Cambridge Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee  
No. 09 – 21

AGENDA

Thursday, October 21, 2021
7:00 p.m. via Zoom

Meeting Called to Order

Disclosure of Interest

Presentations

Michelle Bartlett, Supervisor of Historic Sites – McDougall Cottage

Wally Malcolm, Project Manager and Steven Huang, Engineering – Dickson Hill Globe Lights.

Delegations

Approval of September 16, 2021 Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee Minutes

THAT the Minutes of the September 16, 2021 meeting of the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee be considered for errors and omissions and be adopted.

Agenda Items:

1. Sign Permit Request for Part IV Designated Property – 89 Grand Avenue

THAT the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC) recommends approval of the request to erect a freestanding sign adjacent to the front façade of the property municipally known as 89 Grand Avenue as outlined in Report 21-024 (MHAC).

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.
AND FURTHER THAT the MHAC has no concerns with the variance required to the Sign By-Law to permit the erecting of a sign greater than 1.25 metres in area as outlined in Report 21-024 (MHAC).

2. Request for New Decorative Light Standards for the Dickson Hill Heritage Conservation District

THAT Report 21-027 (MHAC) – Request for New Decorative Light Standards for the Dickson Hill Heritage Conservation District be received;

AND THAT the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC) recommend the Council approve the request for a new Decorative Globe Style Light Standard which includes incorporating LED lighting and concrete poles to be used in the Dickson Hill Heritage Conservation District.

3. Sign Permit Request for Part IV Designated Property – 14 Queen’s Square

THAT the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC) recommends approval of the request to alter the property municipally known as 14 Queen’s Square by permitting the erection of a projecting sign as outlined in Report 21-029 (MHAC).

AND FURTHER THAT the MHAC has no concerns with the variance required to the Sign By-Law to permit the erecting a projecting sign on a Part IV designated property as outlined in Report 21-029 (MHAC).

4. To Advise MHAC of Minor Work Regarding Part V Designated Property – 20 Old Mill Road

THAT Memo 21-05 (MHAC) – Minor work regarding Part V Designated Property – 20 Old Mill Road be received as information.

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: November 18, 2021, at 7 p.m.
Via Zoom

Close of Meeting

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

Distribution:

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

Regrets:

Staff in Attendance: Laura Waldie, Senior Planner – Heritage, Abraham Plunkett-Latimer, Senior Planner - Heritage, Karin Stieg-Drobig, Recording Secretary and Greg Elgie, Network Administrator

Meeting Called to Order

The meeting of the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee was held virtually via Zoom and live streamed to the City of Cambridge website. John Oldfield, MHAC Chair, welcomed everyone present, introductions were made and he 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 late at 7:00 p.m. and the meeting adjourned at 9:44 p.m.

Declarations of Interest:

Presentation:

Mackenzie Meek, Project Planner, Pearle Hospitality and Patrick Simmons, Architect, MartinSimmons Architects Inc gave a presentation on the proposed Cambridge Mill Project at 130 Water Street North. The project is described as transformational for the City of Cambridge; will bring people back to the river and provide a place for people to live in the proposed 37 storey condominium and stay at the proposed 28 storey hotel with a parking tower across the street and a pedestrian bridge to provide access.

The Committee discussed protection of the historic river views, accessibility of trails along the river, proposed landscaping, view of the downtown and church spires when coming downtown along Water Street, the proposed pedestrian bridge, amenity space, balconies and shadow studies. It was noted that at this time, the focus has been on the concept, architecture and the zoning for the development. Landscaping and trails information will be available at a later date. Shadow studies have been completed and are available on the City’s website.
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Laura Waldie, Senior Planner, Heritage addressed the Committee prior to the delegations to inform the Committee about the proposed amendment to the recommendation for 436 Fountain St. South. She noted that the 3rd recommendation would include a condition of submission of a relocation protection plan to be reviewed by heritage planning staff as a condition of the draft approval of the vacant land condominium plan.

**Delegations:**

Ms. Amy Barnes, Heritage Project Manager, ARA Heritage, gave a delegation to the report for 436 Fountain Street South. She noted that as the property is not listed, nor designated with no designated properties adjacent, the property was not flagged as significant in the pre-consultation stage. The cultural heritage attributes were raised during the first statutory public meeting and it was determined that a scoped Heritage Impact Assessment should be completed as a component of the planning application. Ms. Barnes explained the steps completed, the current proposed development and steps taken by the owner in listening to the community in regards to the cultural heritage of the building. The Committee thanked Ms. Barnes for her work on the HIA and that the house is proposed to be listed.

Ms. Karen Scott Booth representing ACO Cambridge, delegated regarding the report for 436 Fountain St. S. She noted that ACO agrees with the recommendation to MHAC to list the property on the City of Cambridge Heritage Register but that the remainder of the recommendations be deferred to allow further consultation regarding the proposed development. She further noted the site is currently listed for sale, and the natural heritage and streetscape need to be addressed as part of a comprehensive rather than scoped HIA. The Chair thanked Ms. Scott Booth for her delegation.

Ms. Jane Newland, representing the community members of Fountain Street South, delegated regarding the report for 436 Fountain St. S. She noted that there are 10 heritage listed or designated homes in the area already; the Wismer house should be designated as well as several other homes as they are from the same period in the 1870’s representing the start of the community and an important part of the community’s cultural heritage. Ms Newland further noted that there are already issues associated with water and slope stability in the area and that increased traffic of a development will lead to further traffic problems to the Fountain Street, Parkview and Preston Heights residents. She further noted the community’s request for a third party peer review. The Chair thanked Ms. Newland for her delegation noting that he sympathizes with her concerns but that the MHAC committee is a group of volunteers that make recommendations to Council on heritage matters, but are not able to comment on all of the community’s concerns; these would be better presented when the development.
application goes before Council. The Committee asked questions of Staff relating to the environmental issues raised by the delegate and Staff noted that as far as they are aware, these issues are dealt with by the Cambridge Environmental Advisory Committee (CEAC)

Mr Thomas Gillelan, neighbouring homeowner, was present to speak to the report on 436 Fountain St. S. He noted that the proposal to move the building and turn it will put it at risk of damage, change the street view and place mature trees in danger. He added that he agrees with the issues related to environment, slope stability and traffic raised by Ms. Newland. The Chair thanked Mr. Gillelan for his delegation.

Minutes of Previous Meeting

Moved by: Scott Roberts
Seconded by: Nelson Cecilia

THAT the minutes of the July 15, 2021 meeting of the Cambridge Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee be considered for errors and omissions and be adopted.

CARRIED

Minutes of the Poll

THAT the poll compiled via email from July 28-30, 2021 held to complete the amended recommendation for 63 Oak St. that was interrupted due to technical difficulties on the evening of July 15, 2021 be adopted.

