AGENDA

Thursday, December 16, 2021
7:00 p.m. via Zoom

Meeting Called to Order

Disclosure of Interest

Presentations

Delegations

Conrad Coutts, property owner, 49 Meadowcreek Lane

Approval of November 18, 2021 Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee Minutes

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

Agenda Items:

1. Request to Demolish an Existing Structure and Construct New Structure on a Part V Designated Property – 999 Blair Road

THAT Report 21-033(MHAC) be received;

AND THAT the Committee recommends that Council approve the demolition of the existing accessory building and construction of a new accessory building on the property municipally known as 999 Blair Road as outlined in Report 21-033(MHAC).

Should you wish to delegate regarding an item on this agenda, please register via email at planning@cambridge.ca by 12 noon of the day prior to the meeting. Be advised that only one person can delegate at a time and additional people cannot be invited to join due to technical limitations. Thank you.
2. Request to Demolish an Existing Structure and Construct New Structure on a Part V Designated Property – Meadowcreek Lane

THAT Report 21-035 (MHAC) be received;

AND THAT the findings of the Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment for 49 Meadowcreek Lane prepared by Stephen Robinson Consulting and dated November 2021 be accepted;

AND THAT the Committee recommends that Council not approve the demolition of the existing residential building and construction of a new residential building on the property municipally known as 49 Meadowcreek Lane for the reasons outlined in Report 21-035(MHAC);

AND FURTHER THAT the applicant submits revised designs addressing the deficiencies outlined in Report 21-035(MHAC) for review by the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee prior to being presented to Council for a decision.

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: January 20, 2022, at 7 p.m.
Via Zoom

Close of Meeting

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

Distribution:

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

Regrets: Nelson Cecilia, John Oldfield

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. Scott Roberts, MHAC Vice-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 7:00 p.m. and the meeting adjourned at 8:29 p.m.

Declarations of Interest: NIL

Presentation:

Wendy Shearer, Landscape Architect, Cultural Heritage Specialist gave a presentation regarding the proposed demolition of Riverside Dam. She noted the heritage value of the dam within the setting of Riverside Park that was designed by Frederick G. Todd and that led to the successful settlement of Preston. Ms. Shearer further explained the proposed location of the new dam which will provide a better opportunity to see and use the head pond, and the proposed interpretive plaques that will incorporate salvaged masonry from the original dam. The existing sluice structure was not identified as a heritage attribute and is proposed to be removed in order to naturalize the area with restorative plantings. The Chair thanked Ms. Shearer for her presentation.

The Committee discussed at length the heritage gates, access to the proposed building site, seasonal flooding near the heritage gates, location of the proposed dam, the sluice gate, archeological study, dredging of sediment and First Nations consultation.
Delegations:

Ahmad Zeitoun, property owner of 4800 Fountain Street North was present to answer questions of the Committee. He noted that he is interested in history, heritage and commemorating the heritage structure that was lost to fire. Mr. Zeitoun is considering the reuse of original stonework for a community garden that would allow community members to use and visit, however, he noted that no definite plans have been made for the property at this time.

The Committee expressed their condolences to Mr. Zeitoun over the loss of the building and thanked him for attending the meeting.

Minutes of Previous Meeting

Moved by: Councillor Wolf
Seconded by: Susan Brown

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

CARRIED

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

Moved by: Nancy Woodman
Seconded by: Councillor Wolf

The Committee discussed the deck being minimally attached to the heritage structure and it was noted the railing system is proposed to be similar to the balcony at the front of the house.

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).

CARRIED

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

Moved by: Michelle Goodridge
Seconded by: Kimberly Livingstone
The Committee discussed the designation by-law and grant funding. Staff noted the designation stays in place until after the demolition of the structure and a report will go to Council to decide whether it will be amended or repealed.

**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.

**CARRIED**

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

Moved by: Michelle Goodridge
Seconded by: Susan Brown

The Committee discussed options that have come before MHAC in the past, heritage plaques, preservation of the history of the dam, previous consultation, steps going forward, the archeological report, comments that will be provided to Engineering, and the role of the Committee to comment on design of the new dam and the proposed heritage plaques and impact to the cultural heritage landscape.

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

**CARRIED**

**Correspondence - NIL**

**Other Business – NIL**

**Chair’s Comments:**

Scott Roberts, Vice-Chairperson thanked the Committee for the opportunity to take the Chair this evening although it was under unfortunate circumstances. He expressed
condolences to Chair, John Oldfield and Laura Waldie, Senior Planner Heritage, who have both recently suffered losses of family members.

Council Report/Comments:

Councillor Wolf echoed the condolences of the Vice-Chair.

Staff/Senior Planner- Heritage comments:

None this month

General Heritage Matters – Updates by Committee Members:

None this month

Next Meeting

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

Close of Meeting

Moved by: Michelle Goodridge
Seconded by: Nancy Woodman

THAT the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee meeting does now adjourn at 8:29 p.m.

CARRIED

______________________________________________  ________________________________________________
Chairperson                                      Recording Secretary
John Oldfield                                     Karin Stieg-Drobig
Meeting Date: 12/16/2021                                           Report #: 21-033(MHAC)

To: Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee

Report Date: 12/02/2021

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

Department: Development and Infrastructure

Division: Planning

Report Title: Request to Demolish an Existing Structure and Construct New Structure on a Part V Designated Property – 999 Blair Road

File No: R01.02.02

Ward No: Ward 1

RECOMMENDATION(S)

THAT Report 21-033(MHAC) be received;

AND THAT the Committee recommends that Council approve the demolition of the existing accessory building and construction of a new accessory building on the property municipally known as 999 Blair Road as outlined in Report 21-033(MHAC).

SUMMARY

- 999 Blair Road was designated as part of the Blair Village Heritage Conservation District in 2001. The property is not considered a historic or very historic property as defined by the Blair Village Heritage Conservation District Plan.

- The applicant is proposing to demolish an existing one storey frame accessory structure and replace it with a larger one and a half-storey accessory structure.
• The existing structure has been evaluated and determined to have no cultural heritage value or interest.

• The new proposed structure conforms to the residential infill policies of the Blair Village Heritage Conservation District Plan and is not anticipated to detract from the cultural heritage value or interest of the property or the Blair Village Heritage Conservation District.

**BACKGROUND**

999 Blair Road was designated in 2001 under Part V of the Ontario Heritage Act as part of the Blair Village Heritage Conservation District by by-law 205-01.

The property is located on Blair Road immediately east of Langdon Hall. 999 Blair Road is identified as being in Area 10 of the District as defined by the Heritage Conservation District Plan. Area 10 was recognized for its historical and landscape value and because it is adjacent to Langdon Hall. The Plan notes:

“This area has historical and landscape value. A newer single detached residence is now present on this property, but it was the site of the stables for Langdon Hall and the Gran Allee entrance to the estate passes through. It is, therefore, deemed appropriate to include in the Heritage District” (BVHCD Plan, 9);

None of the structures on the property were identified as having cultural heritage value or interest. The house that was located on the property at the time of designation was demolished and replaced with the current house in approximately 2010.

The applicant is proposing to demolish an existing single-storey accessory building, currently used as a garage or shed and replace it with a one-and-a-half-storey structure incorporating storage space, a garage, and hobby spaces.

On July 28, 2021 the Committee of Adjustment granted the required variances from the Zoning By-law to permit the construction of the proposed building provided that the designs were approved by the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee.

On November 4, 2021 the applicant submitted a Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment that assessed the impacts of demolishing the existing accessory building and assessed whether the new structure conformed to the policies of the Blair Village Heritage Conservation District Plan (Attachment 1).
ANALYSIS

Strategic Alignment:

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

Goal #3 - Arts, Culture, Heritage and Architecture

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

The proposed development makes a positive contribution to the Blair Heritage Conservation District because it does not involve the demolition of significant resources, and it is designed to be sympathetic to the character of the District.

Existing Policy/By-Law:

Ontario Heritage Act

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

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

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

2. Erect, demolish or remove any building or structure on the property or permit the erection, demolition or removal of such a building or structure. 2005, c. 6, s. 32 (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.

Blair Village Heritage Conservation District Plan (2001)

The Blair Village Heritage Conservation District Plan sets out the following approach for residential infill:

The conservation approach is to ensure that new residential infill is harmonious with the old village character. This will entail conserving as much of the prevailing landscape as
possible, positioning the house in a manner complementary with its neighbours and designing the house so that it fits into the historic streetscape.

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 applicant is proposing to demolish an existing one-storey accessory building currently used as a garage or shed and replace it with a new one and a half storey accessory building incorporating a garage space, hobby space, storage space.

Demolition of Existing Building

The existing building is a one-storey wood frame building clad and roofed with metal sheathing. It has a poured concrete floor and a gable roof. It has vinyl windows and three metal garage doors on the front elevation.

Figure 1: Existing Accessory Building Front Elevation, Megan Hobson, 2021.
Figure 2: Existing Accessory Building Rear Elevation, Megan Hobson, 2021

Figure 3: Existing Accessory Building Interior, Megan Hobson, 2021.
The building was described as part of a Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment prepared by Megan Hobson Consulting and dated 2 November, 2021. The author speculated that the structure may have been constructed in approximately the 1930s or 1940s.

