Corporation of the City of Cambridge

Cambridge Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee Meeting Agenda

Meeting Number: 05-23

Date: July 20, 2023, at 7 p.m.

Location: Virtual Meeting via Zoom

To increase delegate accessibility, this meeting will be livestreamed virtually. If you wish to appear as a delegate, you may register to appear as a delegation by visiting: https://forms.cambridge.ca/Delegation-Request-Form.

Members of the public wishing to speak at the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee may complete the Delegation Request Form no later than 12:00 noon on the day prior to the meeting.

Please be advised that only one person can delegate at a time and additional people cannot be invited to join due to technical limitations. All written delegation submissions will form part of the public record.

This meeting will be livestreamed on the City of Cambridge's YouTube page, which can be accessed via the following link: https://www.youtube.com/@CityOfCambridgeOn/streams.

Meeting Called to Order

Roll Call

Disclosure of Interest

Approval of Minutes

THAT the Minutes of the June 15, 2023 meeting of the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee be considered for errors and omissions and be adopted.

Presentations:

None
Delegations:

Lindsay Benjamin, Senior Cultural Heritage Specialist, WSP, will delegate for Agenda Item #2 – 1102 King Street East – Heritage Impact Assessment

Agenda Items:

1. **23-017 (MHAC) 927 King St. E. – Sign Permit and Variance**  PP 009

   THAT Report 23-017 (MHAC) – 937 King St. E. – Sign Permit and Variance be received;

   AND THAT the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC) approve the application for a sign permit for the property municipally known as 927 King Street East;

   AND FURTHER THAT the MHAC recommend approval for the sign variance for the sign exceeding the prescribed size limits outlined in Sign By-law No.191-03 for the property municipally known as 927 King Street East.

2. **23-018 (MHAC) 1102 King St. E. – Heritage Impact Assessment**  PP 021

   THAT Report 23-018 (MHAC) -Heritage Impact Assessment for Listed, Non-Designated Property located at 1102 King Street East, be received;

   AND THAT the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC) support the recommendations and mitigation measures outlined in Section 11 of the Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) for 1102 King Street East.

3. **23-020 (MHAC) – 33 Main St. – Request to Alter a Part V Heritage Designated Building**  PP 237

   THAT Report 23-020 (MHAC) 33 Main St. – Request to Alter a Part V Heritage Designated Building be received;

   AND THAT the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee recommends that Council approve the proposed alteration to the storefront at 33 Main Street for the reasons outlined in Report 23-020(MHAC);

   AND THAT the MHAC approve the request for a new sign to fit within the existing sign fascia and that the letters not be illuminated internally;

   AND THAT the MHAC approves a variance to the Sign Bylaw to permit a sign measuring greater than 1.25 square meters within the existing sign fascia;
AND FURTHER THAT the MHAC not approve the request for a grant from the Designated Heritage Property Grant Program for the reasons outlined in Report 23-020(MHAC).

Other Business

a) Chair’s Comments  
b) Council Report/Comments  
c) Staff/Senior Planner – Heritage Comments

Next Meeting:

Date & Time: August 17, 2023, at 7 p.m. (Tentative)  
Via Zoom

Close of Meeting

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

Distribution:

MINUTES
Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee
Meeting #04 - 23
June 15, 2023
Held virtually via Zoom
7:00 p.m.

Committee Members in Attendance: Nelson Cecilia, Michelle Goodridge, Jack O’Donnell, Megan Oldfield (7:06 p.m.) Councillor Corey Kimpson (7:02 p.m.) Nancy Woodman and Kimberly Livingstone in the role of Chair.

Regrets: Natasha Beaton, Susan Brown

Staff in Attendance: Laura Waldie, Senior Planner Heritage, Karin Stieg-Drobig, Recording Secretary and Maria Barrantes Barreto, Council Committee Services Coordinator

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 YouTube channel. Kimberly Livingstone, MHAC Chairperson, welcomed everyone present, and she advised those present that in its advisory role, MHAC makes recommendations that then go to Council for a decision. The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. and the meeting adjourned at 8:11 p.m.

Declarations of Interest – NIL

Minutes of Previous Meeting

Moved by: Nancy Woodman
Seconded by: Nelson Cecilia

It was noted that on page 6 of the agenda, in the last paragraph, the words “photolight metrics” should be “photo metrics” and was corrected in the minutes.

THAT the minutes of the March 16, 2023 meeting of the Cambridge Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee be considered for errors and omissions and be adopted.

CARRIED
Presentation:

Paul Willms, Sustainability Planner, gave a comprehensive presentation explaining the draft Parks Master Plan. Mr. Willms explained that the 30 year plan, with shorter, 10 year term increments will include public engagement at various stages. He noted that public and stakeholder input will be gathered through surveys, visits to the advisory committees and public meetings. This information will then be utilized in the report to Council to seek direction moving forward with the Plan.

The number and types of parks was explained in detail, including community and neighbourhood parks, urban squares and parkettes, trailheads and outdoor recreation facilities that are part of the approximately 500 hectares of public space within Cambridge. It was noted that the expected 50% increase of population within the City of Cambridge will require 64 hectares of developable parkland to meet the current service standard and will include privately owned public spaces (POPS) and Strata Parks. These parks on top of low rise parking and buildings are relatively new but it is expected that the City will see more of these through intensification. Lastly, levels and types of services were also explained to the Committee.

It was noted there are numerous heritage resources that are within parks in the City currently and it is expected that this will increase with the addition of various resources such as the Stone Tower that will be removed from the Guelph Avenue Forbes Estate to Jacob’s Landing. Mr. Willms noted that he is seeking input from the Committee on how and when they wish to be consulted moving forward and what areas of interest the Committee feels should be addressed within the Parks Master Plan.

The Committee thanked Mr. Willms for his presentation. The question of designating specific resources within a park versus the entire park was discussed. Further, it was noted that designating any attribute must address operational needs in ensuring the attribute is maintained. The Chair noted that further discussions will take place, with the Committee providing comments once completed.

Reports:

1. Request to Alter a Part V Designated Property: Sign Permit Application for 47 Main Street

Laura Waldie, Senior Planner Heritage provided a brief overview of the applicant’s plans noting the sign fascia will be painted with the letters being pin screwed into the existing fascia. The sign will be illuminated via the existing gooseneck lighting above the
sign. The Committee asked if the fascia trim would also be painted in the same colour. Laura Waldie confirmed that it would.

Moved by: Nancy Woodman  
Seconded by: Michelle Goodridge

THAT Report 23-015 (MHAC)- Request to Alter Part V Designated Property Sign Permit Application for 47 Main Street, be received;

AND THAT the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC) approve the application for a sign permit for the property municipally known as 47 Main Street.

CARRIED

2. Request to Alter a Part V Designated Property: Sign Permit and Variance Application for 43 Main Street.

Laura Waldie, Senior Planner Heritage, provided a brief overview of the application for a sign. She advised the applicant has contacted her to indicate that they have revised their plan for the size of the sign down to 2.59 square metres.

The Committee confirmed that a variance would still be required as it is bigger than the 1.25 square metres permitted under the Sign Bylaw. Additionally, it was confirmed that the sign will fit within the sign fascia and that it will be illuminated through gooseneck lighting and not internally.

Moved by: Nelson Cecilia  
Seconded by: Michelle Goodridge

THAT Report 23-016 (MHAC) Request to Alter a Part V Designated Property: Sign Permit and Variance Application for 43 Main Street, be received;

AND THAT the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC) not approve the application for a sign permit for the property municipally known as 43 Main Street due to the size being 4.29 square metres

AND FURTHER THAT the MHAC approves a variance to the Sign Bylaw to permit a fascia sign measuring three square metres or less for the Suave Social Boutique at 43 Main Street

CARRIED
3. Memo – Mill Race Park HIA

The Chair advised this item is for information purposes and will not require a vote on recommendations. A short Power Point presentation was provided by Lashia Jones, Cultural Heritage Specialist, Stantec. Ms. Jones advised that the wooden bridges within the listed heritage Mill Race Park are due to be replaced as they are unsafe. She provided a brief history of the Park, heritage attributes and reasons for its cultural heritage status.

She further gave the options available and any mitigation required based upon the options. There were no questions of the Committee.

Information Items: NIL

Other Business - NIL

Chair’s Comments:

Chair, Kimberly Livingstone, advised she did not have any comments this month.

Council Report/ Comments:

Councillor Kimpson noted that should any committee members have any items of interest they wish to discuss, that she is available.

Staff/Senior Planner- Heritage comments:

Laura Waldie noted that there would be a designation report and grant request among other things coming to MHAC next month. She also advised that work on the Heritage Register is continuing. She further noted that the plan is to have a break in August unless a time sensitive application is received.

Next Meeting

Date & Time: July 20, 2023, 7:00 p.m.
Location: Virtually via Zoom

Close of Meeting

Moved by: Nancy Woodman
Seconded by: Jack O’Donnell
THAT the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee meeting does now adjourn at 8:11 p.m.

CARRIED

Kimberly Livingstone                 Karin Stieg-Drobig
MHAC Chairperson                    Recording Secretary
To: Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee
Meeting Date: 7/20/2023
Report Title: 23-017 (MHAC) 927 King St. E. - Sign Permit and Variance
Report Author: Jeremy Parsons, Senior Planner-Heritage
Department Approval: Joan Jylanne, Manager of Policy
Department: Planning Community Development
Division: Policy Planning
Report No.: 23-017(MHAC)
File No.: R01.02.01
Ward: Ward 3

RECOMMENDATION(S):
THAT Report 23-017(MHAC) 927 King St. E. - Sign Permit and Variance be received;

AND THAT the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC) approve the application for a sign permit for the property municipally known as 927 King Street East;

AND FURTHER THAT the MHAC recommend approval for the sign variance for the sign exceeding the prescribed size limits outlined in Sign By-law No.191-03 for the property municipally known as 927 King Street East.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

Purpose

The tenant and business owner located within the complex at 927 King Street East is requesting approval for a sign permit to authorize the installation of a sign for a hair salon.

Key Findings

- A sign permit application was submitted to the City of Cambridge on July 7, 2023 (Appendix A). The owner is requesting approval through a permit and variance to authorize the use of a sign larger than what is permitted within the City’s Sign By-law.
• The property is designated under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act and protected under a heritage conservation easement agreement registered on title.

• The sign is proposed to be located on a large blank façade on King Street East on an attached structure without any identified heritage value.

• Staff support the sign permit and variance application given that the proposal does not alter the heritage character of the property, or impact any of the property’s original heritage features, and further because the sign is in proportion to the building façade’s large blank wall space.

Financial Implications

The costs associated with the production and mounting of the sign are the responsibility of the applicant.

STRATEGIC ALIGNMENT:

☐ Strategic Action; or
☒ Core Service

Objective(s): Not Applicable

Strategic Action: Not Applicable

Program: Community Development

Core Service: Heritage Conservation

BACKGROUND:

The subject property is located within a mixed-use, urban context within Preston. The property extends from Duke Street to the north, King Street East to the south, Lowther Street North to the west, and residential properties to the east (Figure 1). The property is 2.73 acres (11,042 m²) in size and is zoned commercial-residential (C1RM2) with site-specific provisions in Section 4.1.90 of the City’s Zoning By-law.

The property contains a three-storey limestone structure known as the Jacob Hespeler Grist Mill. The building was constructed ca. 1839 as a grist mill by Hespeler and remains one of the oldest surviving industrial buildings in Cambridge. In 1875, it was converted to a carriage works and occupied by the Preston Carriage Works. From 1900 onwards, it was used for furniture manufacturing by several companies. The historic limestone structure is attached to a large, two-storey stucco building and is surrounded by surface parking (Figure 2). Various commercial uses currently occupy the first floor of the historic building and attached structure.
The applicant submitted a complete Sign Permit application on July 7, 2023 to Building Services (Appendix A). The property is currently designated under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act and protected through By-law No. 35-89 (Appendix B). The property is also protected under a heritage conservation easement agreement registered on title in 1990. Both the designation by-law and the easement agreement only specify the three-storey limestone building as containing heritage features required to be retained.

The subject property has seen multiple sign permits within the last thirty years on both the three-storey limestone building and on the two-storey addition, including the following:

- Installation of façade fascia sign (Rising Dough Bakery, 1996).
- Installation of façade fascia sign (Cobblestone Wine Company, 1997).
- Installation of façade fascia sign (Giant Tiger, 2002).
- Installation of façade fascia sign (Curves, 2004).
- Installation of façade fascia sign (Northern Tropics Tanning, 2004).
- Installation of façade fascia sign (Bonelle Academy of Hair & Aesthetics, 2019).

Figure 1: Aerial image of the subject property highlighted in red (City of Cambridge)
ANALYSIS:

The proposal involves the installation of a new sign to be installed on the façade of the two-storey stucco addition on the property located at 927 King Street East. Despite the property being designated under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act and protected under a heritage conservation easement agreement, the addition on which the sign is proposed to be located is not a heritage feature of the property. As such, the proposed sign does not require a Heritage Permit to facilitate installation. However, Section 26 of the Sign By-law requires heritage review and approval on all signs proposed on designated properties. As such, the proposal requires review and approval from the MHAC in the form of a sign permit.

The proposed sign consists of acrylic lettering that is pin mounted on the existing stucco cladding. The proposed sign is black in colour and includes the business name in decorative font, “Kristian Lee hair”. The submitted materials do not show any internal or external illumination. According to the submission materials provided (Appendix B), the overall dimensions are 3.05m wide by 0.71m high (2.17m²). Section 26.2(a) of the Sign By-law stipulates that all wall signs on designated properties cannot be larger than 1.25m². As such, the applicant has been required to seek a variance from the provisions of the by-law.

Despite the sign being larger than the permitted limit outlined in the by-law, staff are of the opinion that the sign is supportable in its proposed location given the following:

- The sign is proposed to be located on a two-storey structure without any identified heritage value.
- The sign is proposed to be located on a large, unarticulated stuccoed façade.
- The sign is not proposed to be internally illuminated.
- The sign is proposed to be located directly on the façade with pin mounts as opposed to a large block panel.
The sign’s proposed text-based design is appropriate and consistent with other signs located on designated properties.

As such, staff are of the opinion that the proposed sign will not alter any heritage features on the adjacent limestone structure nor negatively impact the overall heritage value or character of the property. The design, size, and lettering of the proposed sign are appropriate given its context on a modern structure. Staff are recommending that the MHAC approve the proposed sign permit application and support the recommendation that the sign variance be approved despite the sign exceeding the size limit outlined within the by-law.

**EXISTING POLICY / BY-LAW(S):**

**Sign By-law No. 03-191: Section 26 Heritage Conservation Districts and Designated Buildings.**

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

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

(ii) the type of sign;

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**City of Cambridge Official Plan (2018)**

**5.12 Signage**

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

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

3. In Community Core Areas and where addressed in urban design guidelines, overhead lighting of signage is required instead of backlit signage unless there is no feasible alternative.
FINANCIAL IMPACT:
The costs of applying for and installing the sign are the responsibility of the tenant/business owner.

PUBLIC VALUE:

Transparency:

To ensure transparency, meeting agendas of the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee are posted on the City’s website.

PUBLIC INPUT:

Meetings of the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee are open to the public.

INTERNAL / EXTERNAL CONSULTATION:

The Senior Planner-Heritage liaised with the tenant/business owner on the requirements to fulfill the request.

CONCLUSION:

The proposed sign is in keeping with the character of existing signage in the area and does not negatively impact the attached limestone building at 927 King Street East. The proposed sign is located on a large, modern stuccoed façade, will not be illuminated, and includes an appropriate text-based design. Despite the size of the proposed sign exceeding the limits outlined in the Sign By-law, staff are recommending that the sign permit application be approved by MHAC and that the committee support the recommendation for approval of the sign variance.

REPORT IMPACTS:

Agreement: No
By-law: No
Budget Amendment: No
Policy: No

APPROVALS:

This report has been reviewed and approved for inclusion in the agenda by the respective Departmental Manager.

ATTACHMENTS:

1. 23-017(MHAC) Appendix A: Sign Permit Application Submission Material
2. 23-017(MHAC) Appendix B: Designation By-law No. 35-89
Approx. 120” (3.048m) to King St.

Kristian Lee Hair sign location

Approx Building frontage, 107.70ft (32.83m)
DESCRIPTION: (Exterior Signage)
1 set of 1/4" flat cut black acrylic pin mounted flush to existing stucco surface
Size:
120" (3.048m) wide x 28" (0.7112m) high
Overall Sign Weight
Approx. 27lbs.
BY-LAW NO. 35-89

OF THE

CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF CAMBRIDGE

Being a by-law to amend by-law 391-87 of the City of Cambridge to designate the exterior of 927 KING STREET EAST, Cambridge, Ontario (JACOB HESPELER GRIST MILL) as a property of historic and architectural 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 architectural value and interest;

AND WHEREAS Notice of Intention to so designate 927 KING STREET EAST, Cambridge, Ontario, have been duly published and served;

AND WHEREAS it is considered desirable to designate the property known as 927 KING STREET EAST, Cambridge, Ontario.

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

1. THAT there is designated as being of architectural and historic significance the exterior of the original structure located on the real property, more particularly described in Schedule "A" and "B" attached hereto, known as 927 KING STREET EAST, Cambridge, Ontario. The reasons for designation are as 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.

READ A FIRST, SECOND AND THIRD TIME

ENACTED AND PASSED, THIS 23RD DAY OF JANUARY, A.D., 1989

Jane Brewer
MAYOR

James Anderson
CLERK
SCHEDULE "A"

TO BY-LAW NO. 35-89

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 (formerly in the Town of Preston) and Province of Ontario and being composed of Part of Lot 1, North side of King Street, Plan 521 and part of lot 94, Plan 716 more particularly described as follows:

PREMISING that the northerly limit of King Street has a bearing of N 54°26'20" W and relating all bearing herein thereto;

COMMENCING at a point which may be located as follows;

BEGINNING at the west angle of Lot 3, north side of King Street, Registered Plan 521;

THENCE N 35°37'55" E along the northeast limit of the said Lot 3, distance of 6.00 feet to the northeast limit of King Street;

THENCE S 54°26'20" E along the northeast limit of King Street, a distance of 159.18 feet to an iron bar therein;

THENCE N 35°38'40" E, a distance of 5.58 feet to the westerly corner of a three storey old stone building and being the POINT OF COMMENCEMENT of the foregoing described lands

THENCE N 35°38'40" E, a distance of 39.9 feet to a point;

THENCE S 54°09'10" E, a distance of 85.2 feet to a point;

THENCE N 35°50'50" E, a distance of 18.00 feet to a point;

THENCE S 54°09'10" E, a distance of 15.73 feet to a point;

THENCE S 36°11'10" W, a distance of 57.35 feet to a point;

THENCE N 54°28'W, a distance of 100.45 feet to the point of commencement.

The foregoing six courses are all along the outside face of a three storey stone building.
SCHEDULE "E"

TO BY-LAW 35-89

OF THE

CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF CAMBRIDGE

ARCHITECTURAL DESCRIPTION

The subject buildings, referred to as the Jacob Hespeler Grist Mill, is a three storey structure constructed of limestone rubblestone. It is described in detail in the L.A.C.A.C. Building Description dated June 1987.

The architectural features of particular interest are as follows:

1. all exterior wall materials and treatment including all limestone rubblestone sections and uneven quoins;
2. all existing roof profiles and features including the projecting stone eaves band in the roof line;
3. all existing openings including all 6/6 double hung sash and sills; all voussoirs; the wider windows at the northerly end (now boarded up); the square headed door at the northerly end which is of similar width to the windows directly above.

HISTORICAL DESCRIPTION

The subject building is situated in the "Pennsylvania German Village" section of what was formerly Preston. It was constructed circa 1839 as a grist mill by Jacob Hespeler, a local entrepreneur after whom the Village of Hespeler was named. In 1875 the building was converted into a carriage works, the largest of its kind in Preston. From 1900 onward it was used for furniture manufacturing by a number of companies among them the Crown Furniture Company (1902 - 1924); the Schmidt Furniture Company (1931 - 1959); and most recently the Hespeler Furniture Company.

REASONS FOR DESIGNATION

a. Historic Value

(i) it dates from an early period in the development of the City's communities;

(ii) it is associated with a person (Jacob Hespeler) who is recognized as having made a significant contribution to the City's development and as having materially influenced the course of local, and regional development.

b. Architectural Value

(i) it is a good, well preserved and representative example of its period of building;

(ii) it makes an important contribution to the streetscape of which if forms a part.
To: Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee

Meeting Date: 7/20/2023

Report Title: 23-018 (MHAC) 1102 King St. E. - Heritage Impact Assessment

Report Author: Jeremy Parsons, Senior Planner-Heritage

Divisional Approval: Joan Jylanne, Manager of Policy Planning

Department: Community Development

Division: Planning

Report No.: 23-018(MHAC)

File No.: R01.01

Ward: Ward 3

RECOMMENDATION(S):

THAT Report 23-018(MHAC) Heritage Impact Assessment for Listed, Non-Designated Property located at 1102 King Street East, be received;

AND THAT the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC) support the recommendations and mitigation measures outlined in Section 11 of the Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) for 1102 King Street East.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

Purpose

This report has been prepared to consult with the MHAC on an HIA submitted in support of a proposal to construct a four-storey affordable and supportive housing development at 1102 King Street East. The preferred option outlined within the HIA involves the partial demolition of portions of the existing buildings, the restoration of the original limestone structure, and the construction of a large four-storey addition at the rear.

Key Findings

- The applicant is proposing to redevelop the property at 1102 King Street East and construct a four-storey affordable residential development.

- The property is listed on the City's Heritage Register as a non-designated property of cultural heritage value or interest and contains a two-and-a-half storey limestone Georgian building built prior to 1859.
The property was found to possess sufficient cultural heritage value to merit designation under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act, which is recommended to be carried out post-development.

The proposal includes four development alternatives for consideration and the HIA outlined eleven recommendations to guide the conservation of the original limestone building.

Financial Implications

The City’s rate for the review of HIAs relating to development applications is $583.00. There are no other financial impacts to the City related to the HIA.

STRATEGIC ALIGNMENT:

☐ Strategic Action; or
☒ Core Service

Objective(s): Not Applicable

Strategic Action: Not Applicable

Program: Community Development

Core Service: Heritage Conservation

BACKGROUND:

The subject property is located within a mixed-use urban context at the intersection of King Street East and Dolph Street in Preston (Figure 1). The property is 0.30 acres (1,192 m²) in size and is zoned commercial/residential (C1RM2) within the City’s Zoning By-law. The property is located within the Preston Towne Centre Community Core Area within the Official Plan and the Preston Towne Centre Character Area within the Heritage Master Plan.

The property contains a two-and-a-half storey limestone Georgian commercial building built prior to 1859, covered with modern cladding, and including several additions. The additions have been constructed onto the west and south elevations.

The subject property is listed on the City’s Heritage Register as a non-designated property of cultural heritage value or interest. It is adjacent to several listed properties including: 1123 Queenston Road, 1107 King Street East and 1035 King Street East. Historically, the building functioned as a hotel (the Queen’s Hotel and later the Grand River Hotel) since the 19th century. Most recently, the building has included several rental units on the upper floors, however the building currently sits vacant.
In 2019 a fire significantly damaged the interior of the building. City records also indicate electrical issues, water damage, and several complaints of unsafe conditions within the building. On November 15, 2022, a Site Plan Pre-Consultation (P33-22) was submitted to the City of Cambridge proposing a four-storey apartment building with 39 affordable rental units with ground floor office and amenity space.

Heritage staff identified the need for an HIA and a preference to see the original limestone structure adaptively reused. Planning staff have identified, at a preliminary level, that the proposal will require minor variance approval for increased density along with deficiencies in setbacks, lot coverage, landscaping and parking. The proposal will also require site plan approval, given that it involves more than ten residential units. Any conditions related to heritage conservation will be implemented through the Committee of Adjustment and the minor variance process.

Given that the property is not designated under the Ontario Heritage Act, heritage permits are not required to facilitate the proposed development. Further, given that full demolition is not proposed in the preferred option (Option 2), Council approval is not required. Should the proposal be modified to pursue full demolition, Council approval would be required as per Section 27(9) of the Ontario Heritage Act. The present condition of the property is shown in Figures 2 to 5 below.

The HIA, completed by WSP, provides an overview of existing policy, a history of the subject property, a description of the building’s current condition, a cultural heritage evaluation, and a list of recommendations (Appendix A). Four alternatives considered for the future of the site are discussed and eleven recommendations and mitigation measures are outlined to guide the conservation of the original limestone building (Option 2).

![Figure 1: The subject property indicated on aerial imagery (City of Cambridge).](image-url)
Figure 2: Looking south from King Street East at the subject property (City of Cambridge, July 2023).

Figure 3: Looking southwest at the subject property from the intersection of King Street East and Dolph Street North (City of Cambridge, July 2023).
Figure 4: Looking northwest towards the rear of the subject property from Dolph Street North (City of Cambridge, July 2023).

Figure 5: Image showing the condition of building stone under cladding. Evidence exists of inappropriate repairs carried out in the past, including the use of cementitious mortar (City of Cambridge, July 2023).
ANALYSIS:
The two-and-a-half storey limestone building is first depicted on the subject property in 1859 on James Pollock’s 1859 Village of Preston map. By 1867, the building had been named the Roos’ Hotel and by 1914 it is referred to as the Queen’s Hotel. By 1980, the building was known as the Grand Hotel, and until 2019, the Grand River Hotel and Bar. A major fire resulted in significant damage to the interior of the structure in 2019.

The two-and-a-half storey limestone building has had multiple one and two-storey additions constructed onto the southern and western elevations. The building is set upon a stone foundation and covered with mid-century modern curtain screen and stucco.

Despite the building’s poor condition, the HIA determined that the subject property contains cultural heritage value for its representative Georgian architecture and its contributions to the 19th century commercial development of Preston. The report identified the property to meet 3 of the 9 criteria in Ontario Regulation 9/06 (as amended by Ontario Regulation 569/22) and 5 of the 12 criteria under Section 4.4(1) of the Official Plan. As such, the property is considered to be a candidate for designation, a process which is anticipated to begin when the development of the site is complete.

The HIA provided four alternative options for the future of the site:

1) Preserve and maintain the property at 1102 King Street East as is with no further development.

2) Adaptively reuse the original extant limestone building at 1102 King Street East, incorporating it into plans for the property’s redevelopment.

3) Adaptively reuse the original extant limestone building at 1102 King Street East and the extended Dolph Street elevation, incorporating both structures into plans for the property’s redevelopment.

4) Redevelop the property at 1102 King Street East and demolish the extant building.

Of the three options presented for this development, Option 2 is the preferred alternative. This option retains the original limestone structure, removes unsympathetic cladding and additions, and allows for the introduction of affordable housing to the site. Staff are supportive of the removal of existing cladding and modern additions given that they do not contain cultural heritage value. Further, staff are also supportive of the restoration of the original limestone building and the increase in density on the site to enable affordable and supportive housing. The proposed design for the four-storey addition involves brown brick and a mansard style roof with dormer windows. The design is loosely inspired by historic styles however there are no examples of mansard
roofs in the immediate vicinity nor examples of Second Empire buildings. Staff will offer formal design comments on the proposal during the Planning Act process. The Committee is enabled through this consultation to provide comments on design.

In order to facilitate the conservation of the building through Option 2, the HIA provided the following eleven recommendations and mitigation measures, which have the support of staff:

1) Sensitive design in accordance with the Ministry’s design guidelines.

2) Prior to the construction of the new foundation and footing, the existing structure should be assessed to document the physical condition and structural integrity of the building to inform vibration and land excavation thresholds in proximity to the foundation.

3) A comprehensive pre-construction survey should be completed, and a Zone of Influence Construction Vibration Study completed to monitor and mitigate vibration impacts during construction.

4) Documentation and Salvage Report be completed prior to the demolition of the Dolph Street South limestone addition. May be scoped by City because of CHIA.

5) A Plan should be established to avoid impacts to the heritage attributes during construction including a buffer around the original structure with a silt fence and appropriate location of staging and construction materials and equipment.

6) If the property will be vacant for an extended period, a Mothballing Plan should be completed.

7) A Heritage Conservation Plan should be prepared for the original limestone building.

8) Should development plans change significantly in scope or design after approval, additional heritage investigations may be required.

9) Designation should be explored by the City after construction is completed.

10) This report should be filed with the City’s Archives.

11) This report should be sent to the City’s Heritage Planner and the Region.