Moved by: Mark Leclair
Seconded by: Scott Roberts

1. 33 Main Street - Request to Alter a Part V Designated Property – Exterior Sign Permit

Moved by: Michelle Goodridge
Seconded by: Mark Leclair

The Committee discussed the proposed size and colour of the sign. It was noted by staff that while the replacement sign is larger than allowed by the current by-law, it is the same size as the previous sign. Heritage colour palettes were discussed at length and Staff agreed with the proposal made by the Committee that staff provide direction of heritage colours to business owners before an application comes before the Committee. An amendment was proposed to include the recommendation of the heritage colour palette.
Moved by: Michelle Goodridge  
Seconded by: Nancy Woodman

THAT the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC) recommends approval of the request to mount new signs on the front façade of the property municipally known as 33 Main Street as outlined in Report 21-021 (MHAC).

AND FURTHER THAT the MHAC has no concerns with the variance required to the Sign By-Law to permit the mounting of a sign greater than 1.25 metres in area as outlined in Report 21-021 (MHAC).

AND FURTHER THAT MHAC recommends that the new signage background colour be from a heritage pallet as per the Main Street Style Guidelines and approves the increased size of the sign to replace the existing one.

CARRIED AS AMMENDED

2. Heritage Impact Assessment – 436 Fountain Street South

Moved by: Kimberley Livingstone 
Seconded by: Nelson Cecilia

The Committee acknowledged the concerns of the neighbours regarding the heritage, environmental and transportation concerns. It was noted the MHAC committee’s mandate is to deal with the heritage aspects of the proposed development. The Committee questioned when the property would be listed on the heritage register and CEAC’s involvement with the environmental aspects of the proposed development. The property would be added as a listed Heritage property once approved by Council and it was noted by Laura Waldie, that as far as she is aware, CEAC and the Environmental Planner would review the proposal. The Committee discussed at length their concerns with the proposed development, timing aspects of the proposal and limitations of the Committee.

THAT Report 21-022 (MHAC) – Heritage Impact Assessment-436 Fountain Street – be received;

AND THAT the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC) accept the Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) and its findings as submitted by ARA Ltd., dated July 28, 2021 in support of development application R10/20 to redevelop the adjacent lands;

AND THAT MHAC encourage the property owner to implement the recommended mitigation measures identified in the HIA, including the submission of a relocation...
protection plan to be reviewed by heritage planning staff as a condition of the draft approval of the vacant land condominium plan;

**AND THAT** the MHAC recommends that the developer explore options to relocating the stone retaining wall to the proposed new location of the house;

**AND FURTHER THAT** the MHAC recommends that Council add the subject property to the Heritage Register as a listed property of interest due to the cultural heritage value of the property identified in the HIA and in Report 21-022 (MHAC).

CARRIED

3. **Sign Permit Request for Part IV Designated Property – 89 Grand Avenue**

Moved by: Nancy Woodman  
Seconded by: Michelle Goodridge

The Committee discussed First Nations and Region of Waterloo consultation regarding the proposed location, the size of the proposed sign, the heritage attributes of MacDougall Cottage as listed in the designation by-law and alternatives to the proposed location such as the Sculpture Garden, should it be deemed appropriate. It was suggested a deferral would allow time to gather more information on any suggestions made during the discussion.

Moved by: Councillor Wolf  
Seconded by: Susan Brown

**THAT** the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC) recommends approval of the request to erect a freestanding sign adjacent to the front façade of the property municipally known as 89 Grand Avenue as outlined in Report 21-024 (MHAC).

**AND FURTHER THAT** the MHAC has no concerns with the variance required to the Sign By-Law to permit the erecting of a sign greater than 1.25 metres in area as outlined in Report 21-024 (MHAC).

DEFERRED

4. **105 Middle Block Road Heritage Impact Assessment**

Moved by: Nelson Cecilia  
Seconded by: Michelle Goodridge
THAT Report 21-025 (MHAC) – 105 Middle Block Road Heritage Impact Assessment – be received;

AND THAT the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC) accept the Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) and its findings as submitted by MHBC dated July 16, 2021;

AND FURTHER THAT an addendum to the HIA be recirculated to the MHAC at a later date when the uses and plans for the surrounding subdivision have been developed during the zoning by-law amendment process.

5. 51-53 Main Street – Request to Alter Part V Designated Property - Sign Permit

Moved by: Michelle Goodridge
Seconded by: Nancy Woodman

THAT the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC) recommends approval of the request to mount new signs on the front and rear façade of the property municipally known as 51-53 Main Street as outlined in Report 21-026 (MHAC).

AND FURTHER THAT the MHAC has no concerns with the variance required to the Sign By-Law to permit the mounting of a sign greater than 1.25 metres in area as outlined in Report 21-026 (MHAC).

CARRIED

Correspondence - NIL

Other Business – NIL

Chair's Comments:

John Oldfield noted he wishes there were more tools available to the Committee to deal with the development of our City and how this affects the heritage and livability of Cambridge. He noted that developers use the current livability of the City as a way to encourage people to buy and move here yet when a development is too large and over reaching it is inevitable that it affects that same livability.

Council Report/Comments:

Councillor Wolf advised that Council had approved the second phase of the Galt Core Heritage Conservation District Project to begin. She noted that a balance of development and heritage was necessary and that looking for good new development such as the Gaslight Project is important. She further noted that the School of Architecture lost some students this year because the students were not able to find housing.
Staff/Senior Planner- Heritage comments:
No Comments this month.

General Heritage Matters – Updates by Committee Members:
Question to staff regarding the recent Council decision on the Forbes Estate and whether a report would come back to MHAC. Staff noted that if revised plans are received, it will come forward to MHAC again.

Next Meeting
Date & Time: October 21, 2021, 7:00 p.m.
Location: Virtually via Zoom

Close of Meeting
Moved by: Scott Roberts
Seconded by: Mark Leclair

THAT the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee meeting does now adjourn at 9:44 p.m.

CARRIED

__________________________  __________________________
Chairperson                  Recording Secretary
John Oldfield                Karin Stieg-Drobig
RECOMMENDATIONS

THAT the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC) recommends approval of the request to erect a freestanding sign adjacent to the front façade of the property municipally known as 89 Grand Avenue as outlined in Report 21-027 (MHAC).

AND FURTHER THAT the MHAC has no concerns with the variance required to the Sign By-Law to permit the erecting of a sign greater than 1.25 metres in area as outlined in Report 21-027 (MHAC).

SUMMARY

- At the September 16, 2021 Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee meeting, the MHAC deferred making a recommendation to Council to allow heritage planning staff to bring back further information to the Committee to make its decision on a
recommendation. Staff have now obtained that information which is presented in this report.

- A sign permit application was submitted by the Region of Waterloo on August 17, 2021 to the City’s Building Division for a freestanding sign at 89 Grand Avenue South.
- The subject property was designated in 1988 under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act by by-law 58-88.
- By-law 03-191 states that signs on a designated heritage building must be a maximum of 1.25 square metres. MHAC approval is required for a variance from this requirement.
- The proposed sign is approximately 3.46 square metres in area and so requires MHAC to approve a variance from the by-law.
- No permanent alteration to the main structure is proposed.

BACKGROUND

A sign permit application was received on 17 August, 2021 by the City’s Building Division for a freestanding sign at 89 Grand Avenue South. The intent of the sign frame is to hold art display murals from a number of local area residents including those from ethnic minority groups and local Indigenous artists. The public art displays would change every one to two years to coincide with the Region of Waterloo’s Public Art Program.