The building was evaluated using criteria established by Ontario Regulation 9/06 and was determined to meet none of the criteria of significance. Therefore, the structure is not considered to hold cultural heritage value or interest and may be demolished without impacting the heritage value of the property.

**Conformity with Blair Village Heritage Conservation District Plan**

The property is located within the Blair Village Heritage Conservation District. The District is regulated by the Blair Village Heritage Conservation District Plan. The Plan does not outline policies specifically for accessory buildings but does outline policies regulating residential infill development.

The applicant is proposing to replace the existing structure with a new one and a half-storey structure containing garage and workshop on the main floor and hobby rooms on the second floor. The design of the structure incorporates design elements from the Arts and Crafts style including stucco cladding, prominent wooden brackets, and simple form characterized by a large front gable with second-storey balconies.

Figure 4: Front Elevation Proposed Accessory Structure, Barry Wade Group, 2021.

The proposed development conforms to the residential infill policies of the Blair Village Heritage Conservation District Plan, which specify that new infill should: retain as many existing trees as possible; be positioned to be complementary to neighbouring houses; preserve special landscape features; employ a design that has a simple and strong form; be one to two storeys in height; have windows and doors set evenly and symmetrically; and use building materials that blend in with the rural character of Blair, such as wood, stucco, brick, and stone.
The accessory building proposed for demolition has been found to have no cultural heritage value or interest and so it may be demolished without impacting the cultural heritage value or interest of 999 Blair Road.

The proposed new structure is designed to sensitively complement the character of the Blair Village Heritage Conservation District through its use of stucco cladding, wooden brackets, a simple and strong form, and one and a half storey massing with influences of Arts and Crafts design. Based upon the above analysis, staff is recommending that the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee recommend Council approve the proposed demolition and new construction. This change will not detract from the heritage value or interest of the Blair Village Heritage Conservation District.

**SIGNATURE**

Prepared by:

[Signature]

Abraham Plunkett-Latimer,
Senior Planner - Heritage

**Departmental Approval:**

[Signature]

Laura Waldie,
Senior Planner - Heritage

**ATTACHMENTS**

Attachment 1, Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment 999 Blair Road, Megan Hobson, November 2, 2021.
HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT

999 BLAIR ROAD - OUTBUILDING
BLAIR VILLAGE HCD, CAMBRIDGE

02 NOV 2021

Megan Hobson CAHP
M.A. Dipl. Heritage Conservation
Built Heritage Consultant
mhobson@bell.net
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Megan Hobson consulting was retained by Barry Wade Homes Inc to prepare a scoped Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment (CHIA) for a proposal to replace an existing outbuilding at 999 Blair Road in Cambridge because the property is located within the Blair Village Heritage Conservation District and is adjacent to Langdon Hall. The CHIA was scoped because the property is identified as a non-contributing property within the District.

The assessment finds that:

1. the existing outbuilding to be demolished does not have cultural heritage value;
2. the proposed demolition of a non-historic building and construction of a new outbuilding is consistent with policies in the Blair Village HCD Plan;
3. the proposed outbuilding will have no negative impacts on the Blair Village HCD or on the adjacent Langdon Hall property.

Therefore, no mitigation is required, and it is recommended that the applicant be permitted to demolish the existing outbuilding and construct the proposed outbuilding.
1.0 METHODOLOGY

Preparation of this report included a review of relevant heritage policies and legislation, and a review of existing historical information about the subject property and its cultural context. Consultation with Abraham Plunkett-Latimer, Senior Planner at the City of Cambridge was undertaken by Barry Wade Homes Inc. and shared with the consultant. Photographs and architectural drawings were provided by Barry Wade Homes Inc. and are included in the appendix of this report.

2.0 LOCATION & SITE DESCRIPTION

The subject property is a large residential property located at 999 Blair Road in Cambridge. The house is not visible from Blair Road and is set in large grounds surrounded by woods. The house is approached by a long driveway from Blair Road. The area in front of the house contains a large lawn, a water feature in the form of an artificial pond, and two outbuildings. There is a third outbuilding behind the house in the form of a pool cabana. The house consists of a main block connected to a pavilion that contains the garage and additional living space. The subject property is adjacent to Langdon Hall, an historic estate that operates as a spa and hotel. The property line between Langdon Hall and the subject dwelling is heavily wooded.

Aerial View: 999 Blair Road – the house is set in large grounds that contain a pond, swimming pool and 3 outbuildings. The applicant proposes to demolish Outbuilding 2 and replace it with a new structure.
The Dwelling and Pool Cabana (Outbuilding 3) located on the subject property were built for the current owners by Barry Wade Homes in 2009-11. Outbuilding 1 and 2 are currently being used for storage.

**Outbuilding 2**

Out building 2, that is proposed for demolition, is a frame shed that has been converted to a garage. It has a rectangular plan and a gable roof. It is constructed with dimensioned lumber and the wall and roof are covered with metal sheathing and it has a poured concrete floor. The front elevation has been modified for three garage doors. The rear and side elevations have vinyl windows and there are wood doors at either end that don’t match, the door on the east elevation is a raised panel style door with four panels, the door on the west elevation has glazing in the upper half. The framing has been modified for the doors and windows, suggesting that they are not original to the structure. In general, the building appears to be an agricultural shed constructed in the 1930s or 40 that has been heavily modified.
3.0 HERITAGE PLANNING CONTEXT

The owner has conditional approval from the Committee of Adjustment to build a 2-storey storage building, subject to a satisfactory review by the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee. A minor variance is needed for the 4.5 m height of the proposed building because it is slightly higher than the maximum height permitted for accessory buildings under the zoning regulation.

Blair Village HCD

The subject property is located within the Blair Village Heritage Conservation District (Blair Village HCD) and is identified as a non-contributing property located in a Secondary Area (Area 3). The purpose of the District Plan is to conserve and enhance the historic and rural village character of Blair and ensure compatible development. The Blair Village Heritage Conservation District Plan includes policies for ‘new development’ and for ‘building demolition’.
Langdon Hall

Additionally, the subject property is adjacent to Langdon Hall, a former estate that now operates as a Hotel and Spa. Langdon Hall is a Greek Revival style manor that was built in 1898. It is described in the District Plan as “an exemplary historic estate of national architectural and historic significance.” The house and its associated landscape are identified as heritage attributes.

Langdon Hall – current photo of the house (left) and a c.1910 photo of the gardens (right)

The District Plan includes the following information on Langdon Hall:

**Blair Heritage Plan - Area #3 Langdon Hall:**

Built in 1898, Langdon Hall with its enclosing estate of rides, walks, forest and walled garden is a rare and remarkable heritage property rarely found elsewhere in Ontario. It has been superbly restored and is very well maintained. It is considered geographically discreet yet integral to the history of the Blair area, and is deemed appropriate to be included in the Heritage District. (p. 8)

The magnificent Langdon Hall, situated on the east side of the village and said to have been a great source of pride in the community when it was built for Eugene Langdon Wilks between 1898 and 1901. This impressive residence was designed by New York architect Edward Lee Young in the American Federal Revival style and was meant to be clad in clapboard in the manner of similar mansions overlooking the Hudson River. The project was carried out by Toronto architect Eden Smith who changed the material to red brick. The Federal style is distinguished by a semi-circular fanlight above the front door and windows aligned horizontally and vertically in symmetrical rows. On the main front facade there is a neoclassical style full-height entrance portico with pediment and the roof supported by ionic columns. Equally important as the building is the landscape setting, with an expansive forelawn which sets the house off admirably upon the approach up the driveway. (p. 19)

Langdon Hall is an exemplary historic estate of national architectural and historic significance. The principle building and its associated historic landscapes are integral heritage attributes that are widely recognized in the village. (p. 57)
4.0 PROPOSED WORK

The proposed work includes demolition of an existing 1-storey frame shed adjacent to the pond in the front yard and construction of a new 2-storey storage shed in the same location. Designs for the new shed by Barry Wade Homes Inc. are included in the appendix of this report.

