was evaluated by LHC as part of the CHIA prepared in 2018. At that time the following Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest (SCHVI) was prepared.

5.1 Statement of Significance

The cultural heritage value or interest of the property resides in the c.1830 limestone house, the context of the property, and its historical association with the Dickson family.

5.1.1 Legal Description and Civic Address

The legal description of the Subject Property is: Plan 291 Pt Lot 19 RP 58R20441, Part 1 IRREG 25742.75SF 111.33FR D.

The civic address of the Subject Property is: 16 Byng Avenue, Cambridge, Ontario.

5.1.2 Description of Property

The property at 16 Byng Avenue is located on the west side of Byng street; Byng Avenue runs in a north-south direction. Byng Avenue is not a through street and can be accessed by Salisbury Avenue to the north. The property is found north of St. Andrews Street and east of Lansdowne Road South; Laneway 163 is located directly behind the property. The legal description is Part Lot 19, Plan 291, Part 1, Plan 58R-20441\(^7^3\). The property is located within the Dickson Hill Heritage Conservation District.

The property includes a one-and-a-half-storey, limestone, Regency Cottage, built c. 1830. The land was originally part of the large land holding of William Dickson Sr. The building was built for, and occupied by, William Dickson Jr. The property has a large lot and a generous setback from Byng Avenue.

5.1.3 Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest

The property at 16 Byng Avenue demonstrated design or physical value as an early 19th century representation of a Regency cottage architecture style. The limestone portion of the house, with the five-bay symmetrical façade, large window openings, low hipped tiered roof and tall chimney,

---


\(^7^3\) The new updated legal description is The legal address description is Plan 291 Pt Lot 19 RP 58R20441, Part 1 IRREG 25742.75SF 111.33FR D. The one found above is the old legal description.
generous wrap around verandah, and large central door with transom and sidelights, are representative features of this style.

The property at 16 Byng Avenue has historical/associative value because of its direct association with William Dickson Sr. and his son William Dickson Jr. The building was commissioned by William Dickson Sr. for his son William Dickson Jr. William Dickson Sr. is credited with founding the Village of Galt due to his considerable land holdings and was responsible for much of the commercial development on the west bank of the Grand River. William Dickson Jr. inherited the large tract of land from his father and was a prominent member of the community. William Dickson Jr. lived in this house until 1877. Members of the Dickson family played a key role in the division of surrounding lands and the development of the neighbourhood in the early 20th century.

The property at 16 Byng Avenue demonstrates contextual value as the building pre-dates the plan of subdivision and the creation of Byng Avenue. 16 Byng Avenue played an important role in the way the surrounding area was developed.

5.1.4 Heritage Attributes

The heritage attributes supporting the cultural heritage value of the property are represented in the one-and-a-half-storey limestone residence and the relationship to Byng Ave.

Key heritage attributes associated with the original one-and-a-half-storey limestone building and property include:

- The large setback from and relationship with Byng Avenue;
- The east facing five-bay façade;
- The use of limestone, which follows a broken course pattern with high relief or ‘padded joints’;
- The large limestone cornices on the facade;
- The stone voussoirs over the windows and façade door;
- The low-pitched hipped roof;
- The molded wooden eaves and cornice;
- The four segmental shaped dormers;
- The yellow brick chimney with four metal flues;
- The six exposed, casement style, 24 pane, wood windows (four on façade and two on north side);
- The wrap around covered porch supported by decorative wooden posts;
- The façade entrance which features a wide single door with two four-pane windows, sidelights and a decorative shaped fanlight; the fanlight has an elliptical transom with tracery.
6 DESCRIPTION OF SITE ALTERATION

The property owners propose to construct a new addition on the rear of the main residence.

The addition will extend west from the residence to a point 1.34 m from the rear property line. The addition will be one-storey structure with a hip roof and will connect to the rear of the existing house through a breezeway. The breezeway will be located across the existing rear porch and will incorporate the rear porch roof. The breezeway will be enclosed from the north by a transparent glass pane (Figure 28) and accessed from the south based on the south elevation (Figure 29). The breezeway entrance will incorporate design elements such as, a wide single door with sidelights, and a decorative shaped fanlight with an elliptical transom.

The proposed addition includes a medium-pitched hipped roof. The addition will be offset from the house, situated behind the southwest corner of the house. Approximately half of the addition will be behind the house and the other half offset to the south. The addition will be partially built into the slope of the rear yard. It will be clad in a combination of stone veneer and vertical siding with a shingle roof. Windows will imitate the main residence and have two-over-two sash with muntin bars. See Figure 33 through Figure 36 for elevation drawings of the proposed addition.

The addition will include a double door garage, laundry room and master bedroom with ensuite (Figure 37). The garage doors will be on the west elevation and accessed from the rear laneway behind the property.
Figure 33: Proposed addition, east elevation
Figure 34: Proposed addition, north elevation
Figure 35: Proposed addition, south elevation
Figure 36: Proposed addition, west elevation
Figure 37: Proposed addition, floorplan
7 IMPACT ASSESSMENT

The MHSTCI *Info Sheet #5 Heritage Impact Assessments and Conservation Plans* outline seven potential negative impacts to be considered with any proposed development or site alteration. The impacts include:

- **Destruction** of any part of any significant heritage attribute 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 planting, 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 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; and
- **Land disturbances** such as a change in grade that alters soils, drainage patterns that adversely affect an archaeological resource.

Implementation policies in the *HCD Plan* only apply to City-owned public land. As private property, the Property is not beholden to the *HCD Plan’s* policies and implementation requirements. Development on privately owned land within Dickson HCD will require a CHIA as per the *OP.*

No impacts with respect to shadows, isolation, obstruction of significant views, change in land use, or land disturbances are anticipated.

**Table 2: Potential Impacts from Alteration**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affected Heritage Attributes</th>
<th>Potential Impacts (Y/N)</th>
<th>Discussion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Large setback from and relationship with Byng Avenue</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The proposed addition will be located to the rear of the main residence (west elevation). The west elevation backs onto Laneway 163. Because of its location, the addition will not affect the residence’s large setback and relationship with Byng Avenue.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affected Heritage Attributes</th>
<th>Potential Impacts (Y/N)</th>
<th>Discussion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East facing five-bay façade</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The proposed addition will be located to the rear of the main residence (west elevation). The east facing five-bay façade will not be affected by addition.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| The use of limestone, which follows a broken course pattern with high relief or ‘padded joints’ | Yes                     | The proposed addition will connect directly to the west elevation via a breezeway. The construction of the breezeway may affect the limestone on the west elevation; however, with proper mitigation measures, no adverse impacts are anticipated. Mitigative measures include:  
  • Work should be undertaken by a qualified professional with experience working on limestone masonry heritage buildings; and,  
  • Anchors and joints should be carefully planned, by a qualified professional, and should be compatible with existing materials.  
  Refer to Section 9 for mitigation measures. |
| The large limestone cornices on the façade | No                     | The proposed addition will be located to the rear of the main residence and will not affect the limestone cornices on the façade. |
| The stone voussoirs over the windows and façade door | No                     | The proposed addition, as shown, does not affect the stone voussoir over the windows and façade door.  
  The current west elevation wooden door without sidelights does have a stone voussoir. The opening is currently boarded up from the exterior with a door on the interior. This opening will be maintained as an entrance to the addition. Any unanticipated changes or alterations required to reinstate the door that may affect the voussoirs would need to be carefully planned for reversibility. |
| The low-pitched hipped roof | No                     | Although an earlier iteration of the design for the addition used a medium-pitched hipped roof, a shallower pitch has been applied to the current |
### Affected Heritage Attributes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affected Heritage Attributes</th>
<th>Potential Impacts (Y/N)</th>
<th>Discussion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The molded wooden eaves and cornice</strong></td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
<td>The proposed addition will not affect the moulded wooden eaves or cornices of the main residence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The four segmental shaped dormers</strong></td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
<td>The proposed addition will not affect any dormers located on the stone residence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The yellow brick chimney with four metal flues</strong></td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
<td>The proposed addition will not affect the yellow brick chimney with four metal flues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The six exposed, casement style, 24 pane, wood windows (four on façade and two on north side)</strong></td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
<td>The proposed addition is located adjacent to the west elevation of the stone residence. The proposed addition will not affect the windows located on the façade or north elevation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The wrap around covered porch supported by decorative wooden posts</strong></td>
<td><strong>Yes</strong></td>
<td>The proposed development is located on the west elevation. Some posts may be removed to make room for the one-storey addition. Effort should be made to avoid the removal of any posts. If this cannot be avoided, it is recommended that work be carried out by a qualified professional with experience who has worked on heritage carpentry.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Design in order to reduce visual impacts on the stone residence’s low-pitched roof (Figure 38).

As roofing material has not yet been chosen effort should be taken to select a compatible material and colour that is consistent with the surrounding area and secondary to that of the main residence.

The point along which the two roofs intersect is the same location as the roof of the former indoor pool room, as such it has previously been subject to intervention. However, the method of attachment (if any) and pitch of the roofs may result in long-term issues for the main residence roof without consideration given to ensuring that water is not allowed to pool along this connection.

Any necessary alteration to the existing roof, where it meets the addition, should be undertaken by a qualified heritage professional.
### 7.1 Summary of Potential Impacts

Potential impacts related to alterations to the stone residence were explored in Table 2. With Potential adverse impacts were identified for the following heritage attributes:

- The use of limestone, which follows a broken course pattern with high relief or ‘padded joints’
- The low-pitched hipped roof;
- The wrap around covered porch supported by decorative wooden posts.

Alternatives and mitigation measures to lessen or avoid these potential impacts are outlined in the following sections.
8 ALTERNATIVES

The following range of alternative options have been considered. Both have been considered in relation to applicable planning frameworks outlined in Section 3.

8.1 Option 1: Do Nothing

This option would leave the property as is and the existing building would remain in situ.

The 'do nothing' option would have no direct impact on heritage attributes of the Subject Property, as there would be no changes to the property. The one-and-a-half-storey residence is inhabited by the current owners and this option would not affect the CHVI of the Subject Property.

This option still requires regular maintenance of the property.

8.2 Option 2: Construction of addition

This option would see the construction of the one-storey addition to the rear of the stone residence with a medium-pitch roof as shown in Figure 38.

As outlined in Table 2, several potential adverse impacts have been identified based on LHC's current understanding of the proposed undertaking.

The proposed addition with a medium-pitched roof, was found to have the potential to alter the silhouette of the low-pitched hipped roof of the residence. Modifications to the pitch were recommended to further lessen the appearance of the rear addition and lessen the visual impact on the extant roofline. In addition, it is recommended that a material and colour be selected for the new roof that is both compatible with and subordinate to the extant roof. Other impacts to the roof can be mitigated through planning and execution of the work by a qualified heritage professional.

