Cambridge Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee
No. 09 – 22

AGENDA

Thursday, November 17, 2022
7:00 p.m. via Zoom

Meeting Called to Order

Disclosure of Interest

Presentations

1. Slobodanka Lekic, Manager of Building Design & Construction and Chris Matz, Consulting Engineer, Moon-Matz Ltd. will speak to the proposed work to the Dickson Park Grandstand.

Delegations

1. Ray Martin, Director, Old Fire Hall Museum Board will speak to the Sign Permit Application for Old Fire Hall Museum at 56 Dickson Street.

2. Dave Aston, Vice President & Partner, MHBC Planning will speak to Item #1 – Heritage Impact Assessment – 12 Tannery Street East.

Approval of October 20, 2022 Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee Minutes

THAT the Minutes of the October 20, 2022 meeting of the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee be considered for errors and omissions and be adopted.

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.
Agenda Items:

1. Review of Heritage Impact Assessment for 12 Tannery Street East

THAT Report 22-027 (MHAC) Heritage Impact Assessment for 12 Tannery Street East, be received;

AND THAT the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC) support the Heritage Impact Assessment for 12 Tannery Street East prepared by MacNaughton Hermsen Britton Clarkson Planning Limited (MHBC) subject to staff comments and recommendations to be submitted to Heritage Planning staff through the process of Site Plan approval and/or Site Plan agreement, where appropriate. The recommendations include the following:

- That requested changes to the HIA be addressed by MHBC by either amending the report or through an addendum to be submitted to Heritage Planning staff;

- That the mitigation measure recommended by MHBC, that a construction fence be installed to protect against any accidental damage to the adjacent heritage property at 18 Tannery Street, be supported;

- That the applicant confirm that monitoring instruments will be installed to examine potential effects from vibration that have been identified for 18 Tannery Street East due to the proximity of high impact development activities;

- That the applicant addresses building design through the updated HIA and commit to working together to ensure heritage factors are considered within the final building design; and,

- That the applicant submits photo documentation of the property at 12 Tannery Street East in order to document the exterior and interior of the early 20th century structure for municipal archives prior to demolition.

2. Sign Permit Application - 56 Dickson Street (Old Fire Hall Museum)

THAT Report 22-026 (MHAC) Sign Permit Application – 56 Dickson Street (Old Fire Hall Museum), be received;

AND THAT the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC) approve the application for sign permit, subject to a sign variance from Sign By-law 191-03, to mount 2 façade signs on the Old Fire hall Museum on the property municipally known as 56 Dickson Street;
AND FURHER THAT the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee recommends that the sign proposed for the west facing façade of the building, be raised to be in line with the top floor of windows to create a look of symmetry of the sign to the windows.

3. Request to Alter a Part V Designated Property at 30 Park Hill Road West (Dickson Park)

THAT Report 22-024 (MHAC) – Request to Alter Part V Designated Property at 30 Park Hill Road West (Dickson Park), be received;

AND THAT the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC) support the proposed request to alter the grandstand structure at 30 Park Hill Road West (Dickson Park) and recommend that Council approve the Heritage Permit application, subject to the following conditions:

1) Following Council approval, that any minor changes to the plans and elevations shall be submitted to the satisfaction of the Chief Planner, prior to submission as part of any application for a Building Permit and/or the commencement of any alterations; and

2) That the implementation of alterations, in accordance with this approval, shall be completed no later than November 30, 2024. If the alterations are not completed by November 30, 2024, then this approval expires as of that date and no alterations shall be undertaken without a new approval issued by the City of Cambridge.


THAT Report 22-028 (MHAC) – Review of Proposed Changes to the Ontario Heritage Act Through Bill 23 (Schedule 6) – the Proposed More Homes Built Faster Act, 2022 be received for information purposes;

AND THAT comments received from the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee on the Proposed Changes to the Ontario Heritage Act Through Bill 23 (Schedule 6) – the Proposed More Homes Built Faster Act, 2022, inform the City’s response to the Ministry of Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism by November 24, 2022.

Correspondence

Information Items

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

**Next Meeting:**  
Date & Time: December 15, 2022, at 7 p.m.  
Via Zoom  

**Close of Meeting**  
THAT the MHAC meeting does now adjourn at ______p.m.  

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

Regrets: Susan Brown, Mark Leclair

Staff in Attendance: Laura Waldie, Senior Planner – Heritage, Jeremy Parsons, 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 7:55 p.m.

Declarations of Interest – NIL

Presentation – NIL

Delegations: - Vanessa Hicks, Heritage Planner, MHBC, was present to answer questions of the Committee regarding item #2 – 149 Ainslie Street North Scoped Heritage Impact Assessment. There were no questions from the Committee for Ms. Hicks. The Chair thanked her for attending the meeting.

Minutes of Previous Meeting

Moved by: Councillor Wolf
Seconded by: Michelle Goodridge

Kimberly Livingstone noted the misspelling of her name in the minutes. Laura Waldie apologized for the error on behalf of the Recording Secretary and noted the corrections will be made prior to going before Council.
THAT the minutes of the July 21, 2022 meeting of the Cambridge Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee be considered for errors and omissions and be adopted.

CARRIED

Reports:

1. Sign Permit Application – 39 Queen Street East

Moved by: Michelle Goodridge
Seconded by: Councillor Wolf

The Committee discussed at length aesthetics of the proposed sign on the building relating to the colour pallet, size of the sign and primarily its location on the building so as not to obscure the spindles of the verandah above.

THAT Report 22-023 (MHAC) – Sign Permit – 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.

CARRIED

2. Scoped Heritage Impact Assessment for 149 Ainslie Street North

Moved by: Nancy Woodman
Seconded by: Michelle Goodridge

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.

CARRIED

Information Items:

Other Business – NIL
Chair's Comments:

John Oldfield noted that this meeting is Councillor Wolf’s last meeting. He thanked Councillor Wolf for her many years of serving the community and for being an important part of the MHAC Committee as a liaison to Council. He further thanked Councillor Wolf for her commitment to the City of Cambridge and promoting heritage here in the City. Scott Roberts echoed the comments of the Chair. He thanked Councillor Wolf for her support and for being the MHAC voice at Council. The Chair and Vice-Chair wished Councillor Wolf well in the upcoming election as she runs to represent Cambridge at the Region.

Council Report/ Comments:

Councillor Wolf thanked the Chair and Committee for all their kind words. She noted she has been on the MHAC for sixteen years; that it has been a priviledge and she has made many friends during that time. She is happy to have been a part of such a devoted team of people that have worked to preserve heritage in the City and have added many properties to the Heritage Register including her own home.

Staff/Senior Planner- Heritage comments:

Laura Waldie introduced and welcomed Jeremy Parsons as the new additional Senior Planner – Heritage to the Committee. She gave an update to the Committee on Heritage Grants that have been paid out this year and those that are close to completing the approved work. She further noted that the proposed verandah work at 39 Queen Street East had to be put on hold by the owners as they were unable to obtain the services of a qualified heritage carpenter to do the work on time; it is hoped that this can be done next year. Laura Waldie advised the Committee that there will be a Christmas celebration this year after the December meeting and that Councillor Wolf is certainly invited back to take part in the festivities. She further thanked Councillor Wolf for her commitment to the Committee, to Heritage and to the Planning department as a whole; for always being available and willing to answer questions or assist. Lastly, she thanked Councillor Wolf for being a pleasure to work with and for being willing to share her knowledge of Heritage and the City with her.

Jeremy Parsons thanked Laura for her introduction and noted he is excited to work with everyone to preserve Heritage in the City of Cambridge. He thanked the Committee for their volunteer work stating that the work they do is very important and that he is looking forward to working together with the Committee members.

Next Meeting

ECM\Planning Services\Committees\MHAC\MHAC Agendas and Minutes\Minutes\2022 Minutes\10_20_2022 MHAC Minutes
Date & Time: November 17, 2022, 7:00 p.m.
Location: Virtually via Zoom

Close of Meeting

Moved by: Scott Roberts
Seconded by: Nelson Cecilia

THAT the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee meeting does now adjourn at 7:55 p.m.

CARRIED

______________________    ____________________
John Oldfield                 Karin Stieg-Drobig
MHAC Chairperson             Recording Secretary
RECOMMENDATIONS

THAT Report 22-027(MHAC) Heritage Impact Assessment for 12 Tannery Street East, be received;

AND THAT the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee support the Heritage Impact Assessment for 12 Tannery Street East prepared by MacNaughton Hermsen Britton Clarkson Planning Limited (MHBC) subject to staff comments and recommendations to be submitted to Heritage Planning staff through the process of Site Plan approval and/or Site Plan agreement, where appropriate. The recommendations include the following:

- That requested changes to the HIA be addressed by MHBC by either amending the report or through an addendum to be submitted to Heritage Planning staff;

- That the mitigation measure recommended by MHBC, that a construction fence be installed to protect against any accidental damage to the adjacent heritage property at 18 Tannery Street, be supported;
• That the applicant confirm that monitoring instruments will be installed to examine potential effects from vibration that have been identified for 18 Tannery Street East due to the proximity of high impact development activities;

• That the applicant addresses building design through the updated HIA and commit to working together to ensure heritage factors are considered within the final building design; and,

• That the applicant submits photo documentation of the property at 12 Tannery Street East in order to document the exterior and interior of the early 20th century structure for municipal archives prior to demolition.

SUMMARY

• Several development applications were submitted to authorize the construction of a five-storey, 40-unit condominium mixed-use building. Applications for Pre-Consultation (PC) and Minor Variance (MV) were submitted for the subject property in 2021 and a Site Plan (SP) application was submitted in 2022.

• The subject property is neither listed nor designated on the Heritage Register, however, it is adjacent to three listed properties. Due to this adjacency, a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) was required by staff and was submitted during the second submission of the SP application (Attachment 1).

• Staff generally support the HIA however, staff find that the HIA is missing several details. As such, staff recommend that MHBC commit to implementing changes and work together with staff through the Site Plan review process to ensure heritage considerations are addressed.

BACKGROUND

The subject property at 12 Tannery Street East is an irregularly shaped lot located within a mixed-use urban context within the historic community of Hespeler (Figures 1 and 4 to 7). The property is 0.47 acres (1905.33 square metres) in size and is within the Hespeler Village Community Core Area designation (Official Plan, 2012, as amended). The property was originally part of Robert Forbes’ 1869 Survey (Plan 544) on land located adjacent to a tannery lot and pond.

The subject property contains a 2.5 storey building currently in rental use as a five-unit apartment complex (Figure 2). The property features a large front lawn, several mature trees, and a paved driveway. The outbuilding, serving as a two-car garage, also functions as another residential unit. The property has undergone multiple additions in order to accommodate the multi-unit rental use, including what appears to be the addition of wood frame sections connecting two large square brick sections.
Figure 1: The subject property outlined in red on aerial photography. Showing listed and designated heritage properties located nearby (City of Cambridge).

The original structure was constructed in the early 20th century in the Edwardian architectural style. The building displays characteristic Edwardian features such as its unadorned brick construction, box-like American foursquare sections, and low hipped roofs with dormers. The foursquare style is characterized by horizontal lines and a simple but formal appearance indicative of an architectural period where practicality, efficiency, standardization, and cost-savings were increasingly valued over decorative architectural embellishment. The Municipal Property Assessment Corporation (MPAC) data for the property indicates that the structure was built circa 1905. The 1910 Fire
Insurance Plan of Hespeler, included in the HIA (Attachment 1) indicates that the subject property contains a two-storey brick dwelling with a rear section comprising a ½ storey brick section and a one-storey frame section. This information indicates that the front brick foursquare was extant at this time while current additions were likely constructed post-1910.

Figure 2: Looking east from Tannery Street East towards the front of the subject property (City of Cambridge).

The proposed development is a five storey, 40-unit mixed-use condominium building with residential and commercial components. The building includes step backs at the fourth and fifth floors. The proposal sites the new building footprint within 1.7 meters of the frontage property line on Tannery Street and within 3 meters of the adjacent listed building at 18 Tannery Street. A minor variance was approved in 2021 to allow relief from setback provisions within Zoning By-law 150-85. The proposal includes underground parking, a rear amenity area, and 15 standard parking spaces with 8 potential tandem spaces.

The property’s adjacency to listed properties on the City’s Heritage Register triggered the requirement for an HIA. The subject property is directly adjacent to three listed properties including 22 Tannery Street East, 55 Adam Street, and 18 Tannery Street East (former Hespeler Baptist Church) (Figure 3). The property is located immediately west of the Hespeler Town Hall at 11 Tannery Street East, a property designated under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act and listed on the Canadian Register of Historic Places. The subject property is also located immediately west of the Hespeler Carnegie Library at 5 Tannery Street East, a property listed on the City’s Heritage Register.
Collectively, the area functions as the historic civic precinct for the community of Hespeler. Within the Cambridge Heritage Master Plan (2008), this precinct is identified as the “formal square” of Hespeler Village.

Figure 3: Archival photograph of the former Hespeler Baptist Church (circa 1920) not included within the HIA. The image is taken facing northeast on Tannery Street East, a view which will be partially obscured by the proposed development (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.
Although the proposed development does not make positive contributions to heritage districts or buildings in Hespeler, it does not significantly undermine this objective.

**Existing Policy/By-Law:**

**City of Cambridge Official Plan, 2012, as amended**

**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.

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

**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 has liaised with the Planner 1-Site Development/Zoning on this project. The Senior Planner-Heritage has also liaised with the heritage consultant from MHBC Planning on the contents of the HIA, requesting content changes.
On November 1, 2022, the Senior Planner-Heritage conducted a site visit to photograph the location of proposed development and assess the wider context in which development is proposed to occur.

**Comments/Analysis:**

**Items Missing from Heritage Impact Assessment**

Staff are of the opinion that the HIA received for 12 Tannery Street East is missing several details that require updating the existing document or the submission of an addendum to Heritage Planning staff in order to achieve completeness. These include the following:

1. **Inclusion of 22 Tannery Street East**
   
   The HIA should include mention throughout of 22 Tannery Street East as an adjacent (contiguous) property that is listed on the Heritage Register. In addition, the report should provide a historical background of this property, evaluating the property, and providing an impact analysis specific to 22 Tannery Street East. This will necessitate updating Section 1.0 (Introduction), Section 2.3 (Description of Heritage Status), Section 4.0 (Historical Background), and Section 6.0 (Impact Analysis).