The design of the proposed outbuilding is Neo-Traditional and has design elements that evoke an Arts & Crafts style coach house. The building has a T-shaped footprint and a steeply pitched cross gable roof with a standing seam metal cladding. The roof overhang is supported by decorative brackets and the large projecting gable on the front is topped by a small cupola. The wall cladding materials are stone and stucco. The interior has two floors with a garage and storage areas on the ground floor and hobby rooms on the 2nd floor. The 2nd floor is contained within the roof and the building reads as a one-and-a-half storey structure from the exterior. There is a 2nd floor balcony above the entrance on the main elevation that faces the driveway. Two graveled areas will link the existing driveway to the front and side of the building.
5.0 IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Ontario Regulation 09/06

Outbuilding 2 has been evaluated according to *Ontario Regulation 09/06; Criteria for Determining Cultural Heritage Value or Interest* and does not meet any criteria for Designation under the *Ontario Heritage Act*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>ASSESSMENT (YES/NO)</th>
<th>RATIONALE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ontario Regulation 09/06</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Design of physical value:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type,</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>It is a 1-storey frame shed constructed c.1930s/40s that has been converted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expression, material or construction method</td>
<td></td>
<td>to a garage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>It is a 1-storey frame shed with metal cladding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>It is a 1-storey frame shed with metal cladding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Historical or associative value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Has direct associations with a theme, event, believe, person,</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>No significant associations have been directly linked to this structure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>activity, organization or institution that is significant to a community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>It does not have potential for yielding information that would make a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to an understanding of a community or culture</td>
<td></td>
<td>significant contribution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist,</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>It is not associated with a designer or builder.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>builder, designer or theorist who is significant to the community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Contextual Value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Is important in defining, maintaining, or supporting the character</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>It does not contribute to the character of the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of an area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Is physically, functionally, visually, or historically linked to its</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>No significant links to the surroundings have been identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>surroundings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Is a landmark</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>It has not been identified as a landmark.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Blair Village HCD Plan

The proposed demolition of Outbuilding 2 is consistent with the Blair Village Heritage Conservation District Plan policies regarding demolition. Comments are provided in the chart below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BUILDING DEMOLITION</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conservation</strong></td>
<td>Outbuilding 2 was built c. 1930s/40s and has been heavily modified. It has been evaluated according to Ontario Regulation 09/06 and does not meet any criteria. It is not a historic building that warrants conservation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relocation</strong></td>
<td>Outbuilding 2 is not a historic building that warrants relocation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Salvage</strong></td>
<td>Outbuilding 2 is not a heritage building and does not have historic features suitable for salvage and reuse.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The design of the new outbuilding is consistent with the Blair Village Heritage Conservation District Plan policies regarding new construction. Comments are provided in the chart below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEW CONSTRUCTION</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Garages</strong></td>
<td>The proposed outbuilding is set deep in the lot and screened by vegetation. It will not visible from Blair Road or from Langdon Hall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Materials</strong></td>
<td>The primary cladding materials are stone and stucco.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Driveways</strong></td>
<td>Two small gravel areas are proposed that will link the new outbuilding to the existing driveway.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Langdon Hall

The proposed outbuilding will have no negative impacts on Langdon Hall. The height of the proposed building is limited to 2-storeys and is visually buffered from the historic estate by mature trees. It is also noted that the proposed outbuilding is located adjacent to the back of the Langdon Hall property where there is new development that provide further visual buffering.
6.0 CONCLUSIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS

The assessment finds that:

4. the existing outbuilding to be demolished does not have cultural heritage value;
5. the proposed demolition of a non-historic building and construction of a new outbuilding is consistent with policies in the Blair Village HCD Plan;
6. the proposed outbuilding will have no negative impacts on the Blair Village HCD or on the adjacent Langdon Hall property.

Therefore, no mitigation is required, and it is recommended that the applicant be permitted to demolish the existing outbuilding and construct the proposed outbuilding.

7.0 SOURCES

City of Cambridge:
- Blair Village Heritage Conservation District Plan (1999)

Ministry of Tourism, Culture & Sport (MTCS)

Parks Canada
- Standards & Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada (2010)

8.0 QUALIFICATIONS OF THE AUTHOR

The author of this report is a professional member of the Canadian Association of Heritage Professionals. Formal education includes a Master of Arts in Architectural History from the University of Toronto and a diploma in Heritage Conservation from the Willowbank School of Restoration Arts. Professional experience includes an internship at the Ontario Heritage Trust, three years as Architectural Historian and Conservation Specialist at Taylor Hazell Architects in Toronto, and 10 years in private practice in Ontario as a heritage consultant. Other relevant experience includes teaching Art History at the University of Toronto and McMaster University and teaching Research Methods and Conservation Planning at the Willowbank School for Restoration Arts in Queenston. In addition to numerous heritage reports, the author has published work in academic journals such as the Journal of the Society for the Study of Architecture in Canada and the Canadian Historical Review.
Existing Storage Garage to be Demolished - 999 Blair Rd, Cambridge

North Elevation

West Elevation

South Elevation

East Elevation
Existing Storage Garage to be Demolished – 999 Blair Rd, Cambridge

Interior looking east

September 27, 2021
Do not scale the drawings.

If any discrepancies, contradictions or ambiguities occur on the drawings, immediately advise our firm.

Drawings not to be used for construction unless signed below:

All dimensions must be verified by the sub-contractors prior to commencement.

HACKING COACH HOUSE
999 BLAIR RD
CAMBRIDGE, ON

FOUNDATION PLAN

2004

A2
Do not scale the drawings.

If any discrepancies, contradictions or ambiguities occur on the drawings, immediately advise our firm.

Drawings not to be used for construction unless signed below:

All dimensions must be verified by the sub-contractors prior to commencement.
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Report #: 21-035(MHAC)

To: Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee

Report Date: 12/06/2021

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

Department: Development and Infrastructure

Division: Planning

Report Title: Request to Demolish an Existing Structure and Construct New Structure on a Part V Designated Property – Meadowcreek Lane

File No: R01.02.02

Ward No: Ward 1

RECOMMENDATION(S)

THAT Report 21-035(MHAC) be received;

AND THAT the findings of the Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment for 49 Meadowcreek Lane prepared by Stephen Robinson Consulting and dated November 2021 be accepted;

AND THAT the Committee recommends that Council not approve the demolition of the existing residential building and construction of a new residential building on the property municipally known as 49 Meadowcreek Lane for the reasons outlined in Report 21-035(MHAC);

AND FURTHER THAT the applicant submit revised designs addressing the deficiencies outlined in Report 21-035(MHAC) for review by the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee prior to being presented to Council for a decision.
SUMMARY

- The applicant is proposing to demolish an existing circa 1960s one-storey dwelling and to build a new two-storey dwelling.

- 49 Meadowcreek Lane was designated as part of the Blair Village Heritage Conservation District in 2001. The property is not considered a historic or very historic property as defined by the Blair Village Heritage Conservation District Plan. The property is included within plan Area #1, which is defined as the most historic area in the village.

- Council approval is required for demolition and alterations on properties designated as properties of cultural heritage value or interest under the Ontario Heritage Act.

- The existing dwelling has been evaluated and determined to have no cultural heritage value or interest.

- The designs for the new proposed dwelling do not conform to the residential infill policies of the Blair Village Heritage Conservation District Plan and should be revised prior to being presented to Council for approval.

BACKGROUND

49 Meadowcreek Lane was designated in 2001 under Part V of the Ontario Heritage Act as part of the Blair Village Heritage Conservation District by by-law 205-01.

The subject property is an approximately 5913 square metre (1.46 acre) corner lot located at the intersection of Old Mill Road and Meadowcreek Lane, with frontages on both streets.
49 Meadowcreek Lane is identified as being in Area #1 of the District as defined by the Blair Village Heritage Conservation District Plan. Area #1 was recognized as the old village centre of Blair and the most historic area in the village. There is an existing one-storey brick dwelling clad in stucco with an outdoor pool on the property and many mature trees. An existing hedge lines the property along Meadowcreek Lane and Old Mill Road. The owner is proposing to retain this hedge.

On 31 August, 2021 the owner submitted a request to demolish the existing structure to permit construction of a new two-storey dwelling.

On November 26, 2021 the applicant submitted a Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment, prepared by Stephen Robinson Consulting and dated November 2021, that assessed the impacts of demolishing the existing accessory building and assessed whether the new structure conformed to the policies of the Blair Village Heritage Conservation District Plan (Attachment 1). Based upon the analysis of the Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment and heritage staff comments, the applicant submitted revised drawings on 3 December 2021 (Attachment 2). These plans, however, still contain some deficiencies that should be addressed before they are forwarded to Council for a decision.
ANALYSIS

Strategic Alignment:

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

Goal #3 - Arts, Culture, Heritage and Architecture

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

The proposed development is incompatible with the infill policies of the Blair Village Heritage Conservation District Plan, which are designed to ensure that new development makes positive contributions to our heritage districts throughout the community.

Existing Policy/By-Law:

Ontario Heritage Act

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

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

1. Alter, or permit the alteration of, any part of the property, other than the interior of any structure or building on the property.
2. Erect, demolish or remove any building or structure on the property or permit the erection, demolition or removal of such a building or structure. 2005, c. 6, s. 32 (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.

Blair Village Heritage Conservation District Plan (2001)

The Blair Village Heritage Conservation District Plan sets out the following approach for residential infill:
“The conservation approach is to ensure that new residential infill is harmonious with the old village character. This will entail conserving as much of the prevailing landscape as possible, positioning the house in a manner complementary with its neighbours and designing the house so that it fits into the historic streetscape” (BVHCD Plan, 30).

**Financial Impact:**

The property owners are responsible for any financial impacts and costs of the project if approved by Council.

**Public Input:**

The Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC) meetings are open to the public. The owner has indicated that he will attend the December 16 MHAC meeting.

**Internal/External Consultation:**

The Senior Planner-Heritage liaised with the owner.

**Comments/Analysis:**

The applicant is proposing to demolish an existing one-storey dwelling and replace it with a new two-storey, 773 square metre (8,323 square foot) dwelling in its place.

**Demolition of Existing Building**

The existing dwelling on the subject property is a one-storey, L-shaped structure with attached garage wing. It is characterized by a low pitch gable roof, a mix of window types, including a bow window on the south east elevation and a large exterior chimney at the north-east elevation. The building is clad in red brick masonry covered in stucco after 2019. The existing dwelling was constructed after 1963.

Figure 2: 49 Meadowcreek Road front elevation, Stephen Robinson Consulting, November 2021
Figure 3: 49 Meadowcreek Lane rear elevation, Stephen Robinson Consulting, November 2021.