Mitigation measures to lessen or avoid adverse impacts on the limestone masonry, stone voussoirs and decorative wooden porch supports are outlined in Section 9; however, modifications to the design are recommended to lessen impacts related to the low-pitched hipped roof.

8.3 Option 3: Construction of addition with modified roof

This option would see the construction of the one-storey addition to the rear of the stone residence as described in Section 6.

As outlined in Table 2, several potential adverse impacts have been identified based on LHC's current understanding of the proposed undertaking.

Mitigation measures to lessen or avoid adverse impacts on the limestone masonry, stone voussoirs and decorative wooden porch supports are outlined in Section 9; however, modifications to the design are recommended to lessen impacts related to the low-pitched hipped roof.

Modifications to the pitch of the roof were recommended and implemented in order to lessen the visual impact on the extant roofline.
It is recommended that a material and colour be selected for the new roof that is both compatible with and subordinate to the extant roof. Other impacts to the roof can be mitigated through planning and execution of the work by a qualified heritage professional.

**8.4 Evaluation of Options**

In general, Option 3 - the proposed addition with a low-pitched roof - with proper mitigation measures, will result in minimal impacts to the Subject Property’s cultural heritage value or interest. Based on the current proposed design, the addition is compatible with the residence – particularly when compared to the pool, mudroom and garage that were previously located on the Subject Property. Several smaller one-storey detached garages are located along Laneway 163 and the proposed addition is in keeping with this character.

![Comparison of roof pitch. Option 2 (top) and Option 3 (bottom)](image-url)
9 MITIGATION MEASURES
As outlined in Table 2 potential adverse impacts were identified for the following heritage attributes:

- The use of limestone, which follows a broken course pattern with high relief or ‘padded joints’
- The low-pitched hipped roof;
- The wrap around covered porch supported by decorative wooden posts.

Mitigation measures are required to ensure the conservation of these heritage attributes.

The proposed addition will connect directly to the limestone masonry along the west elevation via a breezeway. Anchors and joints should be carefully planned and materials that are compatible with the existing masonry should be selected to avoid direct and irreversible alteration or damage to the masonry. This work should be planned and executed by a qualified professional with demonstrated experience working on limestone masonry heritage buildings.

The point along which the two roofs intersect is the same location as the roof of the former indoor pool room, as such it has previously been subject to intervention. However, the method of attachment (if any) and pitch of the roofs may result in long-term issues for the low-pitched hipped roof of the main residence. The connection should be planned to ensure that water is not allowed to pool along this connection. Any necessary alteration to the existing roof, where it meets the addition, should be undertaken by a qualified professional with heritage experience.

The addition may also result in the removal of some posts on the west elevation. Effort should be made to avoid the removal of any of these posts; however, if this is not possible, any removal should be carried out by a qualified professional with heritage carpentry experience and the posts should be retained and, if possible, reused to replace missing posts along the south elevation.

To minimize the potential for unintended impacts resulting from the delivery of materials, staging areas, and construction activity, a Temporary Protection Plan (TPP) is recommended to be developed for this project. The purpose of a TPP is provide an overview of risks that are associated with construction and development activities and describes measures to mitigate those risks. It should be provided to all contractors on site, including delivery and security.

The TPP should identify:

- The route for access to the site and the delivery of materials and machinery;
- A fire and security plan; and,
- Staging locations.
10 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

LHC was retained to undertake a CHIA for 16 Byng Avenue, Cambridge, Ontario to provide a critical review of a proposed rear addition from a heritage conservation planning perspective.

A CHIA was previously prepared for the Subject Property in 2018 to address a proposed severance and demolition application. The 2018 CHIA included an evaluation of the Subject Property against the criteria outlined in Ontario Regulation 9/06: Criteria for Determining the Cultural Heritage Value or Interest (O. Reg. 9/06) under the Ontario Heritage Act (OHA). A Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest (SCHVI) was prepared, and a list of heritage attributes was identified.

This CHIA built upon the background analysis undertaken as part of the 2018 CHIA and included an impact assessment of the new proposed addition located to the rear of the stone residence.

Several potential adverse impacts were identified with respect to the proposed rear addition (Table 2). This CHIA identified adverse impacts to the following heritage attributes:

- The use of limestone, which follows a broken course pattern with high relief or ‘padded joints’
- The low-pitched hipped roof;
- The wrap around covered porch supported by decorative wooden posts.

As discussed in Section 8.2, the following design considerations are recommended:

- Roofing material and colour should be both compatible with and subordinate to the extant roof.

As discussed in Section 9, the following mitigation measures are recommended:

- A qualified professional(s) with experience working on heritage masonry and carpentry should plan and undertake the work directly involving the extant residence and its heritage attributes.
- Anchors and joints should be carefully planned and materials that are compatible with the existing masonry should be selected to avoid direct and irreversible alteration or damage to the masonry.
- Any connection along which the two roofs meet should be planned to ensure that water is not allowed to pool along this connection.
- Every effort should be made to avoid the removal of any decorative wooden porch posts along the rear elevation; however, if this is not possible, the posts should be retained and, reused to replace missing posts along the south elevation.

A temporary protection plan (TPP) may be put in place to allow for consideration of how the stone residence and its heritage attributes will be protected. This TPP should include a plan for site access, delivery, and staging of materials and machinery as well as a fire and security plan.

Should detailed design plans vary significantly from those reviewed in this CHIA, another evaluation for potential adverse impacts is recommended.
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Jordan Greene is a mapping technician with LHC. She holds a Bachelor of Arts in Geography with a Certificate in Geographic Information Science and a Certificate in Urban Planning Studies from Queen's University. The experience gained through the completion of the Certificate in Geographic Information Science allowed Jordan to volunteer as a research assistant contributing to the study of the extent of the suburban population in America with Dr. David Gordon. Prior to her work at LHC, Jordan spent the final two years of her undergraduate degree working in managerial positions at the student-run Printing and Copy Centre as an Assistant and Head
Manager. Jordan has had an interest in heritage throughout her life and is excited to build on her existing professional and GIS experience as a part of the LHC team.
APPENDIX B Glossary
Definitions are based on those provided in the Provincial Policy Statement (2020), Ontario Heritage Act (OHA) and the Cambridge Official Plan (2018).

**Adjacent** are those lands contiguous to a cultural heritage resource (PPS 2020, Cambridge OP 2014)

**Alter** means to change in any manner and includes to restore, renovate, repair, or disturb. “Alteration” has a corresponding meaning (OHA, O.Reg. 170/04).

**Areas of archaeological potential** means areas with the likelihood of containing archaeological resources. Methods to identify archaeological potential are established by the Province, but municipal approaches which achieve the same objectives may also be used. The Ontario Heritage Act requires archaeological potential to be confirmed through archaeological fieldwork (PPS, 2020)

**Built heritage** means a building, structure, monument, installation or any manufactured remnant that contributes to a property’s cultural heritage value or interest as identified by a community, including an Aboriginal community. Built heritage resources are generally located on property that has been designated under Part IV or V of the Ontario Heritage Act, or included on local, provincial and/or federal registers (PPS, 2020).

**Conserved** means the identification, protection, management and use of built heritage resources, cultural heritage landscapes and archaeological resources in a manner that ensures their cultural heritage value or interest is retained under the Ontario Heritage Act. This may be achieved by the implementation of recommendations set out in a conservation plan, archaeological assessment, and/or heritage impact assessment. Mitigative measures and/or alternative development approaches can be included in these plans and assessments (PPS, 2020).

**Cultural heritage landscape** means a defined geographical area of heritage significance that human activity has modified and that a community values. Such an area involves a grouping(s) of individual heritage features, such as structures, spaces, archaeological sites, and natural elements, which together form a significant type of heritage form distinct from its constituent elements or parts. Heritage conservation districts designated under the Ontario Heritage Act, villages, parks, gardens, battlefields, mainstreets and neighbourhoods, cemeteries, trails, and industrial complexes of cultural heritage value are some examples (PPS, 2020).

**Development** means the creation of a new lot, a change in land use, or the construction of a building(s) and 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* (Cambridge OP, 2018).

*Heritage attributes, as a term, is defined separately (and differently) under the Ontario Heritage Act and the Provincial Policy Statement. As this report is being submitted as part of a complete application under the Planning Act, the PPS definition would apply. However the OHA definition is being included as this property is protected under Section 27, Part IV under the OHA.*

**Heritage attributes** means, in relation to real property, and to the buildings and structures on the real property, the attributes of the property, buildings and structures that contribute to their cultural heritage value or interest (“attributs patrimoniaux”) (Ontario Heritage Act)
**Heritage attributes** means the principal features or elements that contribute to a protected heritage property’s cultural heritage value or interest, and may include the property’s built or manufactured elements, as well as natural landforms, vegetation, water features, and its visual setting (including significant views or vistas to or from a protected heritage property) (PPS, 2020).

**Heritage Conservation District** an area designated under the Ontario Heritage Act for its heritage significance. (Cambridge OP, 2018).

**Heritage Conservation District Plan** is the documentation supporting an area for designation as a district in accordance with the Ontario Heritage Act. It usually contains maps, research, and an implementation guideline. (Cambridge OP, 2018).

**Heritage Master Plan** is a long-term strategic plan for the management of cultural heritage resources as adopted by Council (Cambridge OP, 2018).

**Listed** refers to a property which is included in the Council approved Registry of Cultural Heritage Resources, but is not noted as being a designated property under Part IV or V of the Ontario Heritage Act (Cambridge OP, 2018).

**MHSTCI** refers to the Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism, and Culture Industries.

**OHA** refers to the *Ontario Heritage Act*. 
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RECOMMENDATIONS

THAT Report 21-012 (MHAC) – Request to Alter – 28 Fallbrook Lane – be received;

AND THAT the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC) recommend Council approve the alterations to renovate 28 Fallbrook Lane as outlined in Report 21-012 (MHAC);

AND THAT MHAC accept the Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) and its findings as prepared by Robinson Heritage Consulting dated February 2021.

SUMMARY

• The property located at 28 Fallbrook is designated under Part V of the Ontario Heritage Act as part of the Blair Village Heritage Conservation District (HCD).
• Under the Blair Village HCD Plan, the property is not identified as a contributing heritage property (i.e. 'Very Historic' or 'Historic' property).
• The property owner is requesting permission to renovate the dwelling significantly.
The subject property is designated under Part V of the Ontario Heritage Act as part of the Blair Village Heritage Conservation District (HCD) (Attachment 1). The property contains a one-storey frame and stucco dwelling constructed c.1977 influenced by Central American or Mediterranean styles (Figure 1, Image 1, Attachment 1). Although the property is included in the boundaries of the Blair Village HCD, it is not identified as a building that contributes to the cultural heritage value of the HCD (i.e. ‘Very Historical’ or ‘Historical’). As the subject property is included in the Blair Village HCD, a Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment completed by Robinson Heritage Consulting (RHC) dated February 2021 was submitted (Attachment 2).