2. **Evaluation of proposal in relation to area context**

   Policy 4.10.1 of the Official Plan states that an HIA is required when a development proposal poses indirect impacts "such as changes to the streetscape of lands adjacent to a cultural heritage resource". Further, the City of Cambridge’s Heritage Impact Assessment Guidelines outline that HIAs must describe "changes to the landscape and streetscape" and that the mitigation measures should aim "to preserve and be compatible with the heritage resource and surrounding lands…" The HIA should address impacts of introducing a five-storey, 40-unit mixed-use development into an historic context. The existing area is a civic precinct identified as the “formal square” within Hespeler Village in the Heritage Master Plan (2008). It is defined by landmark institutional buildings and spaces significant to the community of Hespeler, including the Hespeler Town Hall, the Carnegie Library, the former Hespeler Baptist Church, and the formal entrance to Forbes Park. Evaluating area context, particularly within a sensitive historical context within the centre of the community, is important in the submission of an HIA that evaluates all impacts of a proposal.

3. **Evaluation of building design, materials, colour, and style**

   The City of Cambridge's Heritage Impact Assessment Guidelines outline that within HIAs “new construction shall be evaluated in such terms as orientation,
massing, scale, building materials/colour, and fenestration” and that “the scale and design of new development should complement the heritage resource in terms of its orientation, massing, materials, and scale”. In addition to the site plan provided, the HIA should include building renderings or elevations in order to demonstrate the visual aspects of the proposal. In order to be considered complete, the HIA should address building design by commenting on appropriate cladding material, colour, architectural style, and decorative elements specific to a heritage context. Design element consideration is particularly important given the context and the minimal setback proposed to Tannery Street East. Preference should be given to design that does not compete with, or detract from, adjacent and nearby heritage resources. Design should be complementary and can include modern elements which take cues from adjacent or nearby heritage resources.

Recommended Mitigation Measures

As submitted, the HIA completed by MHBC identified one mitigation measure to be addressed through the Site Plan approval process and/or through Site Plan agreement:

- “It is recommended that a construction fence be installed to protect against any accidental damage to the adjacent heritage property at 18 Tannery Street.” (page 26)

Staff agree with the identified mitigation measure outlined above and recommend the following additional mitigation measures be implemented. Measures below are considered appropriate given the context of the proposed development, the size and massing of the proposed development, and the significance of adjacent heritage properties within their context.

1. Monitor vibration impacts

   a. Potential effects from vibration have been identified for 18 Tannery Street East due to the proximity of the church to high impact development activities including heavy equipment use, site grading, and deep excavation. As such, continuous ground vibration monitoring should be carried out near the foundation of the structure during construction. This vibrational exceedance monitoring should be carried out with all construction activities occurring within a 10-meter zone of the church’s southern elevation. This monitoring should be communicated to all on-site personnel. The installed monitoring instruments should be programmed to record continuously, providing peak ground vibration levels at specified time intervals in order to determine any ground vibrations exceeding threshold level. In the event of threshold trigger or exceedance warning, all on-site construction or staging activities must be halted immediately, and the City of Cambridge must be immediately informed.
2. Heritage involvement in final design

   a. Staff recommend that the Senior Planner-Heritage be involved in discussions around final building design in order to ensure that heritage comments and concerns are adequately conveyed and addressed.

3. Submission of photo documentation of 12 Tannery Street East

   a. Staff recommend that, as part of Site Plan approval and/or Site Plan agreement, the applicant submit comprehensive photo documentation of both the exterior and interior of the early 20th century structure for municipal archives prior to demolition.

Figure 4: South-facing photograph of the subject property in the background and adjacent listed properties at 22 Tannery Street East and 18 Tannery Street East (former Hespeler Baptist Church) in the foreground (City of Cambridge).
Figure 5: Southeast-facing photograph showing the relationship between the subject property on the right and adjacent listed property (former Hespeler Baptist Church) on the left (City of Cambridge).

Figure 6: Contextual photograph, looking south, showing the subject property indicated in red and the streetscape character of Tannery Street East, with adjacent heritage properties in view (Hespeler Town Hall on the right and former Hespeler Baptist Church on the left) (Google Maps, 2019).
12 Tannery Street East is currently subject to an ongoing Site Plan application to permit the proposed five-storey, 40-unit condominium mixed-use building. An application for Minor Variance was approved in 2021 to allow relief from several provisions within Zoning By-law 150-85, including setbacks.

As submitted, staff support the recommended mitigation measure outlined within the HIA that a construction fence be installed to protect against any accidental damage to the adjacent property at 18 Tannery Street. However, staff have identified deficiencies within the HIA that should be addressed with Heritage Planning staff through the Site Plan review process and through the Site Plan agreement, where appropriate.

The HIA (March 2022) is supported by staff, subject to MHBC addressing staff comments through an addendum or amendments and through recommendations being addressed with Heritage Planning staff through the Site Plan approval process and/or through Site Plan agreement, where appropriate.
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Acknowledgement

This Heritage Impact Assessment acknowledges that the property located at 12 Tannery Street E, City of Cambridge, is situated within territory of the Haudenosauneega, Anishinabewaki, Attiwonderonk (Neutral), Mississaugas of the Credit First Nation, Mississauga. These lands are acknowledged as being associated with the following treaties (accessed from www.native-land.ca):

- Haldimand Treaty
- The Simcoe Patent, Treaty 4, 1793

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.
Executive Summary

MHBC Planning Ltd. was retained to complete a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) for a redevelopment proposed for the property located at 12 Tannery St E, Cambridge. The purpose of the HIA is to assess the level of impact the proposed redevelopment will have on adjacent heritage properties that are listed on the City of Cambridge Heritage Properties Register, as well as provide mitigation measures and recommendations, if necessary.

This report concludes that adverse impacts of the redevelopment on the adjacent cultural heritage resources are limited to the property located at 18 Tannery Street E. These identified impacts are linked to the potential and temporary impacts of land disturbances during construction.

It is recommended that the following mitigation measures be considered in regard to the impact of land disturbances:

- A construction fence be installed to protect against any accidental damage to the adjacent heritage property at 18 Tannery Street.
1.0 Introduction

MHBC Planning Limited has been retained to undertake a Heritage Impact Assessment for the proposed redevelopment of 12 Tannery St E, Cambridge (the ‘subject property’). The redevelopment plan consists of the removal of the existing structures and the construction of a five storey mixed-use retail and residential building with parking. The subject property is not ‘listed’ on the Municipal Heritage Register, nor has it been designated under Part IV of the *Ontario Heritage Act*. The subject property is however adjacent to properties that are listed on the Cambridge Heritage Properties Register. These properties are located at:

- 18 Tannery St E
- 55 Adam St

The purpose of this Heritage Impact Assessment (‘HIA’) is to assess potential impact of the proposed development on adjacent listed heritage properties, and provide recommendations to mitigate any identified adverse impacts.

*Figure 1: Subject property noted in red (Google, 2022)*
2.0 Overview

2.1 Description of Subject Property

The subject property is located at 12 Tannery St E, Cambridge and is legally described as Lot 10 Concession 3 Beasley Lower Block. The subject property is located in the former Village of Hespeler within the Built-up area of Cambridge in an established neighbourhood and is situated south of Tannery Street E, east of Adam Street, north of Forbes Street and west of Kribs Street.

The subject property is 2,028m² in area with 25m of frontage on Tannery Street E. There is an existing 2.5 storey building located on the subject property that is set back approximately 25m from the Tannery Street road frontage. The front and side yard of the property has some landscaping including a mature tree and a grass lawn.

Figure 2: Aerial view of subject property (Whitney Commercial Real Estate, 2022)
2.2 Description of Surrounding Area

The subject property is within the built-up area of Cambridge and is surrounded by residential, commercial and community uses. The area is comprised predominantly of low-density built forms with taller buildings oriented in the downtown core of Hespeler on Queen Street E. The surrounding area is described in detail below.

NORTH: The Hespeler Public library is directly across from the subject property on the north Tannery Street frontage. Beside the Library is a Fire Station. Beyond the Library and Fire Station is Queen Street E which comprises the majority of downtown Hespeler and consists of commercial buildings. North of Queen Street is the Grand River and industrial uses.

EAST: Hespeler Tennis Club and Forbes Park is east of the subject property. Bounding the park is Krib Street and W.G. Johnson Community Centre. The area to the east is generally comprised of single detached dwellings interspersed with institutional and some commercial uses.

SOUTH: Single detached dwellings that front onto Forbes Street. Hespeler Baptist Church is located at the Adam Street and Forbes Street intersection. The area south of the subject property consists of single detached dwellings. Woodland Park is located further south.

WEST: Tannery Street W is comprised of single detached dwellings and terminates at a cul-de-sac. The area to the west of the subject lands is generally single detached dwellings, with some commercial uses located on Queen Street W.
2.3 Description of Heritage Status

Part IV, Section 27 of the *Ontario Heritage Act* requires that each municipality keep a public register of properties that are of cultural heritage value or interest. The City of Cambridge maintains a heritage register with both listed and designated properties. The subject property located at 12 Tannery Street E is not identified on the City of Cambridge Heritage Properties Register, however, it is within the vicinity of listed heritage properties and is adjacent to two ‘listed’ properties. These properties are identified as:

- 18 Tannery Street E and
- 55 Adam Street.
This HIA will only assess the impacts of the proposed redevelopment on the listed properties contiguous to the subject property. The listed heritage properties and subject property are not identified by the City of Cambridge as being part of a cultural heritage landscape (“CHL”) and are not located in a Heritage Conservation District designated under Part V of the OHA.
Figure 4: Heritage properties noted in black, subject property noted in red (Google, 2022)
3.0 Policy Context

3.1 The Planning Act and PPS 2020

The Planning Act is provincial legislation that guides land use planning in Ontario. It makes a number of provisions respecting cultural heritage. In Section 2, The Act outlines 18 spheres of provincial interest that must be considered by appropriate authorities in the planning process. One of the intentions of The Planning Act is to “encourage the co-operation and co-ordination among the various interests”. Regarding cultural heritage, Subsection 2(d) 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.

The Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) was issued under Section 3 of the Planning Act and came into effect May 1, 2020. The PPS is “intended to be read in its entirety and the relevant policy areas are to be applied in each situation”. 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.

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

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

The following definitions are provided in Section 6.0 of the PPS and outline key terms that are valuable in the overall evaluation of cultural heritage resources:

**Significant:** 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 Ontario Heritage Act.

**Heritage attributes:** means the principal features or elements that contribute to a protected heritage property’s cultural heritage value or interest, and may include the 45
Provincial Policy Statement, 2020 property’s built, constructed, or manufactured elements, as well as natural landforms, vegetation, water features, and its visual setting (e.g. significant views or vistas to or from a protected heritage property).

**Built Heritage Resource:** means a building, structure, monument, installation or any manufactured or constructed part or remnant that contributes to a property’s cultural heritage value or interest as identified by a community, including an Indigenous community. Built heritage resources that are located on a property that may be designated under Parts IV or V of the Ontario Heritage Act, or that may be included on local, provincial, federal and/or international registers.

**Protected Heritage Property:** means a property designated under Parts IV, V or VI of the Ontario Heritage Act; a property subject to a heritage conservation easement under Parts II or IV of the Ontario Heritage Act; a property identified by the Province and prescribed public bodies as provincial heritage property under the Standards and Guidelines for Conservation of Provincial Heritage Properties; a property protected under federal legislation, and UNESCO World Heritage Sites.

### 3.2 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 Regulation 9/06 of the *Ontario Heritage Act* outlines the mechanism for determining cultural heritage value or interest. The regulation sets forth categories of criteria and several sub-criteria.

### 3.3 Region of Waterloo Official Plan

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

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

Pursuant to Chapter 3. G. 13, Cultural Heritage Impact Assessments policies have been outlined for the Municipality of the City of Cambridge for a proposed development that includes or is adjacent to a designated or listed property on the Municipal Heritage Register of the applicable municipality, in this case, the City of Cambridge. The CHIA guidelines outlined by the Region in Chapter 3 G. 17 are reflected in the guidelines used by the City of Cambridge outlined in section 3.6.
3.4 City of Cambridge Official Plan (2018)

The City of Cambridge outlines Community Core Areas in the City in their Official Plan in Section 2.6.3. These areas are described as being “historical central business centres in the city with specialized and diverse planning functions.” Features of these areas related to cultural heritage include:

- their historical role as traditional community focal points;
- conservation and preservation of cultural heritage resources;
- opportunities for unique experiences, such as cultural events, recreation, and specialty shopping and dining, in support of tourism and other functions;
- areas of concentrated and mixed land uses which requires the application of such key elements of urban design, cultural heritage resources, natural environment conservation, a well-linked transit oriented and pedestrian transportation network, and development that is designed to reflect the character of the area and the concept of complete communities;
- areas which benefit from the preservation of historic buildings, including their adaptive re-use;
- areas which benefit from appropriate active and passive use of the natural environment, including the Grand and Speed Rivers and their shorelines;
- tourist-oriented areas, including shopping, integrated trail systems, cultural events, scenic features, and water access along the Grand and Speed Rivers;

The City of Cambridge Official Plan policies and objectives for the conservation of cultural heritage resources have been taken into consideration for the purpose of this Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment.

Section 4.10 of the Official Plan also provides policies on Cultural Heritage Impact Assessments. The Official Plan provides that a HIA is required for a development proposal that includes or is adjacent to an identified heritage resource. The HIA may include:

- Identification and evaluation of the heritage resource;
- Graphic and written inventory of the heritage resource;
- Assessment of the proposals impact on the heritage resource;
- Means to mitigate impacts;
- Alternatives to the proposal, and
- Justification for the preferred option.

This HIA has been prepared in accordance with the Official Plan requirements and contains all relevant information outlined above. The City has also established a Heritage Impact Assessment Terms of Reference. This is addressed in Section 3.6 of the report.
3.5 The Cambridge Heritage Master Plan (2008)

The Cambridge Heritage Master Plan recognizes the importance of the City’s heritage resources, and promotes ‘heritage-friendly’ development. The Master Plan identifies 12 ‘character areas’ which are areas where clusters of heritage resources are located and that contribute to the City’s unique history (figure 5). The subject property and adjacent heritage properties are located within the Hespeler Village character area which is identified as no. 11 areas of cultural opportunity. The character defining elements of Hespeler Village, relevant to this proposal, include:

- Commercial centre of the village;
- Large collection of heritage buildings, stores, inns, industries, town services;
- 2-3 storey retail buildings of which large portions are built of stone;
- No setbacks, broad sidewalks and
- Fine public buildings, continuing with the new library.

