Corporation of the City of Cambridge

Cambridge Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee Meeting Agenda

Meeting Number: 09-23

Date: November 16, 2023, at 7 p.m.

Location: Hybrid Meeting at City Hall and 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 October 19, 2023 meeting of the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee be considered for errors and omissions and be adopted. PP 005

Presentations: NIL

Delegations: NIL
Agenda Items:

1. 23-026 (MHAC) 415 Water Street South – Heritage Impact Assessment, Request to Alter a Designated Property

THAT Report 23-026 (MHAC) 415 Water Street South: Heritage Permit Application, Request to Alter a Designated Property be received;

AND THAT the Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) submitted and included with the heritage permit application be received;

AND FURTHER THAT the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee recommend that Council approve the Heritage Permit application for the proposed alterations to 415 Water Street South, as outlined in Report 23-026 (MHAC), subject to the following conditions:

1) That the proposed replacement windows on the stone house include replicated sashes and frames (if original frames cannot be retained) that match the historic profile, shape, dimensions, and six-over-six frame divisions in wood material and not vinyl or aluminum;

2) That the applicant submits a rendering of the proposed horizontal wood siding material for the replacement structure that matches the current colour and appearance of existing clapboard, to the satisfaction of Heritage Planning staff;

3) That the applicant provides updated quotes with all specifications, to the satisfaction of Heritage Planning staff, for new wood windows on the stone house, replacement doors on the stone house, and new windows on the replacement frame addition;

4) That the wood material from the existing frame addition and both the 19th century and 20th century wood windows on both the stone house and frame addition be carefully removed intact and made available to a list of salvage companies for reuse or donation;

5) That the structural linkage between the existing stone house and the proposed replacement frame addition only make use of existing window and door openings and that no further cut-outs into the stone masonry be carried out;

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

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

2. 23-025 (MHAC)- Recommendation to Designate the Property Located at 120 Shade Street and 40 Marion Way (Soper Park) under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act

THAT Report 23-025 (MHAC) – Recommendation to Designate the Property located at 120 Shade Street and 40 Marion Way (Soper Park) under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act – be received;

AND THAT the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC) advise that Council approve the recommendation to designate the property municipally known as 120 Shade Street (Soper Park) under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act;

AND FURTHER THAT the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC) recommend to Council that the Clerk be authorized to publish a Notice of Intention to Designate (NOID) for the property municipally known as 120 Shade Street and 40 Marion Way (Soper Park) in accordance with Section 29 of the Ontario Heritage Act for its cultural heritage value.

3. 23-027 (MHAC) – Recommendation to Designate the Property Located at 704 Eagle Street North (Pattinson House/Golden Years) under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act

THAT Report 23-027 (MHAC) – Recommendation to Designate the Property located at 704 Eagle Street North under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act – be received;

AND THAT the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC) advise that Council approve the recommendation to designate only the original Pattinson House at the property municipally known as 704 Eagle Street North under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act;

AND FURTHER THAT the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC) recommend to Council that the Clerk be authorized to publish a Notice of Intention to Designate (NOID) only the original Pattinson House at the property municipally known
as 704 Eagle Street North in accordance with Section 29 of the Ontario Heritage Act for its cultural heritage value.

**Other Business**

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

**Next Meeting:**

Date & Time: December 14, 2023, at 7 p.m.  
Hybrid at City Hall and via Zoom

**Close of Meeting**

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

**Distribution:**

Committee Members in Attendance: Nelson Cecilia, Michelle Goodridge, Councillor Corey Kimpson, Rosemary Minnella, Megan Oldfield, Nancy Woodman and Kimberly Livingstone in the role of Chair.

Regrets: Susan Brown and Natasha Beaton

Staff in Attendance: Jeremy Parsons, 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 as a hybrid meeting at City Hall and 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 7:04 p.m. and the meeting adjourned at 8:42 p.m.

Declarations of Interest

Michelle Goodridge advised that she resides across the street from the proposed boundary of the Hespeler Heritage Conservation District Study.

Minutes of Previous Meeting

Moved by: Megan Oldfield
Seconded by: Nelson Cecilia

THAT the minutes of the September 21, 2023 meeting of the Cambridge Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee be considered for errors and omissions and be adopted.

CARRIED
Presentation:

Shannon Noonan, Manager of Transportation Engineering and Wally Malcolm, Project Manager Infrastructure Services – Asset Management and PMO gave a verbal update on the Dickson Hill Globe Lights. The previously proposed options were briefly reviewed and Shannon advised that after further inquiries by staff, they were able to find two companies that would be able to more effectively meet the City’s needs for smaller batches of custom fabricated poles to match the existing ones including the 16 inch LED Globe Fixture. One of the companies indicated they are also able to refurbish existing poles to extend their life span to meet the updated CSA requirements. Costing for these will need to be reviewed, but is expected to be less than previously provided.

The Committee thanked staff for their work on the project. They discussed at length materials, costing and asked for clarification on the proposed replacement and refurbishment of the light standards, and number of poles that require replacement versus those that may be refurbishment. Staff noted that initially, new poles would be on Salisbury Avenue and then any that are not able to be refurbished. Costing is expected to be less than was originally projected since a smaller amount can be purchased. The committee also discussed having the item come forward to MHAC for a recommendation of the Request for Quotation (RFQ) before going to Council. It was decided that a motion would be put forward.

Moved by: Nancy Woodman
Seconded by: Nelson Cecilia

THAT MHAC supports Staff’s Request for Quotation (RFQ) for the creation of seven new replica poles for Salisbury Avenue and refurbishment of the existing poles.

AND FURTHER THAT MHAC recommends that Staff provide MHAC with a project update following the RFQ process.

CARRIED

Reports:

1. Memo 23-003 (MHAC) Memo on Hespeler Heritage Conservation District Study Committee Consultation

Jeremy Parsons, Senior Planner-Heritage provided a brief overview of the project. He provided background and timeline of the HCD study noting the public consultation meeting set to take place on October 30, 2023. An explanation of what a Heritage Conservation District (HCD) is and its purpose was provided. The study and plan...
phases were explained as well as the legislative and policy framework. Lastly, the community engagement opportunities were provided.

Members of TRACE Architectures, Mark Brandt, Partner, Chris Warden, Partner, Sabina Barrett, Heritage Specialist, and Emily Guy, Research Lead of Trace Architectures, introduced themselves to the Committee. Emily Guy explained their methodology and approach to a Heritage Conservation area citing the company’s interdisciplinary approach. A brief historical overview of the proposed Hespeler HCD study area was provided, and the potential boundaries using aerial maps. It was noted that they have done extensive field research in the area viewing over 500 properties observing architectural elements, heritage designated properties historical elements of how the area evolved and overviews of the streetscape and natural landscape in the proposed study area. Sabina spoke to boundary options based on her observations noting that there are several options such as a core or expanded area. It was further noted that they observed a number of themes throughout the study area. They are looking forward to the public engagement to help further inform the study and noted the Engage page and survey available there.

Information Items: NIL

Other Business - NIL

Chair's Comments:
Chair, Kimberly Livingstone, did not have any comments

Council Report/ Comments:
Councillor Kimpson noted that she did not have any updates.

Staff/Senior Planner- Heritage comments:
Jeremy Parsons congratulated Megan Oldfield on her appointment as a Heritage Planner with the City of Hamilton.

Next Meeting
Date & Time: November 16, 2023, 7:00 p.m.
Location: Secord Room, City Hall and via Zoom

Close of Meeting
Moved by: Megan Oldfield
Seconded by: Nelson Cecilia

THAT the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee meeting does now adjourn at 8:42 p.m.

CARRIED

Kimberly Livingstone
MHAC Chairperson

Karin Stieg-Drobig
Recording Secretary
RECOMMENDATION(S):

THAT Report 23-026 (MHAC) 415 Water Street South: Heritage Permit Application, Request to Alter a Designated Property be received;

AND THAT the Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) submitted and included with the heritage permit application be received;

AND FURTHER THAT the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee recommend that Council approve the Heritage Permit application for the proposed alterations to 415 Water Street South, as outlined in Report 23-026 (MHAC), subject to the following conditions:

1) That the proposed replacement windows on the stone house include replicated sashes and frames (if original frames cannot be repaired) that match the historic profile, shape, dimensions, and six-over-six frame divisions in wood material and not vinyl or aluminum;

2) That the applicant submits a rendering of the proposed horizontal wood siding material for the replacement structure that matches the current colour and appearance of existing clapboard, to the satisfaction of Heritage Planning staff;

3) That the applicant provides updated quotes with all specifications, to the satisfaction of Heritage Planning staff, for new wood windows on the stone house, replacement doors on the stone house, and new windows on the replacement frame addition;
4) That the wood material from the existing frame addition and both the 19th century and 20th century wood windows on both the stone house and frame addition be carefully removed intact and made available to a list of salvage companies for reuse or donation;

5) That the structural linkage between the existing stone house and the proposed replacement frame addition only make use of existing window and door openings and that no further cut-outs into the stone masonry be carried out;

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

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

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

This report has been prepared to consult with the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee on a Heritage Permit application and an HIA for alterations proposed to the property located at 415 Water Street South, a property designated under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act.

Key Findings

- A HIA was submitted by Archaeological Research Associates Ltd. to the City of Cambridge on October 6, 2023 (Appendix A).
- A Heritage Permit application was submitted to the City of Cambridge on October 19, 2023 (Appendix B). The application was initially deemed incomplete, however further detail has subsequently been provided to fulfil application requirements.
- The property is designated under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act through Designation By-law No. 55-16.
- Heritage Planning staff support the Heritage Permit application, subject to several conditions, including salvaging existing wood windows and material from the existing frame addition and providing updated quotes for the proposed alterations.
Financial Implications

The owner is responsible for the cost of any approved alterations. There are no financial implications to the City as a result of this application.

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 on the east side of Water Street South, approximately 350 metres east of the Grand River and Moffatt’s Creek (Figure 1). The property is just over one acre in size (4,356 m²) and is surrounded by new residential development to the east and south and a large church property to the north. The property is currently in the process of being redeveloped. There are two phases to the site’s redevelopment: the first phase involved both Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendments to enable the construction of a two-storey mixed-use building at the rear of the property that was the subject of an earlier HIA (Amy Barnes Consulting, 2016). The second phase of the redevelopment is the subject of this revised HIA and involves modifications to the existing stone house, a former single-detached residence, to accommodate new uses.

The property is currently zoned Commercial (CS5) within the City’s Zoning By-law. In 2018, By-law No. 66-18 was passed, pursuant to Section 34(18) of the Planning Act, amending the Zoning By-law to allow for commercial uses on this property and to allow for a maximum gross leasable commercial floor area of 575 m². Residential uses also continue to be permitted on this property in accordance with Section 3.3.3.1 of the Zoning By-law.

The property contains a one-and-a-half storey rough-cut limestone house on a rise of a hill facing north on Water Street South. The property also has a frame addition that was used as a summer kitchen and garage. The dwelling was constructed circa 1841 by David Potter in the Georgian architectural style. The historical front of the building, facing south, contains five bays; two prominent dormers; and a central front door with a transom, large lintel and fanlight window. The historical rear of the building, now the front facing the parking lot, contains a three-bay façade with a pedimented vestibule and...
a central dormer. Two rectangular chimneys are located on each end of the gabled roof (Figures 2 to 6). The property was designated under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act in 1986 and is protected under By-law No. 55-16 (Appendix D).

The applicant is proposing to make alterations to the designated stone house by removing the existing summer kitchen and garage frame addition, replacing it with a new addition, replacing existing windows on the stone house, and replacing both existing doors, including the entrance vestibule. No Building Permits have yet been submitted in connection with the proposed alterations.

Figure 1: Aerial image of the subject property outlined in red (City of Cambridge)
Figure 2: Looking south at the subject property (City of Cambridge, 2023)

Figure 3: Showing the west elevation of the stone house (City of Cambridge, 2023)
Figure 4: Showing the south elevation of the stone house (City of Cambridge, 2023).

Figure 5: A close up of two of the 20th century six-over-six double-hung wood windows set on cast cement sills (City of Cambridge, 2023).
Figure 6: Looking north at the large frame addition with a wall of wood windows (City of Cambridge, 2023).

EXISTING POLICY / BY-LAW(S):

Ontario Heritage Act (R.S.O. 1990, c. O.18)

Alteration of property

33 (1) No owner of property designated under section 29 shall alter the property or permit the alteration of the property if the alteration is likely to affect the property’s heritage attributes, as set out in the description of the property’s heritage attributes in the by-law that was required to be registered under clause 29 (12) (b) or subsection 29 (19), as the case may be, unless the owner applies to the council of the municipality in which the property is situate and receives consent in writing to the alteration. 2019, c. 9, Sched. 11, s. 11.

Application

(2) An application under subsection (1) shall be accompanied by the prescribed information and material. 2019, c. 9, Sched. 11, s. 11.

Other information

(3) A council may require that an applicant provide any other information or material that the council considers it may need. 2019, c. 9, Sched. 11, s. 11.
Notice of complete application

(4) The council shall, upon receiving all information and material required under subsections (2) and (3), if any, serve a notice on the applicant informing the applicant that the application is complete. 2019, c. 9, Sched. 11, s. 11.

Notification re completeness of application

(5) The council may, at any time, notify the applicant of the information and material required under subsection (2) or (3) that has been provided, if any, and any information and material under those sections that has not been provided. 2019, c.9, Sch. 11, s. 11.

City of Cambridge Official Plan (2018)

4.6 Designation of Heritage Properties

1. The City will regulate as fully as possible the demolition, removal or inappropriate alteration of buildings of cultural heritage value or interest included in the Register of Cultural Heritage Resources referred to in Section 4.3, and for these purposes, Council may:

   a) pass by-laws pursuant to the Ontario Heritage Act to designate properties including such buildings or structures to be of cultural heritage value. Council shall not permit the demolition, removal or inappropriate alteration of such buildings or structures for a period of 90 days following application by the owner of such buildings or structures, or such further period of time as Council and the owner may agree upon, unless Council has repealed the by-law designating such property or part thereof.

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).

ANALYSIS:

The proposal involves a series of alterations to the property located at 415 Water Street South including replacing the existing frame addition, replacing existing windows and doors, and reframing the front vestibule.

Heritage Planning staff have worked with the applicant since 2022 to submit and update their HIA and to refine their proposal to ensure that it would be supportable. There remain some concerns with the retention and salvage of existing wood windows. However, conditional support is recommended, provided that the applicant is able to satisfy compliance with the eight conditions outlined in this report.

Removal and Replacement of Summer Kitchen and Garage

The applicant is proposing to demolish the existing summer kitchen and garage which extends from the eastern elevation of the stone house. According to the HIA this frame addition dates to the 19th century and may have been built shortly after the construction of the circa 1841 stone house. According to the Windows Inspection and Assessment Report completed by Furlan Conservation on August 12, 2023 (Appendix A), there are five historic windows that date to the mid-19th century located on this frame structure. The mouldings, construction details, light pattern, sashes, and glass texture are all typical of this period. No period hardware is present on these windows. The summer
kitchen and garage are both indicated as heritage attributes within Designation By-law No. 55-16 (Appendix D).