The property owner is seeking permission to renovate the existing dwelling significantly (Attachment 3). This includes adding a second storey to the centre block, enclosing the open courtyard at the front and establishing a new front entry and replacing the sunroom with a full conservatory. The proposed renovations also include the addition of new doors, windows, and lower pitched and flat roofs. The additions and renovations will maintain a white stucco finish and the roofs will be clad in shingles. With the renovations, the existing Central American or Mediterranean style dwelling will closer resemble a contemporary suburban style dwelling.
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:

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

Blair Village Heritage Conservation District (HCD) Plan
The Blair Village HCD Plan was approved in 2002 and provides guidelines for alterations to 'Very Historic' and 'Historic' properties within the district. The subject property has not been identified as a 'Very Historic' or 'Historic' property. Attachment 4 provides relevant excerpts from the Plan.
City of Cambridge Official Plan

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.

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

Public Input:
The Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee meetings are open to the public.

Internal/External Consultation:
None.

Comments/Analysis:
A Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) prepared by Robinson Heritage Consulting (RHC) dated February 2021 was submitted with the request to alter the property on March 31, 2021.

Cultural Heritage Value of the Current Building

The Blair Village Heritage Conservation District (HCD) Plan identifies properties that contribute to the cultural heritage value or interest of the HCD as ‘Very Historic’ and ‘Historic’. The property at 28 Fallbrook Lane is not identified as a contributing property in the HCD Plan, nor are any other dwellings along the west side of Fallbrook Lane. An evaluation under Ontario Regulation 9/06 and the City’s criteria for cultural heritage value under Section 4.4 of the 2012 Cambridge Official Plan determined that the subject property does not have cultural heritage value or interest.

Assessment of Impact and Mitigation Measures

While the property was determined not to have cultural heritage value or interest, the HIA assessed the proposed development against the guidelines in the Blair Village HCD Plan.

The Blair Village HCD Plan does not provide specific guidance for renovation of dwellings on properties that do not contribute to the cultural heritage value of the district. The Plan does, however, recommend that the hedgerows along Fallbrook Lane be maintained, and that large entry features such as the masonry ones in front 28 Fallbrook Lane be discouraged (Attachment 4).
28 Fallbrook Lane is a large, wooded lot and the existing dwelling is well setback from the road such that cannot be seen due to the dense wooded area. Therefore, there are no anticipated impacts to the cultural heritage value or interest of the Blair Village HCD.

**Conclusion**

WSP concurs with the findings of the HIA that the proposed renovations to 28 Fallbrook Lane will have no impact on the cultural heritage value or interest of the Blair Village Heritage Conservation District (HCD). Furthermore, WSP submits that the HIA satisfies the City of Cambridge’s Detailed Guidelines for the Preparation of Cultural Heritage Impact Assessments Under Policy 4.0 of the 2012 Cambridge Official Plan.

For the reasons above, WSP recommends that MHAC accept the HIA and recommend that Council allow the proposed renovations.
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1.0 Executive Summary

This Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment (CHIA) has been undertaken to study the property located at 28 Fallbrook Lane (Figure 1) in the Blair Village Heritage Conservation District (BVHCD) in the City of Cambridge to determine cultural heritage value or interest and to identify impacts to the heritage conservation district associated with the proposed alterations and additions to the existing dwelling.

The subject property at 28 Fallbrook Lane was built about 1977 is a single-storey, frame and stucco home built in a Central American or Mediterranean style within the historic settlement of Blair. The Blair area was studied as a special policy area in 1997 and the City of Cambridge proceeded with a Heritage Conservation District Plan (HCD) in 1998 which was adopted in 1999. Although 28 Fallbrook Lane is not identified in the Blair Village HCD Plan as a building that contributes to the cultural heritage value of the HCD it is still considered a protected property within the BVHCD and the BVHCD guidelines apply.

The owners are proposing to add a second storey to the centre block, enclosing the open courtyard in the front and establish a new front entry in this location, replacing the small sunroom with a full conservatory as well as several other smaller modernizations. The dwelling will retain its exterior white stucco finish, the general footprint and massing and be given a low pitch hip roofline clad in flat metal shingles. The windows, door and roof with be replaced with modern equivalents to match the updated style.

This Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment (CHIA) has confirmed that there is no cultural heritage value in the dwelling on the property of 28 Fallbrook Lane within the BVHCD in the City of Cambridge and that the property does not satisfy the criteria to determine cultural heritage value used by Ontario Regulation 9/06, the City of Cambridge Official Plan and the BVHCD Study and Guidelines.

RHC anticipates no negative impacts to the dwelling associated with the proposed additions and alterations to the dwelling and therefore is of the opinion that the proposal would not pose a negative impact on the BVHCD.
Figure 1 – 28 Fallbrook Lane, Cambridge (Photo: RHC 2020)
2.0 Study Rationale and Methodology

This Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment (CHIA) was undertaken according to guidelines set out in the Ontario Ministry of Tourism, Culture, and Sport’s booklet “Heritage - Resources in the Land Use Planning Process” from the *Ontario Heritage Toolkit*. A Heritage Impact Assessment is a study that:

- evaluates the significance of a cultural heritage resource;
- determines the impact that a proposed development or site alteration will have on a cultural heritage resource;
- recommends an overall approach to the conservation of the cultural heritage resource.

Section 4.10 of the City of Cambridge Official Plan provides direction as to the City’s ability to require a Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment and specifies the content required in such an assessment.

RHC conducted research using archival and secondary source material gathered from the City of Cambridge Archives, Region of Waterloo Archives, online resources, land registry records, historical county atlas and other historic maps. A site inspection and exterior photographic documentation was undertaken by Robinson Heritage Consulting on December 22, 2020. The day of the inspection was cold with part sun/cloud.
3.0 Legislation and Policy Framework

3.1 Planning Act

Part 1, Section 2 of the Ontario Planning Act identifies matters of provincial interest, which includes the conservation of significant features of architectural, cultural, historical, archaeological, or scientific interest. One of these provincial interests is directly concerned with:

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

Section 3 of the Planning Act allows the Province to issue policy statements on matters of provincial interest. In respect of the exercise of any authority that affects a planning matter, Section 3 of the Planning Act requires that decisions affecting planning matters “shall be consistent with” policy statements issued under the Act.

3.2 Provincial Policy Statement 2020

The Provincial Policy Statement (issued under the authority of Section 3 of the Planning Act) was introduced in 2005 and updated in 2014 and 2020. PPS (2020), Section 2: Wise Use and Management of Resources, states that

*Ontario’s long-term prosperity, environmental health, and social well-being depend on conserving biodiversity, protecting the health of the Great Lakes, and protecting natural heritage, water, agricultural, mineral, and cultural heritage, and archaeological resources for their economic, environmental, and social benefits.*

Policy 2.6.1, in Section 2.6: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology, states that “significant built heritage resources and significant cultural heritage landscapes shall be conserved”.

The 2020 Provincial Policy Statement provides definitions of key terms in the heritage planning process.¹

**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.

**Cultural heritage landscape:** means a defined geographical area that may have been modified by human activity and is identified as having cultural heritage value or interest by a community, including an Indigenous community. The area may include features such as buildings, structures, spaces, views, archaeological sites or natural elements that are valued together for their interrelationship, meaning or association. Cultural heritage landscapes may be properties that have been determined to have cultural heritage value or interest under the Ontario Heritage Act or have been included on federal and/or international registers, and/or protected through official plan, zoning by-law, or other land use planning mechanisms.

**Conserved:** means the identification, protection, management and use of built heritage resources, cultural heritage landscapes and archaeological resources in a manner that ensures their cultural heritage value or interest is retained. This may be achieved by the implementation of recommendations set out in a conservation plan, archaeological assessment, and/or heritage impact assessment that has been approved, accepted or adopted by the relevant planning authority and/or decision-maker. Mitigative measures and/or alternative development approaches can be included in these plans and assessments.

**Heritage attributes:** means the principal features or elements that contribute to a protected heritage property’s cultural heritage value or interest, and may include the property’s built or manufactured elements, as well as natural landforms, vegetation, water features, and its visual setting (including significant views or vistas to or from a protected heritage property). Heritage attributes may also have what are defined in the federal Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Properties in Canada as character-defining elements or the materials, forms, location, spatial configurations, uses and cultural associations or meanings that contribute to the heritage value of an historic place, which must be retained to preserve its heritage value.²

² [https://www.historicplaces.ca/media/18072/81468-parks-sag-eng-web2.pdf](https://www.historicplaces.ca/media/18072/81468-parks-sag-eng-web2.pdf)
3.3 Ontario Heritage Act

Typically, the significance of a built heritage resource is identified by evaluation criteria that define cultural heritage value or interest to local, provincial, or federal jurisdictions. Criteria to define local cultural heritage significance is prescribed in Ontario Regulation 9/06 made pursuant to section 29(1) (a) of the Ontario Heritage Act.

3.3.1 Ontario Regulation 9/06

A property may be designated under section 29, Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act if it meets one or more of the following criteria for determining cultural heritage value or interest:

1. The property has design value or physical value because it,
   i. is a rare, unique, representative, or early example of a style, type, expression, material, or construction method,
   ii. displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit, or
   iii. demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement.

2. The property has historical value or associative value because it,
   i. has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization, or institution that is significant to a community,
   ii. yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of a community or culture, or
   iii. 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,
   i. is important in defining, maintaining, or supporting the character of an area,
   ii. is physically, functionally, visually, or historically linked to its surroundings, or
   iii. is a landmark.

Robinson Heritage Consulting is of the opinion that 28 Fallbrook Lane does not satisfy any of the criteria for determining cultural heritage value set out in Ontario Regulation 9/06 under the Ontario Heritage Act.

Robinson Heritage Consulting recognizes the Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Cultural Industries (MHSTCI) InfoSheet #5 which describes “Principles in the Conservation of Historic Properties” as:

- **Respect for Documentary Evidence**
  Do not base restoration on conjecture.

- **Respect for Original Location**
  Do not move buildings unless there is no other means to save them.

- **Respect for Historic Material**
  Repair/conserve rather than replace building materials and finishes, except where necessary.

- **Respect for Original Fabric**
  Repair with like materials.

- **Respect for the Building’s History**
  Do not restore to one period at the expense of another period.

- **Reversibility**
  Alterations should allow a resource to return to its original conditions.

