Cambridge Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee  
No. 08 – 22  

AGENDA  

Thursday, October 20, 2022  
7:00 p.m. via Zoom  

Meeting Called to Order  

Disclosure of Interest  

Presentations  

Delegations  

Vanessa Hicks, Heritage Planner, MHBC for 149 Ainslie Street North  

Approval of July 21, 2022 Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee Minutes  PP 003  

THAT the Minutes of the July 21, 2022 meeting of the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee be considered for errors and omissions and be adopted.  

Agenda Items:  

1. Sign Permit Application- 39 Queen Street East  PP 011  

THAT Report 22-023 (MHAC) Sign Permit Application – 39 Queen Street East, be received.  

AND THAT the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC) approve the application for sign permit, subject to a sign variance (S11-22) from Sign By-law 191-03, for the property municipally known as 39 Queen Street East.  

2. Scoped Heritage Impact Assessment for 149 Ainslie Street North  PP 032  

Should you wish to delegate regarding an item on this agenda, please register via email at planning@cambridge.ca by 12 noon of the day prior to the meeting. Be advised that only one person can delegate at a time and additional people cannot be invited to join due to technical limitations. Thank you.
THAT Report 22-025 (MHAC) – Scoped Heritage Impact Assessment for 149 Ainslie Street North, be received;

AND THAT the findings of the Scoped Heritage Impact Assessment for 149 Ainslie Street North prepared by MacNaughton Hermsen Britton Clarkson Planning Limited (MHBC) dated April, 2022 be accepted.

Correspondence

Information Items

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

Next Meeting:

Date & Time: November 17, 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: Susan Brown, Michelle Goodridge, Kimberly Livingstone (7:04), Scott Roberts, Councillor Pam Wolf, Nancy Woodman, and Chair, John Oldfield.

Regrets: Nelson Cecilia, Mark Leclair

Staff in Attendance: Laura Waldie, Senior Planner – Heritage, Karin Stieg-Drobig, Recording Secretary and Helly Shah, IT Support

Meeting Called to Order

The meeting of the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee was held virtually via Microsoft Zoom and live streamed to the City of Cambridge website. John Oldfield, MHAC Chair, welcomed everyone present, introductions were made and he advised those present that in its advisory role, MHAC makes recommendations that then go to Council for a decision. The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. and the meeting adjourned at 9:24 p.m.

Declarations of Interest – NIL

Presentation

Slobodanka Leckic, City of Cambridge Manager of Building Design & Construction and Steven Ruffini, City of Cambridge Architectural Technologist spoke to the proposed roof work on 71 Cowan Boulevard (Ferguson House). It was noted that the Homestead both require roof replacements as the cedar roof is at the end of its’ life cycle, causing leakage into the structure. The tenders received for replacement costs were higher than expected due to product supply and labour costs. The available budget is not sufficient to replace the Farmstead roof with cedar shingles. Therefore, it is proposed to replace the roof of the Homestead with asphalt shingles to ensure the structural integrity of the building in the short term. It is hoped that cedar shingles can be used to replace the asphalt in the future.
Delegations:

Penny Young, Heritage Consultant with ARA Heritage Consultants was present to answer questions of the Committee regarding the Heritage Impact Assessment for 193 Water St. South. Questions of the Committee included adjacency to the existing heritage properties on either side, the proposed driveway access, density, massing and height of the proposed buildings; shadow studies and negative impacts to the heritage properties due to vibration. Ms. Young noted that recommendations have been made to address the adjacency issues to protect the existing heritage resources. In addition, mitigation measures have been recommended including a construction management plan, vibration monitoring through a zone of influence study, the addition of vegetative barriers along the property line, investigation of the limestone kilns should they be present and a plan for an interpretive plaque to commemorate the historic use of the property. Comments from the Committee to the delegate noted that it would be helpful to the Committee if the HIA recommendations proposed be shown as a 3D representation that includes the heritage buildings located at 183 Water Street South and 201 Water Street South so as to ascertain what the impact of the proposed structures will be to these properties.

Julia Redfearn, Planning Consultant, IBI Group delegated to answer questions of the Committee regarding the Heritage Impact Assessment for 193 Water Street South. The Committee asked about the proposed location of the access road. Ms Redfearn advised access from the north will be on 193 Water St. South while access from the south is proposed across 201 Water St. S but will be at least 120 metres from the main building and 40 metres from the outbuilding. The Committee further enquired about greater setbacks from the heritage resources and retention of the streetscape. Ms Redfearn provided the proposed setbacks and that while 522 trees are to be removed, 107 are to be retained and 163 new trees will be planted. No development will take place directly next to (Water Street?).

Due to technical difficulties experienced by delegates to this item, the meeting moved to the next item on the agenda and delegates were brought into the meeting later.

Minutes of Previous Meeting

Moved by: Michelle Goodridge
Seconded by: Susan Brown

THAT the minutes of the June 16, 2022 meeting of the Cambridge Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee be considered for errors and omissions and be adopted.
CARRIED

Delegations Continued

Kanika Kaushal, Heritage Specialist, McCallum Sather, and Matthew Bolen, Architect gave a presentation regarding item #4 on the agenda – Revised Heritage Impact Assessment for 255 King Street West. Ms Kaushal noted that the subject land is neither listed nor designated heritage, however, there are three Heritage Designated and five Heritage Listed properties adjacent or nearby that have been taken into consideration. She noted that the proposed development will incorporate design elements reminiscent of the previous Kress Hotel located at the site in the late 1880s. Further, a Zone of Influence Study will be completed as per Staff’s recommendations to ensure land disturbances due to construction are minimized.

Project architect Matthew Bolen noted that the design will use the changing grades and topography of the site in a similar fashion to how these were used previously with the Kress Hotel and Preston Springs. This includes key entrances to be fronting on King Street West and Fountain Street, brick and stone exterior cladding, verandahs, and maintain setbacks and landscape buffers to preserve views of the adjacent heritage buildings. Mr. Bolen further noted the existing entrance will be maintained and a commemorative plaque describing the history of the site will incorporated into the development. The Committee asked for clarification of the number of floors for each of the towers as well as the proposed setback of 3.8 metres from the the back of 153 and 155 Fountain Street North. Mr. Bolen verified the number of stories to be 14, 15 and 16. He explained that the 3.8 metre setback is in a smaller section of the property that is adjacent to the parking garage; most of the area has a larger setback.

Reports:

1. Request to Alter a Part IV Designated Property – 38 Lansdowne Road North

Moved by: Michelle Goodridge
Seconded by: Scott Roberts

THAT Report 22-017 (MHAC) – Request to Alter a Part IV Designated Property – 38 Lansdowne Road North, be received;

AND THAT the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee recommends that Council approve the request to alter the property by construction of a one-storey accessory building (pool house) as outlined in Report 22-017(MHAC).
CARRIED

2. Request to Alter a Part IV Designated Property – 71 Cowan Boulevard – Duncan Ferguson Homestead

Moved by: Nancy Woodman
Seconded by: Susan Brown

The Committee discussed the use of cedar shingles versus asphalt shingles and their individual life spans; noting that cedar does not have the longevity it once did. It was agreed that protecting the building is of utmost importance.

THAT Report 22-018 (MHAC) - Request to Alter a Part IV Designated Property – 71 Cowan Boulevard – Duncan Ferguson Homestead, be received;

AND THAT the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee recommends that Council approve the request to alter the property by replacing the cedar shingle roof with an asphalt shingle roof as outlined in Report 22-018(MHAC).

CARRIED

3. Request to Designate a Property of Cultural Heritage Value Under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act: 119 Blair Road

Moved by: Councillor Wolf
Seconded by: Nancy Woodman

The Committee unanimously agreed that this building is well deserving of protection due to its cultural and heritage value.

THAT the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC) recommends to Cambridge City Council (Council) that the Clerk be authorized to publish a Notice of Intention to Designate for the property municipally known as 119 Blair Road in accordance with Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act because of its cultural heritage value.

CARRIED

4. Heritage Impact Assessment for 215 Allendale Road

Moved by: Scott Roberts
Seconded by: Nancy Woodman

The Committee asked if the owner had been approached to designate the property. Staff reported that the owner was approached several years ago and while agreeing to
list the property on the register, was not agreeable to designation and is still not interested in designation at this time.

**THAT** the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC) accept the HIA and all its findings for 215 Allendale Road as prepared by WSP and dated November 21, 2021;

**AND THAT** the MHAC recommends that the recommendations outlined in the HIA for Option 2 be implemented as part of the Site Plan approval process for 105 Allendale Road.