The structural condition report completed by Centric Engineering in 2022 (Appendix C) reviewed the condition of the wood-frame addition and concluded that, in its current condition, the building does not appear to be suitable to be used for residential or commercial purposes. The report notes that the structural wood frame appears to be compromised in several areas and the lack of frost protection for the foundation makes it possible for the building to shift due to frost heave. Centric also noted that it may be unfeasible to underpin the foundation to provide frost protection without causing further damage to the wood frame.

As such, Heritage Planning staff are willing to support the replacement of the frame addition to accommodate a more stable and secure structure provided that the existing wood material (posts and beams) and existing windows can be carefully salvaged for reuse or donation. Heritage Planning staff are satisfied that the proposed design of the new structure will echo the existing structure and will match the massing, height, and style over the same footprint. The proposed cladding material is prefinished horizontal wood siding that should match the colour and appearance of the current siding. The proposed replacement structure will have French-style doors and a single rectangular window on the north elevation. It will generally reproduce the layout and design of the existing 19th century frame structure.

Replacement of Wood Windows on Stone House

The applicant is proposing to remove and replace fifteen (15) wood windows on the 19th century stone house. These elements are identified as heritage attributes within the property’s designation by-law (Appendix D).

According to the Windows Inspection and Assessment Report completed by Furlan Conservation on August 12, 2023 (Appendix A), there is a combination of double-hung wood sash windows and casement sash windows on the stone house. There is also a fanlight and transom over the door on the south elevation. The fanlight window will remain in situ and will not be replaced. Both the fanlight and the transom window over the south elevation door appear to be original to the structure.

The six-over-six wood windows present across the first and second elevations of this building are, according to Furlan Conservation, all 20th century replacement windows. This is evidenced by the fact that they contain counterweighted spiral tube balances, a technology that was introduced around 1948. The upper casement windows within the dormers are also likely mid-20th century. Finally, exterior windows all have cast cement sills, a material that was not used in this fashion in residential construction until the 20th century.
These six-over-six wooden sash windows are proposed to be replaced with wood windows that match the historic profile, shape, and dimensions of the existing windows, all in wood material. Given the fact that the existing wood windows are of 20th century vintage and most have some level of damage or vandalism, Heritage Planning staff are in support of their replacement with an appropriate product. Heritage Planning staff do not support replacing these wood windows with vinyl, vinyl-clad, or aluminum-clad windows.

Heritage Planning staff have requested that the applicant have a window professional, with experience with historic windows, examine the existing wood frames to see if they can be repaired and retained while the new wooden sash windows are inserted into the existing frames. If the existing frames cannot be repaired, Heritage Planning staff would support new replacement wood frames.

Other alterations

Other alterations proposed in this Heritage Permit application include the replacement of the wooden vestibule on the north elevation and the replacement of doors on both north and south elevations. The pedimented vestibule structure is proposed to be reframed in the same style, size and overall massing, on the same footprint. The vestibule is identified as a heritage feature within the designation by-law. It is not clear whether the structure is original to the building or if it has been added on at a later date. Both doors are proposed to be replaced with modern products, including on the south elevation, where the door is proposed to be constructed in steel or fibreglass with a wood grain finish.

Repointing is also noted within the HIA as being anticipated to be carried out in some point in the future on the stone house. Heritage Planning staff have not received a Heritage Permit application for repointing nor have we received any quotes from contractors for repointing work. Any proposed repointing or other masonry work would require a separate application under the Ontario Heritage Act.

Heritage Planning staff are in support of the proposed Heritage Permit and have included several conditions in this report in order to ensure that the alterations are appropriate and respectful of the building’s historic material and heritage character. These include requiring that the replacement wood windows replicate existing specifications; submission of a rendering to show the material proposed for the replacement frame addition; submission of updated quotes; salvage of wood material and windows; and the structural linkage between the stone house and the new addition not negatively impact the stone masonry.

FINANCIAL IMPACT:

The owner is responsible for the cost of any approved alterations.
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 proposal and the process of applying for a Heritage Permit.

CONCLUSION:

For the reasons outlined in this report, Heritage Planning staff recommend that MHAC recommend Council approve the Heritage Permit application requesting to alter the property, subject to the conditions outlined in this report.

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. 23-026 (MHAC) Appendix A: Heritage Impact Assessment, submitted by ARA
2. 23-026 (MHAC) Appendix B: Heritage Permit Application
3. 23-026 (MHAC) Appendix C: Structural Condition Report by Centric Engineering
4. 23-026 (MHAC) Appendix D: Designation By-law No. 55-16
Scoped Heritage Impact Assessment
415 Water Street South
City of Cambridge
Regional Municipality of Waterloo
Part Lot 3, Concession 9, East of the Grand River
Geographic Township of Waterloo
Former Waterloo County, Ontario

Prepared for
Carlos Moura
Chrisview Custom Homes Ltd.
1661 Morrison Rd.
Cambridge, Ontario  N1R 5S2
Tel: 519-622-0393
Fax: 519-623-5399
chrisviewcustomhomes@hotmail.com

C/O
Andrew N, Head
Dryden, Smith & Head
Planning Consultants Ltd.
54 Cedar Street N. Kitchener
Tel: 519-745-3540
www.dsh.ca

By
Archaeological Research Associates Ltd.
219-900 Guelph Street
Kitchener, ON N2H 5Z6
Tel: (519) 804-2291 Fax: (519) 286-0493

HR-373-2021
Project# 2021-0546

02/10/2022- Original Submission
09/25/2023- Revised HIA
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Under a contract awarded in October 2021 by Carlos Moura of Chrisview Custom Homes, Archaeological Research Associates Ltd. was retained to complete a scoped Heritage Impact Assessment in advance of the proposed redevelopment at 415 Water Street South, City of Cambridge. The subject property, located at 415 Water Street South, is a designated property under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act under By-Law 55-16. There are no adjacent heritage properties. In consultation with the City of Cambridge Senior Planner – Heritage, this Heritage Impact Assessment has been scoped to assess the overall condition of the structure, assess the current heritage attributes of the structure, explain the work proposed for the heritage structure exterior, and provide recommendations.

The subject property is located on part of Lot 3, Concession 9, East of the Grand River, Geographic Township of Waterloo, former Waterloo County, Ontario, currently the City of Cambridge, in the Regional Municipality of Waterloo.

The scoped Heritage Impact Assessment approach consisted of the following:

- Identification and graphic inventory of the existing subject property including photographic documentation;
- Photographic documentation and investigation of areas/items proposed to be removed;
- A description of the proposed redevelopment;
- Identification of parts of the existing structure to be removed;
- Impact assessment and alternative options: and
- Mitigation measures and recommendations

The proposed redevelopment seeks to convert the existing single-family residence into commercial or residential units. The proposed redevelopment involves the removal of all windows and doors as well as the vestibule on the stone house to be replaced with new wooden vinyl clad windows (GoldenClad Series) and a reconstructed vestibule on the façade (north elevation) which will replicate the same size and style. The wooden fanlight on the south elevation will remain. The proposed redevelopment includes the removal of the existing summer kitchen and garage to be replaced with a new structure in the same location and of the same size, shape and form. The new structure would include resized window openings on all elevations of the summer kitchen. Lastly, the proposed redevelopment seeks to replace the wooden cladding, soffit and fascia, with a contemporary siding and conduct site specific repointing of the stone masonry.

The following impacts of the proposed redevelopment were identified:

- Impact 1: Removal of several attributes including all the six-over-six wood windows, the vestibule on the north elevation, the door and transom on the south elevation, the summer kitchen on the east elevation; and the garage on the east elevation.
- Impact 2: The potential for destruction of the rough-cut limestone and lime mortar construction during repointing.
- Impact 3: The potential for accidental damage during the construction process.
- Impact 4: The alteration of window size and location proposed on the summer kitchen and garage.

The following positive impacts of the proposed redevelopment were identified:
The property has been vacant for more than a decade and has been subject to vandalism. The use of a designated property will ensure its ongoing viability.

The options explored can be summarized as follows:

- Option 1: Option 1 – Do Nothing
- Option 2 – Proposed Site Redevelopment with Rehabilitation or Replication of All Windows
- Option 3 – Proposed Site Redevelopment using GoldenWood Series Windows
- Option 4 – Proposed Site Redevelopment with Rehabilitation or Replication of a Select Number of Six-over-six Wood Windows on the Stone Dwelling
- Option 5- Proposed Redevelopment

Option 1 has been determined not to be feasible. ARA determined that the preferred option from a heritage conservation approach is Option 2. Option 3 represents a modern window type that may still satisfy the conservation goals of the City. Option 4 represents an alternative that would seek to compromise between the property owner’s redevelopment goals and the City’s heritage protection requirements. Option 5 is the preferred option of the property owner. Should the owner and the City/MHAC come to an agreement, clear parameters of what is acceptable (restoration or replacement), the number of windows and their location, and how to move forward with permitting in a timely manner, should be communicated directly to the owner. ARA has included a series of mitigation measures to reduce negative impacts below as it pertains to the proposed development. Should MHAC and City staff pursue Option 3 or Option 4, City Staff/MHAC should determine in any of the mitigation options outlined below should also be pursued.

Given the owner wishes to pursue the proposed redevelopment as outlined in Section 9.0, mitigation measures to address the impacts of the proposed redevelopment to 415 Water Street have been included below:

- A Cultural Heritage Resource Documentation report should be prepared. If the photographic and written documentation completed as part of this HIA is considered sufficient, a Cultural Heritage Resource Documentation report may not be required. This is to be determined by City staff.
- The salvage of historic materials should be encouraged as part of the site alteration and considered for reuse. If any of the materials can be salvaged, they should be removed carefully to ensure their reuse and that the removal of materials does not cause any additional damage to the property.
- If it has not already been completed as part of the original recommendation outlined in the HIA completed by Amy Barnes Consulting (2016), a Conservation Plan should be prepared. A Conservation Plan would provide guidance on items proposed for removal in a manner which does not cause additional unintended damage to the building. Furthermore, a Conservation Plan can provide short-, medium- and long-term recommendations to ensure the ongoing viability of the heritage resource. City staff/MHAC should consider if the benefits of requiring a Conservation Plan is warranted and at which stage in the process this should be implemented if required.
- Any masonry repointing should be carried out by a tradesperson who has experience working with heritage buildings. City staff/MHAC should determine if experience with historic buildings is essential to carry out this work, or if they are satisfied with the work being carried out by someone with masonry experience.
- The design of the garage and summer kitchen should be as proposed. If there are any changes to the design, they should be reviewed by a professional member of CHAP to ensure they are compatible with the stone building. The proposed design includes:
- The full removal of the garage and summer kitchen to be replaced with new buildings of the same size (footprint), shape (height) and form (overall massing).
- The proposed new structure will have a 6/12 roof pitch to be clad in asphalt shingles with a prefinished aluminum eavestrough, fascia and soffit, prefinished aluminum clad frieze trim, prefinished white horizontal wood siding, 4” prefinished corner/window trim, finished grade, concrete foundation and concrete footing below grade.
- The garage will have French doors and a single rectangular window on the north elevation.
- All openings on the east elevation are proposed to be closed in.
- The south elevation of the garage portion is proposed to include two rectangular windows, rhythmically placed, along the first storey and one single rectangular window in the upper storey.
- The existing designation by-law should be updated to reflect any changes resulting from the option which was pursued (i.e., removal of heritage attributes).
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1.0 PROJECT CONTEXT

Under a contract awarded in October 2021 by Carlos Moura of Chrisview Custom Homes, Archaeological Research Associates Ltd. (ARA) completed a scoped Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) in advance of the proposed redevelopment at 415 Water Street South, City of Cambridge (henceforth subject property). An initial HIA was submitted to the City of Cambridge planning staff for review in 2022 and comments were received from Planning Staff in September 2022. Since the original submission, several subsequent discussions, including an onsite meeting with Cambridge Planning Staff and the owner, have taken place. As a result of these meetings, and on the direction of the Cambridge planning staff, this HIA has been updated to reflect the current proposed redevelopment and includes additional information requested by City to make an informed decision.

The subject property is designated under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act under By-Law 55-16. The subject property is a one-and-a-half-storey, five bay, limestone Georgian-style residence with a side gable roof constructed circa 1841. There are no adjacent heritage properties. The subject property is located on Part Lot 3, Concession 9, East of the Grand River, Geographic Township of Waterloo, former Waterloo County, Ontario, currently the City of Cambridge, in the Regional Municipality of Waterloo (see Map 1).

A built heritage assessment was completed by Mayer Heritage Consulting in 2002 (and a supplement to the Built Heritage Assessment was conducted in 2003 by Garrod & Associates Inc) in advance of a draft subdivision plan for the surrounding area, which was subsequently built circa 2008. An addendum was completed in 2016 by Amy Barnes Consulting to specifically consider the construction of a new two-story commercial/residential building on 415 Water Street South. The proposed site plan for the new building was reviewed by the Municipal Heritage Committee in March 2017. The site plan agreement for the proposed redevelopment was finalized on February 2, 2021. The subject property has been vacant for over 12 years. As the construction of the new building is nearing completion, the owner wishes to move forward with the proposed redevelopment of the subject property.

In consultation with the City of Cambridge Senior Planner - Heritage, this revised HIA will focus on the proposed redevelopment and impacts on associated heritage attributes. The HIA has been scoped to consider the overall condition of the structure, assess the current heritage attributes of the structure, describe the work proposed for the heritage structure exterior, and provide recommendations.

This assessment was conducted in accordance with the aims of the Planning Act R.S.O. 1990, c. P.13, Provincial Policy Statement (2020), Ontario Heritage Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. O.18, Cambridge Official Plan (2018), and the City of Cambridge’s 2012 Detailed Guidelines for the Preparation of Cultural Heritage Impact Assessments Under Policy 4.10 of the City of Cambridge Official Plan (CHIA Terms of Reference [TOR]).
2.0  LEGISLATION AND POLICY REVIEW


2.1  Federal Guidelines

At the national level, The Standards and Guidelines for Conservation of Historic Places in Canada (Parks Canada 2010) provides guidance for the preservation, rehabilitation and restoration of historic places, including cultural landscapes and built heritage resources. Such guidance includes the planning and implementation of heritage conservation activities.

2.1.1  Standards and Guidelines of Historic Places in Canada

The Standards and Guidelines list the following “General Standards for Preservation, Rehabilitation and Restoration”:

1. Conserve the heritage value of an historic place. Do not remove, replace, or substantially alter its intact or repairable character defining elements. Do not move a part of an historic place if its current location is a character-defining element.
2. Conserve changes to an historic place that, over time, have become character-defining elements in their own right.
3. Conserve heritage value by adopting an approach calling for minimal intervention.
4. Recognize each historic place as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Do not create a false sense of historical development by adding elements from other historic places or other properties, or by combining features of the same property that never coexisted.
5. Find a use for an historic place that requires minimal or no change to its character-defining elements.
6. Protect and, if necessary, stabilize an historic place until any subsequent intervention is undertaken. Protect and preserve archaeological resources in place. Where there is potential for disturbing archaeological resources, take mitigation measures to limit damage and loss of information.
7. Evaluate the existing condition of character-defining elements to determine the appropriate intervention needed. Use the gentlest means possible for any intervention. Respect heritage value when undertaking an intervention.
8. Maintain character-defining elements on an ongoing basis. Repair character-defining elements by reinforcing their materials using recognized conservation methods. Replace in kind any extensively deteriorated or missing parts of character-defining elements, where there are surviving prototypes.
9. Make any intervention needed to preserve character-defining elements physically and visually compatible with the historic place and identifiable on close inspection. Document any intervention for future reference (Parks Canada 2010:22)

The Standards and Guidelines have been considered and help inform conservation approaches and mitigation measures.
2.2 Provincial Policies and Guidelines

2.2.1 The Planning Act

In Ontario, the Planning Act is legislation used by provincial and municipal governments in land use planning decisions. The purpose of the Planning Act is outlined in Section 1.1 of the Act, which states:

1.1 The purposes of this Act are,
   (a) to promote sustainable economic development in a healthy natural environment within the policy and by the means provided under this Act;
   (b) to provide for a land use planning system led by provincial policy;
   (c) to integrate matters of provincial interest in provincial and municipal planning decisions;
   (d) to provide for planning processes that are fair by making them open, accessible, timely and efficient;
   (e) to encourage co-operation and co-ordination among various interests;
   (f) to recognize the decision-making authority and accountability of municipal councils in planning.1994, c. 23, s. 4.

