Cambridge Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee
No. 10 – 21

AGENDA

Thursday, November 18, 2021
7:00 p.m. via Zoom

Meeting Called to Order

Disclosure of Interest

Presentations

Delegations

Approval of October 21, 2021 Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee Minutes

THAT the Minutes of the October 21, 2021 meeting of the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee be considered for errors and omissions and be adopted.

Agenda Items:

1. Request to Alter a Part IV Designated Property – 126 Blair Rd.

THAT Report 21-031(MHAC) be received;

AND FURTHER THAT MHAC recommends that Council approve the request to alter the main structure on the designated property municipally known as 126 Blair Road by building a rear deck as outlined in Report 21-301(MHAC).

2. Request to Demolish Part IV Designated Property – 4800 Fountain St. N.

THAT Report 21-030 (MHAC) be received;

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 Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee recommends that Council approve the request to demolish the main structure on the designated property municipally known as 4800 Fountain Street North in accordance with Section 34 of the Ontario Heritage Act as outlined in Report 21-030(MHAC), subject to the following conditions:

a) That the owner ensures that the fieldstone, of which the exterior walls of the circa 1870 school structure are composed, is salvaged during demolition and is protected on site for use in future commemoration.

3. To request comments on the Heritage Impact Assessment for the Riverside Dam project.

THAT Memo 21-06 (MHAC) – be received by the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee and comments be received on the proposed conservation approach.

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: December 16, 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 #09 - 21
October 21, 2021
Virtually via Zoom
7:00 p.m.

Committee Members in Attendance: Sue Brown, Nelson Cecilia, Michelle Goodridge, Mark Leclair (arrived 7:47 p.m.), Scott Roberts, Councillor Pam Wolf and Nancy Woodman with John Oldfield in the Chair

Regrets: Kimberly Livingstone

Staff in Attendance: Laura Waldie, Senior Planner – Heritage, Abraham Plunkett-Latimer, Senior Planner - Heritage, Karin Stieg-Drobig, Recording Secretary and 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 at 7:01 p.m. and the meeting adjourned at 9:17 p.m.

Declarations of Interest: NIL

Presentation:

Michelle Bartlett, Supervisor of Historic Sites (McDougall Cottage), Region of Waterloo, gave a presentation on the proposed sign for 89 Grand Avenue North. She thanked the Committee for the opportunity to speak to questions raised at the September 16, 2021 meeting. Ms Bartlett noted the proposed location of the sign is meant to allow access of the pathway around the cottage and would not block the cottage along the south or north looking streetscape. She further noted that the proposed sign will not be attached to the cottage and is not meant to be a permanent installation. Ms Bartlett added that the cottage is known for it’s interior murals and the proposed Indigenous mural is meant as a conscious disruption to encourage conversations about truth and reconciliation, to draw visitors into the cottage and give staff the opportunity to discuss the history of the cottage, the area and the Indigenous peoples through programming and conversations.

The Committee asked about consultation with Indigenous groups, whether the art will be juried, alternate locations around the cottage, the size of the proposed mural, how
long the proposed mural art will be displayed, plans for additional displays, how long the proposed sign would be in that particular location and any impacts to the vegetation in the surrounding gardens. The Chair thanked Ms. Bartlett for her presentation.

Wally Malcolm, Project Manager, gave a presentation on the Dickson Hill Globe Light Replacement Project. Steven Huang, Project Engineer was also present to answer questions from the Committee. Mr. Malcolm explained there are actually two projects underway; the addition of 7 Globe Lights along Salisbury Avenue next to Victoria Park as requested by Council in 2020 and the replacement of the decorative light standards and the conversion to LED lights as part of a partnership to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. He further noted that the existing light standards are deteriorating and it is no longer possible to obtain parts needed to keep these compliant with current CSA/ESA standards. The goal is to maintain the heritage character of the current globe lights while providing up to date, cost effective, CSA/ESA safe lighting.

The Committee inquired about the remaining number of original cast iron poles versus aluminium, creating a new mold from existing lights, costs associated with making a new mold, the cost of producing the light standards, various ways to ensure the height and diameter, green of the light standards and orange hue of the globe lights remain true to the originals. The Chair thanked Mr. Malcolm for his presentation.

Delegations: NIL

Minutes of Previous Meeting

Moved by: Nelson Cecilia
Seconded by: Susan Brown

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

CARRIED

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

Moved by: Nancy Woodman
Seconded by: Nelson Cecilia

The Committee discussed the importance of keeping museums relevant and vibrant, the size of the proposed mural, consultations with the Art Board, location and length of time that the proposed sign would be installed for and blocking the heritage elements at the front of the cottage.
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).

NOT CARRIED

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

Moved by: Michelle Goodridge
Seconded by: Nancy Woodman

The Committee discussed the staff report, trialing the proposed light standards on Salisbury Ave where 7 new light standards have been approved, creating a new cast iron mold based upon the original 1914 design, replicating the colours and sizes of the light standards and the globe lights, costs associated with the changes, timing of replacements, and implementation. A revised recommendation was proposed.

Moved by: Nancy Woodman
Seconded by: Councillor Wolf

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 on the 7 lights at Victoria Park on Salisbury Ave. only.

CARRIED AS AMENDED

In addition, the Committee discussed the addition of a further recommendation.

Moved by: Susan Brown
Seconded by: Scott Roberts

THAT MHAC recommends a new mold be cast from an existing original cast iron globe light standard (circa 1914) be made and used for replacement of the globe light standards going forward in the City that will incorporate the desired LED lights that
replicate the desired warm tone and colour of the existing low sodium globe lights when illuminated.

CARRIED AS AMENDED

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

Moved by: Michelle Goodridge
Seconded by: Susan Brown

The Committee discussed projecting signs, size, height from the sidewalk and the sign by-law.

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).

CARRIED

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

Moved by: Nancy Woodman
Seconded by: Nelson Cecilia

The Committee discussed the proposed replacement from cedar to asphalt shingles noting that cedar shingles used in recent years appear to no longer have the lifespan previously enjoyed, thereby making the cost prohibitive.

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

CARRIED

Correspondence - NIL

Other Business – NIL
Chair’s Comments:

John Oldfield noted that while it is difficult to accept some of the proposed development such as the recently proposed towers on Water Street North, it is important to keeping the core areas viable and vital with people living in the area and that it is not too close to the main core area. He is hopeful the proposed HCD and height guidelines will hold developers to respect the heritage of our core areas, that the rules and regulations of the HCD are abided by and that there is plenty of opportunity for development outside of the HCD. He further noted that as the Gaslight Towers are not yet occupied, there is no sense of what the increased number of people will have on traffic, livability within the core and whether they will positively impact the merchants within the core.

Council Report/Comments:

Councillor Wolf noted it has been a very busy time with major projects coming to Council and it is key to try and keep a balance between making the City vibrant and livable while also preserving the heritage of the City. She noted that while it was a narrow vote for the Pearle Development project, they were encouraged to be bold by business owners. The Galt Core Height Guideline Study was approved to move forward and will encourage public comments; further funding was approved for core area businesses.

Staff/Senior Planner- Heritage comments:

Abraham Plunkett-Latimer advised that the Galt Core HCD Study was endorsed by Council, and so are moving forward with preparing a Heritage Conservation District Plan with a timeline of approximately six months. He noted that MHAC will be kept up to date for further opportunities to take part in any initiatives. Abraham further noted that he had sent out information regarding place making earlier in the week and encouraged the Committee members to take part in the survey on the Engage website that is available until October 31, 2021.

General Heritage Matters – Updates by Committee Members:

Susan Brown asked if there were any funds still available in the Heritage Grant Fund for this year. Staff advised that there are no funds available at this time and that receipts are requested by November 1st for any completed work or to make arrangements for previously approved work.

Michelle Goodridge asked about the school house property on Fountain Street that sustained a fire. Staff noted that they received the engineering report, are working with the owner on plans for commemorating the structure and that a report to the MHAC is forthcoming.
Next Meeting

Date & Time: November 18, 2021, 7:00 p.m.
Location: Virtually via Zoom

Close of Meeting

Moved by: Councillor Wolf
Seconded by: Mark Leclair

THAT the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee meeting does now adjourn at 9:17 p.m.

CARRIED

______________________________  ______________________________
Chairperson                        Recording Secretary
John Oldfield                       Karin Stieg-Drobig
Meeting Date: 11/18/2021  
Report #: 21-031(MHAC)  

To: Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee  

Report Date: 11/08/2021  

Report Author: Abraham Plunkett-Latimer, Senior Planner—Heritage  
Department: Development and Infrastructure  
Division: Planning  

Report Title: Request to Alter a Part IV Designated Property – 126 Blair Road  

File No: R01.01.54  
Ward No: Ward 5  

RECOMMENDATION(S)  

THAT Report 21-031(MHAC) be received;  

AND FURTHER THAT MHAC recommends that Council approve the request to alter the main structure on the designated property municipally known as 126 Blair Road by building a rear deck as outlined in Report 21-301(MHAC).  