Staff are in support of the aforementioned recommendations and will ensure that they are reflected as conditions of future applications for minor variance. Both the Documentation and Salvage Report and the Conservation Plan should be submitted prior to or with a complete Site Plan application.
EXISTING POLICY / BY-LAW(S):

Ontario Heritage Act

Section 27 of the Ontario Heritage Act outlines the legislation regulating municipal heritage registers and outlines the restrictions on the demolition or removal of buildings or structures located on listed, non-designated properties in Section 27(9). Staff have determined that the proposal does not involve full demolition of any buildings or structures on the subject property. As such, there is no 60-day restriction on demolition.

City of Cambridge Official Plan, 2012, as amended

4.2 Priorities for Cultural Heritage Resources

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

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

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

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

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.

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

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

4. Additional information may be required by the City, particularly depending on the nature and location of the proposal. The City shall make available any relevant information that it maintains, including archival records.

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 (OP, 71-72).

6. A Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment will be conducted in accordance to Council approved guidelines.

7. Where a Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment relates to a cultural heritage resource of Regional interest, the City will ensure a copy of the assessment is circulated to the Region for review. In this situation, the Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment submitted by the owner/applicant will be completed to the satisfaction of both the City and the Region.

8. Where a development application includes, or is adjacent to, a cultural heritage resource of Regional interest which is not listed on the City’s Register of Cultural Heritage Resources, the owner/applicant will be required to submit a Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment to the satisfaction of the Region.

FINANCIAL IMPACT:

The City’s rate for the review of HIAs relating to development applications is $583.00. There are no other financial impacts to the City related to the HIA.

PUBLIC VALUE:

Posted publicly as part of the report process.
PUBLIC INPUT:
Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee meetings are open to the public.

INTERNAL / EXTERNAL CONSULTATION:
Heritage staff have been in discussions with the property owner and their heritage consultant regarding the proposal for several months.

CONCLUSION:
The subject property comprises the former Grand River Hotel and includes a two-and-a-half storey limestone Georgian building surrounded by modern additions and unsympathetic cladding. The proposal, as outlined within the HIA, involves the redevelopment of the site to allow for affordable and supportive housing. The recommended option (Option 2) involves the removal of additions, the restoration of the original limestone building, and the addition of a rear four-storey building. Staff are in support of the preferred option which retains and restores the pre-1859 limestone building. Staff are also in support of the recommendations and mitigation measures outlined within the HIA which will be included as conditions of future applications under the Planning Act.

REPORT IMPACTS:
Agreement: No
By-law: No
Budget Amendment: No
Policy: No

APPROVALS:
This report has been reviewed and approved for inclusion in the agenda by the respective Divisional Manager.

ATTACHMENTS:
23-018(MHAC) Appendix A – Heritage Impact Assessment, dated June 2023
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

WSP was retained by Flourish on behalf of Indwell (the Client) to complete a Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment (CHIA) for the property located at 1102 King Street East in the Preston Centre Neighbourhood, City of Cambridge, Ontario. The report was undertaken to accompany the submission of a Site Plan, Zoning By-Law Amendment, and Demolition Application being prepared by T. Johns Consulting Group for the subject property, which proposes the retention of the early commercial limestone structure on the property and removal of the later additions to construct a new, medium-density, affordable and supportive residential development. The early limestone structure is proposed to be incorporated into the new development and adaptively reused.

The original structural elements of the property at 1102 King Street East, commonly referred to as the Queen’s Hotel or the Grand River Hotel, is composed of a two-and-a-half storey limestone Georgian commercial building constructed prior to 1859 (and a two-storey rear limestone addition fronting Dolph Street South) covered with a mid-century modern curtainscreen intended to provide a modern appearance. Numerous one and two-storey additions have been constructed to the south and west elevations of the original structure. The subject property is listed as a non-designated property on the City of Cambridge Heritage Properties Register pursuant to Section 27 (1.2) of the *Ontario Heritage Act* (OHA). The property is located in the Preston Towne Centre Character Area as identified in the *Cambridge Heritage Master Plan*, and located adjacent to other listed built heritage resources.

This CHIA has evaluated the subject property against the criteria of *Ontario Regulation 9/06* (as amended by *Ontario Regulation 569/22*), the City of Cambridge’s evaluation criteria, and the Region of Waterloo’s criteria for Regional Significance and determined it does possess cultural heritage value or interest (CHVI) for its representative Georgian architecture and contribution to the nineteenth century commercial development of Preston. As such, a Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest (SCHVI) and list of heritage attributes has been compiled.

Evaluating the proposed development plans for the subject property against the SCHVI and list of heritage attributes, it was determined the new, medium-density, affordable and supportive residential development would have primarily minor and positive impacts on the property at 1102 King Street East. The following alternatives, mitigation and conservation options were considered to avoid or reduce these adverse impacts to the heritage attributes of the property:

1) Preserve and maintain the property at 1102 King Street East as is with no further development.

2) Adaptively re-use the original extant limestone building at 1102 King Street East, incorporating it into plans for the property’s redevelopment.

3) Adaptively re-use the original extant limestone building at 1102 King Street East and the extended Dolph Street South limestone elevation, incorporating both structures into plans for the property’s redevelopment.

4) Redevelop the property at 1102 King Street East and demolish the extant building.
Based on the review of the alternatives, mitigation and conservation options analysis, Option 2, adaptively re-use the original extant limestone building at 1102 King Street East, incorporating it into plans for the property’s redevelopment, is the preferred option for the conservation of the property. Although Option 1 would maintain the general heritage principle that prefers minimal intervention to a heritage resource, it is acknowledged this option would not allow for any redevelopment of the subject property. As such, a “do nothing” approach would not address the Client’s objective to provide new, affordable and supportive residential housing in the City of Cambridge and would not see the subject property receive a viable, long-term new use, thus compromising its ongoing conservation. As such, Option 1 is the next preferred alternative, followed by Option 3, and lastly by Option 4.

The following recommendations are provided to guide the implementation of Option 2:

1. That the Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism’s (MCM) *Heritage Resources in the Land Use Planning Process* (2006) design guidelines should be consulted. These guidelines aim to harmonize mass, setback, setting and materials as a mitigation measure to reduce impacts to cultural heritage resources. The concept for the new development adjacent to the nineteenth century subject building should be sensitively designed to reflect sympathetic materials, massing, and height.

2. That prior to the construction of the new foundation and footing, the existing structure should be assessed to document the physical condition, noting any pre-existing deficiencies, and structural integrity of the building to inform thresholds for vibration impacts and land excavation in proximity to the foundation. Care should be taken not to compromise the existing foundation during excavations for the new footing and foundation.

3. That given the proximity of adjacent heritage properties at 1037, 1103 and 1109 King Street East and 1123 Queenston Road to the proposed limits of grading, a comprehensive pre-construction survey should be completed and a Zone of Influence Construction Vibration Study completed to monitor and mitigate vibration impacts during construction.

4. That a Documentation and Salvage Report should be completed prior to the demolition of the Dolph Street South limestone addition. The City may scope this requirement given the thorough photographic documentation and measured drawings provided in this CHIA.

5. That contract documentation should include information regarding the CHVI of the structure, specifically the List of Heritage Attributes. A plan should be established to avoid impact to the resource during construction including a buffer around the limestone Georgian structure with a silt fence and appropriate location of staging and construction materials and equipment.

6. That if the property will be vacant for an extended period, a Mothballing Plan should be completed to examine the current condition of the limestone structure and to suggest stabilization and maintenance measures necessary to temporarily mothball and secure the building.

7. That a Heritage Conservation Plan be prepared for the property detailing the conservation methods, required actions and trades for the conservation methods and an implementation schedule to conserve the heritage attributes of the subject property in the long-term.
8 That should development plans change significantly in scope or design after approval of this CHIA, additional cultural heritage investigations may be required.

9 That following construction of the proposed development, the City of Cambridge should explore the designation of 1102 King Street East under Part IV of the OHA.

10 This this report should be filed with the City of Cambridge Archives for their records.

11 That this CHIA should be submitted to the City of Cambridge Senior Planner – Heritage and the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee as well as the Region of Waterloo’s Cultural Heritage Planner for review and comment.
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1 INTRODUCTION

WSP was retained by Flourish on behalf of Indwell (the Client) to complete a Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment (CHIA) for the property located at 1102 King Street East in the Preston Centre Neighbourhood, City of Cambridge, Ontario. The report was undertaken to accompany the submission of a Site Plan, Zoning By-Law Amendment, and Demolition application being prepared by T. Johns Consulting Group for the subject property, which proposes the retention of the early commercial limestone structure on the property and removal of the later additions to construct a new, medium-density, affordable and supportive residential development. The early limestone structure is proposed to be incorporated into the new development and adaptively reused.

The approximately 0.32-acre property at 1102 King Street East, historically referred to as the Queen’s Hotel or the Grand River Hotel, is composed of a two-and-a-half storey limestone Georgian commercial building constructed prior to 1859 covered with a mid-century modern curtainscreen intended to provide a modern appearance. Numerous one and two-storey additions have been constructed to the south and west elevations of the original structure. The subject property is listed as a non-designated property on the City of Cambridge Heritage Properties Register pursuant to Section 27 (1.2) of the Ontario Heritage Act (OHA). The property is located in the Preston Towne Centre Character Area, identified in the Cambridge Heritage Master Plan (2008:115).

The contact information for the property owner’s representative is as follows:

Dylan Ward
Development Coordinator
101-1429 Main Street East
Hamilton, ON L8K 1C2

This CHIA has been structured to adhere to the City of Cambridge’s Detailed Guidelines for the Preparation of Cultural Heritage Impact Assessments (City of Cambridge 2012) and guidance provided in the Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism (MCM) Ontario Heritage Tool Kit: Heritage Resources in the Land Use Planning Process (2006); the OHA; Section 2(d) of the Planning Act; Section 2.6.3 of the Provincial Policy Statement (2020); Policy 4.4 and 4.10.1 of the Cambridge Official Plan (2018); and Policy 3.G.17 of the Regional Official Plan (2015). This document will provide:

- A background on the project and introduction to the development site;
- A description of the methodology used to investigate and evaluate the subject property;
- A summary of background research and analysis related to the subject property;
- An assessment of existing conditions;
- An evaluation of the subject property for Cultural Heritage Value or Interest (CHVI) and a Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest (SCHVI) and List of Heritage Attributes, if applicable;
• An evaluation of the subject property for Regional Significance against the Region of Waterloo’s evaluation criteria for identifying Regionally Significant Cultural Heritage Resources;
• A description of the proposed development and a summary of potentially adverse impacts;
• A schedule and reporting structure for implementation and monitoring; and
• An assessment of alternative options, mitigation measures and conservation methods to be considered to avoid or limit negative impacts to the CHVI of the subject property.
2 POLICY FRAMEWORK

2.1 UNITED NATIONS DECLARATION ON THE RIGHTS OF INDIGENOUS PEOPLES

On June 21, 2021, the Canadian federal government enacted the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples Act and confirmed that the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (Declaration - 2007) “must be implemented in Canada.” As a result, Indigenous peoples in Canada are recognized as having unique rights, including those that pertain to the conservation of Indigenous heritage. As per Articles 11 and 31 of the Declaration:

11. 1) Indigenous peoples have the right to practice and revitalize their cultural traditions and customs. This includes the right to maintain, protect and develop the past, present and future manifestations of their cultures, such as archaeological and historical sites, artefacts, designs, ceremonies, technologies and visual and performing arts and literature.

31. 1) Indigenous peoples have the right to maintain, control, protect and develop their cultural heritage, traditional knowledge and traditional cultural expressions, as well as the manifestations of their sciences, technologies and cultures, including human and genetic resources, seeds, medicines, knowledge of the properties of fauna and flora, oral traditions, literatures, designs, sports and traditional games and visual and performing arts. They also have the right to maintain, control, protect and develop their intellectual property over such cultural heritage, traditional knowledge, and traditional cultural expressions.

2) In conjunction with Indigenous peoples, States shall take effective measures to recognize and protect the exercise of these rights.

These rights to historical sites, ceremonies, cultural traditions, etc. (collectively understood as Indigenous heritage) are pertinent to the planning process through Articles 25 and 26 of the Declaration, which state that:

25. Indigenous peoples have the right to maintain and strengthen their distinctive spiritual relationship with their traditionally owned or otherwise occupied and used lands, territories, waters and coastal seas and other resources and to uphold their responsibilities to future generations in this regard.

26. 1) Indigenous peoples have the right to the lands, territories and resources which they have traditionally owned, occupied or otherwise used or acquired.

2) Indigenous peoples have the right to own, use, develop and control the lands, territories and resources that they possess by reason of traditional ownership or other traditional occupation or use, as well as those which they have otherwise acquired.
3) States shall give legal recognition and protection to these lands, territories and resources. Such recognition shall be conducted with due respect to the customs, traditions, and land tenure systems of the Indigenous peoples concerned.

### 2.2 PLANNING ACT AND PROVINCIAL POLICY STATEMENT

The *Planning Act* (1990) and the *Provincial Policy Statement* (PPS) [Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing (MMAH), 2020] issued under Section 3 of the *Planning Act*, provide Ontario-wide policy direction on land use planning. All decisions affecting land use planning “shall be consistent with” the PPS, which identifies that properties and features demonstrating significant architectural, cultural, historical, archaeological, technical or scientific interest are of provincial interest and should be conserved.

The importance of identifying, evaluating and conserving built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes is noted in two sections of the PPS 2020:

- Section 2.6.1 – “Significant built heritage resources and significant heritage landscapes shall be conserved”;
- Section 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.”

The following concepts, as defined in the PPS, are fundamental to an understanding of the conservation of cultural heritage resources in Ontario:

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

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

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

**Heritage attributes** “means the principal features or elements that contribute to a protected heritage property’s cultural heritage value or interest, and may include the property’s built, 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).”

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

## 2.3 ONTARIO HERITAGE ACT

The *Ontario Heritage Act* (OHA) gives municipalities and the provincial government powers to preserve the heritage of Ontario, with a primary focus on protecting heritage properties and archaeological sites. The OHA grants authority to municipalities and the province to identify and designate properties of heritage significance, provide standards and guidelines for the preservation of heritage properties and enhance protection of heritage conservation districts, marine heritage sites and archaeological resources.

Properties can be designated individually (Part IV of the OHA) or as part of a larger group of properties, known as a Heritage Conservation District (Part V of the OHA). Designation offers protection for the properties under Sections 33 and 34 of the OHA, prohibiting the owner of a designated property from altering, demolishing or removing a building or structure on the property unless the owner applies to the council of the municipality and receives written consent to proceed with the alteration, demolition or removal.

In addition to designated properties, the OHA allows municipalities to list properties that are considered to have CHVI on their Register, which provides interim protection against demolition in the form of a 60-day delay in issuing a demolition permit. Under Part IV, Section 27, municipalities must maintain a Register of properties situated in the municipality that are of CHVI. Section 27 (1.1) states that the Register shall be kept by the Clerk and that it must list all designated properties (Part IV and V). Under Section 27 (1.2), the Register may include a property that has not been designated, but that the municipal council believes to possess CHVI. Listed properties, although recognized as having CHVI, are not protected under the OHA as designated properties are, but are acknowledged under Section 2 of the *PPS* (MMAH, 2020).

## 2.4 ONTARIO REGULATION 9/06

The evaluation of cultural heritage resources is guided by *Ontario Regulation 9/06* (O. Reg 9/06; as amended by O. Reg. 569/22), which provides nine criteria for determining CHVI. The criteria set out in the regulation were developed to identify and evaluate properties for designation under the OHA. Best practices in evaluating properties that are not yet protected employ O. Reg. 9/06 to
determine if they have CHVI. These criteria include design/physical value, historical/associative value and contextual value.

1) The property has design value or physical value because it is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, expression, material or construction method.

2) The property has design value or physical value because it displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit.

3) The property has design value or physical value because it demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement.

4) The property has historical or associative value because it has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization or institution that is significant to a community.

5) The property has historical or associative value because it yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of a community or culture.

6) The property has historical or associative value because it demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer or theorist who is significant to a community.

7) The property has contextual value because it is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an area.

8) The property has contextual value because it is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings.

9) The property has contextual value because it is a landmark. O. Reg. 9/06, s. 1 (2).

If a potential cultural heritage resources is found to meet any one of these criteria, it can then be considered an identified resource. If two criteria are met, it is eligible for designation under Part IV of the OHA.

2.5 MINISTRY OF CITIZENSHIP AND MULTICULTURALISM IN LAND USE PLANNING

The MCM’s Heritage Resources in the Land Use Planning Process (2006) identifies CHIAs as an important tool to evaluate cultural heritage resources and to determine appropriate conservation options. The document identifies what a CHIA should contain and any specific municipal requirements.

To determine the effect that a proposed development or site alteration may have on a significant cultural heritage resource, the Heritage Resources in the Land Use Planning Process outlines seven potential negative or indirect impacts:

- 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 an archaeological resource.

The MCM’s *Eight Guiding Principles in the Conservation of Historic Properties* (2007), provide guiding principles for the development of appropriate conservation or mitigation measures:

1. **Respect for documentary evidence**  
   Do not base restoration on conjecture. Conservation work should be based on historical documentation, such as historical photographs, drawings and physical evidence.

2. **Respect for the original location**  
   Do not move buildings unless there is no other means to save them. Site is an integral component of a building. Any change in site diminishes heritage value considerably.

3. **Respect for historical material**  
   Repair or conserve rather than replace building materials and finishes, except where absolutely necessary. Minimal intervention maintains the historical content of the resource.

4. **Respect for original fabric**  
   Repair with like materials, to return the resource to its prior condition without altering its integrity.

5. **Respect for the building’s history**  
   Do not restore to one period at the expense of another. Do not destroy later additions to a house solely to restore it to a single time period.

6. **Reversibility**  
   Alterations should be able to be returned to original conditions. This conserves earlier building design and technique. For instance, when a new door opening is put in a stone wall, the original stones are numbered, removed and stored, allowing for future restoration.

7. **Legibility**  
   New work should be distinguishable from old. Buildings should be recognized as products of their own time, and new additions should not blur the distinction between old and new.

8. **Maintenance**  
   With continuous care, future restoration will not be necessary. With regular upkeep, major conservation projects and their high costs can be avoided.
2.6 REGION OF WATERLOO OFFICIAL PLAN

The Region of Waterloo’s *Regional Official Plan* was approved, with modifications, by the Ontario Municipal Board on June 18, 2015 (Region of Waterloo 2015). Chapter 3, Liveability in Waterloo Region, addresses heritage resource conservation. Relevant policies include those that detail the requirements of a CHIA:

3.G.13 Area Municipalities will establish policies in their official plans to require the submission of a Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment in support of a proposed development that includes or is adjacent to a designated property, or includes a non-designated resource of cultural heritage value or interest listed on the Municipal Heritage Register.

3.G.14 Where a Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment required under Policy 3.G.13 relates to a cultural heritage resource of Regional interest, the Area Municipality will ensure that a copy of the assessment is circulated to the Region for review. In this situation, the Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment submitted by the owner/applicant will be completed to the satisfaction of both the Region and the Area Municipality.

3.G.15 Where a development application includes, or is adjacent to, a cultural heritage resource of Regional interest which is not listed on a Municipal Heritage Register, the owner/applicant will be required to submit a Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment to the satisfaction of the Region.

3.G.16 The Region will undertake a Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment and consult with the affected Area Municipality and the Regional Heritage Planning Advisory Committee prior to planning, designing or altering Regional buildings or infrastructure that may affect a cultural heritage resource listed on the region-wide inventory described in Policy 3.G.4. The Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment will be reviewed and approved in accordance with the policies in this Plan.

3.G.17 Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment will include, but not be limited to the following:

(a) historical research, site analysis and evaluation;
(b) identification of the significance and heritage attributes of the cultural heritage resource;
(c) description of the proposed development or site alteration;
(d) assessment of development or site alteration impacts;
(e) consideration of alternatives, mitigation and conservation methods;
(f) schedule and reporting structure for implementation and monitoring; and
(g) a summary statement and conservation recommendations.

3.G.18 Where a Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment required in this Plan relates to a cultural heritage resource of Regional interest, the conservation recommendations will, wherever feasible, aim to conserve cultural heritage resources intact by:
(a) recognizing and incorporating heritage resources and their surrounding context into the proposed development in a manner that does not compromise or destroy the heritage resource;

(b) protecting and stabilizing built heritage resources that may be underutilized, derelict, or vacant; and

(c) designing development to be physically and visually compatible with, and distinguishable from, the heritage resource.

3.G.19 Where it is not feasible to conserve a cultural heritage resource intact in accordance with Policy 3.G.18, the conservation recommendations will:

(a) promote the reuse or adaptive reuse of the resource, building, or building elements to preserve the resource and the handiwork of past artisans; and

(b) require the owner/applicant to provide measured drawings, a land use history, photographs and other available documentation of the cultural heritage resource in its surrounding context.

3.G.20 Cultural Heritage Impact Assessments may be scoped or waived by the Region or the Area Municipality as applicable.

2.7 CITY OF CAMBRIDGE OFFICIAL PLAN

The Cambridge Official Plan (City of Cambridge 2018) was Consolidated in September 2018. Cultural heritage conservation policies are addressed in Chapter 4. The following policies provide guidance for development proposals that may impact cultural heritage resources.

4.4 Cultural Heritage Value Evaluation Criteria

1. The City will determine that the following shall be used in determining the significance of cultural heritage resources included or proposed to be included in the City’s Register described in Section 4.3 of this Plan:

a) A property shall be considered to have cultural heritage value or interest if the property has been designated by the Province to be of architectural or historical significance pursuant to the Ontario Heritage Act or, in the opinion of the City, satisfies at least two of the following criteria:

i) it dates from an early period in the development of the city’s communities;

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

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

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

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

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

viii) it is a representative example of architectural design;

ix) it terminates a view or otherwise makes an important contribution to the urban composition or streetscape of which it forms a part;

x) it is generally recognized as an important landmark;

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

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

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.

2. The City will determine the need for a Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment in consultation with the owner/applicant. The City will refer the completed Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment to MHAC [an acronym for the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee, sic] when the development is major in nature or where the City believes there will be a detrimental impact to the cultural heritage resource.

3. A Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment shall be undertaken by a professional who is qualified to evaluate the cultural heritage resource under review.
4. Additional information may be required by the City, particularly depending on the nature and location of the proposal. The City shall make available any relevant information that it maintains, including archival records.

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.

6. The City will, and the Region is encouraged to, give consideration to the impact of modifications to Regional or City arterial and major collector roads and other road improvements in general, including re-alignment and road widening, on cultural heritage resources. Conservation of the cultural heritage resource, especially in relation to the character of streetscapes and major crossroads or intersections, shall be encouraged.

7. A Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment will be conducted in accordance to Council approved guidelines.

8. Where a Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment relates to a cultural heritage resource of Regional interest, the City will ensure a copy of the assessment is circulated to the Region for review. In this situation, the Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment submitted by the owner/applicant will be completed to the satisfaction of both the City and the Region.

9. Where a development application includes, or is adjacent to, a cultural heritage resource of Regional interest which is not listed on the City’s Register of Cultural Heritage Resources, the owner/applicant will be required to submit a Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment to the satisfaction of the Region.

2.8 FEDERAL AND PROVINCIAL HERITAGE GUIDELINES

In accordance with the City of Cambridge’s *Detailed Guidelines for the Preparation of Cultural Heritage Impact Assessments*, additional guidelines were considered including Parks Canada’s *Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada* (Parks Canada 2010), hitherto referred to as the *Standards and Guidelines*; the MCM’s *Eight Guiding Principles in the Conservation of Historic Properties* (MCM 1997) and *Heritage Resources in the Land Use Planning Process* (MCM 2006); and *Well-Preserved: the Ontario Heritage Foundation’s Manual of Principles and Practice for Architectural Conservation* (Fram 2003).
3 PROJECT METHODOLOGY

A CHIA evaluates the proposed impact of development on the heritage attributes of a property of potential CHVI. This CHIA is guided by the City of Cambridge’s *Detailed Guidelines for the Preparation of Cultural Heritage Impact Assessments* and guidance provided in the MCM Ontario Heritage Tool Kit: Heritage Resources in the Land Use Planning Process; the OHA; Section 2(d) of the Planning Act; Section 2.6.3 of the PPS; Policy 4.4 and 4.10.1 of the Cambridge Official Plan; and Policy 3.G.17 of the Regional Official Plan.

To address the requirements of a CHIA, this report provides the following information:

- A summary of the history of the immediate context informed by a review of archival sources and historical maps;
- Photographic documentation of the subject property and context;
- A written description of the existing conditions and context of the subject property;
- An evaluation of the subject property according to O. Reg. 9/06, the City of Cambridge’s Cultural Heritage Value Evaluation Criteria, and the Region of Waterloo’s evaluation criteria for identifying Regionally Significant Cultural Heritage Resources;
- Preparation of a Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest and List of Heritage Attributes, if applicable;
- A review of the proposed intervention;
- Identification of impacts;
- The identification and analysis of mitigation opportunities, as required;
- The preferred strategy recommended to best protect and enhance the CHVI and heritage attributes of the cultural heritage resource;
- A schedule and reporting structure for implementation and monitoring; and
- A summary statement and conservation recommendations.
4 HISTORICAL CONTEXT

4.1 PRE-CONTACT PERIOD

The pre-contact period in Ontario has been reconstructed, primarily, from the archaeological record and interpretations made by archaeologists through an examination of material culture and site settlement patterns. Technological and temporal divisions of the pre-contact period have been defined by archaeologists based on changes to natural, cultural, and political environments that are observable in the archaeological record. It is pertinent to state that although these divisions provide a generalized framework for understanding the broader events of the pre-contact period, they are not an accurate reflection of the fluidity and intricacies of cultural practices that spanned thousands of years. The following presents a sequence of Indigenous land-use from the earliest human occupation following deglaciation to the more recent past based on the following periods as defined by archaeologists as the:

- Paleo Period;
- Archaic Period;
- Woodland Period; and
- Post-Contact Period.

4.1.1 PALEO PERIOD

Paleo period populations were the first to occupy what is now southern Ontario, moving into the region following the retreat of the Laurentide Ice Sheet approximately 11,000 years before present (BP). The first Paleo period populations to occupy southern Ontario are referred to by archaeologists as Early Paleo (Ellis and Deller 1990). Early Paleo period groups are identified by their distinctive projectile point types, exhibiting long grooves, or “flutes,” that likely functioned as a hafting mechanism (method of attaching the point to a wooden stick). These Early Paleo group tool types include Gainey (c.10,900 BP), Barnes (c.10,700), and Crowfield (c.10,500) (Ellis and Deller 1990). By approximately 10,400 BP, Paleo projectile points transitioned to various unfluted varieties such as Holcombe (c.10,300 BP), Hi Lo (c.10,100 BP), and Unstemmed and Stemmed Lanceolate (c.10,400 to 9,500 BP). These types were used by Late Paleo period groups (Ellis and Deller 1990). Both Early and Late Paleo period populations were highly mobile, participating in the hunting of large game animals. Paleo period sites often functioned as small campsites where stone tool production and maintenance occurred (Ellis and Deller, 1990).

4.1.2 ARCHAIC PERIOD

By approximately 8,000 BP, climatic warming supported the growth of deciduous forests in southern Ontario. These forests introduced new flora and faunal resources, which resulted in
subsistence shifts and a number of cultural adaptations. This change is reflected in the archaeological record by new tool-kits that are reflective of a shift in subsistence strategies and has been categorized as the Archaic period.

The Archaic period in southern Ontario is sub-divided into the Early Archaic (c.10,000 to 8,000 BP), Middle Archaic (c.8,000 to 4,500 BP), and the Late Archaic (c.4,500 to 2,800 BP) periods. Generally, in North America, the Archaic period represents a transition from big game hunting to broader, more generalized subsistence strategies based on local resource availability. This period is characterized by the following traits:

- An increase in stone tool variation and reliance on local stone sources;
- The emergence of notched and stemmed projectile point types;
- A reduction in extensively flaked tools;
- The use of native copper;
- The use of bone tools for hooks, gorges, and harpoons;
- An increase in extensive trade networks; and
- The production of ground stone tools and an increase in larger, less portable tools.

The Archaic period is also marked by population growth with archaeological evidence suggesting that, by the end of the Middle Archaic period (c.4,500 BP), populations had steadily increased in size (Ellis, et al., 1990).

Over the course of the Archaic period, populations began to rely on more localized hunting and gathering territories and were shifting to more seasonal encampments. From the spring into the fall, settlements were focused in lakeshore/riverine locations where a variety of different resources could be exploited. Settlement in the late fall and winter months moved to interior sites where the focus shifted to deer hunting and the foraging of wild plants (Ellis et al., 1990, p. 114). The steady increase in population size and the adoption of a more localized seasonal subsistence strategy led to the transition into the Woodland period.