The proposed sign’s dimensions are 2.16 metres in length by 1.6 metres in height with an approximate area of 3.46 square metres. The board will be constructed of crezon (a plywood core product) with a steel plate frame and steel legs. It will be mounted on concrete sonotube piles, that will be driven approximately 0.26 metres from the existing house foundation as depicted in Figure 2 below. The complete sign application package is attached as Attachment 1.

On September 16, 2021, a recommendation report was brought forward to the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee recommending approval of the sign application and variance. At that time, members of the MHAC expressed concern about the location of the sign frame. Some members expressed concerns that a portion of the stone wall on the southwest facing rear addition would be obscured by the sign frame. The MHAC members deferred a decision on the installation of the sign frame until the following information could be presented in a subsequent recommendation report:

1. Explore other options for installing the sign frame at another location on the same property or in the Sculpture Garden if another location on site is not feasible; and
2. What consultation was done by the Region with local Indigenous groups on the proposed sign application.
Figure 1: 89 Grand Avenue Current Conditions, Google Street View, October 2020.

Figure 2: Rendering of Proposed Sign Provided by Applicant August 17 2021.
ANALYSIS

Strategic Alignment:

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

Goal #3 - Arts, Culture, Heritage and Architecture

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

The proposed alteration will conserve a building designated as a heritage resource and will make a positive contribution to the heritage of the community by highlighting indigenous history.

Existing Policy/By-Law:

City of Cambridge Official Plan

Section 5.12 of the City of Cambridge Official Plan states that

1. The design and placement of signage will complement the streetscape and the built form and will minimize visual clutter.

2. Signs will be incorporated into the architectural design of the building. Placement of signage will be assessed as part of the design of the building and considered as part of a landscaping plan through site plan approval.

3. In Community Core Areas and where addressed in urban design guidelines, overhead lighting of signage is required instead of backlit signage unless there is no feasible alternative.

Sign By-law 03-191

By-law 03-191 states that,

All proposed signs in Heritage Conservation Districts, and on Designated properties, shall be forwarded to the Heritage Planner for Cambridge Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee approval before being erected. However, the Cambridge Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee is not empowered to refuse to approve the plans or drawings of such signs referred to in this section of the by-law and shall refer such plans and drawings where refusal is recommended to the Council of the Corporation of the City of Cambridge.

The regulations prescribed in sections 8.1(a), 11.2, 13.2(a) and (b), 22.1 and 22.3 shall not apply to the permitted signs in Heritage Conservation
Districts and on Designated Properties and the following regulations shall apply in their stead:

(a) A wall sign shall have a total sign area not greater than 0.3 m² for each 1.0 m of linear frontage of the building wall upon which the sign is located and, in any event, not greater than 1.25 m² for each sign.

(b) No sign installed or erected in Heritage Conservation Districts and on Designated Properties shall be internally illuminated.

(c) No business establishment shall have more than one sign per storey for each building face of such establishment.

Financial Impact:

All costs are the responsibility of the applicant.

Public Input:

The Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC) meetings are open to the public.

Internal/External Consultation:

The Senior Planner-Heritage liaised with Region of Waterloo staff on what was required for review by the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC). On September 27, 2021, heritage planning staff follow-up further with Region of Waterloo staff on addressing the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee’s questions raised at the September 16, 2021 meeting. Region of Waterloo staff were also invited to attend the October 21, 2021 MHAC meeting to make a presentation and be available to answer questions.

Comments/Analysis:

On September 27, 2021, heritage planning staff met with Michelle Bartlett of the Region of Waterloo’s McDougall Cottage to address some of the concerns MHAC members had with the application. In terms of the location of the sign frame, heritage planning staff asked if the Region would consider installing the sign frame in the Sculpture Garden, provided that the City of Cambridge, who owns the Sculpture Garden property, agreed to the installation and upkeep of the sign frame. The Region of Waterloo, who owns the McDougall Cottage, indicated they preferred to keep the sign frame on the McDougall Cottage property. Heritage planning staff then discuss the placement of the sign frame on the property and discussed alternate locations on the property. Because of the size of the property, it was determined that the best location was the location indicated in the sign permit application. Moving the sign frame closer to the street was determined to not be a good option as moving it forward would likely visually obscure more of the stone work than from the proposed location. The Region would like to have the sign frame face the street to entice people to come onto the property to see the art
display up close. Attracting visitors onto the property would also encourage visitors to the interior of the cottage on days that it is open to the public.

The Region of Waterloo staff indicated that no formal consultation with the area’s Indigenous groups was conducted. However, an Indigenous artist who has consulted with the Region before on artist programs throughout the Region was contacted for their opinion about the sign permit application and whether the McDougall Cottage would be a good location for local public art. Through that conversation, it was deemed that the McDougall Cottage was an important cultural asset in the Region of Waterloo and would make an ideal location based on its various programing, accessibility and potential for pedestrian drop-ins.

The McDougall Cottage was recognised at the time of its designation as having important cultural heritage value for its Scottish and Welsh heritage. The murals inside the cottage are also part of the designation statement and reveal very detailed Trompe L’oie characteristics that had been painted by one of the cottage’s inhabitants in the early 20th century. These murals tell the story of how important art was to all citizens of early Galt and not just the wealthy who could afford such artistic styles. The McDougalls and, particularly, the Bairds were Scottish working-class citizens who enjoyed art and artistic styles as much as the McCulloughs or the Dicksons had. Therefore, the Region of Waterloo feels that the McDougall Cottage is an important location to help tell the stories of other local area artists who also have an important voice in the artistic community just as the Bairds had also believed of their class and stature in the community. Therefore, the Region of Waterloo is seeking to diversify its art programs at McDougall Cottage through the displaying of art from different ethnic, cultural, socioeconomic and gendered voices through its Public Art programs. The City of Cambridge also shares this vision by having inclusiveness and respect as two of its core values. Ms. Bartlett has been invited to attend the October 21, 2021 MHAC meeting to delegate to the Committee and answer their questions. Additional Regional staff may also attend the meeting to delegate to the Committee.

The proposed signage on the front façade of the subject property is greater than the maximum area of 1.25 square metres permitted by by-law 03-191.

There is no physical impact to the stonework identified in the designation bylaw as the sign frame will not be physically attached to the building but will be .2 metres in front of the wall. The visual impact to the building is proposed to be minor as only a portion of the southwest addition, set back from the front façade of the structure will obscure the stone work. The wood and steel materials of the sign board are not anticipated to detract from the heritage resource. Staff considers these compatible materials.

Although the proposed sign is greater than the 1.25 square metres permitted by by-law 03-191 heritage planning staff is of the opinion that the proposed sign will enhance the heritage resource by providing the opportunity to interpret the indigenous history of the
area and by showcasing the work of indigenous artists. Painting the mural onto a freestanding sign ensures that no damage will occur to the heritage resource and the alteration may be easily reversible in future. The visual impact is minimal as it will be erected at the rear of the property away from the main façade of the cottage nearest the street. No external illumination has been proposed for any art work displayed in the sign frame.