SUMMARY  

- The property municipally known as 126 Blair Road was designated under the Ontario Heritage Act by City of Cambridge by-law 84-87.  
- The owner has requested permission to construct a rear deck.  
- The property includes a one and a half storey structure that was designated because it is a well-preserved and representative example of a Queen Anne style residence in Cambridge.
• The residence previously included an unsympathetic rear deck that was removed in the 1980s.

• The current owner wishes to construct a new rear deck.

• Council approval is required to alter a Part IV Designated property.

• The proposed deck is not anticipated to detract from the cultural heritage value or interest of the subject property.

BACKGROUND

The subject property was designated under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act in 1987 by City of Cambridge by-law 84-87. The subject property contains a one-and-a-half storey wood framed residence in the Queen Anne Style constructed in approximately 1885 by William Scott. The structure is notable for its well-preserved multicoloured sash windows, decorative front door, range of cladding material textures, off-centre front porch with decorative spindle work, and second storey balconies with decorative millwork.

Figure 1: 126 Blair Road, south-west (front) elevation, August 2021.
The owner submitted a request on October 11, 2021 to alter the property by constructing a rear deck to replace a deck that was removed in the 1980s.

The deck is proposed to be constructed of wood with 28-inch concrete footings. The dimensions are proposed to be 8.23 metres (27 feet) in length by 5.18 metres (17 feet) depth by 3.96 metres (13 feet) in height. It is proposed to be simple and modern in form with a railing characterized by square balusters and spindles and will be supported by diagonal bracing. It will be accessed via an exterior staircase and by an existing second-storey balcony door (Figure 3). Beneath the deck the owner is proposing to construct a concrete patio (Attachment 1).

The deck is proposed to be largely freestanding. It will be affixed to the existing structure with 19mm (¾ inch) bolts.
Figure 3: Proposed deck north east (rear) elevation.

Figure 4: Proposed location of deck and existing structure.
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.

Although the proposed deck is modern in construction, it does not detract from the cultural heritage value of the existing dwelling and positively contributes to the serves to restore function to the existing second-storey balcony door.

Existing Policy/By-Law:

Ontario Heritage Act

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

33 (1) No owner of property designated under section 29 shall alter the property or permit the alteration of the property if the alteration is likely to affect the property’s heritage attributes, as set out in the description of the property’s heritage attributes that was required to be served and registered under subsection 29 (6) or (14), as the case may be, unless the owner applies to the council of the municipality in which the property is situate and receives consent in writing to the alteration. 2002, c. 18, Sched. F, s. 2 (16); 2005, c. 6, s. 21 (1).

City of Cambridge Official Plan (2018)

Section 4.6 of the City of Cambridge Official Plan states that;

The City will regulate as fully as possible the demolition, removal or inappropriate alteration of buildings of cultural heritage value or interest included in the Register of Cultural Heritage Resources referred to in Section 4.3.

Financial Impact:

All costs are the responsibility of the property owner.

Public Input:

The Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC) meetings are open to the public.
Internal/External Consultation:
The Senior Planner-Heritage liaised with municipal building officials, and the owner.

Comments/Analysis:
The owner wishes to construct a deck at the rear of the structure to restore function to the existing door and improve the livability of the residence.

City of Cambridge records indicate that there was previously a similar deck in the location of the proposed deck. This deck was considered to be a later addition to the property and was removed in the 1980s. There is currently a second-storey door opening on the rear façade, suggesting that there was originally a deck or balcony in that location.

The Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada outlines standards for new additions to heritage structures.

Standard 11 states that new work should be “physically and visually compatible with, subordinate to, and distinguishable from the historic place.”

The proposed deck is compatible in terms of materials with the existing wood-framed structure given that it is proposed to be constructed of wood. It is subordinate to the existing structure in that it is located at the rear of the structure and is not visible from the street. It is distinguishable from the existing structure by the use of a simple, modern design that does not seek to replicate nineteenth-century features.

The proposed design does not require the alteration or removal of existing heritage attributes nor does it obscure heritage attributes. The design is such that it could be removed in future without impacting the heritage structure. It is not anticipated that the proposed alteration would have any permanent negative impacts upon the existing structure’s cultural heritage value or interest.

The proposed alteration will, moreover, restore function to the currently non-functional second-storey door which previously opened onto a deck or balcony.

For the above reasons, staff is recommending that the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee recommend that Council approve the proposed alteration to the property. If Council does not approve the proposed alteration, or approves with conditions, the applicant may appeal the decision to the Ontario Land Tribunal.
ATTACHMENTS

- Attachment 1 Structural Drawings, Centex Engineers, September 29, 2021.
126 BLAIR ROAD
CAMBRIDGE, ON N1S 2J4
DECK AND CONCRETE PATIO

Attachment 1

NOTES

1. ALL DIMENSIONS IN FT UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED.
2. USE CONSULT LAYOUT PRIOR TO CONSTRUCTION.
3. CHECKED AS SHOWN ON THE DRAWING.
4. CONSTRUCTION PROVIDER TO CONFIRM ALL DIMENSIONS PRIOR TO CONSTRUCTION.
5. CONSTRUCTION PROVIDER TO MEET ALL CODES.
6. ALL MATERIALS TO BE IN ACCORDANCE WITH CODE.
7. ALL DRAWN TO BE FREE OF DEFECTS AND DAMAGE.
8. ALL LABELS TO BE MOUNTED AND PLACED.
9. ALL JOINTS TO BE CLEANED.
10. ALL JOINTS TO BE FILLED.
11. ALL JOISTS TO BE STIFFENED.
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NOTES

1. ALL DIMENSIONS IN MM UNLESS OTHERWISE STATED.
2. ALL DIMENSIONS SHOWN ON THE DRAWING ARE FAIR AND ADJUSTED AFTER CONSTRUCTION.
3. ALL MATERIALS TO BE DIRECTED TO CONTRACTOR.
4. ALL CALCULATIONS TO MEET ALL CODES.
5. ALL DRAWINGS HAVE BEEN REVIEWED WITH RESPECT TO DRAWING.
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Meeting Date: 11/18/2021  
Report #: 21-030(MHAC)

To: Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee

Report Date: 11/08/2021

Report Author: Abraham Plunkett-Latimer, Senior Planner—Heritage

Department: Development and Infrastructure

Division: Planning

Report Title: Request to Demolish Part IV Designated Property – 4800 Fountain Street North

File No: R01.01.06

Ward No: Ward 1

RECOMMENDATION(S)

THAT Report 21-030(MHAC) be received;

AND FURTHER THAT the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee recommends that Council approve the request to demolish the main structure on the designated property municipally known as 4800 Fountain Street North in accordance with Section 34 of the Ontario Heritage Act as outlined in Report 21-030(MHAC), subject to the following conditions:

a) That the owner ensures that the fieldstone, of which the exterior walls of the circa 1870 school structure are composed, is salvaged during demolition and is protected on site for use in future commemoration.

SUMMARY

- The property municipally known as 4800 Fountain Street was designated in 1980 under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act by City of Cambridge by-law 1769.
• The property includes a one-storey fieldstone former school building constructed in approximately 1870 with a rear addition constructed in 1964.

• On August 24, 2021 the structure was severely damaged by fire.

• Engineering reports submitted by the applicant and commissioned by the City of Cambridge have identified that the structure is unstable and recommend that it must be demolished immediately.

• The remaining building materials are compromised by the heat and cannot be used in a new structure.

• The owner has agreed to salvage the fieldstone used in constructing the walls for use in future commemoration at such time as a plan comes forward for a replacement structure.

• After the structure is demolished, Council will determine if the designating by-law should be amended or repealed.

BACKGROUND

The subject property was designated under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act in 1980 by City of Cambridge by-law 1769. The subject property contains a one-storey fieldstone former school building constructed in approximately 1870. A concrete block addition clad in granite veneer was constructed in approximately 1969. The property is located adjacent to the Grand River in north-west Cambridge and is primarily surrounded by rural lands.

Figure 1: Context Map, 4800 Fountain Street North Circled in Red.
The designating by-law describes that the property is significant for both its design value and its associative value. It describes that the structure is notable as a rare example of a rural, stone school and highlights the multi-coloured granite construction, twelve-paned double sash windows surmounted by an elliptical fan lite and red brick radiating voussoirs as attributes.

Figure 2: 4800 Fountain Street North, East Elevation, December 2020.

The existing structure served as a rural school from approximately 1870 to 1962. The existing structure replaced an earlier wood-frame school built in approximately 1865. The property had previously been used as a school site since approximately 1832. It had recently been adapted for residential use.

Prior to August 2021, previous owners had made unapproved alterations to the property including creating a large opening in the foundation through which to drive vehicles and removing a load-bearing interior wall.
In January 2021 the current owner received a property standards order to repair the exterior walls to prevent entry of moisture into the building.

On March 24, 2021 an updated property standards order was issued requesting that the owner repair the roof and shore the walls of the rear addition to stabilize them.

On August 24, 2021 the subject property was severely damaged by fire. The roof of the structure was completely consumed by fire, leaving the fieldstone walls unsupported. Many of the windows were broken and the stone comprising the walls was compromised by high heat. The existing damage to the foundation has been exacerbated by loss of the roof framing (Figures 4-6).