4.1.3 EARLY AND MIDDLE WOODLAND PERIODS

The beginning of the Woodland period is defined by the emergence of ceramic technology. Similar to the Archaic period, the Woodland period is separated into three timeframes: the Early Woodland (c.2,800 to 2,000 BP), the Middle Woodland (c.2,000 to 1,200 BP), and the Late Woodland (c.1,200 to 350 BP) (Spence et al. 1990; Fox 1990).

The Early Woodland period is represented in southern Ontario by two cultural complexes: the Meadowood Complex (c.2,900 to 2,500 BP), and the Middlesex Complex (c.2,500 to 2,000 BP). During this period, the life ways of Early Woodland populations differed little from that of the Late Archaic with hunting and gathering representing the primary subsistence strategies. The pottery of this period is characterized by its relatively crude construction and lack of decoration. These early ceramics exhibit cord impressions, which are likely the result of the techniques used during manufacture rather than decoration (Spence et al. 1990).
The Middle Woodland period has been differentiated from the Early Woodland period by changes in lithic tool forms (i.e., projectile points, expedient tools), and the increased decorative elaboration of ceramic vessels (Spence et al. 1990). Additionally, archaeological evidence suggests the rudimentary use of maize (corn) horticulture by the end of the Middle Woodland Period (Warrick 2000).

In southern Ontario, the Middle Woodland has been divided into three different complexes based on regional cultural traditions: the Point Peninsula Complex, the Couture Complex, and the Saugeen Complex. These groups are differentiated by sets of characteristics that are unique to regions within the province, specifically regarding ceramic decorations.

The Point Peninsula Complex extends from south-central and eastern Ontario into southern Quebec. The northernmost borders of the complex can be found along the Mattawa and French Rivers. Ceramics are coil constructed with conical bases, outflaring rims, and flat, rounded, or pointed lips. The interior surfaces of vessels are often channelled with a comb-like implement, creating horizontal striations throughout. The exterior is smoothed, or brushed, and decoration generally includes pseudo-scallop stamps or dentate impressions. Occasionally, ceramics will have been treated with a red ochre wash (Spence et al. 1990).

The Saugeen Complex is found generally in south-central Ontario and along the eastern shores of Lake Huron. The Saugeen Complex ceramics are similar in style to Point Peninsula Complex; however, the vessels tended to be cruder than their Point Peninsula counterparts. They were characterized by coil construction with thick walls, wide necks, and poorly defined shoulders. Usually, the majority of the vessel was decorated with pseudo-scallop stamps or dentate impressions, with the latter occurring more frequently at later dates (Spence et al. 1990).

4.1.4 LATE WOODLAND PERIOD

There is much debate as to whether a transitional phase between the Middle and Late Woodland Periods is present in Ontario, but it is generally agreed that the Late Woodland period of occupation begins around 1,100 BP. The Late Woodland period in southern Ontario can be divided into three cultural sub-phases: The early, middle, and late Late Woodland periods. The early Late Woodland is characterized by the Glen Meyer and Pickering cultures and the middle Late Woodland is characterized by the Uren and Middleport cultures. These groups are ancestral to the Iroquoian-speaking Neutral-Erie (Neutral), the Huron-Wendat (Huron), and Petun Nations that inhabited southern Ontario during the late Late Woodland period (Smith 1990:285).

The Pickering and Glen Meyer cultures co-existed within southern Ontario during the early Late Woodland period (c.1250-700 BP). Pickering territory is understood to encompass the area north of Lake Ontario to Georgian Bay and Lake Nipissing (Williamson 1990). Glen Meyer is centred around Oxford and Norfolk counties, but also includes the southeastern Huron basin and the western extent is demarcated by the Ekfrid Clay Plain southwest of London, Ontario (Noble 1975). Villages of either tradition were generally smaller in size (~1 ha) and composed of smaller oval structures, which were later replaced by larger structures in the Late Woodland period. Archaeological evidence suggested a mixed economy where hunting and gathering played an
important role, but small-scale horticulture was present, indicating a gradual shift from hunting-gathering to a horticultural economy (Williamson 1990).

The first half of the middle Late Woodland period is represented by the Uren culture (700-650 BP) and the second half by the Middleport (650-600 BP). Uren and Middleport sites of the middle Late Woodland share a similar distribution pattern across much of southwestern and south-central Ontario. (Dodd et al., 1990). Significant changes in material culture and settlement-subsistence patterns are noted during this short time. Iroquois Linear, Ontario Horizontal, and Ontario Oblique pottery types are the most well-represented ceramic assemblages of the middle Late Woodland period (Dodd et al., 1990). At Middleport sites, material culture changes included an increase in the manufacture and use of clay pipes as well as bone tools and adornments (Dodd et al. 1990; Ferris & Spence 1995).

The appearance of evidence of small year-round villages, secondary ossuary burials, and what are thought to be semi-subterranean sweat lodges suggest a marked increase in sedentism in southern Ontario during the Uren and Middleport cultures (Ferris & Spence 1995). The increasing permanency of settlements resulted in the development of small-scale cultivation and a subsequent increased reliance on staple crops such as maize, beans, and squash (Dodd et al. 1990; Warrick 2000; Ferris & Spence 1995).

Archaeological evidence from the middle Late Woodland sites also documents an increase in population size, community organization and village fissioning, and the expansion of trade networks. The development of trade networks with northern Algonquian peoples has also been inferred from findings at Middleport sites along the northern parts of southwestern and south-central Ontario. These changes resulted in the more organized and complex social structures observed in the late Late Woodland period.

During the late Late Woodland period, village size significantly increased as did the complexity of community and political systems. Villages were often fortified with palisade walls and ranged in size from a few longhouses to over 100 longhouses observed in large villages. Larger longhouses oriented differently than others in the village have been associated with primary familial groups and it has been suggested that longhouses that were located outside of palisade walls may have been for visiting groups for the purposes of trade or social gatherings (Ramsden 1990). More recent research has indicated that smaller, temporary camp or cabin sites were often used seasonally for the tending of agricultural fields or as fishing camps (Ramsden 1990). By this time, large-scale agriculture had taken hold, making year-round villages even more practical as a result of the ability to store large crop yields over winter.

Early contact with European settlers at the end of the Late Woodland period resulted in extensive changes to the traditional lifestyles of most populations inhabiting Ontario including settlement size, population distribution, and material culture. The introduction of European-borne diseases significantly increased mortality rates, resulting in a drastic drop in population size (Warrick 2000).
4.2 POST-CONTACT PERIOD

4.2.1 PRE-CONFEDERATION TREATIES

From the Late Woodland to contact with Europeans in the sixteenth century, southern Ontario was a culturally dynamic area, populated by distinct Nadowek (Iroquoian) and Anishinaabeg (Algonkian) groups (Englebrecht 2003; Trigger 2000; Schmalz 1991). Nadowek life increasingly revolved around growing maize and other crops such as beans, squash, sunflower, and tobacco, while people ancestral to the Anishinaabe following the Western Basin way of life were more mobile, moving with seasonally available resources. However, at the borderlands of the Nadowek and Western Basin were agricultural communities living in small, palisaded villages with a mix of small and large houses, and who were both farming and seasonally mobile.

During the eighteenth century, the British colonial regime entered into a series of treaties with the Indigenous Nations in Canada. While these treaties were intended as formal legally binding agreements that would set out the rights, responsibilities and relationships between Indigenous Nations and the federal and provincial governments, the government of Ontario acknowledges that Indigenous nations may have different understandings of the treaties (Government of Ontario 2022, Historica Canada 2021). As French and British encroachment increased from the early nineteenth century onwards, Indigenous ways of life adapted to the change in complex and varied ways.

The Seven Years’ War (1756-1763) was a global war that was fought in Europe, India, America, and at sea (Historica Canada 2006). In North American, Britain and France struggled for dominance with each side supported by Indigenous allies. At the conclusion of the war, Britain became the leading colonial power in North America (Historica Canada 2006). In 1763, the British issue the Royal Proclamation, which stated that land that was not in control of the British belonged to Indigenous Nations and that the Nations would retain their lands unless ceded to the Crown (Historica Canada 2006). The Nations and the British met at Fort Niagara in 1764 where they negotiated a new alliance that was embodied in the Covenant Chain Wampum Belt and the Treaty of Niagara Alliance Medal (Canadian Museum of History 2023). The Royal Proclamation of 1763 and the Niagara Treaty of 1764 are of great significance since the British recognized that Indigenous Nations owned the land and were an autonomous entity (Canadian Museum of History 2023). This relationship is conveyed on the 1764 Covenant Chain Wampum Belt that depicts two people side by side, as equals (Canadian Museum of History 2023).

The study area, located in the City of Cambridge, is situated on the lands of the Between the Lakes Treaty, No. 3, negotiated in 1784, and confirmed in 1792, by the Mississaugas of the Credit First Nation and the British Crown. Part of the goal of the Between the Lakes Treaty for the Mississaugas was to help and assist Joseph Brant and the Haudenosaunee who had fought for the British in the American Revolution (1775-1783) and provide them with suitable land to settle (Shanahan, 2019). Sir Frederick Haldimand, the Governor of Québec, subsequently signed the Haldimand Proclamation that granted the tract of approximately 3,500 acres of land, or 10 km on either side of the Grand River, to the Haudenosaunee in compensation for their assistance in the
American Revolution (1765-1783) (CIRNAC 2013). The land is commonly known today as the Haldimand Tract. The Simcoe Patent (Treaty 4) was issued in 1793, and further clarified a number of matters, including the extent of the land grant made to the Haudenosaunee (Ministry of Indigenous Affairs 2020).

To recognize and honour the municipality’s Indigenous heritage and land rights, the City of Cambridge has developed the following land acknowledgement:

The City of Cambridge acknowledges that we are situated upon the land traditionally used by the Haudenosaunee, Anishinaabe and Neutral People.

We also acknowledge the enduring presence and deep traditional knowledge and philosophies of the Indigenous People with whom we share this land today.

(City of Cambridge 2023)

4.2.2 WATERLOO COUNTY

In 1788, the Province of Quebec created the first districts to serve administrative needs at the local level – Hesse, Nassau, Mecklenburg and Lunenburg. The study area was in the Nassau District that included as far south as the current Fort Erie and Thunder Bay to the north. After the creation of Upper Canada in 1791, The Nassau District was renamed the Home District. By way of an Act of Parliament in 1798 the Home and Western Districts were realigned with a portion of these districts becoming London and Niagara Districts. The study area remained part of the Home District.

At the turn of the nineteenth century, Crown Land was granted to arriving settlers on conditions, such as the requirement to clear at least 2.02 ha of their lot and the adjacent road allowance as well as to build a house and shingle it within 18 months.

In 1816, the Home District was divided and the majority of what would become Waterloo County was reorganized into the Gore District (Pope 1877:76). The first settlers of the Gore District were almost exclusively United Empire Loyalists (Pope 1877:76). Initially Halton County included the Townships of Beverley, Dumfries, Esquesing, Flamboro West, Flamboro East, Nassagaweya, Nelson and Trafalgar (Pope 1877:76) and was expanded to include the townships of Guelph, Puslinch, Nassagaweya, Esquesing, Eramosa, Erin and Garafraxa in 1822 (Cumming 1971:2).

The District of Wellington was created in 1837-1838 and included the counties of Wellington, Waterloo, Grey and parts of Dufferin County (Wellington County 2020). The United Counties of Waterloo, Wellington and Grey were formed in 1852, but only two years later Wellington County became its own entity and consisted of the Townships and Towns of Amarantha, Arthur, Eramosa, Erin, Guelph, Garafraxa, Maryborough, Nichol, Peel, Pilkington and Puslinch (Wellington County 2020).

In February 1841, Wellington District became part of Canada West in the new United Province of Ontario. Only eight years later in 1849, the District system was eliminated. Wellington District was divided into Grey, Wellington, Perth and Waterloo Counties. Waterloo County included the Townships of Waterloo, Woolwich, Wilmot, Wellesley and North Dumfries. Waterloo County was dissolved in 1973 and replaced with the Region of Waterloo.
4.2.3 **TOWNSHIP OF WATERLOO**

The Township of Waterloo was historically bounded on the north by the Township of Woolwich, on the east by the Townships of Guelph and Puslinch, on the south by the Township of Dumfries and on the west by the Township of Wilmot. The Township of Waterloo was part of Block 2 of the Haldimand Tract. The Haldimand Tract was land granted by Sir Frederick Haldimand on October 25, 1784, to the Six Nations in recognition of their support of the British during the American Revolution. Joseph Brant, representing the Six Nations, arranged for the sale of Block 2 of the tract to United Empire Loyalists, Richard Beasley and his partners James Wilson and Jean-Baptiste Rousseaux in 1796. When the transaction finalized in 1798 Beasley became solely responsible for the mortgage payments.

Due to the terms of the sale of the tract from the Six Nations to Beasley, the final deed was not transferred to Beasley until payment was made in full. As such, Block 2 could not be legally subdivided and sold to make payments for the initial land transfer (English and McLaughlin 1983). Beasley did begin to sell lots, however, despite his inability to grant clear title. In 1800, Beasley sold almost 5571 ha to predominantly German Mennonites who did not realize that the mortgage prevented them from getting clear title to their lands (Bloomfield 1995:21). This led to the almost complete halt of settlement in 1803 and 1804 (Bloomfield 1995:21). Beasley and Brant realized the only solution was a bulk sale of the remaining portions of Block 2 to pay off the mortgage (Bloomfield 1995: 22). Samuel Bricker who had immigrated to Block 2 in 1802 successfully convinced other German Mennonites in Pennsylvania to form the ‘German Company’ to purchase the remaining Block 2 lands. Lots were then drawn and distributed to families that contributed to the German Company according to the number of shares owned. Due to the tract being sold as a block, the area was not addressed in the typical manner by the local of administration of Upper Canada, with surveys and basic services. As such, roads were informally laid out by the new settlers and lots were often oddly shaped.

The area’s reputation for fertile and cheap lands within a predominantly German speaking community attracted non-Mennonite Germans during the early nineteenth century. Additionally, large numbers of Scottish, German and other European immigrants also came to Waterloo (Bloomfield 1995: 45-50). The earliest settlement clusters were not necessarily the areas with the best soil due to the lack of formally laid roads, rather the earliest settlement clusters were around the forks of the Grand and Speed Rivers in the south and in the north along the road connecting John Erb’s mills and Abraham Erb’s mills which are now the urban cores of the cities of Cambridge and Waterloo, respectively (Bloomfield 1995:61).

By 1846, the Township of Waterloo had a population of 4,424, and included 20 sawmills and eight gristmills (Smith 1846:205). Early residential structures tended to be one to two storey log structures. Prior to 1850 log houses and shanties were exempt from taxes if they only had one fireplace and, as such, many were built in the Township. During the second half of the nineteenth century, large, two storey stone dwellings became popular.

The creation of the Grand Trunk Railway, the Galt & Guelph Railway and the Preston & Berlin Railways in the 1850s brought additional prosperity. Wheat and barley were the primary exports,
both becoming especially lucrative when the Crimean War (1853-1856) raised British demand for Canadian Wheat (Hayes 1997:40).

### 4.2.4 CITY OF CAMBRIDGE

The City of Cambridge was created in 1973 by the amalgamation of the municipalities of Preston, Hespeler, Blair, and Galt. The study area is located in the former Town of Preston.

#### 4.2.4.1 PRESTON

The Town of Preston was first settled by German speaking Mennonites from Pennsylvania in 1805 at the intersection of the Speed and Grand rivers in the southern portion of the Township of Waterloo. The land upon which they settled was acquired from the Six Nations through a land speculator named Richard Beasley (City of Cambridge n.d.). John Erb purchased part of Lot 4, Beasley's Broken Front Concession in 1805. Using the Speed River, Erb built a saw mill and flour mill in 1806 and 1807 respectively (Janusas 1988a: 143). The flour mill continues to operate today as the Dover Flour Mill owned by Parrish & Heimbecker Ltd. The first store was opened by Daniel Snider in 1818.

The area became known as Preston in the 1830s when the land east of the Speed River was surveyed, and a grid street layout was established. The sale of the newly surveyed lands attracted a significant number of tradesmen, artisans and craftsmen primarily young German immigrants who had recently arrived in North America. These men saw a place where the German language was spoken, where much of the land had been cleared and where there was a shortage of skilled craftsmen (City of Cambridge n.d.)

The population grew rapidly from about 250 inhabitants in 1836 to about 1600 in 1855. Of these approximately 70% were German in origin (City of Cambridge n.d.). Preston's location on the Great Road into the interior of the province made it a natural stop for travelers. Its eight hotels and taverns attracted more Europeans than any other village in the area (City of Cambridge n.d.). Key to the development of Preston, mills and factories were established along the Speed River in the 1830s and 1840s. Around this time, Jacob Beck established the Beck Foundry. Two breweries were established in the 1840s, Georg Roos’ Preston Lager Beer Brewery and the Bernhardt Brewery, founded by Henry and George Bernhardt (Smith et al. 2014).

Stone architecture was common in the nineteenth century in Cambridge, which contributed to the character of the area. The number of stone buildings is attributed to the combination of a readily accessible supply of quality of building stone and limestone and the settling of the area by well-trained and experienced masons and stone cutters (Heritage Cambridge 1988). Many of these structures, notably industrial and commercial buildings and cottages, were built of limestone and field granite.

By 1850, Preston had a population of 1,100, two grist mills, two saw mills, two vinegar factories, a woolen factory, a chair factory, two distilleries, two tanneries, a starch factory, a pottery, three breweries, three schools, a court house, a town hall and two churches (ARA 2016). On January 1, 1852, Preston became the first village incorporated in Waterloo Township, it was also the largest by population.
The intersection of King Street and Fountain Street became a central settlement area and tourist draw with three hotels built around this intersection: the North American, later known as the Kress Hotel (demolished in the 1990s); the Del Monte, renamed the Preston Springs (demolished in 2021); and the Sulphur Springs, which was destroyed by fire in 1982 (Mills 2017). The development of these hotels was a result of the discovery of mineral springs thought to possess remarkable curative powers in the treatment of a variety of ailments (City of Cambridge n.d.).

Despite the tourist draw, Preston’s population declined from 1539 to 1409 people between 1861 and 1871 and showed only a marginal increase to 1419 by 1881 (City of Cambridge n.d.). It was not until 1900 that the population surpassed 2,000, and part of this growth can be traced to the arrival of the electric railway system.

The electric railway, an interurban streetcar, was first proposed in 1890 to connect Preston and Galt. It was not until 1894 that the railway was built and later it also connected Hespeler. It brought with it renewed population growth, such that in 1899 the population increase allowed Preston to be incorporated as a Town (City of Cambridge n.d.). Streetlamps were installed in 1901 and the new Preston and Berlin Street Railway began service in 1903. A municipal electric power commission, created in 1904, built a coal-fired electric power plant at King and Dolph Streets (1905) and a power plant and water pumping station at Riverside Park (1906-08). By 1910, the Town’s system connected the provincial hydro system (now Ontario Hydro) (Smith et al. 2014). A new Carnegie-funded public library opened on Argyle Street North at Duke Street in 1910. By 1915, Preston had electricity, water service, paved roads and a library.

A Fire Insurance Plan from 1910 indicates that early residential lots had been further subdivided to accommodate the Town’s growing population. The organization of the area appeared similar to today with commercial buildings lining King Street and residences fronting the intersecting streets.

There was steady growth in Preston in the 1950s and 1960s with continued expansion of its industrial base and gradual residential expansion towards Galt and Hespeler (City of Cambridge n.d.). Despite public opposition, the Provincial government decided to amalgamate the Towns of Preston and Hespeler, the settlement of Blair, and the City of Galt to form the City of Cambridge in 1973 (City of Cambridge n.d.).

### 4.3 LAND USE HISTORY: 1102 KING STREET EAST

The Euro-Canadian land use history for 1102 King Street East, City of Cambridge was produced using census returns, land registry records, city directories, assessment and/or collector rolls, historical mapping, and other primary and secondary sources, where available.

#### 4.3.1 1102 KING STREET EAST

The subject property is comprised of part of an unnumbered lot on the 1858 Plan 521, and within Lot 4, Broken Front Beasley Lower Block, in the Geographic Township of Waterloo. Early patent information beginning with the Crown was not available for this property and limited land registry records were located. As such, the property history has been supplemented with historical maps, city directories and archival photos.
The Abstract Parcel Register Book for Village of Preston (Concession Broken Front) indicates the subject property was originally Part of Lot 4, Broken Front Beasley Lower Block. No land registry records specific to the subject property were located.

The Town Plan from 1858 (Figure 2) indicates that lands bounded by Dover Street to the north, William Street to the east, Bishop Street to the south and Hamilton Street to the east have been subdivided as part of Plan 521. No structures are illustrated on the 1858 Town Plan and no property owners are shown for the lot, which is unnumbered.

The 1859 Village of Preston Map by James Pollock indicates that King Street East and the block on which the existing property is located was already developed, with commercial buildings fronting King Street East (Figure 3). The map shows that M. Roos owned the lot on which the hotel is sited. The hotel is illustrated fronting King Street East with an L-shaped plan. Two smaller buildings, one with a square plan and one with a rectangular plan are also shown on the lot. No indication of material or massing is provided on the 1859 Village Map. The road allowance for Dolph Street South has not yet been constructed.

The detail of the Village of Preston on Tremaine’s 1861 Map of the County of Waterloo (Figure 4) shows little growth within the village. Potter Street and Guelph Street, now Laurel Street and Dolph Street North, respectively, are illustrated on the map. The road allowance for Dolph Street South has not yet been constructed.

The building on the subject property is illustrated as an L-shaped building with two accessory buildings, within the core of the village. A brewery is located west of the subject property and the map legend indicates G. Roos is the proprietor of the G. Ross’ Hotel and Brewery.

The Gazetteer and Directory of the County of Waterloo for 1867 lists George Roos, an inn keeper, as living on Upper Block, Concession 110, Lot H (Irwin and Burnham Publishers). The hotel in Preston is also advertized as Roos’ Hotel, with G. Roos as the propietior (Plate 1).

![Plate 1: 1867 advertisement for Roos’ Hotel in Preston](image-url)
There are two Breweries. George Roos’ is a stone building 100x44 feet, two storeys high, with tree cellars or vaults, each 50x18 feet. It was the first brewery established in this locality.

The brewery and hotel are also advertised in the 1877-78 Gazetteer and Directory (Plate 2). Reference to the brewery owned by Roos likely represents the stone building west of the subject property.

Plate 2: 1867 advertisement for the George Roos’ Hotel in Preston

The 1881 Illustrated Historical Atlas of the County of Waterloo (Figure 5) does not identify the building footprint of dwellings in the core of Preston, but it does indicate that the subject property is located in the centre of the urban area, which is well-developed at this point.

The birds eye map entitled Town of Preston with view of principal business buildings (Howell Lithographers 1896-1900) shows the hotel as fronting onto King Street East (Figure 6). The building appears to be one-and-a-half storeys in height with a one-storey addition on the building’s south elevation (demolished by 1910). Two end chimneys are visible on the one-and-a-half storey portion of the building. A one-and-a-half storey building with three bays is also shown within the boundaries of the subject property to the west.

G. M. Roos is listed as a hotel keeper on King Street in the Waterloo County Gazetteer and Directory for 1885-85 (Evans, 1884;Plate 3). The gazetteer does not provide an address or name of the hotel.
Plate 3: 1884-85 Directory listing G.M. Roos as an hotel keeper on King Street.

No information for the Roos’ Hotel or the Queen’s Hotel is listed in the Unions Publishing Company’s Farmers’ and Business Directory for the Counties of Halton, Waterloo and Wellington, Volume X (Union Publishing Company 1896).

The 1910 Fire Insurance Plan (Figure 7) for Preston shows a rectangular building fronting King Street East and St. Lawrence Street (now Dolph Street South). Previous depictions on the 1859 Plan and the illustration of the 1861 Tremaine map indicated the building had an L-shaped plan, however by 1910 the one-storey south addition had been removed. The main portion of the commercial building facing King Street East is depicted as three sections; from east to west they include a two-and-a-half storey stone section with a shingle or board roof, a two-storey stone section with a composition roof, and a small one-storey wood section. This plan is the first evidence of the two-storey rear limestone addition, which was likely constructed between 1890 and 1910.

A one-storey ice house constructed of wood is depicted on the 1910 Fire Insurance Plan, as is a one storey ancillary building with a metal roof, clad in corrugated iron, both are located southwest of the hotel building.

Martin Janz (also known as Marter Yantz, Marter Yanz or Martin Yantz), a hotel proprietor, is listed in the Province of Ontario Gazetteer and Directory, 1910-1911 (Union Publishing Company 1911), however the name of the hotel and location are not provided in the gazetteer. Janz is also depicted in a 1914 photograph of the bar within the Queen’s Hotel (Plate 4). Also pictured are Jack Myers and Mr. Betz.
Plate 4: Archival photograph of Martin Janz and others in the bar at the Queen’s Hotel in 1914 (Courtesy of Darryl Bonk Collection)

The Queen’s Hotel is visible on the 1916 and 1936 Topographic Maps, Galt Sheet (Figure 8 and Figure 10), and is depicted as a brick or stone building, with the letter ‘H’, denoting its use as a hotel.

Janz retired as proprietor of the Queen’s Hotel in 1919 and the Schmalz family took over the hotel in 1923 (Latif 2022). Joseph Alfred Schmalz, also known as "Alfred" or "Alf", ran the hotel until his death in 1986, at which time his son, Cecil E. Schmalz, took over operation. Matchbooks from the Queen’s Hotel during the Schmalz’s ownership are depicted in Plate 5 below.
The 1924 Fire Insurance Plan (Figure 9) for Preston does not show any changes to the configuration of buildings within the subject property from 1910.

A 1954 aerial image (Figure 11) of the subject property was reviewed but the quality is poor, making it challenging to clearly identify property details. However, it appears that the one-storey cinderblock addition to the south and the two-storey cinderblock addition to the southwest had not yet been constructed.

Two archival images from an unknown year, but estimated to be in the 1960s, show the exterior and interior of the Queen’s Hotel (Plate 6 and Plate 7). The first floor of the main façade is asymmetrical with six bays. The main entrance is covered with a flat roof, supported by chains. Two windows are located to the right of the main entrance and two windows and a door are located to the left of the entrance. The upper storey of the main façade features five windows and a large sign that reads “Queen’s Tavern”. The windows and doors on the main façade have thick lintels and sills. Three dormers are present on the main façade and a chimney is visible on the north elevation.

The southwest elevation of the building is partially obscured by trees and a two-storey cinderblock addition. One door is visible on the first floor of the south elevation. Two windows are visible in the upper storey, one of which has been converted to a fire escape. It is believed this addition was constructed sometime between 1954 and 1962.
The interior of the hotel featured a dining room, a ladies’ beverage room and 24 guest rooms. An excerpt from an un-sourced periodical states the following:

_A link with the early settlers of Preston and one of the historic landmarks in Central East Preston, is the Queen's hotel. The Queen's was established about a century ago by the Roos family with Messrs. Zeiler, Steckles, Wilson, Martin Yantz. Charles Schmalz owning it in order until the present proprietor took over._

_The Queen's is now owned and operated by a former famous Riverside hockey goalkeeper, Mr. "Alfie" Schmalz and his three sons, Cecil, Gerald (Bud) and Allan._

_Mrs. Schmalz is in charge of the dining-room where delicious home-cooked meals are served._

_The hotel is noted for its new ladies’ beverage room which is one of the finest in the district. There are 24 clean, comfortable rooms._

_Situated at the busy intersection of King and Guelph streets, the hotel is popular with travellers and business people._
Plate 7: Un-sourced publication detailing history of the Queen’s Hotel and interior and exterior photos. Undated, estimated c. 1960s (Courtesy of Darryl Bonk Collection)

According to a newspaper article in the *Galt Evening Reporter* dated March 1, 1962, the Queen’s Hotel was purchased from the Schmalz family by Walter Skretkowicz and John Cwierzinski (Latif 2022). This contradicts other newspaper reporting that Joseph Alfred Schmalz ran the hotel until his death in 1986, at which time his son, Cecil E. Schmalz, took over operation (Latif 2022). The 1962 *Galt Evening Reporter* article also indicated the building was approximately 140 years old in 1962, potentially placing the date of construction as early as 1822, however this date could not be confirmed through a review of available land records and mapping.
An archival image from 1969 shows the first floor of the main façade of the Queen’s Hotel as being covered in a veneer, possibly of angel stone. The chimney on the north elevation is present, as are three dormers on the east façade. The first floor of the south elevation is covered with a one-storey cinderblock addition (likely constructed between 1960-1969). The windows in the upper storeys are visible and appear to be single-pane sash windows. The south façade of the building features return eaves (Plate 8).