Figure 4: 49 Meadowcreek Lane, front elevation detail, Stephen Robinson Consulting, November 2021.
The structure was evaluated by Robinson Heritage Consulting using criteria for determining cultural heritage value or interest established by Ontario Regulation 9/06. It was determined to meet none of the criteria.

Staff accepts that the existing structure is not considered to hold cultural heritage value and so may be demolished without impacting the significance of the Blair Village Heritage Conservation District or the property at 49 Meadowcreek Lane.

**Conformity with Blair Village Heritage Conservation District Plan**

The property is located within the Blair Village Heritage Conservation District (BVHCD). The District is regulated by the BVHCD Plan. New infill must conform to the policies of the Plan which are designed to ensure that infill is compatible with the existing context.

The design of the proposed structure incorporates some neo-traditional design elements, such as a complex hipped roof with multiple gables, asymmetrical form, and stone veneer and stucco cladding. The windows are capped by a brick soldier course accent band with prominent keystones. The proposed new structure incorporates the existing pool, which will become an indoor pool and includes an attached four-car garage located at the front of the house (Figures 5-7).

![Figure 5: 49 Meadowcreek Lane, Proposed Front Elevation, Fabrik Architects, December 3, 2021.](image-url)
The design of the proposed new dwelling was assessed in the CHIA for its conformity to the Blair Village Heritage Conservation District Plan. The authors identified that there were a number of deficiencies regarding the proposed design and recommended that it be revised to better respond to the rural character of the BVHCD (Attachment 1).
The CHIA outlined the following recommendations:

a) That the design be revised to better reflect a “village design” with a well-defined building form that avoids urban or suburban forms and considers traditional building forms inspired by those in the District;

b) That the height be reduced;

c) That massing be reduced;

d) That the owner considers integrating a porch into the proposed design;

e) That the asphalt driveway be replaced with gravel;

f) That the existing brick and metal gates be replaced with wooden rural style gates.

On December 3, 2021 the owner submitted revised designs intended to respond to the CHIA evaluation. The revised designs lower the pitch of the roof, reducing the height by approximately 2 metres (six feet) to lower the visual impact of the structure from the street. The revised designs also set back the garages slightly from the building face to conform with the requirement of the BVHCD Plan that garages be set back from the front of the building.

It is staff’s opinion that the revised designs have addressed some of the residential infill policies outlined by the Blair Village Heritage Conservation Plan relating to retaining mature trees, positioning of the house, positioning of the garage, and use of compatible materials. These policies are laid out on Pages 30 and 31 of the Plan.

**Height and Massing**

The Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment further raised the issue of the visual impact of the proposed development on the street due to the height and massing of the proposed structure. Staff is satisfied that the reduced building height and location of the house at the low point of the lot, as well as placing the residence to avoid removing mature trees, will provide an adequate buffer to minimize the impact of the building’s height and massing (Figure 8). Existing hedges lining Meadowcreek Lane and Old Mill Road will be maintained, further obscuring the view of the dwelling from the street. Staff is of the opinion that the proposed mitigation is sufficient not to require further reduction in height or massing.
Remain Deficiencies

Although the revised designs have addressed a number of deficiencies outlined by the Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment, it is heritage staff’s opinion that the proposed designs continue to be deficient regarding the complexity of the overall design.

The Blair Village Heritage Conservation District Plan requires that infill development employ a “simple and strong form” and that windows should be set symmetrically and evenly” (BVHCD Plan, 30).

The revised design has not been simplified or adapted to better reflect the built form of the surrounding context and continues to be characterized by a complex design and roofline that are not in keeping with the property’s immediate context on Meadowcreek Lane or Old Mill Road.

Heritage planning staff have advised the applicant that both the front elevation and roofline should be simplified and that the design should more clearly reference, but not replicate, an architectural style that is highlighted in the BVHCD Plan.

Staff are recommending that the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee recommend that the proposed design not be approved unless the design is updated to better respond to the character of the BVHCD.
It is staff’s opinion that if the plans were revised to simplify the roofline and design of the front elevation to more clearly reflect a simple strong form and symmetrical arrangement of windows and doors characteristic of historic architecture in the BVHCD, the proposed development would be appropriate.

Staff are further recommending that the existing dwelling not be permitted to be demolished until plans for its replacement have been approved by Council so that the property is not left as a vacant lot.

**Conclusion**

The residence proposed for demolition has been found to have no cultural heritage value or interest and so it may be demolished without impacting the cultural heritage value or interest of 49 Meadowcreek Lane.

The owner has adjusted the proposed design for the replacement structure based upon feedback from the Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment prepared by Robinson Heritage Consulting and heritage planning staff to better align with the policies of the Blair Village Heritage Conservation District Plan.

At this time, however, the proposed new structure does not adequately respond to the requirement that new infill have a simple and strong form and symmetrical arrangement of doors and windows like earlier residences. It is staff’s opinion that the proposed designs require further revision to ensure that the house fits into the historic streetscape as set out in the BVHCD Plan.

For this reason, staff is recommending that the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee recommend that Council not approve the proposed demolition and new build for the reasons outlined in Report 21-033 (MHAC) and that revised designs be presented for endorsement by MHAC prior to being presented to Council for consideration.

**SIGNATURE**

Prepared by:

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

Laura Waldie,
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ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment, 49 Meadowcreek Lane, Stephen Robinson Consulting, November 2021.

Attachment 2 Revised Building Designs, 49 Meadowcreek Lane, Fabrik Architects, December 3, 2021.
Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment
49 Meadowcreek Lane
City of Cambridge, Ontario
November 2021

Owner
Conrad Coutts

Authors
Tracie Seedhouse
Stephen Robinson
# Table of Contents

1.0 Executive Summary .................................................................................................................................................. 6
2.0 Study Rationale and Methodology .......................................................................................................................... 10
3.0 Legislation and Policy Framework .......................................................................................................................... 12
   3.1 Planning Act ............................................................................................................................................................ 12
   3.2 Provincial Policy Statement 2020 .......................................................................................................................... 12
   3.3 Ontario Heritage Act ................................................................................................................................................ 14
       3.3.1 Ontario Regulation 9/06 ............................................................................................................................... 14
   3.4 Region of Waterloo Official Plan .......................................................................................................................... 17
   3.5 City of Cambridge Official Plan (2018 Consolidation) ....................................................................................... 17
   3.6 Blair Heritage Conservation District (BVHCD) ................................................................................................... 22
4.0 Historical Summary ...................................................................................................................................................... 23
   4.1 Grand River .......................................................................................................................................................... 23
   4.2 Indigenous Peoples ................................................................................................................................................ 24
   4.3 Historical Background ......................................................................................................................................... 25
   4.4 Early Maps of the Township of Waterloo .......................................................................................................... 28
5.0 Subject Property ......................................................................................................................................................... 30
   5.1 Property Description ........................................................................................................................................... 30
   5.2 Architectural Description .................................................................................................................................... 31
   5.3 Determining Cultural Heritage Value and Interest ............................................................................................. 33
5.4 Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest ................................................................. 34

6.0 Proposed Development, Impacts and Mitigation .................................................................. 35

6.1 Proposed Development ........................................................................................................ 35

6.2 Assessment ........................................................................................................................ 36

6.3 Recommendations and Mitigation ....................................................................................... 44

7.0 Conclusion .......................................................................................................................... 46

Bibliography ............................................................................................................................... 47

Appendices .................................................................................................................................. 49
Figure 26 - Excerpts from Village of Blair HCD Plan, 1999. .......................................................... 37
Figure 27 - Map 1 from Village of Blair HCD boundary analysis.) .......................................................... 39
Figure 28 – Historic building properties in the Old Village area in excerpt from Village of Blair HCD Plan, 1999. .......................................................... 40
Figure 29 - Excerpt from Village of Blair HCD Plan, 1999. .......................................................... 40
Figure 30 – Residential Infill in an excerpt from Village of Blair HCD Plan, 1999. .......................................................... 41
Figure 31 - Excerpt from Village of Blair HCD Plan, 1999. .......................................................... 42
Figure 32 - 60 Meadowcreek Lane (Photo: RHC October 2021) .......................................................... 42
Figure 33 - Excerpt from Village of Blair HCD Plan, 1999. .......................................................... 44
Figure 34 - Excerpt from Village of Blair HCD Plan, 1999. .......................................................... 45
Figure 35 - Cover Drawing. A000. (Fabrik Architects, 2021) .......................................................... 50
Figure 36 - Site Plan. A003. (Fabrik Architects, 2021) .......................................................... 51
Figure 37 - Ground Floor Plan. A101. (Fabrik Architects, 2021) .......................................................... 52
Figure 38 - Second Floor Plan. A102. (Fabrik Architects, 2021) .......................................................... 53
Figure 39 - Roof Plan. A103. (Fabrik Architects, 2021) .......................................................... 54
Figure 40 - South and North Elevations. A400. (Fabrik Architects, 2021) .......................................................... 55
Figure 41 - East and West Elevations. A401. (Fabrik Architects, 2021) .......................................................... 56
Figure 42 - Building Section. A500. (Fabrik Architects, 2021) .......................................................... 57
Figure 43 - Building Section. A501. (Fabrik Architects, 2021) .......................................................... 58

Owner Contact Information

Conrad Coutts
505 Florencedale Crescent
Kitchener, Ontario
N2R 0N3
226-500-4875
1.0 Executive Summary

This Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment (CHIA) has been undertaken to study the property known municipally as 49 Meadowcreek Lane (Figure 1) in the Blair Village Heritage Conservation District (BVHCD) in the City of Cambridge. The CHIA is expected to determine cultural heritage value or interest and to objectively identify impacts to the heritage conservation district associated with the proposed demolition and the construction of a new dwelling.