The owner submitted a structural assessment report completed by Caskanette Udall and dated August 31st which evaluated the extent of damage. The report concluded that “the structure cannot be salvaged and should be demolished completely, including the foundation” (Attachment 1).

The City of Cambridge retained Strik Baldinelli Moniz to complete a structural review of the existing building to determine if the structure could be salvaged.
initially visited the site on August 24, 2021 to the condition of the building. A second site visit was conducted on September 8, 2021 to further assess the extent of fire damage, observe any changes, and explore options for shoring if possible. The report identified that the exterior walls are unsupported and the foundation is undermined, meaning that there is high risk for the walls to collapse. The report recommended that the structure be demolished immediately. (Attachment 2).

At the request of staff, the owner submitted a memorandum regarding potential salvage and reuse of materials. This was prepared by David Thompson Architects Ltd. and dated September 17, 2021. The report outlined that the windows had been damaged beyond repair with broken frames, sashes, and muntins and were inoperable.

The memorandum further outlined that the fieldstones comprising the exterior wall could not be salvaged for reuse in new construction due to their structural stability being compromised by high levels of heat (Attachment 3).

On September 27, 2021 the owner submitted an application to demolish the remaining structure.

Figure 4: 4800 Fountain Street North East Elevation, August 25, 2021.
Figure 5: 4800 Fountain Street North interior from west entrance, August 25, 2021.

Figure 6: 4800 Fountain Street North, West Elevation, August 25, 2021.
ANALYSIS

Strategic Alignment:

PEOPLE To actively engage, inform and create opportunities for people to participate in community building – making Cambridge a better place to live, work, play and learn for all.

Goal #1 - Community Wellbeing

Objective 1.1 Work with partners to create a safe, inclusive and accessible city.

Demolition of the remaining walls of the former school at 4800 Fountain Street is required to ensure public safety. The walls are unstable and may collapse imminently.

Existing Policy/By-Law:

Ontario Heritage Act

Section 34 of the Ontario Heritage Act outlines that an owner may not demolish a designated structure unless they receive consent in writing to the demolition. It states,

No owner of property designated under section 29 shall do either of the following, unless the owner applies to the council of the municipality in which the property is situate and receives consent in writing to the demolition or removal:

1. Demolish or remove, or permit the demolition or removal of, any of the property’s heritage attributes, as set out in the description of the property’s heritage attributes in the by-law that was required to be registered under clause 29 (12) (b) or subsection 29 (19), as the case may be.

2. 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 the property’s heritage attributes, as set out in the description of the property’s heritage attributes in the by-law that was required to be registered under clause 29 (12) (b) or subsection 29 (19), as the case may be. 2019, c. 9, Sched. 11, s. 12.

City of Cambridge Official Plan (2018)

Section 4.6 of the City of Cambridge Official Plan states that;

The City will regulate as fully as possible the demolition, removal or inappropriate alteration of buildings of cultural heritage value or interest included in the Register of Cultural Heritage Resources referred to in Section 4.3.
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 staff, the Chief Building Official, and the owner.

Comments/Analysis:

The subject property contains a one-storey fieldstone structure that was constructed as a school in approximately 1870 and a concrete block addition clad in stone veneer that was previously used as a gymnasium space. The structure has been recently converted for residential use. The property was designated in 1980 by the City of Cambridge as a property of heritage value or interest. The property is notable as a rare example of a rural schoolhouse of fieldstone construction in the Region of Waterloo.

On August 24, 2021 the structure was severely damaged by fire.

Structural Assessment

The City has received two assessments by structural engineers regarding the extent of the fire damage and possibility of restoration or salvage. Both reports concluded that the structure was damaged beyond repair and at risk of collapse and recommended immediate demolition of both the remaining walls and the foundation.

The report prepared by Caskanette Udall consulting engineers and dated August 31, 2021 noted that the roof had been entirely consumed by the fire and that the remaining walls had been compromised by fire and also by long-term deterioration of the mortar between the fieldstones. The authors noted that there was no reasonable method to preserve the structure.

The report by Strik Baldinelli Moniz and dated August 31, 2021 (revised September 10, 2021) also concluded that the structural stability of the remaining walls had been compromised by the fire and noted that the remaining walls would not meet CSA standards if they were to be reused. The author also recommended complete demolition of the remaining walls and foundation.

Heritage staff accept the professional engineers’ assessments that the structure cannot be repaired and must be demolished.
Heritage staff requested that the owner provide salvage and commemoration plans prior to demolishing the structure. The owner submitted a memorandum regarding potential salvage of 4800 Fountain Street prepared by David Thompson Architect on 17 September, 2021. The author concluded that there were no remaining heritage attributes that could be salvaged. The remaining windows had been broken and the mechanisms seized and the stone comprising the walls had been potentially structurally compromised by high temperatures and so could not be certified for use in new construction.

The owner has not yet determined future plans for redeveloping the property. The owner has indicated that they intend to create a commemorative feature on the property using stone from the walls, such as a garden or accessory building. The particulars of this feature are to be determined at such time as an application is submitted to re-build on the property.

In order to ensure that all possibilities for commemoration remain open, the owner has agreed to salvage as much fieldstone as possible from the remaining walls during demolition. Until such time as it is to be used, this stone is to be stored on site at the rear of the property, covered by plastic, and protected by fencing to avoid theft or damage.

Heritage staff is satisfied that options to repair the existing structure and to salvage key materials have been adequately explored and repair is not a viable option. For this reason, staff are recommending that Council approve the request to demolish the remaining walls and foundation entirely.

Although the distinctive fieldstone used in the building’s construction cannot be salvaged for new construction due to heat damage, staff is recommending that the stone be salvaged during demolition and retained for future commemorative use.

Based on the above analysis, staff recommends that the MHAC recommend that Council approve the request to demolish the remaining walls and foundation on the property municipally known as 4800 Fountain Street North.
Prepared by:

Abraham Plunkett-Latimer,
Senior Planner – Heritage

Departmental Approval:

Lisa Prime, MCIP, RPP,
Chief Planner

ATTACHMENTS

- Attachment 1 Structural Assessment, Caskanette Udall Consulting Engineers, August 31, 2021.

- Attachment 2 Structural Assessment Strik Baldinelli Moniz, August 31, 2021 (revised September 10, 2021)

August 31, 2021

John Parr
TD Insurance
9th Floor 3650 Victoria Park Ave
North York, ON M2H 3P7

Dear Mr. Parr,

Re: Structural Assessment after Fire
Address: 4800 Fountain St., Cambridge
Insured: Ahmad Zeitoun
Date of Loss: August 24, 2021
Your file No: 033012866
Our File No: 21-263TJ

Caskanette Udall Consulting Engineers was retained on August 25, 2021 to assess the damage to the insured building after a fire and determine if the remaining structure is salvageable.

The house is an older wood, stone, and concrete block framed structure. The section on the north side was originally a school house. The south side of the building has been added on at some time in the past, and covered with stone to match the school house. The original section was constructed with stone walls and wood floors and roof. The newer section used concrete block walls and stone veneer, with wood floors and roof. The house has been classified as a heritage building.

Photo 1: Overhead image of house at 4800 Fountain St. N, Cambridge (Google)
The fire destroyed the entire newer south section, including the floor and roof. The floor of the north section was heavily damaged but remained in place. The roof was completely consumed.

The remaining walls on both sections are damaged and unstable and cannot be salvaged. The concrete block walls on the south side have been compromised from the fire and cannot be saved. The stone walls on the north side have also been compromised from the fire, but also suffer from long term deterioration of the mortar between the stones. There is no reasonable method to preserve the remaining structure.

The foundation of the original section was likely built with rubble stone. A small area at the rear that is visible was reinforced with brick. The overall condition of the foundation is likely that it cannot be re-used for new construction without significant repairs and upgrades.

Prior to the fire, the insured stated that the roof was leaking near the fireplace. The roof was tarped to prevent further moisture ingress. He indicated that he was working with the city and heritage association to have the roof repaired.

The insured also stated that there was an interior wall in the north section that was in disrepair from the previous owners after incomplete renovations. He was in the process of applying for a permit to remove the wall and have a beam installed. The permit was still outstanding at the time.

There were no other pre-existing deficiencies reported by the insured.

Based on my inspection of this property after the fire, the remaining structure cannot be salvaged and should be demolished completely, including the foundation. The walls remain in an unsafe condition and temporary shoring is not feasible.

This completes my assessment. Please contact our office if you have any further questions.

Yours very truly,

Jeff Udall, P.Eng
Photo 2: Fire damaged house at 4800 Fountain St N, Cambridge

Photo 3: Remains of interior on south side (newer addition)
Photo 4: Remains of interior on north side (original section)

Photo 5: Original stone wall on north section
Photo 6: Rebuilt foundation corner at rear of house

Photo 7: Wall construction at rear of south section
Limitations

1. The work performed in the preparation of this report and the conclusions presented are subject to the following:
   (a) The Scope of Services, and time and budgetary limitations discussed at the time of our retainer; and,
   (b) The Limitations stated herein.