The Master Plan also identifies cultural assets of Hespeler Village, of which include:

- Intersection of Adams, Tannery and Queen Street East (formal square) including churches, fire hall, public library, former post office building;
- Speed River; and
- Forbes Park.

The Master Plan recognizes the heritage elements and assets that the City contains, and notes that it is a ‘first step’ in moving forward with heritage conservation initiatives within Cambridge. Notwithstanding that the Master Plan is a tool for future policy, it does not have a regulatory framework.

Despite the status of the Master Plan, it has been taken into consideration and consulted as part of the preparation of this HIA.
3.6 Terms of Reference

The City of Cambridge has a terms of reference for Heritage Impact Assessments entitled *Detailed Guidelines for the Preparation of a Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment*. These guidelines outline what is required within an HIA. Content required in an HIA as per these guidelines include:

- Identification and evaluation of the built heritage resource;
- Graphic and written inventory of the heritage resource;
- Assessment of the proposal’s impact on the heritage resource;
- Means to mitigate negative impacts, in accordance with the heritage resources priorities established in Policy 4.2.1 of this plan;
- Alternatives to the proposal;
- Identification of and justification for the preferred option.

This HIA report has been further scoped beyond the City’s Terms of Reference. Given that no heritage resources reside on the subject lands, this report will not assess the subject property for CHVI. Further, the adjacent properties (55 Adam Street and 18 Tannery Street) have been identified as cultural heritage resources as they are listed on the City’s heritage register and are the subject of this HIA.

For reference, the full Terms of Reference document is attached as Appendix ‘A’ to this report.
4.0 Historical Background

4.1 Pre and Post European Contact

The Pre-Contact settlement of the province can be divided into 4 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 Paleo-Indians 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. These lands are acknowledged as being associated with the Haldimand Tract Treaty (www.whose.land.ca). The Haldimand Tract is a tract of land six miles on either side of the Grand River which originally included 950,000 acres.

4.2 City of Cambridge (Hespeler)

The former Village of Hespeler is located along the Speed River and was originally called Bergeytown and later New Hope (Hespeler Village BIA). The land was purchased as part of Block 2 by Richard Beasley who then sold a portion of the land, which included Hespeler, to Abraham Clemens in 1809. In 1830, Joseph Oberholtzer purchased a portion of land from Mr. Clemens who in turn deeded land to his sister Susanna who had immigrated to the area with her husband Michael Bergey; the Bergeys were considered “Hespeler’s first residents”. By 1830s, the name was changed from Bergytown to New Hope (Cambridge. Web. Net, 2020). The village was renamed and incorporated as the ‘Village of Hespeler’ in 1859 following the arrival of Jacob Hespeler who arrived in the area in 1845 and purchased 145 acres along the Speed River (Kohli, 217). The introduction of the Great Western Railway to the village via Galt to Guelph increased the population to the area and the village was incorporated as a town in 1901.

Similar to the neighbouring towns of Preston and Galt, Hespeler was based on industrial entrepreneurship. The village originated with a grist mill, distillery and textile mill. This was followed by the establishment of a foundry, bathtub manufacturer, appliance manufacturing and the renowned Hespeler hockey stick factory (Brewster, 2010, 23). In the 1930s, Dominion Woollens and Worsteds helped employ those who were suffering in the Depression. During WWII, many women were recruited to work in the Dominion Woollens
mills. Many workers’ homes were created as a result of the industrial enterprises in the village (City of Cambridge, 2020). In 1973 Hespeler was amalgamated with Preston and Galt to form Cambridge as part of the Regional Municipality of Waterloo.

Figure 6 & 7: (Above) 1860 Tremaine Map detailing Hespeler Village (Courtesy of the University of Toronto); (Below) 1878 Illustrated Atlas of Hespeler Village (Courtesy of McGill University).

4.3 18 Tannery Street E

The property addressed as 18 Tannery Street E is legally addressed as Part Lot 23, Plan 544 Cambridge As In J8632m S/t & T/w J8632, Cambridge. The property is occupied by a one ½ storey building, with brick foundation, which was the former Hespeler Community Church and Salvation Army. The property consists of minor vegetation at the front of the property with a paved driveway and parking area to the rear of the property.

According to the City of Cambridge Register of Heritage Properties, the building was constructed c.1892 with a brick exterior. The property is located on Tannery Street, however, the Fire Insurance Plan from 1910 identifies the street as ‘Jackson Street’. Refer to Appendix C for Fire Insurance Plan.
Land title records suggest that the property was purchased by ‘Trustees Hespeler Reg. Baptist Church’ in 1892. The 1910 Fire Insurance Plan for Hespeler (see figure 10) shows a brick building on the subject lands. Originally, the building was the Hespeler Baptist Church, which it served from 1892 until 1951, at which point the Salvation Army purchased the building (Cavalin, 1998).

The building maintains majority of its original exterior features, including all of the window and door openings, front entrance with portico and colonnades and bell tower. All of the windows and doors appear to be original. The property landscape has been changed, with minor vegetation in the form of shrubs, added to the front elevation.
The architectural style of the building is best described as vernacular. While there is some architectural detailing and ornamentation as seen in the lancet arch windows, voussoirs, bell tower with four-pair louvered arch windows, and cornice brackets, the building is modest in design. The building at 18 Tannery Street was not designed to be viewed with great importance on all façades, beyond that which can be expected of a late 19th century community church. There are examples of churches on the Cambridge Heritage Register which demonstrate grandiose designs that were intended to provide viewing opportunities on all facades. The front façade of 18 Tannery Street was intended to be the primary entrance and façade. This is evident in the front bell tower, portico entrance, and window placement, as this is the focal point of the church. The heritage features of the property are related to the physical design features of the building, including its original scale and massing, front entrance, the lancet arch windows openings with voussoir detailing, bell tower louvered arch, and cornice brackets.

![Figure 10 &11: 18 Tannery Street present day (Ontario Heritage Trust, 2022)](image)

### 4.4 55 Adam Street

The property addressed as 55 Adam Street is legally described as Part Lot 1 E/s Adam St Plan 540 Cambridge As In 1546747 Cambridge. The property is occupied by a 1 ½ storey dwelling with stone foundation. According to the City of Cambridge Register of Heritage Properties, the dwelling was built c.1890 with a pebbledash exterior.

The property appears in a photograph c.1906, and the church located at 18 Tannery Street is visible in the background. The photograph shows that the house appears to be clad in stucco. Based on the photograph the dwelling was likely constructed prior to the 20th century.
Figure 12: Photograph c.1906 showing rear yard of 55 Adam St and Church at 18 Tannery St (Courtesy of the Cambridge Archives)

The 1910 Fire Insurance Plan for the Village of Hespeler shows the dwelling on the property. The dwelling is noted with a front porch and wood frame.

Figure 13: Fire Insurance Plan c.1910, property noted in red (Library and Archives Canada)

The property maintains the original dwelling, with minimal landscaped elements. The dwelling on the property was most likely workers housing influenced by Georgian style elements. This is evident in the side gable roof, symmetrically balanced windows with centre door. It is possible that there were originally upper flanked windows which are now filled and covered, however, this cannot be confirmed. The dwelling has experienced some alterations, including the removal of the front porch, replacement of all window and doors, as well as the exterior cladding has been altered from wood frame and stucco to aluminum siding. Notwithstanding these alterations, the heritage value of the property can be attributed to the exterior of the dwelling, which retains original massing, window, and door openings.
5.0 **Proposed Development**

The development site is located at 12 Tannery Street and the proposed development includes the demolition of the existing building on site and construction of a new 5-storey mixed use building containing commercial and residential uses. The ground floor will consist of commercial units, with the upper storeys consisting of 40 residential units. The building will be oriented towards Tannery Street with pedestrian access provided from the existing sidewalk network along Tannery Street. Vehicular access will be provided via a driveway connecting to Tannery Street, with parking located underground. At-grade parking will be accessible at the rear of the building and will be reserved for commercial units.

The building is designed with step backs at the front and the rear of the building. The front of the building is designed to step back at the fourth floor and the fifth floor to achieve the appearance of continuity at the street and pedestrian level, and to reduce the overall massing and appearance of the building from the street line. The building is designed to step back at the rear of the building on the fourth floor to provide an amenity space, and on the fifth floor to accommodate private terraces. The Site Plan is attached as Appendix B.

*Figures 14 & 15: proposed concept plan for mixed-use building (MHBC, 2022)*
6.0 Impact Analysis

The impacts of a proposed development or change to a cultural heritage resource may be direct or indirect. They may occur over a short term or long term duration, and may occur during a pre-construction phase, construction phase or post-construction phase. Impacts to a cultural heritage resource may also be site specific or widespread, and may have low, moderate or high levels of physical impact.

The following sub-sections of this report provide an analysis of the impacts which may occur as a result of the proposed development in accordance with the Ontario Heritage Toolkit Infosheet #5:

- **Destruction**: of any, or part of any significant heritage attributes or features;
- **Alteration**: that is not sympathetic, or is incompatible, with the historic fabric and appearance;
- **Shadows**: created that alter the appearance of a heritage attribute or change the viability of a natural feature or plantings, such as a garden;
- **Isolation**: of a heritage attribute from its surrounding environment, context or a significant relationship;
- **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;
- **Land disturbances**: such as a change in grade that alters soils, and drainage patterns that adversely affect a cultural heritage resource.

The following chart will provide an analysis of potential impacts that may result from proposed redevelopment on the identified cultural heritage resources.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Property Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Destruction / alteration of heritage</td>
<td>No. The proposed development will not result in the destruction or alteration of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attributes</td>
<td>identified heritage attributes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadows</td>
<td>Potential. The anticipation of shadows is minimal given the existing and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>surrounding land uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolation</td>
<td>No. The proposed development will not change the relationship of the property to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the surrounding area. The proposed development will not isolate the adjacent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>property from its surroundings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct or Indirect Obstruction of Views</td>
<td>No. Despite the location of the proposed development adjacent to the building,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no significant views will be impacted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Change in Land Use</td>
<td>No. There will be no change to the heritage property. The property will continue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>its existing land use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Disturbance</td>
<td>Potential. The proposed development is setback approximately 3 metres from the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>property and building. There is potential for land disturbance impacts as a result</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of construction activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. The proposed development is approximately 7 metres from the property and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>an additional 15+ metres to the dwelling. The distance and the scale of the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>proposed development make it unlikely that any impacts due to land disturbance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>would occur.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.1 Assessment of Impacts for 18 Tannery Street

**Shadows**

The proposed building is five stories tall and therefore the City does not require a shadow study. While it can be anticipated that building’s location and mass will result in some shadowing on the adjacent property at 18 Tannery Street, the shadows are not expected to negatively impact heritage attributes. The shadows will not alter the appearance of the property, nor will the shadows change the viability of any natural features.
Obstruction of Significant Views

The proposed development will limit the oblique view of the side façade of the building when viewed from a vantage point on Tannery Street looking east. However, the central and intended view of the building is the front façade which is available from Tannery Street. This view will not be obstructed by the proposed development.

The side elevation of the church is not considered to be a significant view, and as such the proposed development will not be obstructing a significant view of the church. The church will maintain a view from the opposite side of the road on the northern frontage of Tannery Street, which is the intended viewing point. Therefore the impact on the view is negligible.

Land Disturbance

Given that the existing building at 18 Tannery Street is located very close to the property line, there is potential for short-term land disturbances during construction that could impact the building. These include vibration from excavation, construction and equipment during the demolition and construction periods; and, potential damage due to construction activities or construction debris affecting the exterior of the building. These potential impacts would be temporary and can be addressed by mitigation measures recommended in Section 7.0
7.0 Mitigation Recommendations

7.1 Alternative Development Approaches

The City of Cambridge’s Detailed Guidelines for the Preparation of Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment (November 21, 2012), pursuant to Section 4.10 of the Cambridge Official Plan, requires that alternative development options that may avoid or limit the adverse impact on a cultural heritage resource be considered.

In this case, alternatives would include the “do nothing alternative” or modifying the development proposal with a building of a different size or location on the property. The impact analysis in Section 6.0 identifies that there is no anticipated impact on the property at 55 Adam Street and only a potential impact to the adjacent building at 18 Tannery Street due to construction activities. Therefore, alternative development options are not required since the proposed development can be supported subject to mitigation recommendations provided in the following section of this report.

7.2 Mitigation Measures

It is recommended that the following mitigation measures be considered during the site plan approval process.

- It is recommended that a construction fence be installed to protect against any accidental damage to the adjacent heritage property at 18 Tannery Street.
8.0 Conclusion

MHBC Planning was retained to undertake a Heritage Impact Assessment for a property located at 12 Tannery Street E, which is adjacent to two properties listed on the City of Cambridge Heritage Register. The owner of the subject property is proposing to demolish the existing building located on-site and develop a new mixed-use building. The purpose of this HIA was to assess the impacts of the proposed redevelopment on the adjacent listed heritage properties.

This report concludes that the property located at 12 Tannery Street E is not of CHVI. The two adjacent properties located at 18 Tannery Street E and 55 Adam Street are of CHVI as they are listed on the Cambridge Heritage Register.

This report concludes that adverse impacts of the redevelopment on the adjacent cultural heritage resources are limited to the property located at 18 Tannery Street which has the potential adverse impact of Land Disturbances during the construction phase.

It is recommended that the following mitigation measures be considered in regard to the impact of land disturbances:

- A construction fence be installed along the 12 Tannery Street property boundary to protect against any accidental damage to the adjacent heritage property at 18 Tannery Street.
9.0 Sources


City of Cambridge Archives. B/W Postcard Photo of the Rearview of Homes on Adam Street in Hespeler. 1906. Main Collections.
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Terms of Reference
DETAILED GUIDELINES
FOR THE PREPARATION OF

CULTURAL HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENTS
UNDER POLICY 4.10 OF THE
CITY OF CAMBRIDGE OFFICIAL PLAN
(Council adopted May 7, 2012 with Regional Approval on November 21, 2012)

Endorsed by
Cambridge Council
on May 7, 2012
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 ¹ proposal or Community Plan² potentially impacts a cultural heritage resource.³ 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).
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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.

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 <HAC 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 B
Site Plan
Appendix C

Fire Insurance Plans c.1910
Source: Library and Archives Canada. Hespeler, Ontario (Waterloo County), Sept. 1910, revised March 1917. Chas. E. Goad.

https://recherche-collection-search.bac-lac.gc.ca/eng/Home/Record?app=fonandcol&IdNumber=3826056&new=-8585905175369661683
Source: Library and Archives Canada. Hespeler, Ontario (Waterloo County), Sept. 1910, revised March 1917. Chas. E. Goad.