- **Legibility**
  New work to be distinguishable from old.

- **Maintenance**
  With continuous care, future restoration will not be necessary.

---

Negative impacts on a cultural heritage resource identified in Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Cultural Industries (MHSTCI) InfoSheet #5 include, but are not limited to:

- 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;
- 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 an archaeological resource.

Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Cultural Industries (MHSTCI) InfoSheet #5 recommends methods of minimizing or avoiding a negative impact on a cultural heritage resource. These include, but are not limited to:

- Alternative development approaches
- Isolating development and site alteration from significant built and natural features and vistas
- Design guidelines that harmonize mass, setback, setting, and materials
- Limiting height and density
- Allowing only compatible infill and additions
- Reversible alterations
- Buffer zones, site plan control, and other planning mechanism
3.4 City of Cambridge Official Plan

Policy 4.7.1 of the City of Cambridge Official Plan states that “the City will regulate as fully as possible the demolition, removal or inappropriate alteration or erection of buildings, which, in the opinion of Council, constitute or impact on a cultural heritage resource within a Heritage Conservation District as shown on Schedules 1, 2 and 3” (Figure 2).

28 Fallbrook Lane has been listed on the City of Cambridge’s Register of Cultural Heritage Properties as a property designated within the Blair Village Heritage Conservation District. The City of Cambridge Official Plan defines the Register of Cultural Heritage Resources (the “Register”) as a listing of properties which includes those designated under either Part IV or V of the Ontario Heritage Act or are deemed to have the potential for designation.4

Section 4.4 of the City of Cambridge Official Plan5 states that a property included or proposed to be included in the City’s Register has been determined to have cultural heritage value 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:

---

5 City of Cambridge Official Plan - September 2018 Consolidation. Chapter 4, Section 4.4, pp.64-65.
i) it dates from an early period in the development of the city’s communities;

ii) 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;

iii) 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;

iv) it is directly associated with an historic event which is recognized as having local, regional, provincial, national or international importance;

v) it is a representative example and illustration of the city’s social, cultural, political, economic or technological development history;

vi) it is a representative example of a method of construction now rarely used;

vii) it is a representative example of its architectural style or period of building;

viii) it is a representative example of architectural design;

ix) it terminates a view or otherwise makes an important contribution to the urban composition or streetscape of which it forms a part;

x) it is generally recognized as an important landmark;

xi) it is a representative example of outstanding interior design; or

xii) it is an example of a rare or otherwise important feature of good urban design or streetscaping.
Robinson Heritage Consulting is of the opinion that 28 Fallbrook Lane does not satisfy any of the City’s criteria for determining cultural heritage value. However, as stated above, the subject property is located within a heritage conservation district that has been designated under Part V of the Ontario Heritage Act and, therefore, is subject to the policies of the Blair Village HCD Plan.

Section 4.10 of the City of Cambridge Official Plan states that a Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment shall be required for a development proposal or Community Plan that includes or is adjacent to a designated property or cultural heritage landscape, or that includes a non-designated resource of cultural heritage value or interest listed on the Municipal Heritage Register. 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. A Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment may include the following elements:

a) identification and evaluation of the cultural heritage resource;
b) graphic and written inventory of the cultural heritage resource;
c) assessment of the proposal’s impact on the cultural heritage resource;
d) means to mitigate impacts, in accordance with the cultural heritage resources priorities established in Policy 4.2.1 of this Plan;
e) alternatives to the proposal; and
f) identification of and justification for the preferred option.

The City will determine the need for a Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment in consultation with the owner/applicant. The City will refer the completed Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment to MHAC when the development is major in nature or where the City believes there will be a detrimental impact to the cultural heritage resource.

A Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment shall be undertaken by a professional who is qualified to evaluate the cultural heritage resource under review.
3.5 City of Cambridge Heritage Master Plan

The Cambridge Heritage Master Plan (Bray, 2008) was finalized in June 2008 and is introduced as follows:

“It is a new approach to current issues surrounding the management of heritage places. In this it is both a vision document and a policy document, both a product and a process. At the highest level, the Plan expresses the shared values of the community, as manifest in buildings and landscapes and in the cultural uses of such places. The Plan explores these values, puts them in an historic context, and shows how they can have relevance now and in the future. Policies (and actions) in the Plan are intended to make that vision a reality. The Plan is a document to reference as well as a process to forge new ways of doing things. The Heritage Master Plan is an essential first step in moving forward and focusing on the key issues around preparing heritage conservation policies and strategies. However, the Plan is no panacea: it depends upon acceptance by both the City administration and the public at large and, thus, will be proven if it results in new projects and improved management practices.” (Bray, 2008)

In particular Section 6.3 Character Areas:

“Blair has a distinct identity as a rural village, a character that has been conserved as a result of the village core being designated as a Heritage Conservation District. While threats to this character still exist in the form of suburban development on the fringes and increased traffic through the village core, the visual image of a stable rural setting remains intact. Because this is a village and not a larger settlement, the density of building is lower and the prevalence of landscape more evident. Informal development patterns can be seen in both the irregular street layout and the scattered placement of buildings. Of particular note is the survival of a representative sample of a range of former building types, including mills, inns, shops, institutional and agricultural buildings. The village’s rural character is further enhanced by the conservation of its surrounding natural setting, with the Grand River on the east and the rare land trust to the south and west. Several themes from Blair’s history can be used to guide conservation and development.” (Bray, 2008)
3.6 Blair Heritage Conservation District (BVHCD)

The Blair area was studied as a special policy area in 1997 and the City of Cambridge proceeded with a Heritage Conservation District Plan (HCD) in 1998 which was adopted in 1999 (Figure 3).

“The community of Blair will remain a village in character, form and function, protected from suburban development with strong policies to protect and enhance the natural environment and heritage features, and promote village design. New development must be assimilated into the village – not be an entity unto itself, nor engulf the village.” (Hill, 1999)

Although 28 Fallbrook Lane is not identified in the Blair Village HCD Plan (Hill, 1999) as a building that contributes to the cultural heritage value of the HCD it is still considered a protected property within the BVHCD and the BVHCD guidelines apply.

---

**Figure 3** – Blair Village Heritage Conservation District Boundary. (Image: Blair Village HCD Plan.)
4.0 Historical Summary

4.1 Grand River

The Grand River watershed is the largest in Ontario and flows approximately 275 kilometres south from its sources in the Townships of Amaranth, Luther, Maryborough and Mornington to its mouth at Lake Erie. (Bray et al., June 2008). Its primary tributaries are the Speed, Nith, Eramosa and Conestogo Rivers and along with all the tributaries make up a watershed of approximately 6734 square kilometers. In the Mohawk language the name for the Grand River is O:se Kenhionhata:tie which translates to "Willow River". Early French colonists called the river “Grande-Rivière” and later still John Graves Simcoe named the river Ouse River after the river that was near his boyhood home on the east coast of England. However, the anglicized form of the French name became the common name.

The Grand River is a Canadian Heritage River and along with the Speed River (a tributary), is the most significant geographic feature in the City of Cambridge with wide breadth, steep treed banks and magnificent limestone outcroppings. Included in the reasons for nomination the river has the following distinctive elements as it passes through the city of Cambridge:

- evidence of the groups that have settled and retained their culture since the mid-19th century through settlement patterns, buildings, arts and events;
- recognition of the stewardship role of First Nations peoples;
- significant concentrations of 19th century industrial buildings and structures;
- associations with famous people such as artist Homer Watson;
- and varied natural habitats, some of them Provincially significant.

In addition, there are:

- areas of archaeological potential;
- distinctive bridges, flood control levees, converted rail corridors, and former riverside industrial buildings adapted to new uses.6

It was designated along with its tributaries as a Canadian Heritage River System in 1994. This designation is an honorific status and not the same as designations of built heritage resources or cultural heritage landscapes under the Ontario Heritage Act. Maintaining the heritage river status is dependent upon the retention and conservation of identified features and values that contribute to the Grand River as a heritage river system.\(^7\)

Small tributaries of the Grand River characterize this area including Bowman and Bechtel Creeks and four mill ponds Durham, Sheave, Carlisle and Bechtel.

### 4.2 Indigenous Peoples

There have been indigenous peoples in southern Ontario for approximately 11,000 years and the site of this study is situated on land that is in the traditional territory of the Neutral, Anishinaabe and Haudenosaunee people. Remnants of historic Indigenous communities have often been found close by lakes and rivers as they were ideal locations for fishing, hunting, foraging for plants, roots, nuts and berries and water for travel as well as drinking and washing.

The neutral first nation, named so for their neutral position and efforts in mediation between warring nations. Some of the first local evidence of their settlements is located near the Huron Natural Area in the City of Kitchener and is thought to date from the 1500’s.

By the 1700’s the Neutral first Nation people’s population in the area dwindled as the more dominant Six Nations settled in the area covering much of the Great Lakes basin. The Iroquois people settled into villages and practiced agriculture in a way that demonstrated their complete understanding of the earth and cycles by growing their primary crops of beans, corn and squash cooperatively together.

Their societal mores and the way they organized their communities was also mutual beneficial for all. In detailed notes by Samuel de Champlain and the Jesuits we learned that the Iroquoians practiced “personal independence and economic equality “in their society.

---

The Mohawk chief Thayendanega (Joseph Brant) had led four of the six Iroquois nations in support of the British during the American Revolution. As a result, the six nations were granted the lands six miles wide either side of the entirety of the Grand River. Joseph Brant would go on to be a representative for the Six Nations in the subsequent sale of some of these lands.8

4.3 Historical Background

Waterloo Township

Sir Frederick Haldimand granted land up both sides of the Grand River from source to mouth to the Six Nations for their loyalty to the British during the American Revolutionary Wars from the lands he had previously acquired from the indigenous people that resided in these lands. The entire area he acquired became known as the Haldimand Tract.9

The lands granted to the Six Nations were then divided into large blocks and offered for sale and Block Two consisting of 94,012 acres was purchased by land speculator Richard Beasley from Joseph Brant on behalf of the Six Nations in 1796. Block Two was incorporated into the District of Gore in 1816 and became Waterloo Township within Waterloo County.