Plate 8: View of the Queen’s Hotel along King Street East, c. 1969 (Courtesy of the City of Cambridge Archives)

It is likely that the extant mid-century modern curtainscreen was added, concealing the King Street East façade, in the 1970s, with the west one storey cinderblock addition likely constructed in a similar era. By 1980, the building was known as the Grand Hotel, and until 2019, the Grand Hotel and Bar. In May 2019, the interior was damaged by fire and the building remains vacant to present day.

4.3.1.1 MARTIN JANZ

Martin Janz was born in Breslau, Waterloo Township on March 1, 1861. He enumerated in the 1911 Census as Marter Janz, a 48 year-old hotel keeper, born in Ontario, of German descent. His wife Matilda, aged 38 and their children, John, aged 18 years and Doris, aged four years, are also listed in the Census (Year: 1911; Census Place: 23 - Preston, Waterloo South, Ontario; Page: 31; Family No: 307).

Janz is also enumerated in the 1921 Census with his children Doris, John, Cecilia, Lona and one unnamed child. Janz’s occupation is listed as a gardener (Reference Number: RG 31; Folder Number: 95; Census Place: 95, Waterloo South, Ontario; Page Number: 10).

Jantz died on September 22, 1935 at his home at 1161 Queen Street in Preston. The death certificate indicates he was a hotel keeper for 49 years, retiring from the profession in 1919 (Plate 9; Library and Archives Canada 2022).
His obituary in the Kitchener Daily Record from September 23, 1935, states (Waterloo Region Generations 2022):

A prominent figure in early hotel life in this district, Martin Janz, former owner of the Queen's Hotel here, passed away Sunday at his home, 1161 Queen street, in his 76th year. Mr. Janz retired 16 years ago and for a quarter of a century previous to his retirement had conducted the Queen's Hotel. He came to this town from Blair, where he operated the hotel there. Surviving are one daughter, Mrs. Arthur Hummel, four grandchildren, four brothers, Henry of Preston, Joseph in Breslau, George of Bridgeport and Jacob of Souris, Man. and two sisters, Mrs. Mary Hertel, Preston and Mrs. Mark Lewis, Kitchener. He was predeceased by his wife 18 years ago. One son passed away six years ago. The funeral will be held Wednesday morning from the home to St. Clement's Roman Catholic Church for services at 9 o'clock. Interment will take place in the adjoining cemetery.
4.3.1.2  JOSEPH ALFRED "ALFRED" "ALF" SCHMALZ

Joseph Alfred Schmalz was born in Maryhill (New Germany), Waterloo Township on February 26, 1899. He worked as a button sawyer prior to purchasing the Queen’s Hotel in 1923. His obituary from the Kitchener-Waterloo Record, dated May 20, 1986 reads:

At his residence, 1156 Queenston Rd., Cambridge, Monday, May 19, 1988, in his 88th year. Beloved husband of the late Wilma Schnurr; dear father of Cecil of Cambridge. Predeceased by two sons, Gerald (Bud) and Allan (Barney). Also survived by 17 grandchildren; 37 great-grandchildren; three brothers, Leo, William and Gordon of Kitchener; four sisters, Rose (Mrs. William Diemert) of Mildmay, Mrs. Edna Deneteau, Mrs. Eleanor Bickers of Kitchener and Mrs. Minette Innis of Waterloo. Mr. Schmalz was born in Maryhill, Ont. and came to Cambridge in 1923 from Kitchener. Retired from the hotel business (Queens Hotel, Cambridge), active in sports, a member of the Preston Riverside Hockey Team of the Big Six Senior Hockey League, 1921 to 1931 as a goal tender, nick-named (Alfred the Eagle Eye). Friends will be received at the Barthel-Stager Funeral Home, 566 Queenston Rd., Cambridge, Tuesday (today), 7-9 and Wednesday from 2-4 and 7-9 p.m. Funeral mass will be celebrated in St. Clements Church, Thursday at 9 a.m. Interment in St. Clements cemetery. Rosary will be recited at the funeral home, Wednesday evening at 7 p.m.
Figure 2: Location of the Study Area on Plan 521 (1858)
Figure 4: Location of the Study Area on Tremaine's 1861 Map of the County of Waterloo
Figure 5: Location of the Study Area on the 1881 Illustrated Historical Atlas of the County of Waterloo.
Figure 8: Location of the Study Area on the 1916 Topographic Map
Figure 9: Location of the Study Area on the 1924 Fire Insurance Plan.
Figure 11: Location of the Study Area on the 1954 Aerial Photograph
5 EXISTING CONDITIONS

The subject property at 1102 King Street East is an approximately 0.32-acre commercial property on a rectangular lot that includes a two-and-a-half storey limestone Georgian commercial building constructed prior to 1859 to which numerous one and two-storey additions have been constructed to the south and west elevations. The property is located on the southwest corner of King Street East and Dolph Street South in the core of the community of Preston, City of Cambridge. The commercial building is oriented toward King Street East and the rear two and one-storey additions run adjacent to Dolph Street South. Consistent with the streetscapes, the building has a very narrow setback from both street frontages. The subject property is surrounded by nineteenth and twentieth century commercial buildings to the east and south, a multiunit residential building to the west, and a vacant lot proposed for condominium development to the north.

King Street East and the grid pattern of the intersecting streets in the study area do not align north-south. As such, ‘north’ has been used to describe the direction toward the Speed River.

The following description of the subject property is based on a site visit conducted on November 8, 2022 by Lindsay Benjamin, Senior Cultural Heritage Specialist. Access to the entire property, including the interior of the building was granted by the current property owner. Due to water damage resulting from a fire in the structure’s second floor and attic in 2019 and an accumulation of stored items, some portions of the basement and main floor could not be safely entered and documented.

5.1 COMMERCIAL BUILDING

The two-and-a-half storey limestone Georgian commercial building covered with a mid-century modern curtainscreen is located on a rectangular lot with a narrow setback from both King Street East and Dolph Street South. The structure is oriented with its façade to King Street East (Image 1).

Originally constructed prior to 1859, a number of significant additions and alterations have been made to the building, resulting in a one and two-storey cinderblock addition to the south elevation (Images 2 and 3), an early two-storey limestone addition to the west elevation (Image 4) and a single-storey cinderblock addition (Image 5) also to the west. The portion of the commercial building fronting King Street East, or the façade, is of limestone construction set upon a limestone and fieldstone foundation covered with a mid-century modern curtainscreen obscuring the upper storeys and angel stone cladding on the lower storey, both intended to provide a modern appearance during their era of construction in the late 1960s or early 1970s. The original portion of the building fronting King Street East was built to a rectangular plan extended with a rear two-storey limestone addition fronting Dolph Street South. The one and two-storey cinderblock additions have been built to rectangular plans.
Image 1: View to façade of 1102 King Street East, looking west

Image 2: View to one-storey addition to west elevation, looking northwest

Image 3: View to two-storey addition to south elevation (rear), looking west

Image 4: View to two-storey limestone addition to west elevation, looking south

Image 5: View to one-storey addition to west elevation, looking south
5.1.1 EXTERIOR

East Elevation (Façade)

The east elevation represents the building’s façade and is comprised of the original two-and-a-half storey limestone building and a one-storey cinderblock addition constructed to the south (Image 1). The foundation is not visible on the façade.

The façade of the original stone building has been obscured by the addition of a two-storey mid-century modern curtainscreen added in the late 1960s (Images 6 and 7). The screen extends upwards from the second storey and west to the peak of the structure’s gable roof. The screen appears to be constructed of aluminum painted brown and formed into a row of five arches with columns and capitals. The area beneath the arches is screened with sheets of plastic formed to a diamond-shape motif. Following a review of the interior of the second storey and attic, the fenestration of the original structure remains behind the screen, inclusive of five flat-arched windows at the second floor and three gabled dormer windows projecting from the roof, all with single-hung wood windows (Images 95 and 149; see Section 5.6.3 and Appendix F). The street-level, lower portion of the original building’s façade is clad in an angel stone veneer (Image 8) and composed of three bays; a central arched and recessed entrance with a steel door with brass hardware (Image 9) flanked by two false arches with chalkboards in the top and a rectangular band of blank signage beneath (Image 10). The recessed central doorway is accessed by one terrazzo step that extends along the base of the building to the north corner of the façade (Image 11).

The façade of the one-storey addition is also clad in an angel stone veneer and includes two bays (Image 12); a false arch in the centre of the elevation and an arched and recessed entrance door at the north side of the elevation (Image 13). The door is comprised of long, narrow wood panels arranged vertically. A half-storey boomtown front has been added above this one-storey addition in a style reflective of the curtainscreen on the original building (Image 14). The boomtown front is constructed entirely of aluminum with the arches painted brown and the void space painted white.

An aluminum awning with an orange sign spans the length of the entire façade of both the original building and the addition between the first and second storey (Image 1). Over the centrally placed entrance on the original building, a projecting, arched awning sign reads “Grand River Hotel”. An additional projecting awning wraps around the northeast corner of the building. The signage is damaged and only reads “Grand River”.

The roofline of the façade is not visible as a result of the introduction of the curtainscreen on the original building and boomtown front on the one-storey addition, both of which project above the structure’s rooflines.

Behind the boomtown front of the one-storey addition, the upper level of a rear two-storey cinderblock addition is visible (Image 15). The only features of this structure visible on the east elevation are two flat-arched, single-hung wood windows with aluminum screens and faux shutters painted brown. The elevation is clad in plaster and rises slightly above the flat roofline.
South Elevation

The south elevation, described from east to west, includes the blank plastered wall of the one-storey cinderblock façade addition at the southeast corner of the building (Image 16), the upper portion of the original limestone building, which features the gable roofline remaining beneath the façade’s curtainscreen (Image 17), and the two-storey rear cinderblock addition at the southwest corner of the building, which is also clad in plaster (Image 18).

The south elevation of the one-storey cinderblock building fronting King Street East is blank and clad in plaster. It features a flat roof and the rising profile of the boomtown front facing King Street East. The foundation is not visible (Image 19) but the cinderblock construction is evident beneath the flaking plaster cladding (Image 20). A portion of the upper two-storeys of the original limestone building is evident from ground level and includes a wood, flat-arched, single-hung window with faux shutters and a doorway accessed by a metal staircase beneath the gable peak, leading to the attic (Image 17). A rectangular, flat-arched window opening is also located on the west side of the elevation at the second floor, however it was not visible from the ground. The elevation has been clad in plaster, obscuring the stone construction beneath. The roofline is simple with overhanging eaves with wood fascia covered in aluminum. The construction of the curtainscreen that obscures the façade of the original building has been built flush with the peak of the gable roofline, resulting in a flat roof on the east half of the structure.

The two-storey rear addition at the southwest corner of the building (Image 21) is clad in plaster and also shows evidence of the cinderblock construction beneath (Image 22). The foundation is not visible. The elevation is blank aside from a covered entranceway on the north side with a steel door accessed by three concrete steps, and a simple raised doorway with a steel door on the west side (Image 28). The lower courses of cinderblocks have been parged to look like cut stone. Beyond the one-storey rear addition, the west elevation of the early two-storey stone addition with a flat roof is partially visible and includes four flat-arched rectangular window openings; the window furthest north is smaller than the others (Image 29). The west side of the gable roof is the only portion of the original two-and-a-half storey stone building visible from the west. It is clad in asphalt shingles and features a centrally-placed dormer with a simple flat-arched doorway with a utilitarian wood door in the gable peak. The dormer is clad in aluminum siding and includes single-hung wood windows in both the north and south elevations of the dormer. A buff brick chimney is visible.

West Elevation

The west elevation (Image 26) is comprised of a number of one and two-storey additions as well as the upper portion of the original limestone structure, which is otherwise obscured by additions. Described from north to south, the one-storey addition that spans two-thirds of the west elevation is a cinderblock structure clad in plaster with a flat roof with a band of paneled aluminum fascia (Image 27). It is blank aside from a covered entranceway on the north side with a steel door accessed by three concrete steps, and a simple raised doorway with a steel door on the west side (Image 28). The lower courses of cinderblocks have been parged to look like cut stone. Beyond the one-storey rear addition, the west elevation of the early two-storey stone addition with a flat roof is partially visible and includes four flat-arched rectangular window openings; the window furthest north is smaller than the others (Image 29). The west side of the gable roof is the only portion of the original two-and-a-half storey stone building visible from the west. It is clad in asphalt shingles and features a centrally-placed dormer with a simple flat-arched doorway with a utilitarian wood door in the gable peak. The dormer is clad in aluminum siding and includes single-hung wood windows in both the north and south elevations of the dormer. A buff brick chimney is visible.
projecting from the north side of the roofline at the gable peak, and metal fire escape ladder leads from the flat roof of the addition.

The south elevation of the two-storey cinderblock addition at the southwest corner of the building is clad in plaster and rises slightly above the flat roofline (Image 30). The elevation includes a simple doorway opening with a steel door offset from centre on the upper floor and a window opening with broken glazing that has been boarded from the inside (Image 31). Like the south elevation of this addition, the window is flat-arched, wood and single-hung with a simple sill. The doorway on this upper level is accessed by a metal fire escape staircase with railings. The lower level of this addition includes a basement door accessed beneath an aluminum shelter (Image 32). The doorway access is constructed of cinderblock and projects from the addition and features a wood door with a wood frame that has been reduced in size. A single-storey enclosed smoking area constructed of coregulated metal with grates and a sloped roof projects from the west elevation of this addition (Image 33). It is constructed on a concrete foundation and a doorway from the main floor leads to this area on the south side of the west elevation.

**North Elevation**

The north elevation (Image 35), described from east to west, is comprised of the original two-and-a-half storey limestone building (Image 36), an early two-storey limestone addition (Image 37), and a one-storey cinderblock addition (Image 38). The foundations of these structures were not visible.

The north elevation of the original portion of the building has been largely obscured by plaster cladding on the lower level and aluminum siding on the upper storeys. A portion of the limestone cladding with raised mortar joints is exposed where the aluminum siding has been removed (Images 39 and 40; see Section 5.6.3 and Appendix F). It also appears the corner of the original structure features granite quoins. The elevation is two bays and includes two wood, single-hung, flat-arched windows with aluminum screens, simple sills, faux shutters painted brown on the second storey and smaller, wood, single-hung windows with faux shutters in the gable peak (Image 41). Unlike the south elevation, the gable peak of the north elevation has been altered through the introduction of the curtainscreen on the façade. Only the west half of the roofline is visible on this elevation. A corbelled buff brick chimney projects from the centre of the roof’s gable peak (Image 42). HVAC ductwork from the structure’s former kitchen descends from the roof of the two-storey addition and runs across the elevation from east to west at the second floor. Awning signage from the façade wraps around the east corner of this elevation.

The north elevation of the early two-storey limestone addition with a flat roof is also clad in plaster on the lower level and aluminum siding on the upper storey (Image 37). The original limestone cladding is visible on this structure as well (Image 43). The ground level of this elevation has been significantly altered through the introduction of a large plate glass window topped with a rectangular sign panel (Image 37). The upper storey is comprised of three flat-arched, rectangular, wood, single-hung windows with aluminum screens and faux shutters (Image 44).

The north elevation of the rear single-storey cinderblock addition features a flat roof with a band of paneled aluminum fascia (Image 38). The elevation is clad in plaster with the exception of a panel of aluminum siding and blank aside from a doorway opening set to the east side of the wall with
two large-paned sidelights. The door opening is boarded and accessed by three concrete steps leading to a concrete platform covered with an awning. Like the west elevation, the lower courses of cinderblocks have been parged to look like cut stone.

The exterior features of the commercial building that exhibit the original form or materials or retain direct association with the Georgian architectural style include but may not be limited to the:

- Two-and-a-half storey Georgian-style massing and scale of the original building;
- Limestone construction with raised mortar joints and granite quoins;
- End-gable roof;
- Overhanging eaves (south elevation);
- Corbeled buff brick chimney;
- Recessed main entrance (east façade);
- Fenestration of the north and south elevations;
- Five flat-arched window openings in the façade (east façade) with single-hung wood windows and stone sills;
- Three gabled dormer windows in the roof (east façade) with single-hung wood windows; and
- Early two-storey rear limestone addition (projecting from the west elevation of the original building) with three flat-arched window openings in the upper storey of the north elevation with single-hung wood windows.

Image 6: View to façade of original two-and-a-half storey building with curtainscreen

Image 7: Detail of curtainscreen on façade (east elevation)
Image 8: Detail of angel stone cladding on façade

Image 9: Detail of recessed arched entrance doorway

Image 10: Detail of false arch on façade

Image 11: Detail of terrazzo entrance step on façade

Image 12: Detail of façade (east elevation) of one-storey addition, looking west

Image 13: Detail of recessed entrance in façade of one-storey addition
Image 14: Detail of boomtown front on façade of one-storey addition

Image 15: Detail of second floor windows in east elevation of two-storey cinderblock addition

Image 16: View of southeast corner of 1102 King Street East, looking northwest

Image 17: Detail of south elevation of original two-and-a-half storey limestone building

Image 18: View of south elevation of 1102 King Street East, looking west

Image 19: Detail of plaster cladding of south elevation and angel stone on façade (right)
Image 20: Detail of cinderblock construction beneath plaster cladding on south elevation of one-storey addition

Image 21: Detail of south elevation of two-storey cinderblock addition, looking east

Image 22: Detail of cinderblock construction beneath plaster cladding on south elevation of two-storey addition

Image 23: Detail of upper storey windows in south elevation of two-storey addition

Image 24: Detail of upper storey windows and fire escape in south elevation

Image 25: View to southwest corner of building at 1102 King Street East
Image 26: View to west elevation of building at 1102 King Street East

Image 27: View to west elevation of one-storey cinderblock addition

Image 28: Detail of two entrances in west elevation of one-storey addition

Image 29: Detail of west façade of early two-storey limestone addition (middle) and roof of original building (rear)

Image 30: View to west elevation of two-storey cinderblock addition
Image 31: Detail of door opening, fire escape and window opening in west elevation of two-storey addition

Image 32: Detail of enclosed basement access in west elevation of two-storey cinderblock addition

Image 33: Detail of enclosed smoking area projecting from west elevation

Image 34: View to northwest corner of building at 1102 King Street East

Image 35: View to north elevation of building at 1102 King Street East

Image 36: Detail of north elevation of two-and-a-half storey original limestone building
Image 37: Detail of north elevation of two-storey limestone addition

Image 38: Detail of north elevation of one-storey cinderblock addition

Image 39: Detail of fenestration on north elevation of two-and-a-half storey original limestone building

Image 40: Detail of limestone construction with raised mortar joints on north elevation

Image 41: Detail of roofline on north elevation of two-and-a-half storey original stone building

Image 42: Detail of buff brick corbelled chimney projecting above north elevation
5.1.2  INTERIOR

5.1.2.1  MAIN FLOOR

The main floor of the commercial building has evolved and been adapted to accommodate the number of uses and tenants that occupied the space over its century and a half history. Very little original material remains on this level following significant alterations made in the 1960s and 1970s and expansion through multiple additions. It is primarily composed of a large room that was occupied by the former tavern, flanked by a dining lounge and kitchen to the north and a number of smaller rooms (offices, washrooms, storage) to the west. The main floor will be described...
beginning at the main entrance and moving clockwise through the building as per the existing building plans included in Appendix A.

The main floor is accessed by a recessed public entrance in the original limestone building fronting King Street East (Image 46). A simple vestibule is located between the exterior and interior doors and provides access to the tavern, a staircase to the second floor (Image 47), and the dining lounge or “Lunch Room” (Image 48) on the main floor. The doors are simple steel doors. The vestibule is carpeted and terrazzo floors may be present beneath as evidenced by the terrazzo observed in the exterior entranceway and step leading to the public entrance (Image 11). The walls of the vestibule are clad with a half-height brick veneer topped with a wood panel.

Beyond the vestibule, the large room that served as the former tavern occupies two-thirds of the main floor and is a state of disrepair, suffering significant water damage following a fire in the second floor and attic in 2019 (Image 49). The vaulted drop ceiling cladding has collapsed in many areas, exposing few painted tin ceiling panels (only near the entrance) (Image 50), which do not appear to be in their original location, but added haphazardly. Portions of the walls have also been removed, exposing the thick limestone construction of the original portion of the structure beneath (Image 51). The south side of the former tavern, described from east to west, includes a dance floor and raised stage area (Images 52 and 53) surrounded by a lounge (Image 54). The north side of the room is dedicated to lounge space divided by walls with false arches and vaulted ceilings clad in brick veneer (Images 55 to 57) with a bar in the northeast corner (Image 49), and a larger bar spanning the west wall (Images 58 to 60). Portions of the dance floor are terrazzo (Image 61). The remainder of the floor in this room is carpeted, concrete or laminate wood planks. The wall cladding appears to be a mix of plaster and drywall and is largely clad in brick veneer and wallpaper (Image 62). Metal electric heaters are located along the south wall (Image 63), and a doorway in the south side of the west wall leads to the enclosed, outdoor smoking area (Image 64).

In the centre of the west wall of the former tavern, behind the bar, a hallway (Image 65) leads to an office on the north side (Image 66) and connects to a smaller office (this office was not accessible due to an accumulation of material in the larger office), and a large walk-in cooler clad in wood panels on the south side of the hallway (Images 67 and 68). The hallway leads to an exterior door on the west wall and a narrow corridor used for storage extends to the south (Image 69).

In the northwest corner of the former tavern, a hallway clad in tiles to half-height with a stucco ceiling (Image 70) leads to a small janitor’s closet (Image 71) and two storage rooms on the south side, and a women’s (Images 72 and 73) and men’s restroom (Images 74 and 75) on the south side. An exterior doorway is present at the end of the hallway on the west wall. Both washrooms are of contemporary construction and include no original material.

The north third of the main floor is comprised of a kitchen to the east and dining lounge to the west. No original material remains in these portions of the main floor. The dining lounge is accessed via multipaned double doors from the west side of the tavern’s north wall (Image 76) as well as an exterior door on the north elevation that leads from Dolph Street South to a glassed vestibule (Image 77). The dining lounge features a tiled floor, stucco ceiling and walls clad with brick veneer and a band of wood paneling to half-height (Images 78 and 79). A single-step leads to the counter (Image 80) and kitchen area, which includes contemporary stainless steel HVAC equipment and a
plaster ceiling (Images 81 and 82). A hallway running parallel to the south side of the kitchen leads to the entrance vestibule at King Street East (Image 83).

Aside from a portion of terrazzo floor and a limited number of tin ceiling panels, no interior features of the main floor remain that represent notable original elements.

Image 46: Detail of recessed entrance to vestibule from King Street East

Image 47: Detail of staircase to second floor from vestibule accessed from King Street East

Image 48: Detail of doorway to dining lounge or “Lunch Room” from main floor vestibule

Image 49: View across east side of former tavern, looking north (note entrance door to east (right))
Image 50: Detail of collapsed drop ceiling and section of tin tiles beneath

Image 51: Detail of limestone construction beneath wall cladding in original portion of structure

Image 52: View to the stage and dance floor, looking south from King Street East entrance

Image 53: View to the dance floor and stage beyond, looking east from lounge

Image 54: Detail of the lounge looking northwest, note false arches and vaulted ceiling

Image 55: View from main entrance and smaller bar in northeast corner of tavern, looking west
Image 56: View of lounge area divided by walls of false arches, looking east

Image 57: View across lounge to large bar on west wall of tavern, looking west

Image 58: Detail of large bar, looking north from entrance to smoking area in west wall

Image 59: Detail of large bar on west wall looking southwest from dining lounge entrance

Image 60: View of large bar on west wall, looking north to dining lounge

Image 61: Detail of remaining terrazzo on a portion of dance floor
Image 62: Detail of wallpaper and brick veneer cladding on south wall of tavern

Image 63: Detail of electric heater along south wall of tavern

Image 64: Detail of exterior steel door with a window in south end of west wall leading to smoking area

Image 65: View of hallway behind large bar in west wall, looking west

Image 66: View of larger office off north side of hallway, looking northwest

Image 67: View of walk-in cooler off south side of hallway, looking northwest
Image 68: View of walk-in cooler off south side of hallway, looking southwest

Image 69: View of corridor west of walk-in cooler used for storage, looking south

Image 70: View of hallway in northside of tavern, looking west

Image 71: View of small janitor’s closet off north side of hallway, looking south

Image 72: View of women’s washroom, looking south

Image 73: View of women’s washroom, looking northwest
Image 74: View of men’s washroom, looking south

Image 75: View of men’s washroom, looking northwest

Image 76: Detail of entrance to tavern from dining lounge, looking south

Image 77: Detail of glassed vestibule at entrance to dining lounge from Dolph Street South, looking north

Image 78: View of dining lounge, looking west

Image 79: View of dining lounge, looking east
5.1.2.2 SECOND FLOOR

The second floor, accessed by an enclosed and carpeted staircase from the main floor vestibule at King Street East (Images 84 and 85), is comprised of the original limestone building fronting King Street East, the early limestone addition to the west and the cinderblock addition constructed projecting from the south elevation and offset to the west. The second floor will be described beginning at the staircase in the original building and moving clockwise through the building as per the existing building plans included in Appendix A. Similar to the main floor, the second floor suffered significant water damage following a fire in 2019 and much of the walls and/or wall cladding, baseboards, trim and fixtures have been removed. It is believed the fire started in the hallway of the second floor and spread to the attic (see Section 5.6.2 and Appendix E).

Original Building

The floorplan of the original portion of the building includes four bedrooms, an office and a bathroom placed around a central staircase, which also provides access to the attic. The plaster has been removed from the walls of most of these rooms (Images 86 and 87), revealing the lathe (Image 88), and the flooring has also been removed, revealing the thin plank wood beneath (Image 89).
The two large bedrooms in the northeast corner of the second floor are connected by a door (Image 87) and both include window openings in the north wall. The windows feature deep wells of paneled wood due to the structure’s limestone construction (Images 90 and 91). Single-hung wood windows are located in the window openings. The window surrounds that remain are simple. Plaster remains on the north wall of the first large room (Images 86 and 87), applied decoratively with a swirl pattern (Image 92). The south and west walls of the second large bedroom (Images 93 and 94) have been clad in plywood panels (Image 93). Two window openings, similar to the others previously described, are located in the east wall of the room (Image 94). The view from these windows is obscured by the curtainscreen affixed to the building’s façade (Image 95). Simple wood baseboards, door surrounds and plinth remain in this room (Image 96).

A door in the south wall of the large corner bedroom leads to the central hallway oriented east-west across the second floor (Images 97 and 98). The staircase to the centre of the hallway provides access to the attic from the east and the main floor from the west. A deep-welled window is located in the east wall of the hallway (Image 99). An office is located across the hallway to the south, and includes a window and is in a similar condition to the other rooms described (Images 100 and 101).

To the west of the office, a hallway (Image 102) aligned north-south leads to a smaller bedroom in the southeast corner of the original structure (Image 103) as well as a bathroom at the south end of the hallway. The lathe between the small bedroom and bathroom showed remnants of newspaper and grass placed between the wall cavity for insulation (Image 104). Almost all fixtures in the bathroom had been removed (Image 105). One decorative metal grate remained in the wall (Image 106).

Another large bedroom is located in the southwest corner of the building, accessed from the west side of the hallway (Images 107 and 108). This room included two recessed closets in the west wall that were formerly window openings before the limestone addition was constructed on the west elevation (Image 109). A window in the south wall has been enclosed due to the cinderblock addition constructed to the south. Ornate metal hot water radiators of various sizes are located in each room and the central hallway of the original portion of the second floor (Image 110).

**West Stone Addition**

The portion of the second floor located in the west limestone addition is composed of five bedrooms, a bathroom and a storage area accessed via a hallway oriented east-west and constructed through the west elevation of the original building (Image 111). There are two steps down between the original portion of the structure and the addition (Image 112). This hallway leads to a second hallway that aligns north-south and provides access to a storage area, and the portion of the second floor in the cinderblock addition to the south (Image 113). A second, longer and narrower hallway is aligned parallel to this hallway and links to the row of bedrooms and the bathroom arranged along the extent of the north-south portion of the addition (Images 114 and 115). A bathroom and one bedroom (Images 116 and 117) are located on the east side of the hallway, and four bedrooms and an open space are located on the west side. A skylight was included in this hallway but it was removed following the fire damage. Almost all of the wall cladding (Image 118) and details have been removed from these rooms with the exception of some wall plaster. The interior doorways once included transom windows that have been removed (Image 119). The windows are narrow, rectangular and deep-welled but do not include the
decorative wood panelling seen in the original building (Image 120). Baseboard heaters are located in the addition and some evidence of linoleum flooring remains (Image 121). A portion of the roof in the southwest corner of the addition is open to the elements (Image 122). This area also includes two enclosed windows converted to recessed closets following construction of the cinderblock addition to the south (Image 123).