**CARRIED**

**Delegations Continued (IT staff were able to connect with Mr. Omar Kaake later in the meeting)**

Omar Kaake, resident and owner of 183 Water Street South delegated in regards to the Heritage Impact Assessment for 193 Water Street South. He explained that his main concern is with the proximity of the building proposed to be closest to the house and barn that are designated under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act. Mr. Kaake noted that the proposed building will have negative impacts to the historic sightlines and the current proposal’s massing and setbacks do not take into consideration the heritage components of the adjacent site. Mr Kaake also expressed his concern for how vibrations may affect the foundations of the barn and house.

**5. Heritage Impact Assessment for 193 Water Street South**

Moved by: Nancy Woodman
Seconded by: Kimberly Livingston

The Committee discussed at length various aspects of the HIA and proposed development including adjacency to the designated and listed properties, scale, massing, lack of drawings showing the relation to the surrounding properties, sightlines coming in to the core area, the proposed removal of the 522 trees, setbacks in relation to the heritage properties, details of the designating by-law for 182 Water St. South, streetscape designs, long term effects of vibration on the heritage buildings and surrounding neighbourhood. Further, The Zone of Influence Study for Vibration was discussed as much of the area sits on limestone bedrock. An amendment was put forth as follows:

Moved by: Susan Brown
Seconded by: Nancy Woodman
AND WHEREAS The City of Cambridge Designation By-Law 109-05 for 183 Water St. South identifies that it terminates a view or otherwise makes an important contribution to the urban composition or streetscape of which it forms a part;

AND THAT a design be required as recommended in the Heritage Impact Assessment, that significantly reduces the mass and scale impact on 183 Water Street South and that the revised design be presented to MHAC for consideration with 3D renderings that show both the proposed development and the two adjacent heritage properties in full;

AND FURTHER THAT all remaining mitigation measures outlined in the Heritage Impact Assessment for 193 Water Street South be considered during the Site Plan application phase and required as conditions for Site Plan approval to the satisfaction of the Chief Planner where appropriate.

AMMENDMENT CARRIED

Moved by: Nancy Woodman
Seconded by: Kimberly Livingston

THAT Report 22-018 (MHAC) Heritage Heritage Impact Assessment for 193 Water Street South, be received;

AND THAT the findings of the Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment for 193 Water Street South prepared by Archaeological Research Associates Ltd. (ARA) revised June 29, 2022 be accepted.

AND WHEREAS The City of Cambridge Designation By-Law 109-05 for 183 Water St. South identifies that it terminates a view or otherwise makes an important contribution to the urban composition or streetscape of which it forms a part;

AND THAT a design be required as recommended in the Heritage Impact Assessment, that significantly reduces the mass and scale impact on 183 Water Street South and that the revised design be presented to MHAC for consideration with 3D renderings that show both the proposed development and the two adjacent heritage properties in full;

AND FURTHER THAT all remaining mitigation measures outlined in the Heritage Impact Assessment for 193 Water Street South be considered during the Site Plan application phase and required as conditions for Site Plan approval to the satisfaction of the Chief Planner where appropriate.

CARRIED

6. Revised Heritage Impact Assessment for 255 King Street West
Moved by: Kimberly Livingston
Seconded by: Susan Brown

It was noted by Michelle Goodridge that drawings requested last month to show the scale and massing of the development in relation to the surrounding heritage properties have not been provided and that there is still a concern regarding the set back of the garage from the heritage buildings along Fountain Street North.

THAT Report 22-020 (MHAC) Revised Heritage Impact Assessment for 255 King Street West, be received;

AND THAT the findings of the Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment for 255 King Street West prepared by McCallum Sather revised June 30, 2022 be accepted;

AND THAT a condition be added to the Site Plan approval for 255 King Street West Requiring a Commemorative Plaque or Sign to the satisfaction of the Chief Planner;

AND FURTHER THAT that a condition be added to the Site Plan approval for 255 King Street West requiring a Zone of Influence Study be completed and implemented to the satisfaction of the Chief Planner to address vibration concerns for adjacent listed and designated heritage properties.

NOT CARRIED

Information Items:

Other Business – NIL

Chair’s Comments:

John Oldfield advised he attended the public meeting regarding the Galt Core Height Guidelines and found it to be very informative. He noted that it is very important as it will need to mesh with the Galt Core Heritage Conservation District. He explained that because the Core area is part of the Urban Growth Centre set by the Province, there are requirements that need to be met that will include heritage. He is hopeful that strong and clear guidelines will be provided going forward.

Council Report/ Comments:

Councillor Wolf advised she also attended the Galt Height Study meeting and thanked John Oldfield for his explanation to the Committee. She further noted that Council has approved to adaptive reuse of the Heritage Designated former Silknit Factory for mixed use residential, and that previous minutes and recommendations for 34 Fallbrook Lane
were approved.

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

Laura Waldie thanked the Committee for their time and review of the agenda this month. This was done, in part, to allow for a summer break in August and to have as many items as possible be heard at Council before the break for the election. She advised the Committee that should an August meeting be necessary, they will be notified by the end of the first week in August.

**Next Meeting**

Date & Time: August 18, 2022, 7:00 p.m. (Tentative)
Location: Virtually via Zoom

**Close of Meeting**

Moved by: Nancy Woodman
Seconded by: Kimberly Livingston

**THAT** the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee meeting does now adjourn at 9:24 p.m.

CARRIED

______________________    ____________________
John Oldfield           Karin Stieg-Drobig
MHAC Chairperson        Recording Secretary
Meeting Date: 10/20/2022  
Report #: 22-023(MHAC)

To: Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee

Report Date: 10/06/2022

Report Author: Jeremy Parsons, Senior Planner – Heritage

Department: Development and Infrastructure

Division: Planning

Report Title: Sign Permit Application – 39 Queen Street East

File No: R01.01.36, S11-22

Ward No: Ward 2

RECOMMENDATION(S)

THAT Report 22-023 (MHAC) Sign Permit Application – 39 Queen Street East, be received;

AND THAT the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC) approve the application for sign permit, subject to a sign variance (S11-22) from Sign By-law 191-03, for the property municipally known as 39 Queen Street East.

SUMMARY

- A sign variance application (S11-22) was submitted to the City of Cambridge on August 18, 2022 (Attachment 1). Approval was provided by the planning department on September 19, 2022 ahead of consulting with the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC) (Attachment 3).

- The owner is requesting approval for a sign permit (S11-22) to authorize the use of a sign larger than what is permitted within the City’s Sign By-law.
The proposed sign conforms to signage previously approved for the structure, and does not alter any of the property’s original heritage features.

BACKGROUND

The subject property is located within a mixed-use, urban context within the historic community of Hespeler. The subject property comprises an irregularly shaped lot with frontage on Queen Street East at the northern terminus of Tannery Street East, between Cooper Street and Guelph Avenue (Figure 1). The property is 0.18 acres (737.44 square metres) in size and is within the Hespeler Village Community Core Area designation (Official Plan, 2018). Known as the former Hespeler Hotel, the property was built by Charles Siegle in 1847 and was designated under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act in 1985.

The subject property has seen multiple alterations and been granted multiple heritage permits and sign permits within the last ten years, including the following:

- Restoration of the façade balcony (2011)
- Wood window replacement across the exterior (2016)
- Insertion of new window opening on façade (2016)
- Limestone repointing on façade (2016)
- Removal of chimney on façade (2016)
- Repainting of façade balcony, window sills, and trim (2017)
- Introduction of façade signage for other tenant businesses on site (2015, 2018)

In 2014, two signs were installed on the subject property that were larger than the size permitted for designated heritage structures. In September 2014, the MHAC gave both business owners a one-year reprieve to get their signs into conformity with the sign by-law or seek a variance. If each business wished to keep the signs they had installed, the property owner of the building was required to apply for a sign by-law variance for each sign. An application was received for the Wellness Team on Queen in September 2015 and approved in November 2015.

A clerical error was made when a Letter of Approval for the sign variance was issued on September 19, 2022 before consulting with the MHAC. Heritage planning staff were alerted to this error when meeting with the business owner on site on September 27, 2022 who informed staff they had been issued the letter. The Manager of Development Planning was alerted to this clerical error and the Manager has informed all development planning staff that in future the MHAC must be consulted first for a decision before issuing an approval letter for a sign permit and/or sign variance permit.
Figure 1: The subject property outlined in red on aerial photography (City of Cambridge).

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 aligns with the strategic plan and supports the objective to make positive contributions to our heritage properties throughout the community.