2. No other warranties or representations, either expressed or implied, are made as to the professional services provided, or the conclusions presented.

3. The opinions presented in this report were based, in part, on visual observations of the site and attendant structures. Our conclusions cannot and are not extended to include those portions of the site or structures which were not reasonably available, in our opinion, for direct observation.

4. In so far as the investigation included obtaining information from third parties and employees or agents of the owner, no attempt has been made to verify the accuracy of any information provided, unless specifically noted in our report.

5. Because of the limitations referred to above, different building conditions from those stated in our report may exist. Should such different conditions be encountered, we must be notified in order that we may determine if modifications to the conclusions in the report are necessary.

6. The utilization of our services during the implementation of any remedial measures will allow us to observe compliance with the conclusions and recommendations contained in the report. Our involvement will also allow for changes to be made as necessary to suit field conditions as they are encountered.

7. This report is for the sole use of the party to whom it is addressed unless expressly stated otherwise in the report. Any use which any third party makes of the report, in whole or in part, or any reliance thereon, or decisions made based on any information of conclusions in the report, is the sole responsibility of such third party. We accept no responsibility whatsoever for damages or loss of any nature or kind suffered by any such third party as a result of actions taken or not taken or decisions made in reliance on the report or anything set out therein.

8. **Waiver of Consequential Damages**

   Notwithstanding any other provision of this Agreement, and to the fullest extent permitted by law, neither the Client or the Consultant, their respective officers, directors, partners, employees, contractors or subconsultants shall be liable to the other or shall make any claim for any incidental, indirect or consequential damages arising out of or connected in any way to the project or this assignment. This mutual waiver of consequential damages shall include, but is not limited to, loss of use, loss of profit, loss of business, loss of income, loss of reputation and any other consequential damages that either party may have incurred from any cause of action including negligence, strict liability, breach of contract and breach of strict or implied warranty. Both the Client and the Consultant shall require similar waivers of consequential damages protecting all the entities or persons named herein in all contracts and subcontracts with others involved in this project.

9. **Limitation of Liability**

   To the maximum extent permitted by law, the Client agrees to limit the Consultant’s liability for the Client’s damages to the sum of the Consultant’s fee or the available proceeds of insurance at the time a claim is made, whichever is greater. This limitation shall apply regardless of the cause of action.

10. **Corporate Protection Provision**

   It is intended by the parties to this Agreement that the Consultant’s services in connection with the Project shall not subject the Consultant’s individual employees, officers or directors to any personal legal exposure for the risks associated with this Project. Therefore, and notwithstanding anything to the contrary contained herein, the Client agrees that as the Client’s sole and exclusive remedy, any claim, demand or suit shall be directed and/or asserted only against the Consultant, Caskanette Udall Consulting Engineers, and not against any of the Consultant’s individual employees, officers or directors.
City of Cambridge
Attention: Mr. Ralph Schmidt

4800 Fountain Street North
Cambridge, Ontario

Ralph;

At your request, Garrett Nicholson, P.Eng of Strik Baldinelli Moniz attended site on the afternoon of August 24, 2021 to complete a structural review of the existing building. The purpose of review was to assess the fire damage and reported safety concerns regarding the structure of the schoolhouse and gymnasium. An additional site visit was performed on September 8, 2021 with Darryl Cowan, P.Eng of SBM to further assess the extent of the fire damage, observe any changes since the previous inspection and determine if warranted, options for safely installing shoring.

It was reported that the fire occurred sometime during the morning of August 24, 2021. Emergency services were called and extinguished the fire during the morning. On the afternoon of August 24 portions of the schoolhouse roof framing had failed and fallen on to the ground floor framing. The roof structure of the gymnasium had failed and fallen into the structure. Below is a summary of our observations, conclusions, and recommendations. This report is based on a visual review from the outside of the building only. Due to safety concerns the building was not entered.

OBSERVATIONS:

The building is a 1-storey schoolhouse with a full basement. The schoolhouse appears to have been used as storage for some years. There is a gymnasium addition which had been modified for use as a vehicle workshop by removing most of the floor joists, excavating down 4’ to suit the surrounding grade, and a large door opening was created in the rear (west) elevation. The building is listed by the City of Cambridge as a designated heritage structure. The original building was constructed in 1870 and is known as the Riverbank School.

The schoolhouse appears to be the original building as it is constructed with mass round field stone load bearing walls. The interior was mostly covered with plaster at the time of review. The floor framing is rough sawn wood floor joists. The roof framing is mostly missing but was previously framed with rough sawn rafters with raised ceiling joists to create a vaulted ceiling.

The gymnasium appears to be an addition to the original building as it is constructed with 8” thick concrete block walls with a field stone veneer supported on 12” concrete block foundation walls. The roof framing is completely missing but was previously wood roof joists.

At the time of review, the roof framing of both the schoolhouse and gymnasium has failed, leaving all walls of both structures laterally unsupported at the top.

Prior to the fire, the gymnasium floor framing had been removed and the interior had been excavated down to match the low grade at the rear (west) elevation, leaving the walls unbraced from the strip footing to the underside of roof elevation. A large section of the gymnasium’s rear (west) elevation had been removed to create a large door opening (see photo 8). The
excavated interior creates a walk-in condition, but also exposed the interior and exterior face of the strip footing (see photo 12) thereby leaving insufficient frost cover to the footings which are now susceptible to heave.

At the south-west corner of the schoolhouse, the field stone foundation had failed prior to the fire. It appears the wall was damaged or undermined and the foundation wall had been reconstructed/reinforced with clay brick masonry (see photo 11) directly on grade. During the second inspection, shear cracks were observed in the field stone wall above window and door openings near this area (see photo 13 and 14). It is unclear if the cracking occurred prior to or after the fire.

In the schoolhouse, the underside of the ground floor framing was not easily viewed from the north basement window but appeared to be in fair condition. The top of the ground floor interior was obstructed due to the failed roof framing and was not visible for inspection. The interior partition framing in the basement was partially visible and showed no visible signs of fire damage. The basement floor was flooded as a result of the fire fighting efforts.

The gymnasium interior was observed from both the front (east) elevation, left (south) elevation as well as the rear (west) elevation. Near the front elevation, some floor joists remained in place and showed signs of fire damage. In the remainder of the gymnasium interior, the floor framing had been previously removed exposing the joist pockets in the wall thus creating a taller wall than originally intended. At the rear (west) elevation, the large door opening does not have a proper lintel installed and triangular cracking is visible in both the concrete blocks and stone veneer extending from just above the opening to the peak of the wall, indicating some blocks may be in danger of falling out of the wall. This may have been present prior to the fire, however during the second inspection, the cracks were observed to have widened directly above the opening. The front wall elevation was observed to have been extensively undermined, leaving large sections unsupported (see photo 15). This condition would have been present prior to the fire. The front and south side elevations were also observed to have small diagonal shear cracks at the window openings (see photo 16 and 17).

CONCLUSIONS

Due to the extent to the fire damage to the roof, all concrete block and field stone load bearing walls are unsupported at the top and thus are structurally unstable and unsafe. Further, due to the pre-existing damage or undermining to the foundation walls, the stability of the gymnasium walls and rear corner of the school house are further reduced.

The small diagonal cracking over the windows and doors is typical for older masonry structures where lintels are not present and are not necessarily indicative of structural failure. However, the pattern and size of cracking over the large rear gymnasium door is indicative that potential partial failure may occur.

The gymnasion foundations and part of the school house foundations have insufficient frost cover leaving them susceptible to heave during freezing weather. Additionally, without a roof the building cannot control the temperature leaving the founding soil on the inside of the building further susceptible to frost heave during freezing weather.

The schoolhouse ground floor framing and foundation appear to be in fair condition based on the conditions observed on-site

The original mass round field stone walls of the schoolhouse were constructed using a method of construction that is no longer employed in modern construction. Field stone wall framing is not recognized by the Ontario Building Code or for quantitative design under CSA S304.1 “Masonry Design for Buildings.” The empirical slenderness ratios provided in the CSA appear to be exceeded thereby making it difficult to provide any engineered repair details or to certify the walls for re-use.

Due to the unsupported condition of the exterior masonry walls, the risk for partial failure of some walls and the undermined foundation walls, it is our opinion that the existing schoolhouse and gymnasium structure are unsafe for occupancy. Further, because of the unsafe conditions described above, it is our opinion that attempting to temporarily shore the walls of the schoolhouse and gymnasium is also unsafe.
RECOMMENDATIONS

The schoolhouse and the gymnasium buildings are structurally unstable and unsafe for occupancy or for temporary shoring. In the interest of public safety, it is our opinion that the schoolhouse and gymnasium structure be fully demolished.

It is further recommended that additional construction fencing, or hording be installed around the property to completely block public access to the building. We recommend that no person enter the building for any reason until the unstable portions of the structure are demolished under a valid demolition permit.

LIMITATIONS:

- This report is intended exclusively for the Client(s) named in the report. The material in it reflects our best judgment in light of the information reviewed by Strik Baldinelli Moniz at the time of preparation. No portion of this report may be used as a separate entity, it is written to be read in its entirety.