Beasley was having financial challenges and as the property was mortgaged he was prohibited from dividing and selling lots until it was paid in full and he had received the deed from his creditors. However, despite this, by 1800 he was subdividing selling lots in order to raise funds. Lots were sold largely to German Mennonites from Pennsylvania who began settling and clearing land. When a lien was placed against the lands for nonpayment the settlers learned of it and fearing loss of their lands that they did not hold clear title on, they came to an agreement with Beasley to raise funds themselves to purchase a further 60,000 acres from him in 1803. The funds they paid him were

8 Mancini, Joe. Remembering Our Underlying Aboriginal Heritage https://www.theworkingcentre.org/ideas-and-influences/2696-remembering-our-underlying-aboriginal-heritage

to be used to pay off the creditors so the Mennonites would own the land free and clear. With this agreement in place Samuel Bricker and Daniel Erb representing the newly formed German Company returned to Pennsylvania to raise funds among their family and brethren.\textsuperscript{10}

\textbf{Village of Blair}

The first settler in the area was Samuel D. Betzner, he owned the block of land that the village would be established on and while he cleared and farmed a portion of it, he sold the block in 1817 to Joseph Bowman and moved to West Flamborough.

Bowman built the first dam on what became know as Bowman Creek and established the first sawmill. In 1846, his son Samuel B. Bowman built a four-storey mill on the site which is now the Blair Flour Mill.

The Sheave Tower (Figure 40) is believed to be the only extant example of this type of this mechanical transfer technology. The tower was built in approximately 1876 to provide more power to the mill and stands thirty-one feet high and is located approximately two hundred and forty feet downstream and was connected to the mill via a wire cable run on large eight-foot cast iron wheels at either end that attached to the vertical shaft that ran down inside the tower to a water powered turbine at its base. The tower needed to be braced with wire cables on its opposite side to prevent collapse.

\textsuperscript{10} Quantrell, Jim \textit{A Part of Our Past: Essays on Cambridge’s History} (Published by the City of Cambridge Archives, 2000), p.21
The village went through several names including Durham and Durhamville inspired by Henry Bechtel’s Durham Flour Mill in the 1830’s (lost to fire in 1955) followed by Shinglebridge for the shingled covered bridge that crossed the Grand River around 1835 (until damaged by ice in 1857). The name that followed was Lamb’s Bridge due to John Lamb’s tavern and store located at the end of the bridge that spanned the Grand River’s in the 1850’s. The village was known as Carlisle for the Carlisle Mill (the original 4-storey building lost to fire in 1931) until 1858 when the post office was established and as a Carlisle post office already existed the name Blair was chosen after Adam Johnston Ferguson-Blair a local judge, colonel of the militia and elected official.

4.4 Early Maps of the Township of Waterloo

Block 2 (German Company Tract) as depicted in 1805 indicated the west and east halves of the entire Lot 3 in Beasley’s Old Survey as owned by Abraham Bechtel and Jacob Bechtel respectively (Figure 5). Tremaine’s Map of the County of Waterloo dated 1861 (Figure 6) indicates H. and J. Bechtel as owners of the part of Lot 3 that is west of Bechtel’s Creek. The road allowance that is Fallbrook Lane today is indicated on Tremaine’s Map as well as in the Illustrated Historical Atlas of the County of Waterloo published in 1881 (Figure 7).
4.5 Ownership and Land Title Abstract

The land title abstracts for the City of Cambridge in the Region of Waterloo indicate that the subject real property is part of Lot 3 on Plan 67R-555 registered in 1974 in the City of Cambridge. Prior to 1974 the subject property was described as Part of Lot 3 in Beasley’s Old Survey, Lower Block in the Town of Preston.

Gordon Rottar purchased the lot (3.32 acres) from Ronald Reid and Arlene Pueschel in 1973 and the lot itself was part of land registered in Plan 67R-555 in 1974. An agreement of sale was registered on title in 1976 for Gerhard Sowa to purchase Part 3 of Plan 67R-555 from Gordon Rottar. Sowa took out a mortgage from his company Sowa Tool & Machine Company and the T-D Bank in 1976. Litigation between Sowa and Rottar was registered on title in 1978-79. Sowa sold the property to P. K. Kutty and O. K. Kutty in 1986. After living at the property for more than a decade, John Jonas sold the property to Ms. Andrea May Clark and Mr. Christopher John Home Hamilton in 2017. The current owners purchased the property in October 2020.

For more information see Table 1 in Appendix 1 for selected entries from the land title abstracts for Part of Lot 3 in Beasley’s Old Survey, Lower Block, City of Cambridge, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (formerly in the Town of Preston) and for Lot 3 on Reference Plan 67R-555.
5.0 Subject Property

5.1 Property Description

The subject property is described as Part 3 on Registered Plan 67R-555 (Figure 8) and comprises 3.313 acres.

Travelling south on Fallbrook Lane from Blair Road, the property is on the west side of 28 Fallbrook Lane just north of the a ninety-degree turn in the road leading east over Bechtel Creek (Figure 9).

Figure 8 - Plan 67R-555, dated February 27, 1974. (Image provided by owner.)

Figure 9 - Location of subject property. (Image: City of Cambridge; yellow highlight by RHC.)
5.2 Architectural Description

The subject dwelling is approached via a long, asphalt lane rising gently to the east elevation of the house (Figures 1 and 10). The house is built into the hill so that it is a low single storey along the front with a walk out basement in the rear. The building has low pitch roof slopes which are clad in red terracotta tiles and deep, open cornice soffits supported by three single, slendour struts at the gable walls. The exterior walls are clad in white stucco with trowel marks for a textured surface.

The view from the driveway approach contains largely the two east-facing gables and a three-arch arcade containing a metal gate leading to an open atrium and the front door.

The L-shape plan has a three-car garage extending east toward the road (Figure 11). A blind window faces Fallbrook Lane on the front or east gable wall of the garage (Figure 12).
The terra cotta roof, white succo exterior, arcaded entrance with decorative metalwork all give the dwelling the appearance of a design influenced by Central American or Mediterranean residential architectural styles (Figure 13).

The atrium floor has been laid with red terra cotta quarry tiles,

The front door is within a glass wall and supported by large beams. (Figures 14 and 15) To either side of the glass wall are patio doors leading to the dining room on left and another room to the right.
Although difficult to see from the approach via the driveway, the house has a tall (2-storey equivalent) swimming pool wing to the north with a floor plate at the basement level (Figure 16).

The basement level rooms are large and typical of so many large suburban dwellings built in the later 20th century. The group of photos in Figure 17 show the tall ceiling of the swimming pool room as well as the relatively low basement ceiling in the billiards room and the bar room.

Figure 16 - Pool wing. (Photo: RHC 2020)

Figure 17 - Basement level rooms: swimming pool, billiards room and bar room. (Photo: RHC 2020)
The large property is treed throughout largely with evergreens of similar age that suggests they were likely planted about the time that the house was built (Figure 18). The owner has recently removed the understorey and several damaged and or diseased mature trees but otherwise the trees will remain with the proposed project.

The sunroom shown in Figure 19 appears has been added after the original construction without a full foundation is located off the kitchen and living room.

Figure 18 - View from west rear of house. (Photo: RHC Dec 2020)

Figure 19 - Sunroom off kitchen with masonry barbeque on right. (Photo: RHC Dec 2020)
### 5.3 Determining Cultural Heritage Value and Interest

The following criteria (in the left column of the table) are prescribed by Ontario Regulation 9/06 under the Ontario Heritage Act for determining cultural heritage value or interest: In the opinion of Robinson Heritage Consulting, the property known as 28 Fallbrook Lane in the City of Cambridge, has no cultural heritage value in and of itself. It is designated under part V of the Heritage Act by virtue of its location inside the BVHCD but is not recognized as a contributing building on the inventory.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. The property has <strong>design value or physical value</strong> because it,</th>
<th>28 Fallbrook Lane has <strong>no design value or physical value</strong> because it,</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i. is a rare, unique, representative, or early example of a style, type, expression, material, or construction method,</td>
<td>i. is <strong>not</strong> a rare, unique, representative, or early example of a style, type, expression, material, or construction method,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit, or</td>
<td>ii. does not display a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit, or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement.</td>
<td>iii. does not demonstrate a high degree of technical or scientific achievement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. The property has <strong>historical value or associative value</strong> because it,</th>
<th>28 Fallbrook Lane <strong>does not</strong> have <strong>historical value or associative value</strong> because it,</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i. has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization, or institution that is significant to a community,</td>
<td>i. does not have direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization, or institution that is significant to the City of Cambridge, the Village of Blair or the Region of Waterloo,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of a community or culture, or</td>
<td>ii. does not yield, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of the City of Cambridge, the Village of Blair or the Region of Waterloo, or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer, or theorist who is significant to a community.</td>
<td>- does not yield, or have the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of a community or culture,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. The property has **contextual value** because it,
   
i. is important in defining, maintaining, or supporting the character of an area,
   
ii. is physically, functionally, visually, or historically linked to its surroundings, or
   
iii. is a landmark.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>28 Fallbrook Lane has <strong>no contextual value</strong> because it,</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i. <strong>is not</strong> important in defining, maintaining, or supporting the character of an area,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. <strong>is not</strong> physically, functionally, visually, or historically linked to its surroundings, or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. <strong>is not</strong> a landmark.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Using criteria from the City of Cambridge’s Official Plan policies (described in Section 3.4 of this CHIA), 28 Fallbrook Lane in the BVHCD in the city of Cambridge does not have cultural heritage value as it does not meet any of the criteria prescribed by Ontario Regulation 9/06 under the Ontario Heritage Act for determining cultural heritage value or interest.

### 5.4 Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest

The house at 28 Fallbrook Lane in the city of Cambridge was built in 1977 in what would become the Village of Blair Heritage Conservation District. The house at 28 Fallbrook Lane predates the district and therefore the guidelines for new construction within the BVHCD were not in existence. The house is of no cultural heritage value or interest other than as a large, wooded lot consistent with the lots along Fallbrook Lane.
6.0 Proposed Development, Impacts and Mitigation

6.1 Proposed Development

The owners are proposing alterations to the dwelling to update it and make it more functional for their family. Overall, they are retaining the basic footprint and adding a second storey over the middle section maintaining a low roofline. This addition coupled with the new doors, windows and flat roof additions changes the design from a Central American or Mediterranean style to a modern suburban style dwelling.

Demonstrated in Figures 20 and 21, the blind window in the garage gable wall has been removed, new garage doors and windows throughout added, the open atrium would be enclosed with a new columned and hooded front entryway added. This new entryway is more appropriate for the scale and massing of the dwelling and more readily articulates the front entry with the columns and flat roof hood which ties in with the proposed flat roof conservatory in the rear.

Most significantly a second storey has been added over the centre section of the dwelling only in order not to overwhelm the lower sections of the dwelling nor the landscape. The house is quite secluded from Fallbrook and the neighbouring dwelling which is of a similar building height. The tile roof is proposed to be replaced with modern shingle. The dwelling including the additions will maintain a white stucco finish.
From the rear of the dwelling (Figure 22) the building would rise three stories where the basement is above grade. The proposed flat roofed conservatory ties in with the front entry hood and is balanced nicely with the outdoor kitchen/gilling and entertaining area is expanded and would be better integrated into the dwelling (Figure 23). This is a significant improvement over the current unconnected spaces along the rear elevation. The windows and doors would be replaced with the same as the other elevations.