Meeting Date: 11/17/2022  
Report #: 22-026(MHAC)

To: Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee

Report Date: 10/06/2022

Report Author: Laura Waldie, Senior Planner – Heritage

Department: Development and Infrastructure

Division: Planning

Report Title: Sign Permit Application – 56 Dickson Street (Old Fire Hall Museum)

File No: R01.01.28, S13/22

Ward No: Ward 4

RECOMMENDATION(S)

THAT Report 22-026 (MHAC) Sign Permit Application – 56 Dickson Street (Old Fire Hall Museum), be received;

AND THAT the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC) approve the application for a sign permit, subject to a sign variance from Sign By-law 191-03, to mount two façade signs on the Old Fire Hall Museum on the property municipally known as 56 Dickson Street;

AND FURHER THAT the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee recommends that the sign proposed for the west facing façade of the building, be raised to be in line with the top floor of windows to create a look of symmetry of the sign to the windows.

SUMMARY

- A sign permit application (S13/22) was submitted to the City of Cambridge on October 19, 2022 (Attachment 1).
• The tenant is requesting approval for two wood constructed wall signs; one to be mounted on the west façade; and the other on the east façade of the building. The west facing sign is larger than what is permitted within the City’s Sign By-law and will require a variance.

• The proposed signs do not alter any of the property’s original heritage features.

BACKGROUND

The Old Fire Hall Museum is owned by the City of Cambridge. The tenants are the Old Fire Hall Museum Advisory Board who are the custodians of the building. The subject property fronts onto Dickson Street within the commercial and civic heart of the former Town of Galt, now the City of Cambridge. The structure was built in 1898 at the direction of nationally renowned local architect, Frederick Mellish. Mellish, whose key to architectural fame was designing buildings in red brick in the Romanesque style of architecture, was also responsible for the red brick extension onto the Farmers’ Market Building, the Carnegie Library in Galt at 34 Water Street South, the Scott Building at 16-18 Water Street North, and several large Edwardian homes in Dickson Hill and Preston. 

Mellish left Galt in 1909 and relocated to Vancouver, British Columbia, where he designed a number of civic buildings, churches, military camp buildings and grand houses in Vancouver’s west end of Shaughnessy. He died there in 1928, leaving a legacy of architecture in both the Cambridge area and Vancouver.
The subject property has seen few external alterations over the years. The last external alteration was very minor. It consisted with the addition of a firehose port for the nearest fire hydrant in 2018. Previous to that, the roll up front doors were replaced in 2014. In 2018-2019, an extensive internal renovation upgraded many systems inside the building including fire protection sprinklers, electrical, plumbing and a new heating/cooling system. Historic display cases were also added as well and an exhibit space that changes themes several times a year. The Old Fire Hall Museum is open Saturday mornings during the Farmer’s Market season.

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

Existing Policy/By-Law:

Ontario Heritage Act

Designation By-law No. 169-84 (Attachment 2) identifies the red brick construction as a heritage attribute of the structure.

City of Cambridge Official Plan, 2012, as amended

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.

**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.
Financial Impact:
The tenant is 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
N/A

External Consultation
Heritage Planning staff have liaised with a member of the Old Fire Hall Museum Advisory Board since February of 2022 regarding the process of applying for a sign permit as well as what was required to consult with the MHAC.

Comments/Analysis:

Figure 2: West façade of Old Fire Hall Museum with the proposed wooden sign indicated in the picture.
There are two wood signs proposed for the Old Fire Hall Museum. The first sign is proposed to be mounted on the east facing façade wall as shown in Attachment 1. The second sign is proposed to be mounted on the west facing façade wall. 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 for the east facing façade falls within the Sign By-law size regulations at 0.99 square meters. Both signs will be affixed to the building with lag bolts. The holes will be drilled into the mortar joints and secured with epoxy suitable for brick lime mortar. The second sign, proposed to be mounted on the west facing façade of the building is larger than the permitted 1.25 m² under the Sign By-law. This sign is 2.23 m² in size. Given this, a sign variance will be required to allow for the installation of a sign that exceeds the limits prescribed in the Sign By-law. A sign variance application (S13/22) was submitted to the City of Cambridge on October 19, 2022.

The tenants’ 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 brick façade because the signs will be affixed by lag bolts going through the mortar joints. Staff, however, does recommend that the west facing sign be raised on the building to have the top and bottom of the sign to line up with the top floor window dimensions. This will bring a better sense of balance and cohesiveness to the building’s window symmetry. At the time of writing this report, there are currently no plans to illuminate the signage.

The proposed signs are in keeping with the character of the building and with historic signage and logos previously used for the Old Fire Hall Museum. The proposed signs will also contribute to the continued use of a cultural heritage resource and to the downtown Core of Galt.

SIGNATURE

Prepared by:

Laura Waldie, M.A., CAHP
Senior Planner – Heritage
Departmental Approval:

Joan Jylanne, MCIP, RPP
Manager of Policy Planning

ATTACHMENTS

1. Sign Permit/Variance Application Drawings
2. Designation By-law No. 169-84
32" X 48" X 19mm
0.81m X 1.21m X 19mm
Crezon Mdo Sign Panel
Install On Customers Brick Building
With(6) 2 1/2" Tapcon’s 1" Washers
Total Weight 28 Lbs

126m² total wall area
48" X 72" X 19mm
1.21m X 1.82m X 19mm
Crezon Mdo Sign Panel
Install On Customers Brick Building
With (8) 2 1/2" Tapcon’s 1 1/2" Washers
Total Weight 42 Lbs

126m2 total wall area
# Item | Description | State | Qty | UOM | Taxable
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
1 | 32"w x 48"h wall sign single sided | New | 1 | Unit | Y
19mm thick outdoor crezon sign board custom CNC cut to shape professionally coated for outdoor, digital print pattern background, with raised 1/2" thick acrylic lettering attached. Scroll, border and logo may need to be incorporated into the digital print (not raised)

2 | Installation of 32" x 48" and 4'x6' wall sign | New | 1 | Unit | Y
Professional install to wall including hardware, labor and equipment.

3 | 4'w x 6'h wall sign single sided | New | 1 | Unit | Y
19mm thick outdoor crezon sign board custom CNC cut to shape professionally coated for outdoor, digital print pattern background, with raised 1/2" thick acrylic lettering attached. Scroll, border and logo may need to be incorporated into the digital print (not raised)

4 | Entrance panel to get mounted on door | New | 1 | Unit | Y
Material either thin aluminum or plastic cut at 27.5" x 8.75" BLACK with ENTER in white to fit in door beside door handle. Produced and installed
BY-LAW NO. 169 - 84

OF THE

CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF CAMBRIDGE

Being a by-law of the City of Cambridge to designate the exterior of the former Galt Fire Department Hall at 56 Dickson Street 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 so designate the former Galt Fire Department at 56 Dickson Street, Cambridge, Ontario have been duly published and served;

AND WHEREAS it is considered desirable to designate the property known as the former Galt Fire Department Hall at 56 Dickson Street;

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 significance the exterior of the original structure located on the real property, more particularly described in Schedule "A" attached hereto, known as the former Galt Fire Department Hall at 56 Dickson Street, 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.


[Signatures]

RECEIVED
JUL 18 1984
Cambridge Planning Dept.
SCHEDULE "A"

TO BY-LAW NO. 169 - 84

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, formerly in the City of Galt, and being composed of Lot 7, Registered Plan 615, North Side of Dickson Street.
SCHEDULE "B"

TO BY-LAW NO. 169 - 84

OF THE

CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF CAMBRIDGE

Reasons for Designation

The former Galt Fire Department Hall is recommended for designation for architectural and historical reasons. This predominantly red brick, High Victorian building in the Romanesque Revival style is one of a group of important civic landmarks in the Town Hall area of downtown Cambridge.

Among the Fire Hall's outstanding features are a four-storey pyramidal-roofed tower in the companile style, crowned with brickwork trim and, on each of the four walls, a pair of arcaded windows with original sash. On the main facade of the building there is a large gabled dormer with pilasters, brackets and dentils and a pediment filled with embossed foliage and the embossed wood carved letter "G.F.D.". The openings for doors and windows have not been changed and the window openings have there original stone sills as well as the brick voussoirs although the sashes have been replaced. The original wooden roof cornice with dentils is still present. The original chimney with projecting angled brick top is located above the east wall.

Historically, the Fire Hall was built in 1898 under the direction of well-known local architect Fred Mallish who also designed the Carnegie Library and the main portion of the Galt Vegetable Market. The first fire company was organized in Galt in 1842 and this structure served as its home from 1898 to 1980.
MAYOR OF THE CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF CAMBRIDGE

BY-LAW NO. 179-84

Dated: 4th July 1984
Meeting Date: 11/17/2022

To: Cambridge Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee

Report Date: 11/07/2022

Report Author: Jeremy Parsons, Senior Planner - Heritage

Department: Development and Infrastructure

Division: Planning

Report Title: Request to Alter Part V Designated Property at 30 Park Hill Road West (Dickson Park Grandstand)

File Nos: R01.03.03

Ward No: Ward 5

RECOMMENDATIONS

THAT Report 22-024 (MHAC) Request to Alter Part V Designated Property at 30 Park Hill Road West (Dickson Park), be received;

AND THAT the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC) support the proposed request to alter the grandstand structure at 30 Park Hill Road West (Dickson Park) and recommend that Council approve the Request to Alter subject to the following conditions:

1) Following Council approval, that any minor changes to the plans and elevations shall be submitted to the satisfaction of the Chief Planner, prior to submission as part of any application for a building permit and/or the commencement of any alterations; and,

2) That the implementation of alterations, in accordance with this approval, shall be completed no later than November 30, 2024. If the alterations are not completed by November 30, 2024, then this approval expires as of that date and no...
alterations shall be undertaken without a new approval issued by the City of Cambridge.

SUMMARY

- Dickson Park was designated under Part V of the *Ontario Heritage Act* in 2005 as part of the Dickson Hill Heritage Conservation District.

- Staff from Building Design and Construction requested approval to repair and replace deteriorated structural elements of the grandstand on October 12, 2022.

- Subject to consultation with the MHAC, staff is satisfied that the proposed alterations, as submitted, represent routine maintenance necessary for the upkeep of the grandstand. Staff is also satisfied that the proposed alterations do not detract from the cultural heritage value of Dickson Park or the broader Heritage Conservation District.

BACKGROUND

The subject property at 30 Park Hill Road West (Dickson Park) is a municipal park located immediately west of the Grand River within the Dickson Hill neighborhood (Figure 1). The Park is 12.78 acres (51,729.55 square metres) in size and is bounded by Park Hill Road West (to the south), George Street North (to the east), Park Avenue (to the west) and James Street (to the north). The Park is located within the Dickson Hill Heritage Conservation District (By-law No. 150-05). The Park was established in 1871, having been granted by William Dickson Jr. to the former Town of Galt. Recreational structures in the park, including the grandstand, were not constructed until after 1875, as evidenced by the 1875 *Bird’s Eye View of Galt* (Figure 2). The Park originally had a wooden grandstand with gabled roof (Figure 3) but by 1919 it was replaced by a new steel and concrete grandstand that was approved for Dickson Park for a cost of $15,000 (Quantrell, *Historical Chronology*, 2000). An archival photograph from 1924 and the Fire Insurance Plan of Galt (1929) confirm that by the 1920s the wooden grandstand had been replaced by the current concrete structure (Figures 4 and 5).

This ca. 1919 structure has remained largely unchanged over the years (Figure 6). Some renovations to the grandstand did occur in 1997 as part of a Building Permit issued on April 2, 1997. The proposed renovations were supported by a 2019 structural condition assessment of the structure (*Attachment 2*). As per approved, the capital budget, design work (including heritage consultation), is being carried out in 2022 and construction is slated for 2023. A notice of receipt was issued to the project manager (Manager of Building Design and Construction) on November 9, 2022, to satisfy Section 42(3) of the *Ontario Heritage Act*. The present condition of the grandstand is shown in Figures 7 to 12 below.
Figure 1: The subject property and grandstand outlined on aerial photography (City of Cambridge).
Figure 2: The approximate location of the lands that would become Dickson Park in 1875 as shown on the *Bird’s Eye View of Galt* (City of Cambridge Archives).

Figure 3: The original wooden grandstand structure is visible in this ca. 1900 photograph of event at Dickson Park (City of Cambridge Archives).
Figure 4: The newly constructed concrete and steel grandstand is partially visible in this 1924 photograph of a baseball game (Stephanie Kirkwood Walker, *A Waterloo County Album*, 2002).

Figure 5: Dickson Park shown on the Fire Insurance Plan of Galt (1929). Note the concrete grandstand (blue) with a “tar and gravel or composition roof” (P). There is a one-storey wooden “open stand” shown in yellow and a one-and-a-half storey wooden “exhibition building” which is partially shown to the southeast (McMaster University).
Figure 6: A photograph of the concrete grandstand in 1941 (City of Cambridge Archives).

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 renovations align with the strategic plan and support the objective to make positive contributions to our heritage properties throughout the community. The proposed renovations also generally align with the policies outlined in the Dickson Hill Heritage Conservation District Plan.

Existing Policy/By-Law:

Ontario Heritage Act

Section 42 of the Ontario Heritage Act identifies the process for altering a Part V designated property. It states:
42 (1) No owner of property situated in a heritage conservation district that has been
designated by a municipality under this Part shall do any of the following, unless the
owner obtains a permit from the municipality to do so:

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

2. Erect, demolish or remove any building or structure on the property or permit the
erection, demolition or removal of such a building or structure. 2005, c. 6, s. 32
(1).

42 (2.1) The owner of property situated in a designated heritage conservation district
may apply to the municipality for a permit to alter any part of the property other than the
interior of a building or structure on the property or to erect, demolish or remove a
building or structure on the property.

City of Cambridge Official Plan, 2012, as amended

4.1 Objectives

The following objectives provide a foundation for the cultural heritage resources policies
of this Plan to:

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

Dickson Hill Heritage Conservation District Plan (2005)

4.1.4 Dickson Park

Historically, Dickson Park was established in 1871 as a public park and agricultural fair
grounds. By 1905, historic photographs show that a grandstand and a baseball diamond
had been built located at the south end. In 1966, a new recreation/exhibition complex
replaced the earlier wood frame exhibition hall of 1897.