- Any use which a third party makes of this report, or any reliance on or decisions to be made based on it, are the responsibility of such third parties.

- Only the specific information identified has been reviewed. The consultant is not obligated to identify mistakes or insufficiencies in the information obtained from the various sources or to verify the accuracy of the information. The Consultant may use such specific information obtained in performing its services and is entitled to rely upon the accuracy and completeness thereof.

- This assessment does not wholly eliminate uncertainty regarding the potential for existing or future costs, hazards or losses in connection with a property. No site inspections, physical or destructive testing and no design calculations have been performed unless specifically recorded. Conditions existing but not recorded were not apparent given the level of study undertaken. We can perform further investigation on items of concern if so required.

- We accept no responsibility for any decisions made or actions taken as a result of this report unless we are specifically advised of and participate in such action, in which case our responsibility will be as agreed to at that time. Any user of this report specifically denies any right to claims against the Consultant, Sub-Consultants, their Officers, Agents and Employees in excess of the fee paid for professional services.

We trust this report meets your satisfaction. If you need further clarification, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Respectfully submitted,

Strik, Baldinelli, Moniz Ltd.
Planning • Civil • Structural • Mechanical • Electrical

Prepared By

Garrett Nicholson, P.Eng.
Darryl Cowan, P.Eng.
Associate II

Cc: Dennis Purcell, Chief Building Official – City of Cambridge
Photo 1: Front (east) elevation of schoolhouse.

Photo 2: Rear (west) elevation of schoolhouse.
Photo 3: Ground floor interior from rear door.  
Note: The roof framing has failed inwards on to the ground floor framing. The furniture and interior partitions showed little to no fire damage.

Photo 4: Basement and ground floor framing visible from side window on north elevation.  
Note: The basement is flooded with water at the time of the first and second inspection due to the fire fighting efforts.
Photo 5: South-west corner at rear elevation.

Note: The field stone foundation has failed and been reinforced with brick masonry on grade. Surrounding grade slopes steeply away from the schoolhouse towards the large unsupported opening of the gymnasium’s rear (west) wall.

Photo 6: South elevation of gymnasium.

Note: The roof framing has failed inwards and the concrete masonry walls are unbraced.
Photo 7: Gymnasium interior from the front door, looking towards the south elevation.

Note: The roof framing has failed inwards and the concrete masonry walls are unbraced.
Photo 8: Gymnasium interior from the front door, looking towards the west elevation. **Note:** The roof framing has failed inwards and the concrete masonry walls are unbraced. Unsupported wall openings are present throughout the west elevation. Cracking is visible in the concrete masonry wall above the large unsupported opening.
Photo 9: West elevation of gymnasium, above large unsupported opening.

Note: Cracking is visible in the stone veneer above the large unsupported opening.
Photo 10: West elevation of gymnasium, at large unsupported opening.

Note: Concrete masonry foundation wall has been excavated and exposed on both interior and exterior face at the west elevation. With the space now being unheated, there is no frost protection for the gymnasium walls.

Photo 11: South-west corner at rear elevation.

Note: The field stone foundation has failed and been reinforced with brick masonry. Field stone wall above does not have solid bearing on to the masonry. Surrounding grade slopes steeply away from the schoolhouse towards the gymnasium’s rear (west) wall.
Photo 12: West elevation of gymnasium, at large unsupported opening.

Note: Concrete masonry foundation wall has been excavated and exposed on both interior and exterior face at the west elevation. Strip footing is visible. With the space now being unheated, there is no frost protection for the gymnasium walls.
Photo 13: Rear (west) elevation of schoolhouse at door opening.

Note: Cracking is visible at the corners above door opening and extend to roof.

Photo 14: Rear (west) elevation of schoolhouse at window opening.

Note: Cracking is visible above the large window opening and extend to roof. This cracking is typical at the window opening on the front (east) elevation as well.
Photo 15: Gymnasium interior from the rear large unsupported opening, looking towards the east elevation. 
Note: The wall is undermined and unsupported at multiple locations.

Photo 16: Front (east) elevation of gymnasium at window openings. 
Note: Cracking is visible at the corners and extend to roof.
Photo 17: Side (south) elevation of gymnasium at window opening.

Note: Cracking is visible at the corner of window opening.
David Thompson Architect Ltd.

RE: ARCHITECTURAL AND HISTORIC ASSESSMENT AFTER FIRE
4800 FOUNTAIN STREET, CAMBRIDGE, ON
ARCHITECT’S COMMENTS

September 17, 2021

Owner: Ahmad Zeitoun
Date of Fire: August 24, 2021
Location: 4800 Fountain Street, Cambridge, ON
Formerly Riverbank School
Being of Architectural and Historic Significance
Cambridge By-Law 1769

David Thompson Architect Ltd was retained in September of 2021 to assess the condition of Architectural and Historic elements at 4800 Fountain Street, after they were exposed to a significant fire in August of the same year.

Formerly known as Riverbank School, the building was deemed to be of Architectural value and Historical interest in November of 1980, see Cambridge By-Law 1769. It was one of the few remaining stone rural schools in the area and was deemed an aesthetic example of the type. The windows were not typical of the time, but noted as ‘unusual’ in the 1980 report, the two large front windows each twelve paned and double sashed complete with elliptical fan above and radiating brick voussoirs. The multi-coloured granite was laid up in a typical rural manner, with thick flat mortar joints. The building functioned as a school for more than ninety years from 1870 to 1962, and then as a library from 1962-1973. The following year after it served as Headquarters for the Waterloo Regional Library.

After its use as a Library, the building became privately owned and used as a single family dwelling for about twenty years. The owner of the house let the building fall into disrepair and much of the structure was seriously compromised, a result of ongoing renovations he took on himself without the consent of Structural Engineers and the local Building Department.

As Riverbank Drive was closed off over the years, a large manufacturing plant built just south of the property and Waterloo Regional Airport expanded its services, traffic levels increased on Fountain Street and the property became more isolated from the community which it had served for so many years.

Prior to the fire in August 2021, we were called in to give an opinion on the integrity of the building. We felt it was unfit for habitation and went so far as to comment it was structurally unsafe to renovate, and recommended temporary shoring to be designed by a Professional Engineer and installed prior to undertaking any renovations.
The current owner had engaged a local Structural Engineering firm, Witzel Dyce Engineering Inc, and was in the process of working with the Municipality and Historical boards to renovate the building. It was their intent to create a single-family home on the property which would become their principal residence.

It is our understanding the Owner was in the process of securing a grant to restore elements of the building.

The fire destroyed much of the building, generating intense amounts of heat and smoke, both of which severely compromised the existing historic stone and windows referred to in By-law 1769, previously mentioned.

The Structural report by Caskenette and Udall Consulting Engineers recommends the remnants of the building left standing and the associated concrete and rubble foundations be demolished immediately, as their structural integrity has been compromised. The granite walls had not been maintained and the report added the loss of grout in the joints between the stones allowed water to penetrate and damage the assembly.

The windows have been damaged beyond repair with broken frames, sashes, muntins and so on. The hardware has long been seized and is not operable.

While we unfortunately recommend demolition as well, we do suggest any stone that could be salvaged for outdoor structures, fences, landscape walls, columns or other landscaping elements on the property should be done so.

This completes my assessment. Should you have any further questions, please contact me directly any time.

Regards,

DAVID THOMPSON ARCHITECT LTD.

David Thompson, Principal
OAA, MRAIC, Dipl. Arch., BA, LEED Green Associate
RE: ARCHITECTURAL AND HISTORIC ASSESSMENT AFTER FIRE
4800 FOUNTAIN STREET, CAMBRIDGE, ON
ARCHITECT’S COMMENTS

ADDENDUM

September 27, 2021

Owner: Ahmad Zeitoun
Date of Fire: August 24, 2021
Location: 4800 Fountain Street, Cambridge, ON
Formerly Riverbank School
Being of Architectural and Historic Significance
Cambridge By-Law 1769

As requested, see attached Personal CV. I also attached Testimonials and a brief Firm Description for your reference.

I am an Architect with close to 30 years experience in Toronto, Vancouver and Toronto, and while the majority of my work is new builds, I do a number of renovations to buildings in scale of the subject building and I do work in an historical style. The Balsillie house on Malabar in Waterloo is an example of late 1900’s Shingle Style, for example, and I have many other examples over the years. I also worked on the Wellington County Museum and Archives restoring their front steps and entrance way.

As for structural stability of stone after a fire, I will cite ‘Fire Damaged Stone Structures in Historical Monuments. Laboratory Analyses of Changes in Natural Stones by Heat Effect’, by M Hajpal:

‘Although natural stones are non-combustible materials, the fire and heat effect can cause irreversible changes in their structure and mechanical properties, which influence the strength and static behaviour of the stone structures. These changes risk the stability of the entire building. Some fires at the end of 20th century brought attention to the importance of this research topic, since understanding the changes in mechanical properties of natural stones by heat provide additional information for the reconstruction and restoration work of fire damaged historic buildings. The typical forms of alteration of stones exposed to fire are: changes of colour, rounding off corners, spalling and cracking.’
As for the question about structural stability of stone after a fire, the best one to comment is a Professional Engineer and a Fire Specialist. Often Building Codes require new material. I did offer a solution that the stone could be used on site in Landscape projects such as walls, columns and so on, where any fire damage would not affect the building envelope.