Figure 2: Looking northwest on Tannery Street East, towards the subject property (City of Cambridge, 2022).

Existing Policy/By-Law:

Ontario Heritage Act

Designation By-law No. 100-85 (Attachment 2) identifies the front façade’s wooden verandah as a heritage attribute.
Sign By-law No. 191-03: Section 26 Heritage Conservation Districts and Designated Buildings.

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

(b) All proposed signs in Heritage Conservation Districts and on Designated Properties shall be accompanied by scale drawings showing:

(i) the building(s) where the sign is to be located;

(ii) the type of sign;

(iii) the dimension of the sign along with any design or lettering;

(iv) materials and colour of which the sign is to be constructed;

(v) a cross-section of the sign showing the bracket and method of affixing the sign to the wall; and

(vi) any means of external illumination of the sign.

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

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

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

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

City of Cambridge Official Plan (2018)

4.5 Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC)

3. Council will also consult with MHAC when reviewing applications for funding through the Cambridge Heritage Conservation Fund, proposals for signage on designated structures, proposals to alter designated structures, applications to sever designated
properties and/or any other development applications potentially affecting a property on the Register.

5.12 Signage

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

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

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

Financial Impact:

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

Public Input:

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

Internal/External Consultation:

Internal Consultation

Heritage Planning staff have liaised with Building Services and Development Planning staff regarding the sign variance and issuance of the sign permit.

External Consultation

On September 27, 2022 staff met with the applicant (tenant) at the subject property in order to view the proposed location of the sign and discuss details of the application.

Comments/Analysis:

The existing Sign By-law requires that signs proposed for installation on designated properties conform to a series of regulations including size limits. Wall signs are required to have a total sign area not greater than 1.25 m² for each sign.

The proposed sign is approximately 3.05 metres (120 inches) in length and 0.61 metres (24 inches) in height. The proposed sign has a total sign area of 1.86 m².

Given this, a sign variance was required to allow for the installation of a sign that exceeded the limits prescribed in the Sign By-law. A sign variance application (S11-22)
was submitted to the City of Cambridge on August 18, 2022, and approval was granted on September 19, 2022.

Figure 3: Looking north on Queen Street East, towards the subject property (City of Cambridge, 2022).

Figure 4: A closer view of the location of the proposed sign on the painted wooden verandah (City of Cambridge, 2022).

The owner’s request is for MHAC approval to authorize the use of the proposed sign on a designated property.
Staff are supportive of the proposal given that the proposed sign will not alter any of the property’s original heritage features and no impact will occur on the limestone façade. Although the proposed sign will be attached to the verandah’s horizontal boards, doing so will not alter the existing wood, which has not been identified as original fabric.

**Figure 5: Signage Proposal Details (courtesy of the business owner)**

The proposed sign is in keeping with the character of existing signage and is comparable in size, style, and materials to adjacent signs at 39 Queen Street East. The proposed sign will also contribute to the continued use of a cultural heritage resource and to the downtown core of Hespeler.

**SIGNATURE**

Prepared by:

Jeremy Parsons, M.A., CAHP
Senior Planner – Heritage
Departmental Approval:

Joan Jylanne, MCIP, RPP  
Manager of Policy Planning

ATTACHMENTS

1. Sign Variance Application Package  
2. Designation By-law No. 100-85  
3. Sign Variance Approval Letter
Subject Site Location

Subject Land's Municipal Address:
39 Queen St East, Cambridge ON N3C 2A6

Present Zoning By-Law Classification of the Site:
C1

Link to Zoning By-Law and Maps
https://maps.cambridge.ca/Maps/WebPages/Landing/Public.aspx

Is or was the project subject to a previous Sign Variance Application?

☐ Yes, File No.: ____________________________
☐ No

Nature and Extent of the Variance:
- Request for larger sign than bylaw.
Why is not possible to comply with the provisions of the By-Law?
The esthetic of the sign, size of the front porch and balance in the middle of the front of the building.

Describe type of sign and check applicable boxes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Free Standing:</th>
<th>Fascia:</th>
<th>Projecting:</th>
<th>Animated Moving Image (TV)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-Illuminated:</th>
<th>Internally Illuminated LED:</th>
<th>Back Lit Box Sign:</th>
<th>Automatic Changing Static Image</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Registered Owner

Name: Cory de Villiers

Company Name (If applicable): Natcordev Inc

Street Address: 39 Queen St East, Unit 201

City: Cambridge Province: ON Postal Code: N3C 2A6

Bus Tel: ____________________________ Fax: ____________________________

Agent / Contractor

Name: ____________________________

Company Name (If applicable): Bennett Social Work Professional Corporation

Street Address: 39 Queen St. E. Unit 201A

City: Cambridge Province: ON Postal Code: N3C 2A7
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Agent to Submit Sign Variance Application (to be completed by Owner)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

If the applicant is not the Owner of the Land(s) that is subject to this application, confirmation by the Owner that the Agent is authorized to make the application on his/her behalf must be completed below:

I/we [Redacted]

the Registered Owner(s) of
39 Queen St E, Cambridge ON N3C 2A6

(municipal address or legal description)

hereby authorize [Redacted]

(print: name of agent)

to act as an agent for this Application for the Sign Variance.

Aug 18, 2022

Date: [Redacted]  
Signature: [Redacted]
Permission to Enter Property:

I/we hereby authorize the staff members of the Corporation of the City of Cambridge to enter upon the subject lands and premises during normal business hours for the purposes of evaluating the merits of this application and subsequently to conduct any inspections and work on the subject lands that may be required as condition of approval of this application. Should there be a need for the accompanying of a staff member on a site inspection due the operations of the business (security/health and safety), please confirm this by checking the box below and to whom the inspection should be arranged with.

☐ Due to security/health and safety reasons, city staff will need to be accompanied while on site by trained personnel.

Inspections shall be arranged with:
☐ Owner;
☑ Agent;
☐ Other: ____________________________

Subject Lands: 39 Queen St E, Cambridge ON N3C 2A6
(municipal address or legal description)

Signed: [REDACTED] Dated: Aug 18, 2022
(I have authority to bind the corporation)

Signed: ____________________________ Dated: ____________________
(I have authority to bind the corporation)
Community Development
Building & By-Law,
50 Dickson St., 3rd Fl., P.O. Box 669
Cambridge, ON, N1R 5W8
Telephone: (519) 623-1340
Fax: (519) 622-6184
TTY: (519) 623-6691 www.cambridge.ca

SIGN PERMIT INFORMATION

☑ FASCIA SIGN ☐ FREE STANDING ☐ SIGN OTHER

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building number, street name</th>
<th>Unit no.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39 Queen St. East</td>
<td>201a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Tenant Name | |
|-------------| |
|             | |

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIGN BY-LAW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing sign(s) to remain: □ No ☑ Yes - I don't have a sign currently.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front yard setback: approx. 36.7 ft. (11.2 m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office (my usage)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office 11&quot; &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office 126&quot; wide x 24&quot; high.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing: 1774.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed: 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ONTARIO BUILDING CODE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ground sign(s) height above finished ground?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projecting sign(s) weigh?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projecting sign(s) attached or fastened in any manner to a parapet wall? □ No □ Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roof sign(s) that has any face that is more than 10 m² (108 ft²)? □ No □ Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any plastic sign facing materials? □ No □ Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Height: 2.5 m |
Weight: 131.95 lbs

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

The plot plan was submitted via portal.

An updated drawing meeting height bylaw is attached to this email.

All information with regard to the building, the lot and neighbouring lots may be necessary to determine and provide for enforcement of the building by-law and the sign by-law, which is not noted herein. Moving, swinging, revolving and flashing light(s) or sign(s) are not permitted. Sec. (27) (3).

Application is hereby made for a permit to erect/alter a sign as described herein or shown on accompanying plans and specifications, which sign is, or is to be located as shown on plot plan. The accuracy of the information which follows and the accompanying plan and specifications with the representations therein contained are the responsibility of the owner and are hereby made a part of this application.

I/we agree to comply with the provisions of the Building Code/ Ontario Reg. 332/12; zoning by-laws and sign by-law of the Corporation of the City of Cambridge and any amendments thereto. I/we further agree that neither the granting of a permit nor the approval of the drawings and specifications, nor inspections made by the authority having jurisdiction during work on the sign shall in any way relieve me/us from full responsibility for carrying out the work in accordance with the requirements of the by-laws above mentioned.

Personal information contained on this form is collected pursuant to the Building Code Act and will be used for the purpose of responding to your application. Questions about the collection of personal information should be directed to the City's Corporate Records Co-ordinator / Deputy City Clerk, in the Clerk’s Department at (519) 740-4680.