Dickson Park is a spacious and impressive open area that lacks landscape integrity. As
changes have been made and buildings added, the overall impression has become
cluttered and fragmented. A strong landscape design can both integrate and beautify
the park. The following matters should be considered:

History: That Dickson Park should be recognized as one of the older and larger public
landscapes in the City.

Future Change: That any major future improvements or landscape master plan for
restoration of Dickson Park shall be developed in consultation with the Municipal
Heritage Advisory Committee and shall be based on the period circa 1871 that would
enhance its sense of history, landscape beauty, and pedestrian amenity. Presently, an
unattractive chain link fence encloses the park. While important for safety, alternatives should be explored. Because of its 1966 construction date, improvements to Dickson Arena will be exempt from the circa 1871 objectives. However, MHAC shall be consulted in the case of major alterations, additions or reconstruction as set out in Section 5.0 Implementation.

**Financial Impact:**

The costs associated with the proposed renovations are approved through the Capital Works budget and will be borne by the City of Cambridge. The approximate costs for the design stage are $59,200. The costs associated with the future construction phase are not yet public information.

**Public Input:**

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

**Internal/External Consultation:**

The Senior Planner-Heritage has liaised with the project manager (Manager of Building Design and Construction) to determine the scope of the alterations.

On November 1, 2022, the Senior Planner-Heritage conducted a site visit to photograph the grandstand and park. Photographs can be seen in Figures 7 to 12.

**Comments/Analysis:**

The proposed renovations to the grandstand structure include the following:

- Replacing existing roof material;
- Repair wood decking where possible;
- Replace wood decking where deteriorated;
- Recoating existing structural steel (contains lead paint);
- Replacement of deteriorated retaining and partition walls and concrete stairs;
- Repair deteriorated concrete pilasters;
- Replacement of existing guardrails; door headers, and perimeter walls; and,
- Repair and/or replacement of deteriorated wood framing and beams.
Figure 7: Facing west, towards the grandstand from the ballpark outfield (City of Cambridge).

Figure 8: The rear of the grandstand showing deteriorated concrete steps (City of Cambridge).
Figure 9: Looking down from the top of the bleachers at the condition of wooden seating and stairs (City of Cambridge).

Figure 10: Looking up to riveted steel roof trusses, beams, and wooden roof underlay (City of Cambridge).
Figure 11: Showing the condition of concrete walls and steel barriers proposed for replacement (City of Cambridge).

Figure 12: The lower level of the grandstand currently operating as storage (City of Cambridge).
The proposed renovations represent overdue maintenance work designed to improve the safety of the grandstand structure and extend its lifespan for continued use in Dickson Park. Many of the original 1919 features on the grandstand (wood framing, wood beams, structural steel, and concrete elements) are structurally compromised and require repair or replacement to ensure that the structure remains intact. The replacement of existing guardrails (increasing their height) and the re-coating of lead painted steel beams are two of the works required to satisfy the Ontario Building Code Act.

Overall, heritage planning staff are supportive of the proposal given that it extends the life of the original 1919 structure and does not propose full demolition or removal. The grandstand has seen several alterations over the years, including in 1997. Continued renovations and maintenance work help to support the structural stability and safety of the building and support the continued function of the building for public use.

SIGNATURE

Prepared by:

Jeremy Parsons, M.A., CAHP
Senior Planner – Heritage

Departmental Approval:

Joan Jylanne, MCIP, RPP
Manager of Policy Planning

ATTACHMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Development Length (mm)</th>
<th>Lap Splice Length (mm)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beam</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slab</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Use of Tension Development Length**

- Elements noted otherwise on drawings.

**Tension Lap Splice**

- For structural concrete, lap splice lengths are determined based on the tensile strength of the concrete.

**Scale:**

- NTS (Not at Scale)
LOWER AND UPPER GROUND FLOOR PLAN

NOTES:
1. CONTRACTOR SHALL PROTECT ALL EXISTING MECHANICAL, AND ELECTRICAL INSTALLATIONS, INCLUDING CONDUITS, BOXES, PLUMBING, RAISING, LIGHTING, MOUNTED LOCKERS, AND EXISTING STRUCTURAL CONCRETE COLUMNS FROM DAMAGE DURING CONSTRUCTION.

REPAIR LEGEND:
1. Concrete columns shall be patched with a mix of concrete and aggregate to match the existing concrete.
2. Concrete floor shall be patched with a mix of concrete and aggregate to match the existing concrete.
3. Existing electrical conduits shall be patched with a mix of concrete and aggregate to match the existing concrete.
4. Existing mechanical systems shall be replaced with new systems.

SCALE: 1:75

FIG.1 FIG.2 FIG.3 FIG.4 FIG.5 FIG.6
FLANGE REPAIR ELEVATION

1. SANDBLAST TO CLEAN EXIST.
2. REMOVE AND REPLACE CONCRETE COLUMN BEYOND CONCRETE PILASTER.
   FOR DETAIL.

WEB REPAIR ELEVATION

NOTE:

SECTION

STEEL COLUMN BASE PREPARE DETAIL

NOTE:

SECTION

STEEL COLUMN REINFORCING DETAIL

NOTE:

SECTION

STEEL BEAM REINFORCING DETAIL

NOTE:

WEB REPAIR SECTION

NOTE:

WEBREPAIRING PLATES

NOTE:

TOP AND BOTTOM CHORD REPAIR

NOTE:
DOWNSPOUT

REPLACE EX. EAVES TROUGH W/ NEW SILICONE SEALANT. SLOPE EAVES SCREW AND CAULKED W/ CLEAR DOW.

5" WHITE 22 GA. ALUMINUM EAVES TRough AND CONNECT TO EX. JOINTED W/ GALV. SELF TAPPING SCREWS. 20'-0" SECTIONS TO BE INSTALLED TO MATCH EXISTING PROFILE.

INSTALL NEW 38mm CORRUGATED HWH SCREWS @ 300 c/c.

FASTEN SIDE-LAPS W/ HILTI NO. 10 HIGH FLUTES TO EX. WOOD BEAMS.

REMOVE EX. METAL DECK AND METAL DECK (22 Ga.). CONNECT DECK W/ NEOPRENE WASHER @150 c/c.

W/ 9 X 1 1/2" TEKS ROOFING SCREWS


doors, not to exceed 1200 lbs. per door.

NEW 2-PLY MODIFIED BITUMEN ROOF ASSEMBLIES

NEW 5" WHITE 22 GA. ALUMINUM EAVES TRough AND CONNECT TO EX. DOWNSPOUTS.

NEW GUARDRAIL AND REPLACE GUARDRAIL. SEE DETAIL 4/S9

EXIST WOOD DECK/RIM BOARDS. COLOR AND EXTENT TO MATCH EXISTING PROFILE.

NEW STEEL DECK BEYOND EX. 38X184 RAKER BEAM W/ 3 ROW 76mm 10D NAILS @ 300 c/c

ADD NEW 38X184 CONNECTED W/ NEW CONT. HSS 60X4.8 POST w/ 100 EXIST WOOD DECK

newCont. Hss 60x4.8 Rail

EX. 38X84 RAKER BEAM W/ 3 ROW 76mm 10D NAILS @ 300 c/c

EX. CONC. WALL

EX. REINF. GROUT CORE SOLID PRIOR TO CORING. DO NOT CUT FOUNDATION WALL CAP REINF.

LOCATIONS @950+/- (SITE VERIFY). SCAN TO LOCATE EX. GUARD POST CORE AT EX. GUARD POST

NEW HSS 60X4.8 POST w/ 100 EMBED. INTO 100 DIA. X 100 DEEP

EXIST WOOD DECK

NEW/EXIST. SHEATHING

NEW 2-PLY MODIFIED BITUMEN ROOF ASSEMBLIES

EXIST W310 STEEL RAKER BEAM

REPLACE W/ NEW EX. GUARDRAIL AND REMOVE GUARDRAIL. SEE DETAIL 4/S9

EXIST WOOD RIM BOARDS.

NEW CONT. HSS 60X4.8 RAIL

EX. STEEL TRUSS

EX. STEEL COLUMN

EX. STACK VENT

NEW GUARDRAIL REINSTATED AFTER HEADER REPAIR

EXIST. DOOR/WINDOW AND FRAME TO BE REMOVED, PROTECTED AND REQUIRED TO REPAIR DOOR/WINDOW HEADER

CUT BACK EX. WOOD DECKING AND JOISTS AS REQUIRED TO REPAIR DOOR/WINDOW HEADER.

LOCATION (MIN.) - 1/2" NOT TO EXCEED 1200 MIN. PER CENTER LINE.

150 MIN.

700 MIN. SPLICE

150 MIN.

200 MIN.

PORTION OF EX. DOOR/WINDOW HEADER CONCRETE TO BE REPAIRED

NEW 2-15M DOWELS W/ HILTI 12 DIA. HILTI HAS-E RODS @400 INSTALLATION OF NEW ANCHORS

REPAIR AS REQUIRED EX. DOOR/WINDOW OPENING SECTION

EXIST. GUARDRAIL AND REMOVE GUARDRAIL. SEE DETAIL 4/S9

EXISTING METS WASHROOM/FLOOR

REMOVE EX. METAL DECK AND INSTALL NEW 28 ga. CORRUGATED METAL DECK HIGHLITLES TO EX. WOOD BEAMS. @ 8 X 1 1/2" TEKS DRIVING SCREWS. W/ NEOPRENE WASHER @150 c/c.

FASTEN DECK-APRIL HILTI No. 10 HEAD SCREWS @ 200 c/c.

NEW METAL DECK

NEW DOWNSPOUTS MATCHING EXIST.

NEW DOWNSPOUTS W/ EXIST. EAVES TRough W/ NEW CONT. HSS 60X4.8 POST W/ 100 EXIST. EAVES TRough

EXISTING MEN'S WASHROOM FLOOR

REMOVE AND REPLACE EX. DOWNSPOUT W/ NEW DOWNSPOUT MATCHING EXIST.
Dickson Park Grandstand

2019 Structural Condition Assessment

30 Park Hill Road West
Cambridge, Ontario

October 16, 2019 - FINAL
RJC No. TOR.124478.0001

Prepared for:

The City of Cambridge
50 Dickson Street, PO Box 669
Cambridge, ON N1R 5W8

Prepared by:

Read Jones Christoffersen Ltd.
22 Frederick Street, Suite 1014
Kitchener, ON N2H 6M6
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Read Jones Christoffersen Ltd. (RJC) was authorized by Ms. Lisa Keys of the City of Cambridge to undertake a structural condition assessment of the Dickson Park Grandstand located at 30 Park Hill Road West in Cambridge, Ontario. The Dickson Park Grandstand is a two level spectator facility located at Dickson Park in Cambridge, Ontario. The Grandstand consists of two primary levels; the public grandstand exterior seating area with roof above and the various interior storage and maintenance rooms below.

Based on the findings of this review, the Dickson Park Grandstand structure generally appears to be in fair condition relative to its age. Localized areas of corrosion related deterioration were noted during our review. Localized repairs are recommended at these locations in the short term (1-2 years) as outlined in Chapter 5.1 to reinstate the existing load carrying capacity of the structure. We recommend these repairs are phased over two years with the immediate concerns addressed in year one. Our opinion of the probably construction costs excluding H.S.T., engineering fees, material testing costs and assuming all the work is phased over two years, in 2019 dollars is in the order of $160,000 to $190,000.

With the exception of one interior room, the majority of the bleacher wood and steel framing could not be reviewed due to the presence of the interior sloped metal deck ceiling. Temporary removal of the metal deck is recommended in order to facilitate a thorough visual review of the bleacher framing in the short term (1-2 years).

In addition, replacement of the roof, recoating of the grandstand roof structural steel members and removal/replacement of the interior partition walls and retaining wall south of the grandstand is recommended in the medium term (3-5 years) to address the remaining noted deterioration and install effective moisture protection systems on the roof deck and roof steel structure. These repairs are outlined in Chapter 5.2 of this report. Our opinion of the probably construction costs excluding H.S.T., engineering fees, material testing costs and assuming all the work is undertaken in one program in 2019 dollars is as follows:

1. Wholesale built-up roofing system replacement $100,000 to $120,000
2. Wholesale recoating of structural steel members $125,000 to $150,000
3. Replacement of partition and retaining walls $50,000 to $70,000

Installation of an elastomeric coating on the exterior of the perimeter walls is recommended in the long term to provide an effective moisture protection system to reduce further corrosion related deterioration of the perimeter concrete walls. In addition, retrofit of the existing steel guard rail around the perimeter of the grandstand seating area should be considered as it does not appear to be in conformance with the requirements of the current Building Code. This work may be completed over the long term (6-10 years) or as budgets allow. These repairs are outlined in Chapter 5.2 of this report. Our opinion of the probably construction costs excluding H.S.T., engineering fees, material testing costs and assuming all the work is undertaken in one program in 2019 dollars is as follows:

1. Perimeter wall elastomeric coating installation $50,000 to $70,000
2. Modification of the grandstand railings $75,000 to $100,000
1.0 INTRODUCTION

Read Jones Christoffersen Ltd. (RJC) was authorized by Ms. Lisa Keys of the City of Cambridge to undertake a structural condition assessment of the Dickson Park Grandstand located at 30 Park Hill Road West in Cambridge, Ontario, as outlined in our proposal dated August 16, 2019 (RJC No. TOR.099521.0001).

In general, the purpose of this visual structural condition assessment was to determine the present condition of the Dickson Park Grandstand structure (i.e. concrete walls, steel roof framing, wood bleachers, landscaping walls, stairs, etc.) and roofing system in order to determine the extent of repairs and maintenance required to maintain the structure in a serviceable and functioning condition for the next ten (10) years. This report presents our findings of the types and extent of deterioration currently evident, complete with a recommended course of action for repairs and maintenance required, including our opinion of probable construction costs for the recommended repairs.

As part of this review, the following work, briefly described below, was carried out:

.1 Review of available drawings, documents and reports describing the structural systems and previous evaluation/repair programs undertaken at this facility.

.2 Discussion with facility staff regarding known problems or other items of concern with respect to the building structure and roofing systems.

.3 A comprehensive interior visual walk-through examination of the building to identify visually obvious signs of distress and/or deterioration in the various structural elements (i.e. steel/timber framing, exposed concrete foundation walls, etc.).