The idea of recalling the existing building and its historical significance in the area is a very good one.

Regards,

DAVID THOMPSON ARCHITECT LTD.

David Thompson, Principal
OAA, MRAIC, Dipl. Arch., BA, LEED Green Associate
Subjects: To request comments on the proposed conservation strategy for the Riverside Dam project.

Purpose

The purpose of this memorandum is to advise the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee of a Heritage Impact Assessment submitted to the City in support of the reconstruction of the Riverside Dam and to request comments on the proposed conservation approach.

The Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee was previously consulted regarding the demolition and reconstruction of the Riverside Dam as part of an Environmental Process.

Background

The Riverside Dam is listed as a property of cultural heritage value or interest on the City of Cambridge’s Heritage Register. The dam is located to the north east of King Street East on the Speed River in Preston. The dam was constructed in approximately 1890.

The existing dam is failing. A structural investigation prepared by AMEC Environment and Infrastructure dated December 23, 2014 outlined that retention of the existing dam was not feasible.

An Environmental Assessment process was undertaken regarding demolition or reconstruction of the dam between 2013 and 2018. A Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report was prepared as part of the Environmental Assessment Process. The Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee provided comments in November 2013.

On June 26, 2018 Council endorsed a preferred option to rebuild the existing dam and directed staff to prepare detailed designs.

In March 2020 the Riverside Dam Detailed Design project was awarded to Sanchez Engineering Inc. in partnership with B.T. Engineering and the design was initiated.
To support this design work, the City Commissioned a Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment (CHIA) to provide guidance on mitigating negative heritage impacts of the demolition and reconstruction of the dam. This CHIA, prepared by Wendy Shearer and dated March 8, 2021 has been attached to this memo for review by the MHAC.

**Comments**

The current proposal is to construct a new dam approximately 40 metres upstream of the existing dam and to decommission the existing dam. The proposal will require demolition or removal of the existing dam entirely.

Since retention of the existing dam is not feasible, the Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment recommends that the existing dam be recorded and salvaged, and for the heritage values of the control structures to be interpreted nearby in Riverside Park.

The CHIA also comments on the proposed location of the new dam. The report recommends that the new dam be located at or upstream from the existing dam in order to minimize impacts on the existing landscape and to permit interpretative features to be located nearby.

Finally, the CHIA provides recommendations for future interpretation of the dam.

The Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee is asked to provide comments on the conservation approach suggested by the Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment so that these comments may inform finalized designs.

**Attachments**

Heritage Impact Assessment

Riverside Dam, City of Cambridge

March 8, 2021

Prepared by: Wendy Shearer, OALA, ASLA, FCSLA, CAHP,
Landscape Architect, Cultural Heritage Specialist

Submitted to: Sanchez Engineering Inc.

Riverside Dam Heritage Impact Assessment

1.0 Purpose of this report
2.0 Background Information
3.0 Summary of Heritage Attributes and Values
4.0 Existing Conditions
5.0 Relevant Policies and Requirements
6.0 Options and Mitigation Strategies
7.0 Review of Alternatives and Preferred Location for the Dam
8.0 Guidance for Interpretation
9.0 Next Steps
10.0 Resources

Appendix A
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Section 1.0 Purpose of this report

The purpose of this Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) is to summarize the extensive heritage assessment work that has been completed and approved as part of the Environmental Assessment process for the Riverside Dam in the City of Cambridge Preston area. A Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report (CHER) was completed in 2012, revised 2013 by qualified heritage consultants that provides valuable background to the history and evolution of the Riverside Dam and its setting. Following the direction of the City of Cambridge, the detailed design of a rebuilt dam at this location on the Speed River is now underway.

The purpose of this Heritage Impact Assessment is to review the heritage work to date, to add any new information to the understanding of the heritage values associated with the dam, to update the description of the existing conditions, and to identify adverse impacts on the
heritage resources from the project and describe potential mitigation strategies to lessen these impacts. To complete these tasks a review has been completed of the existing heritage materials as well as the information provided by the Heritage Planner at the City of Cambridge regarding the municipal policies and procedures that apply to the undertaking. Field work has also been undertaken to document the cultural heritage landscape setting of the dam. The resulting findings provided the framework that guided the evaluation of the various alternatives that have been considered for the integration of the listed heritage attributes in the dam rebuild project.

The new dam will continue to control and manage water levels on the Speed River in the approximate area of this historic location. Retention and repair of the existing dam was thoroughly studied and evaluated during the EA process and this treatment was not selected for many reasons including cost and the structural issues relating to the historic structure.

The current detailed design study for the new dam has involved developing options for the integration of the identified heritage attributes of the existing dam in a new structure. Several locations for the new dam have been proposed and analysed.

The scope of work for this Heritage Impact Assessment is to develop a conservation and interpretation strategy to share the multiple heritage values of the dam and its historic setting with the community and the public. It will also guide the integration of the heritage resources in the new design.

### 2.0 Background Information

The approved Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report (CHER) completed by Unterman McPhail Associates (UMA) in 2012 revised March 2013 contains extensive background information regarding the early settlement of the Preston area beginning in the early 1800’s. The CHER report begins with the historic contact period with Euro-Canadians and does not include any discussion of earlier use of the area by Indigenous people. (This important information is included in the separate archaeological investigation work and is being considered as part of the project understanding.)

The dependable flow and volumes of the Speed River provided an ideal location for the development of a sawmill and later a grist mill and subsequent industries powered by the control in water levels provided by the gravity dam. The concentration over time of various industries along the river supported the connection of these industries by road and later railway to distant markets. The prosperity of late nineteenth and early twentieth century Preston was founded on the dam operations supported by the productive agricultural landscape of the surrounding Waterloo area.
The CHER identifies the chronology of the dam, the adjacent buildings and town growth tracing through historic documents the various figures who were prominent in the community. The involvement of these citizens adds to the historic value of the dam.

The CHER applies Regulation 9/06 of the Ontario Heritage Act to determine heritage value or interest of the dam. It concludes that the dam has cultural heritage value for design/physical, historical and contextual reasons. The CHER also contains a list of attributes that are to be conserved in order that the identified heritage values may be addressed. The list includes:

- the limestone facing stone on the north control and south control structures,
- the round headed stone arches with stone voussoirs on the south elevation of the north control structure,
- the stone buttresses on the south elevation of the north control structure.

The CHER also comments that the sluice gate to the former mill race is an important element in the landscape setting of the dam although it is not part of the dam structure. This separate structure was part of the former mill race that has been filled in and the downstream section across King Street realigned around a new parking lot.

Part of the history already identified in the CHER traces the early development of Riverside Park. The Park was created in the late 1890’s by the initiative of Samuel Cherry, a prominent local businessman who later became the Chair of the Preston Parks Board. It was through his initiative that Frederick Gage Todd, (1876-1948) a landscape architect based in Montreal and Ottawa was engaged in 1911 to prepare a plan for Speed Park, later renamed Riverside Park. Prominent sites associated with F.G. Todd include Assiniboine Park in Winnipeg, the parks and parkway system in the National Capital Region, Wascana Park in Regina, parks in Vancouver, Montreal and closer to Preston, the “green necklace” of parkland along the Avon River in Stratford.

In October 2020, F.G. Todd was named a National Historic Person, one of only five persons designated as such in Canada. The designation by the Historic Sites and Monuments Board of Canada and Parks Canada elevates the places that are associated with F.G. Todd to sites worthy of conservation, enhancement and interpretation. The involvement of F.G. Todd adds considerable additional significance to the setting of Riverside Dam.

As one of Canada’s first landscape architects, F.G. Todd was successful in introducing the ideas rooted in the tradition of a natural parkland landscape designed for human pleasure and enjoyment. This pattern of green space design was promoted by Frederick Law Olmsted and became the prominent design idea of the late nineteenth and twentieth century. Before moving to Canada, F.G. Todd worked in the Olmsted office and developed a familiarity with the Olmsted approach to open space planning. The key design features of this approach are the inclusion of active and passive recreational activities in a maintained and aesthetic parkland setting. The open parkland is highlighted by curvilinear drives and walks for moving through the park. Individual trees or groupings of trees provide points of interest along with framed and panoramic views. Inclusion of a water body is a key part of the Olmstedian design intent. The head pond or mill pond on the Speed River created by the Riverside Dam provides the water feature that is an integral part of the historic design for Riverside Park.
Other identified heritage resources in the area:

As part of the heritage values associated with the setting of Riverside Dam are the Memorial Gates at the park entrance. This built feature originally added in 1921, has associative value as it commemorates the war dead of WW1. The current structure was installed in 1973 and welcomed royal visitors, Queen Elizabeth and Prince Philip. The gates consist of the main entrance pillars and arch but also the curving stone wall that links the gates with the river’s edge adjacent to the Dam.
In 1993, the City of Cambridge designated the structure under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act. This structure is the closest extant designated built heritage feature to Riverside Dam.