**Southwest Cinderblock Addition**

The southwest cinderblock addition is accessed through the south wall of the limestone addition (Image 124). All wall and ceiling cladding and most fixtures have been removed from the entirety of the second floor of this addition, which included eight bedrooms, a bathroom and a vestibule arranged around a hallway running north-south (Images 125 and 126) and another intersecting hallway running east-west (Image 127). The cinderblock construction is visible behind the wall studs, as is the masonry construction of the original building and limestone addition on the north wall (Images 128 and 129). Enclosed windows between the structures are also visible (Image 130). The wood subfloor is exposed beneath the crumbling linoleum tiles (Image 131). Many of the windows have been boarded, but they appear to be wood, single-hung units located in the bedrooms along the east and south walls (Image 132). Simple hot water radiators are located beneath the windows. A doorway with a steel door is located in the vestibule in the west elevation and provides access to the second storey fire escape (Image 133).

Aside from the ornate hot water radiators and remaining paneled, deep-welled window openings in the original portion of the building, no interior features of the second floor endure that represent notable original elements.
Image 86: View of large bedroom in northwest corner of original building, looking southwest

Image 87: View of large bedroom in northwest corner of original building, looking northeast

Image 88: Detail of exposed lathe in second floor of original building

Image 89: Detail of wood plank beneath removed flooring of original building on second floor

Image 90: Detail of window opening in north wall of second floor of original building

Image 91: Detail of deep window well and paneling in north wall of original building
Image 92: Detail of decorative plaster wall cladding in bedroom in northwest corner of original building

Image 93: Detail of plywood paneled cladding in bedroom in northeast corner of original building, looking southwest

Image 94: View of bedroom in northeast corner of original building, looking northeast

Image 95: Detail of window in east wall obscured behind curtainscreen on façade

Image 96: Detail of simple wood baseboards, door surround and plinth in northeast bedroom, looking south to hallway beyond

Image 97: View of central hallway on second floor looking west to attic staircase and addition beyond
Image 98: View of central hallway on second floor looking east

Image 99: Detail of window in east wall of central hallway of original building

Image 100: View to office on south side of central hallway, looking northeast

Image 101: View to office on south side of central hallway, looking southwest

Image 102: View of hallway leading to two bedrooms and a bathroom, looking south

Image 103: View small bedroom in southeast corner of second floor, looking southeast
Image 104: Detail of newspaper and grass placed between wall cavity for insulation

Image 105: View of bathroom at south end of hallway, looking south

Image 106: Detail of decorative metal grate in south bathroom wall

Image 107: View of large room in southwest corner of original building, looking north

Image 108: View of large room in southwest corner of original building, looking southwest

Image 109: Detail of enclosed window converted to recessed closet in west wall
Image 110: Detail of ornate hot water radiator in original building

Image 111: View of hallway leading to west limestone addition, looking west

Image 112: View of hallway leading to west limestone addition, looking east (note steps up)

Image 113: View of hallway leading to southwest cinderblock addition, looking south

Image 114: View of narrow hallway lined with bedrooms, looking south

Image 115: View of narrow hallway lined with bedrooms, looking north
Image 116: View of bedroom in northeast corner of west limestone addition, looking northwest

Image 117: View of bedroom and enclosed window in northeast corner of west limestone addition, looking east

Image 118: Detail of exposed lathe in second storey of west limestone addition

Image 119: Detail of former transom windows in doorways of west limestone addition, looking east

Image 120: Detail of narrow, rectangular, deep-welled window in north wall of stone addition

Image 121: Detail of baseboard heater in second floor of limestone addition
Image 122: Detail of roof open to elements in southwest corner of limestone addition

Image 123: Detail of enclosed window converted to a recessed closet in southwest corner of limestone addition

Image 124: View to access between limestone addition and cinderblock addition, looking north

Image 125: View of north-south hallway in second floor of cinderblock addition, looking south

Image 126: View of north-south hallway in second floor of cinderblock addition

Image 127: View of east-west hallway in second floor of cinderblock addition, looking west
Image 128: Detail of limestone and cinderblock construction behind wall studs

Image 129: Detail of opening in south stone wall of west addition

Image 130: Detail of enclosed window between additions

Image 131: Detail of wood subfloor

Image 132: Detail of wood, single-hung window in east wall of cinderblock addition (note, window has been boarded)

Image 133: Detail of exterior door opening in west wall of vestibule
5.1.2.3 ATTIC

The attic, accessed by an enclosed staircase with a wood banister in the centre of the floorplan (Images 134 to 136), occupies only the original limestone building fronting King Street East. Similar to the other floors in the building, the attic suffered significant water damage following a fire in 2019, and much of the walls and/or wall cladding, baseboards, trim and fixtures have been removed. Additional damage was observed on this floor as the fire spread to the attic from the second floor hallway through the knee wall cavity between the original building and the west stone addition (see Section 5.6.2 and Appendix F).

The floors in the attic have been removed leaving the wood plank sub-floor (Image 137) and the plaster walls have also been mostly removed, revealing the lathe beneath. Most of the ceilings have been removed due to the fire damage, revealing the roof trusses, many of which have been burned. Some simple, undecorated wood baseboards, door and window casings remain. Facing east, the attic will be described in a clockwise manner beginning at the staircase landing as per the existing building plans included in Appendix A.

The attic is composed of three bedrooms, a former kitchen and bathroom, and two crawl spaces in the west gable peak, all accessed from the central hall plan. The central hallway is oriented east-west and includes one ornate hot water radiator (Image 138) and small entrances to the crawl spaces in the north and south walls (Image 135). The ceiling and west wall of the bedroom in the northwest corner of the attic shows significant fire damage to the roof trusses (Images 139 to 142) and charring of the north masonry wall (Image 143). One square, single-hung wood window set in a deep well is located in the north wall (Image 144). The bedroom in the northeast corner of the attic (Images 146 and 148) and the kitchen in the southeast corner (Images 151 to 153) both feature vaulted ceilings to accommodate the gable roof as well as projecting dormer window openings with a pair of rectangular wood, single-hung windows. Like the view from the second floor, these windows are obscured by the curtainscreen on the façade (Image 149). The northeast bedroom also includes a smaller square window opening in the north wall (Image 150). The former kitchen includes a small doorway opening with a wood panel door with a lite (Image 154) and some remaining moulded wood baseboards (Image 155). The ceiling of this room also shows evidence of fire damage (Image 156). The smaller room in the centre of the east side of the attic features a pair of wood, single-hung windows with broken glazing (Images 157 and 158). The former bathroom located in the southwest corner of the attic also shows significant fire damage to the roof trusses (Images 159 and 160) and the square window opening in the south wall has been boarded (Image 161).

The few interior features of the attic that remain and represent notable original elements include the hand-hewn and milled log trusses, joists and support beams and metal hot water radiator.
Image 134: Detail of attic staircase at landing, looking east

Image 135: View of attic central hallway, looking east (note crawl space to right)

Image 136: View of attic central hallway, looking west

Image 137: Detail of wood plank sub-floor floor in attic

Image 138: Detail of hot water radiator in attic hallway

Image 139: View of northwest bedroom in attic, looking southeast (note fire damage)
Image 140: View of northwest bedroom in attic, looking northwest (note fire damage)

Image 141: Detail of fire damage to roof trusses in northwest bedroom of attic

Image 142: Detail of fire damage to roof trusses and wall studs in northwest bedroom of attic

Image 143: Detail of charring on north masonry wall of attic

Image 144: Detail of square, single-hung wood window set in deep well in north wall of northwest bedroom

Image 145: Detail of doorway with simple wood casing in northwest bedroom
Image 146: View of northeast bedroom in attic, looking southwest

Image 147: View of northeast bedroom in attic, looking northeast

Image 148: Detail of paired window in dormer on east wall of northeast bedroom, looking east

Image 149: Detail of obscured view from attic windows looking east due to curtainscreen affixed to façade

Image 150: Detail of square, single-hung wood window set in deep well in north wall of northeast bedroom

Image 151: View of former kitchen in southeast corner of attic, looking north
Image 152: View of former kitchen in southeast corner of attic, looking southeast

Image 153: Detail of paired window in dormer on east wall of former kitchen, looking east

Image 154: Detail of small doorway with wood panel door in south wall of former kitchen, looking south

Image 155: Detail of remaining moulded wood baseboards in former kitchen in attic

Image 156: Detail of fire damage to ceiling of former kitchen in attic

Image 157: View to small centre bedroom on east side of attic, looking southwest
5.1.2.4 BASEMENT

The basement of the building at 1102 King Street East is comprised of two rooms beneath the original limestone structure, two rooms beneath the west limestone addition, and one large room beneath the southwest cinderblock addition. The floors in the basement are concrete, and the thick exterior (current and former) walls are a combination of whitewashed limestone and fieldstone in the stone portions of the building and cinderblock in the southwest addition. Some interior walls have been constructed of particle board, drywall and plaster. The ceiling has been largely enclosed with a variety of materials including drywall and particle board, obscuring most of the timber construction. Concrete and steel support posts are located throughout the basement. There are no window openings in the basement. The basement will be described beginning at the staircase below the original building and moving clockwise as per the existing building plans included in Appendix A Portions of the basement were not accessible due to an accumulation of stored items prohibiting safe passage, and a number of sealed rooms located beneath the additions to the south and west represented inaccessible space.
The basement is accessed by an enclosed wood staircase leading to the centre of the basement of the original portion of the structure (Images 162 and 163). This first room occupies the south half of the original structure (Images 164 and 165) and includes a storage room in the southeast corner (Image 166) and a walk-in cooler in the centre of the south wall (Image 167). The room to the north is a mechanical room and includes an insulated, early Royal Boiler (Images 168 and 169). A smaller mechanical room is accessed through the west wall and is located beneath the limestone addition (Image 170). The furnace is located in this room.

An opening in the west limestone wall of the south room beneath the original portion of the building leads to a storage room under the south half of the west limestone addition (Image 171, Image 174 and 175). Evidence of the thick limestone wall construction of the original structure is visible at this opening (Images 172 and 173). Beyond this room to the south, another opening in the foundation wall leads to a large storage room beneath the southwest cinderblock addition. This opening shows evidence of collapse of the timber support frame and the fieldstone and limestone wall construction (Image 176). The ceiling above this entrance is exposed, revealing hand-hewn timber beams and the wood plank sub-floor above (Image 177).

The storage room beneath the cinderblock addition was challenging to access and photograph due to the accumulation of items in the space (Images 178 and 179). A number of board-formed concrete support pillars are located in the room, some of which have been drywalled (Image 180). An exterior door opening is located in the west wall of this room and provides access via an enclosed staircase to the exterior (Image 32). A smaller storage room with plaster walls and ceilings is located in the southwest corner of this space and was used for alcohol storage for the tavern (Image 181).

The interior features of the basement that represent notable original elements include the limestone and fieldstone foundation and hand-hewn wood support beams and floor joists.

Image 162: View of staircase to basement, looking east
Image 163: View of basement staircase to main floor, looking west
Image 164: View of basement room in south half of original structure, looking south

Image 165: View of basement room in south half of original structure, looking southwest

Image 166: View of small storage room in southeast corner of basement, looking south

Image 167: View of walk-in cooler in centre of basement’s south wall, looking east

Image 168: Detail of Royal Boiler in large north mechanical room, looking west

Image 169: View of large north mechanical room, looking north
Image 170: View to entrance to smaller mechanical room, looking west

Image 171: View of opening in original west limestone wall leading to basement beneath stone addition, looking southwest

Image 172: Detail of thick original limestone wall construction, looking south

Image 173: Detail of whitewashed limestone construction of basement walls beneath original structure

Image 174: View of south room beneath limestone addition, looking southwest

Image 175: View of south room beneath stone addition, looking west
Image 176: Detail of collapsed opening between limestone and cinderblock addition, looking south

Image 177: Detail of hand-hewn timber beams and wood plank sub-floor in south room beneath limestone addition

Image 178: View of storage room beneath cinderblock addition, looking southwest

Image 179: View of storage room beneath cinderblock addition, looking south

Image 180: View of storage room beneath cinderblock addition, looking west (note concrete support pillar)

Image 181: View of small storage room in southwest corner of cinderblock addition, looking southwest
5.2 LANDSCAPE CONDITIONS

The subject property consists of a 0.32-acre commercial property at the southwest corner of King Street East and Dolph Street South (Image 182). The building is oriented with its façade facing King Street East, and is the only structure on the lot. The building spans the extent of the north-south property boundary and is built to the edge of the east property line fronting King Street East and north property line fronting Dolph Street South. The property is accessed via an asphalt driveway from Dolph Street South (Image 183), which leads to a large asphalt parking lot that spans the rear of the building and composes the remaining west portion of the lot. A driveway associated with 1123 Queenston Road, the adjacent property to the west, travels parallel to the south boundary of the subject property and also provides access to the rear parking lot (Image 184). A wood fence lines the west property boundary. The grade of the lot is flat and there is no vegetation on the property.

Image 182: View of subject property at southwest corner of King Street East and Dolph Street South in Preston

Image 183: View of driveway access from Dolph Street South, looking southeast

Image 184: View of driveway parallel to south property boundary from King Street East
5.3 STUDY AREA CONTEXT

Located in the Preston Centre Neighbourhood and the Preston Towne Centre Character Area along King Street East, the subject building is located in the south end of the nineteenth century core of the community, the oldest established village in the City of Cambridge. It is surrounded by nineteenth and twentieth century commercial buildings to the east and south (Images 185 and 186), a multiunit residential building to the west accessed from Dolph Street South and fronting Queenston Road (Image 187), and a vacant lot to the north proposed for condominium development (Image 188). The surrounding commercial and residential buildings are all between one and two-storeys and exhibit a variety of materials including red and buff brick, vinyl siding and angel stone. They reflect the architectural styles typical of the mid-nineteenth century through to the twentieth century, indicating the evolution of the commercial streetscape. Commercial properties located immediately east of the subject property at 1037 King Street East (Image 189), 1103 and 1109 King Street East (Image 190), and a multiunit residential property at 1123 Queenston Road (Image 191) are listed on the City of Cambridge Heritage Properties Register.
5.4 ARCHITECTURAL STYLE

5.4.1 GEORGIAN

The commercial building on the subject property at 1102 King Street East was originally constructed in the Georgian architectural style, which was common in Ontario from the 1780s-1860s.

The Georgian style is typically characterized by “stripped-down decoration, understated elegance, grace, and a formalized system of proportions that could be applied to the humble or grand…It very much became a national architecture for all classes” (Mikel 2004:13). However, not all buildings conformed to the strict Georgian rules. Depending on circumstances and cultural backgrounds, variations appeared in the design (Mikel 2004:16).
Features of the style include classical proportion, symmetry, and refined ornamentation based on historic classical precedents. Generally, in Canada, ornamentation was reserved for chimney pieces and other focal points, but refinement extended to the delicate glazing bars in the large windows and simple staircase balusters. Symmetry extended to the plan, which typically was based on a central entrance and stair hall (Blumenson 1990:5).

In Ontario, the Georgian style was introduced to Upper Canada by British immigrants and United Empire Loyalists (those loyal to the British Crown who found themselves displaced by the newly formed United States of America). Given the harsh climate of Upper Canada and limited financial resources of early settlers, early Georgian buildings were often more utilitarian than examples found in Britain and the United States. Additionally, the varied background of early settlers resulted in Georgian structures that incorporated vernacular construction methods that reflected the settler's origins, skill levels and personal aesthetics (Blumenson 1990:5). This resulted in several sub-categories of Georgian building styles including Mennonite Georgian, which was popular between the 1820s and the 1900s (HRC 2009:4).

Many of the surviving Georgian structures in Ontario have been greatly altered or modernized in the 200 years since their construction. This was initially due, in part, to an influx of people after the War of 1812, when many Georgian buildings were modified to reflect the more popular Neoclassical or Regency building styles (Blumenson 1990:5).

A comparative analysis is included in Section 5.5.

5.4.2 MID-CENTURY MODERN

The façade of the mid-nineteenth century limestone commercial building on the subject property has been concealed behind the addition of a mid-century modern curtainscreen and an angel stone veneer.

Downtowns have never been static but are dependent on the style desired at the time. Commercial building design of the mid-twentieth century expressed a period of optimism and economic prosperity (Dyson 2017:4). Sleek new materials and structural systems represented a post-war, unwavering belief in new technology and material. Glassy, accessible storefronts showcased the twentieth century’s more open relationship between consumers and products, and modern designs promised customers up-to-date goods and service (Dyson 2017:4).

At the end of World War II, as a post-war economy emerged, modern commercial designs utilizing new materials filled architectural journals, design books, and storefront manufacturers’ advertising (Dyson 2017:5-6). Dramatic commercial building and storefront plans by well-known designers such as Raymond Loewy, Morris Lapidus, Victor Gruen, and Morris Ketchum Jr., were widely published and promoted to architects and building owners (Dyson 2017:5-6). These advances in materials and design, combined with material marketing, all had a visual impact on downtowns and diversity prevailed, particularly on the ground level (Dyson 2017:5-6). New buildings were built, businessowners updated their buildings, retailers wanted the latest styles, and downtown service businesses became more customer-focused (Dyson 2017:4).
As illustrated in Plate 10 below, some commercial buildings in the mid-century era were “slipcovered” with a curtainwall rather than completely refaced. For example, the façade might be covered with a lightweight aluminum, plastic or steel facade, often with a screen or panelized motif (Dyson 2017:9). Many slipcovers or facade alterations were well-considered designs to showcase an up-to-date style. In contrast, some buildings were inexpensively covered in the last part of the twentieth century with panels or corrugated siding devoid of design or signage simply to avoid repainting or repointing (Dyson 2017:9).


5.5 COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS

A comparative analysis was undertaken to establish a baseline understanding of similar recognized heritage properties in the City of Cambridge, and where possible, within the community
of Preston, to determine if the subject property “is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, expression, material or construction method” as described in O. Reg. 9/06.

As only two comparative examples of Part IV designated properties within the City of Cambridge were noted on the City of Cambridge Heritage Properties Register, listed properties were also considered. Commercial buildings were selected from this data set, with a preference for buildings of similar age, style, typology and material. Five comparable designated and listed properties were identified within the City of Cambridge (see Table 1 below). This analysis does not represent all available properties, but the examples are intended to provide a representative sample of similar building typologies.

Table 1: Comparative analysis of heritage properties of a similar age, style and/or typology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Recognition</th>
<th>Photograph</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Style</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1679 Blair Road</td>
<td>Part IV and Part V Designated (Blair Village</td>
<td></td>
<td>1837-</td>
<td>Vinyl over buff brick and</td>
<td>Former Lamb’s Inn, constructed in the Georgian style; constructed of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Blair)</td>
<td>Heritage Conservation District)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1849</td>
<td>stucco</td>
<td>buff brick, then clad in wood and stucco during major renovations in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the 1920s; rectangular plan; symmetrical second storey façade,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>asymmetrical main floor façade; two storey balcony on main façade;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>shallow-pitch end gable roof; exterior brick chimney.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>Photograph</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Material</td>
<td>Style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39-43 Queen Street East (Hespeler)</td>
<td>Part IV</td>
<td>1841</td>
<td>Limestone</td>
<td>Former Hespeler Hotel; three storey building in the vernacular Georgian style with a flat roof; rectangular plan; main façade has a symmetrical coursed limestone façade; eight-over-eight double-hung sash windows; denticulated cornice; original wooden doors; balcony on main facade; large rear wing with a gable roof, constructed of broken-coursed limestone rubble, heavily mortared in the Pennsylvanian German style; porte-cochere on lower level rear wing; wooden box cornice with sloped soffit and frieze on east façade of the rear wing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210 King Street East (Preston)</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>Mid-1800s</td>
<td>Plaster</td>
<td>Former store in the Georgian style; originally built with a rectangular plan; stone building with exterior covered in plaster; molded plaster quoins; two-and-a-half storeys; symmetrical three-bay façade; simple cornice on facade; medium-pitched end-gable roof; two interior end chimneys; raised parapet walls on end gables; surviving two-over-two double-hung sash windows on gable end.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>Photograph</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Material</td>
<td>Style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>639 and 641 King Street East</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>Mid-1800s</td>
<td>Red Brick</td>
<td>Two-storey brick building in the Pennsylvania Georgian commercial style; rectangular plan; asymmetrical façade; recessed main floor entrances and large commercial windows; medium-pitched end gable roof; raised parapet walls on end gables; two end chimneys.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Preston)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>991 King Street East</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>Pre-1851</td>
<td>Plaster</td>
<td>Former Cambridge Century Inn; three-storey Georgian building constructed of stone and covered in plaster; rectangular plan; symmetrical main façade with full-width balcony; bracketed cornice on main façade; shallow-pitched end-gable roof.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Preston)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>over stone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of these examples, the following architectural elements characteristic of the commercial Georgian style buildings were observed:

- **Type**: All five are commercial examples of the Georgian style, three of which were built as hotels.
- **Plan**: All five examples are built to a rectangular plan.
- **Height**: Each example is two-and-a-half to three-storeys.
- **Roof**: Four examples have end-gable roofs, including two roofs with a shallow pitch and two with a medium pitch. One building has a flat roof.
- **Cladding**: One example is constructed of red brick and one is built of yellow brick. Three of the examples are constructed of stone, two of which have been covered in plaster.
- **Facade**: Four examples have symmetrical facades with at least three bays.
- **Chimneys**: Two of the examples include two surviving brick chimneys, one of the examples includes a single surviving brick chimney.
- **Balcony**: Three examples include balconies on the main façade, two of which are covered.
- **Decorative Elements**: Three examples exhibit decorative cornices.
• **Windows**: Two examples include surviving double-hung sash windows.

• **Alterations**: Although it is difficult to confirm when viewed from the public right of way, it appears that two of the examples have undergone alterations to their facades, one example has been painted, one clad in vinyl, and another covered in plaster.

This comparative analysis suggests that the original limestone portion of the commercial building on the subject property at 1102 King Street East demonstrates surviving representative elements of the Georgian style (primarily located behind the curtainscreen) including the: two-and-a-half storey massing; limestone construction with raised mortar joints and granite quoins; rectangular plan; shallow-pitched end-gable roof with overhanging eaves; corbelled buff brick chimney; and five flat-arched window openings at the second storey and three gabled dormer windows in the roof, all with single-hung wood windows on the façade. Although many of these remaining elements reflective of the Georgian style are obscured, the curtainscreen and cladding interventions are likely reversible, as such it is recommended the subject structure is still a representative example of the style.

With the original portion of the building constructed prior to 1859 and possibly as early as 1822, the structure is one of the earliest examples of a Georgian style commercial building in the City of Cambridge. All of the examples highlighted in the comparative analysis above were built around the same time, with the Former Lamb’s Inn in Blair built in 1837. Regardless of its architectural style, the subject building is believed to be one of the earlier structures remaining in the community of Preston.

Lastly, as there are at least two examples of commercial Georgian buildings designated under Part IV of the OHA and numerous properties that are not designated but included on the City of Cambridge Heritage Properties Register, 1102 King Street East is not considered to be a rare representation of the style. A number of Georgian structures were constructed in this south end of Preston where remnants of a former “Pennsylvania German Village” once composed of distinctive Georgian style two-and-a-half storey commercial blocks and residences remain. It appears that at least one well-preserved, early-to-mid-nineteenth century hotel structure survives in each of the former town centres in Cambridge (aside from Galt), with the Lamb’s Inn (1679 Blair Road) in Blair, the Hespeler Hotel (39-43 Queen Street East) in Hespeler, and the Cambridge Century Inn (991 King Street East), also in Preston.

It is acknowledged that the small number of examples reviewed means that this comparative analysis could be misleading. It was also challenging to fully assess the architectural details of each structure from the public right of way. As such, the cultural heritage evaluations included in Section 7 have not only considered the results of this comparative analysis, but typical architectural trends across Ontario.

### 5.6 DISCUSSION OF INTEGRITY

In the context of heritage conservation, the concept of integrity is linked not with structural condition, but rather to the literal definition of “wholeness” or “honesty” of a place. The MCM *Heritage Identification & Evaluation Process* (2014:13) and *Ontario Heritage Tool Kit: Heritage*
Property Evaluation (2006:26) both stress the importance of assessing the heritage integrity in conjunction with evaluation under O. Reg. 9/06, yet provide no guidelines for how this should be carried out beyond referencing the US National Park Service Bulletin 8: How to Evaluate the Integrity of a Property (US NPS, n.d.). In this latter document, integrity is defined as ‘the ability of a property to convey its significance’, so can only be judged once the significance of a place is known. Other guidance suggests that integrity instead be measured by understanding how much of the asset is “complete” or changed from its original or “valued subsequent configuration” (English Heritage 2008:45; Kalman 2014:203). Kalman’s Evaluation of Historic Buildings, for example, includes a category for “Integrity” with sub-elements of “Site”, “Alterations”, and “Condition” to be determined and weighted independently from other criteria such as historical value, rather than linking them to the known significance of a place.

Kalman’s approach is selected here and combined with research commissioned by Historic England (The Conservation Studio 2004), which proposed a method for determining levels of change in conservation areas that also have utility for evaluating the integrity of individual structures. The results for the original limestone building on the property are presented in Table 2.
Table 2: Heritage Integrity Analysis for 1102 King Street East

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Original Material/Type</th>
<th>Alteration</th>
<th>Survival (%)</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Setting</td>
<td>Early nineteenth century commercial village.</td>
<td>Vacant lot to the north, otherwise similar land uses remain. Some early buildings on the lot have been removed and a paved parking lot added.</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Some early buildings on the lot have been removed and additions added.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Location</td>
<td>Original.</td>
<td>No change.</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>The property retains its original siting and setback.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footprint</td>
<td>Rectangular prior to 1859, rear limestone addition constructed prior to 1910.</td>
<td>Original rectangular building plan elongated to west with two-storey limestone addition. Three other additions to south and west.</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>While the original footprint has been altered, the overall shape has been retained and the first phase of construction is visible. Portions of additions are reversible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wall</td>
<td>Limestone.</td>
<td>Lower portion of the south and west elevations altered to accommodate the tavern that occupied the first floor. Notable addition of a large plate glass window on the main level of the Dolph Street South limestone addition. The original limestone walls remain covered by a variety of exterior cladding veneers.</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Exterior walls covered by a variety of exterior cladding materials. Interior and exterior wall cladding removed in portions to reveal limestone walls remain beneath.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation</td>
<td>Limestone and fieldstone foundation.</td>
<td>Appears largely intact.</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>Note that this rating refers to heritage integrity, not structural integrity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Element</td>
<td>Original Material/Type</td>
<td>Alteration</td>
<td>Survival (%)</td>
<td>Rating</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exterior Doors</td>
<td>Steel and aluminum with glass.</td>
<td>All original wood doors, some with transom, removed.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>No additional comment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>Flat arched, single-hung wood windows.</td>
<td>Some window openings have been enclosed due to additions. Original or early windows largely remain. A large plate glass window has been added to the lower level of the limestone Dolph Street South addition.</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>While retained, not all of the wood exterior frames appear to be in excellent condition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roof</td>
<td>End-gable roof, unknown original cladding material.</td>
<td>Asphalt shingles. East half of roofline has been altered to accommodate curtainscreen on the façade.</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>East half of roof alteration appears reversible following removal of curtainscreen and cladding on north elevation. Roof of limestone addition is open to the elements and severely damaged following 2019 fire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chimneys</td>
<td>Originally two brick chimneys, one on each gable end.</td>
<td>Chimney on the south elevation has been removed.</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Buff brick chimney with corbelled detail remains on the north elevation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water System</td>
<td>Unknown.</td>
<td>Likely replaced.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>No additional comment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exterior Decoration</td>
<td>Stone quoins, thick stone lintels and sills, and three dormer windows.</td>
<td>The return eaves, large sign that reads “Queen’s Tavern”, and flat roof supported by chains covering the recessed entrance have been removed. The façade has been covered with a mid-century modern</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>The current exterior elevations are clad in contemporary materials, obscuring the remaining exterior decoration beneath.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Element</td>
<td>Original Material/Type</td>
<td>Alteration</td>
<td>Survival (%)</td>
<td>Rating</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exterior Additions</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td>The west limestone, one-storey rear, and two cinderblock additions to the south were built after the original construction.</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>The west limestone wing was likely built between 1890 and 1910. It has been largely altered through the addition of a large plate glass window and interior alterations and damage following a fire in 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior Plan</td>
<td>A central hall Plan.</td>
<td>Main floor was largely altered to accommodate the large, open tavern space and a dinner to the north. The plan of the second and third floor appears unchanged.</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>No additional comment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior Walls and Floors</td>
<td>Lathe and plaster walls and wood flooring. Small portion of terrazzo flooring on main level.</td>
<td>Due to fire and water damage almost all walls, ceilings and floors have been removed, especially in the upper storeys.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>With plaster removed, lathe walls were revealed beneath. The walls in some rooms have been removed to the studs. The wood subfloor is visible in many rooms. The small portion of terrazzo flooring remaining on the main level is in poor condition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior Trim</td>
<td>Wood baseboards and moulding around windows and doors. Wood, paneled, deep-welled window openings.</td>
<td>Due to fire and water damage almost all moulded wood baseboards and window and door surrounds have been removed.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Remaining material indicates simple, moulded wood trim was extant. Wood, paneled, deep-welled window openings are only present on the second floor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Element</td>
<td>Original Material/Type</td>
<td>Alteration</td>
<td>Survival (%)</td>
<td>Rating</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior Features (i.e., stairs, doors)</td>
<td>Wood staircase in upper storeys. Ornate hot water radiators. Hand-hewn and milled log trusses, joists and support beams in basement and attic.</td>
<td>Most interior features have been removed. The staircase from the main floor to the second storey has been removed and rebuilt.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Most hot water radiators remain. The hand-hewn and milled log trusses, joists and support beams in the attic have been charred by fire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape Features</td>
<td>Landscaped with shrubs, grass, trees and walkway.</td>
<td>Paved parking lot.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>No vegetation or landscaping remains on the property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Rate of Change/Heritage Integrity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Rating of Good based on the original element survival rating of 50-75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.6.1 RESULTS

Overall, the commercial property is classified on the cusp of having a “Good” level of heritage integrity despite the number of alterations made to the interior and exterior, many of which are reversible, as described in Section 5.6.3 below.