Part I Provincial Administration, Section 2 states:

The Minister, the council of a municipality, a local board, a planning board and the Municipal Board, in carrying out their responsibilities under the Act, shall have regard to, among other matters, matters of provincial interest such as,
   (d) the conservation of features of significant architectural, cultural, historical, archaeological, or scientific interest. 1990: Part I (2. d)

Part I Provincial Administration, Section 3, 5 Policy statements and provincial plans states:

A decision of the council of a municipality, a local board, a planning board, a minister of the Crown and a ministry, board, commission or agency of the government, including the Tribunal, in respect of the exercise of any authority that affects a planning matter,
   (a) shall be consistent with the policy statements issued under subsection (1) that are in effect on the date of the decision; and
   (b) shall conform with the provincial plans that are in effect on that date, or shall not conflict with them, as the case may be. 2006, c. 23, s. 5; 2017, c. 23, Sched. 5, s. 80.

The current Provincial Policy Statement (PPS), issued under section 3 of the Planning Act, came into effect May 1st, 2020.

2.2.2 The Provincial Policy Statement (2020)

The Provincial Policy Statement (PPS 2020) contains a combined statement of the province’s land use planning policies. It provides the provincial government’s policies on a range of land use planning issues including cultural heritage outlined in Section 1.7 c) as including: “Ontario's long-term prosperity, environmental health, and social well-being depend on conserving biodiversity, protecting the health of the Great Lakes, and protecting natural heritage, water, agricultural, mineral and cultural heritage and archaeological resources for their economic, environmental and social benefits” (Section 1.7 e) MMAH 2020:24). The PPS 2020 promotes the conservation of...
cultural heritage resources through detailed polices in Section 2.6, such as “2.6.1 Significant built heritage resources and significant cultural heritage landscapes shall be conserved” and “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” (MMAH 2020:31).

2.2.3 Ontario Heritage Act

The OHA, R.S.O. 1990, c.018 is the guiding piece of provincial legislation for the conservation of significant cultural heritage resources in Ontario. The OHA gives provincial and municipal governments the authority and power to conserve Ontario’s heritage. The OHA has policies which address individual properties (Part IV) and heritage districts (Part IV), which require municipalities to keep a register of such properties and allows the municipalities to list non-designated properties which may have cultural heritage value or interest (Section 27).

In order to objectively identify cultural heritage resources, O. Reg. 9/06 (as amended by O. Reg, 569/22) made under the OHA sets out nine criteria for determining cultural heritage value or interest (CHVI) (MCM 2006b:20–27). 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 (as amended by O. Reg, 569/22) to determine if they have CHVI. These nine criteria are:

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, or
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 value 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 value or associative value because it yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of a community or culture, or
6. The property has historical value 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, or
9. The property has contextual value because it is a landmark. (O. Reg. 569/22, s. 1 (2)).

The OHA provides three key tools for the conservation of built heritage resources (BHRs) and cultural heritage landscapes (CHLs). It allows for protection as:

1. A single property (i.e., farmstead, park, garden, estate, cemetery), a municipality can designate BHRs and CHLs as individual properties under Part IV of the OHA.
2. Multiple properties or a specific grouping of properties may be considered a CHL, as such, a municipality can designate the area as a Heritage Conservation District (HCD) under Part V of the OHA.

3. Lastly, a municipality has the authority to add an individual or grouping of non-OHA designated property(ies) of heritage value or interest on their Municipal Heritage Register.

An OHA designation provides the strongest heritage protection available for conserving cultural heritage resources.

2.2.4 Summary of Provincial Policies

The PPS addresses cultural heritage resources, including cultural heritage landscapes in Section 2.6. The property located at 415 Water Street is recognized as a significant heritage resource by way of its designation under Part IV of the OHA.

2.3 Municipal Policies

2.3.1 Region of Waterloo Official Plan

The Regional Official Plan - 2031 (ROP) Chapter 3 contains policies that address cultural heritage resources, such as Policy 3.G.1 indicating that: “The Region and Area Municipalities will ensure that cultural heritage resources are conserved” (Region of Waterloo 2015:48).

There are additional policies that are for the identification and protection of Regionally Significant Cultural Heritage Resources. The OP policy information below is also outlined in the "Regional Implementation Guideline for Conserving Regionally Significant Cultural Heritage Resources (RSCHR)” (2018:9).

3.G.2 The Region will prepare and update a Regional Implementation Guideline for Conserving Regionally Significant Cultural Heritage Resources. In accordance with the Ontario Heritage Act, this guideline will outline the criteria and processes the Region will follow to identify and conserve cultural heritage resources of Regional interest including regional roads that have cultural heritage value or interest.

3.G.3 Area Municipalities will identify cultural heritage resources by establishing and maintaining a register of properties that are of cultural heritage value or interest. Area Municipalities will include on their register properties designated under Part IV, V or VI of the Ontario Heritage Act, and will consider including, but not be limited to, the following additional cultural heritage resources of cultural heritage value or interest:

a) properties that have heritage conservation easements or covenants registered against title;

b) cultural heritage resources of Regional interest; and

c) cultural heritage resources identified by the Grand River Conservation Authority and the Federal or Provincial governments.

3.G.4 The Region will coordinate and maintain a region-wide inventory of cultural heritage resources that are:

a) listed on registers established and maintained by Area Municipalities;

b) identified by the Federal or Provincial governments, and the Grand River Conservation Authority;
c) identified through research by the Region, Area Municipalities, post-secondary institutions or local historical societies;  

d) of Regional interest; or  

e) owned by the Region (Region of Waterloo 2015:48-49).

The ROP includes policies related to potential impacts to cultural heritage resources within the region. Policy 3.G.13 states: “Area Municipalities will establish policies in their official plans to require the submission of a Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment (CHIA) 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” (ROP 2015:51). Where a cultural heritage resource is of Regional interest there are policies that address the circulation and the contents of a CHIA and mitigative recommendations to conserve the resource, where feasible (ROP 2015:51-52).

As specified in Policy 3.G.17 in the ROP, a CHIA is to include, but not be limited to, the components outlined below:

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 (2015:51-52).

The Regional Implementation Guideline for Conserving Regionally Significant Cultural Heritage Resources (RSCHR) (2018) defines Regionally Significant Cultural Heritage Resources (RSCHRs), their identification and evaluation, the objectives of the RSCHR identification process, documentation of RSCHRs, approval by Council of these resources and the conservation process. As the subject property is not considered regionally significant, these policies do not apply to this HIA.

### 2.3.2 City of Cambridge Official Plan

The Cambridge Official Plan is the primary tool to guide land-use, growth, and development within the City of Cambridge. The Vision Statement begins by stating: “Cambridge celebrates the uniqueness of its founding communities and is united by its heritage, rivers, cultures and common future” (City of Cambridge 2018:1). With respect to cultural heritage, Chapter 4: “Cultural Heritage Resources” in the Cambridge Official Plan (2018: 61-73) states that:

> The City recognizes and benefits from a variety of cultural heritage resources which are focal to community identity and economic prosperity and inherited from past generations. Cultural heritage resources throughout the municipality are used for such activities as industry, tourism and other commercial uses and residences (2018:61).

One of the objectives for cultural heritage resources is to “support the conservation, restoration and prominence of the city’s built heritage as a key identifying feature of the community” (Policy 4.1 a - City of Cambridge 2018:61). Policy 4.3.1 in the OP states: “The City will prepare, publish and periodically update a Register of the City’s cultural heritage resources” (2018:63). Policy 4.4
of OP lays out criteria for evaluating cultural heritage value of cultural heritage resources, assessing heritage significance. It states:

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 (City of Cambridge 2018:64);

As noted in the OP (Policy 4.10.1) it states: “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” (2018:71). As outlined in the Cambridge Detailed Guidelines for the Preparation of Cultural Heritage Impact Assessments Under Policy 4.10 of the City of Cambridge Official Plan (2012) and in the OP Policy 4.10.1 a Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment may include the following components:

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. (City of Cambridge 2018:71; 2012:3-4).

Policies 4.10.2 to 4.10.9 provide details on conducting a CHIA prepared on properties situated in the City of Cambridge (2018:71-72). Also, the Detailed Guidelines for the Preparation of Cultural Heritage Impact Assessments Under Policy 4.10 of the City of Cambridge Official Plan (2012) and in the OP Policy 4.10.1 provide guidance on how to conduct a CHIA.
2.3.3 Summary of Municipal Policies

The Official Plan policies in the ROP and the City of Cambridge’s OP call for the conservation of cultural heritage resources, the maintenance and promotion of heritage registers and provide policies related to potential development impacts to cultural heritage resources and the need for CHIAs. This HIA has been scoped by the City of Cambridge Senior Planner - Heritage and is not required to include all contents outline above.

3.0 KEY CONCEPTS

The following concepts require clear definition in advance of the methodological overview and proper understanding is fundamental for any discussion pertaining to cultural heritage resources:

- **Built Heritage Resource** (BHR) can be defined in the PPS 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 Indigenous community. Built heritage resources are located on property that has been designated under Parts IV or V of the Ontario Heritage Act, or that may be included on local, provincial and/or federal and/or international registers” (MMAH 2020:41).

- **Cultural Heritage Value or Interest** (CHVI), also referred to as Heritage Value, is identified if a property meets one of the criteria outlined in O. Reg. 9/06 namely historic or associate value, design or physical value and/or contextual value. Provincial significance is defined under Ontario Heritage Act (OHA) O. Reg. 10/06.

- **Conserved** means “the identification, protection, management and use of built heritage resources, cultural heritage landscapes and archaeological resources in a manner that ensures their cultural heritage value or interest is retained. This may be achieved by the implementation of recommendations set out in a conservation plan, archaeological assessment, and/or a cultural heritage impact assessment that has been approved, accepted or adopted by relevant planning authority and/or decision-makers. Mitigative measures and/or alternative development approaches can be included in these plans and assessments” (MMAH 2020:41).

- **Heritage Attributes** are defined in the PPS as: “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)” (MMAH 2020:44-45).

- **Protected heritage property** is defined as "property designated under Parts IV, V or VI of the Ontario Heritage Act; property subject to a heritage conservation easement under Parts II or IV of the Ontario Heritage Act; property identified by the Province and prescribed public bodies as provincial heritage property under the Standards and Guidelines for Conservation of Provincial Heritage Properties; property protected under federal legislation, and UNESCO World Heritage Sites" (MMAH 2020:49).

- **Significant** in reference to cultural heritage is defined as: “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” (MMAH 2020:51).
The City of Cambridge provides a number of definitions related to cultural heritage resources which echo definitions found in the Ontario Heritage Act. Additionally, the City of Cambridge (2018:2017) provides a definition of adjacent as: “those lands contiguous to a cultural heritage resource” which echoes a component of the definition of adjacent in the PPS 2020.

4.0 SITE HISTORY

A full property history was not required for this scoped HIA. Several reports have been completed on the property that provide a thorough analysis of the property’s history. These reports include:

- *Supplement to Built Heritage Assessment by Mayer Heritage Consulting* (Garrod & Associates Ltd. 2003)

5.0 CONSULTATION

Built Heritage Resources (BHRs) and Cultural Heritage Landscapes (CHLs) are broadly referred to as cultural heritage resources. A variety of types of recognition exist to commemorate and/or protect cultural heritage resources in Ontario. As part of consultation, ARA reviews relevant online sources and databases to determine if any of the subject properties within the study area are recognized. Consultation with the local planning authorities and the community is essential for determining the community value of cultural heritage resources.

The MCM’s current list of Heritage Conservation Districts was consulted. No designated districts were identified in the study area (MCM 2021). The list of properties designated by the MCM under Section 34.5 of the OHA was consulted. The Ontario Heritage Trust (OHT) plaque database and the Federal Canadian Heritage Database were searched. The subject property is not commemorated with an OHT plaque.

The subject property at 415 Water Street South is a designated property under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act under By-law 55-16. On October 27, 2021, the Senior Planner – Heritage for the City of Cambridge provided direction via email regarding completion of a scoped HIA in accordance with the HIA TOR. It was determined that since an HIA had already been completed for 415 Water Street South as part of the site redevelopment application, the contents of this HIA should be scoped to: an assessment of the overall condition of the designated structure, assessment of the current heritage attributes of the structure, description of the work proposed for the heritage structure exterior, and provide recommendations (City of Cambridge, personal communication). Additional consultation between ARA and the Senior Planner – Heritage for the City of Cambridge was conducted on July 14, 2023. This consultation resulted in clarification on the information to be contained within the revised HIA, specifically regarding supporting documentation about the replacement and/or restoration of the wooden windows. Additionally, it was confirmed by the Senior Planner – Heritage that a second site visit was not required as part of the revised HIA.

6.0 FIELD SURVEY

The field survey component of the project involves the collection of primary data through systematic photographic documentation of all potential cultural heritage resources within the
property, as identified through historical research and consultation. Photographs of the subject property are taken, as are general views of the surrounding landscape. The field survey also assists in confirming the location of each potential cultural heritage resource and helps to determine the relationship between resources.

A field survey was conducted by A. Barnes and A. Bousfield-Bastedo on November 15, 2021, to photograph and document the subject property and surrounding landscape, to record any local features that could enhance ARA's understanding of the property's setting and to contribute to the understanding of the heritage value. ARA staff received permission to enter the subject property to conduct the site visit. Photographs of the surrounding context were taken from public land. Photographs can be found in Appendix A.

As part of the consultation with City staff, it was noted that J. Parsons (Senior Planner – Heritage) conducted a site visit with the owner in September 2022 and is familiar with the subject property. As such, updated photos for the revised HIA were not required.

6.1 Limitations

The information and recommendations in this HIA reflect ARA's best judgement based on observed conditions. We cannot guarantee that all building-related problems have been encountered during preparation of the report, or that unreported building conditions will not develop after the report has been submitted. The condition assessment focused on the identified heritage attributes of the building. Our results are based on visual observation only. No invasive or exploratory work was undertaken. The condition assessment conducted as part of this HIA does not constitute a structural assessment.

Implementation of suggested conservation treatments may require the expertise of additional professionals, including engineers, architects, electricians, building officials, etc. to ensure compliance with relevant legislation, such as the Ontario Building Code and hazardous materials legislation.

7.0 DESCRIPTION OF 415 WATER STREET SOUTH

The following section describes the condition subject property on November 15, 2021, and the observed condition of specific heritage attributes are further described in Table 3. The condition of the property's heritage attributes were classified as poor, fair, good or excellent to aid in the assessment of the structure's state of deterioration.