Based on the planning analysis in this report, staff is recommending that the MHAC approve the request for a sign permit at 89 Grand Avenue South for the mounting of a freestanding sign adjacent to the front façade as outlined in Report 21-027 (MHAC). Should the MHAC vote to not approve the sign permit application, heritage planning staff must take a report to Council for a decision as the MHAC does not have the authority to refuse a sign permit application. Only Council has the ability to do so.

SIGNATURE

Prepared by:

Laura Waldie,, CAHP
Senior Planner-Heritage

Abraham Plunkett-Latimer
Senior Planner-Heritage

Departmental Approval:

Deanne Friess, MCIP, RPP
Manager of Policy Planning

ATTACHMENTS

Elevation - Southwest Corner Of Cottage

Concrete Sonotube Pile

Foundation

Concrete Slab Above Pile

Exhibit Designer

Elevation - Mural Frame
Southwest Corner of Cottage (looking north)
Mural Elevation Front

Corner Back Detail

Corner Front Detail

254mm Steel Tubing - 3/16"

Threaded Rod - 1/4

1/2" plate

Cement Mixture

3mm steel plate frame

50mm x 50mm plate frame

Corner Substrate

3mm steel plate frame protects Ocason plywood edge.

Ocason Substrate
RECOMMENDATION(S)

THAT Report 21-027(MHAC) – Request for New Decorative Light Standards for the Dickson Hill Heritage Conservation District be received;

AND THAT the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC) recommend the Council approve the request for a new Decorative Globe Style Light Standard which includes incorporating LED lighting and concrete poles to be used in the Dickson Hill Heritage Conservation District.

SUMMARY

- In 2020, Council requested staff look into the installation of seven to eight decorative globe to be installed along Victoria Park beside the proposed sidewalk
The City cannot locate the old mold previously fabricated for the original decorative globe lights. The old mold standard would not likely meet current Canada Standards Association and Electrical Safety Authority (CSA/ESA) standards.

The new industry standard for lighting is LED. The City standard for street light poles are concrete.

The City of Cambridge has voluntarily committed to the Partners for Climate Protection (PCP) Program aimed at reducing Green House Gas (GHG) emissions and mitigating climate change. The City has also been proactive in meeting its obligations under O. Reg. 397/11 (The Ontario Green Energy Act (GEA). A Corporate Greenhouse Gas and Energy Conservation and Demand Management Plan was developed in June 2014.

The City identified a two-phase approach to reduce energy and GHG emissions associated with street lighting.

Upgrading existing street lights to more efficient LED equivalents will improve efficiencies and reduce costs. New street light standards will be more sustainable/energy-efficient, reduce maintenance costs, reduce energy costs, and reduce GHG emissions.

The installation of new light standards for the Dickson Hill Conservation District would be taking place on City owned lands and therefore would be classified as an alteration to the District as per Section V of the Ontario Heritage Act. An alteration in an HCD requires a MHAC recommendation to Council for a decision.

BACKGROUND

As part of the City of Cambridge’s sustainability efforts, the city has voluntarily committed to the Partners for Climate Protection (PCP) Program aimed at reducing Green House Gas (GHG) emissions and mitigating climate change. The City has also been proactive in meeting its obligations under O. Reg. 397/11 (The Ontario Green Energy Act (GEA). A Corporate Greenhouse Gas and Energy Conservation and Demand Management Plan was developed in June 2014.

The City identified a two-phase approach to reduce energy and Green House Gas (GHG) emissions associated with street lighting. First, the City, along with the municipalities in Waterloo Region completed a contract for the supply, delivery, and installation of approximately 43,649 LED street lights and the disposal of existing High Intensity Discharge (HID) Cobra Head Luminaires in the Region of Waterloo. The City of
Cambridge’s portion of HID Cobra Head Luminaires converted was approximately 5,298 fixtures. Phase 1 was completed in 2018 under the Region of Waterloo Contract. Second, the City will complete the replacement of Decorative type street lights to a LED Equivalent. The approximate number of Decorative lights is 2,907. Upgrading existing street lights to more efficient LED equivalents will improve efficiencies and reduce costs. New street light standards will be more sustainable/energy-efficient, reduce maintenance costs, reduce energy costs, and reduce GHG emissions.

Council has requested seven to eight decorative globe lights be installed along Victoria Park beside the proposed sidewalk (Aberdeen Rd S to Forest Road) as part of the Salisbury Avenue Reconstruction Project to blend in with other streets in the Dickson Hill HCD. Staff has identified two pole options available for the LED conversion project and the Salisbury Avenue road reconstruction project.

The City of Cambridge is completing an LED Street Lighting Conversion Project related to decorative lights located within the City. Globe lighting, located in the Dickson Hill HCD is part of the street lighting conversion project. A schematic of the original heritage globe light standard is attached. (Attachment 1). A decision is required to determine the globe light standard and pole standard to be used in the conversion project as well as the globe lights to be installed as part of the Salisbury Avenue Reconstruction Project (Attachment 2). A decision is required before the end of 2021 to ensure delivery meets the timelines for both projects.

Changing the existing light standards in the Dickson Hill HCD to a new design is considered an alteration under Part V of the Ontario Heritage Act. Alterations require a Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC) recommendation to Council for a decision.

**ANALYSIS**

**Strategic Alignment:**

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

Goal #3 - Arts, Culture, Heritage and Architecture

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

The proposed new light standard for Salisbury Avenue is a light standard that meets the CSA/ESA minimum requirements whereas the current lights do not. By upgrading the lights standards to comply with code will ensure that the HCD will maintain its heritage lighting, which is central to its heritage character.
**Existing Policy/By-Law:**

Erection, demolition, etc.

42 (1) No owner of property situated in a heritage conservation district that has been designated by a municipality under this Part shall do any of the following, unless the owner obtains a permit from the municipality to do so:

1. Alter, or permit the alteration of, any part of the property, other than the interior of any structure or building on the property.

2. Erect any building or structure on the property or permit the erection of such a building or structure.

3. Demolish or remove, or permit the demolition or removal of, any attribute of the property if the demolition or removal would affect a heritage attribute described in the heritage conservation district plan that was adopted for the heritage conservation district in a by-law registered under subsection 41 (10.1).

4. Demolish or remove a building or structure on the property or permit the demolition or removal of a building or structure on the property, whether or not the demolition or removal would affect a heritage attribute described in the heritage conservation district plan that was adopted for the heritage conservation district in a by-law registered under subsection 41 (10.1).

**Financial Impact:**

**Traditional Concrete Pole**

1. The direct buried coloured concrete pole as per attached (Appendix 3) is $2225.00 each

2. The metal pole as per attached (Appendix 4) is $1430.00 each

**Decorative Globe Light**

The Globe light as per attached concept drawing (Appendix 5) which would be produced to match the pole aesthetically is $1950.00 each.

Funding for the decorative globe lights along Salisbury Avenue has been approved as part of the Salisbury Road Reconstruction Project.