The subject property (49 Meadowcreek Lane) at the northeast corner of Meadowcreek Lane and Old Mill Road contains a dwelling that was built after 1963 as a single story, stucco clad, L-shaped building with an attached garage wing set at a 90-degree angle (Figures 2 and 3). The Blair area was studied as a special policy area in 1997 and the City of Cambridge proceeded with a heritage conservation district study which produced the Blair Village HCD Plan in 1998 which was adopted in 1999 (Figure 4). Although 49 Meadowcreek Lane is not identified in the BVHCD Plan as containing a building that contributes to the cultural heritage value of the HCD the real property is still considered a protected property within the BVHCD and the BVHCD policies and guidelines apply.

The owners are proposing to demolish the existing dwelling and construct a new two-storey home with garages and pool house. With a footprint of 8,323 ft$^2$ (773.23 m$^2$) and height of 41.5 ft (12.5m) the proposed two-storey home with four car garages and pool house.

In this Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment, RHC has confirmed that there is no cultural heritage value in the existing dwelling on the property of 49 Meadowcreek Lane within the BVHCD in the City of Cambridge and that the building does not satisfy any of the criteria to determine cultural heritage value used by Ontario Regulation 9/06, the City of Cambridge Official Plan and the BVHCD Study and Plan.

The proposed dwelling has been objectively assessed directly against the BVHCD policies and guidelines and has been found not to be compliant overall and would pose significant negative impact to The Old Village. Further, it would set a precedent for demolishing non heritage buildings for the purpose of replacing them with large urban/suburban homes which would result in The Old Village cultural heritage landscape and historic buildings being overwhelmed and potentially lost.

RHC anticipates no negative impacts to the subject property with the proposed demolition and replacement of the existing building in general terms provided that the new dwelling is of a design in rural village character and that is determined to comply with the BVHCD Plans
policies and guidelines through an objective assessment prepared by a Canadian Association Heritage Professional member in good standing. RHC recommends that a new design includes a significant reduction in height and massing and is more in keeping with the rural village character of The Old Village area of the BVHCD that is designed to integrate with the nature of the cultural heritage landscape.
Figure 1 - Location of 49 Meadowcreek Lane in the Village of Blair (City of Cambridge Maps)
Figure 2 - 49 Meadowcreek Lane (Photo: RHC October 2021)
2.0 Study Rationale and Methodology

A site visit was conducted by RHC on Wednesday October 6, 2021 to document the exterior of the property including buildings and structures on the subject property. The buildings were not entered nor documented on the interior as per the scope of this CHIA.

This Report reviews several documents to supplement this assessment:

- Planning Act
- Ontario Heritage Act
- Ontario Heritage Toolkit
- City of Cambridge’s Official Plan (2018)
- Cambridge Master Heritage Plan (June 2008)
- City of Cambridge Heritage Properties Register
- Grand River-Canadian Heritage System
- Region of Waterloo Public Buildings Inventory
- Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada (Second Edition)
- Region of Waterloo Practical Conservation Guides for Heritage Properties

This scoped Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment (CHIA) assesses the proposed development in terms of its compliance with these policies, guidelines and recommendations and assesses any impacts of the development on the cultural heritage value and attributes of the adjacent resources and the Blair Village Heritage Conservation District.

The Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment (CHIA) was undertaken according to guidelines set out in the Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Cultural Industries (MHSTCI)’s booklet “Heritage - Resources in the Land Use Planning Process” from the Ontario Heritage Toolkit. A Heritage Impact Assessment is a study that:
- evaluates the significance of a cultural heritage resource;
- determines the impact that a proposed development or site alteration will have on a cultural heritage resource;
- recommends an overall approach to the conservation of the cultural heritage resource.

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

3.1 Planning Act

Part 1, Section 2 of the Ontario Planning Act identifies matters of provincial interest, which includes the conservation of significant features of architectural, cultural, historical, archaeological, or scientific interest.

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

3.2 Provincial Policy Statement 2020

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

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

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

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

Built heritage resource: means a building, structure, monument, installation or any manufactured or constructed part or remnant that contributes to a property’s cultural heritage value or interest as identified by a community, including an Indigenous community.

Built heritage resources are located on property that may be designated under Parts IV or V of the Ontario Heritage Act, or that may be included on local, provincial, federal and/or international registers.

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

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

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

2 https://www.historicplaces.ca/media/18072/81468-parks-s-g-eng-web2.pdf
3.3 Ontario Heritage Act

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

3.3.1 Ontario Regulation 9/06

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

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

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

3. The property has contextual value because it,
   i. is important in defining, maintaining, or supporting the character of an area,
   ii. is physically, functionally, visually, or historically linked to its surroundings, or
   iii. is a landmark.

Robinson Heritage Consulting is of the opinion that the existing dwelling at 49 Meadowcreek Lane does not satisfy any of the criteria for determining cultural heritage value set out in Ontario Regulation 9/06 under the Ontario Heritage Act.
The assessment of potential impact by development on cultural heritage resources is guided by the Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Cultural Industries (MHSTCI) InfoSheet #5 – Heritage Impact Assessments and Conservation Plans contained within Ontario Heritage Tool Kit booklet Cultural Heritage Resources in the Land Use Planning Process: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology Policies of the Ontario Provincial Policy Statement, 2005.³

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Pursuant to Chapter 3.G.13, Cultural Heritage Impact Assessments policies have been outlined for the Municipality of the City of Cambridge for a proposed development that includes or is adjacent to a designated or listed property on the Municipal Heritage Register of the applicable municipality, in this case, the City of Cambridge. The CHIA guidelines outlined by the Region in Chapter 3.G.17 are reflected in the guidelines used by the City of Cambridge defined in 4.10 of the City of Cambridge Official Plan.

3.5 City of Cambridge Official Plan (2018 Consolidation)

Policy 4.7.1 of the City of Cambridge Official Plan states that “the City will regulate as fully as possible the demolition, removal or inappropriate alteration or erection of buildings, which, in the opinion of Council, constitute or impact on a cultural heritage resource within a Heritage Conservation District as shown on Schedules 1, 2 and 3” (Figure 5).

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

Section 4.4 of the City of Cambridge Official Plan5 states that a property included or proposed to be included in the City’s Register has been determined to have cultural heritage value if the property has been designated by the Province to be of architectural or historical significance pursuant to the Ontario Heritage Act or, in the opinion of the City, satisfies at least two of the following criteria: i) it dates from an early period in the development of the city’s communities;

   ii) it is a representative example of the work of an outstanding local, national or international architect, engineer, builder, designer, landscape architect, interior designer, sculptor, or other artisan and is well preserved or may be rehabilitated;

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

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

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

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

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

   viii) it is a representative example of architectural design;

---

5 City of Cambridge Official Plan - September 2018 Consolidation. Chapter 4, Section 4.4, pp.64-65.
ix) it terminates a view or otherwise makes an important contribution to the urban composition or streetscape of which it forms a part;

x) it is generally recognized as an important landmark;

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

xii) it is an example of a rare or otherwise important feature of good urban design or streetscaping.

Robinson Heritage Consulting is of the opinion that the dwelling on the property known as 49 Meadowcreek Lane does not satisfy any of the City’s criteria for determining cultural heritage value. However, as stated above, the subject property is located within a heritage conservation district that has been designated under Part V of the Ontario Heritage Act and, therefore, is subject to the policies of the Blair Village HCD Plan.

Section 4.10 of the City of Cambridge Official Plan states that a Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment shall be required for a development proposal or Community Plan that includes or is adjacent to a designated property or cultural heritage landscape, or that includes a non-designated resource of cultural heritage value or interest listed on the Municipal Heritage Register. The potential impacts could be direct, such as demolishing or altering a structure on a designated property, or indirect such as changes to the streetscape of lands adjacent to a cultural heritage resource. A Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment may include the following elements:

a) identification and evaluation of the cultural heritage resource;

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

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

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

e) alternatives to the proposal; and

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

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

3.6 City of Cambridge Heritage Master Plan

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

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

In particular Section 6.3 Character Areas:

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

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

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

Although the existing dwelling at 49 Meadowcreek Lane is not identified in the Blair Village HCD Plan (Hill, 1999) as a building that contributes to the cultural heritage value of the HCD the real property is still protected property within the BVHCD and the BVHCD Plan guidelines and policies apply.
4.0 Historical Summary

4.1 Grand River

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

4.2 Indigenous Peoples

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

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

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

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

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

4.3 Historical Background

Waterloo Township

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

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

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

\textsuperscript{9} Taylor, Andrew W. Our Todays and Yesterdays: A History of the Township of North Dumfries and the Village of Ayr (Published for the North Dumfries and Ayr Centennial Committee, 1967), p. 20.
Beasley was having financial challenges and as the property was mortgaged he was prohibited from dividing and selling lots until it was paid in full and he had received the deed from his creditors. However, despite this, by 1800 he was subdividing selling lots in order to raise funds. Lots were sold largely to German Mennonites from Pennsylvania who began settling and clearing land. When a lien was placed against the lands for nonpayment the settlers learned of it and fearing loss of their lands that they did not hold clear title on, they came to an agreement with Beasley to raise funds themselves to purchase a further 60,000 acres from him in 1803. The funds they paid him were to be used to pay off the creditors so the Mennonites would own the land free and clear. With this agreement in place Samuel Bricker and Daniel Erb representing the newly formed German Company returned to Pennsylvania to raise funds among their family and brethren.\textsuperscript{10}

**Village of Blair**

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

\textsuperscript{10} Quantrell, Jim *A Part of Our Past: Essays on Cambridge’s History* (Published by the City of Cambridge Archives, 2000), p.21
Bowman built the first dam on what became known as Bowman Creek and established the first sawmill. In 1846, his son Samuel B. Bowman built a four-storey mill on the site which is now the Blair Flour Mill.