- Poor: Where the heritage attribute shows evidence of severe deterioration.
- Fair: Where the heritage attribute shows evidence of moderate deterioration.
- Good: Where the heritage attribute shows evidence of minimal deterioration.
- Excellent: Where the heritage attribute shows no evidence of deterioration.

7.1 Context – 415 Water Street South

415 Water Street South is located on a rise in land located on the east side of Water Street South which is a two-lane paved road that runs in a north to south direction. The subject property is bound to the south by residential properties and by a church property to the north (see Image 2 and Image 3). The property’s west and south boundary are framed by other residential dwellings (see Image 4–Image 5). The surrounding residences and church building are representative of
21st century, contemporary construction. The subject property at 415 Water Street South is located at the apex of a slight rise in land (see Image 6).

The subject property is representative of a former agricultural landscape that historically would have been on the outskirts of the City of Cambridge. The property is now immersed in a mixed-use neighbourhood with residential, institutional, and commercial properties interspersed.

7.2 Arrangement of Buildings and Structures – 415 Water Street South

The building at 415 Water Street South is located on, and accessed from, the east side of Water Street South. It is positioned on a rise of land that overlooks the surrounding area and the Grand River, located to the west, can be viewed from the house. The subject building’s west elevation fronts Water Street however, the south elevation appears to be the intended façade according to its design (see Image 6). The north elevation (façade) has been used more recently as the primary entrance to the property. The property is accessed via a paved driveway on the north side of the building (see Image 7).

7.3 Landscape Features – 415 Water Street South

The building at 415 Water Street South has a large setback. A single paved driveway leads to the structure (see Image 7). A mortared fieldstone retaining wall is located along the southern side of the driveway (see Image 8) and corresponds with the property’s rise in land. Portions of this retaining wall have deteriorated or fallen away (see Image 9–Image 10). A large coniferous tree is closely placed to the building along the west elevation (see Image 11). The landscape has been largely disturbed by construction related to the property’s new development, leaving a few deciduous trees remaining to the east of the building (see Image 12–Image 13).

7.4 Exterior – 415 Water Street South

The building at 415 Water Street South is a one-and-a-half-storey, five bay, limestone Georgian-style residence with a side gable roof (see Error! Reference source not found. and Error! Reference source not found.). Attached to it is a one-storey summer kitchen with a covered porch and an attached one-and-half storey timber framed garage (see Image 14). The north elevation, most recently used as the primary entrance, is a one bay entrance portico with a gable roof placed at the centre (see Image 15). The entrance contains a six-panel wooden door that is in poor condition and is flanked by four-panel sidelights on either side as well as two groupings of two pilasters (see Image 16). The door displays signs of rot and significant damage (see Image 17). The building has a wooden soffit and frieze board that also feature eave returns on the east and west elevation (see Image 18). The window openings on the first and second floor of the stone building are primarily six-over-six wooden sash windows with concrete sills (Image 19). Though the windows display some signs of cosmetic deterioration (peeling/chipped paint, cracking glazing putty) the windows appear to be in an operable state, ranging from fair to excellent condition. No storm windows were present on the dwelling’s openings. A dormer located on the upper half storey is designed in a similar style to the entrance portico on the first storey and shows similar signs of wear (see Image 20). The dormer contains two six-paneled casement wood windows.

The covered porch contains a door opening to the stone portion of the dwelling, a stone lintel to the right of the door marks the exterior basement entrance which is accessed through a hatch (see Image 21–Image 22). A door on the covered porch provides an entrance to the summer kitchen area (see Image 23). The north elevation of the timber-frame garage portion of the building contains one garage opening and a single six-panel fixed wooden window on the upper level (see Image 24–Image 25). The garage and summer kitchen area are clad in wooden siding. Wooden
ceiling joists are visible along the garage’s soffit (see Image 25). The east elevation of the garage
contains two window openings and an arched entrance (see Image 26). The windows are also
multi-paned and in a fixed position (see Image 27) The entrance, which has a subtle arched frame,
is located at the southeastern corner of the property and is framed with wooden pilasters (see
Image 28). When viewed from the southeast corner, it is visible that the second storey of the
garage is slightly cantilevered (see Image 29). The south elevation of the garage and summer
kitchen contains a large bank of windows, which have been boarded up. There are four sets of
windows on the rear elevation. Each set has three, 8 pane, windows which together create a very
modest segmental arch (see Image 30–Image 31). Molded wooden paneling is located below
each window opening and built on a concrete foundation (see Image 32).

The east elevation of the stone house is partly obscured by the summer kitchen addition but the
second storey with two window openings and a slightly projecting chimney placed at centre is
visible (see Image 33). The south elevation of the stone portion of the building contains more
formal details that suggest it was initially the front entrance and façade of the structure. The
elevation is five-bays with a door placed at the centre (see Image 33). The door has a multi-
paneled transom window located above the wooden doors. A half-circle fanlight window is located
directly above this entrance. The half-circle fanlight window on the is in excellent condition. The
window openings have concrete sills and the openings are all topped by large limestone lintels
(see Image 34). There are two dormers on the south elevation both designed in a similar state to
the dormer on the north elevation and showing similar signs of wear (see Image 35–Image 36).
The topography of the property is sloped to the north of the building and the door opening is
positioned off the ground (see Image 37). The west elevation is similar to the east elevation, with
a wooden eave returns visible, two windows on the upper half storey, and two windows on the
first storey (see Image 38). A chimney is also placed at the centre of this elevation; however it
does not protrude from the masonry wall as the chimney on the east elevation does.

7.5 Interior – 415 Water Street South

7.5.1 Stone Building

The interior follows a centre hall plan (see Error! Reference source not found.). The stairs are
located directly upon entering the building from the north elevation entrance. The main level
includes a living room, dining room, kitchen, powder room, and hallway (see Image 41–Image
62). The upper level includes four bedrooms and a bathroom (see Image 63–Image 80). The main
and upper floor interior are all hardwood of varying types and widths. The kitchen floor interior is
finished with ceramic tile (see Image 54). The basement is an open, unfinished space with a
concrete floor and white-washed stone walls (see Image 81–Image 83 and Error! Reference
source not found.). Deterioration due to water infiltration was observed in a window well in the
northeast corner of the basement (see Image 84–Image 85).

7.5.2 Summer Kitchen

The interior is an open room that is accessed through a door in the covered porch on the north
elevation. The interior is wood paneled with a brick fireplace located on the northwest corner of
the room. The southern wall contains several windows that are framed by wooden paneling. There
is a door on the western wall that leads into a hallway in the stone building and a door on the
opposite (east) wall that leads to a sunroom (see Image 86–Image 92). The sunroom also
contains a southern wall of windows with wooden paneling. A door on the eastern wall of the
sunroom is designed in the same style as the windows. The door shows signs of deterioration
and damage due to water infiltration and vandalism (see Image 93–Image 98).
### 7.5.3 Garage

The timber frame garage has an interior entrance from the summer kitchen sunroom (see Image 99). Former window openings, some filled in, support the understanding that the garage was extant prior to the sunroom addition (see Image 100–Image 101). The first and second floor are open, unfinished storage spaces (see Image 102–Image 105). The unfinished interior reveals the structure’s timber frame construction that uses mortice and tenon joinery secured by wooden pegs (see Image 106–Image 108). The floorboards on the second floor measured to a width of 20 inches (see Image 109).

### 7.6 Architectural Style/Design – 415 Water Street South

The building at 415 Water Street South is listed as a Georgian Revival style house on the Cambridge Heritage Register (2020:58). 415 Water Street South was examined against the typical characteristics of the Georgian architectural style as outlined by Mark Fram in *Well-Preserved: The Ontario Heritage Manual of Principles and Practice for Architectural Conservation* (1988). Table 1 shows that the building meets all of the characteristics of the style and is therefore considered a representative example of the Georgian style.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics (Adapted from Fram 1988)</th>
<th>Applicable</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Box-like</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Follows a rectangular plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symmetrical façade</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Entrances placed at centre of both north and south elevations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One to Three-storeys</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>One-and-a-half storeys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center-hall plan</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>While portions of the interior have been re-oriented, the centre-hall floor plan is still interpretable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-bay façade, residences often 3-bay</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Building has a five-bay façade on both the north and south elevation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone or brick cladding</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Building is constructed of limestone masonry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side-gable roof</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Gable is oriented to east-west</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple cornices with return eaves</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small-paned wooden sash windows</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>There are six-over-six wooden sash windows located on both the first and second storey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paneled doors</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The building contains numerous wooden six-panel doors with through mortice and tenon joinery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flat top or shallow arched fanlights, transom and side lights at central entry</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The building features a half-circle fanlight and transom on the south elevation (former façade). Both the north and south entrance both feature entrances with sidelights.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1: 415 Water Street South: Existing Elevations (North and West)
(Orchard Design Studio Inc., 2021)
Figure 2: 415 Water Street South: Existing Elevations (East and South)
(Orchard Design Studio Inc., 2021)
Figure 3: 415 Water Street South: Existing Basement Plan
(Orchard Design Studio Inc., 2021)
Figure 4: 415 Water Street South: Existing Main Floor Plan
(Orchard Design Studio Inc., 2021)
8.0 HERITAGE ASSESSMENT

8.1 Statement of Cultural Heritage Value (By-Law 55-16)

The subject property at 415 Water Street South is a designated property under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act under By-law 55-16. The By-law dictates:

Statement of Cultural Heritage Value
This residence was constructed c. 1841 of limestone in the Georgian style, which was a common farmhouse style between 1830 and 1870 in Ontario. True to its architecture style, this residence is a one and half storey, five bay design with gabled ends and a chimney at either end. The covered porch on the east elevation was the original summer kitchen while the vinyl clad garage is believed to be the original heavy timber-framed dwelling which pre-dates the limestone farmhouse. The garage structure and farmhouse were constructed for David Potter who acquired the property from William Dickson in 1831 for $115. The property remained in the Potter family until 1924. In 1945, Raymond Munro Myers, the Member of Provincial Parliament for South Waterloo from 1951-1963, acquired the property and remained here until his death in 1980.

The heritage attributes for 415 Water Street South include:

- location looking north on Water Street South;
- rough cut limestone and lime mortar construction;
- five bay façade on south (rear) elevation;
- door, transom and fanlight on the south (rear) elevation;
- 6 over 6 wood windows and storms on all elevations;
- window keystones and sills on all elevations;
- dormers on the south (rear) and north (front) elevations;
- two limestone chimneys, including the protrusion on the east elevation;
- vestibule on the north (front) elevation;
- summer kitchen on the east elevation;
- garage on the east elevation; and
- size, shape and form of the entire structure including additions.

9.0 PROPOSED SITE REDEVELOPMENT

9.1 Background on Proposed Site Development

There are two phases to the proposed site redevelopment at 415 Water Street. The first phase involves the construction of a two-storey mixed-use structure which has been the subject of an earlier HIA (Amy Barnes Consulting 2016). The construction of the two-storey mixed-use structure is proposed within the subject property but is adjacent to the existing Georgian-style building discussed in the designation by-law above. The new building is to include three commercial units at ground level and three residential units located on the second storey. The proposed redevelopment also includes the creation of vehicle and pedestrian access routes from Water Street South to the new structure and the construction of a parking lot. The proposed site plan for this portion of the redevelopment was approved by the City of Cambridge on February 2, 2021 (City of Cambridge, 2021). A landscape plan was also created and approved. The HIA conducted by Amy Barnes Consulting in 2016 reviewed these changes and the site plan and landscape plan
for the approved site redevelopment are found in Figure 5 and Figure 6. ARA has assumed that the approved site plan took into consideration the recommendations from the 2016 HIA. It is ARAs understanding that the construction of this building is currently underway and nearing completion (Pers. Communication 2023).

The second phase of the proposed site redevelopment, which is the subject of this revised HIA, is associated with the existing Part IV designated building at 415 Water Street South. The proposed redevelopment seeks to modify the existing single-family residence and to convert it into a commercial or residential unit/s. Based on the materials provided by the property owner, the proposed modifications will have impacts on several heritage attributes identified in designation By-law 55-16 (see Section 8.0). The proposed modifications are directly or indirectly associated with the following heritage attributes:

- rough cut limestone and lime mortar construction;
- door and transom on south (rear) elevation
- 6 over 6 wood windows and storms on all elevations
- vestibule on the north (front) elevation;
- summer kitchen on the east elevation;
- garage on the east elevation; and
- size, shape and form of the entire structure including additions.

The property owner has indicated the proposed changes to the designated building are required for the following reasons:

- Due to a deterioration of materials (cladding, broken windowpanes, rot);
- To accommodate the modern days needs of the proposed new use;
- To reduce heat loss and increase the energy efficiency of the structure as a whole, and
- As an effort to reduce the ongoing and anticipated maintenance needs required over the long term.

The property owner indicated that the size, style and visual aesthetic of the proposed changes will be replicated and the aesthetic from the streetscape would be maintained. Lastly, the owner’s rationale for the proposed removal and redevelopment of the garage and summer kitchen area is required to enable usable interior space throughout all seasons.

### 9.2 Proposed Redevelopment of Heritage Attributes

Site specific repointing of the stone masonry is anticipated at some point in the future on the stone portion of the building. No removal or alterations to the limestone is anticipated. According to the property owner this will be carried out by a bricklayer who has over 20 years’ experience, but not necessarily with heritage-specific training.

The door and transom on the south elevation, are proposed to be removed and replaced. The door and transom will be replaced with a single unit with attached door and transom. The door is proposed to be constructed of steel door with a smooth finish or a fiberglass door with a wood grain finish. The transom will be replaced with a Golden Clad Series window with exterior vinyl cladding. The existing fanlight will remain in situ (see Figure 5).

The existing six-over-six wooden sash windows on the stone building (see Image 19) are proposed to be removed and replaced with contemporary windows of the same style and size and will be designed to include grills to resemble the appearance of muntins. The windows are
proposed to be replaced with the *Golden Clad Series* windows, made by Golden Windows Limited in Kitchener. These windows are made of wood with an exterior vinyl cladding.

The vestibule on the north elevation is proposed to be reframed to the same style and size and retain the same overall massing. Similarly, the existing wooden windows and doors within the vestibule will be replaced with the *Golden Clad Series*’ products, which are made of wood with an exterior vinyl cladding (see Figure 6).

With respect to the summer kitchen and garage, both sections are proposed for full removal and are to be replaced with new buildings of the same size (footprint), shape (height) and form (overall massing) (see Figure 5 and Figure 6). The proposed garage will be built with 6/12 roof pitch, asphalt shingles, prefinished aluminum eavestrough, fascia and soffit, prefinished aluminum clad frieze trim, pre-finished horizontal wood siding, 4” prefinished corner/window trim, finished grade, concrete foundation and concrete footing below grade. The garage will have French doors and a single rectangular window on the north elevation. All openings on the east elevation are proposed to be closed in. The south elevation of the garage portion is proposed to include two rectangular windows, rhythmically placed, along the first storey and one single rectangular window in the upper storey. The east and rear elevation will also be clad in prefinished horizontal wood siding. The siding on the garage and summer kitchen is proposed to be white to match the current colour and appearance of the current siding.