**Public Input:**

The Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC) meetings are open to the public.
Internal/External Consultation:

Engineering, Transportation staff liaised with Heritage Planning staff. Engineering and Heritage Planning staff liaised with residents of Salisbury Avenue near Victoria Park regarding the addition of Globe lights.

Comments/Analysis:

Globe Light Replacement and the Ontario Heritage Act

The decorative globe lights located in the Dickson Hill Heritage Conservation District (HCD) have been in place for more than 50 years and are beginning to show signs of coming to the end of their life cycle. In accordance with the City’s LED Street Lighting Installation Project

Pole Standard

The original mold used for the fabrication of the ornamental globe lights is no longer available to the City of Cambridge. As a result, alternative options were obtained to be utilized for new and replacement projects.

The two (2) options available for the new globe standard poles for the LED Decorative Globe Street Lighting Conversion Project and the Salisbury Avenue Reconstruction Project are as follows:

1. Utilize a traditional concrete pole (Appendix 3)
2. Utilize a metal pole (Appendix 4)

The City of Cambridge has implemented a concrete pole standard for new residential subdivisions. The metal poles would be of the same type of material used in the fabrication of the original poles.

Both pole options would provide the City with a standard design and material for use in future projects.

Decorative Globe LED Lighting

LED lighting is the new standard of roadway lighting. Upgrading existing street lights to more efficient LED equivalents will improve efficiencies and reduce costs. New street light standards will be more sustainable/energy-efficient, reduce maintenance costs, reduce energy costs, and reduce GHG emissions. The Globe Lighting Fixture chosen (Appendix E) provides a close match to the style of the current lights.

As part of the LED Street Lighting Installation Project, decorative globe lights will be converting to the new LED standard. Council has approved the installation of new Decorative Globe Lighting adjacent Victoria Park beside the proposed sidewalk (Aberdeen Rd S to Forest Road) as part of the Salisbury Avenue Reconstruction
The City cannot locate the old mold previously fabricated and donated by Heritage Cambridge (now ACO Cambridge). Public Work staff believe that the mold may have been damaged and was discarded in the mid-2000s. According to Energy Plus, that mold likely would not meet current CSA/ESA requirements and a new mold would have to be cast.

Example of King Lumiere Lighting

Engineering staff were able to source a suitable replacement LED globe style fixture and concrete and Metal poles. The proposed new fixture and pole are fluted like the originals and follow a traditional style of heritage lighting appropriate for the Dickson Hill HCD. The proposed new design is in keeping with heritage lighting found in other heritage areas across Ontario. The new LED lighting will also provide safer lighting for pedestrian traffic at night than the current light standards provide Heritage Planning staff recommends that the MHAC recommends Council approve the request for a new Decorative Globe Style Light Standard which includes incorporating LED lighting and concrete poles for the Salisbury Avenue Reconstruction Project and replacement of Globe Style Decorative Lights within the HCD.
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ATTACHMENTS

1. Original Globe Light Design Drawing
2. Salisbury Avenue Light Installation Map
3. Traditional Concrete Pole
4. Traditional Metal Pole
5. Cambridge KG20 Pole Schematic
PROPOSED GLOBE LIGHTS LOCATION MAP
ON EAST SIDE ALONG VICTORIA PARK

LEGEND:

- APPROXIMATE EXISTING COBRA HEAD STREETLIGHT LOCATION
- APPROXIMATE PROPOSED GLOBE STREETLIGHT LOCATION
- 50mm RPVC DUCT
This simple 10 fluted pole was originally designed and installed in many residential areas in several west coast cities. Now in spun concrete it continues to offer understated elegance to any project it may be used for. It is currently available in heights from 10’ to 15’ as well as a lighted and nonlighted bollard.

For more details please visit the bollard section in the King Luminaire Catalog or website www.kingluminaire.com
**How to Catalog**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Catalog Number</th>
<th>“A” Pole Height Above Grade</th>
<th>“C” Tip Dimension</th>
<th>“B” Direct Burial Length &amp; “D” Dia.</th>
<th>Pole Weight Direct Burial</th>
<th>Pole Weight Base Plate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traditional 10’</td>
<td>KD10</td>
<td>10’ 1”</td>
<td>5 1/2”</td>
<td>4’ 6” x 8 1/4”</td>
<td>525 lbs</td>
<td>375 lbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional 13’</td>
<td>KD13</td>
<td>13’ 1”</td>
<td>5”</td>
<td>4’ 6” x 8 1/4”</td>
<td>615 lbs</td>
<td>465 lbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional 15’</td>
<td>KD15</td>
<td>15’ 1”</td>
<td>5”</td>
<td>4’ 6” x 8 1/4”</td>
<td>710 lbs</td>
<td>560 lbs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*For bollard catalog information please see the bollard section in the King Luminaire catalog or visit our website at www.kingluminaire.com*

**Options**

- **Color Selection:** Listed below are a few suggested color options. Other standard or custom colors are available in etched (sand blasted) finish only.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Etched Finish Description</th>
<th>Color Catalog Number</th>
<th>Color of Matrix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Desert Sand</td>
<td>E70</td>
<td>Buff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eclipse</td>
<td>E11</td>
<td>Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aztec Jade</td>
<td>E51</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saluki Bronze</td>
<td>E90</td>
<td>Brown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Base Plate Mounting:** Two options available (see details below). Specify “FBP” for Option 1 or “SBP” for Option 2 (e.g. KD15-FBP). Unless otherwise specified, pole will be supplied as direct buried. Anchor bolts are optional. Please specify “AB” if required.

- **Electrical Receptacle:** Specify “DR” for 2 outlet, “GFI” for Ground Fault 2 outlet or “SR” for 1 outlet.

- **Ladder Rest:** Specify “LRN”

- For Mounting Accessories see Arms & Capitals in King catalog or at www.kingluminaire.com.

- For Standard Arms and Post Top Mounting, see Pole Accessories in StressCrete catalog or at www.stresscrete.com.

**Example of Typical Pole Specification**

**KD15**

- Desert Sand
- Etched Finish
- Baseplate Option 1
- 2 7/8” O.D. x 3” long Tenon Mount

**E70**

- Baseplate

**FBP**

Note: as FBP is indicated, pole will come with base plate. Anchor Bolts are optional. Please specify “AB” if required.

**Footing Details**

- **Direct Embedment** (Simple and Cost Effective)
  1. Auger the setting hole.
  2. Set pole in hole and plumb straight.
  3. Backfill* with required backfill tamping every 4” to 6”.

**Baseplate Option 1: FBP**

- Hot-dipped galvanized baseplate
- Wire Access Hole
- 1-1/4” x 1-1/2” L Slots on a 16” Diameter Bolt Circle
- Foundation by others
- Anchor Rod (55,000 PSI min. yield) 3/4” x 27” x 3-3/4” bend minimum
- Concrete extension for baseplate mounting

**Baseplate Option 2: SBP**

- 1-1/4” x 1-1/2” L Slots on a 14-1/2” B.C.
- Anchor Rod (55,000 PSI min. yield) 3/4” x 27” x 3-3/4” bend minimum
- Concrete extension for baseplate mounting
- Foundation by others

*Generally the excavated material can be used for backfill, in some situations better backfill may be required.*
Decorative Base Cover:
Specifications:

Pole Shaft:
Shallow Fluted Extruded (SFE) non-tapered aluminum shaft.