The Sheave Tower (Figure 7) is believed to be the only extant example of this type of this mechanical transfer technology. The tower was built in approximately 1876 to provide more power to the mill and stands thirty-one feet high and is located approximately two hundred and forty feet downstream and was connected to the mill via a wire cable run on large eight-foot cast iron wheels at either end that attached to the vertical shaft that ran down inside the tower to a water powered turbine at its base. The tower needed to be braced with wire cables on its opposite side to prevent collapse.

The village went through several names including Durham and Durhamville inspired by Henry Bechtel’s Durham Flour Mill in the 1830’s (lost to fire in 1955) followed by Shinglebridge for the shingled covered bridge that crossed the Grand River around 1835 (until damaged by ice in 1857). The name that followed was Lamb’s Bridge due to John Lamb’s tavern and store located at the end of the bridge that spanned the Grand River’s in the 1850’s. The village was known as Carlisle for the Carlisle Mill (the original 4-storey building lost to fire in 1931) until 1858 when the post office was established and as a Carlisle post office already existed the name Blair was chosen after Adam Johnston Ferguson-Blair a local judge, colonel of the militia and elected official.

Figure 7 - Sheave Tower, Blair (Photo: RHC Oct 2021)
4.4 Early Maps of the Township of Waterloo

Block 2 (German Company Tract) as depicted in 1805 indicated the west and east halves of the entire Lot 3 in Beasley’s Old Survey as owned by Abraham Bechtel and Jacob Bechtel respectively (Figure 8). Tremaine’s Map of the County of Waterloo dated 1861 (Figure 9) indicates H. and J. Bechtel as owners of the part of Lot 3 that is west of Bechtel’s Creek. The road allowance that is Meadowcreek Lane today is indicated on Tremaine’s Map as well as in the Illustrated Historical Atlas of the County of Waterloo published in 1881 (Figure 10).

Figure 8 - Block 2 (German Company Tract) in 1805.

Figure 9 - Tremaine’s Map of the County of Waterloo dated 1861.

Figure 10 - Illustrated Historical Atlas of the County of Waterloo published in 1881.
Meadowcreek Lane

Meadowcreek Lane while still an early laneway is actually a later addition to the village established on the lands of the former Benjamin B. Bowman farm. Originally named Craig Street it is found on the Allan and Geddes Survey of 1857 as a narrow gravel road that was extended over Old Mill Road to the former public school (now Blair Outdoor Education Centre) when newly built in 1959. (Hill, 1999)
5.0 Subject Property

5.1 Property Description

The subject property is described historically as Parts 4 and 5 of Richard Beasley’s Old Survey now known as Part 1 on Registered Plan 67R-1579 and comprises 1.46 acres (Figure 13).

Travelling west on Meadowcreek Lane from Blair Road the lane makes a ninety-degree turn to the south and just before it meets Old Mill Road the property is on the east side of Meadowcreek Lane.

The subject property is a corner lot addressed on Meadowcreek Lane to the west and Old Mill Road to the south. The east and north boundaries and shared with other residential properties. Within Area #1 of the Village of Blair HCD this property is in The Old Village which is the most historic area in the District.

The lot slopes from the highest point at the northeast corner toward the southwest and includes a house with garage, shed and inground pool.

Landscape features include hedgerows along both Meadowcreek Lane and Old Mill Road, several larger trees along the driveway that continue and wrap around the house and pool area as well as scattered small to mid-sized trees and shrubs throughout the large lawn of the 1.46 acre lot (Figure 14).

Figure 13 - Surveyor’s sketch showing existing conditions of subject property. (Contract Survey Consultants Inc., 2021)

Figure 14 - View to subject property from Old Mill Road and Meadowcreek Lane. (Photo: RHC October 2021)
5.2 Architectural Description

The subject dwelling is approached via brick posts and gates flanking an asphalt driveway off Meadowcreek Lane (Figure 15). The property has been used as rental housing recently and is now vacant.

The dwelling appears to be a relatively modern (post 1963) single storey, L-plan residence with stucco exterior with a low pitch gable roof with low wide overhangs in fair condition. The garage wing has a lower roof ridge that could be original or added at a later date.

The northeast corner of the dwelling has a large, oversized chimney and either end of the building has suggestions of return eaves and a deep-set single window.

The stucco rendering appears to also be more recent which could hide additions or alterations of openings. Air photos show that the lot was empty in 1963 (Figure 11).
Figure 19 - Northwest wall of house with chimney at left. (Photo: RHC October 2021)

Figure 20 - Northeast wall with edge of swimming pool. (Photo: RHC October 2021)

Figure 18 - Southeast wall of garage. (Photo: RHC October 2021)

Figure 17 - Front entrance door and bow window. (Photo: RHC October 2021)
5.3 Determining Cultural Heritage Value and Interest

The following criteria (in the left column of the table) are prescribed by Ontario Regulation 9/06 under the Ontario Heritage Act for determining cultural heritage value or interest. In the opinion of Robinson Heritage Consulting, the existing dwelling on property known as 49 Meadowcreek Lane in the City of Cambridge, has no cultural heritage value in and of itself. It is designated under part V of the Heritage Act by virtue of its location inside the BVHCD but the existing dwelling is not recognized as a contributing building in the HCD inventory.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. The property has <strong>design value or physical value</strong> because it,</th>
<th>49 Meadowcreek Lane has <strong>no design value or physical value</strong> because it,</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i. is a rare, unique, representative, or early example of a style, type, expression, material, or construction method,</td>
<td>i. is <strong>not</strong> a rare, unique, representative, or early example of a style, type, expression, material, or construction method,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit, or</td>
<td>ii. <strong>does not</strong> display a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit, or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement.</td>
<td>iii. <strong>does not</strong> demonstrate a high degree of technical or scientific achievement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. The property has <strong>historical value or associative value</strong> because it,</th>
<th>49 Meadowcreek Lane <strong>does not</strong> have <strong>historical value or associative value</strong> because it,</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i. has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization, or institution that is significant to a community,</td>
<td>i. <strong>does not</strong> have direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization, or institution that is significant to the Village of Blair, the City of Cambridge or the Region of Waterloo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of a community or culture, or</td>
<td>ii. <strong>does not</strong> yield, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of the Village of Blair, the City of Cambridge or the Region of Waterloo, or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer, or theorist who is significant to a community.</td>
<td>- <strong>does not</strong> yield, or have the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of a community or culture,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. The property has **contextual value** because it,

   i. is important in defining, maintaining, or supporting the character of an area,
   
   ii. is physically, functionally, visually, or historically linked to its surroundings, or
   
   iii. is a landmark.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>- it <strong>does not</strong> demonstrate or reflect the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer, or theorist who is significant to the Village of Blair, the City of Cambridge or the Region of Waterloo.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 49 Meadowcreek Lane has **no contextual value** because it,

   i. is **not** important in defining, maintaining, or supporting the character of an area,
   
   ii. is **not** physically, functionally, visually, or historically linked to its surroundings, or
   
   iii. is **not** a landmark. |

Using criteria from the City of Cambridge’s Official Plan policies (described in Section 3.5 of this CHIA), 49 Meadowcreek Lane in the BVHCD in the City of Cambridge does not have cultural heritage value as it does not meet any of the criteria prescribed by Ontario Regulation 9/06 under the Ontario Heritage Act for determining cultural heritage value or interest.

### 5.4 Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest

The dwelling at 49 Meadowcreek Lane in the City of Cambridge is located in what would become the Village of Blair Heritage Conservation District. The house at 49 Meadowcreek Lane predates the district and therefore the policies and guidelines for new construction within the BVHCD were not in existence. The dwelling is of no cultural heritage value or interest other than the real property itself as large lot consistent with the lots along Meadowcreek Lane.
6.0 Proposed Development, Impacts and Mitigation

6.1 Proposed Development

The owner is proposing to demolish the existing dwelling with its attached garage and associated detached shed retaining only the concrete inground swimming pool, driveway and trees and shrubs except those in the construction area. The intent is to retain the maple trees on the south of the driveway.

The design of the proposed new dwelling is based largely on those in the subdivision on John Bricker Road with two large stories and a tall, steep and complex roofline as well as four car garages. The footprint of the proposed building is 8,323 ft.$^2$ (773.23 m$^2$) and 41 feet in height (12.5 m).