The proposed summer kitchen will include a 3/12 roof pitch, asphalt shingles, prefinished aluminum eavestrough, fascia, and soffit, prefinished aluminum clad beams, 4” prefinished corner/window trim, two 10” decorative columns over 6”x6” structural posts which will frame the opening, a finished concrete foundation at grade and concrete footing below grade. The rear (south) elevation of the summer kitchen portion is proposed to include two rectangular windows, rhythmically placed, along the first storey. The rear elevation will also be clad in prefinished horizontal siding.
Figure 5: 415 Water Street South: Proposed Rear (South) Elevation and Left (East) Elevation  
(gb Architect 2023)
Figure 6: 415 Water Street South: Proposed Front (North) and Right (West) Elevation (gb Architect Inc. 2023)
10.0 CONDITION ASSESSMENT AND CONSIDERATIONS

The proposed redevelopment seeks to remove several heritage attributes. Based on discussion and communication with the client, ARA and City of Cambridge Staff requested additional information from third party professionals to help inform the development of alternative options, impacts, and mitigation measures.

10.1 Observation from Structural Review of Garage

Centric Engineering Corporation (CEC) completed a preliminary site review on the existing wood frame addition (garage), on the morning of October 27, 2022. The findings of the report were based on visual inspection only. Twenty numbered observations with notes and the full report can be found in Appendix C. The following selected observations were provided on the existing condition of the garage regarding the feasibility of repurposing the building for commercial or residential use.

1. The roof framing was constructed using 2¾”x3¾” rafters with spacing ranging from 30” o/c to 44” o/c. The typical rafters are in line with each other on opposite sides of the ridge with no ridge board or beam. These rafters appear to be undersized based on the requirements of the 2012 Ontario Building Code (OBC).

3. The roof framing was sheathed with rough wood boards. The boards appeared to have water damage in various locations. The board thickness appeared undersized to span between roof rafters based on the requirements of the 2012 OBC.

6. The floor framing was constructed using 3”x6” joists spaced at 22” o/c. These joists are undersized based on the requirements of the 2012 Ontario Building Code (OBC).

9. In various locations, water damage was observed in main structural post and beam members.

11. Wood members are in direct contact with the concrete foundation. The 2012 OBC requires wood members that are not pressure-treated to be separated from the concrete with a protective film/barrier.

14. The slab on grade foundation did not show signs of any frost protection measures. The 2012 OBC would not permit a slab on grade foundation for a building with these characteristics supported on undefined soils.

15. The slab on grade foundation did not show any signs of additional provisions for footing supports below the main structural posts.

18. The exterior cladding for the building showed signs of water damage and deterioration (CEC 2022:1-2)

The review of the existing wood frame addition concluded with these two key points:
19. Due to the extensive issues noted in the wood framed structure above the foundation level, it may be unfeasible to underpin the foundation to provide frost protection without causing further damage to the wood frame.

20. In its current condition, the building does not appear to be suitable to be used for residential or commercial occupancies. The structural wood frame appears to be compromised in several areas due to notched framing members, water damage, and potentially undersized framing members. The slab-on-grade foundation system does not appear to be adequate for a building of this type. If the building is finished, the lack of frost protection for the foundation makes it possible for the building to move due to frost heave and damage to interior and exterior finishes. (CEC 2023:2)

10.2 Window Inspection and Assessment Report

As part of the owner’s due diligence, a Window Inspection and Assessment Report was conducted by Walter Furlan of Furlan Conservation on August 12, 2023. Walter Furlan has over 30 years of woodworking experience, heritage training, and specializes in repair and conservation of historic windows and period windows replication (Furlan Conservation Website 2023). Furlan’s full report is included in Appendix D.

The purpose of the report was to provide the owner with an assessment to determine the viability of window repair and associated costs. The report provided additional information about the observed conditions of the windows. The report notes “several different forms of windows were observed, from two distinct eras” which are classified as Window Type A (circa 1840) and Window Type B (Post World War II c.1950), and Window Type C (Post World War II c.1950) (Furlan Conservation 2023:2). The report also notes that “There are no storm windows on any of the windows, nor were any found on site” (Furlan Conservation 2023:2).

Observations on Window Type A include:

*There are 5 historic windows that date to the mid-19th century. These windows are relegated to the 2-storey garage portion of the complex... W1-24 is a horizontal sliding window, the rest are fixed and do not operate. They vary from 4 to 6 lights per sash. The frame and sill that surrounds the sash are made of wood. The construction detail is typical of mid-19th century sash manufacturing* (Furlan Conservation 2023:2)

Observation on Window Type B include:

*These windows are not original but because the glass is flat, the balances are spiral, and the detail of the moulding profiles, it is believed that they date from after the second world war. There is also a fanlight and transom over the door on the south first floor elevation. The transom ... appears to be an early window, original to the house, with very thin muntin bars. The transom is the only original transom remaining in the Georgian part of the house ... The rough sawn timber framed original roof trusses have been cut to accommodate 3 new dormers on the second floor. This was most likely altered mid twentieth century .... The double hung windows are 6 over 6 configuration and counterweighted with spiral tube balances. According to Caldwell manufacturing in Rochester, New York they developed their first spiral balance product for windows in 1948 called Spirex.*
This is about the time that we see this counter weight system used widely throughout North America to counter weight sash windows. (Furlan Construction 2023:3)

Observation on Window Type C include:

These are casement sash windows with 8 lights in each sash. They are all located at the southeast corner of the site at the summer kitchen and garage area…They are commonly referred to as French doors. These windows are identical in construction details as the windows in the main house (type B) (Furlan Conservation 2023:5)

Additional information on observed conditions included in Furlan’s report have been included in Table 2. It should note the observations are general in nature and not specific to each individual window. Furlan’s report provides the following summary:

There are 5 original historic windows, Which I refer to as Type A. Window W1-24 is a horizontal sliding window. The other 4 windows are fixed. How significant the windows are to the site is debatable. The kitchen and garage portion at the east side of this site does not appear to be a significant attribute of the heritage designation, however the windows are the last remaining attributes of the original 1840 period. This is important because of the evidence of the sash technology. These sashes positioned one over the other in a 6 over 6 configuration would have been most likely what existed in the main house.

Of note is the transom over door DI-02 which does appear to be an original attribute of the main building.

The south side of the building appears to have been originally the dominant faced as it contains the 5 bay façade with a transom over the door and fanlight. Compared to the north elevation containing 3 bay façade.

When we look at window types B and C it is clear to me that these were reproductions made sometime in the early to mid-twentieth century. The moulding profile, thickness of the muntin bars and construction details including float glass and tube balances all appear in wood sash window after 1900. But in this case the use of spiral tube balances and clear float glass indicate that these windows were installed after the second world war. The house was sold by the original family to Mr. in 1945, Raymond Munro Myers, the Member of Provincial Parliament for South Waterloo from 1951-1963, acquired the property and remained here until his death in 1980. It appears most likely that most of the windows, dormers and doors were replaced at this time. Further I believe that the dormers were installed in this period.

This could be viewed as another historic layer and discussion should take place as to the relevance of these attributes to its cultural heritage value. (Furlan Conservation 2023:7).

10.2.1 Approach and Costs
Furlan’s report notes that any conservation plan for the property should adhere to the Standard and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada and that the work should be undertaken by a heritage window conservation specialist. Furlan’s approach also recommends a paint analysis be completed on the original sash windows.

As per the intention of the Window Inspection and Assessment Report, a cost for full conservation and restoration of the windows, as well as replicas is outlined as follows:

Generally full conservation cost would vary from $4000.00 to $6000 per 6 over 6 window and frame. To construct period-appropriate replica windows, including period storm windows, $4000.00 to $6000.00 per window. This would include specially made cope and stile router bits, period wavy cylinder glass and an experienced sash maker.

Timelines for the conservation of sash windows could be as long as 1 year. To replicate new period windows and install could take 6 months. (Furlan Conservation 2023:8)

10.3 Window Restoration and/or Replacement

As per the required due diligence and at the direction of City of Cambridge and ARA, the property owner contacted several heritage windows, and/or wood window specialists to obtain input on the feasibility of restoring or replacing the existing wooden windows. The property owner also inquired about specialist availability for this scope of work. A summary of the companies contacted has been provided in Appendix E. Some of this communication was done via phone by the property owner. Any written correspondence has been included in Appendix E.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company Contacted</th>
<th>Replied</th>
<th>Comments/Notes</th>
<th>Cost for Window Restoration/Restoration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Heritage Mill</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Contacted via phone and sent photos of subject property via email by property owner. Reply received from business owner indicating they do not wish to involve themselves in conflict between city and contractor and would not provide an opinion on the feasibility of repairing the windows. Copies of this correspondence have not been provided to ARA by property owner.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Heritage Restoration Inc.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Contacted via email by property owner and quote provided. See Appendix E for correspondence and quote.</td>
<td>$215,250.00 for the removal, restoration and installation of all existing windows and construction and installation of new wood storm windows.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Restoration Windows and Doors (Rob Lawson)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Contacted via phone by property owner and no reply received.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Henderson Carpentry</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Contacted via phone by property owner. Reply from business owner indicating</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company Contacted</td>
<td>Replied</td>
<td>Comments/Notes</td>
<td>Cost for Window Restoration/Restoration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Old World Woodworking</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Contacted via phone by property owner. Reply from business owner indicating he does not know why he is in the list of window specialist provided.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 David Wylie Restoration</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Contacted via email by property owner. Reply received from business owner requesting photos which were provided by property owner. No quote has been provided to date.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>See Appendix E for correspondence.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Everest Restoration</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Contacted via phone by property owner. Reply from business owner communicating he was too busy and would not service Cambridge area.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Reg Ogilvie</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Responded to email by property owner. Photos were provided. No quote has been provided to date.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>See Appendix E for correspondence.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Hoffmeyer’s Mill</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Contacted via phone by property owner and no reply received.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Euan Lowson</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Contacted via email by property owner and no reply received.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>See Appendix E for correspondence.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Historic Building Co.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Contacted via email by property owner. Reply received from business owner provided rough estimate noting: I'd have to inspect and assess each window individually in order to determine whether they can be repaired. Often times it's less costly to replace them entirely.</td>
<td>$60,000 estimated to reproduce all windows. To assess and repair individually is $175/hour.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>See Appendix E for correspondence.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Furlan Conservation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Contacted via email by property owner. Business owner visited subject property and provided quote and report.</td>
<td>$4000-$6000 Per Window. $136,000 - $204,000 estimated for replacement of all windows. $48,000 - $72,000 estimated cost for replacement of 12 six-over-six sash windows.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>See Appendix E for correspondence.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Authentic Window &amp; Doors</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Contacted via email by property owner. Reply from business owner provided a quote for new wood windows.</td>
<td>$122,000 +HST for True Divided Lite Windows. $101,000 +HST for Simulated Divided Lite.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>See Appendix E for correspondence and quote.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Golden Windows</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Contacted via email by property owner. Reply from business provided a quote for new replacement wood with vinyl exterior windows.</td>
<td>$ 46,432.96 for all windows.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10.4 Summary of Conditions of Heritage Attributes

The following table provides a summary of the conditions of the heritage attributes that will be impacted by the proposed development. This summary includes observations from ARA’s site visit, CEC’s structural assessment and Walter Furlan’s Window Inspection and Assessment Report (see Table 3).
## Table 3: Overview of Heritage Attributes Condition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rough Cut Limestone and lime Mortar construction</td>
<td>Site Specific repointing as needed</td>
<td>Fair to excellent</td>
<td>No commentary on condition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Door, transom, and fanlight on south (rear) elevation</td>
<td>Removal of the existing door with transom to be replaced with single unit with attached door and transom. The proposed door is to be constructed of steel or fiberglass. The proposed transom is a Golden Clad Series (wood with vinyl cladding) window. Existing fanlight will remain in situ.</td>
<td>Door: Fair Transom: Fair Fanlight: Excellent</td>
<td>No commentary on the condition of these attributes specifically.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six over Six wood windows and storms on all elevations</td>
<td>Removal of all six-over-six wood windows to be replaced with Golden Clad Series (wood with vinyl cladding) windows.</td>
<td>Fair to excellent condition</td>
<td>Furlan Conservation Observations: These have broken muntin bars, failed finishes and are non-operative. The putty is in fair condition on most of the windows. The glass is clear and not wavy as would be expected in pre-war glass. The glass is 3mm thick. The wood appears to be in good condition with no rot observed. There are some unknowns with the condition as they were all hoarded up. But overall, the meeting joinery at the stiles and rails seem to be in good condition. All the tube balances were heavily painted and non were operable. Casement windows on the second floor have window stay hardware. There is no weather stripping on any of the windows. Frames Exterior: Generally, all window frames are in similar condition. The wooden frames appear to be original in the house. There are many finished layers, and some frames have missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vestibule on the north (front) elevation</td>
<td>Removal and replacement of the vestibule with new structure in same size, form and style. Existing windows on vestibule are proposed to be replaced with Golden Clad Series (wood with vinyl cladding) windows.</td>
<td>Vestibule Exterior and Door: Poor The wooden six-panel door shows signs of deterioration and missing elements along the bottom rail. Deterioration is not evenly spread across the door with the damage primarily focused at the bottom. The entire door shows cosmetic wear through paint peeling</td>
<td>Finishes exposing bare wood. There is good slope to the sills to throw off the weather. The double hung windows have their sills replaced with cement cast sills. They may very well have been originally wood sills that had rotted away over time. There are tooled limestone door sills at the main entrance to the house. Finishes have failed on most of the window frames and bare wood is visible. (2023:6-7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer kitchen on the east elevation</td>
<td>Removal and replacement of entire structure with new buildings of the same size, shape and form. New structure will include changed window opening sizes.</td>
<td>Poor to fair condition</td>
<td>Furlan Conservation Observations: These have broken muntin bars, failed finishes and are non-operable. The putty is in fair condition on most of the windows. The glass is clear and not wavy as would be expected in pre-war glass. The glass is 3mm thick. The wood appears to be in good condition with no rot observed. There are some unknowns with the condition as they were all hoarded up. But overall, the meeting joinery at the stiles and rails seem to be in good condition. All the tube balances were heavily painted and non were operable. Casement windows on the second floor have window stay hardware. There is no weather stripping on any of the windows.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garage on the east elevation</td>
<td>Removal and replacement of entire structure with new buildings of the same size, shape and form. New structure will include changed window opening sizes.</td>
<td>Fair condition</td>
<td>CEC Observations: In its current condition, the building does not appear to be suitable to be used for residential or commercial occupancies. The structural wood frame appears to be compromised in several areas due to notched framing members, water damage, and potentially undersized framing members. The slab-on-grade foundation system does not appear to be adequate for a building of this type. If the building is finished, the lack of frost protection for the foundation makes it possible for the building to move due to frost heave and damage interior and exterior finishes (CEC 2023:2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11.0 ANALYSIS OF POTENTIAL IMPACTS

The MCM InfoSheet #5: Heritage Impact Assessments and Conservation Plans (2006b:3) provides a list of potential negative impacts to consider when evaluating any proposed development. Impacts can be classified as either direct or indirect.

Direct impacts (those that physically affect the heritage resources themselves) include, but are not limited to: initial project staging, excavation/levelling operations, construction of access roads and renovations or repairs over the life of the project. These direct impacts may impact some or all significant heritage attributes or may alter soils and drainage patterns and adversely impact unknown archaeological resources.