5.6.2 STRUCTURAL ASSESSMENT REPORTS

In May and December 2019, Structural Assessment Reports (see Appendix E) were prepared by Caskanette Udall Consulting Engineers following a fire on the second and third floor of the original limestone building, with the most notable damage in the attic. The May 23, 2019 report indicated, “Although the timbers were heavily charred in some areas, there is sufficient remaining material that the roof remains stable. Overall, the integrity of the building’s structure was not affected by the fire” (Caskanette Udall Consulting Engineers 2019a:1).

Further to the initial May 23, 2019 report, Caskanette Udall Consulting Engineers were asked to re-visit the building to assess the damage to the roof structure and the findings were recorded in a second Structural Assessment Report dated December 6, 2019. This report still found the integrity of the building’s structure was not affected by the fire and recommended the larger roof rafters be cleaned and remain in place and the smaller rafters be removed and replaced with new lumber or cleaned and reinforced (Caskanette Udall Consulting Engineers 2019b:6).

5.6.3 SELECTIVE STRUCTURAL ENGINEERING INVESTIGATIONS

To proactively investigate the structural integrity and potential treatments for the building’s original limestone masonry, the Client retained a structural engineer from Kalos Engineering Inc. on January 5, 2023. Selective investigations behind the curtainscreen and cladding of the original building indicated:

- The curtainscreen on the façade is built almost entirely proud of the limestone walls and could be easily removed;
- The limestone walls appear to be in reasonable condition behind the various veneers; and
- Some of the original windows and doors have been infilled with masonry but remain (Nydam, L., Email Correspondence, January 6, 2023).

Based on this assessment, it appears the original massing and many of the original elements of the commercial Georgian structure remain intact. See Appendix F for photographs taken on January 5, 2023 by Kalos Engineering Inc. of building elements revealed during the selective investigations.
6 CONSULTATION

6.1 REGION OF WATERLOO

The Region of Waterloo’s Cultural Heritage Planner was contacted via email on October 28, 2022 to inquire about heritage interests related to the subject property at 1102 King Street East. A response was received the same day requesting additional time to respond due to work load constraints. A follow-up response was received on November 10, 2022 confirming the property has not been recognized as a Regionally Significant Cultural Heritage Resource, however it was requested the property be evaluated for Regional Significance in accordance with the Region’s evaluation criteria given its early construction date and history. Regional staff shared some general historical information related to the subject property from their files.

Regional Cultural Heritage staff strongly recommended the Client adaptively reuse the original limestone structure, or at minimum the stone façade of the structure, within the proposed plans for redevelopment.

It was also noted an archaeological assessment is required for the property due to the potential for the recovery of archaeological resources related to the age of the structure and proximity to other historically mapped structures, its location along an historic road and within an historic core area.

6.2 CITY OF CAMBRIDGE

The City of Cambridge’s Senior Planner – Heritage was contacted via email on October 28, 2022 to inquire about heritage interests related to the subject property at 1102 King Street East. A follow-up email was sent on November 8, 2022 and a response was received the same day confirming:

- The property is listed as a non-designated property on the City of Cambridge Heritage Properties Register;
- This CHIA should include a full cultural heritage value review and analysis of the subject property, including an evaluation against O. Reg. 9/06 and the criteria set out under Section 4 of the City’s Official Plan; and
- Any engineering reports or structural assessments prepared for the subject property after the fire in 2019 that may document its structural integrity and the feasibility of adaptive reuse should be included as an appendix to the CHIA (see Appendix E and F).

The City did not confirm if there is an intention to designate 1102 King Street East or if a municipal heritage easement agreement exists for the property. No additional historic background material was provided and no specific cultural heritage concerns related to the property were shared.

Upon review of the City’s Heritage Register, the properties immediately to the east at 1037 King Street East, and 1103 and 1109 King Street East as well as to the west at 1123 Queenston Road
are listed on the City of Cambridge Heritage Properties Register. To remain consistent with the PPS, impacts to these adjacent built heritage resources will be evaluated in this CHIA.

The Cambridge Official Plan was reviewed and it was confirmed that 1102 King Street East is not located within an identified CHL. The Cambridge Heritage Master Plan identifies "character areas" in the City and Preston Towne Centre, which contains the subject property, is noted as one such area in Preston (2008:15).

6.3 FEDERAL AND PROVINCIAL REVIEW

The MCM’s list of Heritage Conservation Districts was reviewed and the study area was not found to be located within a designated district (MCM 2019). The Ontario Heritage Trust (OHT) plaque database was searched, as was the Federal Canadian Heritage Database. The subject property is not commemorated with an OHT plaque nor recognized with a federal heritage designation. It also does not appear that 1102 King Street East is subject to an OHT conservation easement.
7 CULTURAL HERITAGE EVALUATION

7.1 EVALUATION USING ONTARIO REGULATION 9/06

The principal built heritage resource on the subject property at 1102 King Street East is a two-and-a-half-storey limestone Georgian commercial building. The property is listed as a non-designated property on the City of Cambridge Heritage Properties Register.

O. Reg. 9/06 of the OHA provides criteria for determining whether a property has CHVI. If a property meets two or more of the criteria in O. Reg. 9/06, it is eligible for designation under the OHA. Table 3 presents the evaluation of the subject property using O. Reg. 9/06.

Table 3: O. Reg. 9/06 Evaluation of 1102 King Street East

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O. Reg. 9/06 Criteria</th>
<th>Criteria Met (Y/N)</th>
<th>Justification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The property has design value or physical value because it is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, expression, material or construction method.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>As demonstrated in Section 5.5, the commercial building at 1102 King Street East is a representative example of the Georgian architectural style with many of its representative elements believed to be remaining beneath the curtainscreen and angel stone veneer obscuring the façade. As the curtainscreen and cladding interventions are likely reversible, it is recommended the subject structure is still a representative example of the style. The building’s integrity has been classified on the cusp of “Good”, as indicated in Section 5.6. Upon a review of the City of Cambridge Heritage Properties Register, Georgian architecture, which can date from the 1780s to 1860s, is a common style in the City and across Ontario. As such, the subject property is not a rare or unique example of the style. With a construction date prior to 1859, and possibly as early as 1822, it is among the early expressions of the style in the City of Cambridge, with other Georgian hotels and commercial buildings built around the same era still extant in the City. The subject building is believed to be one of the earlier structures remaining in the community of Preston.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The property has design value or physical value because it displays a high</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Although of mid-nineteenth century construction, the property does not display a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit, but rather reflects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O. Reg. 9/06 Criteria</th>
<th>Criteria Met (Y/N)</th>
<th>Justification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit.</td>
<td>construction techniques and materials common to its time.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The property has design value or physical value because it demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>The property does not demonstrate a high degree of technical or scientific achievement. The structure displays construction techniques common to the era and the contemporary interventions made in subsequent decades.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The property has historical or associative value because it has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization or institution that is significant to a community.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>As detailed in Section 4.3, 1102 King Street East is associated with a number of individuals involved in the operation of the former Queen’s Hotel and later the Grand River Hotel on the property, including George Roos, Martin Janz, Joseph Alfred Schmalz, and Cecil E. Schmalz. Following a review of the Euro-Canadian land use history for 1102 King Street East, no notable individuals, themes, events, beliefs or activities of significance to the community were identified. A further review of the Waterloo Region Hall of Fame and the City of Cambridge Hall of Fame did not identify any individuals, events, beliefs, or activities linked to the subject property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The property has historical or associative value because it yields, or has the potential to yield information that contributes to an understanding of a community or culture.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>The results of research did not indicate that 1102 King Street East yields new information that could contribute to the understanding of a community or culture. The subject property’s history as a former hotel and tavern is a land use common to developing industrial centres across Ontario in the early-to-mid-nineteenth century. Commercial activities, such as hotels and taverns, supported travelers and newly arriving tradespeople, artisans and craftspeople looking for work in developing settlement areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The property has historical or associative value because it demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer or theorist who is significant to a community.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>The architect and builder of the commercial building at 1102 King Street East is unknown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O. Reg. 9/06 Criteria</td>
<td>Criteria Met (Y/N)</td>
<td>Justification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The property has contextual value because it is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an area.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>The King Street East streetscape through the core of Preston contains a collection of low-density nineteenth and early twentieth century commercial buildings with no setbacks fronting broad sidewalks. Following removal of the curtainscreen and angel stone veneer from the façade, it is believed that 1102 King Street East will once again contribute to the mid-nineteenth century commercial character of Preston’s “main street”. Located nearer the southern portion of the community, the subject property also supports remnants of a former “Pennsylvania German Village” once composed of distinctive Georgian style two-and-a-half storey commercial blocks and residences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The property has contextual value because it is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1102 King Street East is physically and historically linked to its surroundings through its placement at the southwest corner of King Street East and Dolph Street South since at least 1859, operating for a majority of that time as the Queen’s Hotel then the Grand River Hotel, and later the Grand River Hotel and Bar. The subject property is no longer functionally linked to its surroundings as it is now vacant, and it is not visually linked as the structure has been significantly altered. This visual linkage could be restored through the removal of the curtainscreen and angel stone veneer obscuring the original façade of the nineteenth century building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The property has contextual value because it is a landmark, O. Reg. 9/06, s.1 (2).</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>No significant views to the property distinguish the building as a notable or distinct property. With its two-and-a-half storey massing consistent with the height of the other buildings that comprise the King Street East streetscape and its obscured façade and elevations, the subject property does not currently serve as a local landmark in the community.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.2 EVALUATION UNDER CITY OF CAMBRIDGE CRITERIA

Under Section 4.4(1) of the Cambridge Official Plan, the City has adopted specific evaluation criteria to determine if a property has CHVI. If a property satisfies at least two (2) of the criteria it is considered to have CHVI. Table 4 identifies how the subject property is evaluated in accordance with the City’s criteria.

Table 4: Evaluation under City of Cambridge Criteria for Cultural Heritage Value or Interest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Y/N</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i) it dates from an early period in the development of the city’s communities;</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Early development in Preston began in 1805 when John Erb purchased part of Lot 4, Beasley’s Broken Front Concession and built the first mill a year later. As the subject property was constructed prior to 1859 and is believed to be one of the earliest remaining buildings in Preston, it does date to an early period in the development of the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) it is a representative example of the work of an outstanding local, national or international architect, engineer, builder, designer, landscape architect, interior designer, sculptor, or other artisan and is well preserved or may be rehabilitated;</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>The commercial building on the subject property is not known to be associated with the design of any outstanding architect, engineer, builder, designer, landscape architect, interior designer, sculptor, or other artisan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) it is associated with a person who is recognized as having made an important contribution to the city’s social, cultural, political, economic, technological or physical development or as having materially influenced the course of local, regional, provincial, national or international history;</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>As detailed in Section 4.3, 1102 King Street East is associated with a number of individuals involved in the operation of the former Queen’s Hotel and later the Grand River Hotel on the property, including George Roos, Martin Janz, Joseph Alfred Schmalz, and Cecil E. Schmalz. Following a review of the Euro-Canadian land use history for 1102 King Street East, no notable individuals were identified that made an important contribution to the City of Cambridge’s social, cultural, political, economic, technological or physical development, nor was an individual identified that influenced the course of local, regional, provincial, national or international history. A further review of the City of Cambridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Y/N</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) it is directly associated with an historic event which is recognized as having local, regional, provincial, national or international importance;</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>The subject property is not directly associated with any recognized historic event.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v) it is a representative example and illustration of the city’s social, cultural, political, economic or technological development history;</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>The subject property is a representative example and illustration of an early period of economic growth and subsequent commercial development in Preston ushered by the arrival of a significant number of primarily young German immigrant tradespeople, artisans and craftsmen. Preston’s location on the Great Road into the interior of the province made it a natural stop for travelers. Its eight hotels and taverns, inclusive of the subject property, attracted more Europeans than any other village in the area, which was key to the development of Preston’s mills and factories that were being established along the Speed River in the 1830s and 1840s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi) it is a representative example of a method of construction now rarely used;</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>The two-and-a-half-storey commercial building with thick exterior walls constructed of limestone is representative of a construction method rarely employed in the twenty-first century.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii) it is a representative example of its architectural style or period of building;</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>As demonstrated in Section 5.5, the commercial building at 1102 King Street East is a representative example of the Georgian architectural style with many of its representative elements believed to be remaining beneath the curtainscreen and angel stone veneer obscuring the façade. As the curtainscreen and cladding interventions are likely reversible, it is recommended the subject structure is still a representative example of the style. The building’s integrity has been classified on the cusp of “Good”, as indicated in Section 5.6. With a construction date prior to 1859, and possibly as early as 1822, it is among the earlier expressions of the style with other Georgian hotels and...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Y/N</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>commercial buildings built around the same time still extant in the City. The subject building is believed to be one of the earliest structures remaining in the community of Preston.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viii) it is a representative example of architectural design;</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>The commercial building on the subject property is not a representative example of architectural design.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ix) it terminates a view or otherwise makes an important contribution to the urban composition or streetscape of which it forms a part;</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>The King Street East streetscape through the core of Preston contains a collection of low-density nineteenth and early twentieth century commercial buildings with no setbacks fronting broad sidewalks. Following removal of the curtainscreen and angel stone cladding from the façade, it is believed that 1102 King Street East supports the mid-nineteenth century commercial character of Preston’s “main street”. Located nearer the southern portion of the community, the subject property also supports remnants of a former “Pennsylvania German Village” once composed of distinctive Georgian style two-and-a-half storey commercial blocks and residences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x) it is generally recognized as an important landmark;</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>No significant views to the property distinguish the building as a notable or distinct property. With its two-and-a-half storey massing consistent with the height of the other buildings that comprise the King Street East streetscape and its largely altered façade and elevations, the subject property does not currently serve as a local landmark in the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xi) it is a representative example of outstanding interior design; or</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>The interior of the subject property has evolved and been significantly altered to accommodate the number of uses and tenants that occupied the space over its 160+ year history. It has also been subject to fire and neglect, which have further damaged its interior. Very little original interior material remains.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 7.3 EVALUATION FOR REGIONAL SIGNIFICANCE

In 2002, Regional Council approved ten (10) evaluation criteria for identifying a Regionally Significant Cultural Heritage Resource. The fulfillment of at least four (4) criteria determines Regional Significance. Table 5 identifies how the subject property is evaluated in accordance with the Region’s criteria.

**Table 5: Evaluation for Regional Significance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Y/N</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>xii) it is an example of a rare or otherwise important feature of good urban design or streetscaping.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>The subject property is not currently considered a rare or important feature of good urban design or streetscaping.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3 EVALUATION FOR REGIONAL SIGNIFICANCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In 2002, Regional Council approved ten (10) evaluation criteria for identifying a Regionally Significant Cultural Heritage Resource. The fulfillment of at least four (4) criteria determines Regional Significance. Table 5 identifies how the subject property is evaluated in accordance with the Region’s criteria.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Table 5: Evaluation for Regional Significance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Y/N</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Is the resource, or element(s) within the resource, recognized on a municipal, regional, provincial or national heritage list?</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1102 King Street East is listed on the City of Cambridge Heritage Properties Register.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Does the resource date from a prehistoric or early historical period in the development of the region, province or nation?</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Early development in Preston began in 1805 when John Erb purchased part of Lot 4, Beasley’s Broken Front Concession and built the first mill a year later. As the subject property was constructed prior to 1859 and is believed to be one of the earlier remaining buildings in Preston, it does date to an early period in the development of Preston.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Is the resource, or element(s) within the resource, a good representative example of the work of an outstanding regional, national or international architect, engineer, builder, designer, landscape architect, interior designer or sculptor, or of vernacular architecture?</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>The commercial building is not known to be the work of an outstanding architect, engineer, builder, designer, landscape architect, interior designer or sculptor either regionally, nationally or internationally, nor is it a good representative example of vernacular architecture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Is the resource associated with a person(s) who is recognized as having made a significant contribution to the social, cultural, political, economic, technological or</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>As detailed in Section 4.3, 1102 King Street East is associated with a number of individuals involved in the operation of the former Queen’s Hotel and later the Grand River Hotel on the property, including George Roos, Martin Janz, Joseph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Y/N</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>physical development? Or as having materially influenced the course of regional, provincial, national or international events?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Alfred Schmalz, and Cecil E. Schmalz. Following a review of the Euro-Canadian land use history for 1102 King Street East, no notable individuals were identified that made a significant contribution to the Region’s social, cultural, political, economic, technological or physical development, nor was an individual identified that influenced the course of regional, provincial, national or international history. A further review of the Waterloo Region Hall of Fame did not identify any individuals linked to the subject property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Is the resource directly associated with an historic event which is recognized as having regional, provincial, national or international importance?</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>The resource is not directly associated with an historic event of regional, provincial, national or international importance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Is the resource a significant example and illustration of the region’s prehistoric or historic social, cultural, political, economic or technological development?</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>The resource is not a significant example or illustration of the region’s prehistoric or historic development. The subject property’s history as a former hotel and tavern is a land use common to developing industrial centres across the Region of Waterloo and Ontario in the early-to-mid-nineteenth century. Commercial activities, such as hotels and taverns, supported travelers and newly arriving tradesmen, artisans and craftsmen looking for work in developing settlement areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Does the resource contribute to the effectiveness of the urban composition, streetscape, view shed, or landscape of which it may form part of?</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>The King Street East streetscape through the core of Preston contains a collection of low-density nineteenth and early twentieth century commercial buildings with no setbacks fronting broad sidewalks. Following removal of the curtainscreen and angel stone veneer from the façade, it is believed that 1102 King Street East would support the mid-nineteenth century commercial streetscape and character of Preston’s “main street”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Y/N</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Does the resource have potential for contributing to commercial</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>The subject property does not have the potential to contribute to commercial tourist or other development based on its heritage and/or culture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tourist or other development that is based on heritage and/or culture?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Is the resource, or element(s) within the resource, part of a group</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Located nearer the southern portion of Preston, the subject property reflects remnants of a former “Pennsylvania German Village” once composed of distinctive Georgian style two-and-a-half storey commercial blocks and residences. Although the subject building and many of the surviving Georgian style structures have been largely altered, they do contribute to a particular “look” unique to the core of Preston within the Region of Waterloo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of similar structures which contribute to the particular “look” of the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>area or region?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Is the resource, or element(s) within the resource, part of a group</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>The subject property does not contribute to a landscape or grouping or resources significant to the Grand River or its tributary, the Speed River.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of historically associated structures which may be totally within the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>region or which may be part of a larger area within the context of the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand River and its main tributaries as a recognized Canadian Heritage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rivers System?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**7.4 RESULTS OF THE CULTURAL HERITAGE EVALUATION**

Based on the evaluation of the property at 1102 King Street East, the following results related to the property’s CHVI were identified:

- The evaluation using the criteria of O. Reg. 9/06 determined that the subject property does possess CHVI for its design or physical, historical, and contextual value;
- The evaluation found that the subject property met five (5) of the City of Cambridge’s criteria, thus the property possesses CHVI; and
- The subject property was found to meet four (4) of the Region of Waterloo’s criteria for determining Regional Significance, as such the subject property is a Regionally Significant Cultural Heritage Resource.
7.5 STATEMENT OF CULTURAL HERITAGE VALUE OR INTEREST

As the subject property at 1102 King Street East was found to possess CHVI, the following Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest and List of Heritage Attributes was prepared.

7.5.1 DESCRIPTION OF HISTORIC PLACE

1102 King Street East is a rectangular property situated on the southwest corner of King Street East and Dolph Street South. The property is located in the nineteenth century commercial core of the community of Preston, in the City of Cambridge. The key resource is the former Queen’s Hotel/Grand River Hotel, a two-and-a-half storey limestone building constructed in the Georgian style prior to 1859.

7.5.2 HERITAGE VALUE

1102 King Street East has design value as a representative example of the Georgian architectural style with many of its representative elements typical of classical proportion, symmetry, and refined ornamentation. Common to the early style, this surviving Georgian structure, like others across Ontario, has been altered or modernized in the over century and a half since its construction. However, it is believed the elements representative of the style remain beneath the curtainscreen and angel stone veneer obscuring the façade. Constructed prior to 1859, the two-and-a-half storey limestone commercial building with raised mortar joints and granite quoins was built to a rectangular plan in the Georgian style, with a shallow-pitched end-gable roof with overhanging eaves (south elevation). The recessed commercial entrance though the thick limestone walls of the façade welcomed patrons to the former Queen’s Hotel, and later the Grand River Hotel, which occupied the building for over 160 years. Typical of the style, the symmetrical north and south elevations contain windows and/or a door opening beneath the end-gable peak. The largely symmetrical façade also features five flat-arched window openings with single-hung wood windows and three gabled dormer windows in the roof with single-hung wood windows. A two-storey limestone addition with a flat roof was constructed to the rear (west) of the original building, enlarging the commercial structure sometime between 1890 and 1910.

1102 King Street East has contextual value as it supports the mid-nineteenth century commercial character of Preston’s “main street” having been located at the corner of King Street East and Dolph Street South since prior to 1859 and operating for a majority of that time as the Queen’s Hotel, then the Grand River Hotel. The King Street East streetscape through the core of Preston contains a collection of low-density nineteenth and early twentieth century commercial buildings with no setbacks fronting broad sidewalks. Located nearer the southern portion of the community, the subject property also supports remnants of a former “Pennsylvania German Village” once composed of distinctive Georgian style two-and-a-half storey commercial blocks and residences.
7.5.3 LIST OF HERITAGE ATTRIBUTES

The heritage attributes that contribute to the cultural heritage value or interest of 1102 King Street East include:

- Frontage with no setback along King Street East and Dolph Street South;
- Two-and-a-half storey Georgian-style massing and scale of the original building;
- Limestone construction with raised mortar joints and granite quoins;
- End-gable roof;
- Overhanging eaves (south elevation);
- Corbeled buff brick chimney;
- Recessed main entrance (east elevation);
- Arrangement of fenestration of the north and south elevations;
- Five flat-arched window openings in the façade (east elevation) with single-hung wood windows and stone sills;
- Three gabled dormer windows in the roof (east elevation) with single-hung wood windows; and
- Early two-storey rear addition (projecting from the west elevation of the original building) with three flat-arched window openings in the upper storey of the north elevation with single-hung wood windows.

7.6 PRESTON TOWNE CENTRE CHARACTER AREA

The description of the Preston Towne Centre Character Area included below was extracted from the Cambridge Heritage Master Plan, and details its heritage character, character defining elements, and conservation and development concerns and opportunities (BRAY Heritage et al. 2008:115-117). The landscape has not yet been formally protected through a Part V designation under the OHA or an Official Plan Amendment.

7.6.1 HERITAGE CHARACTER

The mill site that began by serving a rural Mennonite population, blossomed into an industrial and spa village, evolved into a “sleepy German town”, and later merged into the City of Cambridge has retained key components of each of its development stages, from the early mills to the spa hotels to residential and retail districts. One of its outstanding features is its broad main commercial street that still retains many of its fine nineteenth and early twentieth century buildings. The ornate detailing found on several of the commercial buildings contrast with the simpler treatment common elsewhere in the City’s commercial cores. The development pattern of commercial buildings
flanking the main road, off which is a town square, relates Preston to many other Ontario towns built in the mid-nineteenth century.

7.6.2 CHARACTER DEFINING ELEMENTS

- The town square, anchored by the former Preston Public School;
- Retail concentrated along both sides of main highway, interspersed with residential and institutional buildings;
- At south end, remnants of “Pennsylvania German Village” with its distinctive Georgian style two-and-half storey commercial blocks and residences;
- Early century retail/commercial main street;
- Predominantly two-to-three-storey retail buildings;
- No set backs, broad sidewalks;
- High quality architecture, brick construction, with skilled craftsmanship evident;
- Some large Victorian “avenue” residences with mature trees; and
- Mill and factory buildings anchor King Street at the south and north ends of retail strip.

7.6.3 CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT CONCERNS AND OPPORTUNITIES

The very feature that distinguishes the downtown is also its most vulnerable point; namely, its frontage on a major highway. Traffic has had a profound impact on the buildings and streetscape, diminishing what was once a coherent grouping of harmonious buildings and an attractive pedestrian streetscape. Opportunities exist to reclaim the street from the dominance of vehicles by reviving the emphasis on public transit (as with the original street railway system) and improving the pedestrian realm. Conservation and enhancement of the remaining heritage buildings to create a more visually coherent retail precinct will also be necessary, along with urban design guidelines to produce compatible infill, in order to fully revitalize this important district.
8 PROPOSED UNDERTAKING AND IMPACTS

8.1 DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED UNDERTAKING

The proposed development concept for 1102 King Street East consists of the adaptive reuse of the existing two-and-a-half storey limestone Georgian structure on site and construction of a new, four-storey affordable and supportive residential development to the rear (west). The proposed building has a ground floor area of 620.7 m. sq. and the main entrance will be accessed off of Dolph Street South. The new building will be set back slightly from the King Street East and Dolph Street South property line behind the existing building. The fourth floor will step back from the south and west elevations of the building to mitigate the larger massing of the new structure. The building is currently contemplated to include 34 residential units and commercial, office, amenity and waste/bike storage space on the ground level to support the tenants (see Appendix B for Site and Development Plans current as of November 11, 2022).

Vehicular access to the site will be provided off of Dolph Street South and a right-of-way easement from King Street East and will provide access to 14 ground level parking stalls along the west and south property boundary.

The site is contemplated to include a 61 sq. m. outdoor amenity space for the tenants, which will provide a landscape buffer on its eastern façade fronting King Street East. A Landscape Plan has yet to be completed for the proposed development. Balconies are only proposed for units on the south elevation.

The Client has worked with the City of Cambridge to revise the preliminary development concepts to propose the adaptive reuse of the existing structure and the sympathetic design for the new construction ensuring it is distinguishable from the built heritage resource on the subject property and reflective of the architectural tradition of the surrounding area. Removal of the curtainscreen and various veneer claddings from the original Georgian limestone structure is proposed, restoring the building closer to its original form. Detailed site plans, including renderings and proposed construction materials, have not yet been confirmed as the Client has paused design work while additional capital is secured. However, at present the development proposes the use of brown brick and a mansard style roof with dormer windows, consistent with other roof styles in the immediate area (1103 King Street East; see Image 190). Mitigative design recommendations provided in this CHIA can inform the Client’s future design considerations for the development.

8.2 POTENTIAL IMPACTS

The MCM Ontario Heritage Toolkit: Resources in Land Use Planning Process identifies seven potential impacts that an undertaking may have on a cultural heritage resource (see Section 2.5 for the full list).
As neither MCM nor any other Canadian agency provides guidance on evaluating the magnitude of impact, this report uses guides published by the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) of United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) from the World Heritage Convention of January of 2011. The grading of impact is based on the “Guide to Assessing Magnitude of Impact” summarized in Table 6 below.

Table 6: Impact Grading

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Grading</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Major</strong></td>
<td>Change to heritage attributes that contribute to the CHVI such that the resource is totally altered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comprehensive changes to the setting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moderate</strong></td>
<td>Change to many heritage attributes, such that the resource is significantly modified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Changes to the setting of a heritage property, such that it is significantly modified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minor</strong></td>
<td>Change to heritage attributes, such that the asset is slightly different.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Change to the setting of a heritage property, such that it is noticeably changed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negligible/Potential</strong></td>
<td>Slight changes to heritage attributes or the setting that hardly affects it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>None</strong></td>
<td>No change to heritage attributes or setting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.3 EVALUATION OF IMPACTS

Below, Table 7 will evaluate impacts to the subject property at 1102 King Street East, followed by Table 8, which will evaluate impacts to adjacent cultural heritage resources at 1037 King Street East, 1103 and 1109 King Street East, 1123 Queenston Road, and the Preston Towne Centre Character Area.