.4 A comprehensive exterior visual walk-through examination around the perimeter of the building to identify visually obvious signs of distress and/or deterioration at the exposed areas of the concrete foundation walls, steel/concrete columns, steel roof framing, wood bleachers, landscaping retaining walls and steel/concrete stairwells. In general, the exterior visual review was completed from grade level and where accessible from a boom lift to review the condition of the roof framing system, roofing system and steel columns near the top of the Grandstand.

Review of the existing door and window systems was not included within the scope of this review. Note that this review of the exposed elements was visual in nature only; destructive testing and exploratory openings were not included as part of the scope of work at this time.

This report is exclusively for the use and benefit of the client identified on the first page of this report and is not for the use and benefit of, nor may it be relied upon by, any other entity. The contents of this report may not be quoted in whole or in part or distributed to any person or entity other than the client.
2.0 BUILDING DESCRIPTION AND HISTORY

2.1 General Description of the Facility

The Dickson Park Grandstand is a two level spectating facility located at Dickson Park in Cambridge, Ontario. The property is bound by Park Hill Road West to the south, James Street to the north, Park Ave to the west, and George Street North to the east. The grandstand serves as a spectating facility for the adjacent baseball field and other events within Dickson Park (Refer to Photograph No. 1 in Appendix A). It is our understanding that the Dickson Park Grandstand was constructed circa 1919 (Refer to Figure 1).

The Dickson Park Grandstand has a rectangular footprint with base plan dimensions of approximately 130 feet in the north/south direction and 35 feet in the east/west direction. The structure consists of two primary sections; the public grandstand seating with roof structure and the ground level storage rooms below. The various rooms below the grandstand bleachers include a maintenance storage room (101), change room (102), shower/washroom (103), a second larger change room (104), equipment storage room (105), storage room (106) and independent male and female washrooms. Refer to Figure No. 1 in Appendix B for a partial plan of the various interior rooms and partition wall layout. The use of the lower level rooms generally has been converted into maintenance/equipment storage rooms since the original construction of the Dickson Park Grandstand; however, they will be referred to by their original use/function throughout the report. Access to the lower interior rooms (101 to 106) is provided through doorways along the east elevation at the dugout level (Refer to Photograph No. 2 in Appendix A). The men’s washroom is accessed from the south elevation and the women’s washroom is accessed from a stairwell at the west elevation of the grandstand (Refer to Photograph No. 3 in Appendix A).

2.2 Drawings and Previous Reports Reviewed

The original structural and architectural drawings for the grandstand building were not available for review.

An architectural drawing (78-P-76) prepared by Cambridge Community Services Department dated September 1978 was available for review. The drawing including installation of an interior eaves trough and metal deck water collection system to capture water from the grandstand above. The drawings also detail an interior renovation of the various rooms below the grandstand, including upgrades to the interior finishes and fixtures and installation of a 3 inch thick concrete slab-on-grade within the maintenance storage room (101).
A drawing (SAX-10-005) related to the replacement of the south exterior steel staircase was available for review. The drawing was prepared by KWO Ironworks, dated August 18, 2010, and bears the stamp of Y. Sze, Registered Professional Engineer in the Province of Ontario.

Finally, a condition assessment report prepared by Tacoma Engineers dated September 15, 2016 was available for our review. The report bears the stamp of G.H. Zegerius Licensed Professional Engineer in the Province of Ontario.

2.3 Detailed Description of Building Structure

Based on our review of the available documents and visual review of the site, the Dickson Park Grandstand utilizes a variety of structural systems including cast-in-place concrete, timber framing and structural steel framing.

1. Roof Structure

The roof of the grandstand is a low-sloped roof structure with a single slope highest along its east elevation (Refer to Photograph No. 4 and 5 in Appendix A). The roofing system appears to be a built-up roofing (BUR) with a pea gravel ballast installed on the surface of a wood plank roof deck with the planks spanning in the north-south direction.

The roof framing system is primarily constructed of timber beams, steel beams and steel trusses (Refer to Photograph No. 6 in Appendix A). Six inch by 10 inch timber beams (spaced at approx. 88 inches on centre) directly support the wood plank roof deck and span in the east-west direction. The timber beams are supported along the west elevation and at mid span by 15 inch deep steel beam W-sections which span in the north-south direction. The timber beams are supported along the east elevation by a 66 inch deep steel truss. The steel beams and OWSJ spanning in the north-south direction are framed into steel W-section columns (Refer to Photograph No. 7 in Appendix A). The steel beam localized near the centre of the roof is supported by steel trusses spanning the east-west direction. The steel trusses (spaced at approx. 30 ft. on centre) span the east-west direction and vary in depth from the west elevation to a maximum depth at the east elevation of 66 inches (Refer to Photograph No. 8 in Appendix A). The roof framing is supported by 5.25 inch deep steel W-section columns along the east and west elevations of the grandstand (Refer to Photograph No. 9 in Appendix A). Based on our visual review, it appears the lateral bracing system for the grandstand roof structure consists of vertical tension rod cross bracing bays.

2. Grandstand Structure

The grandstand bleacher framing system is primarily constructed of a combination of steel and timber framing supported by steel columns, and perimeter concrete foundation walls (Refer to Photographs No. 10 and 11 in Appendix A). The grandstand tiered seating area is constructed of wood planks spanning in the north-south direction. The wood planks are supported by sloped wood raker beams and framing below (Refer to Photograph No. 12 in Appendix A).
Appendix A). In general, the wood raker beams consist of dimensional lumber varying in size spanning the east-west direction spaced at approximately 30 inches on centre. The raker beams are supported by timber beams, spanning the north-south direction at approximately 76 inches on centre. The timber beams are supported by sloped, 12 inch deep steel W-sections spanning the east-west direction (Refer to Photograph No. 13 in Appendix A). The ends of the steel beams are cast into concrete pilasters along the east and west perimeter walls (Refer to Photograph No. 14 in Appendix A). In addition, the beams are supported at approx. mid-span by steel W-section columns.

Four stairs provide pedestrian access to the grandstand area including two concrete stairs at the west elevation and two steel-framed stairs at the east elevation (Refer to Photographs No. 15 and 16 in Appendix A). The steel stair at the southeast corner of the grandstand was reported to have been replaced in 2010 based on the available drawings.

A wood framed dugout roof structure is located along the east elevation of the grandstand. A wood framed dugout roof structure appears to be supported by the grandstand perimeter foundation walls along the west side and wood posts along the east side. A corrugated steel roof is secured to the roof wood framing.

Perimeter Walls, Rooms and Foundations

The review of the perimeter walls and foundations was limited to the exposed sections above grade. The walls and pilasters around the perimeter of the structure generally appear to consist of reinforced, cast-in-place concrete construction (Refer to Photograph No. 17 in Appendix A). The type and condition of the foundation systems utilized are not known at this time. The walls around the perimeter of the structure appear to be approximately 8 inches thick min. Although not visible at the time of review, it is assumed that the buried foundations consist of concrete strip footings and pad footings centered under the columns. Steel guardrails are present around the perimeter of the grandstand area and anchored to the top of the concrete walls (Refer to Photograph No. 18 in Appendix A).

A concrete stair enclosure is constructed proud of the west perimeter wall to enclose the women’s washroom access stair. The enclosure appears to be constructed of reinforced cast-in-place concrete walls, roof slab and on-grade concrete stairs (Refer to Photograph No. 19 in Appendix A).

Interior partition walls are constructed within the various rooms below the grandstand. The partitions generally appear to be constructed of a combination of brick masonry and concrete masonry units (Refer to Photograph No. 20 in Appendix A). Based on our review of the available drawings, the interior ground floor slab in the maintenance storage area (101) consists of a 3 inch thick concrete slab-on-grade constructed on a 4 inch thick granular “A” base. With the exception of the storage room (106), the remaining rooms have a concrete slab-on-grade of unknown thickness. Storage room (106) does not appear to have a finished floor structure-on-grade.
4. Landscaping

The landscaping directly adjacent the grandstand structure consisted of a combination of hard and soft landscaping elements. The hard landscaping includes asphalt walkways and four on-grade concrete staircases providing pedestrian access to the south and west elevations of the grandstand (Refer to Photographs No. 21 and 22 in Appendix A). Concrete retaining walls are utilized to the south of the grandstand to create a series of soft landscaped planter beds (Refer to Photograph No. 23 in Appendix A). In addition to the planter bed, soft landscaping including sod, and various plantings are located around the grandstand structure.

2.4 History of Previous Repairs and Alterations

Although exact records were not available at the time of our review, it is our understanding that the original Dickson Park Grandstand structure was constructed circa 1919. Based on our review of the available drawings, an interior renovation was completed circa 1978 to upgrade the existing fixtures and finishes within the various rooms below the grandstand and install an eaves trough/sloped metal deck to collect water entering these rooms via the bleacher framing above (Refer to Photograph No. 24 in Appendix A).

The exterior steel staircase at the southeast corner of the grandstand appears to be replaced in 2010 based on the available project drawings.

Based on our conversation with the City of Cambridge building staff on site it is our understanding the men’s and women’s washrooms below the grandstand area were decommissioned in approximately 2016 at which time a new washroom/changeroom facility was constructed at the site. Staff advised regular maintenance of the grandstand wood planks is required in the order of approximately $5,000 per year to replace all deteriorated/uneven bleacher deck boards (Refer to Photograph No. 25 in Appendix A).
3.0 DESCRIPTION OF FIELD WORK AND RESULTS

The field work associated with this review was performed by RJC on September 12, 2019. Representatives of Read Jones Christoffersen Ltd. performed a visual examination of the accessible areas of the grandstand structure to record areas of visually obvious deterioration and obtain a general understanding of the present condition of the structure. Visual review of the roofing system and steel roof structure were completed in accessible areas via a boom lift. The remainder of the building was reviewed from grade.

In addition to a visual review, a hammer tapping survey was completed of the accessible surfaces of the exposed concrete perimeter walls and pilasters in order to identify localized areas of concrete delamination.

The hammer tap survey is a technique used to locate concrete delaminations. Concrete delaminations are typically the result of corrosion of the embedded reinforcing steel. Corrosion products of reinforcing steel occupy many times the volume of the original material. This swelling of the embedded reinforcing steel creates very high tensile stresses within the concrete and can cause delamination and spalling of the concrete cover at locations of reinforcing steel corrosion. These delaminations may not be initially visible as concrete spalls, but can be detected by the hollow sound created when they are struck with a heavy metallic object such as a steel hammer.

The tables below summarize our visual observations organized by segments of the structure:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Area</th>
<th>Observed Deterioration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roofing System and Wood Deck</td>
<td>• In general, the exposed surface of the built-up roofing system appeared to be in fair to poor condition. Approximately 40 square feet of alligator cracking was observed within the flood coat of the built-up roofing system <em>(Refer to Photograph No. 26 in Appendix A).</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Debris including large rocks, sticks and litter were observed on the surface of the roof.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• A localized visual review of the roofing system indicated the flood coat of the BUR system was brittle with poor adhesion between the pea gravel, flood coat and underlying roofing felts. The underlying roofing felts in the area of localized review appear to be in fair condition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Review of the wood roof deck boards was limited to the soffit due to the presence of the BUR system. In general, the roof wood deck boards appeared to be in fair condition exhibiting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
localized areas of apparent water leakage in the form of peeling paint and water staining *(Refer to Photograph No. 27 in Appendix A).*

- A section of eaves trough, approximately 20 feet in length, along the west roof perimeter was noted to be deformed and no longer in a serviceable condition *(Refer to Photograph No. 28 in Appendix A).*

### 2 Roof Structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Area</th>
<th>Observed Deterioration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roof Structure</td>
<td>- No significant evidence of visually obvious distress/deterioration was observed on the timber roof beams.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- In general, the steel trusses appear to be in fair condition with surface rusting located throughout. One curved double angle supporting the east cantilevered section of roof at the north east corner of the grandstand appeared to be exhibiting localized evidence of corrosion related steel deterioration (i.e. sectional loss) <em>(Refer to Photograph No. 29 in Appendix A).</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The steel W-columns are in fair condition exhibiting localized evidence of corrosion related steel deterioration. Steel sectional loss was noted at the base of one column along the west elevation and surface rusting was noted throughout <em>(Refer to Photograph No. 30 in Appendix A).</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The existing paint coating on the surface of the steel roof framing members appears to be in fair to poor condition exhibiting rust staining, alligator cracking and debonding of the coating from the steel members <em>(Refer to Photograph No. 31 in Appendix A).</em> The age and type of the existing paint coating are unknown at this time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- With the exception of the steel column and angle deterioration noted above, no significant evidence of visually obvious structural distress/deterioration was observed on the roof structural steel framing components (i.e. W-beams, steel trusses, and exterior W-columns).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3. Bleacher Structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Area</th>
<th>Observed Deterioration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Bleacher Framing | - Review of the underside of the grandstand structure was limited to the storage room (106) due to the presence of a sloped corrugated metal deck secured to the underside of the grandstand framing in the remaining rooms. It is our understanding the sloped metal decking collects water and debris which pass through the grandstand wood deck boards. The decking drains into the interior eaves trough installed in 1978.  
- The surface of the bleacher wood deck boards appear to be of various ages and range in condition from good to poor *(Refer to Photograph No. 32 in Appendix A)*.  
- In general, no significant evidence of visually obvious distress/deterioration was observed on the accessible interior framing elements (i.e. steel W-beams, timber beams and light frame lumber raker beams). However, localized steel deterioration was observed at the sloped steel bleacher beam at the concrete pilaster support *(Refer to Photograph No. 33 in Appendix A)*.  
- The accessible steel columns appeared to be in fair condition. No deterioration or items of concern were observed at the time of the review; however, it was noted in Tacoma Engineering’s condition assessment *(dated September 2016)* that two steel column bases were severely corroded within the shower room (103). These areas were inaccessible at the time of the review due to presence of storage containers.  
- In general, the interior partition walls separating the lower levels appeared to be in fair to poor condition. The clay and masonry block partition walls appear to be exhibiting signs of deterioration at their mortar joints and loose bricks were noted within the partition assemblies. In addition, the partition walls were noted to be laterally unsupported at the top of the walls  
- The accessible areas of the cast-in-place concrete slab-on-grade appeared to be in fair condition considering their age. No significant evidence of visually obvious distress/deterioration was observed. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Perimeter Walls | • In general, the exterior of the perimeter concrete foundation walls appear to be in fair to poor condition. Approximately 255 square feet of delaminated concrete spalling and 60 linear feet of horizontal cracking was observed on the accessible areas of the exterior concrete perimeter walls *(Refer to Photographs No. 34 and 35 in Appendix A).*  
  • The interior of the perimeter walls appears to be in fair condition. Approximately 15 linear feet of horizontal cracking and 20 square feet of concrete delaminations were noted on the interior of the perimeter foundation walls *(Refer to Photograph No. 36 in Appendix A).* |
| Washrooms       | • In general, the female washroom concrete entrance stair enclosure appears to be poor condition. Separation cracks were observed between the grandstand perimeter walls, the stair enclosure and the stair enclosure roof. In addition, water ingress was noted on the interior of the enclosure at the crack locations. *(Refer to Photograph No. 37 in Appendix A).* |
| Guardrail       | • In general, the steel guardrail around the perimeter of the grandstand seating area appears to be in fair condition; however, it was noted the guardrail does not appear to be in conformance with height and climbability requirements of the 2012 Ontario Building Code *(Refer to Photograph No. 38 in Appendix A).* |
| Dugout          | • In general, the timber framed dugout along the east elevation appears to be in fair condition. One wood column at the north extent of the dugout appears to have been displaced *(Refer to Photograph No. 39 in Appendix A).* |
| Stairs          | • In general, the two exterior concrete stairs providing access to the west side of the grandstand are in poor condition. Approximately 35 square feet of delaminated concrete was observed on the exposed sections of the stair foundations. In addition, the existing stair railings do not appear to meet the current climbability requirements of the 2012 Ontario Building Code *(Refer to Photograph No. 40 in Appendix A).*  
  • The two metal staircases providing access to the east elevation of the grandstand appears to be in good to fair condition. No significant evidence of deterioration was observed on the stair |
structures. Concrete deterioration was noted on the foundation wall at the stair knee brace anchors at both stair locations (Refer to Photograph No. 41 in Appendix A).