Thank you
DESCRIPTION: (Exterior Signage)
1 - Single sided digital print laminated graphic applied to 3mm alupanel backer. Contour cut acrylic butterfly with vinyl applied, to measure 11.5" W x 12" W

Size: 120" (3.048m)wide x 24" (.61m)high
Sign Weight approx. 17lbs

NEW SUBMISSION AS OF
AUG.9/22
BY-LAW NO. 100 - 85

OF THE

CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF CAMBRIDGE

Being a by-law of the City of Cambridge to designate the original structure at 39 Queen Street East, Cambridge, as a property of architectural and historical significance.

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

AND WHEREAS Notices of Intention to designate 39 Queen Street East, Cambridge, Ontario have been duly published and served;

AND WHEREAS it is considered desirable to designate the property known as 39 Queen Street, East, Cambridge, Ontario;

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

1. THAT there is designated as being of architectural and historical significance the original structure located on the real property, more particularly described in Schedule "A" attached hereto, known as 39 Queen Street East, Cambridge, Ontario. The reasons for designation are set out in Schedule "B" attached hereto.

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


[Signature]
MAYOR

[Signature]
CLERK

[Stamp]
RECEIVED
MAY 2, 1995
Cambridge Planning Dept.
SCHEDULE "A"

TO BY-LAW NO. 100 - 85

OF THE

CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF CAMBRIDGE

ALL AND SINGULAR that certain parcel or tract of land and premises, situate, lying and being in the City of Cambridge, in the Regional Municipality of Waterloo and Province of Ontario, and being composed of Part of Lot 1 and Part of Lot 2, Registered Plan 540 and Lot 78, Registered Plan 802.
SCHEDULE "B"

TO BY-LAW NO. 100 - 85

OF THE

CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF CAMBRIDGE

The property located at 39 Queen Street East and known as the Hespeler Hotel is recommended for designation for historical and architectural reasons. Historically, it was built as a hotel by Charles Siegle in 1847, the year of Jacob Hespeler's first industrial enterprise in the town. It continued to operate as a hotel from 1847 until recent times and is the last remaining intact example of its kind in the Hespeler section of Cambridge. Architecturally, the structure consists of a front section of coursed limestone symmetrically arranged in the vernacular Georgian style, and a massive rear wing of broken-coursed limestone rubble stone, heavily mortared in the Pennsylvania German manner. A rare local example of a port-cochere pierces the rear wing to give access to the former stable yard to the west. Other features of a particular interest are wooden boxed cornice with sloped soffit and frieze on the eastern façade of the rear wing. The interior features included in the designation are as follows: in the front section wood window trim and side panels, wood wainscoting with chair rail and base, wallpaper with trim, pine floor, stencil on plaster walls, plaster mould markings, stair case base panelling and hand rail with balusters, stone fireplace opening in basement; in the rear wing, second floor hallway 12' - 8" ceiling featuring two plaster moulded circles. The doors, trim, transom, two wooden arches with wood trim in the hallway are an early alteration to the original ballroom. The original hotel had a verandah at the front as well as wood 8/8 windows and wooden doors.

The Hespeler Hotel occupies an important position as the most significant of a row of similarly scaled commercial buildings in the historic core of Hespeler.
Corporation of the City of Cambridge

By-law No. 100-85

Dated: April 22nd, A.D. 1985

3rd Reading: APR 2 1985
2nd Reading: APR 2 1985
1st Reading: APR 2 1985

of architectural and historical significance.
Queen Street East, Cambridge, as a property
designate the original structure at 19
being a by-law of the city of Cambridge to
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MEMORANDUM

To: Lisa Prime  
Chief Planner of Planning and Development

From: Mila Masic

Date: September 19, 2022.

Our File: S11/22

Re: Sign Variance Approval by the Chief Planner of Planning and Development

The Chief Planner of the City of Cambridge, Community Development Department approves the following proposed sign variance from the regulations of the City of Cambridge Sign By-Law subject to the conditions below:

**Natcordev Incorporated - 39 Queen Street E (Ward 2) File No. S11/22**

- To allow for a fascia sign (1) with a total area of 1.86 square meters where the Sign By-Law currently permits a maximum size of 1.25 square meters for Heritage Designated properties.
- To allow for the proposed sign to project into an opening on the building face. The current Sign By-law prohibits any signage projecting into or covering the opening of any building face.

Notice of the proposal was given by prepaid first-class mail to assessed owners of property within 60 m. of the site, and interested parties were given fourteen days to submit a letter expressing their views in writing. The fourteen days have lapsed and we have not received any submissions.

Please note that the City Planner of the City of Cambridge, Community Development Department has been authorized by Cambridge City Council to approve such variances. There are no outstanding issues or objections. Further information may be obtained from the City of Cambridge Planning Services, 50 Dickson Street (3rd Floor), or by telephoning Mila Masic at (519) 623 1340 Ext. 4305 between 8:30 am and 4:30 pm, Monday through Friday or email masicm@cambridge.ca.

Approved: Sept 19, 2022

Chief Planner’s Approval

cc: Planning Technician
Clerical Assistant
Meeting Date: 10/20/2022

To: Cambridge Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee

Report Date: 09/28/2022

Report Author: Chelsey Tyers, BES, MCIP, RPP, Cultural Heritage Specialist (WSP)

Department: Development and Infrastructure

Division: Planning

Report Title: Scoped Heritage Impact Assessment for 149 Ainslie Street North

File No: OR04/22

Ward No: Ward 4

RECOMMENDATIONS

THAT Report 22-025(MHAC) Scoped Heritage Impact Assessment for 149 Ainslie Street North, be received;

AND THAT the findings of the Scoped Heritage Impact Assessment for 149 Ainslie Street North prepared by MacNaughton Hermsen Britton Clarkson Planning Limited (MHBC) dated April, 2022 be accepted.

SUMMARY

- An Official Plan Amendment (OPA) and Zoning Bylaw Amendment (ZBA) application was submitted for the subject property in 2022.
- The subject property is neither listed nor designated on the Heritage Register, however, it is adjacent to a listed property.
- Due to the adjacent listed property on the Heritage Register, a Heritage Impact Assessment was required to accompany the OPA and ZBA applications.
BACKGROUND

The subject property is the site of the former Galt Paper Box Co. Factory and consists of an irregular shaped lot with frontage on Ainslie Street and Market Street between Simcoe Street and Park Hill Road East (Figure 1). The subject property contains a heavily modified building originally constructed in the late nineteenth or early twentieth century.

The subject property is adjacent to 38 Park Hill Road which is included on the Heritage Register as a listed property of interest and in discussion with City staff it was determined that the Heritage Impact Assessment should also address 40 and 42 Park Hill Road East as together these three properties comprise the entire row of houses.

The proposed development is comprised of an L-shaped, eight-storey multi-unit residential building with a total of 104 residential units and two levels of structured parking.

Figure 1 - Aerial view showing 149 Ainslie Street North, Cambridge (outlined in yellow)
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 aligns with the strategic plan and supports the objective to make positive contributions to our heritage properties throughout the community.

Existing Policy/By-Law:

City of Cambridge Official Plan (2018)

4.10 Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment

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

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

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.
Internal/External Consultation:

The Senior Planner-Heritage liaised with the Senior Planner-Development on this project. The Senior Planner-Heritage also liaised with the heritage consultant from MHBC Planning on the contents of the HIA.

Comments/Analysis:

The subject property is not considered to be a significant cultural heritage resource. However, it is located adjacent to 38 Park Hill Road which is listed on the Heritage Register.

Figure 2 - Front Façade of 38, 40 and 42 Park Hill Road East

149 Ainslie Street is currently subject to an ongoing Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment application to permit the proposed eight-storey multi-unit residential building. A Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) was prepared to determine whether the proposed development will negatively impact the row house located at 38, 40 and 42 Park Hill Road (Attachment 1).

Following consultation with City staff, the HIA was scoped to consider potential negative impacts to the adjacent listed property rather than to complete an assessment of the subject property which does not have any heritage status. Through the course of the research, the HIA identified that the building on the subject property was the former Galt
Paper Box Co. Factory built in the late nineteenth or early twentieth century. Given the extensive modifications to the building since it was built, the HIA concluded it is unlikely to have cultural heritage value or interest.