Indirect impacts include but are not limited to: alterations that are not compatible with the historic fabric and appearance of the area; alterations that detract from the cultural heritage values, attributes, character or visual context of a heritage resource. This could include the construction of new buildings; the creation of shadows that alter the appearance of an identified heritage attribute; the isolation of a heritage attribute from its surrounding environment; the obstruction of significant views and vistas; and other less-tangible impacts.

This HIA has been scoped to consider any impacts which are the direct result of the proposed redevelopment of the designated building at 415 Water Street South. MCM InfoSheet #5: Heritage Impact Assessments and Conservation Plans (2006b:3) impacts can be evaluated in a table. Table 4 provides an overview of the types of negative impacts identified in the proposed development. Table 3 (above) provides a description of the specific building heritage attributes to be impacted including a summary of their condition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4: Impact Evaluation of Preferred Design Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Adapted from MCM 2006c:3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Negative Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destruction of any, or part of any, significant heritage attributes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alterations to a property that detract from the cultural heritage values, attributes, character or visual context of a heritage resource</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As Table 4 summarizes, the proposed redevelopment has the potential to adversely impact the heritage attributes of 415 Water Street South as defined by MCM InfoSheet #5: Heritage Impact Assessments and Conservation Plans (MCL 2006b:3). The impacts which have been identified by ARA in the impact assessment include:

- Impact 1: Removal of several attributes including all the six- over-six wood windows, the vestibule on the north elevation, the door and transom on the south elevation, the summer kitchen on the east elevation; and the garage on the east elevation.
- Impact 2: The potential for destruction of the rough-cut limestone and lime mortar construction during repointing.
- Impact 3: The potential for accidental damage during the construction process.
- Impact 4: The alteration of window size and location proposed on the summer kitchen and garage.
There are positive impacts associated with the proposed redevelopment of the subject project. They include:

- The property has been vacant for more than a decade and has been subject to vandalism. The use of the designated property will ensure its ongoing viability.

12.0 ALTERNATIVES AND MITIGATION MEASURES

If potential impacts to identified heritage resources are determined, proposed alternative development options must be explored. The following potential alternative options to the development proposal have both been identified and explored. Based on discussions with the City and Property Owner, the alternative options explored primarily focus on the windows. Option 1 is a do-nothing option, Options 2 and 3 have been explored by the proponent, and Option 4 has been explored as part of the CHIA process. Option 5 is the property owner’s preferred option.

12.1 Option 1 – Do Nothing

The “Do Nothing” approach is an alternative redevelopment approach whereby the proposed redevelopment and modification of the building does not proceed. The subject property and heritage attributes would remain in-situ. The subject property will remain designated under Part IV of the OHA.

This option is feasible; however, the condition of the structure as observed by ARA, CEC, and Furlan Conservation noted areas of deterioration that will continue if no action is taken. Additionally, the structure is currently vacant, and while openings have been boarded up in numerous areas, the owner has noted that there is evidence of it being repeatedly breached and vandalized. These instances contribute to the ongoing deterioration of the structure and pose a health and safety hazard. The ‘do nothing’ option would only exacerbate conditions and has the potential to increase health and safety concerns.

12.2 Option 2 – Proposed Site Redevelopment With Rehabilitation or Replication of All Windows

This option includes the rehabilitation or replication of all windows on the subject building, including the six-over-six windows on the stone dwelling and the garage and summer kitchen windows. The proposed site redevelopment would be allowed to proceed with the rehabilitated or replicated windows installed. During the preparation of the HIA initially submitted in 2021, ARA recommended that the owner consider the retention of the wooden windows which were observed to be in fair to excellent condition. Information about the value of original wooden windows and a rationale for keeping them was provided to the owner. Additionally, information regarding the Cambridge heritage grant program which could help offset concerns about cost was communicated by ARA to the owner. ARA recommended that windows which were in fair to excellent condition should be retained. With respect to the retention of windows, the property owner indicated that this option was not being considered due to the ongoing maintenance associated with wooden windows, costs, and cited concern regarding potential increased heating and cooling costs.

As part of this revised HIA and under direction of City staff, the subject property owner obtained several quotes from wooden window specialists to consider the rehabilitation and/or replication of all windows on the property. One quote for the restoration of all the existing windows was received an estimated cost of $215,250.00. Another specialist indicated that restoration of the existing
windows would be charged at $175.00 per hour. It should be noted that many of the specialists contacted indicated that a replication of the existing windows would be the more cost-effective strategy and provided quotes for this action. Price points received for the replication of the windows ranged from $60,000.00 to $204,000.00.

Selecting Option 2 to rehabilitate or replicate the existing windows would allow for the removal of the garage and summer kitchen to be replaced with a new structure consistent in location, size, and form. As per the CEC report, the replacement with a new building could support commercial or residence use and ensure it is in compliance with the Ontario Building Code. As this option includes the replication of all windows, it would result in reinstating the rehabilitated or replicated windows in the garage and summer kitchen in the new structure.

While ARAs recommendation to retain the windows is in keeping with best practices for heritage conservation, this option is not supported by the owner. The property owner has indicated that if this option is required by the City of Cambridge, may result in the property remaining vacant and/or additional action regarding the property’s designation status being pursued by the owner.

12.3 Option 3 – Proposed Site Redevelopment using GoldenWood Series Windows

This option would include all the proposed alterations as outlined in Section 9.0 however, this option would use the GoldenWood series available through Golden Windows Ltd in Kitchener. The GoldenWood series uses a natural pine interior and exterior finish and can be customized for any window style or shape. It is described as being “perfect for log homes or to maintain the authenticity of heritage homes” (Golden Windows Ltd Website). This alternative option was proposed by ARA to the property owner to consider instead of the GoldenClad series which is a wood window clad in vinyl. Information about the value of wooden windows and a rationale for replacing wooden framed windows rather than vinyl covered windows was provided to the owner. The owner has expressed that they do not wish to pursue the use of the GoldenWood series windows option, citing cost and ongoing maintenance requirements.

12.4 Option 4 – Proposed Site Redevelopment With Rehabilitation or Replication of a Select Number of Six-over-six Wood Windows on the Stone Dwelling

Option 4 includes the restoration or replication of only the six-over-six wood windows in the stone dwelling. As outlined above in Section 12.2, the property owner obtained several quotes as part of this revised HIA to consider the rehabilitation and/or replication of all windows on the property. While ARA has communicated the value of wooden windows and outlined why they should be considered from a heritage perspective, the property owner has indicated that based on the quotes received they are unwilling to explore the conservation of all windows due to the cost and ongoing maintenance.

As this revised HIA outlines, inconsistencies regarding what windows are considered original to the building were found. According to the Window Inspection and Assessment Report, the six-over-six windows represent windows constructed in the mid-20th century likely constructed in the same style and manner as the building’s original windows. While this is beneficial information that contributes to a better understanding of the property’s history and evolution, the six-over-six wood windows are outlined in the property’s designation by-law, regardless of their construction date.

Considering the circumstances outlined above, for this option ARA proposes that City staff and the Heritage Committee work with the property owner to determine how many of the six-over-six wood windows should be retained, restored, or reconstructed. ARA has developed this option
considering the heritage value of the property, the intentions of the property owner and the analysis related to the windows as outlined in this revised HIA.

Selecting a number of the six-over-six wood windows to restore while allowing the remaining windows to be replaced with the GoldenClad Series, as outlined in Section 9.0, is a compromise that will maintain or partially maintain the heritage attribute associated with these windows while also supporting a more cost-effective strategy for the property owner that supports the ongoing use of the building.

This option requires the City staff, MHAC, and property owner reach a conclusion on the number of six-over-six wood windows to be conserved that would adequately communicate the heritage value of the property while allowing the removal of the garage and summer kitchen to be replaced with the proposed structure which is consistent in location, size, and form.

12.5 Option 5- Proposed Redevelopment

This option would see the removal and replacement associated with all noted heritage attributes as outline in Section 9.0.

12.6 Preferred Option

The preferred alternative from heritage best practice, guidelines, policies, the property’s existing by-law and a conservation perspective remains as Option 2 which includes the restoration or replication of all existing windows. Discussions with the property owner, however, have indicated that they are unwilling to pursue this option due to challenges that they feel are insurmountable to the intended reuse of the building including the financial implications, and level of maintenance required. Over the course or completing this revised HIA, ARA made several attempts to communicate the value of the retention and rehabilitation of the building’s windows, in particular the six-over-six windows in the stone dwelling due to their inclusion as heritage attributes on the property’s statement of cultural heritage value. Practically, the cost to restore the existing wood windows as demonstrated in the due diligence of the owner, is higher than replacement with the proposed new vinyl-clad windows (see Table 2). The information gathered by the property owner for this revised HIA also brought forth inconsistencies in the understanding and/or assumptions made about the heritage value of the six-over-six windows as outlined in the Window Assessment and Inspection Report (see Appendix D). The property owner has indicated that they believe this additional information provides support for the rationale to allow for the redevelopment to proceed as proposed. Option 5 remains the property owner’s preferred option.

13.0 MITIGATION MEASURES

If potential impacts to identified heritage resources are determined, proposed conservation or mitigative/avoidance measures must be recommended. The MCMs InfoSheet #5: Heritage Impact Assessments and Conservation Plans (2006b:3) lists several specific methods of minimizing or avoiding a negative impact on a cultural heritage resource, including but not limited to:

- Alternative development approaches;
- Isolating development and site alteration from significant built and natural features and vistas;
- Design guidelines that harmonize mass, setback, setting, and materials;
- Limiting height and density;
- Allowing only compatible infill and additions;
• Reversible alterations; and
• Buffer zones, site plan control, and other planning mechanisms.

These mitigation strategies are echoed in the City of Cambridge Detailed Guidelines for the Preparation of Cultural Heritage Impact Assessments under Policy 4.10 of the City of Cambridge Official Plan (2012). This section outlines suggested mitigation measures for the proposed development as outlined in Section 9.0. The impacts (as outlined in Section 11.0) that are addressed by each mitigation measure have been provided in brackets for reference.


A Cultural Heritage Resource Documentation (CHRD) report should be prepared. A CHRD report is completed in order to provide in-depth documentation of the building elements proposed for removal. The process involves photographic documentation of the heritage attributes from all (accessible) angles as well as detailed photographs. A physical description of the built elements are also included in the report. Additional measured drawings, or archival photographs obtained would also be added to the report. This report is then provided to local municipalities, stakeholder groups, local historical societies, museums, archives and/or libraries as part of the public record. The completion of a CHRD should be carried out prior to removal of the identified built elements. Detailed photographic and written documentation of 415 Water Street South has been completed as part of the HIA (Appendix A). If the photographic and written documentation completed in this report is considered sufficient, a Cultural Heritage Resource Documentation report may not be required. This is to be determined by City staff.

13.2 Material Salvage and Reuse (Impact 1 and 4)

In instances of material removal, 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 salvage of historic materials should be encouraged as part of the site alteration and considered for reuse. If any of the materials listed below can be salvaged, they should be removed carefully. Materials which may be worthy of salvage or reuse can extend beyond those elements which may be considered to possess historical, architectural or cultural value to historical fabric in order to align best practices for sustainable redevelopment.

Items proposed to be removed that should be considered for salvage include:

- Six-over-six wooden sash windows
- Wooden casement windows
- Wooden windows in the summer kitchen along the south elevation

The following recommendations for the salvage and reuse of materials are suggested:

- A reputable contractor(s) with proven expertise in salvage removal should be obtained.
  - The Architectural Conservancy of Ontario (ACO) North Waterloo Region maintains a Directory of Heritage Practitioners located in Ontario that claim to have experience with heritage and/or older properties. The section dedicated to “Moving, Dismantling and Salvage” could be referred to for salvage contacts, however, it is recommended that references and/or previous work be assessed before engaging with any of the listed businesses. The ACO directory is available
13.1 Conservation Plan (Impact 3, 4 and 5)

The original HIA completed by Amy Barnes Consulting (2016) recommended a Conservation Plan for any proposed work or alteration to the heritage building. It is ARAs understanding that this has not been completed. For this project, a Conservation Plan should be tailored to provide additional guidance on how to address the proposed site redevelopment in a manner which ensures that no additional heritage attributes, beyond those necessary, are impacted. A Conservation Plan could provide guidance on how to replace the vestibule in a sympathetic manner. Additionally, it could provide additional guidance on the short-, medium- and long-term recommendations to ensure the long-term viability of the buildings as a whole. City staff/MHAC should consider if the benefits of requiring a Conservation Plan is warranted and at which stage in the process this should be implemented if required.

13.2 Masonry Repointing (Impact 2)

The proposed repointing of selected areas of the rough-cut limestone and lime mortar should be undertaken by a tradesperson who is familiar with the historic materials and has experience working with heritage buildings. The Canadian Association of Heritage Professionals and/or the Architectural Conservancy of Ontario (ACO) Directory of Heritage Practitioners provides information for tradespeople with this type of experience. Seeking a tradesperson who has demonstrated skills and experience is recommended in order to ensure no unintended damage occurs (i.e., the use of mortar which is incompatible). It is recommended that a person with heritage experience carry out any masonry work. City staff/MHAC should determine if experience with historic buildings is essential to carry out this work, or if they are satisfied with the work being carried out by someone with experience doing this work.

13.3 Update Property’s Designation By-Law (General)

If the proposed redevelopment is accepted and approved, the by-law will require amendments to reflect the loss of attributes. The proposed redevelopment will result in the removal of listed heritage attributes associated with the property. Additionally, no storm windows were observed on the building during the preparation of this HIA. Similarly, if other options are pursued the designation by-law will need to be updated to reflect this on the City of Cambridge’s Heritage Register.

14.0 SUMMARY STATEMENT AND CONSERVATION RECOMMENDATIONS

The subject property, located at 415 Water Street South, is a designated property under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act under By-Law 55-16. 415 Water Street South is a one-and-a-half-storey, five bay, limestone Georgian-style residence with a side gable roof constructed circa 1841.
The proposed redevelopment seeks to convert the existing single-family residence into commercial or residential units. The proposed redevelopment involves the removal of all windows and doors as well as the vestibule on the stone house to be replaced with new wooden vinyl clad windows (GoldenClad Series) and a reconstructed vestibule on the façade (north elevation) which will replicate the same size and style. The wooden fanlight on the south elevation will remain. The proposed redevelopment includes the removal of the existing summer kitchen and garage to be replaced with a new structure in the same location and of the same size, shape and form. The new structure would include resized window openings on all elevations of the summer kitchen. Lastly, the proposed redevelopment seeks to replace the wooden cladding, soffit and fascia, with a contemporary siding and conduct site specific repointing of the stone masonry.

The following impacts of the proposed redevelopment were identified:

- Impact 1: Removal of several attributes including all the six-over-six wood windows, the vestibule on the north elevation, the door and transom on the south elevation, the summer kitchen on the east elevation; and the garage on the east elevation.
- Impact 2: The potential for destruction of the rough-cut limestone and lime mortar construction during repointing
- Impact 3: The potential for accidental damage during the construction process.
- Impact 4: The alteration of window size and location proposed on the summer kitchen and garage.

The following positive impacts of the proposed redevelopment were identified:

- The property has been vacant for more than a decade and has been subject to vandalism. The use of a designated property will ensure its ongoing viability.

Several alternative options were explored however, ARA has been unable to find a solution which conserves the heritage attributes and is amenable to the property owner. Therefore, recognizing that through the HIA process clear directions on how to move forward remain unresolved and has been ongoing for over two years, the following summary has been provided to help inform the City staff/MHAC understanding of options and determine a pathway forward.