Table 7: Evaluation of Impacts to Subject Property at 1102 King Street East

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Destruction</strong> of any, or part of any, significant heritage attributes or features;</td>
<td><strong>Impact:</strong> Positive/Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Analysis:</strong> The proposed development will see the retention of the original two-and-a-half storey limestone structure on the property and the demolition of later additions. One addition, the two-storey limestone extension fronting Dolph Street, is proposed to be removed and has</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alteration</strong> that is not sympathetic, or is incompatible, with the historic fabric and appearance;</td>
<td>been identified as a heritage attribute contributing to the CHVI of 1102 King Street East. The removal of the addition will impact the heritage attributes of the subject property, however the integrity of this addition has been impacted through the installation of a large plate glass window on the main level. The removal of the later additions from the property as well as the curtainscreen and various veneers from the original structure will result in a positive impact that will reveal the original architectural elements and heritage attributes of the Georgian building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact:</strong> Positive/Minor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rationale:</strong> The proposed development will present a positive and minor alteration to the subject property. The removal of the later additions from the property as well as the curtainscreen and various veneers from the original structure will result in a positive impact that will reveal the original architectural elements and heritage attributes of the Georgian building and will restore its contribution to the nineteenth century Georgian architectural tradition of the streetscape in south Preston. The proposed removal of the two-storey limestone extension fronting Dolph Street, an identified heritage attribute contributing to the CHVI of 1102 King Street East, will result in a minor alteration. The removal of the addition will impact the heritage attributes of the subject property, however the integrity of this addition has been impacted through the installation of a large plate glass window on the main level.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shadows</strong> created that alter the appearance of a heritage attribute or change the viability of a natural feature or plantings, such as a garden;</td>
<td>Impact: None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rationale:</strong> Given the four-storey construction of the proposed development affixed to the subject structure, no new shadows will be created that will alter the appearance of the building.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Isolation</strong> of a heritage attribute from its surrounding environment, context or a significant relationship;</td>
<td>Impact: Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rationale:</strong> The proposed removal of the additions from the property, as well as the curtainscreen and veneer cladding will showcase the original two-and-half storey Georgian structure and allow its reintroduction to the King Street East streetscape in Preston. The new development is proposed behind and setback from the original structure and will not isolate from its surrounding context.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direct or indirect obstruction</strong> of significant views or vistas within, from, or to built and natural features;</td>
<td><strong>Impact:</strong> Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Rationale:</strong> The new development is proposed behind and setback from the original structure and will not obstruct any significant views to the subject property when viewed from King Street East or Dolph Street South. Removal of the additions from the property, as well as the curtainscreen and veneer cladding will reintroduce views to the original two-and-half storey Georgian structure, representing a positive impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A change in land use</strong> such as rezoning a battlefield from open space to residential use, allowing new development or site alteration to fill in the formerly open spaces;</td>
<td><strong>Impact:</strong> Negligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Rationale:</strong> Proposed redevelopment of the site will result in the subject property’s land use changing from Commercial/Residential (Converted Hotel), C1RM2, to Residential. This land use change represents a negligible impact to the consistency of building scales, materials, features, massing and surrounding landscapes that comprise the King Street East streetscape.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land disturbances</strong> such as a change in grade that alters soils, and drainage patterns that adversely affect an archaeological resource.</td>
<td><strong>Impact:</strong> Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Rationale:</strong> Vibration impacts from the construction of the proposed development on the original limestone building may present indirect impacts to the structure. The property at 1102 King Street East should be subject to an archaeological assessment, as indicated by the Region of Waterloo (see Section 6.1).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8: Evaluation of Impacts to 1037 King Street East, 1103 and 1109 King Street East, 1123 Queenston Road, and Preston Towne Centre Character Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>1037 King Street East Evaluation</th>
<th>1103 and 1109 King Street East Evaluation</th>
<th>1123 Queenston Road Evaluation</th>
<th>Preston Towne Centre Character Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Destruction of any, or part of any, significant heritage attributes or features;</td>
<td>Impact: None</td>
<td>Impact: None</td>
<td>Impact: None</td>
<td>Impact: Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rationale:</strong> The proposed development will not result in the destruction of any heritage attributes of the property as interventions will be limited to the subject property parcel at 1102 King Street East.</td>
<td><strong>Rationale:</strong> The proposed development will not result in the destruction of any heritage attributes of the property as interventions will be limited to the subject property parcel at 1102 King Street East.</td>
<td><strong>Rationale:</strong> The proposed development will not result in the destruction of any heritage attributes of the property as interventions will be limited to the subject property parcel at 1102 King Street East.</td>
<td><strong>Rationale:</strong> The proposed development will not result in the destruction of any heritage attributes of the property as interventions will be limited to the subject property parcel at 1102 King Street East.</td>
<td><strong>Rationale:</strong> The proposed development will not result in the destruction of any heritage attributes of the Preston Towne Centre Character Area, rather it will improve the visibility of the original Georgian façade of the subject building, located at the south end of the character area amongst remnants of the “Pennsylvania German Village” with its distinctive Georgian style two-and-half storey commercial blocks and residences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alteration that is not sympathetic, or is incompatible, with the historic fabric and appearance;</td>
<td>Impact: None</td>
<td>Impact: None</td>
<td>Impact: None</td>
<td>Impact: Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rationale:</strong> The proposed development will be limited to the subject property and will not result in the alteration of any heritage attributes of this adjacent property.</td>
<td><strong>Rationale:</strong> The proposed development will be limited to the subject property and will not result in the alteration of any heritage attributes of this adjacent property.</td>
<td><strong>Rationale:</strong> The proposed development will be limited to the subject property and will not result in the alteration of any heritage attributes of this adjacent property.</td>
<td><strong>Rationale:</strong> The proposed development will result in a positive alteration to the Preston Towne Centre Character Area. Removal of the curtainscreen and numerous later additions will improve the visibility of the original Georgian façade of the subject building, located at the south end of the character area amongst remnants of the “Pennsylvania German Village” with its distinctive Georgian style two-and-half storey commercial blocks and residences.</td>
<td><strong>Rationale:</strong> The proposed development will result in a positive alteration to the Preston Towne Centre Character Area. Removal of the curtainscreen and numerous later additions will improve the visibility of the original Georgian façade of the subject building, located at the south end of the character area amongst remnants of the “Pennsylvania German Village” with its distinctive Georgian style two-and-half storey commercial blocks and residences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>1037 King Street East Evaluation</td>
<td>1103 and 1109 King Street East Evaluation</td>
<td>1123 Queenston Road Evaluation</td>
<td>Preston Towne Centre Character Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shadows</strong> created that alter the appearance of a heritage attribute or change the viability of a natural feature or plantings, such as a garden;</td>
<td>Impact: None</td>
<td>Impact: None</td>
<td>Impact: None</td>
<td>Impact: Negligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rationale:</strong> The new development will not result in additional shadows cast on this adjacent property.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Rationale:</strong> The new development will result in additional shadows cast on the landscape. However, these shadows will not alter the appearance of the streetscapes or buildings or impact their ability to provide active use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Isolation</strong> of a heritage attribute from its surrounding environment, context or a significant relationship;</td>
<td>Impact: None</td>
<td>Impact: None</td>
<td>Impact: None</td>
<td>Impact: None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rationale:</strong> The proposed development will be located on the west half of the lot at 1102 King Street East, behind the extant two-and-a-half storey building and will not isolate this adjacent property from its surrounding environment, context or significant relationship.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Rationale:</strong> The proposed development will not isolate the heritage attributes of the Character Area from its surrounding environment, context or significant relationship as it will be located to the rear of the extant nineteenth century two-and-a-half storey stone Georgian commercial building fronting King Street East.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direct or indirect obstruction</strong> of significant views or vistas within, from, or to built and natural features;</td>
<td>Impact: None</td>
<td>Impact: None</td>
<td>Impact: None</td>
<td>Impact: None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rationale:</strong> No significant views or vistas within, from or to the subject property were identified through this study.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Rationale:</strong> No significant views or vistas within, from or to the Character Area were identified as heritage attributes of the landscape.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A change in land use</strong> such as rezoning a battlefield from open space to residential use,</td>
<td>Impact: None</td>
<td>Impact: None</td>
<td>Impact: None</td>
<td>Impact: Negligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rationale:</strong> The land use of this property will not change as a result of the proposed development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Rationale:</strong> Proposed redevelopment of the site will result in the subject property's land use changing from Commercial/Residential (Converted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>1037 King Street East Evaluation</td>
<td>1103 and 1109 King Street East Evaluation</td>
<td>1123 Queenston Road Evaluation</td>
<td>Preston Towne Centre Character Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>allowing new development or site alteration to fill in the formerly open spaces;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Land use change represents a negligible impact to the consistency of building scales, materials, features, massing and surrounding landscapes that comprise the King Street East streetscape and Preston Towne Centre Character Area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land disturbances</strong> such as a change in grade that alters soils, and drainage patterns that adversely affect an archaeological resource.</td>
<td><strong>Impact:</strong> Minor</td>
<td><strong>Impact:</strong> Minor</td>
<td><strong>Impact:</strong> Minor</td>
<td><strong>Impact:</strong> None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rationale:</strong> Vibration impacts from the construction of the proposed development on the subject property may present indirect impacts to the structure at 1037 King Street East.</td>
<td><strong>Rationale:</strong> Vibration impacts from the construction of the proposed development on the subject property may present indirect impacts to the structure at 1103 and 1109 King Street East.</td>
<td><strong>Rationale:</strong> Vibration impacts from the construction of the proposed development on the subject property may present indirect impacts to the structure at 1123 Queenston Road.</td>
<td><strong>Rationale:</strong> Land disturbance will not impact the heritage attributes of the Character Area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8.4 ARCHAEOLOGY

An archeological assessment has not yet been completed for the subject property.

8.5 RESULTS OF IMPACT ASSESSMENT

The preceding impact assessment has determined that without conservation or mitigation measures, the construction of the proposed development will result in:

- Minor, positive and negligible impacts to the identified heritage attributes of the subject property at 1102 King Street East through the demolition of the later additions and removal of the curtainscreen and veneer cladding from the original limestone structure;
- Minor impacts to the identified heritage attributes of 1037, 1103 and 1109 King Street East and 1123 Queenston Road as a result of potential vibration impacts; and
- Positive and negligible impacts to the identified heritage attributes of the Preston Towne Centre Character Area.

An options analysis of potential alternatives, mitigation and conservation options is provided in Section 9.
9 ALTERNATIVES, MITIGATION AND CONSERVATION OPTIONS

In adherence with, and exceeding the direction provided in the City of Cambridge’s *Detailed Guidelines for the Preparation of Cultural Heritage Impact Assessments*, this CHIA has presented four alternatives that range from “do nothing” to redevelopment of the subject property.

The following alternatives, mitigation and conservation options were considered to avoid or reduce adverse impacts to the heritage attributes of the property at 1102 King Street East:

1) Preserve and maintain the property at 1102 King Street East as is with no further development.

2) Adaptively re-use the original extant limestone building at 1102 King Street East, incorporating it into plans for the property’s redevelopment.

3) Adaptively re-use the original extant limestone building at 1102 King Street East and the extended Dolph Street South limestone elevation, incorporating both structures into plans for the property’s redevelopment.

4) Redevelop the property at 1102 King Street East and demolish the extant building.
## 9.1 ALTERNATIVES, MITIGATION AND CONSERVATION OPTIONS ANALYSIS

### Table 9: Alternatives, Mitigation and Conservation Options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
<th>Mitigation/ Conservation Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Preserve and maintain the property at 1102 King Street East as is with no further development.</td>
<td>This option would maintain the general heritage principle that prefers minimal intervention to a heritage resource. It would ensure the subject property retains all identified heritage attributes.</td>
<td>Preservation would require ongoing repair and maintenance to ensure conservation of the heritage attributes of 1102 King Street East. Continued vacancy without an active use could result in further detrimental physical impacts to the structure if required repairs and security measures are not undertaken. Redevelopment of the property ensures a viable and stable new use that will improve the probability the site will be utilized and conserved in the long-term. The limited indirect impacts of the proposed development are not cause to deny the development proposal. Rather the positive impacts proposed through the removal of the curtainscreen, various veneer cladding and later additions will return the subject property to its original Georgian form and the contribution it makes to the King Street East streetscape in south Preston.</td>
<td>None necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Adaptively re-use the original extant limestone building at 1102 King Street East, incorporating it into plans for the property’s redevelopment.</td>
<td>The indirect impacts to 1102 King Street East have been mitigated through the new development’s sympathetic design concept arrived at through iterative consultation with the Client and development concept refinement resulting in a design that retains, conserves and restores the original two-and-a-half storey limestone building.</td>
<td>The proposed development will see the demolition of later additions to the subject property. One addition, the two-storey limestone extension fronting Dolph Street, is proposed to be removed and has been identified as a heritage attribute contributing to the CHVI of 1102 King Street East. The removal of the addition will result in the removal of one of the subject property’s heritage attributes. However, the integrity of this addition has</td>
<td>In accordance with the MCM’s Heritage Resources in the Land Use Planning Process, design guidelines that harmonize mass, setback, setting and materials are mitigation measures to reduce impacts to cultural heritage resources. The design of the new building should be sensitively planned to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Options</td>
<td>Advantages</td>
<td>Disadvantages</td>
<td>Mitigation/ Conservation Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| This option represents a number of positive impacts to the subject property resulting from the removal of the later additions as well as the curtainscreen and veneer cladding from the original structure, which will reveal the original architectural massing and heritage attributes of the Georgian building. It will also improve the visibility of the original Georgian façade of the subject building, located at the south end of the Preston Towne Centre Character Area amongst remnants of the “Pennsylvania German Village” with its distinctive Georgian style two-and-half storey commercial blocks and residences. This option is consistent with Standard 3 of the Standards and Guidelines, which direct to “Conserve heritage value by adopting an approach calling for minimal intervention”; Standard 5, “Find a use for an historic place that requires minimal or no change to its character-defining elements”; Standard 11, “Conserve the heritage value and character-defining elements when creating any new additions to an historic place or any related new construction. Make the new work physically and visually compatible with, subordinate to and distinguishable from the historic place”; and Standard 12, “Create any new additions or related new construction so that the essential form and integrity of an historic place will not be impaired if the new work is removed in the future”.
| been impacted through the installation of a large plate glass window on the main level, removing almost half of the original elevation. The Client has evaluated the retention of this façade and found it to be challenging to conserve from an engineering perspective and thus costly. Removal of this elevation will not impact the legibility of the original two-and-a-half storey commercial Georgian structure on the subject property, which will be conserved and will continue to contribute to the King Street Streetscape in the Preston Towne Centre Character Area. The proposed development will be located immediately adjacent to the south and west elevations of the extant limestone building at 1102 King Street East. This proximity increases the likelihood of the subject property experiencing indirect impacts due to land disturbance, construction vibrations, and the potential for direct impacts in the form of damage from construction activities and machinery.
| reflect a similar or sympathetic massing, height, and materials to that of the extant structure. A structural engineer should be retained to complete a building inspection to ensure the extant limestone structure can withstand the proposed adaptive reuse project. Given the proximity of the adjacent heritage properties to the proposed limits of grading, a comprehensive pre-construction survey should be completed and a Zone of Influence Construction Vibration Study completed to monitor and mitigate vibration impacts during construction. Care should be taken not to compromise the existing foundation of the limestone structure at 1102 King Street East during excavations for the new building. A Construction Hoarding Plan should be prepared detailing where temporary construction fencing should be erected to buffer the construction area and the extant stone building at 1102 King Street East. Fencing should be erected at a sufficient distance to ensure there will be no direct or indirect impacts to the built heritage resource from construction activities or equipment. Prior to the demolition of the two-storey limestone extension fronting Dolph Street South, the addition should be thoroughly documented through measured plans and photography. If acceptable to...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
<th>Mitigation/ Conservation Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The proposed new development will also not result in direct impacts to the heritage attributes of the adjacent heritage properties at 1037, 1103 and 1109 King Street East and 1123 Queenston Road, nor the Preston Towne Centre Character Area. As such, it is ensured the properties will retain all identified heritage attributes.</td>
<td></td>
<td>the City of Cambridge, the measured plans and photography included in this CHIA may provide a sufficient record of the structure. If the property at 1102 King Street East will remain vacant for any extended period, a Mothballing Plan should be completed to examine the current condition of the structure and to suggest stabilization and maintenance measures necessary to temporarily mothball and secure the building and its heritage attributes. A Heritage Conservation Plan should be completed for the property to identify how the built heritage resource will be conserved in the long-term.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The advantages of Option 3 are consistent with those of Option 2 with the additional advantage of the retention of the extended Dolph Street South limestone façade.</td>
<td>The Client has evaluated the retention of this façade and found it to be challenging to retain from an engineering perspective and is thus a more timely and costly option. Given the integrity of this addition has been negatively impacted through the installation of a large plate glass window on the main level, removing almost half of the elevation’s original material, and the interior damage and alterations resulting from previous uses and a 2019 fire, its demolition is not considered to significantly impact the CHVI of the subject property. Removal of this later addition will not impact the legibility of the original two-and-a-half storey, limestone, commercial, Georgian structure, which will continue to contribute to the King In accordance with the MCM’s Heritage Resources in the Land Use Planning Process, design guidelines that harmonize mass, setback, setting and materials are mitigation measures to reduce impacts to cultural heritage resources. The design of the new building should be sensitively planned to reflect a similar or sympathetic massing, height, and materials to that of the extant structure. A structural engineer should be retained to complete a building inspection to ensure the extent limestone structure and Dolph Street South addition can withstand the proposed adaptive reuse project.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Adaptively re-use the original extant limestone building at 1102 King Street East and the extended Dolph Street South limestone elevation, incorporating both structures into plans for the property’s redevelopment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Options</td>
<td>Advantages</td>
<td>Disadvantages</td>
<td>Mitigation/ Conservation Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Street Streetscape in the Preston Towne Centre Character Area. The proposed new development will be located immediately adjacent to the south and west elevations of the extant limestone building at 1102 King Street East. This proximity increases the likelihood of the subject property experiencing indirect impacts due to land disturbance, construction vibrations, and the potential for direct impacts in the form of damage from construction activities and machinery.</td>
<td>Given the proximity of the adjacent heritage properties to the proposed limits of grading, a comprehensive pre-construction survey should be completed and a Zone of Influence Construction Vibration Study completed to monitor and mitigate vibration impacts during construction. Care should be taken not to compromise the existing foundation of the limestone structure at 1102 King Street East during excavations for the new building. A Construction Hoarding Plan should be prepared detailing where temporary construction fencing should be erected to buffer the construction area and the extant stone building and addition at 1102 King Street East. Fencing should be erected at a sufficient distance to ensure that there will be no direct or indirect impacts to the built heritage resource from construction activities or equipment. If the property will remain vacant for any extended period, a Mothballing Plan should be completed to examine the current condition of the original structure and Dolph Street South addition and to suggest stabilization and maintenance measures necessary to temporarily mothball and secure the building and its heritage attributes. A Heritage Conservation Plan should be completed for the property to identify how the built heritage resource will be conserved in the long-term.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Options</td>
<td>Advantages</td>
<td>Disadvantages</td>
<td>Mitigation/ Conservation Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Redevelop the property at 1102 King Street East and demolish the extant building.</td>
<td>This option would provide a record of the building and recommendations for items to be salvaged, such as limestone and wood beams. These elements could be potentially integrated into the new development and/or landscape features. If acceptable to the City of Cambridge, historical materials could also be donated for reuse in other historical structures or to teaching institutions. The salvage and reuse of material is consistent with Cambridge Official Plan policy 4.2.2.c.</td>
<td>The redevelopment of the subject property proposed in Option 4 will result in the demolition of the commercial building and its heritage attributes. Demolition is the least preferred option. Removal of the structure would result in a major alteration to the character and context of the nineteenth century King Street East commercial streetscape in the Preston Towne Centre Character Area. This option should only be selected if a structural engineer recommends retention is not a feasible option. Structural Assessment Reports completed following a fire in 2019 and detailed in Section 5.6.2 of this CHIA indicate the roof of the subject property is sound.</td>
<td>Prior to the demolition of the structure, recommendations should be provided for materials salvage in a Documentation and Salvage Report. Documentation typically involves photography of interior and exterior features, the façade, elevations and floor plans to provide a public record. In instances of building demolition, the salvage of building materials is considered good practice for the retention of historic materials. Further, salvage positively contributes to climate change mitigation by diverting waste from landfill and providing an opportunity to extend the lifespan of materials and their embodied carbon footprint. As such, the structure’s limestone and any well-preserved wood over 3/4” thick are suggested for potential salvage and reuse. Once the report is complete, the building would be removed, and recommended materials salvaged and stored. The measured drawings, documentation and photographs provided in this CHIA may serve as a sufficient record of the building on the subject property.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Symbolic conservation allows for the recovery of heritage components of a property and reuses them to construct a visible record of the resource. This approach, along with the reuse of portions of a property, is often the recommended mitigation strategy when retention or relocation of a structure is determined infeasible. The materials that can be salvaged should be explored through a commemoration strategy that examines the condition of the materials, outlines their potential reuse opportunities and interpretation. Options for symbolic conservation on the subject property include:

- Incorporation of salvaged materials, such as stone and wood beams, into entry gates, retaining walls, fences, benches or landscape features (i.e., planters) within the development; and/or,
- The construction of an interpretive plaque commemorating the property’s history.

Any salvaged items would need to be safely and securely stored until they were utilized onsite or, if satisfactory to the City of Cambridge, donated for reuse in other historical properties, offered to the wider public or salvage companies for reuse, or donated to educational organizations such as schools or museums.
9.2 RESULTS OF OPTIONS ANALYSIS AND CONSERVATION RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the review of the alternatives, mitigation and conservation options analysis presented in Table 9, Option 2, adaptively re-use the original extant limestone building at 1102 King Street East, incorporating it into plans for the property’s redevelopment, is the preferred option from a cultural heritage perspective, followed by Option 1, preserve and maintain the property at 1102 King Street East as is with no further development, then Option 3, adaptively re-use the original extant limestone building at 1102 King Street East and the extended Dolph Street South limestone elevation, incorporating both structures into plans for the property’s redevelopment, and lastly Option 4, redevelop the property at 1102 King Street East and demolish the extant building.

Although Option 1 would maintain the general heritage principle that prefers minimal intervention to a heritage resource, it is acknowledged this option would not allow for any redevelopment of the subject property. As such, a “do nothing” approach would not address the Client’s objective to provide new, affordable and supportive residential housing in the City of Cambridge and would not see the subject property receive a viable, long-term new use.

Option 2 would involve direct impacts to the heritage attributes of 1102 King Street East but the proposed adaptive reuse of the original two-and-a-half storey limestone Georgian structure represents a number of positive impacts resulting from the removal of the later additions as well as the curtainscreen and various cladding veneers. Removal of these materials will reveal the original architectural massing and heritage attributes of the commercial Georgian building. It will also improve the visibility of the original Georgian façade of the subject building, located at the south end of the Preston Towne Centre Character Area amongst remnants of the “Pennsylvania German Village” with its distinctive Georgian style two-and-half storey commercial blocks and residences. Through the new development’s sympathetic design concept and massing arrived at through iterative consultation with the Client, the proposed design of the new building is more in keeping with the character of the subject property and surrounding commercial heritage structures.

The proposed development will not result in direct impacts to the heritage attributes of the adjacent heritage resources or the Preston Towne Centre Character Area.

To successfully facilitate Option 2, the MCM’s Heritage Resources in the Land Use Planning Process design guidelines should be consulted. These guidelines aim to harmonize mass, setback, setting and materials as a mitigation measure to reduce impacts to cultural heritage resources. The concept for the new development adjacent to the nineteenth century subject building should be sensitively designed to reflect sympathetic materials, massing, and height.

A structural engineer should be retained to complete a building inspection to ensure the extant limestone structure can withstand the proposed adaptive reuse project.

Given the proximity of the adjacent heritage properties to the proposed limits of grading, a comprehensive pre-construction survey should be completed and a Zone of Influence Construction Vibration Study completed to monitor and mitigate vibration impacts during construction. Care
should be taken not to compromise the existing foundation of the limestone structure at 1102 King Street East during excavations for the new building.

Prior to the demolition of the two-storey limestone extension fronting Dolph Street South, the addition should be thoroughly documented through measured plans and photography. If acceptable to the City of Cambridge, the measured plans and photography included in this CHIA may provide a sufficient record of the structure.

The contract documentation for the project must contain all necessary direction to the contractor to protect cultural heritage resources, notably the heritage attributes listed in Section 7.5.3. A Construction Hoarding Plan should be prepared detailing where temporary construction fencing should be erected to buffer the construction area and the extant stone building at 1102 King Street East. Fencing should be erected at a sufficient distance to ensure that there will be no direct or indirect impacts to the built heritage resource from construction activities or equipment.

If the property will remain vacant for any extended period, a Mothballing Plan should be completed to examine the current condition of the structure and to suggest stabilization and maintenance measures necessary to temporarily mothball and secure the building and its heritage attributes. A Mothballing Plan should be prepared by a qualified individual in accordance with the Standards and Guidelines; the Code of Ethics and Guidelines for Practices by the Canadian Association of Conservation of Cultural Property and the Canadian Association of Professional Conservators (2009); the MCM’s Eight Guiding Principles in the Conservation of Built Heritage Properties (2007); Preservation Briefs 31: Mothballing Historic Buildings (Park 1993), and Well-Preserved: The Ontario Heritage Foundation’s Manual of Principles and Practice for Architectural Conservation (Fram 2003).

To ensure the long-term conservation of the property’s heritage attributes, a Heritage Conservation Plan should be completed. A Heritage Conservation Plan is a document that identifies how cultural heritage resources should be conserved. It should detail the conservation methods, required actions and trades for the conservation methods and an implementation schedule to conserve the property’s heritage attributes in the short-, medium-, and long-term.
# 10 IMPLEMENTATION & MONITORING

Below, Table 10 outlines the recommended schedule and reporting structure for implementation and monitoring of conservation/mitigative/avoidance measures addressed to conserve the built heritage resource as the development project is undertaken (Option 2). The requirement for these heritage mitigation measures may be incorporated by the City of Cambridge into the Site Plan Agreement or by the Client into the Contractor Specifications.

**Table 10: Implementation Schedule**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction Phase</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Development Application Conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Construction</td>
<td>In accordance with the MCM’s <em>Heritage Resources in the Land Use Planning Process</em>, design guidelines that harmonize mass, setback, setting and materials are mitigation measures used to reduce impacts to cultural heritage resources.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retain a structural engineer to conduct a pre-construction survey of the original limestone structure and assess its condition to determine its soundness prior to initiating the adaptive reuse project.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A comprehensive pre-construction survey should be completed followed by a Zone of Influence Construction Vibration Study to identity the vibration zone of influence for 1102, 1037, 1103 and 1109 King Street East and 1123 Queenston Road.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prior to the demolition of the two-storey limestone extension fronting Dolph Street South, the addition should be thoroughly documented through measured plans and photography.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Complete a Mothballing Plan for the subject building if it will remain vacant for an extended period of time.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Phase</td>
<td>Mitigation Measures</td>
<td>Development Application Conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Complete a Heritage Conservation Plan for the property.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Draft a contract document to include information regarding heritage attributes of the property.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Construction</strong></td>
<td>Establish a plan to avoid impact to the resources during construction including a buffer around the limestone Georgian structure with a silt fence and appropriate location of staging and construction materials and equipment.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monitor vibration impacts.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Post-Construction</strong></td>
<td>Structural engineer to conduct a follow-up assessment to review the physical condition of the limestone structure’s heritage attributes/structural integrity.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Cambridge to work with the Client to consider designation of the subject property under Part IV of the OHA.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11 SUMMARY STATEMENT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the results of the historical research, field review, site analysis and evaluation of the identified built heritage resources against the criteria for heritage designation under O. Reg. 9/06 of the OHA, as well as the City of Cambridge and Region of Waterloo’s evaluation criteria, 1102 King Street East was confirmed to possess CHVI for its representative Georgian architecture and contribution to the nineteenth century commercial development of Preston. The property was found to possess design or physical and contextual value and as such is worthy of designation under Part IV of the OHA. Additional evaluations found the subject property met five (5) of the City of Cambridge’s criteria and thus possessed CHVI, and met four (4) of the Region of Waterloo’s criteria, indicating it is a Regionally Significant Cultural Heritage Resource.