The impact analysis (Section 6 of the HIA) evaluated potential adverse impact as per the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport’s Info Sheet #5 and concluded that the proposed development will have no impacts on 38, 40, and 42 Park Hill Road East. The proposed development will not result in the destruction or alteration of the dwellings on the adjacent heritage properties, there will be no shadows cast on these properties, nor will these properties be isolated from the surroundings or views obstructed. The proposed development will not result in a change in land use for 38, 40 and 42 and given the distance between the proposed building and existing buildings no impacts due to construction activities are anticipated.

The HIA (April 2022) satisfies the City of Cambridge’s Detailed Guidelines for the Preparation of Cultural Heritage Impact Assessments as scoped through discussion with City Staff. WSP concurs with findings of the report, as such, it is recommended that MHAC accept the Scoped HIA for 149 Ainslie Street North.

SIGNATURE

Prepared by:

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

Departmental Approval:

Joan Jylanne, MCIP, RPP
Manager of Policy Planning

ATTACHMENTS

SCOPED HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT

149 Ainslie Street North, City of Cambridge

Date:
April, 2022

Prepared for:
149 Ainslie St N Limited Partnership

Prepared by:
MacNaughton Hermsen Britton Clarkson Planning Limited (MHBC)
200-540 Bingemans Centre Drive
Kitchener, ON  N2B 3X9
T: 519 576 3650
F: 519 576 0121

Our File: '1978c'
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Cultural Heritage Landscape

CHER  
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Land Acknowledgement

This Heritage Impact Assessment acknowledges that the subject property located at 149 Ainslie Street North in Cambridge is situated on the territory of the Haudenosaunee, Anishinaabe, and the Neutral People. These lands are acknowledged as being associated with the Haldimand Treaty of 1784 (Native-Land Digital, Mapbox).

This document takes into consideration the cultural heritage of Indigenous Communities, including their oral traditions and history when available and related to the scope of work.

Acknowledgement of Organizations and Institutions

We would like to thank the City of Cambridge Archives for their generous assistance in providing historical information for this report.
Executive Summary

MHBC was retained in 2022 by 149 Ainslie St N Limited Partnership (the “Owner”) to undertake a Scoped Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) for the proposed development located at 149 Ainslie Street North in Cambridge (herein referred to as the “subject property”). The subject property is located adjacent to the listed (non-designated) property at 38 Park Hill Road East.

The proposed development includes the removal of the existing building located on the subject property to permit the construction of a new 8 storey multi-residential building. While the existing building located on the subject property is not listed on the heritage register, available Fire Insurance Plans suggest that the building was constructed in the late 19th or early 20th century. As a result, this HIA included an analysis of the existing features of the building to determine whether or not it is of potential heritage value. Ultimately, the building on the subject property has been altered extensively over time and the majority of original features and fabric have been removed. The existing building is not worthy of further study or long-term conservation.

Section 6 of this report provides an assessment of the impacts to the adjacent dwelling located at 38-42 Park Hill Road East. The impact analysis has determined that there are no anticipated impacts on the adjacent properties at 38-42 Park Hill Road East; therefore, this HIA does not provide mitigation measures. Given that there are no identified heritage resources on the subject lands, alternative development options and conservation recommendations are not warranted.
1.0 Introduction

The purpose of this Scoped Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) is to assess the impact of the proposed development at 149 Ainslie Street North, Cambridge, on adjacent properties located at 38, 40 and 42 Park Hill Road East.

1.1 Subject Property

The subject property is municipally addressed as 149 Ainslie Street North in the City of Cambridge. The property is currently occupied by a two storey office building and associated surface parking. The property has frontage on the east side of Ainslie Street North and the west side of Market Street. The subject property is situated north of Park Hill Road East, north of downtown Galt, and east of the Grand River.

The Location Plan is attached as Appendix A to this report.

Figure 1: Aerial photograph noting the location of the subject property (149 Ainslie Street North) outlined in red and the adjacent properties under consideration (38-42 Park Hill Road East) outlined in yellow (City of Cambridge, Interactive Mapping).
1.2 Heritage Status

The subject property is not listed (non-designated) or designated on the City of Cambridge Heritage Properties Register (the ‘Register’) as per Section 27 of the *Ontario Heritage Act*. The adjacent (contiguous) property at 38 Park Hill Road East is listed (non-designated) on the Register. The subject property abuts the rear lot line of the aforementioned adjacent listed property.

The description of the 38 Park Hill Road East in the Register refers to a Landmarks article, which provides the following description:

*Constructed as digs for the working man, this simple triplex on Galt’s east side is anything but plain. The structure is thought to have been built in the 1870s and is an unusual example of the Gothic Revival row house. The house has many of the defining features of this building style, including a steeply pitched roof, dominant central gable and multi-coloured brickwork that emphasizes the decorative detailing and the overall symmetry of the building. The residence features twin round-top windows in the central gable. There are decorative brackets along the eaves. The entrance to each of the three residences has a solid wooden door and transom above it. The doorways are also protected by a long fronting porch with squared columns and wide arches.*

Through discussion with City Staff, it was determined that the entire row house building, addressed as 38, 40 and 42 Park Hill Road East, is included in the scope of this HIA given that the existing building of CHVI is situated on each of these three properties. The subject property abuts the rear property line of 38, 40 and 42 Park Hill Road East. The adjacent Gothic Revival row house dwelling is setback approximately 12 metres from the rear property line.

---

1 The City of Cambridge’s interactive mapping only shows the property of 38 Park Hill Road East as listed, whereas the City of Cambridge Heritage Register document indicates that the properties located at “38 and 42 Park Hill Road West” are listed. Regardless, this HIA will consider the impacts of the entirety of the building at 38-42 Park Hill Road East. Also note that the City of Cambridge Heritage Properties Register refers to the properties as being located on “Park Hill Road West” as opposed to “Park Hill Road East”.

2 The Landmarks article references the entire row house building addressed as 38-42 Park Hill Road East whereas the Register only includes 38 Park Hill Road East.
Figure 2: The subject property (149 Ainslie Street North) is outlined in red; the adjacent properties included in the scope of this report (38, 40 and 42 Park Hill Road East) are outlined in yellow (City of Cambridge, Interactive Map).

This report acknowledges that the Galt Core Heritage Conservation District (HCD) process is underway. The recommended boundary of the Galt Core HCD is located south of Park Hill Road East and does not include the subject property or the adjacent properties that are subject to the scope of this HIA. The HCD process is ongoing and has not yet been formally designated. Therefore, this area is not subject to any HCD Plan.
2.0 Policy Context

2.1 Planning Act & PPS 2020

The Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, c.P.13 makes a number of provisions respecting cultural heritage, either directly in Section 2 of the Act or Section 3 respecting policy statements and provincial plans. In Section 2, the Planning Act outlines 18 spheres of provincial interest that must be considered by appropriate authorities in the planning process. Regarding cultural heritage, Section 2 of the Act provides that:

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

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

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

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

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

Significant: e) in regard to cultural heritage and archaeology, resources that have been determined to have cultural heritage value or interest. Processes and criteria for determining cultural heritage value or interest are established by the Province under the authority of the Ontario Heritage Act.

The PPS also provides in Subsection 2.6.3:
Planning authorities shall not permit development and site alteration on adjacent lands to protected heritage property except where the proposed development and site alteration has been evaluated and it has been demonstrated that the heritage attributes of the protected heritage property will be conserved.

2.2 Ontario Heritage Act

The Ontario Heritage Act, R.S.O, 1990, c.0.18 remains the guiding legislation for the conservation of significant cultural heritage resources in Ontario. This HIA has been guided by the criteria provided with Ontario Regulation 9/06 (O/Reg 9/06) of the Ontario Heritage Act which outlines the criteria for determining CHVI.

2.3 City of Cambridge Official Plan

Chapter 4 of the City of Cambridge Official Plan provides policies related to the identification, evaluation and conservation of cultural heritage resources. The following provides a selection of these policies which are pertinent to this HIA.

Section 4.2 of the City of Cambridge Official Plan provides a list of priorities for cultural heritage resources as it relates to a proposed development, which is as follows:

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

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

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

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

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

   a) promote the re-use of the resource, building, or building elements where a cultural heritage resource cannot be conserved intact;
b) require, prior to approving a development application which would result in the destruction of a cultural heritage resource, that the proponent provide to the City architectural measured drawings, a land history, photographs and other available documentation of the cultural heritage resource in its surrounding context and, if feasible, relocate the cultural heritage resource; and

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

2.4 City of Cambridge Terms of Reference

This HIA has been guided by the City of Cambridge Official Plan (2018) and the Detailed Guidelines for the Preparation of Cultural Heritage Impact Assessments (Council adopted May 7, 2012) which has been scoped as per the conservation with City Staff on March 22, 2022. The City of Cambridge Guidelines for the preparation of HIAs are provided in Appendix B of this report.