The dwelling would be situated against the north side yard setback, 10 feet from the property line on the lower grade of the property. The building is located in this section of the property in order to allow the existing pool to be retained. Using the lower grade area is also attempts to mitigate some of the building’s height and massing.

The home is a large suburban style with complex rooflines and facades as found in the subdivision on John Bricker Road and is proposed to be clad in the materials seen in the Bricker subdivision: stone veneer, stucco and with high contrast doors and windows.
The four garages are prominent in the design with the end two set along the front plane of the façade on the same plane with the front entry topped with an oversized upper gable wall and roofline. The second two garages are stepped back slightly in line with other elements of the front façade. A projecting gable upper floor creates a covered entryway into the house. 

(For proposed design drawings – see Appendix A.)

6.2 Assessment

The owner purchased 49 Meadowcreek Lane with the expectation that the home that has been designed would be suitable for the lot because of the similar style of dwellings in the subdivision on John Bricker Road which is south of the subject property. RHC was retained to conduct the CHIA after the design was set and the drawings prepared so that heritage advice was not part of the original or preliminary design process. Heritage consultation earlier in the design process may have provided valuable assistance in the proposed design.

The Blair HCD Plan includes policies that set out a “presumption against demolition and for conservation of historic buildings” (Hill, 1999) and provides policies for this undertaking however there are no direct policies for the demolition of non-heritage buildings like the dwelling on the subject property.

The dwelling at 49 Meadowcreek Lane as determined in Part 5 of this report does not have cultural heritage value in and of itself but rather is
representative of the size and massing of other non-heritage properties on the lane. Therefore, demolition could be supported with an approved design for a single family dwelling consistent with the policies and guidelines of the District Plan.

There are numerous references throughout the District Plan policies and guidelines that describe the vision for the District and this is further supported in Section 2.12 of the City of Cambridge Official Plan which reiterates the vision outlined in the Blair HCD Plan. The Official Plan states the following:

“The community of Blair is a village in character, form and functions, protected from suburban development with strong policies to protect and enhance the natural environment and heritage features, and promote village design. New development must be assimilated into the village - not be an entity unto itself, nor engulf the village. Blair will remain small and compact, walkable and self-contained with a central village core. The village core will promote the interaction of residents and become the centre of the community with a mix of residential, commercial and institutional land uses. Commercial uses will primarily provide convenience goods and services to the community residents and promote some tourism. Mixed uses within buildings will be encouraged. New residential development will evolve only through infilling. In addition, the Blair Heritage Conservation District Plan (HCD) provides for the conservation and preservation of
the significant heritage attributes of the community and ensures the protection of the remarkable heritage features in Blair. The HCD also provides for unique design criteria that define the guidelines for building form, materials and details to best reflect the existing Blair community architecture, landscapes and land uses. The community of Blair will remain a village within the city, unspoiled by urban development and the pressures for suburbanization, yet vibrant with new and existing residential land uses and a traditional village core. Blair shall remain a harmonious village community.”

The design of a new residential dwelling for 49 Meadowcreek will need to need to be a “village design” with well defined building form, rural village architecture avoiding urban/suburban designs. Given that the proposed design is closely modeled on the suburban designs of the John Bricker Road subdivision suggests it needs extensive revisions to better reflect the rural village architecture.

A review of the City of Cambridge Zoning By-law confirms that there are only provisions for minimum heights and no provisions regarding maximum height for the R1 (residential) zone. It would be recommended that the City of Cambridge develop maximum heights for sensitive areas like HCDs to assist property owners with realistic infill designs.

11 City of Cambridge Official Plan
The proposed building height at the roof ridge of just over 41 feet (12.5 m) is roughly equivalent to a flat roofed four-storey building and while the proposed dwelling is being presented as a two-storey it has high ceiling heights (11’ on the ground floor and 9’ on the upper floor) it is topped with a soaring 18’ attic space. It is the combination of ceiling heights and soaring attic space that become difficult to successfully mitigate as it is not a characteristic of rural village architecture and its generally urban/suburban in design. The buildings in the BVHCD are generally of more modest heights and further tend to be tucked into the landscape where the grade allows. The BVHCD policies and guidelines clearly state that infill buildings are to be “one and a half or two storeys like the earlier residences” (Hill, 1999). While modern subdivision homes may have high, vaulted or cathedral ceilings these features are not found in “earlier residences”. The proposed high ceilings do not translate to a design that conforms to the prescriptive policy set out in the BVHCD.

Map 1 on page 7 of the District Plan (Figure 20) shows the District divided into areas each with a description which is to aid in the understanding of the district and the subsequent Plan with its guidelines and policies. The subject property is located in Area #1 identified as “The Old Village” the most historic and is considered the old village centre. As most of the historic buildings and streetscapes are located in this area (Figure 21) this would indicate that it is the area that requires the most sensitivity for any proposed change or infill. The subject property in located well within Area #1 The Old Village and is...
viewed from Meadowcreek Lane and John Bricker road at the intersection with Old Mill Road,

We also look to Map 1 for Area #6 as it is providing the owners inspiration and rationale for the proposed dwelling for 49 Meadowcreek Lane. Area #6 is made up of lands that at the time of the BHCD Study and Plan were only in the planning stages but had yet to be developed. Control of density and design would be required to protect the village-like character of the historic District. John Bricker Road was extended to the south leading into the subdivision that is made up of large lots that keep density low, curving roads without sidewalks curb and gutters to preserve a rural style roadway. It is this low density and therefore less traffic through the Old Village that may have allowed the large sized dwellings as a compromise. Even with the success of large lots and low density it is important to note that the size and design of the dwellings in the John Bricker Road subdivision are not entirely compliant or consistent with the character of the District or the District Plan policies and guidelines. The dwellings do however have with detached and/or side entry garages as recommended in the District Plan. This subdivision is on the periphery of the District and is not located along any of the historic streetscapes, access to and from the subdivision is limited and therefore does not detract as significantly in this location that is would if located within the fabric of The Old Village (Hill, 1999).

Section 8 of the BHCD policies and guidelines (Figure 22) contains the goals that are further supported in the Official Plan that new development is

---

**Figure 28** – Historic building properties in the Old Village area in excerpt from Village of Blair HCD Plan, 1999.

**Figure 29** – Excerpt from Village of Blair HCD Plan, 1999.

---

8. NEW DEVELOPMENT

8.1 INTRODUCTION

A primary goal of the Plan is to ensure that new development is assimilated into the village and promotes the historic attributes and rural characteristics of the existing village. Traditional approaches of land use controls seem to produce buildings that often do not fit with the community. Character- and context-based regulations are most appropriate for inclusion in heritage conservation plans and design guidelines. These policies will provide flexibility, but ensure that the rural and historic characteristics of the village are carried through in new development.
assimilated into the “village and promotes historic attributes and rural characteristics of the existing village” (Hill, 1999) and also warns that “Traditional approaches of land use controls seem to produce buildings that often do not fit with the community. Character-and context-based regulations are most appropriate for inclusion in heritage conservation plans and design guidelines. These policies will provide flexibility but ensure that the rural and historic characteristics of the village are carried through in new development.” (Hill, 1999)

The flexibility to demolish and existing building should be approved only with a replacement design that is representative of the rural and historic characteristics of the Old Village area of the VBHCD.

It is the property on Meadowcreek Lane directly across from the subject property that is given as an example in the District Plan under Conservation Policy Residential Infill and is supported as a good example of a new house fitting into the Old Village (Figures 30-32). It is described as being large but not overwhelming. It has two storeys with the second floor contained within the steep roof pitch and dormers. Painted wood cladding, a country drive, welcoming entrance, hidden garage and masterful landscaping that includes a naturalized hedgerow are all aspects of the property that “perfectly complements the rural character of the village” (Hill, 1999).

This section of the Conservation Policy goes on to describe conservation aspects for the landscape:
“This will entail conserving as much of the prevailing landscape as possible, positioning the house in a manner complementary with its neighbours and designing the house so that it fits into the historic streetscape.” (Hill, 1999)

In this detailed set of policies for residential infill the one and a half to two storey home with simple and strong form like earlier residences, verandah and positioning the house so that it is complementary to neighbouring houses are described. Retention and/or planting of trees and hedgerows are also part of the infill policy and there are several sections that detail, hedgerow and tree species, country garden styles (avoiding urban/suburban garden styles), gravel drives, fences and gates in the BVHCD that a successful design would include.

The proposed design is not consistent with the rural character of the Old Village where the subject property is located. Its complex rooflines and facades, massing and heights, particularly when in combination are well beyond that of the Old Village and further would set a precedent for demolition of non-heritage buildings followed by replacement with dwellings in this large urban/suburban design which would quickly change the character of the District’s cultural heritage landscape and overwhelm the generally modest heritage buildings.

The proposed design is however planned for the lowest elevation of the subject property which could be considered helping mitigate some of the height however much of the vegetation is without foliage 6-7 months of the years and it not a replacement for designing a dwelling that is compliant with
the District policies and guidelines. The location of the proposed dwelling does plan to retain many of the maples that line the south side of the driveway, this aspect is in compliance with the BVHCD policies and guidelines.