### 4 Landscaping

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Area</th>
<th>Observed Deterioration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landscaping</td>
<td>- In general, the lower retaining wall south of the grandstand is in poor condition. Approximately 40% of the concrete retaining wall is exhibiting evidence of concrete deterioration in the form of cracking and concrete spalls (Refer to Photograph No. 42 in Appendix A).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The on-grade concrete stairs south of the grandstand appear to be in fair condition considering their age.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.0 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Based on the findings of this review, the Dickson Park Grandstand at 30 Park Hill Road West in Cambridge, Ontario generally appears to be in fair condition relative to its age. Localized repairs are recommended in the short term to address the localized deterioration observed. Repairs are recommended over the short term (1-2 years), medium term (3-5 years) and long term (6-10 years) to assist in capital planning and prioritization of the required repairs. Based on the findings of this review, the deterioration of the structure is expected to progress at an accelerated rate if the current deterioration is not addressed.

Based on the information obtained from our survey, we provide the following discussion and conclusions:

.1 In general, the built-up roofing system appears to be in fair to poor condition and is nearing the end of its effective service life. Wholesale replacement of the BUR roofing system is recommended in the medium term (3-5 years) to reinstate the effectiveness of the roofing system and prevent further deterioration of the structural members below. Localized repair of the damaged eaves trough is recommended in the short term (1-2 years) to reinstate the effectiveness of the drainage system in the near term.

Alligator cracking of the flood coat and the poor adhesion between the flood coat and the underlying roofing felts indicate the roof system is nearing the end of its effective service life. In addition, the water damages (i.e. peeling paint, water staining) on the underside of the wood roof deck boards indicate the current system is no longer effective in preventing the ingress of moisture. Replacement of the deteriorated deck boards is recommended to be completed at the time of wholesale roof replacement.

.2 In general, the structural elements of the roof framing system (wood and steel beams, trusses) appear to be in fair condition and are functioning as per their design intent. Corrosion related steel deterioration with steel section loss was observed at localized areas throughout the structure which affect the load carrying capacity of these elements. Localized structural steel repairs are required in the short term (1-2 years) to reinstate the original load carrying capacity of the structure.

Sectional loss of the structural steel members was noted at four locations throughout the structure (curved roof truss angle, one exterior west columns base, two interior column bases). Localized structural repairs are required at these locations to address the steel deterioration and address the reduced capacity of these elements.

.3 The existing paint coating on the exposed roof steel framing elements appears to be in fair to poor condition throughout with cracking and debonded paint. In addition, areas of surface corrosion were observed throughout the exposed roof framing components. Wholesale removal of existing coatings and surface rust, surface preparation, and
recoating of the exposed structural steel members is recommended for the medium term (3-5 years) to protect the structural steel systems from corrosion related deterioration over the long term.

Wholesale recoating the structural steel members is recommended to protect the structure in the long term from corrosion related deterioration. Prior to removal of the existing coating it is recommended a Designated Substances Survey is completed at the site to confirm if the existing coating on the surface of the structural steel is a lead containing material.

.4 The bleacher wood deck boards are generally in good to fair condition exhibiting signs of localized age related deterioration. The localized repair/maintenance programs recently completed appear to have replaced the most severely deteriorated deck boards; however, based on the typical service life of treated light frame lumber in exposed environmental conditions, ongoing localized replacement should be budgeted for the lifespan of the structure.

The localized replacement of the wood deck boards completed in 2019 appears to have addressed and severe deteriorated areas. Based on our conversation with maintenance staff on site, the annual cost of replacement of the deteriorated deck boards is in the order of $5,000.

.5 With the exception of one interior room, the majority of the bleacher wood and steel framing could not be reviewed due to the presence of the interior sloped metal deck ceiling. Temporary removal of the metal deck is recommended in order to facilitate a thorough visual review of the bleacher framing in the short term (1-2 years).

.6 The interior partition walls dividing the various rooms below the grandstand are in poor condition exhibiting evidence of mortar loss within the joints and loose brick units within the walls. In addition, based on our visual review, the walls do not appear to be laterally supported at the top. It is our understanding there is no current mandate to bring the walls in line with current code requirements; however, as there is significant deterioration to the wall structures we recommended demolition of the existing partition walls and, if required, replacement with new laterally supported block or light timber framed partition walls in the medium term (3-5 years).

.7 Localized concrete deterioration was observed on the interior and exterior of the perimeter concrete foundation walls. The extent of the concrete deterioration appears to be moderate and may be affecting the load carrying capacity of the concrete elements. Localized concrete repairs are recommended in the short term (1-2 years) to address the current extent of the corrosion related concrete deterioration. To protect the perimeter walls from further water ingress and corrosion related deterioration in the long term, installation of an elastomeric coating on the exterior of the perimeter walls above grade is recommended (6-10 years).
In general, the steel guard rail around the perimeter of the grandstand seating area appears to be in fair condition; however, it does not meet the current height or climbability requirements of the 2012 Ontario Building Code. We are not currently aware of any legal requirements to retroactively upgrade this building to meet current Building Code requirements, however, the stakeholders may elect to proceed with a guard retrofit as a matter of risk aversion. This work may be completed over the long term (6-10 years) or as budgets allow.

The lower landscaping retaining wall south of the grandstand is in poor condition and is exhibiting evidence of corrosion and age related deterioration. Wholesale replacement of the retaining wall is recommended in the medium term (3-5 years).

The two concrete stairs providing access to the west elevation of the grandstand appear to be in poor condition. The deterioration has reached the point where wholesale replacement of the existing concrete stairs is recommended. Replacement of the existing stair railings is recommended as they do not conform to the climbability or guard spacing requirements of the current Building Code. Replacement of the two stairs and stair guardrails is recommended in the short term (1-2 years).

Localized repair of the displaced wood post at the dugout is recommended in the short term (1-2 years).

With regards to all of the repairs outlined above, it is our understanding the building is designated as a heritage site by the City of Cambridge. In general, modifications made which affect the overall physical appearance of the structure typically would need to be reviewed by the heritage committee having jurisdiction. The stakeholders should consider this during the design of the repairs noted above.
5.0 RECOMMENDED COURSES OF ACTION

In general, we recommend the following repairs be performed to rehabilitate the deterioration observed to date, to provide protection against the ingress of moisture and/or chlorides and to prevent continuing corrosion related concrete and steel deterioration from occurring. Short term (1-2 years), medium term (3-5 years) and long term (6-10 years) recommendations are outlined below.

The estimated cost of the proposed repairs are included in Chapter 6.0 of this report.

5.1 Short Term Repairs (1 – 2 Years)

In general, we recommend the following repairs be performed in the short term (1 – 2 years) to address the observed deterioration and to protect the structure against further deterioration in the long term.

- Localized replacement of the grandstand bleacher wood deck boards (annually)
- Localized repair of the deteriorated grandstand structural steel roof angle and column bases.
- Localized concrete delamination repairs to the exterior and interior perimeter foundation walls.
- Localized repair of the existing eaves trough along the west elevation.
- Repair of the displaced dugout timber post.
- Replacement of the two concrete stairs and railings at west side of the grandstand.
- Visual review of bleacher framing system, including contractor assistance with temporary removal/reinstatement of ceiling sloped metal decking

This repair option will address the immediate deterioration concerns noted during our review and reinstate the original load carrying capacity of the structure. We recommend that these repairs be phased over the next two years with the most immediate repairs completed in year one. It should be noted the opinion of probable construction cost for these repairs includes a cash allowance of $10,000 for the repair of embedded steel elements due to the lack of information available related to the as-built construction of the structure. Delays in undertaking the required repairs will result in ongoing deterioration of the identified items at an accelerated rate, greater repair costs and potential further loss of the load carrying capacity of the structure.

5.2 Medium Term Repairs (3 – 5 Years)

In general, we recommend the following repairs be performed in the medium term (3 – 5 years) to address the observed deterioration and to protect the structure against further deterioration in the long term.

- Localized replacement of the grandstand bleacher wood deck boards (annually)
- Wholesale replacement of the built-up roofing system.
- Wholesale surface preparations and recoating of all exterior structural steel roof framing and column members.
• Removal and replacement (if required) of the interior brick/block partition walls
• Replacement of the lower landscaping retaining wall south of the grandstand

This repair option will address the remainder of the deterioration noted during our review and install effective moisture protection systems on the steel framing and roof deck to protect from further moisture and corrosion related deterioration of the roof structure. We recommend that these repairs be implemented over the next 3 to 5 years.

5.3 Long Term Repairs (6 – 10 Years)

In general, we recommend the following repairs be performed in the long term (6 - 10 years) to address the observed deterioration and to protect the structure against further deterioration in the long term.

• Localized replacement of the grandstand wood deck boards (annually)
• Installation of an elastomeric coating on the exterior of the exposed perimeter foundation walls
• Modifications to the existing grandstand railing system to bring into conformance with current Building Code requirements

These repairs will provide an effective moisture protection system on the exterior of the perimeter foundation walls and address the non-conformance of the existing railing system with relation to the current Building Code. We recommend these repairs be implemented over the next 6 – 10 years or as budgets allow.
6.0 OPINION OF PROBABLE CONSTRUCTION COSTS

The following costs for the repair of the Dickson Park Grandstand represent our opinion of the probable construction costs and are based on the information obtained during this condition survey assessment. The final costs will not be known until such time that the work is tendered and completed and the final quantities of required concrete repairs are known. It is not possible to accurately forecast the final bid unit-prices that may be tendered for the work because they are directly related to the construction climate at the time of tendering. The following cost estimates should be treated as "ballpark" or Class "C" figures only and cannot be guaranteed accurate (Class "C" probable costs – a statement of general requirements and an outline of a solution (degree of accuracy +/- 25%)).

Probable Construction Costs are in 2019 dollars and do not include soft costs or H.S.T. unless noted otherwise. Soft Costs include engineering fees (including disbursements), material testing, and permits. Typically these costs are in the range of 8 – 10% of the Probable Construction Cost.

Based on the construction review experience we have had in the field of structural repair and rehabilitation, we advise that it is reasonable to assume that the repair quantities - as compared to those deteriorated quantities observed during the condition survey - will be larger. Different items for repair characteristically have exhibited different increases in size during the repair program. Our following summaries which outline the probable construction costs, has considered this increase from the observed deteriorated quantities.

Consideration to complete various repairs outlined below into a fewer number of projects is recommended to take advantage of efficiencies and economies of scale.

6.1 Short Term Repairs

The probable construction cost for the repairs described in Chapter 5.1 of this report excluding H.S.T., engineering fees, material testing costs and assuming all the work is undertaken in one program in 2019 dollars is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.1 Grandstand deck board maintenance</td>
<td>$5,000/year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.2 Localized short term structural repairs (as outlined in 5.1)</td>
<td>$160,000 to $190,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.3 Visual review of bleacher framing system</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.2 Medium Term Repairs

The probable construction cost for the repairs described in Chapter 5.2 of this report excluding H.S.T., engineering fees, material testing costs and assuming all the work is undertaken in one program in 2019 dollars is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.1 Grandstand deck board maintenance</td>
<td>$5,000/year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
.2 Wholesale replacement of built-up roofing system $100,000 to $120,000
.3 Wholesale recoating of exterior structural steel members $125,000 to $150,000
.4 Replacement of partition and retaining walls $50,000 to $70,000

6.3 Long Term Repairs

The probable construction cost for the repairs described in Chapter 5.3 of this report excluding H.S.T., engineering fees, material testing costs and assuming all the work is undertaken in one program in 2019 dollars is as follows:

.1 Grandstand deck board maintenance $5,000/year
.2 Perimeter wall elastomeric coating installation $50,000 to $70,000
.3 Modification of the grandstand railings $75,000 to $100,000
7.0 CLOSING REMARKS

Thank you for selecting Read Jones Christoffersen Ltd. for this project. RJC would be pleased to assist you with the implementation of our recommendations. Should you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact this office.

This report prepared by:

READ JONES CHRISTOFFERSEN LTD.

[Signatures]
Jordan Ladd, B.Eng., EIT
Engineering Intern
Building Science and Restoration

Reviewed by:
Tim Van Zwol, M.Sc., P.Eng.
Regional Manager/Associate
Building Science and Restoration

Ryan Dougherty, BASc, EIT
Engineering Intern
Building Science and Restoration

Reviewed by:
Jeremy Horst, C.E.T., LEED AP
Principal, Group Leader
Building Science and Restoration
Appendix ‘A’

Photographs
Photograph No. 1: Overview of the Dickson Park Grandstand structure.

Photograph No. 2: View of the east elevation ground level dugout with lower storage/maintenance rooms.
Photograph No. 3: View of the west elevation. Red arrow identifies the women’s washroom stair enclosure.

Photograph No. 4: View of the north elevation. Roof slopes from east to west.
Photograph No. 5: Overview of the existing built up roofing (BUR) system.