The Speed River as part of the Grand River system was recognized in 1994 as a Canadian Heritage River.

The recognition of both Riverside Park and the Speed River as part of the heritage setting of the dam adds associative and contextual heritage value to its heritage resources. Conservation of these cultural landscape elements of the setting has informed the planning for the design and staging during construction of the rebuilt dam.

3.0 Summary of Heritage Attributes and Values

The identification of the heritage attributes and heritage values is a key part of the planning for the conservation of the heritage resources. Through understanding the historical background and integrity of each heritage resource, it is possible to integrate their heritage values, both tangible and intangible, in planning for the future.

The list of heritage attributes of Riverside Dam included in the CHER includes the stone masonry facings on the north and south control structures, and the curved arches of the sluice openings and the buttresses on the north structure.

Figure 4: Historic Photo, South Control Structure and Dam, Source: City of Cambridge Archives Photo ARC1 Dam 1894, West view of South Half of Dam Photo 6382 - selected from the Sanchez Engineering Inc. Structural Report October 2009
In addition to these architectural details, there is mention of the concrete sluiceway leading to the mill race on the north end of the dam. These built features have been identified as having architectural and contextual value.

Based on a review of additional information, the following features in the cultural landscape setting of the dam have heritage value and planning for the dam rebuild project safeguards these additional features.
-the general location on the Speed River where historically the water depths allowed for a crossing and the reliable volume and flow provided the necessary foundation for water powered mills

-the Part IV OHA designated Memorial Gates and curving wall at the entrance drive to Riverside Park.

-the scenic parkland setting in the area close to the dam. The combination of maintained turf with shoreline vegetation with mature specimen trees allows for framed views of the head pond.

![Photo 3: View to the southeast. Riverside Park features scenic views towards the head pond](image)

-the head pond consists of slow-moving water creating opportunities for reflections of riverside vegetation that enhances the aesthetic visual character
Photo 4: View from the south side of the head pond highlights the reflection of trees in Riverside Park

-views of the moving water flowing over the dam and the faster flowing river below the dam contrast with the calm upstream river character adding visual interest

These features have tangible heritage value and have been considered in the planning for the rebuilt dam. In addition, there are several intangible heritage values that have been considered in the planning and form part of the messages interpreted for the community and public.

-the role of the area in the lifeways and culture of indigenous people

-the role of the Speed River as the foundation for the settlement of Preston

-the evolution and prosperity of the historic industrial landscape surrounding the Riverside Dam based on water-powered milling and manufacturing

-the involvement of key local figures in the enhancement of Preston in the early twentieth century as part of the Civic Beautification movement

-the cenotaph movement in Canada, part of the community-based commemoration of the sacrifices of WWI (and later wars) evidenced in the Memorial gate initiative

-the association with Frederick G. Todd, a National Historic Person and the Olmstead park design ideals evident in the 1911 Riverside Park plan

-the connection to places and markets beyond Preston from this former industrial area by means of expanded roads and railway links
- the traditional operation of a gravity dam using manually placed stoplogs to control water flow in the sluices, the important role of the mill race linking the head pond with the mill location downstream

- the role of nineteenth century stone masons and other craftsmen in creating standard engineering structures in the challenging environment of an active river subject to ice and seasonal fluctuations in water volumes.

It should be noted that this Heritage Impact Assessment does not address the heritage values that may associated with the location by representatives of the indigenous people who used this area. The information regarding their past and current view of the Speed River continues to be investigated in the work by the archaeologist and through the engagement work done with the indigenous community.

4.0 Existing Conditions

Riverside Dam has undergone a structural assessment as part of the EA process. The completed report has documented the condition of the existing dam and its control structures. Each of these features is in poor to fair condition and requires major alteration and repair. The south control structure shows considerable failure and large rock blocks have been piled against its southern edge to prevent it from further collapse and loss of stone masonry.

The stone masonry on the north structure is more visible from the water’s edge in Riverside Park. The masonry and mortar joints show signs of major deterioration. The stop logs are no longer operable. Many of the stone facing blocks are missing exposing random cobble stone fill in the interior. Most of the mortar joints in the masonry walls have cracked and invasive naturalized vegetation is growing in the structure.

The cultural landscape setting of Riverside Dam has undergone significant change in recent years except in the area immediately adjacent to the dam in Riverside Park. Within the Park, the changes in this area have involved some minor realignment of the entrance drive and the addition of a small parking area.
Figure 6: *Aerial Photo, c. 1974, City of Cambridge Archives PH6554* – selected from the CHER Appendix A.

Several buildings in the setting of the dam in the north, south and west have been demolished. The mill race has been filled in.

![Aerial Photo, c. 1974, City of Cambridge Archives PH6554](image)

Photo 5: View of the bank of the head pond illustrates the transition from naturalized vegetation along the water’s edge and the maintained parkland with its mature specimen trees in Riverside Park

On the south bank, the former manufacturing buildings evident in the 1900 aerial sketch have been demolished. Highrise condos have been built in the adjacent area upstream of the dam. On the downstream side of the dam, there have been removals of the brick residence at the former Dover Mill property west of King Street and the entrance leading to the mill race for this mill has been filled in.
The King Street bridge was rebuilt and widened in 1987 replacing the concrete bridge built at this location in 1923 that had replaced the historic steel truss bridge of 1900.

5.0 Relevant Policies and Requirements

The EA process was guided by provincial guidelines for a Cultural Heritage Assessment. As a result of the work of the completed CHER, several heritage attributes have been identified and the heritage value of the dam has been confirmed. As the planning proceeds it is required that the integration of heritage values be part of the development of the detailed design, staging and construction works.

The City of Cambridge has several policy documents that guide the planning for the heritage resources associated with Riverside Dam. These are relevant in this phase of the planning work.

While Riverside Dam has not been designated under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act, it has been listed on the Municipal Register of Historic Properties of Heritage Interest or Value. As such the City of Cambridge has included in its Official Plan of September 2018 Consolidation in Section 4.10 several heritage policies that relate to the treatment of such listed properties. The requirements under the Official Plan include the preparation of a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) of any proposed undertaking that has the potential to adversely affect the heritage resource. Potential impacts are listed as direct such as demolishing or altering a structure or indirect such as changes to lands adjacent to a cultural heritage resource. The contents of the HIA are to include an evaluation and description of the cultural heritage resource, assessment of the impacts of the proposed works and means to mitigate impacts, alternatives to the proposed change and justification for the preferred option. The completed HIA is to be reviewed by the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC).

One of the provisions of the OP policy is that the required content of the HIA may be scoped or adjusted by either Council or MHAC.

The City of Cambridge has placed Preston Dam (Cambridge Mills) on the Municipal Register of Heritage Properties of Heritage Value or Interest. Discussion with the Heritage Planner indicates that there is no additional information included as to the rationale for the listing that could provide guidance regarding conservation actions.

The City of Cambridge has prepared detailed Guidelines for the Preparation of an HIA. It contains a definition of built heritage resources as physical remains and includes cultural heritage landscapes, vistas/views and culturally significant natural features as potential heritage resources. The HIA requires several sections to be completed by a qualified member of the Canadian Association of Heritage Professionals. It is to include the identification and evaluation
the built heritage resources, a map of the site, property ownership information, photos and plans of the existing conditions and the proposed undertaking and a discussion of the impacts on the heritage resources. The guidance describes the policy that new works should preserve and be compatible with the heritage resources and respect their heritage resources. It encourages the integration of the existing features with new works.

The HIA is to contain 3 options for new works including a do-nothing option if appropriate. The justification for the preferred option is required.

Of note, the HIA guidelines describe an option that the requirement for a HIA to be submitted may be waived or scoped by Council or the MHAC.

In summary, the historical research and assessment work already completed as part of the EA meets the stated requirements for a HIA. It is appropriate then to prepare this supplementary report that may be considered a scoped HIA as part of this stage of detailed design.

This report focuses on identifying ways in which the heritage attributes and their associated values can be conserved in the rebuilt dam project. This scoped HIA submission to MHAC references and does not repeat the historical chronology of Preston, the key figures involved with the community development and summarizes the findings of the CHER. The scoped HIA contains a description and evaluation of options for conservation and interpretation of the identified heritage attributes of the dam in the rebuild project.

6.0 Options and Mitigation Strategies

In the completed CHER, several potential heritage conservation options for the dam project were identified:

- retention of existing built heritage resources in-situ with no major modification or with sympathetic modifications or adapted for a new use. (An example of this would be a path or scenic viewing with a new sympathetically designed structure in proximity),

- relocation of the existing heritage resource to an appropriate new location preferably nearby

- salvage of elements and incorporation in other structures

- full recording and documentation of the resource and its associated cultural heritage landscape is it is to be demolished.