The overall massing of the proposed dwelling coupled with the siting on the lower grade does however put the building edge up against the north side setback and while it is permitted under current zoning it is not generally consistent with the surrounding properties where there are generous although varied setbacks which are a significant part of the rural village character.

Design details will further assist successful new residential infill and include gravel drives, wooden entry gates and picket fences, country gardens, small lawns stacked dry limestone retaining walls.
6.3 Recommendations and Mitigation

RHC has recommended to the owner that the proposed design was more in keeping with urban/suburban designs and was not well suited to The Old Village in which the subject property is located. RHC’s concerns and recommendations regarding the proposed design have been discussed with both the owner and the design team representative. Many options were discussed such as reducing the overall massing in building area and heights and also by pushing back or detaching one or both garages and turning some or all from facing the street. The owner and design team initially did present two alternate options to reduce height and massing by moving the garages back and turning one set away from the street but since then have decided to proceed with their original design.

RHC recommends that the owner and design team closely review the BVHCD policies and guidelines and significantly revise the design to better reflect the height, massing and rural village character of the District noting the policy for ‘simple strong rural village design’. The reduction in overall massing may also serve to allow a deeper north side setback and as a result still save the maple lined drive. The proponent should also

---

**CONSERVATION GUIDELINES**

The Guidelines are voluntary, but they provide assistance for historic conservation. A country garden should build on the intrinsic qualities of the surrounding rural landscape - qualities of simplicity, organic form and harmonious detail. Simplicity is all. Principles include:

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

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

**DESIGN DETAILS**

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

---

*Figure 33 - Excerpt from Village of Blair HCD Plan, 1999.*
consider more of a traditional porch or verandah across the front to draw attention to the front entry and make for a welcoming aspect on the street. Consider traditional building forms inspired by historic buildings in the District.

A recent addition to the proposed design is to extend the asphalt driveway across most of the front of the proposed house which is not recommended in the BVHCD. RHC recommends that the driveway be reduced to an absolute minimum and not be a “feature” from the street. Consider replacing the existing asphalt with a gravel drive and including rural landscaping as per the BVHCD policies and guidelines to further mitigate the new construction. The brick gate posts are considered to be more urban in design and could be replaced with wood variations at the time of construction or when the brick structures need to be replaced as they are not in sound condition. The metal gates would be best replaced with a wooden, rural style.

During any and all construction every attempt to use the existing drive for construction access and avoid removing or impacting the hedgerows should be undertaken. Any where hedgerows are disturbed, they should be planted with native shrub and small tree species in a random fashion. The hedgerows and trees should be checked for both health and invasive species by a qualified arborist. Invasive species and unhealthy specimens should be removed and replaced with native or historically correct species as laid out in the BVHCD policies and guidelines.

Figure 34 - Excerpt from Village of Blair HCD Plan, 1999.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Hedgerows</th>
<th>New Hedgerows</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Where hedgerows exist, they should be maintained and rebuilt. Maintenance should consist mainly of removing dead or diseased branches and thinning overcrowded or mature stock. A 30% to 50% porous cover should be achieved for an effective windbreak. Quality trees should be selected for full growth. The lower mantel shrubs should be retained for windbreak and wildlife habitat. While existing hedgerows self-seed, occasionally tree planting is required for rebuilding. Prevailing plant species should be continued.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New hedgerows should be extended in both the old village where they are absent and in new residential areas. They will provide visual continuity between old and new areas, enhance the rural character of the village and provide a network of wildlife corridors. Prevailing native species should be planted. Coniferous species could be white cedar and white pine and deciduous white and red oak, burr oak, black walnut and sugar maple. Native lower mantel shrubs such as hazel, viburnum and hawthorn, as well as lilac and apple, are also important to plant as wildlife habitats and corridors.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLANTINGS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An important goal is to ensure the hedgerows are managed in a naturalized manner and comprise native plant material. The following is a partial list of recommended native species.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trees</th>
<th>Edge Shrubs &amp; Trees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beech</td>
<td>Viburnum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Oak</td>
<td>Hawthorn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basswood</td>
<td>Hazelnut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Walnut</td>
<td>Gray Dogwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sugar Maple</td>
<td>Red Berried Elder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butternut</td>
<td>Common Buckthorn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shagbark Hickory</td>
<td>Blue Beech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Cherry</td>
<td>Sumac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Ash</td>
<td>Apple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Pine</td>
<td>Red Oak Dogwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern White Pine</td>
<td>Lilac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Elm</td>
<td>Hackberry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ironwood</td>
<td>Serviceberry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Common naturalized plants include lilacs and apples and are not considered invasive. In old hedgerows, a common species is now buckthorn, which has largely displaced the original hawthorn. While not native, it has become well established and near impossible to remove. In new hedgerows, hawthorn should be used.
7.0 Conclusion

This Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment (CHIA) has confirmed that there is no cultural heritage value in the existing dwelling on the property of 49 Meadowcreek Lane within the BVHCD in the City of Cambridge and that the existing dwelling does not satisfy the criteria to determine cultural heritage value used by Ontario Regulation 9/06, the City of Cambridge Official Plan and the BVHCD Study and Plan.

The proposed dwelling has been objectively assessed directly against the BVHCD policies and guidelines and has been found not to be compliant overall and would pose significant negative impact to The Old Village. RHC recommends that a new design includes a significant reduction in height and massing and is more in keeping with the rural character of The Old Village area of the BVHCD that is designed to integrate with the nature of the property within the cultural heritage landscape.

Further, it would set a precedent for demolishing non heritage buildings for the purpose of replacing them with large urban/suburban homes which would result in The Old Village cultural heritage landscape and historic buildings being overwhelmed and negatively impacted.

RHC anticipates no negative impacts to the subject property with the proposed demolition and replacement of the existing building in general terms provided that the new dwelling is of a design in rural village character and that is determined that it complies with the BVHCD Plans policies and guidelines through an objective assessment of the new design prepared by a Canadian Association Heritage Professional member in good standing.
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24 Carlton Place
Centre Wellington (Elora), Ontario

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

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

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

Rural cultural heritage landscapes may be protected by retaining views of original farms with treed laneways that dot the countryside as landmarks of craftsmanship and prosperity. This Huron Road property is one of the few remaining farmhouses along a portion of the Huron Road within the City of Kitchener. RHC worked with Mattamy Homes and the City of Kitchener to integrate the historic home within a residential subdivision that established an appropriate lot and dedicated lands in front of the home protecting the views of the house and treed laneway to and from the Huron Road. RHC prepared the Heritage Impact Assessment and the Conservation Plan which guided the removal of the rear outbuilding and recommended protective measures until restoration began. The new owners of the property have restored the windows and front door, had new storm windows created and are restoring interior features using the Conservation Plan which also guides recreating the front porch and addresses landscaping and potential additions.
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Client: Recchia Developments Inc., and Greg Poole & Associates, February 2006

246 Crawley Road, Guelph – Heritage Impact Assessment

Industry & Perseverance: A History of the City of Brantford
(Compact disc) in collaboration with Dr. Peter Farrugia
Client: Wilfrid Laurier University and Brant Historical Society, 2006

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

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

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

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

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

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

1471 Gordon Street, Guelph – Heritage Documentation Report
Produced in association with The Ventin Group Architects
Client: Reid’s Heritage Homes, July 2003

341 Forestell Road, Guelph – Heritage Documentation Report
Produced in association with TSH Engineers Architects and Planners
Client: City of Guelph, September 2002

Heritage Sampler and An Interactive Guide to Tremaine’s Map of County of Waterloo, 1861
Client: Waterloo Regional Heritage Foundation, 2002 (compact disc)
PREFABRICATED THERMALLY BROKEN WINDOW WALL FRAMING SYSTEM c.w. 1" SEALED UNIT GLAZING
- SEE PLANS & WINDOW SCHEDULE

PREFABRICATED 4" PRECAST CONCRETE SILL
- SEE WINDOW DETAIL SHEET

PREFABRICATED CONCRETE STAIRCASE, TO BE SITE MEASURED & VERIFIED PRIOR TO MANUFACTURE

PREFABRICATED THERMALLY BROKEN WINDOW FRAMING SYSTEM c.w. 1" SEALED UNIT GLAZING
- SEE PLANS & WINDOW SCHEDULE

3 1/2" SHOUDICE ESTATE STONE VENEER

PREFABRICATED INSULATED DOOR WITHIN THERMALLY BROKEN WINDOW FRAMING SYSTEM
- SEE DOORS & WINDOW SCHEDULES + PLANS

PREFABRICATED 8" CONCRETE HEADER
- TYPICAL ABOVE ALL WINDOWS & DOORS @ STONE VENEER

PROVIDE CEMENTITIOUS PARGING @ ALL EXPOSED CONCRETE ABOVE GRADE

25 YEAR ASPHALT SHINGLES
- OWNER TO SPECIFY

OLD GRADE ELEV. -2' - 11"
T.O. GROUND FLOOR ELEV. 0' - 0"
T.O. SECOND FLOOR ELEV. 11' - 0"
CEILING ELEV. 20' - 0"
BASEMENT ELEV. -10' - 4"
GRADE ELEV. -2' - 11"

EXTERIOR ELEVATIONS
A401 SCALE: 1 : 100
WEST ELEVATION

EAST ELEVATION

WEST ELEVATION