Decorative Base Cover:
Two piece cast aluminum base cover with maximum shaft opening of 6.125”.

Base Weight*:
12 lbs
*Consult Shaft Detail Chart below for pole shaft weight

Finish:
Available in textured or smooth.

Options:
GFI > Ground Fault Receptacle

How to Order:

### Pole Shaft Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KAS7SFE-A-10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.5” x 3.5”</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAS7SFE-A-11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.5” x 3.5”</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAS7SFE-A-12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.5” x 3.5”</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAS7SFE-A-13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.5” x 3.5”</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAS7SFE-A-14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.5” x 3.5”</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAS7SFE-A-15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.5” x 3.5”</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAS7SFE-A-16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.5” x 3.5”</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LUMINAIRE SPECIFICATIONS

CATALOGUE NO.: KG20R-R1AR-III-75(SSL)
- 1042-120:277V-K13

QUANTITY:

OPTICAL SYSTEM: REFRACTIVE ARRAY ACRYLIC WHITE
IES CLASS.: TYPE III

WATTAGE: 75W (1042 SERIES)
SOLID STATE LIGHTING
LINE VOLTAGE: 120:277V
KELVIN CCT: 4000K/HE5
POLE ADAPTOR: K13
PAINT: TEXTURED
OPTIONS: VENTED FINIAL
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To: Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee
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Report Author: Abraham Plunkett-Latimer, Senior Planner—Heritage

Department: Development and Infrastructure

Division: Planning

Report Title: Sign Permit Request for Part IV Designated Property – 14 Queen’s Square

File No: R01.01.16

Ward No: Ward 5

RECOMMENDATION(S)

THAT the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC) recommends approval of the request to alter the property municipally known as 14 Queen’s Square by permitting the erection of a projecting sign as outlined in Report 21-029 (MHAC).

AND FURTHER THAT the MHAC has no concerns with the variance required to the Sign By-Law to permit the erecting a projecting sign on a Part IV designated property as outlined in Report 21-029 (MHAC).

SUMMARY

- A sign permit application was received on September 29, 2021 by the City’s Building Division for a projecting sign at the property municipally known as 14 Queen’s Square.
- The subject property was designated in 1982 under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act by City of Cambridge by-law 8-82.
The City of Cambridge Sign By-law 03-191 states that signs on a designated heritage building must be a maximum of 1.25 square metres. The proposed sign meets these requirements.

The City of Cambridge Sign By-law states that projecting signs are not permitted on Designated Properties. A variance from By-law 03-191 is required to erect a projecting sign.

No permanent alteration to the structure is proposed.

Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee Review is required for the alteration or installation of signs on properties Designated under the Ontario Heritage Act.

**BACKGROUND**

A sign permit application was received on 29 September, 2021 by the City’s Building Division for a projecting sign at 14 Queens Square.

The subject property was designated in 1982 by City of Cambridge by-law 8-82. The property contains a three-storey limestone commercial structure construction in approximately 1837 for Richard Irwin. The property is acknowledged as containing the oldest commercial structure in the former City of Galt and is a key structure supporting the context of Queen’s Square.

The applicant is proposing to install a new projecting sign. The proposed sign’s dimensions are 0.762 by 0.762 metres with an area of approximately 0.58 square metres. The sign is proposed to be affixed to the existing wood sign fascia using 14-centimetre tapcone screws. The sign would be constructed of aluminum with acrylic faces. The colour palette is proposed to be a medium yellow as depicted in Figure 3. The applicant has advised that they are willing to adjust the final hue based upon recommendations of the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee.

A vinyl decal is proposed to be installed on the shop window and door of the front façade as depicted in Figure 2.

The complete sign application package is attached as Attachment 1.
Figure 1 14 Queen’s Square Current Conditions, Google Street View, October 2020.

Figure 2: Rendering of Proposed Sign Provided by Applicant September 29, 2021.
ANALYSIS

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

Goal #3 - Arts, Culture, Heritage and Architecture

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

It is anticipated that the proposed alteration would conserve a building designated as a heritage resource and would make a positive contribution to the heritage of the community by highlighting indigenous history. No heritage attributes are proposed to be impacted.

Existing Policy/By-Law:

City of Cambridge Official Plan

Section 5.12 of the City of Cambridge Official Plan states that;

1. The design and placement of signage will complement the streetscape and the built form and will minimize visual clutter.

2. Signs will be incorporated into the architectural design of the building. Placement of signage will be assessed as part of the design of the
building and considered as part of a landscaping plan through site plan approval.

3. In Community Core Areas and where addressed in urban design guidelines, overhead lighting of signage is required instead of backlit signage unless there is no feasible alternative.

Sign By-law 03-191

By-law 03-191 states that,

All proposed signs in Heritage Conservation Districts, and on Designated properties, shall be forwarded to the Heritage Planner for Cambridge Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee approval before being erected. However, the Cambridge Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee is not empowered to refuse to approve the plans or drawings of such signs referred to in this section of the by-law and shall refer such plans and drawings where refusal is recommended to the Council of the Corporation of the City of Cambridge.

The regulations prescribed in sections 8.1(a), 11.2, 13.2(a) and (b), 22.1 and 22.3 shall not apply to the permitted signs in Heritage Conservation Districts and on Designated Properties and the following regulations shall apply in their stead:

(a) A wall sign shall have a total sign area not greater than 0.3 m2 for each 1.0 m of linear frontage of the building wall upon which the sign is located and, in any event, not greater than 1.25 m2 for each sign.

(b) No sign installed or erected in Heritage Conservation Districts and on Designated Properties shall be internally illuminated.

(c) No business establishment shall have more than one sign per storey for each building face of such establishment.

Financial Impact:

All costs are the responsibility of the applicant.

Public Input:

The Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC) meetings are open to the public.

Internal/External Consultation:

The Senior Planner-Heritage liaised with Building Services staff on what was required for review by the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC).
Comments/Analysis:

The proposed signage on the front façade of the subject property is smaller than the maximum area of 1.25 square metres permitted by by-law 03-191 and will require no variance to the Sign Bylaw. However, the sign may require an encroachment agreement which is yet to be determined by Building staff. The obtaining of an encroachment agreement is not an item usually requiring comment by the MHAC.

The proposed sign is not anticipated to cause significant permanent alteration to the heritage resource given that a minimal amount of drilling into the existing structure will be necessary to install a sign of this size, and this drilling is restricted to a small area of wall. No artificial illumination is proposed.

Projecting signs of this type, a traditional “shingle” have been used for commercial advertising since at least the seventeenth century and were common in Galt in the early twentieth century and so would not be inappropriate for the context and age of the structure.

It is staff’s opinion that the proposed projecting sign’s colour, orientation, and size would not detract from the heritage character of structure. The alteration is considered to be reversible, and no heritage resource is proposed to be removed. The method for attaching the sign is also minimally invasive.

The vinyl window decal would have no permanent impact on the heritage resource and is easily reversible. The design is subtle and would not detract from the heritage resource or its context.