The options explored can be summarized as follows:

- Option 1: Option 1 – Do Nothing
- Option 2 – Proposed Site Redevelopment with Rehabilitation or Replication of All Windows
- Option 3 – Proposed Site Redevelopment using GoldenWood Series Windows
- Option 4 – Proposed Site Redevelopment with Rehabilitation or Replication of a Select Number of Six-over-six Wood Windows on the Stone Dwelling
- Option 5 – Proposed Redevelopment

Option 1 has been determined not to be feasible. ARA determined that the preferred option from a heritage conservation approach is Option 2. Option 3 represents a modern window type that may still satisfy the conservation goals of the City. Option 4 represents an alternative that would seek to compromise between the property owner’s redevelopment goals and the City’s heritage protection requirements. Option 5 is the preferred option of the property owner. Should the owner and the City/MHAC come to an agreement, clear parameters of what is acceptable (restoration or replacement), the number of windows and their location, and how to move forward with permitting in a timely manner, should be communicated directly to the owner. ARA has included...
a series of mitigation measures to reduce negative impacts below as it pertains to the proposed development. Should MHAC and City staff pursue Option 3 or Option 4, City Staff/MHAC should determine in any of the mitigation options outlined below should also be pursued.

Given the owner wishes to pursue the proposed redevelopment as outlined in Section 9.0, mitigation measures to address the impacts of the proposed redevelopment to 415 Water Street have been included below:

- A Cultural Heritage Resource Documentation report should be prepared. If the photographic and written documentation completed as part of this HIA is considered sufficient, a Cultural Heritage Resource Documentation report may not be required. This is to be determined by City staff.
- The salvage of historic materials should be encouraged as part of the site alteration and considered for reuse. If any of the materials can be salvaged, they should be removed carefully to ensure their reuse and that the removal of materials does not cause any additional damage to the property.
- If it has not already been completed as part of the original recommendation outlined in the HIA completed by Amy Barnes Consulting (2016), a Conservation Plan should be prepared. A Conservation Plan would provide guidance on items proposed for removal in a manner which does not cause additional unintended damage to the building. Furthermore, a Conservation Plan can provide short-, medium- and long-term recommendations to ensure the ongoing viability of the heritage resource. City staff/MHAC should consider if the benefits of requiring a Conservation Plan is warranted and at which stage in the process this should be implemented if required.
- Any masonry repointing should be carried out by a tradesperson who has experience working with heritage buildings. City staff/MHAC should determine if experience with historic buildings is essential to carry out this work, or if they are satisfied with the work being carried out by someone with masonry experience.
- The design of the garage and summer kitchen should be as proposed. If there are any changes to the design, they should be reviewed by a professional member of CHAP to ensure they are compatible with the stone building. The proposed design includes:
  - The full removal of the garage and summer kitchen to be replaced with new buildings of the same size (footprint), shape (height) and form (overall massing).
  - The proposed new structure will have a 6/12 roof pitch to be clad in asphalt shingles with a prefinished aluminum eavestrough, fascia and soffit, prefinished aluminum clad frieze trim, pre-finished white horizontal wood siding, 4” prefinished corner/window trim, finished grade, concrete foundation and concrete footing below grade.
  - The garage will have French doors and a single rectangular window on the north elevation.
  - All openings on the east elevation are proposed to be closed in.
  - The south elevation of the garage portion is proposed to include two rectangular windows, rhythmically placed, along the first storey and one single rectangular window in the upper storey.
- The existing designation by-law should be updated to reflect any changes resulting from the option which was pursued (i.e., removal of heritage attributes).
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Appendix A: 415 Water Street South Images

Map 2: Photo Location Map of 415 Water Street South
(Produced by ARA under licence using ArcGIS® software by Esri, © Esri)
Image 1: Context – 415 Water Street South Viewed from Water Street South
(Photo taken on November 15, 2021; Facing Southeast)

Image 2: Context – 415 Water Street South and Adjacent Properties Viewed from Water Street South
(Photo taken on November 15, 2021; Facing Southeast)
Image 3: Context – Adjacent Property 10 Birkenshaw Road (New Apostolic Church),
(Photo taken on November 15, 2021; Facing North)

Image 4: Context – Properties Adjacent to Subject Property Fronting Birkenshaw Road
(Photo taken on November 15, 2021; Facing Southeast)
Image 5: Context – Properties Adjacent to Subject Property Fronting Lockwood Street  
(Photo taken on November 15, 2021; Facing Southeast)

Image 6: Context – 415 Water Street South Viewed from Water Street South  
(Photo taken on November 15, 2021; Facing Northeast)
Image 7: 415 Water Street South Landscape – Driveway Off Water Street South  
(Photo taken on November 15, 2021; Facing East)

Image 8: 415 Water Street South Landscape – Stone Retaining Wall  
(Photo taken on November 15, 2021; Facing Southeast)
Image 9: 415 Water Street South Landscape – Damaged Portion of Stone Retaining Wall
(Photo taken on November 15, 2021; Facing South)

Image 10: 415 Water Street South Landscape – Stone Retaining Wall
(Photo taken on November 15, 2021; Facing South)
Image 11: 415 Water Street South Landscape – Large Coniferous Tree Beside West Elevation
(Photo taken on November 15, 2021; Facing Northeast)

Image 12: 415 Water Street South Landscape – Remaining Trees
(Photo taken on November 15, 2021; Facing Northeast)
Image 13: 415 Water Street South Landscape – Graveled Surface  
(Photo taken on November 15, 2021; Facing Northeast)

Image 14: 415 Water Street South Exterior – North Elevation  
(Photo taken on November 15, 2021; Facing Southwest)
Image 15: 415 Water Street South Exterior – Entrance Vestibule
(Photo taken on February 5, 2021; Facing Southwest)

Image 16: 415 Water Street South Exterior – Entrance Vestibule
(Photo taken on November 15, 2021; Facing South)
Image 17: 415 Water Street South Exterior – Deteriorated Front Door
(Photo taken on November 15, 2021; Facing South)

Image 18: 415 Water Street South Exterior – Wooden Soffit and Return Eaves and Limestone Chimney on East Elevation
(Photo taken on November 15, 2021; Facing Northeast)
Image 19: 415 Water Street South Exterior – Six-over-Six Wooden Sash Windows
(Photo taken on November 15, 2021; Facing South)

Image 20: 415 Water Street South Exterior – Dormer with Two Six-Paneled Casement Windows
(Photo taken on November 15, 2021; Facing Southwest)
Image 21: 415 Water Street South Exterior – East Elevation Entrance, Outline of Basement Entrance Located to Right of Door
(Photo taken on November 15, 2021; Facing Southwest)

Image 22: 415 Water Street South Exterior – Limestone Lintel for Basement Entrance Visible to Right of Door
(Photo taken on November 15, 2021; Facing West)
Image 23: 415 Water Street South Exterior – Summer Kitchen Addition Connecting Limestone House to Timber-frame Structure
(Photo taken on November 15, 2021; Facing South)

Image 24: 415 Water Street South Exterior – Timber Framed Structure/Garage
(Photo taken on November 15, 2021; Facing South)
Image 25: 415 Water Street South Exterior – Six Paneled Wooden Window
(Photo taken on November 15, 2021; Facing South)

Image 26: 415 Water Street South Exterior – East Elevation
(Photo taken on November 15, 2021; Facing Southwest)
Image 27: 415 Water Street South Exterior – East Elevation Wooden Multi-Paned Window Openings
(Photo taken on November 15, 2021; Facing West)

Image 28: 415 Water Street South Exterior – Corner Doorway
(Photo taken on November 15, 2021; Facing West)
Image 29: 415 Water Street South Exterior – Cantilevered Second Floor
(Photo taken on November 15, 2021; Facing Northwest)

Image 30: 415 Water Street South Exterior– South Elevation of Timber Framed Structure/Garage and Summer Kitchen
(Photo taken on November 15, 2021; Facing Northwest)
Image 31: 415 Water Street South Exterior – View of Stone House East Elevation and Summer Kitchen South Elevation
(Photo taken on November 15, 2021; Facing North)

Image 32: 415 Water Street South Exterior – Summer Kitchen Concrete Foundation and Wooden Paneling
(Photo taken on November 15, 2021; Facing Northwest)
Image 33: 415 Water Street South Exterior – South Elevation and Former Façade
(Photo taken on November 15, 2021; Facing Northwest)

Image 34: 415 Water Street South Exterior – Six-over-Six Wooden Sash Windows
(Photo taken on November 15, 2021; Facing North)
Image 35: 415 Water Street South Exterior – East Dormer on South Elevation with Six-Paned Casement Windows, Cosmetic Deterioration Visible
(Photo taken on November 15, 2021; Facing North)

Image 36: 415 Water Street South Exterior – West Dormer on South Elevation with Six-Paned Casement Windows, Cosmetic Deterioration Visible
(Photo taken on November 15, 2021; Facing North)
Image 37: 415 Water Street South Exterior – West Dormer on South Elevation with Six-Paned Casement Windows, Cosmetic Deterioration Visible
(Photo taken on November 15, 2021; Facing North)

Image 38: 415 Water Street South Exterior – Southwest Corner Showing South and West Elevation
(Photo taken on November 15, 2021; Facing Northeast)
Image 39: 415 Water Street South Exterior – West Elevation
(Photo taken on November 15, 2021; Facing East)

Interior Photos

Image 40: Stone Dwelling Interior – Entrance Vestibule
(Photo taken on November 15, 2021)
Image 41: Stone Dwelling Interior – Wood Paneled Entrance Vestibule  
(Photo taken on November 15, 2021)

Image 42: Stone Dwelling Interior – Interior Entrance Door  
(Photo taken on November 15, 2021)
Image 43: Stone Dwelling Interior – Paneled Moldings and Sidelights
(Photo taken on November 15, 2021)

Image 44: Stone Dwelling Interior – Hallway
(Photo taken on November 15, 2021)
Image 45: Stone Dwelling Interior – Slender Newel Post
(Photo taken on November 15, 2021)

Image 46: Stone Dwelling Interior – Wooden Moldings on Stair
(Photo taken on November 15, 2021)
Image 47: Stone Dwelling Interior – Powder Room Off Stair Hall
(Photo taken on November 15, 2021)

Image 48: Stone Dwelling Interior – Port Key Window Opening in Powder Room
(Photo taken on November 15, 2021)
Image 49: Stone Dwelling Interior – Hall Leading to Kitchen
(Photo taken on November 15, 2021)

Image 50: Stone Dwelling Interior – Kitchen
(Photo taken on November 15, 2021)
Image 51: Stone Dwelling Interior – Kitchen  
(Photo taken on November 15, 2021)

Image 52: Stone Dwelling Interior – Dining Room  
(Photo taken on November 15, 2021)
Image 53: Stone Dwelling Interior – Dining Room Mantel with Stone Hearth  
(Photo taken on November 15, 2021)

Image 54: Stone Dwelling Interior – Various Flooring Types  
(Photo taken on November 15, 2021)
Image 55: Stone Dwelling Interior – Living Room
(Photo taken on November 15, 2021)

Image 56: Stone Dwelling Interior – Living Room
(Photo taken on November 15, 2021)
Image 57: Stone Dwelling Interior – Living Room Mantle with Stone Hearth
(Photo taken on November 15, 2021)

Image 58: Stone Dwelling Interior – Boarded up Doorway
(Photo taken on November 15, 2021)
Image 59: Stone Dwelling Interior – Rear Hallway
(Photo taken on November 15, 2021)

Image 60: Stone Dwelling Interior – Former Entrance on South Elevation with Transom
(Photo taken on November 15, 2021)
Image 61: Stone Dwelling Interior – Rear Hallway Leading to Summer Kitchen
(Photo taken on November 15, 2021)

Image 62: Stone Dwelling Interior – Wooden Paneling in Rear Hall
(Photo taken on November 15, 2021)
Image 63: Stone Dwelling Interior – Stair Landing Leading to Second Storey
(Photo taken on November 15, 2021)

Image 64: Stone Dwelling Interior – Half-circle Fanlight Window on Stair Landing
(Photo taken on November 15, 2021)
Image 65: Stone Dwelling Interior – Second Floor Hallway
(Photo taken on November 15, 2021)

Image 66: Stone Dwelling Interior – Second Floor Bathroom
(Photo taken on November 15, 2021)
Image 67: Stone Dwelling Interior – Casement Windows in Bathroom with Screen Insert
(Photo taken on November 15, 2021)

Image 68: Stone Dwelling Interior – Second Floor Hall Leading to East Bedrooms
(Photo taken on November 15, 2021)
Image 69: Stone Dwelling Interior – Entrance to Northeast Bedroom
(Photo taken on November 15, 2021)

Image 70: Stone Dwelling Interior – Northeast Bedroom
(Photo taken on November 15, 2021)
Image 71: Stone Dwelling Interior – Northeast Bedroom
(Photo taken on November 15, 2021)

Image 72: Stone Dwelling Interior – Entrance to Southeast Bedroom
(Photo taken on November 15, 2021)
Image 73: Stone Dwelling Interior – Southeast Bedroom with Dormer
(Photo taken on November 15, 2021)

Image 74: Stone Dwelling Interior – Southwest Bedroom with Dormer
(Photo taken on November 15, 2021)
Image 75: Stone Dwelling Interior – Southwest Bedroom, Built-in Cabinetry
(Photo taken on November 15, 2021)

Image 76: Stone Dwelling Interior – Southwest Bedroom
(Photo taken on November 15, 2021)
Image 77: Stone Dwelling Interior – Casement Windows in Southwest Bedroom with Screen Insert  
(Photo taken on November 15, 2021)

Image 78: Stone Dwelling Interior – Hall Leading to Northwest Bedroom  
(Photo taken on November 15, 2021)
Image 79: Stone Dwelling Interior – Northwest Bedroom
(Photo taken on November 15, 2021)

Image 80: Stone Dwelling Interior – Northwest Bedroom
(Photo taken on November 15, 2021)
Image 81: Stone Dwelling Interior – Basement Stairs
(Photo taken on November 15, 2021)

Image 82: Stone Dwelling Interior – Basement with Concrete Floor
(Photo taken on November 15, 2021)
Image 83: Stone Dwelling Interior – Basement
(Photo taken on November 15, 2021)

Image 84: Stone Dwelling Basement Interior – Water Damage Visible in Northeast Window Well
(Photo taken on November 15, 2021)
Image 85: Stone Dwelling Basement Interior – Water Damage Visible in Northeast Window Well
(Photo taken on November 15, 2021)

Image 86: Summer Kitchen Addition Interior – Entrance Door
(Photo taken on November 15, 2021)
Image 87: Summer Kitchen Addition Interior – Entrance Door and Corner Brick Hearth
(Photo taken on November 15, 2021)

Image 88: Summer Kitchen Addition Interior – North Elevation Windows
(Photo taken on November 15, 2021)
Image 89: Summer Kitchen Addition Interior – Water Leakage Visible
(Photo taken on November 15, 2021)

Image 90: Summer Kitchen Addition Interior – Wooden Paneling
(Photo taken on November 15, 2021)
Image 91: Summer Kitchen Addition Interior – Entrance Leading to Stone Dwelling
(Photo taken on November 15, 2021)