6.2 Impacts and Mitigations

The original 1977 dwelling at 28 Fallbrook Lane appears to be inspired by a Central American or Mediterranean style which is not a recognized historic style in the district and therefore the dwelling is of no cultural heritage value in its own right and does not contribute to the BVHCD. There is little in the BVHCD that addresses alterations to non-contributing buildings.

The proposed additions and alterations make use of the non-contributing building in a largely sustainable manner with the result that the renovated dwelling would still be a non-contributing building to the BVHCD.

The large, wooded lot is typical of those along this section of Fallbrook Lane and the proposed development retains the large, mature trees and thus provides limited views of the house from the road.

The BVHCD Guidelines does talk to the nature of Fallbrook Lane with hedgerows and recommends that where found are protected and
encouraged. The guidelines also comment directly on the walls, fences and gates as entry features to properties and indicates that large masonry types such as those found along Fallbrook lane are not in keeping with the BVHCD and should be avoided. The guidelines offer suggestions for simply masonry and wood structures as well as “country” gardens that avoid urbanizing the laneway. Likewise gravel for lanes or driveways are appropriate in country settings. RHC would concur and would recommend that the “gates” and wing walls be softened with more natural plantings and if replaced that a style from the BVHCD guidelines be adopted.

7.0 Conclusion

This Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment (CHIA) has confirmed that there is no cultural heritage value in the dwelling on the property at 28 Fallbrook Lane within the BVHCD in the city of Cambridge. Built in 1977, the original dwelling is designed in a Central American or Mediterranean-inspired style which is not a contributing dwelling in the BVHCD. The subject property is located in the BVHCD and therefore is designated which triggered the need for a CHIA which ultimately after assessed was determined that the property does not satisfy the criteria to determine cultural heritage value used by Ontario Regulation 9/06, the City of Cambridge Official Plan and the BVHCD Study and Guidelines.

RHC anticipates no negative impacts to the dwelling associated with the proposed additions and alterations and therefore is of the opinion that would not pose a negative impact on the BVHCD.
### Appendix 1 – Selected Entries from Land Title Abstract

**Table 1 - Selected entries from Land Title Abstract (Source: OnLand, Ontario Land Registry Access)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reg No</th>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Instr Date</th>
<th>Regist Date</th>
<th>Grantor</th>
<th>Grantee</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Consid</th>
<th>Land and Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>517587</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>5 Mar 1973</td>
<td>9 Mar 1973</td>
<td>Ronald J. Reid &amp; Arlene L. Pueschel</td>
<td>Gordon J. Rottar (to uses)</td>
<td>3.32 acres</td>
<td>$2</td>
<td>Part Lot recital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67R-555</td>
<td>Ref Plan</td>
<td>27 Feb 1974</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>547753</td>
<td>Agreement of Sale</td>
<td>26 Feb 1976</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gerhard Sowa</td>
<td>Gordon J. Rottar</td>
<td>Pt Lot shown as Part 3 on 67R-555</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>554937</td>
<td>Mortgage</td>
<td>15 May 1976</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gerhard Sowa</td>
<td>Sowa Tool &amp; Machine Company</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>Pt Lot shown as Part 3 on 67R-555</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>571851</td>
<td>Judgement</td>
<td>4 Apr 1978</td>
<td>6 Apr 1978</td>
<td>Gerhard Sowa (P)</td>
<td>Gordon Rottar (D)</td>
<td>Pt Lot shown as Part 3 on 67R-555</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>582533</td>
<td>Order</td>
<td>9 Mar 1979</td>
<td>13 Mar 1979</td>
<td>S.C.O. Gerhard Sowa, Plaintiff</td>
<td>Gordon J. Rottar, Defendant</td>
<td>Pt Lot shown as Part 3 on 67R-555</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel Number</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Dates</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>583236</td>
<td>Assign of D. B. of C.</td>
<td>June 1977 to 10 Apr 1979</td>
<td>Exec of Ronald Reid debtor, Joseph Sprackman trustee, Pt Lot shown as Part 3 on 67R-555</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>583237</td>
<td>Discharge Mortgage</td>
<td>15 Mar 1979 to 10 Apr 1979</td>
<td>Trustee of Ronald J. Reid, Gordon J. Rottar, re: 517588</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>625993</td>
<td>Mortgage</td>
<td>26 Jan 1984</td>
<td>SOWA, Gerhard, The Royal Bank of Canada, $150,000, Part being Part 3 on 67R-555</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>656855</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>15 July 1986</td>
<td>SOWA, Gerhard, KUTTY, Patinjareparayil K. KUTTY, Moana K., Part being Part 3 67R-555</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>757545</td>
<td>Charge</td>
<td>31 Dec 1991</td>
<td>KUTTY, Patinjareparayil Karunakaran and KUTTY, Omana Karumathil, Royal Bank of Canada, $500,000, Part being Part 3 67R-555, 28 Fallbrook Lane Assigned by 1268121</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2 – Elevations and Plans of Existing Dwelling

Figure 24 – Elevations of Existing Dwelling, A-01 (360 Smart Design, Oct 2020)
Figure 25 - Basement Plan of Existing Dwelling, A-01 (360 Smart Design, Oct 2020)
Figure 26 - Main Floor Plan of Existing Dwelling, A-01 (360 Smart Design, Oct 2020)
Appendix 3 - Plans and Conceptual Renderings of Proposed Dwelling

Figure 27 - Proposed Main Floor Plan (360 Smart Design, Oct 2020)
Figure 28 - Proposed Second Floor Plan (360 Smart Design, Oct 2020)
Figure 29 - Conceptual rendering (front) (Image: 360 Smart Design, Oct 2020)
Figure 30 - Conceptual rendering (rear) (Image: 360 Smart Design, Oct 2020)
Figure 31 - Conceptual rendering (rear corner) (Image: 360 Smart Design, Oct 2020)
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24 Carlton Place
Centre Wellington (Elora), Ontario

24 Carlton Place, Elora, Ontario was built by Joseph Walser to expand the Elora Furniture Company’s factory in 1911. Referred to as Building No. 2, it was a functional space that housed finishing, shipping and administration for the company. More recently it is remembered as the Little Folks children’s furniture factory administration building before being left vacant. 24 Carlton Place now enjoys its role in the Elora Mill revitalization project which has been a masterful reinvigoration of the picturesque Elora Mill on the north bank and surrounding buildings into gracious wedding facilities and hotel accommodations. 24 Carlton Place was the first building on the south bank to be brought back from its vacant state of disrepair and reimagined as a chapel and offices in concert with the mill facilities on the north bank. RHC prepared the Heritage Impact Assessment and Conservation Plan that identified the property’s heritage attributes and guided their conservation as well as advising on the new elements to be incorporated in the building envelope. With RHC’s guidance the design team has reimagined the building keeping the simplicity of its industrial heritage intact while adding details that mark the building in Pearle Hospitality’s signature style. RHC is continuing work on the balance of the development on the south bank of the Grand River in Elora.
Fergus High School
Centre Wellington (Fergus), Ontario

Built in 1929 this cut limestone school building was the Fergus High School for many Centre Wellington teens before the doors closed when a modern high school was built to accommodate a growing population. First imagined as apartments or office suites, the building was eventually purchased by the Emmanuel Christian School to be reopened as their high school. This landmark building marks an architectural period when form and function were embraced even within the constraints of limited budgets. When heritage buildings can continue in the service for which they were built it is always an exciting project. RHC prepared a Heritage Impact Assessment and Conservation Plan that resulted in the restoration of the old GIRLS entrance leaving the stone exterior exposed inside the new addition and restoration of stonework on the remaining facades. The Conservation Plan remains a relevant guiding document for future such changes as window replacement and repointing.
Dickson Public School
Cambridge, Ontario

Dickson Public School, located at 65 St. Andrews Street in the old Galt area of Cambridge, was originally built in 1876 with two expansions for the growing town made by 1894. Closed by the school board as being inadequate for the community’s needs it was sold and plans are underway to convert the space into high end commercial office space. RHC prepared a Heritage Impact Assessment that uncovered the history of the additions and original layout of the building that kept the style and proportion of the original design. Rehabilitation is underway that would retain and highlight the wonderful heritage attributes in these new sophisticated offices.
Robert Orr Farmhouse  
Huron Road, Kitchener, Ontario

Rural cultural heritage landscapes may be protected by retaining views of original farms with treed laneways that dot the countryside as landmarks of craftsmanship and prosperity. This Huron Road property is one of the few remaining farmhouses along a portion of the Huron Road within the City of Kitchener. RHC worked with Mattamy Homes and the City of Kitchener to integrate the historic home within a residential subdivision that established an appropriate lot and dedicated lands in front of the home protecting the views of the house and treed laneway to and from the Huron Road. RHC prepared the Heritage Impact Assessment and the Conservation Plan which guided the removal of the rear outbuilding and recommended protective measures until restoration began. The new owners of the property have restored the windows and front door, had new storm windows created and are restoring interior features using the Conservation Plan which also guides recreating the front porch and addresses landscaping and potential additions.
RHC PROJECT HISTORY

2019

11 Irwin Avenue, Town of Aurora – Heritage Impact Assessment
Client: Hemraj Sarwor, May 2019

2018

Potter Foundry and the Elora South Condominiums, Elora, Township of Centre Wellington – Heritage Impact Assessment (Scoped)
Client: Elora South Inc., December 2018

3650 Eglinton Avenue West, Mississauga – Heritage Impact Assessment
Client: Minuk Contracting Company Ltd., November 2018

Robert Orr Farmhouse, Huron Road, Kitchener – Interpretive Panel
Client: City of Kitchener, November 2018

1040 Garner Road West (Ancaster), Hamilton – Heritage Impact Assessment
Client: Garner Investments Inc., October 2018

St. Mary’s Parish Rectory Building, Owen Sound – Heritage Impact Assessment
Client: St. Mary’s and the Missions, September 2018

45 James Street, Cambridge – Heritage Impact Assessment (Scoped)
Client: Ed Gazendam, August 2018

Ross Street Properties, Elora, Township of Centre Wellington – Heritage Impact Assessment
Client: Elora South Inc., April 2018

2017

7177 Lancaster Avenue, Mississauga – Heritage Impact Assessment
Client: Balkar Singh Garcha, November 2017

Little Folks Building, 24 Carlton Place, Elora, Township of Centre Wellington – Heritage Impact Assessment/Conservation Plan
Client: Elora South Inc., September 2017
“The Gore”, 266 and 280 Northumberland Street, Ayr, Township of North Dumfries – Heritage Impact Statement  
Client: Engel Developments, April 2017