Based on the planning analysis in this report, staff recommends that the MHAC approve the alteration to the designated property at 14 Grand Avenue South of mounting a projecting sign on the sign fascia and affixing a vinyl decal to the front window and door as outlined in Report 21-029 (MHAC). The signs would result in no permanent alterations to the structure nor would they negatively impact a significant heritage attribute.

SIGNATURE

Prepared by:

Abraham Plunkett-Latimer,
Senior Planner - Heritage
Departmental Approval:

Laura Waldie,
Senior Planner - Heritage

ATTACHMENTS

# Application for a Permit to Construct or Demolish

This form is authorized under subsection 81(1) of the Building Code Act.

## For use by Principal Authority

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application number:</th>
<th>Permit number (if different):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date received:</td>
<td>Roll number:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Application submitted to:

**City of Cambridge**  
(No. of municipality, upper-tier municipality, board of health or conservation authority)

### A. Project Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building number, street name: 34 Queens Square</th>
<th>Unit number</th>
<th>Lot/Con.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Municipality: Cambridge</td>
<td>Postal code: N1S 1J6</td>
<td>Plan number/other description:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project value est.: $5,000.00</td>
<td>Area of work (m²): 6.6 ft²</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### B. Applicant

Applicant is: [X] Owner or [ ] Authorized agent of owner

### C. Owner (if different from applicant)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last name</th>
<th>First name</th>
<th>Corporation or partnership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Street address</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unit number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipality</td>
<td>Postal code</td>
<td>Province</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone number</td>
<td>Business number</td>
<td>Home</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### D. Builder (optional)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last name</th>
<th>First name</th>
<th>Corporation or partnership (if applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Street address</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unit number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipality</td>
<td>Postal code</td>
<td>Province</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone number</td>
<td>Business number</td>
<td>Home</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### E. Purpose of application

[ ] New construction  [ ] Addition to an existing building  [ ] Alteration/repair  [ ] Demolition  [ ] Conditional Permit

Proposed use of building: 
Description of proposed work: **Business signage**

Current use of building: 

### F. Tarion Warranty Corporation (Ontario New Home Warranty Program)

i. Is proposed construction for a new home as defined in the Ontario New Home Warranties Plan Act? If no, go to section G.
ii. Is registration required under the Ontario New Home Warranties Plan Act?
iii. If yes to (ii) provide registration number(s):

### G. Attachments

i. Attach documents establishing compliance with applicable law as set out in Article 1.4.1.3. of Division A.
ii. Attach Schedule 1 for each individual who reviews and takes responsibility for design activities.
iii. Attach Schedule 2 where application is to construct, install or repair a sewage system.
iv. Attach site plans and specifications for the proposed construction or demolition that are prescribed by the bylaw, resolution, or regulation of the municipality, upper-tier municipality, board of health or conservation authority to which this application is made.

### H. Declaration of applicant

[Signature]

042
**SIGN PERMIT INFORMATION**

Two (2) copies of a plot plan and working drawings must be submitted with this application. An application hereby made for a permit to erect/alter a free standing sign as described herein shall be accompanied by a plot plan showing the location of all other existing free standing signs on the lot and abutting lots.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building number, street name</th>
<th>Unit no.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14 Queens Square</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Area</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Hespeler</th>
<th>☒ Galt</th>
<th>Preston</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### APPLICABLE LAW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G.R.C.A.</th>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Provided</th>
<th>Not Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M.T.O.</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Provided</td>
<td>Not Required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage</td>
<td>Designated</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>Not Required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Provided</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SIGN BY-LAW

Existing sign(s) to remain:  
No ☒ Yes |

Front yard setback:  

Lot frontage:  

Existing use of property:  

Proposed use of property:  

Area of each sign(s):  

Existing:  

Proposed:  one |

Number of signs:  

Total cost of sign(s):  

$ 5,000

### ONTARIO BUILDING CODE

- Ground sign(s) exceeds 7.5 m (24'-7") in height above finished ground?  
  No ☒ Yes*  
  Height: 22'-6"

- Projecting sign(s) weigh more than 115 kg (254Lb)?  
  No ☒ Yes*  
  Weight: 10 Kilos

- Projecting sign(s) attached or fastened in any manner to a parapet wall?  
  No ☒ Yes*  
  Area: 6.6 ft²

- Roof sign(s) that has any face that is more than 10 m² (108 ft²)?  
  No ☒ Yes*  
  Area: 6.6 ft²

- Are there any plastic sign facing materials?  
  No ☒ Yes

* A Professional Engineer or Architect shall design the sign structure(s). Commitment Form required.

### ADDITIONAL INFORMATION
Suave Boutique

0.762m X 0.762m X 0.152m ALUMINUM CIRCULAR SIGN WITH ACRYLIC FACES
TOTAL WEIGHT 10 KILOS
3.473 m OFF GRADE
Date: 10/12/2021          Memo #: 2021-05
To: Members of the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee
Department: Community Development
Division: Planning Services
From: Abraham Plunkett-Latimer, Senior Planner - Heritage
Subject: To Advise MHAC of Minor Work Regarding Part V Designated Property–20 Old Mill Road

Comments

Purpose

The purpose of this memorandum is to advise the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee of a repair and alteration to a Part V Designated Property classified as “Minor Work” by the Blair Village Heritage Conservation District Plan.

Background

The property municipally known as 20 Old Mill Road is a property Designated under Part V of the Ontario Heritage Act as part of the Blair Village Heritage Conservation District. The property was designated by City of Cambridge By-law 205-01 in 2001.

The property contains a one-storey stone structure with a hipped roof. The structure was constructed as a schoolhouse in approximately 1859 and was converted for residential use in approximately 1893. The Blair Village Heritage Conservation District Plan identifies the property as very historic.

The owner is proposing to repair the structure’s heavily damaged roof by replacing the existing cedar shake roofing with asphalt shingles in a similar colour and three-dimensional texture. The owner is also proposing to install aluminum eaves troughing to avoid further damage to the structure’s mortar and foundation.

The existing cedar shingles were installed by the current owner in approximately 1995 and replaced asphalt shingles that had previously been installed. Images available through the City of Cambridge archives confirm that an asphalt roofing material had been in place in the 1980s (Figure 1).
Figure 1: 20 Old Mill Road, Courtesy of the City of Cambridge Archives, 1983.

Existing Conditions

The existing cedar shingles were installed in approximately 1995 and have reached the end of their useable life. The dwelling is being penetrated by water, causing damage to the interior. Animals have been able to access the roof due to its degraded condition. Large sections of the roof have been compromised entirely and are currently patched with a mixture of wooden and asphalt shingles (Figures 2-6).
Figure 2: 20 Old Mill Road Front, provided by applicant, October 8, 2021.

Figure 3: 20 Old Mill Road Roof Detail, provided by applicant, October 8, 2021.
Figure 4: 20 Old Mill Road Interior Water Damage, provided by applicant, October 8, 2021.

Figure 5: 20 Old Mill Road Interior Water Damage, provided by applicant, October 8, 2021.
Figure 6: 20 Old Mill Road Roof, provided by applicant, October 8, 2021.