The proposed development project, consisting of the construction of a four-storey affordable and supportive residential development, was evaluated and determined to pose primarily minor and positive impacts to the identified heritage attributes of 1102 King Street East. Based on the review of the alternatives, mitigation and conservation options analysis, Option 2, adaptively re-use the original extant limestone building at 1102 King Street East, incorporating it into plans for the property’s redevelopment, is the preferred option for the conservation of the property.

The following conservation/mitigation strategies are recommended for the preferred Option 2:

1. That the MCM’s *Heritage Resources in the Land Use Planning Process* design guidelines should be consulted. These guidelines aim to harmonize mass, setback, setting and materials as a mitigation measure to reduce impacts to cultural heritage resources. The concept for the new development adjacent to the nineteenth century subject building should be sensitively designed to reflect sympathetic materials, massing, and height.

2. That prior to the construction of the new foundation and footing, the existing structure should be assessed pre-construction to document the physical condition, noting any pre-existing deficiencies, and structural integrity of the building to inform thresholds for vibration impacts and land excavation in proximity to the foundation. Care should be taken not to compromise the existing foundation during excavations for the new footing and foundation.

3. That given the proximity of adjacent heritage properties at 1037, 1103 and 1109 King Street East and 1123 Queenston Road to the proposed limits of grading, a comprehensive pre-construction survey should be completed and a Zone of Influence Construction Vibration Study completed to monitor and mitigate vibration impacts during construction.

4. That a Documentation and Salvage Report should be completed prior to the demolition of the Dolph Street South limestone addition. The City may scope this requirement given the thorough photographic documentation and measured drawings provided in this CHIA.

5. That contract documentation should include information regarding the CHVI of the structure, specifically the List of Heritage Attributes. A plan should be established to avoid impact to the resource during construction including a buffer around the limestone Georgian structure with a silt fence and appropriate location of staging and construction materials and equipment.
6 That if the property will be vacant for an extended period, a Mothballing Plan should be completed to examine the current condition of the limestone structure and to suggest stabilization and maintenance measures necessary to temporarily mothball and secure the building.

7 That a Heritage Conservation Plan be prepared for the property detailing the conservation methods, required actions and trades for the conservation methods and an implementation schedule to conserve the heritage attributes of the subject property in the long-term.

8 That should development plans change significantly in scope or design after approval of this CHIA, additional cultural heritage investigations may be required.

9 That following construction of the proposed development, the City of Cambridge should explore the designation of 1102 King Street East under Part IV of the OHA.

10 This report should be filed with the City of Cambridge Archives for their records.

11 That this CHIA should be submitted to the City of Cambridge Senior Planner – Heritage and the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee as well as the Region of Waterloo’s Cultural Heritage Planner for review and comment.
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E  STRUCTURAL ASSESSMENT REPORTS
May 23, 2019

John Hall
Greater Toronto Adjusters
3228 South Service Rd, Suite 102
Burlington, ON L7N 3H8

Dear Mr. Hall,

Re: Structural Assessment after Fire
Address: 1102 King St. E., Cambridge, ON
Insured: 1912427 Ontario Inc. o/a Grand River Hotel
Date of Loss: May 10, 2019
Your file No: Pol# C31652-5
Our File No: 19-179GJ

Caskanette Udall Consulting Engineers was retained on May 12, 2019 to conduct an independent investigation into the above matter. We were asked to provide a preliminary structural scope of repairs to return this building to its pre-fire condition.

We attended at the site on May 14, 2019 with Mr. Hall. The attached photographs were taken at that time.

The building is a three storey multi-occupancy commercial building (hotel) originally built in 1920s. There have been multiple modifications to the structure of the hotel throughout the time. The first floor of the building is mainly occupied by a restaurant bar. There are several guest rooms at the second and the third floor of the hotel. We understand from insured that the fire originated in the hallway at the second floor of the hotel and then spread into the roof space over the third floor through the knee wall cavity between the building sections.

Due to the multiple additions and modifications, the layout of the building is somewhat complex. For instance, a flat roof was added on top of existing third floor’s roof (see Figure 3). The fire damage was mainly noticed in the second and the third floor, especially within the attic areas. The roof is constructed with large timber framing. Although the timbers were heavily charred in some areas, there is sufficient remaining material that the roof remains stable. Overall, the integrity of the building’s structure was not affected by the fire. Therefore, to keep the building in an acceptable state before commencing the repair, no shoring is required.

A couple of ceiling joists beneath the attic of the third floor, right above the opening in the hallway were heavily charred. The two 2”x8” joists in this area will need to be replaced. Within the same area, there was a damage to the interior walls. The damage to the walls will need to be confirmed after tearout is complete. In addition, there is one area on the floor in the second floor hallway where the floor boards have burned through which needs to be repaired.
No shoring is required for the purpose of guests re-entering the building to attend their belongings. However, precautionary actions must be taken to prevent any injuries due to slips, falls and trips as guests re-enter the building. Also, care should be taken in regards to fire debris on the floors and possible falling ceiling finishes. A preliminary scope of repair is highlighted below:

1. Remove and replace the top floor roof assembly. This requires full removal of the flat roof assembly on top.
2. Repair or replace ceiling/roof joists over the second floor hallway adjacent to the flat roof.
3. Remove and replace interior finishes and floors as required and provide new insulation suitable for the existing construction.

This completes our preliminary structural assessment. A full scope of repairs and engineered drawings can be completed once tearout is performed to enable a complete inspection of the structure.

Yours truly,

Jeff Udall, P.Eng.
Figure 2: Arial View of Building Showing the Scope of Repair

- **Remove and Replace**
- **Flat Roof**
- **Third Floor Roof**
- **To be removed to provide access to the roof under it**
- **Repair the damaged areas as required on the roof**

**NOT FOR PUBLIC USE**
Figure 3 - Addition of Flat Roof on top of Existing Roof

Figure 4: Roof of the Building (looking south). Tarped area between building sections is damaged
Figure 5: Burn patterns on floor throughout the second level.

Figure 6: Damages in the Attic area.
Figure 7: Charred joists and roofing in area between building sections

Figure 8: Hole cut through sloped front roof into the cavity below the flat roof
Limitations

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

8. **Waiver of Consequential Damages**

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

9. **Limitation of Liability**

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

10. **Corporate Protection Provision**

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

---
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Caskanette Udall Consulting Engineers
December 6, 2019

Michael Lowthian
Greater Toronto Adjusters Inc.
3228 South Service Rd, Suite 102
Burlington, ON L7N 3H8

Dear Mr. Lowthian,

Re: Structural Assessment after Fire
Address: 1102 King St. E., Cambridge, ON
Insured: 1912427 Ontario Inc. o/a Grand River Hotel
Date of Loss: May 10, 2019
Your file No: PoI# C31652-5
Our File No: 19-179GJ

Further to our initial report on this matter dated May 23, 2019, we were asked to re-visit the building to assess the damage to the roof structure. I returned on November 29, 2019 to inspect the building.

At the time of my visit, the subject areas of the fire had been gutted to remove the interior floor, wall and ceiling finishes. The roof structure over the main part of the building was fully visible. I noted that the roof attic space was charred to varying degrees. The roof was constructed in general with large timber beams as rafters covered by wood planks. The planks were covered with tar paper, and roof shingles.

The fire char patterns in the attic space were unusual. In the lower section of the west attic, there were charred roof planks alternating with uncharred planks. The rafters were charred significantly immediately beside the uncharred planks. The uncharred planks also did not appear to be covered in smoke. The upper attic did not have the same pattern of uncharred and charred planks. The uncharred roof planks show that this lower attic area was exposed to a previous fire that has had some repairs at some time later.

The sketch below shows the configuration of the roof construction with the upper and lower attic spaces. The photos following show the various char patterns in the area.
Figure 1: Sketch illustrating the configuration of the roof and attic spaces of the main building section

Photo 1: Unburnt roof planks and charred roof rafters in lower attic
Photo 2: Charred rafters and roof planks alternating with uncharred planks in the space between the ceiling and knee wall

A photo provided in our previous report also showed this lower attic area prior to the tearout of the interior finishes. The photo shows a synthetic Christmas tree in the attic that has not been damaged by the fire.

Photo 3: Photo taken shortly after the fire showing Christmas decorations not damaged by the fire.
A video was provided that was taken at the time of the fire. The video clearly showed flames coming from one of the attic vents near the roof peak on the east side (assuming King St runs east and west). The fire did not penetrate the single vent on the west side of the roof, although there was significant smoke coming from the vent.

![Image of the building with a vent](image.jpg)

*Photo 1: Image taken from Facebook video recorded by bystander*

The images below show the transition of the fire from the hallway in the east flat roof section into the attic space of the main building. This path of the fire illustrates how the fire did not extend into the lower attic space of the main building on the west side.

**NOT FOR PUBLIC USE**
Photo 5: Overhead view of the building. Red arrow points to vent where fire was seen in Photo 1. The green arrow points to the area where the fire in the east flat roof section of the building penetrated the roof.

Photo 6: Green lines represent the hallway of the flat roof section where the fire started. Red arrows show the movement of the fire into the roof space of the main building. Green cloud shows area of roof attic that was not affected by this recent fire.
The available evidence shows that a fire occurred in the upper attic on the east side of the main building. The fire may have spread somewhat to the west side upper attic but it was not sufficient to penetrate the roof vent on that side. There is fire damage in the lower attic of the west side but this damage is pre-existing.

The large roof rafters on the east side have been charred, but the char depth on the rafters is relatively minimal so these rafters may be cleaned and remain in place.

The rafters on the east side are somewhat smaller and show more significant char depth. This deep charring is not the result of the recent fire. The upper attic may have been slightly charred, but not to the extent that is currently observed. The depth of the char on these rafters is considerable and these rafters should either be removed and replaced with new lumber, or cleaned and reinforced.

The planks on the roof are about 1" thick. In the areas affected by the recent fire, there is sufficient remaining thickness that the planks may be cleaned and left in place. However, consideration for cleaning or replacing the planks should include the flat roof section on the front of the building, and the economics of working around that construction or removing it to enable access.

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

Yours truly,

Jeff Udall, P.Eng.
Limitations

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

8. **Waiver of Consequential Damages**

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

9. **Limitation of Liability**

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

10. **Corporate Protection Provision**

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

F SELECTIVE STRUCTURAL ENGINEERING INVESTIGATION
Image 192: Detail of limestone wall remaining behind contemporary cladding on north elevation of original building (Kalos Engineering Inc., 2023)

Image 193: Detail of limestone wall remaining behind angel stone cladding at entrance on east façade of original building (Kalos Engineering Inc., 2023)
Image 194: Detail of limestone wall remaining behind angel stone and plaster cladding at northeast corner of original building (Kalos Engineering Inc., 2023)

Image 195: Detailed view of image above. Note gap between contemporary cladding and original limestone wall (Kalos Engineering Inc., 2023)
Image 196: Detailed view of dormer window remaining on roof of original structure’s façade behind curtainscreen (Kalos Engineering Inc., 2023)

Image 197: Detailed view of second window remaining on original structure’s façade behind curtainscreen (Kalos Engineering Inc., 2023)
Image 198: Detailed view of second storey limestone wall, windows, soffit, and frieze board remaining on original structure’s façade behind curtainscreen (Kalos Engineering Inc., 2023)

Image 199: Detailed view of curtainscreen construction proud of original structure (Kalos Engineering Inc., 2023)
To: Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee

Meeting Date: 7/20/2023

Report Title: 23-020 (MHAC) 33 Main St._Request to Alter a Part V Heritage Designated Building

Report Author: Laura Waldie, Senior Planner-Heritage

Department Approval: Joan Jylanne, Manager of Policy Planning

Department: Community Development

Division: Policy Planning

Report No.: 23-020(MHAC)

File No.: R01.02.01

Ward: Ward 4

RECOMMENDATION(S):

THAT Report 23-020 (MHAC) 33 Main St._Request to Alter a Part V Heritage Designated Building be received;

AND THAT the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee recommends that Council approve the proposed alteration to the storefront at 33 Main Street for the reasons outlined in Report 23-020(MHAC);

AND THAT the MHAC approve the request for a new sign to fit within the existing sign fascia and that the letters not be illuminated internally;

AND THAT the MHAC approves a variance to the Sign Bylaw to permit a sign measuring greater than 1.25 square meters within the existing sign fascia;

AND FURTHER THAT the MHAC not approve the request for a grant from the Designated Heritage Property Grant Program for the reasons outlined in Report 23-020(MHAC).

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

Purpose

The property owner is seeking permission to:

- Reconfigure a storefront frame and kickplates with a redesigned appearance using similar materials;
- Enlarge the window area on the storefront with new aluminum framed windows;
• Replace the existing front door with a new powered metal door to allow for barrier free access into the new business;
• Erect a new fascia sign as depicted in the sign permit drawings; and
• Receive a Designated Heritage Property Grant to help fund the alterations.

Key Findings

• The proposed alterations conform to the Main Street Heritage Conservation District Plan.
• The proposed alterations reflect a number of other buildings along Main Street according to the Main Street Urban Design Guidelines.

Financial Implications

The owner is responsible for the cost of any approved alterations. The property owner has applied to the City for a Commercial Property Improvement Grant. The current application is not eligible for a Designated Heritage Property Grant because the application is requesting to make alterations to the exterior of the building.

STRATEGIC ALIGNMENT:

☐ Strategic Action; or
☒ Core Service

Objective(s): Not Applicable

Strategic Action: Not Applicable

Core Service: Heritage Conservation

BACKGROUND:

33 Main Street is designated under Part V of the Ontario Heritage Act by by-law 028-85 passed on February 11, 1985.

The property owner contacted heritage planning staff May 9, 2023 via email to inform that he would be relocating his business, Liberty Tax, to 33 Main Street and was applying for a Commercial Property Improvement Grant through Economic Development staff. Heritage planning staff replied explaining that drawings needed to be submitted that would be reviewed by the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC) in order to make a recommendation to Council for a decision.
ANALYSIS:

The storefront at 33 Main Street was the location of Layers of Joy Indian Bakery. The owners of the bakery, who were tenants of the building, have outgrown their location and have relocated to Kitchener to expand their business. The property owner of 33 Main Street is looking to relocate his business, Liberty Tax, from across the street at 28 Main Street. The lease at 28 Main Street expires on July 31, 2023. The business will operate from 33 Main Street after the lease across the street expires.

The owner is proposing to alter the storefront façade of 33 Main Street. The proposal includes removing the existing wood frame and kickplates, and reconfiguring the design to include larger glazed windows that will be surrounded by new wood framing and kickplates. The front door will also be replaced with a steel door that will be automatic to provide barrier free access and bring it up to code under the Ontario Building Code. There are minimal interior renovations proposed. The interior renovations proposed do not require review by MHAC or by Council and are, therefore, exempt from this report.
Alterations to properties designated under Part V of the Ontario Heritage Act require Council approval unless they are exempted by the Heritage Conservation District Plan that implements the designation. The Main Street HCD Plan and the Main Street Urban Design Guidelines do not exempt work on the front facades of the buildings.

The following is an analysis of the proposed alterations to the front storefront façade as well as the request for funding through the Designated Heritage Property Grant Program.

**Storefront Alterations**

![Figure 2: Existing and Proposed Front Elevation Drawings, 33 Main Street](image)

The articulation, or the sum of a building’s parts, fits into the whole design of a building’s façade and plays a significant role in the pedestrian experience along a street. Remaining consistent with the existing articulation found within the heritage buildings along Main Street will help to promote the area’s heritage character by maintaining a
rhythm of openings, recesses, projections, and vertical and horizontal demarcations. Such patterns of façade articulation should be implemented where possible. Many of the addresses along the Main Street HCD maintain narrow bay widths in order to reinforce the rhythm of the historic fabric.

Figure 3: An Example of Vertical Articulation of Bays in a Building from the Main Street Urban Design Guidelines
Figure 3 is an example of how vertical articulation follows the vertical lines of the bays of a building. The proposed alterations to 33 Main Street would align the vertical articulation for window design and configuration as recommended in the Main Street Urban Design Guidelines. The proposed design for 33 Main Street’s storefront is considered to be complementary to the streetscape and provides enhanced heritage attributes for the building’s design.

The existing storefront is proposed to be removed and reconfigured using the existing materials. The current materials are aluminum framed windows that are surrounded with wood framing plates and kick plates. The storefront will be made flush to the exterior wall and a larger aluminum framed window will be placed on the east side of the storefront. The front door will be relocated to the west side of the storefront, making the door follow the vertical articulation of the third bay window above. Kickplates will be included with the reconfiguration and will be constructed of wood.

Heritage Planning staff do not have any concerns with the request to alter the property and are of the opinion that the changes reflect the materials that have been present on many of the storefronts along Main Street since the 1950s. The proposed reconfiguration does not contradict the intent of the Main Street HCD Plan and would still maintain its heritage attributes to the cultural significance of the HCD.

**Sign Bylaw Permit Application and Variance Request**

The proposed sign will look similar to the signage seen at 28 Main Street in terms of colours and logo design. Figure 4 below was submitted as part of the Sign Bylaw Permit application process.

![Figure 4: Proposed Design of Sign at 33 Main Street](image)
The proposed sign will be individual letters affixed to the existing sign fascia, which will be painted white. Each letter, coloured red, will measure 21.5 inches high (0.54 metres) and in length will measure 13 feet or 3.9 meters. This equals a total of just over 2.10 square metres. Because this measurement is more than the 1.25 square metres permitted under the sign bylaw, a variance will be required from development planning staff to issue the permit. Heritage Planning staff do not have any concerns with the sign application as presented.

Application to the Designated Heritage Property Grant Program

The intent of the Designated Heritage Property Grant Program is to help property owners offset the costs of conserving the original heritage attributes of their properties. It is also an incentive for people to hire trained heritage professionals to restore and maintain their properties for future generations to enjoy. The intent of the Designated Heritage Property Grant Program is not to award funds to property owners who wish to make alterations to the exterior, remove identified cultural heritage attributes that were the reason for designation, or to demolish features of the exterior. Because this permit application is requesting the demolition and reconfiguration of the current storefront design and is not seeking to maintain the exterior as it exists today, the project is ineligible to receive funding from the Designated Heritage Property Grant Program. The owner was provided with the Designated Heritage Property Grant Program brochure in June, 2023, which explained what projects were and were not eligible. The application for a grant was received on July 3, 2023 along with the drawings for the alterations and the sign permit.

The property owner has also applied to the Commercial Property Improvement Grant (CPIG) program. Provided that Council agrees to the request to alter the property and grants the issuance of a heritage permit and a building permit, the owner may be eligible to receive funding from the CPIG provided that he has fulfilled all requirements of the application process. Economic Development staff have been working with the property owner on his application to the CPIG program.

EXISTING POLICY / BY-LAW(S):

Ontario Heritage Act

42 (1) of the Ontario Heritage Act requires that property owners receive Council approval for alterations to a property designated under Part V of the Ontario Heritage Act

Section 42 (1) states, no owner of property situated in a heritage conservation district that has been designated by a municipality under this Part [V of the Act] shall do any of the following, unless the owner obtains a permit from the municipality to do so:
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).

(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. 2005, c. 6, s. 32 (1).

City of Cambridge Official Plan

Section 4.1 of the Official Plan includes Objective a) to “support the conservation restoration and prominence of the City’s built heritage as a key identifying feature of the community.”

Section 4.2 of the Official Plan discusses the priorities for cultural heritage resources in the City. Section 4.2.1 states:

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

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

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

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

Main Street Heritage Conservation District Plan

The Main Street Heritage Conservation District Plan outlines policies for the conservation of heritage resources within the area governed by the Plan and outlines guidelines for new development to ensure compatibility with existing heritage resources.

The Plan sets out the following broad objectives:

• To conserve and restore a selection of existing structures within the district which contribute to the historic and architectural style of Cambridge (Galt) and to redevelop a selection of properties in a compatible manner.
• To maintain the business core area of the city as a progressive, viable, and profitable commercial entity.

• To upgrade upper floors for residential and office use.

• To maintain a local atmosphere. To foster and preserve a sense of human scale, place, history, and personal contact in the district.

Main Street Urban Design Guideline

The City of Cambridge adopted Main Street Urban Design Guidelines provide recommendations regarding the conservation of heritage resources, including the subject property:

4.2.4 Windows and Doors

Original windows should be repaired if possible. Original wood windows, even single glazed, can, with appropriate restoration, perform as well as modern replacement windows. Proper caulking, installation of astragals and weather stripping can allow existing windows to perform well thermally. If it is necessary to replace a window, the replacement should be wood and replicate existing window configurations. Aluminum or vinyl window replacements are not acceptable.

FINANCIAL IMPACT:

The owner is responsible for the cost of any approved alterations. The property owner has applied to the City for a Commercial Property Improvement Grant. The current application is not eligible for a Designated Heritage Property Grant because the application is requesting to make alterations to the exterior of the building.

PUBLIC VALUE:

Transparency:

To ensure transparency, MHAC meeting agendas are posted on the City’s website

PUBLIC INPUT:

Meetings of the MHAC are open to the public via the City’s YouTube channel.

INTERNAL / EXTERNAL CONSULTATION:

Heritage planning staff liaised with the property owner on the process of application for a heritage permit to the City.
CONCLUSION:

For the reasons outlined in this report, heritage planning staff recommend that MHAC recommend Council approve the request to alter the property’s storefront and sign permit/variance request as well as refuse the request for funding from the Designated Heritage Property Grant Program because alterations are not eligible for funding.

REPORT IMPACTS:

Agreement: No
By-law: No
Budget Amendment: No
Policy: No

APPROVALS:

This report has been reviewed and approved for inclusion in the agenda by the respective Departmental Manager.

ATTACHMENTS:

1. Application to the Designated Heritage Property Grant Program.
Date: May 09, 2023

To Whom It May Concern

RE: Upgrading the storefront, 33 Main Street, Cambridge ON N1R 1V6

I am planning to renovate the building that I just purchased. I am the small business owner of Liberty Tax Service at 26 Main Street, Cambridge and the lease is expired on June 30, 2023. I have already signed a contract to start the work on June 01, 2023.

Attached documents as the following.

- Application – signed .......................................................... Page 2
- Proposed works along with drawing ........................................ Pages 3 to 6
- Two quotes for storefront exterior improvements ...................... Pages 7 to 11
- Two quotes for signage exterior improvements........................ Pages 12 to 15

Sincerely,

John Ly Thangbal
APPLICATION FOR DESIGNATED HERITAGE PROPERTY GRANT PROGRAM

MUNICIPAL HERITAGE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

To be completed and returned to the Planner-Heritage

APPLICANT:
NAME: John Ly Thang Gebäl
ADDRESS: 16 Isabella St
CITY: Kitchener
PHONE: Bus: Res.
E-mail: 

POSTAL CODE: N2E 4K1

SUBJECT LANDS AND/OR PREMISES:
ADDRESS: 33 Main St, Cambridge ON N1R 1V6
LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Pt Lt 2 S/S Main St @ E/S Water St S PL 615 CAN

HAVE YOU PREVIOUSLY RECEIVED A HERITAGE CONSERVATION FUND LOAN AND/OR GRANT?
Yes [ ] No [X]

IF YES, EXPLAIN:

PROVIDE A DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT PROPOSAL AND TWO QUOTES. Include details such as the materials to be used, sizes, mortar mixes, etc. Submit all drawings, photographs and/or other material necessary for a complete understanding of the property work (use additional sheets as required). Please include any available historic photographs.

Exterior
- New storefront glazing / glasses with standard bronze anodized signage + channel letters

Interior
- To install new flooring, new drywall @ paint

I certify that to the best of my knowledge, the information provided in this application for funds through the Designated Heritage Property Grant Program is accurate and complete.

[Signature]
Date: May 9, 2023

THIS FORM CONSTITUTES A PUBLIC DOCUMENT

Personal information contained on this form is collected pursuant to the Ontario Heritage Act and will be used for the purpose of responding to your application. Questions about the collection of personal information should be directed to the Deputy City Clerk/Manager of Info. Management and Archives at (519) 740-4680.
Work proposed for 33 Main Street, Cambridge

1. Work improvements: Exterior

- To remove interior glasses, both walls' glasses in the middle. New storefront glazing glasses to be installed, standard Bronze anodized, knees on the bottom. According to the drawing.

![Old storefront pics]
2. **Work improvements: exterior**

- Signage – storefront signage with Channel Letters (Liberty Tax Service) as soon on above proposed storefront pic.

3. **Work improvements: Interior**

- To install new flooring with vinyl and repaint
- I will do the interior work **myself**, so no quote is provided.
**COMMDOOR ALUMINUM**
Member Of The Turo Aluminum Group Of Companies (Est. In 1979)
471 Chrislea Road,
Woodbridge, ON L4L 8N6
Tel: (416) 743-3667 • Fax (416) 746-0979
info@commdooraluminum.com

**Quote**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quote No</th>
<th>50460</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quote Date</td>
<td>08/25/2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cust Id</td>
<td>GLASSCO2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terms</td>
<td>COD 50% DEP CSTM.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>Pls Supply Job Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact Id</td>
<td>MIKE 226-921-9424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>1 of 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Bill To:**
GLASS CO.
2870 LINE 45
GADSHILL, ON
NOK 1J0
TEL: (619)814 5026 FAX: (619)393 8299

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Id</th>
<th>Tag #</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Qty</th>
<th>U/M</th>
<th>Unit Price</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2500</td>
<td>S1.1</td>
<td>2500 SERIES FRAMING SYSTEM - STANDARD BRONZE ANODIZED. STANDARD BRONZE ANODIZE 175 1/2&quot; X 103&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Diagram:**

- NOSILL
- 145 1/2
- TH
- 26
- 702
- 703
- 709
- 175 1/2
- 57 3/4
- 57 3/4
- 57 3/4
- 77
- 77
- 77
- 26

**Locks:**
- PREP ONLY MS DEAD LOCK

**Door Series:**
- 1 3/4

**Hinges:**
- PREP ONLY-BUTT

**Note:** This estimate is valid for 30 days from date issued.

Terms are subject to credit acceptance.
All accounts exceeding 60 days will be placed on credit hold.
A late finance charge of 2% per month will be assessed on this portion of any amount beyond 30 days. This is an annual percentage rate of 26%.
All Orders are F.O.B. Commdoor
Taxes Extra

**Estimator:** MELANIE
The following quote is just for installing the storefront glasses and supply only.
Not include the removing of exiting glasses + knee walls, and new frames.
Prime Glass Solution Inc
7305 Woodbine Ave, Unit 420
Markham, ON L3R3V7
Phone: (416) 627-0883
Email: info@primeglasswindows.com
Web: primeglasswindows.com

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>single glass temper</td>
<td>$125.00</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>$15,625.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125$ per sqft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal         $15,625.00
Tax               $2,031.25
Total             $17,656.25

Notes:
job can be done in 2 weeks from approval
The following is a second quote for installing the new storefront (glazing), including the removing of exiting glasses + knee walls, and new frames.
Aug 10-2022
34 Main St
Balt
quote 226-339-2124

1. Remove Interior glass + knee walls.
2. Secure front entrance Temporarily
3. Supply + install new frames + 38" door
   Includes Tempered Units
4. All Scrap removal included
5. Any permits not included

$23,000.00 + HST

Thank Mike
## Quote

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Id</th>
<th>Tag #</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Qty</th>
<th>U/M</th>
<th>Unit Price</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2500</td>
<td>S1.1</td>
<td>2500 SERIES FRAMING SYSTEM - STANDARD BRONZE ANODIZED, STANDARD BRONZE ANODIZE 175 1/2&quot; X 103&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** This estimate is valid for 30 days from date issued.

Terms are subject to credit acceptance.
All accounts exceeding 60 days will be placed on credit hold.
A late finance charge of 2% per month will be assessed on this portion of any amount beyond 30 days. This is an annual percentage rate of 26%.
All Orders are F.O.B. Commdoor
Taxes Extra

**Estimator:** MELANIE
Hi Johnly,
I am attaching a drawing and quote

I am estimating your new storefront to be 15 ft wide

Price to supply and install a new Channel Letter sign at 12.75 ft wide is

$2,900

Thanks,

Brett Chin
All In One Signs
42 Riviera Drive
Markham, Ontario L3R 5M1
647-896-1965
LED illuminated Channel Letters
22 in high x 12.75 ft wide
Installed on 6 in high metal raceway
Hi Johnly,
Price to supply and install the 4" deep LED lit channel letter Liberty tax logo as per your received drawing: .............................................$5660.00 plus HST

Price to supply and install non illuminated 1" thick Liberty Tax Logo cut out letters: .............................................$2350.00 plus HST

Please confirm that you've received this e:mail

Regards,
Mike

Michael Brown,
Senior consultant

Sign Language Inc.
9-300 Gage Ave., Kitchener, Ontario, N2M 2C8
T:519-743-8293

Check us out at www.signlanguage.net