Section 4.10.1 of the City’s Official Plan provides the following for when an HIA is to be required:

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.

The following provides a list of the required components of an HIA, as included in Section 4.10 of the Official Plan:

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 Guidelines attached to **Appendix B** of this report provide further direction on these required components and provide further information on the process that the City takes to evaluate development proposals that implicate heritage resources.
3.0 Historical Background & Cultural Heritage Resources

3.1 Indigenous Pre-Contact History

The Pre-Contact settlement of the province can be divided into four main time periods; including: Paleolithic, Archaic, Woodland, and Historic. According to the Regional Municipality of Waterloo Archaeological Facilities Master Plan (1989), evidence of the first Paleolithic Indigenous Peoples residing in the vicinity of Waterloo Region were found between 9,500 B.C. and 8,000 B.C. The Paleo period was characterized by hunter-gatherer-type societies who followed big game. The Archaic period can be dated approximately 8,000 B.C. to 800 B.C. Their material cultures are primarily based on the presence stone, bone, shell, and copper tools. By the Woodland period (900 B.C. – 1650 A.D.), pottery, horticulture and more sedentary lifestyles (such as villages) were common. The Historic Euro-Canadian period did not begin until the late 1700s.

The City of Cambridge is situated on territory of the Haudenosaunee (Longhouse Confederacy), originally Five Nations known as the Mohawk, Oneida, Onondaga, Cayuga and Seneca, as well as the Anishinaabe and the Neutral People. These lands are acknowledged as being associated with the Haldimand Tract Treaty of 1784 (Native-Land Digital). The Haldimand Tract is a tract of land six miles on either side of the Grand River which originally included 950,000 acres.

3.2 City of Cambridge (Galt) Historical Context

In 1798, Colonel Joseph Brant, acting on behalf of the Six Nations sold portions of the Six Nations lands within the Haldimand Tract. A portion of the lands (known as Block One) were sold to Philip Stedman of Niagara. A formal deed was drawn up in 1798 surrendering the lands; however, Steadman died shortly after receiving a Patent conveying the lands, leaving no heirs or a will. The lands were inherited by his sister, Mrs. John Sparkman of Niagara who sold to Thomas Clarke, of Stamford, County of Lincoln. On July 3, 1816, William Dickson purchased all of Block One from Thomas Clarke. In order to encourage settlement of his lands, Dickson contracted A. Shade to see the opening of a grist mill and a saw mill at the junction of Mill Creek and Grand River (Young, 1880). Early industrial operations, such as mills and distilleries in Galt spawned additional settlement (Young, 1880).
By 1851 development had expanded from the intersection of Main Street and the Grand River. Galt had recently been incorporated as a Village (soon becoming a Town in 1857) and was connected to Hamilton and Goderich by stage coach. The arrival of the Great Western Railway and the Galt and Guelph Railway in 1855 encouraged additional development. The Grand Trunk Railway was added in 1879. Galt was considered the administrative hub of the community. The presence of the Grand River enabled the construction of early mills and factories. Soon, Galt was said to be reminiscent of Manchester, England due to its industrial prowess (Young, 1880).
3.3 149 Ainslie Street North (Subject Property) & 38, 40 and 42 Park Hill Road East (Adjacent Lands)

The subject property located at 149 Ainslie Street North and the adjacent row house building located at 38, 40 and 42 Park Hill Road East are located on lands formerly described as Part of Lot 1 East of Grand River, Concession 11, Township of Dumfries.

Marcus Smith’s Map of Galt, 1851, illustrates that Ainslie Street was formerly known as King Street, and that Park Hill Road was formerly Queen Street. What is now Market Street was formerly referred to as Arthur Street. This map also illustrates that the subject property at 149 Ainslie Street North was developed in the mid-nineteenth century with a small structure towards the east side of the property. Also, that the properties at what is now 38, 40 and 42 Park Hill Road East were undeveloped at this time.

According to the 1867 Map of Galt, neither the subject property nor the adjacent lands were developed beyond what can be seen in the 1851 map. The 1867 map notes that the subject

Figure 5: Excerpt of Marcus Smith’s Map of Galt, 1851. The approximate location of 149 Ainslie Street North is noted in red while the adjacent properties of 38, 40 and 42 Park Hill Road East are noted in yellow (courtesy of the City of Cambridge Archives).
property was owned by Hon. R. Dickson’s Estate and that the adjacent lands at Park Hill Road East were owned by M.C. Schofield, who both owned extensive landholdings in Galt in the 19th century.

**Figure 6**: Excerpt from the Map of the Town of Galt, by James Pollock, 1867, with subject property noted in red and adjacent lands noted in yellow (courtesy of the University of Waterloo).

The 1916 topographical map of Galt (below) depicts a small structure at the east side of the subject lands, fronting what is now Ainslie Street North. The properties at 38, 40 and 42 Park Hill Road East appear to be developed with the existing Gothic Revival row house by this time. These historic maps and plans confirm that the existing Gothic Row House was constructed between 1867 and 1916.

**Figure 7**: Excerpt from the Topographical Map of Galt, 1916, with the subject property indicated in red and the adjacent lands indicated in yellow (courtesy of the Historical Topographical Map Collection).
The 1929 Fire Insurance Plan depicts the existing two storey building located on 149 Ainslie Street North. The features of the building noted on the 1929 FIP is similar to what is existing in terms of location, size, footprint, and building materials (Source: McMaster University digital library, accessed 2022)\(^3\). The 1929 Fire Insurance Plan depicts a two storey brick building with a two storey stone wing towards the northeast corner of the property. The building is noted as being occupied by the Galt Paper Box Co. The 1945 aerial image depicts the outline of the building (see below).

![Figure 8](image)

**Figure 8:** Excerpt of a 1945 aerial image with approximate location of subject property shown in red (courtesy of the University of Waterloo).

The Landmarks article (referenced in the City of Cambridge Heritage Register) states that the row house building at 38, 40 and 42 Park Hill Road East was constructed likely in the 1870s as “…digs for the working man…” (Martin, 2001) (see Figure below).

---

\(^3\) The 1929 Fire Insurance Plan, courtesy of McMaster University, is not available for inclusion in this report due to copyright law.
Figure 9: Image of the row house building located on 38, 40 and 42 Park Hill Road East (Martin, 2001).
4.0 Description of Subject Property and Adjacent Lands

4.1 Description of Subject Property (149 Ainslie Street North)

The building located at 149 Ainslie Street North can be described as a two storey office building oriented east-west with frontage on both Ainslie Street and Market Street. The building has a paneled exterior with a stucco-like finish, flat roof, blue-tinted glass windows and glass entrance vestibules. Surface parking is situated at the north and south elevations of the building.

4.1.1 North Elevation

The main entrances span the height of the building with blue-tinted glass. Window openings are paired and evenly distributed along the north and south elevations. The upper level window openings are tall and narrow. The lower level window openings include gently arched upper frames.

Figure 10: View of the north side of the building on 149 Ainslie Street North (MHBC, March 2022).
4.1.2 East Elevation

The east elevation has parapet that extends above the roof line and beyond the north and south elevations. This elevation has contemporary windows with wider window openings than that of the north elevation. A utility door is situated on the south portion of the elevation.

![Figure 11: View of east elevation (MHBC, March 2022)](image)

4.1.3 South Elevation

The south elevation contains contemporary paired window openings. Similar to the north elevation, the upper level window openings are tall and narrow.

![Figure 12: View of the south elevation of the building, looking east (MHBC, March 2022).](image)
4.1.4 East Elevation

The east elevation includes a one storey utility area and a garage.

The building at 149 Ainslie Street has been adaptively re-used given that it was formerly recognized as an industrial building (i.e. the Galt Paper Box Factory) and is currently used as office space. The extent of changes to the building in support of its adaptive re-use have removed all original features and materials visible from the public realm. While some window openings along the north and south elevation may be original, the building no longer communicates a built form which is representative of the late 19th or early 20th century. This building has not been listed on the City’s Register and has been subject to unsympathetic alterations and is therefore not considered a
potential heritage resource. As a result of the alterations and exclusion from the Register, further analysis of this property as per Ontario Regulation 9/06 is not recommended.

4.2 Description Adjacent Properties of 38, 40 and 42 Park Hill Road East

The properties located at 38, 40 and 42 Park Hill Road East include one building that can be described as a one and a half storey Gothic Revival row house. The City of Cambridge Heritage Register identifies that the property is of CHVI for the existing dwelling. The Register does not identify any other features as being of potential CHVI. The following provides a more detailed description of the features of the existing dwelling.