6830 Main Street West, Town of Milton – Heritage Impact Assessment  
Client: Paul De Battista, March 2017

22 Shade Street, Cambridge – Heritage Impact Assessment  
Client: Salvation Army, August 2016

Reid Farmhouse, 20 Stokes Trail (Campbellville), Milton - Heritage Impact Assessment  
Client: Carson Reid Homes, August 2016

Dickson Public School, 65 St. Andrews Street, Cambridge – Heritage Impact Assessment  
Client: Summerco Properties, May 2016

St. Agnes Anglican Church, 69 Long Branch Boulevard and 24 Marina Avenue, Toronto - Heritage Impact Statement  
Client: Gil Shcolyar, March 2016

4908 Highway 7 (Woodbridge), Vaughan - Heritage Impact Assessment  
Client: Camelot on 7 Inc., January 2016

Huronia Regional Centre, 700 Memorial Avenue, Orillia - Heritage Impact Assessment  
Client: Infrastructure Ontario (represented by MHPM Development Solutions Inc. and DST Consulting Engineers Inc.) December 2015

Chatham Provinical Courthouse and Walkway, 21 Seventh Street, Chatham - Heritage Impact Assessment  
Client: Infrastructure Ontario (represented by MHPM Development Solutions Inc. and DST Consulting Engineers Inc.) December 2015

Cassidy Farmhouse at St. Thomas Psychiatric Hospital, 467 Sunset Drive - Heritage Impact Assessment  
Client: Infrastructure Ontario; (represented by MHPM Development Solutions Inc. and DST Consulting Engineers Inc.) December 2015
York Detention Centre, 354 George Street, Toronto - Heritage Impact Assessment  
Client: Infrastructure Ontario; represented by MHPM Development Solutions Inc. and DST Consulting Engineers Inc., December 2015

Brooklyn and College Hill Heritage Conservation District - Expert Witness at Ontario Municipal Board Hearing (MM140079)  
Employer: City of Guelph, October 2015

7575 Kennedy Road, Brampton - Heritage Impact Assessment  
Client: City of Brampton, June 2015

Lot 22 Concession 9 Bridge, Township of Windham (Norfolk County) – Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report  
Client: County of Norfolk, and G. Douglas Valee Limited, March 2015

Fergus High School, 680 Tower Street, (Fergus) Township of Centre Wellington - Scoped Heritage Impact Assessment/Conservation Plan  
Client: Emmanuel Christian High School, February 2015

2 William Street, Elmira - Heritage Impact Assessment  
Client: Scott and Libby Playford, January 2015

Herb & Elsie Crawford Farm, Brampton – Heritage Impact Assessment  
Client: City of Brampton, August 2014

Silvercreek Farm, Caledon – Review of Reasons for Designation  
Client: Town of Caledon, August 2014

111 Mary Street, Milton - Heritage Impact Assessment  
Client: Andrew and Caroline Kocher, May 2014

New Toronto Hydro Substation, 124 Birmingham Street, Toronto - Heritage Impact Statement  
Client: 5th Essential Inc., April 2014
150 King Street South, Waterloo – Heritage Impact Assessment  
Client: ABA Architects Inc., December 2013

58 Richmond Street, Richmond Hill - Cultural Heritage Impact Statement  
Client: Alex Boros Planning + Design Associates, December 2013

Bob Devereaux Bridge, County of Brant – Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report  
Client: County of Brant, and G. Douglas Valee Limited, August 2013

Concession A Bridge, Township of South Walsingham – Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report  
Client: County of Norfolk, and G. Douglas Valee Limited, July 2013

“Heritage Square” Condominium, Fergus – Heritage Impact Assessment  
Client: Jennark Homes Ltd., May 2013

1683 Huron Road, Kitchener – Conservation Plan  
Client: Mattamy Homes Ltd., May 2013

9307 Union Drive, Strathroy-Caradoc – Heritage Impact Assessment  
Client: Canadian Solar Developers and Exp Inc., Renewal Energy Approval, September 2012

8338 Scotchmere Drive, Strathroy-Caradoc – Heritage Impact Assessment  
Client: Canadian Solar Developers and Exp Inc., Renewal Energy Approval, September 2012

1216 Penetanguishene Road, Township of Springwater – Heritage Impact Assessment  
Client: Canadian Solar Developers and Exp Inc., Renewal Energy Approval, September 2012

Dolby House, 6003 Regional Road 25, Milton – Heritage Impact Assessment  
Client: Regional Municipality of Halton, October 2012

7030 Walker’s Line, Milton - Heritage Impact Assessment  
Client: Jay Robinson Custom Homes, Inc., June 2012

Wilson Farmhouse, 80 Simmonds Drive, Guelph – Expert Witness at Conservation Review Board Hearing (CRB1103)
Employer: City of Guelph, June 2012

John Love House, 630 King Road, Richmond Hill – Heritage Impact Assessment
Client: Evans Planning, February 2012

“Rural Church Architecture: Ellis Church, Puslinch Township”
Public presentation given at Ellis Church, 150th Anniversary, July 2011

Dolby Garage, 6009 Regional Road 25, Milton – Heritage Impact Assessment
Client: Regional Municipality of Halton, April 2011

2485 Conservation Road, Milton - Heritage Impact Assessment
Client: K. Strobele, February 2011

5761 First Line, Milton - Heritage Impact Assessment
Client: Scrap Metal Depot Inc., November 2010

61 Usher Street, Brantford - Heritage Impact Assessment
Client: First Home Construction Inc., July 2010

Alexandra School, 1525-7th Ave. E., Owen Sound – Cultural Heritage Property Evaluation
Client: Bluewater District School Board, May 2010

124 Birmingham Street, Toronto – Heritage Impact Assessment
Client: City of Toronto Economic Development Corporation, March 2010

8656 Creditview Road, Brampton - Heritage Research Report

13941 Airport Road, Town of Caledon - Heritage Impact Assessment
Client: Glen Schnarr & Associates, November 2009

9381 Guelph Line, Milton - Heritage Impact Assessment
Client: Loedige (Canada) Limited, October 2009

ROBINSON
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8763 Bayview Avenue, Richmond Hill - Heritage Impact Assessment
Client: Signature Developments Inc., July 2009

1524 Countryside Drive, Brampton - Heritage Impact Assessment
Client: City of Brampton, July 2009

418 Glasgow Street, Kitchener - Heritage Impact Assessment
Client: Doug Cornwell, June 2009

7435 Ninth Line, Mississauga - Heritage Impact Statement
Client: ProLogis Canada and Erin Mills Development, April 2009

340 Oak Street, Milton - Heritage Impact Assessment
Client: 52457 Ontario Limited, April 2009

501 and 511 John Street, Burlington – Heritage Impact Assessment
Client: Carriage Gate Group Inc., and Millington & Associates, February 2009

11859 Hurontario Street, Brampton – Heritage Impact Assessment
Client: Dinesh Patel, January 2009

47-49 Alice Street, Guelph – Expert Witness at Conservation Review Board Hearing (CRB0816)
Client: City of Guelph, December 2008

1571 Fisher Hallman Road, Kitchener – Salvage Documentation Report
Client: Mattamy Homes Ltd., November 2008

Branningham Grove, 2010 16th Street East – Cultural Heritage Property Evaluation
Client: City of Owen Sound, October 2008

12 Henderson Avenue, Brampton – Heritage Impact Assessment
Client: 1753849 Ontario Inc., October 2008

318 Guelph Avenue, Cambridge – Heritage Assessment
Client: Doug Craig, Mayor of Cambridge, June 2008
48 George Street North, Cambridge – Heritage Impact Assessment
Client: Maison Canada Holdings Ltd., May 2008

27-31 Cambridge Street, Cambridge – Heritage Impact Assessment
Client: Techno Steel Canada, April 2008

1120 Bovaird Drive West, Brampton – Heritage Impact Assessment

St. Mary’s High School – Heritage Documentation Report
Client: Bruce Grey Catholic District School Board and SRM Architects Inc., December 2007

Fergus High School – Heritage Impact Assessment
Client: Reid’s Heritage Homes, December 2007

“An Uncertain Future – The Royal Hotel, Cambridge”

33 Southwood Drive, Cambridge – Heritage Impact Assessment
Client: Geoffrey Reid, September 2007

Carnegie Public Library, Owen Sound – Reasons for Designation
Client: City of Owen Sound, September 2007

Harrison Park, Owen Sound – Reasons for Designation
Client: City of Owen Sound, September 2007

1683 Huron Road, Kitchener – Heritage Impact Assessment
Client: Mattamy Homes Ltd., June 2007

1571 Fisher Hallman Road, Kitchener – Heritage Impact Assessment
Client: Mattamy Homes Ltd., June 2007

Preston Meadows, 633 Margaret Street, Cambridge – Heritage Impact Assessment
Client: Reid’s Heritage Homes, in collaboration with Stantec Consulting, April 2007
443 Dover Street North, Cambridge – Heritage Impact Assessment
Client: Carl Csanits, January 2007

Barber Paper Mill, Town of Halton Hills – Heritage Impact Assessment
Produced in collaboration with The Ventin Group Architects
Client: Everlast Restoration, December 2006

806 Gordon Street, Guelph – Heritage Documentation Report
Client: Mar-Cot Homes Ltd., November 2006

Revue Theatre, Roncesvalles Avenue, Toronto – Heritage Documentation Report
Client: Chris McQuillan, September 2006

Interpretive Plaque Project on Queen Street, Cambridge (Hespeler)
Client: Heritage Cambridge, July 2006

John Abell Factory, Toronto - Preliminary Heritage Assessment
Client: Verdiroc Development Corporation, and AREA Architects, May 2006

Peer Review of Heritage Assessment of Proposed Duntroon Quarry Expansion
Clearview Township, County of Simcoe, Ontario

Queen’s Hotel, Owen Sound – Reasons for Designation
Client: City of Owen Sound, April 2006

299 & 313 Plains Road W., Burlington – Heritage Impact Assessment
Client: Recchia Developments Inc., and Greg Poole & Associates, February 2006

246 Crawley Road, Guelph – Heritage Impact Assessment

Industry & Perseverance: A History of the City of Brantford
(Compact disc) in collaboration with Dr. Peter Farrugia
Client: Wilfrid Laurier University and Brant Historical Society, 2006
148 Crawley Road, Guelph – Heritage Impact Assessment
Client: Royal-LePage Commercial, June 2005

Brantford Heritage Inventory
Built heritage assessments/ research for over 5,000 properties in the City of Brantford
Employer: Brantford Planning Department, June 2001 to February 2005

63-67 Woolwich Street, Guelph – Heritage Documentation Report
Client: Wellington Catholic District School Board, February 2004

*Grand Old Bridges: The Grand River Watershed Bridge Inventory*
Assessment of heritage bridges within the Grand River watershed
Client: Grand River Conservation Authority, 2004

*John McCrae in Flanders Fields* – web tour
produced with Tracie Seedhouse for the Keys to History series
Client: Guelph Civic Museum / McCord Museum, Montreal, April 2004

Brant Arts, Culture & Heritage Centre (BACH Project)
Heritage assessments for Roger Jones & Associates and The Ventin Group Architects
Client: BACH Steering Committee, September 2003

340 Clair Road, Guelph – Heritage Documentation Report
Produced in association with The Ventin Group Architects
Client: Reid's Heritage Homes, July 2003

1471 Gordon Street, Guelph – Heritage Documentation Report
Produced in association with The Ventin Group Architects
Client: Reid's Heritage Homes, July 2003
341 Forestell Road, Guelph – Heritage Documentation Report
Produced in association with TSH Engineers Architects and Planners
Client: City of Guelph, September 2002

*Heritage Sampler* and *An Interactive Guide to Tremaine’s Map of County of Waterloo, 1861*
Client: Waterloo Regional Heritage Foundation, 2002 (compact disc)
GENERAL NOTES
DO NOT SCALE DRAWINGS. WORK TO DIMENSIONS SHOWN. THE CONTRACTOR MUST CHECK ALL DRAWINGS AND VERIFY ALL DIMENSIONS ON THE JOB.