The CHER has identified that the heritage attributes to be conserved relate to the built heritage of the control structures, primarily in the masonry and features of the north structure (arched sluice openings and buttresses). The nearby sluice gate structure on the mill race is also mentioned although not connected to the dam. The cultural landscape setting has also been confirmed as having heritage value.
Based on these conclusions, the CHER describes several potential alternatives for the mitigation of changes affecting the heritage resources. These alternatives are subject to the detailed engineering study of the dam completed as part of the EA process. The alternatives include:

1. rehabilitation of the existing structure conserving the heritage attributes
2. designation of the Riverside Dam including the sluice gate under Part IV of the OHA
3. if decommissioned and removed, full recording and documentation of the dam, sluice gate, mill race, Cambridge Mills site and Riverside Park in the area surrounding the dam
4. if a replacement dam is built, it should complement the scenic character and views along the river and construction works should not impact on the adjacent structures (sluiceway and mill race)
5. if retention of the existing is not feasible, consideration is to be given to rehabilitation of parts of the existing structure (north and south control structures) in situ or relocated to nearby Riverside Park for interpretative purposes.

With the conclusion of the EA and considering the structural condition of the existing dam, Council has decided to proceed with a new dam on the Speed River and the decommissioning of the existing dam.

As a result of this decision, alternatives 1 and 2 of the above mitigation strategies are not feasible. However, alternative 3 (documentation), 4 (consideration of scenic setting and views), and 5 (salvage of parts of the structure for interpretation purposes) are feasible and form the foundation for the planning for the rebuilt dam that incorporates the identified heritage attributes.

In summary, the structural condition of the identified heritage attributes of the control structures will continue to deteriorate because of their exposed location within the river and their poor condition. Leaving the structures in situ will result in the continued loss of key facing stones and exposing the interior of the control structure. This has already happened at the south control structure causing its collapse and ultimately the north structure will face the same fate. Therefore, the do nothing option is not feasible as a way to conserve the heritage resource.
The preferred mitigation strategy is to record, salvage and interpret the heritage values of the control structures in a new nearby location within the park. This will ensure that the key heritage attributes are conserved and placed in a setting where the many themes and messages associated with this historic place can be recognized and shared with the community.

7.0 Review of Alternatives and Preferred Location for the Dam

This Heritage Impact Assessment has added to the heritage information already developed in the approved CHER. As part of the planning process, the design team has developed several alternatives for the location for the rebuilt dam. Each of these alternatives has been reviewed to determine if the recognized heritage resources are appropriately integrated in the plans. In addition to the location of the dam, other factors such as access during construction and a staging area for materials and equipment have been identified. Four alternatives have been developed for the rebuilt dam, a new dam built either upstream and close to the existing dam, upstream but set approximately 30 metres from the existing dam, at the existing dam location or downstream on the far side of the King Street bridge. The criteria for selecting the preferred alternative from a heritage perspective include:

- the feasibility of staging and construction activities to avoid adversely impacting the heritage resources of the cultural landscape setting at the existing dam location
- minimum permanent loss of cultural heritage features in the lands on either end of the new dam
- the potential for creation of an interpretative feature highlighting the salvaged materials from the control structures
-the enhancement of the pedestrian environment in Riverside Park adjacent to the rebuilt dam including scenic viewpoints of the head pond, dam and river.

Applying these criteria, from a heritage perspective, the options locating the new dam at or upstream from the existing dam are most appropriate. Locating the dam below the King Street bridge is not appropriate since it does not provide a connection with the cultural landscape setting of Riverside Park.

The preferred alternative for the dam is upstream from the existing dam at such a distance that access is direct from both the south and north sides. This minimizes the impact on the parkland setting of the new dam. As well, this proposed location allows for an interpretative feature to be created at the edge of the park close to the new dam location. The placement of the feature in this area will be able to take advantage of the historic views upstream of the flat water of the head pond in contrast with the turbulent water flowing over the dam. The different scenic visual qualities of the Speed River below the new dam will be evident in this location.

8.0 Guidance for Interpretation

Current best practices in heritage conservation are guided by the Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada (Second Edition 2011). The document has been adopted by the City of Cambridge as providing direction for conservation planning that can be applied to the mitigation strategies for the rebuilt dam project.

There are several Standards that are relevant to the planning for the rebuilt dam and the interpretation of the heritage resources. The Standards do not recommend the relocation of historic structures (Standard 1) or the creation of replicas (Standard 4). Standard 11 recommends that new designs should be physically and visually compatible with, subordinate to and distinguishable from the historic place.

Therefore, the recommended mitigation strategy is to record and document the control structures prior to removal and salvage all masonry materials. This material may then be incorporated in a nearby land-based feature in such a way that the history of the dam, its operation and construction, especially the stone masonry, is conveyed to the public. The display of the original stones in an interpretative feature will allow for an enhanced understanding of how important the Speed River and its dam was to the establishment of early Preston founded on milling and manufacturing. These successful industrial activities supported the beautification and commemorative activities centred in Riverside Park. The lasting legacy of this early period of industrial activity is the current landscape character of the community.

As part of the rebuild of the dam, there is an opportunity to interpret many messages about the history of the area, the dam and its operation and its impact on the development of the
community. These messages can be shared by many means including interpretative panels and web-based links to the historical information.

The key messages to be highlighted in the interpretation plan are:

- the character of the Speed River at this location and the recognition as part of a Canadian Heritage river system
- the design and operation of the historic gravity dam with water levels controlled by structures with stoplogs and sluices.
- the material and construction details of historic stone masonry
- the indigenous and early settlement history of Preston centred on the Speed River
- the expansion of milling and manufacturing in the area over several decades
- the connection of the area through road and railway construction including the street railway
- the significance of Riverside Park with its Memorial gates and deliberate aesthetic design combining the maintained parkland and scenic views of the mill pond created by the dam
- the involvement of Frederick G. Todd, a National Historic Person in the 1911 plan of the park.

The overall design for the interpretation feature includes the installation of the salvaged cut stone blocks to showcase their different sizes and shapes. These stones will be used to demonstrate the skill of the stone masons who constructed the control structures with their double curved arches and buttresses. Complementing the cut stones will be the smooth river-worn cobbles that were used as fill inside the historic sluice gates. Incorporated in the stone installation will be interpretative panels with descriptive text and historic photos that convey to the public the many themes and messages identified above. This interpretative feature provides an opportunity for a gathering place where new seating will accommodate visitors who want to overlook the head pond and dam and learn about the heritage values of this riverside location.

9.0 Next steps

The planning for the dam project will continue over the next few months. In addition to the detailed design work there are opportunities for community engagement built into the next phases of the project. The development of detailed plans for the interpretation feature, its materials, construction, location, and linkages to the dam and existing park features will form part of the next detailed design stage of work.

In addition to the consultation with the design team, this Heritage Impact Assessment will be presented to the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC) for review. This step will be
part of public engagement process. This will provide an opportunity to receive comments from
the MHAC on the mitigation strategy related to the preferred option for the dam. This step will
also satisfy the intention of the OP regarding the requirement for a Heritage Impact Assessment
(HIA).

10.0 Resources

  2011, Parks Canada

- Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report, June 2012, Revised March 2013, Unterman McPhail
  Associates

- Section 4.10 City of Cambridge Official Plan, September 2018 Consolidation

- Terms of Reference for Heritage Impact Assessments, City of Cambridge, 2012

- Ontario Heritage Act Part IV Designation By-law, Memorial Gates, Riverside Park

- Website: www.csla-aapc.ca Frederick G. Todd

- Website: www.pc.gc.ca Todd, Frederick Gage Todd, National Historic Person, Parks Canada

- Contacts: John Calhoun, Heritage Planner, City of Cambridge, Nov.19, 2020
A.1 – Plan of the 3 options for the new dam location and the preferred location
A.2– Plan showing the access routes and staging areas for materials and equipment during construction
Memo:  Removal of former sluice gate control structure

Project:  Riverside Dam, Cambridge

Date:  October 21, 2021

The Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report (CHER) previously completed by Unterman McPhail Associates (UMA) consultants as part of the EA process in March of 2013 evaluated the heritage resources associated with the Riverside Dam. It concluded “the sluice gate to the former mill race to its north is considered to be an important defining element in the landscape associated with the dam” (p.26).

The CHER further contains a section on Mitigation Recommendations that provides relevant guidance for the concrete sluice gate structure. It recommended as follows: “Item 6: Full recording and documentation of the built heritage resource and its associated cultural heritage landscape if it is to be demolished.”

Although the concrete sluice gate structure is an identified heritage resource, it was not listed as a heritage attribute to be retained or salvaged in the planning for the dam rebuilding. The location on the bank of the river of the sluice gate is now part of the necessary area needed for the construction of the replacement dam. This area will require extensive regrading to provide access to the dam and as a result the elevations in this area will be modified. Further, the remainder of the mill race that had connected the mill pond by means of the sluice gate control structure with the mill on the south side of King Street has been extensively altered and the original purpose of the structure has been lost. Once the structure is removed, there is an opportunity for the bank to be regraded to integrate it with the remainder of the river edge treatment along the maintained parkland.

The recommended treatment for this structure following the direction of the CHER is full documentation by means of photos, measured plans detailing materials and construction method. The resulting documents can then be provided to the City of Cambridge for record keeping.
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