4.2.1 South Elevation

The front elevation of the building is oriented south towards Park Hill Road. The building is constructed of brick which has been painted/stained red and pale beige. The painting details include quoins, decorative brick window and door details and roof edges have been painted a pale beige color.

This front elevation has a gently pitched central gable and paired arched window openings that extend into the central gable. A single storey porch spans the length of the building with wide, gently sloping arches between support pillars. Each of the main entrances have transoms above the doors.

![Figure 15: View of the front (south) elevation, looking north.](image-url)
4.2.2 East Elevation

The portion of the east elevation that is visible from the public realm includes red-painted brick, similar to that of the front elevation.

![Figure 16: View of east elevation (MHBC, March 2022).](image)

4.2.3 North Elevation

The north elevation is the rear of the building that is partially visible from the public realm from either Market Street or the subject property at 149 Ainslie Street North. The rear elevation of the building has two brick additions. This portion of the building is composed of primarily unpainted buff/brown brick. The west portion of the rear elevation has been painted.

![Figure 17: View of rear elevation of property at 38-42 Park Hill Road East, looking south from subject property (parking lot). Note portion of rear elevation painted red (circled in red). (MHBC, March 2022).](image)
4.2.4 West Elevation

The west elevation is partially visible from the public realm. Two window openings are visible at the second storey. The west elevation has not been painted red and the buff/brown brick color is clearly visible.

![Figure 18: View of the west elevation, looking north-west from the north side of Park Hill Road East (MHBC, March 2022).](image)

4.3 Description of Context of the Subject Property

The context of the subject property includes a mix of land uses and built forms with a variety of architectural styles indicative of their periods of construction. The northern context includes a single detached low-density dwelling and institutional uses, including the shelter and addictions support center known as The Bridges.

![Figures 19 & 20: (left) View of the east side of Ainslie Street, looking north towards Simcoe Street (MHBC, March 2020) (right); View of the intersection of Ainslie Street and Simcoe Street, looking south-east towards the subject property (Google Street View, March 2022).](image)

The east side of Market Street includes multiple residential buildings. The streetscape profile of Market Street is different than that of Park Hill Road East and Ainslie Street and does not include any...
curbs or sidewalks. Park Hill Road East contains mainly low density residential dwellings, dating roughly to the 19th century and/or early 20th century (See figures below).

Figure 21: Context to the east of the subject lands, facing north along Market Street (MHBC, March 2022).

Figure 22: Context of Park Hill Road East from the intersection of Ainslie Street and Park Hill Road, facing northeast (MHBC, March 2022).

Ainslie Street North between Market Street and Park Hill Road contains a mix of residential uses and commercial uses, with the commercial uses primarily being oriented towards Park Hill Road.
Figures 23 & 24: Ainslie Street looking southeast (left); Ainslie Street looking northwest (right) (MHBC, March 2022).

A location map is included in Appendix A which illustrates context of the subject property.
5.0 Proposed Development

The proposed development of 149 Ainslie Street North includes the demolition of the existing building to permit the construction of a multi-residential development. The proposed new building can be described as an 8 storey brick residential building of contemporary design. The first two storeys are clad with brick while the upper storeys include a mix of brick and paneling. The proposed development includes 104 residential units and two levels of structured parking. The building is intended to have frontage on Ainslie Street North as well as Market Street. Access to the structured parking is provided from two points at Market Street.

A copy of the Site Plan and Elevations are provided in Appendix C and Appendix D of this report, respectively.

![Figure 25: View of proposed south and west elevations from Ainslie Street North, (Reinders & Law Ltd., March 2022).](image-url)
6.0 Impact Analysis

6.1 Introduction & Scope of Impact Analysis

The scope of this HIA includes the assessment of potential impacts to the adjacent properties located at 38 Park Hill Road East, 40 Park Hill Road East and 42 Park Hill Road East.

6.2 Potential Sources of Adverse Impacts

The following impact analysis refers to the list of potential sources of adverse impacts recognized by the Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Culture Industries as per InfoSheet #5 of the Heritage Resources in the Land Use Planning Process, which are as follows:

- **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 planting, such as a garden;
- **Isolation** of a heritage attribute from its surrounding environment, context, or a significant relationship;
- **Direct or Indirect Obstruction** of significant views or vistas within, from, or of built and natural features;
- **A Change in Land Use** such as rezoning a battlefield from open space to residential use, allowing new development or site alteration to fill in the formerly open spaces; and
- **Land Disturbances** such as a change in grade that alters soils, and drainage patterns that adversely affect an archaeological resource.

6.3 Impact Analysis: 38, 40 and 42 Park Hill Road East

The following table provides an analysis of the potential negative impacts to the cultural heritage resources at 38-42 Park Hill Road East as a result of the proposed development:
### Potential Sources of Impacts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Impact</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Destruction</strong></td>
<td>No. The proposed development will not result in the destruction of any features located on the properties at 38-42 Park Hill Road East.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alteration</strong></td>
<td>No. The proposed development will not result in the alteration of any features located on the properties at 38-42 Park Hill Road East.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shadows</strong></td>
<td>No. The proposed new building is located to the north of the property at 38-42 Park Hill Road and the Shadow Study demonstrates that the proposed building will not cast shadows upon the adjacent building. A copy of the Shadow Study is attached as Appendix E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Isolation</strong></td>
<td>No. The proposed development will not isolate the properties at 38, 40 and 42 Park Hill Road East from their context.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Obstruction</strong></td>
<td>No. All existing views of the building at 38, 40 and 42 Park Hill Road East will remain visible from the public realm will not be obstructed as a result of the proposed development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Change in Land Use</strong></td>
<td>No. There will be no change in the use for the properties located at 38, 40 and 42 Park Hill Road East as a result of the proposed development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Disturbances</strong></td>
<td>No. The distance between the new building and the existing buildings is such that no impacts due to construction activity are anticipated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The figure below illustrates the positioning of the proposed development relative to the building on 38, 40 and 42 Park Hill Road East. It is illustrated to be situated approximately 14.5 metres from the northern wing of the closest portion of the building.

**Figure 26:** Situation of proposed development relative to 38, 40 and 42 Park Hill Road East (City of Cambridge, Interactive Mapping).
7.0 Mitigation Measures, Conservation Recommendations, & Alternative Development Options

Given that the subject property does not include identified cultural heritage resources worthy of long-term conservation, no alternative development options or conservation recommendations are necessary. The impact assessment has concluded that no impacts are anticipated to occur to the adjacent properties of 38-42 Ainslie Street North as a result of the proposed development; therefore, no mitigation measures are required.
8.0 Conclusions & Recommendations

This HIA has assessed the potential impacts of the proposed development relative to the adjacent properties located 38, 40 and 42 Park Hill Road East. This assessment has identified that there are no anticipated impacts to these properties as a result of the proposed development on the subject lands. Given that there are no identified heritage resources on the subject lands, alternative development options and conservation recommendations are not warranted. Recognizing that there are no anticipated impacts to the adjacent properties under consideration, no mitigation measures are provided.
9.0 References
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Heritage Impact Assessment Guidelines

2

Detailed Guidelines for the Preparation Of a Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment

1. INTRODUCTION

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

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

2. CULTURAL HERITAGE RESOURCES

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

---

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

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

3. CONTENTS OF HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENTS

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

Policy: identification and evaluation of the built heritage resource:

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

Policy: graphic and written inventory of the heritage resource:

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

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

Guideline: The proposal will be described and its impact on the heritage resource assessed. Changes to the heritage resource such as additions, alterations or demolition will be described. Changes to the landscape and streetscape will be described. New construction shall be evaluated in such terms as orientation, massing, scale,
building materials/colour and fenestration. Distance from existing heritage resources, traffic patterns and grading shall be evaluated.

**Policy:** means to mitigate negative impacts, in accordance with the heritage resources priorities established in Policy 4.2.1 of this plan.

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

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

**Policy:** alternatives to the proposal

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

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

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

**4. QUALIFICATIONS**

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

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

5. **FORMAT**

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

6. **PROCESS**

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

Should you have any questions about these guidelines please contact:

Senior Planner - Heritage

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

1. City of Cambridge Official Plan – Chapter 5: Built Heritage Resources
2. City of Cambridge Sign By-Law for Heritage Conservation Districts
APPENDIX C – Site Plans
### Site Benchmark:
- **Landscape Drawing:**
- **Note:**
  - February, 2022.
  - Survey performed by J.D. Barnes Limited, dated 28th of [month].