ALL STEEL ANGLES SUPPORTING BRICK VENEER TO HAVE MIN. 6" BEARING @ ENDS, TYP.

ALL STRUCTURAL MEMBERS TO HAVE MIN. REQUIRED BEARING.

ALL ELECTRICAL WORK TO BE COMPLETED AS PER O.B.C. 9.34.

GARAGE FOUNDATION WALLS TO BE FOUNDED MIN. 4'-0" BELOW FINISHED GRADE TO ENSURE FROST COVER, TYP.

PROVIDE TWO COATS OF ASPHALT DAMPPROOFING TO ALL BELOW GRADE FOUNDATION WALLS.

PROVIDE APPROVED DRAINAGE LAYER TO FOUNDATION WALLS BELOW GRADE.

ENSURE MIN. 6'-5" HEADROOM CLEARANCE BELOW DUCTS / BULKHEADS / BEAMS.

PROVIDE VENTING TO EXTERIOR FOR ALL BATHROOMS & DRYERS. GAS FIREPLACES AND RANGE HOODS ARE TO BE VENTED TO EXTERIOR w/ NON-COMBUSTIBLE AND CORROSION RESISTANT DUCTWORK.

SMOKE DETECTORS ARE REQUIRED ON EACH FLOOR LEVEL AND IN EACH BEDROOM. THEY SHALL BE INTERCONNECTED AND HAVE A VISUAL SIGNALLING COMPONENT. INTERCONNECT CARBON MONOXIDE DETECTORS ON BEDROOM FLOORS.

PROVIDE SOLID BLOCKING IN BATHROOM WALLS FOR FUTURE GRAB BAR INSTALLATION.

NON-LOADBEARING WALLS PARALLEL TO THE FLOOR JOISTS SHALL BE SUPPORTED BY JOISTS BENEATH THE WALL OR ON BLOCKING BETWEEN THE JOISTS.

5/8" THICK SHEATHING GLUED & SCREWED UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED.

INTERIOR DOORS TO BE UNDERCUT 3/4'' FOR ROOMS WITHOUT A RETURN AIR
Goals • To maintain the narrow paved width (21') and shoulders (8').
  • Not to undertake road widening or installation of sidewalks, curbs, gutters and street lights. To finish in tar and chip.
  • To conserve and extend the hedgerows and street trees through management and annual pruning.
  • To identify the road with historic style street signs.
  • To carefully manage street trees and hedgerows with annual pruning.

MORNINGSIDE DRIVE

Morningside is one of the very earliest routes in the village, originating in 1800 as a wagon track into Joseph Wismer's farm and later extended to Doon and known as the road to Ferrie's Mill or Mill Street.

Goals • To maintain the narrow paved width (20') and shoulders (8').
  • To improve the appearance of the drive so it becomes part of the old village. Improvements would include planting edge street trees and hedgerows. Street lights should not be installed. Use tar and chip.
  • To identify the drive with historic style street signs.

LANGDON DRIVE

Langdon Drive began as a farm lane heading south through the Bechtel farm to the family's land holdings in Township of North Dumfries. It eventually connected with other primitive roads and became a public road under the Township of Waterloo in 1830. It is still a beautiful, narrow rural road enclosed by a dense hedgerow.

Goals • To maintain the narrow paved width (17') and shoulders (7').
  • To conserve and enhance the edge trees and hedgerows through management and annual pruning.
  • Not to widen the Drive or install curbs, gutters and street lights. To finish in tar and chip.
  • To post a "No Truck" traffic sign.
  • To identify the drive with historic style street signs.

FALLBROOK LANE

Access to Bechtels' tannery was by a track which turned off the farm road (now Langdon Drive) that led to the family's land in North Dumfries. Over time, this track was extended and then turned back towards the river to meet the earthworks of the mill dam on Blair Road. Many years later the track connected with Blair Road and became a public street, Fallbrook Lane. It is one of the most beautiful small scenic roads in the village.
Goals • To maintain the narrow paved width (17') and shoulders (7').
• To conserve and enhance the edge trees and hedgerows through management and annual pruning.
• Not to widen the lane or install curbs, gutters. Use tar and chip.
• To identify the lane with historical style street signs.

MEADOWCREEK LANE

Meadowcreek Lane is a later addition to the streets of Blair, appearing as Craig Street on the Allan and Geddes Survey of 1857 (former Benjamin B. Bowman farm). It is thought to have been in place by 1862 as a narrow gravel road. When the new school (present Blair Outdoor Education Centre) was built in 1959, Meadowcreek was extended further south across Old Mill Road. While relatively new compared with the other streets, it has an attractive rural character with fine views across a horse paddock at the west end.

Goals • To maintain the narrow paved width (16') and shoulders (2').
• To conserve and enhance the edge trees and hedgerows through management and annual pruning.
• Not to widen the lane or install curbs and gutters. Use tar and chip.
• To identify the Lane with historical style street signs.

ASHTON STREET OR CEMETARY LANE

Ashton Street probably originated in the early 1800s as a narrow lane from Old Mill Road to the cemetery. When the Allan and Geddes Survey was laid out in 1857, Ashton Street followed its course; the section north of Old Mill Road was never put through. In 1930, the Cemetery Board created a ceremonial entrance to the cemetery by erecting stone pillars and an ornamental archway at the Old Mill end of the lane. Frost undermined the structure, and at some point the arch was removed and the pillars reduced to their present form. Ashton Street is a landscape gem - short and very narrow and enclosed by high banked hedgerows.

Goals • To maintain the narrow paved width (12') and shoulders (3').
• To conserve and enhance the edge trees and hedgerows through management and annual pruning.
• Not to widen the lane or install, curbs and gutters. Use tar and chip.
• To re-erect the ceremonial entrance at Old Mill Road, with a metal archway inscribed "Blair Cemetery."
• To identify the lane with historic style street signs.

MUNICIPAL SERVICES

All municipal service work that impacts on the character of the historic streetscapes shall be presented to LACAC for review and approval. In general, Hydro, Bell, Cable and gas lines should be buried so as to preserve and enhance existing and future trees and hedgerows.
Shown above is the garden at 166 Morningside Drive. This is a very well designed residential garden. The lot is not overly large but the garden appears spacious by the way it has been divided up into a series of "rooms." At the front is the garage and car park, both screened by coniferous trees so that only the house is seen prominently and to advantage. Brick paths lead to the front and side entrances, edged with hedges and groundcover. Steps lead down to a paved sunken courtyard in the centre of which is a small pond. Being low and enclosed by a ground cover bank to the north creates a warm micro-climate where many sun-loving plants thrive. Vegetable and flower gardens extend down the south boundary. An old lilac hedgerow, running along one side of the vegetable garden, has been preserved. A lawn continues east to a bank affording magnificent views across the Grand River valley.

The success of this garden results from the way it has been shaped to take advantage of the sloping site to provide a series of delightful garden spaces for different purposes and plants. The house and garden meld together to create a harmonious whole. Over time, more emphasis on native plant material would be welcome.

GOALS

• To encourage country style gardens.
• To plant native plant species that provide continuity with the naturalized landscapes of the village.
• To locate non-native exotic plants around the residence and separated from native plants.
• To integrate residential gardens into the richly diverse living landscape of the village as a whole.

LOCATION

The location applies to existing and new residential gardens in the village.
CONSERVATION GUIDELINES
The Guidelines are voluntary, but they provide assistance for historic conservation,

A country garden should build on the intrinsic qualities of the surrounding rural landscape - qualities of simplicity, organic form and harmonious detail. Simplicity is all. Principles include:

• Allowing the site to suggest the design.
• Enhancing the rural village character.
• Using naturally occurring elements.
• Expressing the local ecology.
• Creating a quiet understated appearance.

These principles will give a garden in Blair coherence, durability and harmony with the surrounding rural landscape. Recommended design details are as follows:

DESIGN DETAILS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General</th>
<th>Create a soft-edged country garden design. Avoid over designed, over built and assertive city style design.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Driveways</td>
<td>Gravel is the traditional rural finish. It is porous and textured. Asphalt paving and concrete pavers are city style finishes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrance Gates</td>
<td>Wood posts and gates are traditional. Elaborate brick or stone piers are city style designs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundary Hedges</td>
<td>Native species hedgerows are a rural tradition. For additional enclosure, a wire fence between wood fence posts can be added. Pressure treated timber fences or chain link fences are city style designs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawns</td>
<td>Traditionally, rural lawns were quite small. Ground cover plantings may be used to reduce the size of the grassed area and therefore the need to use lawn maintenance chemicals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fences</td>
<td>Painted wood picket fences were traditional. Other appropriate styles include split rail and wire and post and fieldstone walls.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flower Beds</td>
<td>Country garden flower borders are traditionally full of a few classic flowers. Invasive exotic species should be avoided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard Surfaces</td>
<td>Traditional hard surfaces were flag stones. They blend with the natural and rural character. Concrete pavers and interlocking blocks are hard-edged city style.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retaining Walls</td>
<td>Dry limestone walls are a traditional retaining wall approach. Small plants seed in the joints. Pre-manufactured concrete is hard-edged city style.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>