**Proposed Replacement**

The owners are proposing to replace the existing cedar shake roof with asphalt roofing. The existing roof structure is not proposed to be altered. The owners are proposing to use landmark asphalt shingles manufactured by Certainteed in a weathered wood colour to visually approximate the existing roofing [Attachment 1].

**Policy Context**

Section 7.1 of the Blair Village Heritage Conservation Plan includes provisions for “Minor Work.” Minor work does not require review by the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee. Section 7.1 of the plan defines “Minor Work” as “work that does not substantially change the historic appearance of the building” and explicitly includes re-roofing, painting, and eavestroughs as examples of minor work.

**Comments**

Staff have evaluated the application and determined that the replacement of the existing cedar shakes with asphalt shakes in a similar colour and pattern would not substantially change the historic appearance of the structure. The house is not highly visible from the road.
Staff are of the opinion that the existing roofing material is not a heritage attribute, considering that it was installed in the 1990s and replaced existing asphalt shingles. Furthermore, the change in material approximates the colour and texture of the existing roofing and so substantially maintains the visual appearance of the structure. No other features of the house, other than the roof, are proposed to be removed or replaced as part of the project.

For these reasons, staff has determined that the Blair Village Heritage Conservation District Plan permits the alteration as “minor work.” Minor work, as outlined by the Heritage Conservation District Plan, does not require Council approval.

This memorandum serves to advise the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee and to record the alteration. No recommendation is required.

Attachments

1. Application to Replace Roofing Materials – 20 Old Mill Road, provided by Applicant on October 8, 2021.
QUOTE

Customer: [Redacted]  
Date: September 17, 2021  
Address: 20 Old Mill Rd, Cambridge On  
Phone Number: [Redacted]  
Quote Includes:
- remove and dispose of old cedar shakes  
- install 3/8 plywood over top of strapping  
- install Certainteed Landmark shingles  
- install Shadow Ridge capping on all ridges and hips  
- install ridge vents along all ridges for air flow  
- install Certainteed starter on all eaves and rakes  
- 3 feet of Winter Guard ice and water shield on all eaves and valleys  
- cover the entire roof runner Synthetic underlay  
- replace all vent and plumber flashings  
- install pre-painted steel valley  
- install new drip edge  
- install custom bent drip edge at transition from flat to sloped roof  
- install new custom bent chimney metal  
- knock out old chimney and cover hole with equivalent plywood  
- replace chimney flashing with new custom bent metal  
- install Flintlastic flat roofing system  
- install new eaves trough on entire home  
- install down pipe in appropriate places for water to flow away from home  
- remove and dispose of old plastic trough  
- grounds to be tarped and full magnetic clean up to be done after roof system installation  
- Quality Roof Solutions to provide a driveway friendly bin  
- 50 yr surestart warranty plus on all certainteed products  

- total amount is 24802.00+HST  
- upgrade to Landmark Pro for 26152.00+HST  
- upgrade to Certainteed Presidential Shake TL 35602.00+HST  
- Upgrade to half inch plywood for 1620.00+HST

Signature
LANDMARK® PRO

- Two-piece laminated fiberglass-based construction
- Classic shades and dimensional appearance of natural wood or slate
- Lifetime limited transferable warranty - residential*
- 50-year limited transferable warranty - group-owned or commercial
- 15-year StreakFighter® algae-resistance warranty
- NailTrak® extra-wide nailing area for accurate installation
- 10-year SureStart™ protection
- 15-year 110 mph wind-resistance warranty
- Wind warranty upgrade to 130 mph available. CertainTeed starter and CertainTeed hip and ridge required
- CertainTeed Starter and hip and ridge accessory available (see details in back of brochure)

* CertainTeed products are tested to ensure the highest quality and comply with the following industry standards:

**Fire Resistance:**
- UL Class A
- UL certified to meet ASTM D3018 Type I

**Wind Resistance:**
- UL certified to meet ASTM D3018 Type I
- ASTM D3161 Class F

**Tear Resistance:**
- UL certified to meet ASTM D2462
- CSA standard A123.5

**Wind Driven Rain Resistance:**

**Quality Standards:**
- ICC-ES-ESR-1388 & ESR-3537

Thicker / Heavier / More Colors / Longer Lifespan
LUXURY SHINGLES

COLOR AVAILABILITY

- Aged Bark
- Autumn Blend
- Charcoal Black
- Classic Weathered Wood
- Shadow Gray
- Weathered Wood

PRESIDENTIAL SHAKE® TL

- Three-piece laminated fiberglass construction
- Distinctive sculpted, rustic look
- Lifetime limited transferable warranty - residential*
- 50-year limited transferable warranty - group-owned or commercial*
- 15-year StreakFighter® algae-resistance warranty
- 10-year SureStart™ protection
- 15-year 110 mph wind-resistance warranty
- Wind warranty upgrade to 130 mph available. CertainTeed starter and CertainTeed hip and ridge required
- Presidential Starter (required) and hip and ridge accessory available (see details in back of brochure)
- CertainTeed products are tested to ensure the highest quality and comply with the following industry standards:

  **Fire Resistance:**
  - UL Class A
  - UL certified to meet ASTM D3018 Type 1

  **Wind Resistance:**
  - UL certified to meet ASTM D3018 Type 1
  - ASTM D3161 Class F

  **Tear Resistance:**
  - UL certified to meet ASTM D3462
  - CSA standard A123.5

  **Wind Driven Rain Resistance:**
  - Miami-Dade Product Control
  - Acceptance: Please reference www.certainteed.com to determine approved products by manufacturing location.

**Quality Standards:**
- ICC-ES-ESR-1399 & ESR-3537
COLOR AVAILABILITY

Atlantic Blue  Heather Blend  Harvest Brown  Hunter Green  Colonial Slate  Pewter
Cottage Red  Poison Oak  Urnwood  Georgetown Gray  Weathered Wood

LANDMARK®

• Two-piece laminated fiberglass-based construction
• Classic shades and dimensional appearance of natural wood or slate
• Lifetime limited transferable warranty*
• 10-year StreakFighter® algae-resistance warranty
• NailTrak® extra-wide nailing area for accurate installation
• 10-year SureStart™ protection
• 15-year 110 mph wind-resistance warranty
• Wind warranty upgrade to 130 mph available. CertainTeed starter and CertainTeed hip and ridge required
• CertainTeed Starter and hip and ridge accessory available (see details in back of brochure)

* See warranty for specific details and limitations.

CertainTeed products are tested to ensure the highest quality and comply with the following industry standards:

Fire Resistance:
• UL Class A
• UL certified to meet ASTM D3018 Type I

Wind Resistance:
• UL certified to meet ASTM D3018 Type I
• ASTM D3151 Class F

Tear Resistance:
• UL certified to meet ASTM D3462
• CSA standard A123.5

Wind Driven Rain Resistance:
• Miami-Dade Product Control Acceptance: Please reference www.certainteed.com to determine approved products by manufacturing location.

Quality Standards:
• ICC-ES-ESR-1389 & ESR-3537