#### Site Statistics - New Concept

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>New</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Building Footprint Area</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landscaping / Open Space Coverage</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Requirement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Floor Plan</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Building Requirements:

- **Occupant BC Table # Fixt. Req. Fixt. Provided**
- **Prop. FRR**
- **Type of Constr.**
- **Type of Cladding**

#### Building Area

- **Existing:** 0
- **New:** 2088.8
- **Total:** 2088.8

### Consent:
- **Alteration Permitted Construction:**
  - Combustible: Non-Combustible: Both
- **Barrier Free Design:**
  - Yes: No
- **Comply to OBC Matrix**
  - 3.2.1.4

#### Site Layout:

- **Roadway:**
  - Fire Route
- **Markings:**
  --marking
- **Signage:**
  - (4 Required)
- **Existing Structures:**
  - Board Fence
  - Concrete Walkway/Pad
  - Asphalt Paint Lines for Property Line

#### Proposals:

- **Eightth Level Party Room:** 106.4 m²
- **Third Level Community Room:** 106.4 m²
- **Storage Units:** 84.2 m²
- **Eighth Level Roof Top Amenity Space:** 165.4 m²
- **Exterior Courtyards:** 226.6 m²
- **Infill Storage Units:** 98.9 m²
- **Rental Motel Unit:** 56.1 m²
- **Total Residential Balconies:** 968.0 m²

#### Design:

- **Access to Lot:**
  - Ex 1: 0
  - New: 0
  - Total: 0

- **Loading Space Dimensions:**
  - Accessible Parking Aisle: 2.4 m X 6.0 m
  - Accessible Parking Space (Type A): 2.4 m X 6.0 m
  - Accessible Parking Space (Type B): 2.4 m X 6.0 m

#### Amenities:

- **Amenity Area (sm per Dwelling Unit):**
  - 20 sqm/1Bed + 21.4 sqm/unit
- **Planting Strips and Fencing Setback:**
  - 3.0 m
- **1800 Wood Board Fence**

#### Local Plan:

- **Building Above Building Above:**
  - 3.50 m X 12.0 m
- **1.5 m X 6.0 m
  - 2.4 m X 6.0 m
  - 2.9 m X 5.5 m

#### Site Infrastructure:

- **Sprinkler System Proposed:** Entire Building
- **Standing Pipe Required:** Yes: No
- **Plumbing Fixture Requirements:**
  - 3.7.4.2.
- **Fire Resistance:**
  - 3.2.1.4

#### Site Statistics:

- **Total = 2,757 m²**
- **100.00%**

#### Contact Information:

- **Email:** email@reinders.ca
- **Website:** www.reinders.ca
- **Phone:** T. 905.457.1618  F. 905.457.8852
APPENDIX D – Elevations
APPENDIX E – Sun Study
149 AINSLIE STREET N.
CAMBRIDGE, Ontario

Sun Study
Spring Equinox Solar Study
March 21st - 10:00 AM to 6:00 PM
149 AINSLIE STREET N.
CAMBRIDGE, Ontario

Sun Study
Summer Equinox Solar Study
June 21st - 10:00 AM to 6:00 PM
149 AINSLIE STREET N.
CAMBRIDGE, Ontario

Sun Study
Autumn Equinox Solar Study
September 21st - 10:00 AM to 6:00 PM
149 AINSLIE STREET N.
CAMBRIDGE, Ontario

Sun Study
Winter Equinox Solar Study
December 21st - 10:00 AM to 6:00 PM
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CURRICULUMVITAE

Dan Currie, MA, MCIP, RPP, CAHP

Dan Currie, a Partner and Managing Director of MHBC’s Cultural Heritage Division, joined MHBC Planning in 2009, after having worked in various positions in the public sector since 1997. Dan provides a variety of planning services for public and private sector clients including a wide range of cultural heritage policy and planning work including strategic planning, heritage policy, heritage conservation district studies and plans, heritage master plans, cultural heritage evaluations, heritage impact assessments and cultural heritage landscape studies.

PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS

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

SELECTED PROJECT EXPERIENCE

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

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

Cultural Heritage Evaluations
MacDonald Mowatt House, University of Toronto

EDUCATION

2006
Masters of Arts (Planning)
University of Waterloo

1998
Bachelor of Environmental Studies
University of Waterloo

1998
Bachelor of Arts (Art History)
University of Saskatchewan

CONTACT

540 Bingemans Centre Drive,
Suite 200
Kitchener, ON N2B 3X9
T 519 576 3650 x 744
F 519 576 0121
dcurrie@mhbcplan.com
www.mhbcplan.com
CURRICULUM VITAE

Dan Currie, MA, MCIP, RPP, CAHP

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

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

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

Conservation Plans
Black Bridge Strategic Conservation Plan, Cambridge
Conservation Plan for Log house, Beurgetz Ave, Kitchener
Conservation and Construction Protection Plan - 54 Margaret Avenue, Kitchener

CONTACT
540 Bingemans Centre Drive, Suite 200
Kitchener, ON N2B 3X9
T 519 576 3650 x 744
F 519 576 0121
dcurrie@mhb巡察.com
www.mhb巡察.com
CURRICULUMVITAE

Dan Currie, MA, MCIP, RPP, CAHP

Tribunal Hearings: Local Planning Appeal Tribunal & Conservation Review Board
Port Credit Heritage Conservation District (LPAT)
Demolition 174 St Paul Street (Collingwood Heritage District) (LPAT)
Brooklyn and College Hill HCD Plan (LPAT)
Rondeau HCD Plan (LPAT)
Designation of 108 Moore Street, Bradford (CRB)
Redevelopment of property at 64 Grand Ave, Cambridge (LPAT)
Youngblood subdivision, Elora (LPAT)
Designation of St Johns Church, Norwich (CRB - underway)

MASTER PLANS, GROWTH MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES AND POLICY STUDIES

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

DEVELOPMENT PLANNING

Provide consulting services and prepare planning applications for private sector clients for:

- Draft plans of subdivision
- Consent
- Official Plan Amendment
- Zoning By-law Amendment
- Minor Variance
- Site Plan
Vanessa Hicks, M.A., C.A.H.P.
Associate

Vanessa Hicks is a Senior Heritage Planner and Associate with MHBC. Vanessa and joined the firm after having gained experience as a Manager of Heritage Planning in the public realm where she was responsible for working with Heritage Advisory Committees in managing heritage resources, Heritage Conservation Districts, designations, special events and heritage projects.

Vanessa is a full member of the Canadian Association of Heritage Professionals (CAHP) and graduated from the University of Waterloo with a Masters Degree in Planning, specializing in heritage planning and conservation. Vanessa provides a variety of research and report writing services for public and private sector clients. She has experience in historical research, inventory work, evaluation and analysis on a variety of projects, including Heritage Conservation Districts (HCDs), Heritage Impact Assessments (HIAs), Cultural Heritage Evaluation Reports (CHERs), Conservation Plans (CPs), Documentation and Salvage Reports, and Commemoration Projects (i.e. plaques).

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

June 2016 - Present
Cultural Heritage Specialist/ Heritage Planner
MacNaughton Hermsen Britton Clarkson Planning Ltd.

2012 - 2016
Program Manager, Heritage Planning
Town of Aurora

May 2012 - October 2012
Heritage Planning Assistant
Town of Grimsby

2007 - 2010
Archaeologist
Archaeological Research Associates Ltd.

EDUCATION

2016
Master of Arts in Planning, specializing in Heritage Planning
University of Waterloo, School of Planning

2010
Bachelor of Arts (Honours) in Historical/Industrial Archaeology
Wilfrid Laurier University

CREDENTIALS

Canadian Association of Heritage Professionals (full member)
CURRICULUM VITAE

Rachel Neiser, M.Sc.
Heritage Planner

Rachel Neiser is a Planner with MHBC. Rachel joined the firm after having gained experience as a researcher in the public realm where she was responsible for working with various non-profit organizations and community groups to produce policy reports and social studies. Rachel graduated from the University of Guelph with a Master of Science in Planning degree, specializing in Indigenous Community Planning. Rachel provides a variety of development application, research, and report writing services for public and private sector clients.

PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS

Candidate Member, Canadian Institute of Planners (CIP)
Candidate Member, Ontario Professional Planners Institute (OPPI)

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

July 2021 - Present            Planner
                               MacNaughton Hermesen Britton Clarkson Planning Ltd.

2019 - 2021                   Research Assistant
                               University of Guelph

2019                         Planning Student
                               City of Hamilton