Photograph No. 6: Overview of the existing roof structure framing system.
Photograph No. 7: View of steel truss spanning in north-south direction.

Photograph No. 8: View of steel trusses spanning in east-west direction.
Photograph No. 9: Overview of the typical steel W-columns supporting the roof structure.

Photograph No. 10: View of the wood deck boards on bleachers.
Photograph No. 11: View of the bleacher framing system.

Photograph No. 12: View of the bleacher framing construction.
Photograph No. 13: View of timber beams spanning north-south (red arrow) and steel beams spanning east-west (blue arrow)

Photograph No. 14: View of steel W-beams cast into the perimeter wall concrete pilaster.
Photograph No. 15: View of the west side concrete stairs providing access.

Photograph No. 16: View of southeast steel-framed stair previously replaced circa 2010
Photograph No. 17: Interior view of the west concrete foundation wall.

Photograph No. 18: View of steel guardrail around east perimeter of grandstand.
Photograph No. 19: View of the stair enclosure providing access to the women’s washroom.

Photograph No. 20: View of typical interior partition walls.
Photograph No. 21: View of exterior landscaping including asphalt walkways and soft landscaping.

Photograph No. 22: View of on-grade concrete stairs south of the grandstand.
Photograph No. 23: View of the lower concrete retaining wall south of the grandstand.

Photograph No. 24: View of the eaves trough and sloped metal deck installed below the bleachers.
Photograph No. 25: View of previously replaced grandstand deck boards

Photograph No. 26: Localized roof area of exposed BUR flood coat exhibiting alligator cracking
Photograph No. 27: View of debonded paint and water staining on the soffit of roof wood deck boards.

Photograph No. 28: View of localized area of eaves trough damage along the west elevation.
Photograph No. 29: View of localized corrosion related deterioration at curved steel truss angle.

Photograph No. 30: View of localized steel corrosion related deterioration at column base.
Photograph No. 31: View of the existing coating exhibiting surface rust staining and debonding.

Photograph No. 32: View of varying condition of grandstand seating area wood deck boards.
Photograph No. 33: View of localized steel deterioration at bleacher steel beam support.

Photograph No. 34: View of localized concrete delamination at exterior of the perimeter foundation walls.
Photograph No. 35: View of typical concrete delamination at the exterior of the perimeter walls.

Photograph No. 36: View of concrete delamination at the interior perimeter walls.
Photograph No. 37: View of gap between women’s washroom stair enclosure and grandstand perimeter wall.

Photograph No. 38: View of existing railing along west perimeter of grandstand seating area.
Photograph No. 39: View of displaced wood post framing at dugout area.

Photograph No. 40: View of concrete deterioration at concrete stairs west of the grandstand.
Photograph No. 41: View of concrete deterioration at perimeter wall at the knee brace of the steel stair.

Photograph No. 42: View of delaminated concrete spalling and cracking at lower retaining wall.
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Lower Level Room Layout
Meeting Date: 11/17/2022  
To: Cambridge Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee

Report Date: 11/02/2022  
Report Author: Jeremy Parsons, Senior Planner - Heritage

Department: Development and Infrastructure  
Division: Planning

Report Title: Review of Proposed Changes to the Ontario Heritage Act Through Bill 23 (Schedule 6) – the Proposed More Homes Built Faster Act, 2022

File Nos: R01.01, R01.02  
Ward No: All Wards

RECOMMENDATIONS

THAT Report 22-028 (MHAC) Review of Proposed Changes to the Ontario Heritage Act Through Bill 23 (Schedule 6) – the Proposed More Homes Built Faster Act, 2022 be received for information purposes;

AND THAT comments received from the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee on the Proposed Changes to the Ontario Heritage Act Through Bill 23 (Schedule 6) – the Proposed More Homes Built Faster Act, 2022, inform the City’s response to the Ministry of Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism by November 24, 2022.

SUMMARY & BACKGROUND

The Government of Ontario has proposed changes to the Ontario Heritage Act through Bill 23 (Schedule 6), More Homes Built Faster Act, 2022. The proposed changes involve:
• Changes to the Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Provincial Heritage Properties;
• New requirements for municipal registers and the inclusion of non-designated properties on municipal heritage registers;
• An increase in the threshold for designation of Part IV individual properties and new limitations on designation for properties subject to proposed development; and,
• Changes to Heritage Conservation Districts.

A thirty-day consultation period, hosted by the Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism, began on October 25, 2022. Comments can be submitted through the Environmental Registry of Ontario until November 24, 2022. Staff formally requested comments from members of the MHAC for inclusion within a consolidated commenting package to the Province on October 28, 2022. Staff requested that comments be submitted by MHAC members to staff by November 11, 2022. A synopsis of MHAC comment themes will be presented to the Committee as part of the November 17, 2022 MHAC meeting.

Cambridge Cultural Heritage Resources Data

The City of Cambridge draws much of its character and identity from its connection with the Grand River, a designated Canadian Heritage River, and its historic founding communities of Galt, Preston, Hespeler and Blair. Formally recognized cultural heritage resources in the City of Cambridge include the following:

Part V Designated Properties (Heritage Conservation Districts)

There are 190 properties designated as part of three Heritage Conservation Districts.

- Blair Village
- Dickson Hill
- Main Street

The following two potential Heritage Conservation Districts are scheduled or underway:

- Galt Core (Underway, Plan Stage)
- Hespeler Core (Scheduled)

Part IV Designated Properties (Individually Designated Properties)

There are 145 properties individually designated and three (3) properties under Notice of Intention to Designate status. Council directed staff in 2019 to annually designate four (4) properties. Over the last seven years, 15 properties have been designated and one (1) property has been de-designated (by-law repeal).
Heritage Register

There are 335 designated properties on the Heritage Register and approximately 665 listed non-designated properties. Six properties have been de-listed within the last seven (7) years.

An overview of the proposed changes, implications and preliminary staff comments have been provided below.

OVERVIEW OF PROPOSED CHANGES

Part V Designated Properties (Heritage Conservation Districts):

- A process is proposed which will allow Heritage Conservation District Plans to be more easily amended or repealed.
- More stringent evaluation criteria will be established for the creation of Heritage Conservation District Plans, through subsequent regulation.

Part IV Designated Properties (Individually Designated Properties):

- There will be an increase in the threshold for designation of individual properties under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act and new limitations on designation for properties subject to proposed development.
- Currently, Section 29 of the Act provides that, if a prescribed event (Planning Act application) occurs, a Notice of Intention to Designate (NOID) for a property may not be given after 90 days have elapsed from the prescribed event, subject to such exceptions as may be prescribed. The proposed amendment to this section outlines that a municipality may only issue a NOID within the 90 days if the property is already listed on the Heritage Register under Section 27 as of the date of the prescribed event. If the property has no heritage status under the Act, a NOID cannot be issued if a prescribed event occurs.

Heritage Register:

- New requirements for the Heritage Register and the inclusion of non-designated properties on the Heritage Register have been established.
- Allowance is now made for property owners to object to their property being on the Heritage Register, regardless of when the property was added to the Register.
- The Heritage Register must be reviewed by municipalities and a decision made whether listed properties are to be designated or, if not, they must be removed from the Register within two (2) years. Any further properties added to the
Heritage Register after the proposed amendments come into force would be subject to the same two-year timeline from the time they are listed.

- If Council issues a NOID on a listed property, but a designation by-law is not passed or repealed upon appeal, the property would have to be removed from the Heritage Register.
- If a property is removed from the Heritage Register, it cannot be re-listed for a period of five years.
- The Heritage Register must be up-to-date and accessible on the City’s website.

Other Changes:

- Changes are proposed to the Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Provincial Heritage Properties, including that the Province or provincial agencies would not be required to abide by their own Standards and Guidelines if the Lieutenant Governor in Council is of the opinion the application of the Guidelines would compete with other provincial priorities.

IDENTIFIED IMPLICATIONS OF PROPOSED CHANGES

Part V Designated Properties (Heritage Conservation Districts):

- The new legislation will ensure it is more challenging to designate new Districts, proposing to “increase the rigour in the process of identifying and protecting HCDs by requiring municipalities to apply a prescribed criteria to determine an HCDs cultural heritage value”.
- Existing HCD Plans will need to be reviewed with increased criteria in mind.
- It will be easier to alter and reduce existing District policies through amendments.
- It will be easier to remove Districts entirely through the repeal of District designation by-laws.
- District Plans will be expected to be more flexible and better able to facilitate development, including opportunities to support smaller scale development and “missing middle” housing.
- These changes have implications for proposed HCDs) in Cambridge, such as the future Hespeler Core HCD Study by making HCDs less likely to pass the Study phase and progress to by-law passage. The new legislation also portends to ensure that approved Districts are much smaller, are more easily opposed, and have more permissible policies.
The new legislation may require the City of Cambridge to look at amending, repealing or reducing the strength of its existing HCDs in order to support more development within HCDs.

- If existing HCDs are amended, the new legislation may enable more permissible policies within existing HCDs to allow for more development and require the City to require fewer Heritage Permits.

**Part IV Designated Properties:**

- Individual properties will be more difficult to designate through Part IV due to the establishment of an increased threshold of designation criteria. It is anticipated that under *Ontario Regulation 9/06*, two (2) of nine (9) criteria must be met instead of one (1) of nine (9) criteria as was previously established). This indicates that fewer properties will be considered as candidates for designation and fewer properties will be protected through the use of this tool in the future. Note: this amendment only applies to properties designated *after* the legislation passes.

- “Emergency designations” for unprotected heritage resources subject to development or demolition will no longer occur. Designation will no longer factor into the development process, given that NOIDs cannot be issued unless the property subject to development is already designated or listed at the time an application is received. Given the new two-year timeline to remove listed properties, likely very few non-designated properties will be listed on the Heritage Register in the future at the time a development application is received. There will be pressure to designate properties, particularly over the next two years to retain a level of protection, especially properties at risk. Unless a property is designated, it is unlikely to be eligible for designation if it is subject to a development application.

**Heritage Register:**

- The Heritage Register as a conservation tool will be rendered ineffectual.

- It will be more difficult for municipalities to list properties on the Heritage Register. It is anticipated that under *Ontario Regulation 9/06*, one (1) of nine (9) criteria must be met instead of zero (0) as was previously established). Note: this will only apply to properties listed *after* the legislation comes into force.

- The City of Cambridge will be required to review its listed properties (approximately 665) within only two years, in order to determine cultural heritage value and priority properties to designate before they are de-listed. Reviewing hundreds of listings will be extremely costly for the City and require additional resources. The implications of this two-year timeline are significant: it may mean...
additional spending on heritage consultants to assist in the review and designation of properties, additional conflicts (and appeals) with property owners would likely occur over designation, and additional workload for Heritage staff in terms of Heritage Permits and Grant applications given the anticipated increase in the number of designated properties. Currently listed Heritage Register properties, that are not designated within the next two years will subsequently have no legislated protections in place and will be vulnerable to demolition and character-compromising alterations.

- Within the City’s existing policy regime, a property must be listed or designated, or adjacent to a listed or designated property, in order for staff to require a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) when a Planning Act application is received. Through the proposed amendments, fewer requests for HIAs will be made on applicants proposing to develop properties given that fewer properties will remain on the Heritage Register. This will lead to greater development certainty and cost-savings for developers and would likely result in less compatible development and more demolitions as fewer impacts to heritage properties are taken into account.

- The new legislation also requires the City to pass or repeal designation by-laws on appeal immediately or de-list the property if Council issues a NOID on a listed property. This removes uncertainty for developers and no longer allows properties to remain on the Register under protected NOID status.

Other Changes:

- Changes to the provincial standards and guidelines make it easier for the government to bypass best practices in heritage conservation, as established within the Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Provincial Heritage Properties, in order to meet other provincial goals.

- There are additional secondary impacts to heritage conservation and heritage policy that will result from other changes proposed within Bill 23 including changes within the Proposed Planning Act and City of Toronto Act Changes (Schedules 9 and 1 of Bill 23 – the Proposed More Homes Built Faster Act, 2022) such as the following:
  - Elimination of third party appeals to all Planning Act applications.
  - Public meetings are no longer required for a plan of subdivision.
  - Exemption of site plan review for developments under ten units.
  - Architectural details, urban design, and landscape architecture will no longer be able to be regulated through site plan approval.
The proposed changes to the *Ontario Heritage Act* through Bill 23 (Schedule 6) represent a provincial focus on increasing housing supply at all costs and eliminating perceived impediments to development. The amendments seek to streamline development approvals and eliminate regulations and protections around heritage properties in Ontario.

It is anticipated that the changes will result in fewer properties protected under the *Ontario Heritage Act* within the City of Cambridge, less oversight or review of development applications on or near heritage properties, additional demolition or removal of heritage structures, more incompatible development, and more unsympathetic alterations and additions. It is anticipated that fewer HIAs, Conservation Plans, Salvage Plans, and Heritage Permits will be reviewed by heritage staff, MHAC and Council as needed. Further, the City’s Heritage Register will be significantly downgraded over a two-year period. Existing HCDs are anticipated to see amendments or be repealed and will likely result in less compatible development being approved through amended HCD plans. In addition, it is anticipated that fewer properties will be designated under Part IV of the *Ontario Heritage Act* given more stringent evaluation criteria and a freeze on designations carried out in response to development applications.

Given that the Heritage Register will no longer function as a comprehensive list of properties of cultural value or interest, the City of Cambridge should establish a new process to keep track of properties of value or interest. This may come in the form of re-establishing a comprehensive inventory list despite the fact that the inventory will have no legislative standing.

Lastly, in light of proposed changes to the *Planning Act*, less site plan review will mean less staff input on design and architectural compatibility of new development with on-site or adjacent heritage properties. The lack of landscape review on smaller development projects (less than ten units) will also mean a lack of assurance of character compatibility with regards to trees and other landscape features on heritage properties or within heritage character areas.

Overall, staff do not support the proposed changes to the *Ontario Heritage Act*. Staff are of the opinion that the changes may result in a significant increase in incompatible development, demolition or removal of heritage structures, and fewer protections for heritage properties. The changes will also result in a significant amount of staff time needed to assess properties and determine their cultural heritage value. Staff are of the opinion that the proposed two-year time limit for review of listed properties is not sufficient to adequately assess properties for designation or de-listing. All of these changes have the potential to significantly impact the cultural heritage properties,
heritage conservation districts, cultural heritage landscapes, and character-laden streetscapes within the City of Cambridge.
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