Image 92: Summer Kitchen Addition Interior – Entrance Leading to Garage Area
(Photo taken on November 15, 2021)
Image 93: Summer Kitchen Addition Interior – Exterior Doors on East Elevation
(Photo taken on November 15, 2021)

Image 94: Summer Kitchen Addition Interior – Exterior Doors on East Elevation
(Photo taken on November 15, 2021)
Image 95: Summer Kitchen Addition Interior – Exterior Doors on East Elevation
(Photo taken on November 15, 2021)

Image 96: Summer Kitchen Addition Interior – Opening with Segmental Arch and Wooden Windows
(Photo taken on November 15, 2021)
Image 97: Summer Kitchen Addition Interior – Wooden Paneling Framing Openings
(Photo taken on November 15, 2021)

Image 98: Summer Kitchen Addition Interior – Solid Wood Six-Panel Door with Mortice and Tenon Joinery
(Photo taken on November 15, 2021)
Image 99: Timber Framed Garage Interior – Entrance from Summer Kitchen  
(Photo taken on November 15, 2021)

Image 100: Timber Framed Garage Interior – Interior Fixed Wooden Window  
(Photo taken on November 15, 2021)
Image 101: Timber Framed Garage Interior – Former Opening Filled
(Photo taken on November 15, 2021)

Image 102: Timber Framed Garage Interior – First Floor
(Photo taken on November 15, 2021)
Image 103: Timber Framed Garage Interior – First Floor
(Photo taken on November 15, 2021)

Image 104: Timber Framed Garage Interior – First Floor
(Photo taken on November 15, 2021)
Image 105: Timber Framed Garage Interior – Second Floor
(Photo taken on November 15, 2021)

Image 106: Timber Framed Garage Interior – Timber Framed with Wooden Board Cladding
(Photo taken on November 15, 2021)
Image 107: Timber Framed Garage Interior – Beams Connected Using Mortice and Tenon Joinery Secured by Wooden Pegs
(Photo taken on November 15, 2021)

Image 108: Timber Framed Garage Interior – Beams Connected Using Mortice and Tenon Joinery Secured by Wooden Pegs
(Photo taken on November 15, 2021)
Image 109: Timber Framed Garage Interior – Second Floor, Floorboards Measuring 20 Inches Wide

(Photograph taken on November 15, 2021)
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Kayla Jonas Galvin, MA, RPP, MCIP, CAHP
Heritage Operations Manager
ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESEARCH ASSOCIATES LTD.
1 King Street West, Stoney Creek, ON L8G 1G7
Phone: (519) 804-2291 x120 Fax: (519) 286-0493
Email: kayla.jonasgalvin@araheritage.ca
Web: www.araheritage.ca

Biography
Kayla Jonas Galvin, Archaeological Research Associates Ltd.’s Heritage Operations Manager, has extensive experience evaluating cultural heritage resources and landscapes for private and public-sector clients to fulfill the requirements of provincial and municipal legislation such as the Environmental Assessment Act, the Standards & Guidelines for the Conservation of Provincial Heritage Properties and municipal Official Plans. She served as Team Lead on the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport Historic Places Initiative, which drafted over 850 Statements of Significance and for Heritage Districts Work!, a study of 64 heritage conservation districts in Ontario. Kayla was an editor of Arch, Truss and Beam: The Grand River Watershed Heritage Bridge Inventory and has worked on Municipal Heritage Registers in several municipalities. Kayla has drafted over 150 designation reports and by-laws for the City of Kingston, the City of Burlington, the Town of Newmarket, Municipality of Chatham-Kent, City of Brampton and the Township of Whitchurch-Stouffville. Kayla is the Heritage Team Lead for ARA’s roster assignments for Infrastructure Ontario and oversees evaluation of properties according to Standards & Guidelines for the Conservation of Provincial Heritage Properties. Kayla is a Registered Professional Planner (RPP), Member of the Canadian Institute of Planners (MCIP), a professional member of the Canadian Association of Heritage Professionals (CAHP) and is President of the Ontario Association of Heritage Professionals.

Education
2016 MA in Planning, University of Waterloo. Thesis Topic: Goderich – A Case Study of Conserving Cultural Heritage Resources in a Disaster
2003-2008 Honours BES University of Waterloo, Waterloo, Ontario
Joint Major: Environment and Resource Studies and Anthropology

Professional Memberships and Accreditations
Current Professional Member, Canadian Association of Heritage Professionals (CAHP)
Member of the Canadian Institute of Planners (MCIP)
Registered Professional Planner (RPP)
Board Member, Ontario Association of Heritage Professionals.

Work Experience
Current Heritage Operations Manager, Archaeological Research Associates Ltd.

2009-2013 Heritage Planner, Heritage Resources Centre, University of Waterloo
Coordinated the completion of various contracts associated with built heritage including responding to grants, RFPs and initiating service proposals.

2008-2009, Project Coordinator--Heritage Conservation District Study, ACO
2012  Coordinated the field research and authored reports for the study of 32 Heritage Conservation Districts in Ontario. Managed the efforts of over 84 volunteers, four staff and municipal planners from 23 communities.

2007-2008  **Team Lead, Historic Place Initiative, Ministry of Culture**
Liaised with Ministry of Culture Staff, Centre’s Director and municipal heritage staff to draft over 850 Statements of Significance for properties to be nominated to the Canadian Register of Historic Places. Managed a team of four people.

**Selected Professional Development**
2020  “Shaping The Public Realm: The Intersection Of Design & Planning” by Ontario Professional Planners Institute
2020  “Bill 189: The Coronavirus Support and Protection Act, 2020 and LPAT Update: All In An Hour” by Ontario Professional Planners Institute
2020  “COVID-19 and Planning” by Canadian Institute of Planners
2020  “Cities in the Age of COVID: What are the impacts on urban design and architecture?” by Canadian Urban Institute
2019  Annual attendance at Ontario Heritage Conference, Goderich, ON (Two-days)
2019  Information Session: Proposed Amendments to the OHA, by MHSTCI
2018  Indigenous Canada Course, University of Alberta
2018  Volunteer Dig, Mohawk Institute
2018  Indigenizing Planning, three webinar series, Canadian Institute of Planners
2018  Cultural Heritage, Archaeology and Planning Symposium
2018  How to Plan for Communities: Listen to the Them, Webinar, Canadian Institute of Planners
2017  Empowering Indigenous Voices in Impact Assessments, Webinar, International Association for Impact Assessments
2017  Cultural Heritage, Archaeology and Planning Symposium
2017  Capitalizing on Heritage, National Trust Conference, Ottawa, ON.
2016  Cultural Heritage, Archaeology and Planning Symposium
2016  Heritage Rising, National Trust Conference, Hamilton
2016  Ontario Heritage Conference St. Marys and Stratford, ON.
2016  Heritage Inventories Workshop, City of Hamilton & ERA Architects
2015  Cultural Heritage, Archaeology and Planning Symposium
2015  Ontario Heritage Conference, Niagara on the Lake, ON.
2015  Leadership Training for Managers Course, Dale Carnegie Training

**Selected Publications**
Biography
Amy Barnes, a Project Manager with the Heritage Team, has over ten years of experience evaluating cultural heritage resources and leading community engagement. Amy has extensive experience working with provincial and municipal legislation and guidelines, including the Ontario Heritage Act, Official Plans, the Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places, and the Ontario Heritage Toolkit. Ms. Barnes has completed over fifty heritage related projects including 150+ cultural assessments and has been qualified as an expert witness at the Ontario Superior Court of Justice. Amy has worked in the public and private sector where her duties included project management, public consultation, facilitator, research, database and records management, and report author. Amy has worked with the Town of Oakville, City of Cambridge, City of Kitchener, Niagara-on-the-Lake, City of London, and the City of Kingston on projects which range in size, scale and complexity. Amy Barnes holds an M.A. in Heritage Conservation from the School of Canadian Studies at Carleton University in Ottawa, Ontario. Amy has successfully completed the International Association of Public Participation (IAP2) Foundations in Public Participation, the IAP2 Planning and Techniques for Effective Public Participation, and Indigenous Awareness Training through Indigenous Awareness Canada. Amy is a professional member of the Canadian Association of Heritage Professionals (CAHP) and formerly served as the Vice-Chair of the Cambridge Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee.

Education
2009 MA in Heritage Conservation, School of Canadian Studies, Carleton University, Ottawa, Ontario.
2006 Honours BA, Carleton University, Ottawa, Ontario
Canadian Studies (Major) and Psychology (Minor).

Professional Memberships and Accreditations
Current Professional Member, Canadian Association of Heritage Professionals (CAHP)
Member, International Network for Traditional Building, Architecture & Urbanism, Guelph Chapter.

Work Experience
Current Heritage Project Manager, Archaeological Research Associates Ltd.
2020 Principal Heritage Consultant, Amy Barnes Consulting.
2012-2015 Coordinated the completion of various contracts associated with built heritage, cultural heritage landscapes, including Heritage Impact Assessments, Cultural Heritage Evaluation Reports, Designation Reports and professional consultation.
Coordinated the development of a feasibility study and strategic planning initiatives for the anticipated purchase of a Provincial Property of Provincial Heritage Significance. Coordination of workshops and community events, external outreach and communications and implementing strategic planning initiatives. Liaison with
Infrastructure Ontario, Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Cultural Industries, non-profits, charities, school boards and community members.

2015-2019 **Project Manager and Senior Cultural Heritage Specialist – Letourneau Heritage Consulting Inc.**
Coordinated and authored various heritage related contracts. Duties included historic research, heritage impact assessments, cultural heritage assessments and evaluations, and public engagement activities. Served as the firm’s Public Engagement Specialist.

2011-2012 **Creative Content Developer, Virtual Museums Canada.**
Worked as part of an interdisciplinary team to help create an online virtual exhibit for Virtual Museums Canada. Responsible for historical research, record management, creative design, narrative and content development and internal coordination for the Archives and Research Team.

2010 **Junior Heritage Planner, Municipality of North Grenville.**
Responsible for historic research, public consultation and engagement and community development for heritage related projects. Worked with local heritage committees, Council and planning staff in accordance with the Ontario Heritage Act, Official Plans and other guiding policies.

2009 **Heritage Planner Intern, City of Kingston.**
Aided in heritage related projects and worked closely with heritage committees, Council, and planning staff.

**Selected Professional Development**
  – Indigenous Awareness Certification
  – Indigenous Peoples and Cultures
  – Indigenous Communication & Consultation
  – Indigenous Employment Outreach, Recruit, and Retain


2017 International Association of Public Participation Certification
  - Foundations in Public Participation
  - Planning and Techniques for Effective Public Participation.

**Publications**

**Selected Presentations**
2020 “Heritage Planning”, University of Guelph Speaker Series.
2018 “Heritage Planning in Ontario”, Willowbank School of Restorative Arts, Queenston.
2016 “Jane’s Walk Promotion”, Rogers TV, Kitchener, Ontario.
Aly Bousfield-Bastedo, ARA’s Heritage Technical Writer and researcher has four years of experience in evaluating cultural heritage resources, conducting historical research and providing conservation recommendations on a variety of projects. She holds an Honours BA in Sociology from the University of Guelph as well as a post-graduate certificate in Urban Design from Simon Fraser University. Building on these experiences, Aly received a graduate Diploma in Heritage Conservation from the Willowbank School of Restoration Arts. Aly has gained substantial experience in provincial and municipal legislation and guidelines, including the Ontario Heritage Act, Official Plans, the Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places, and the Ontario Heritage Toolkit. Aly has gained considerable experience in evaluating potential impacts and recommending mitigation strategies for a variety of resources such as farmsteads, bridges, houses, churches, cultural heritage landscapes and heritage districts in urban and rural areas.

Aly’s breadth of work has demonstrated her ability in conducting consultations with heritage stakeholders including interviews and surveys.

**Education**

2017-2020  Post-Graduate Diploma in Heritage Conservation, Willowbank School of Restoration Arts, Queenston, ON

2016-2017  Post-Graduate Certificate in Urban Design, Simon Fraser University, Vancouver, BC

2009-2013  Honours BA, University of Guelph, Guelph, ON

**Select Work Experience**

**Current**  

**Technical Writer and Researcher, Archaeological Research Associates Ltd.**  
Produce deliverables for ARA’s heritage team, including historic research, heritage assessment and evaluation for designation by-laws, Heritage Impact Assessments, Built Heritage and Cultural Heritage Landscape Assessments, and Cultural Heritage Resource Evaluations.

2021  

**Cultural Consultant, Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Culture**  
Provided liaison and advisory services to municipalities and stakeholders in the heritage sector on cultural heritage legislation in Ontario.

2020  

**Heritage Planning Consultant, Megan Hobson & Associates**  
Provided heritage consulting services, including site investigation and documentation. Provided cultural heritage value assessment and evaluations.

2019-2020  

**Cultural Heritage Planning Intern, ERA Architects**  
Coordinated and authored various heritage related contracts. Duties included historic research, heritage impact assessments, cultural heritage assessments and evaluations.

2016-2017  

**Heritage Vancouver, Programs and Communications**  
Conducted research and analysis of heritage properties and neighbourhoods in Vancouver. Assisted in the creation of a cultural heritage landscape assessment of Vancouver’s Chinatown neighbourhood through historical research and community engagement.
Select Professional Development

2021 International Network for Traditional Building and Urbanism (INTBAU) membership

2021 “Drafting Statements of Significance.” Webinar presented by ARA’s K. Jonas Galvin for ACO’s job shadow students.


2021 “Perspectives on Cultural Heritage Landscapes”. Cultural Heritage, Archaeology and Planning Symposium. ARA Ltd.

2019 University of Toronto, Mark Laird “Selected topics on Landscape Architecture”, Course audit

Messors, “Fornello Sustainable Preservation Workshop”, Cultural Landscape Field School


Presentations

2018 Essential issues or themes for education in heritage conservation: Montreal Roundtable on Heritage (Canada Research Chair on Built Heritage)
Appendix C: Structural Assessment Report

Site Review Report

Project Title: Proposed Commercial and Residential Building
Project Address: 415 Water Street, Cambridge, Ontario
Building Permit #: XXXXXX
Reviewed By: Edward Gomez, P.Eng.

Project ID: CEC-21-1340
Number of Pages: Six (6)
Date Issued: 2022-11-03

Attention: Carlos Moura – Chrisview Custom Homes Ltd.

Date of Site Review: 2022-10-27
Weather Conditions: Sunny, 10°C

Time In: 9:00 am
Time Out: 10:30 am

Scope of Site Review: Review of Existing Wood-Frame Addition to Heritage Stone Building

Centric Engineering Corporation (CEC) was retained by Chrisview Custom Homes LTD. to perform a visual site review in regards to the existing exposed structural elements of the structure referenced above. CEC was not retained to perform any design work relating to any new structure or required structural remediation/reinforcing as a result of the new intended loading or use of the existing structure.

As requested, we conducted our site review on the morning of October 27th, 2022 at 9:00am.

In accordance with the scope of work, no physical or intrusive testing was undertaken to determine the condition of the existing structure. The recommendations of this report were based on the visual examination of the existing structure exposed to view. CEC attempted to identify any deficiencies with the existing structure for the purpose of this report, however, in accordance with standard engineering practice, CEC shall not be responsible for conditions arising from deficiencies not noted.

CEC shall not be responsible for conditions arising from information not provided or fully disclosed to CEC at the time of the review.

This report was prepared by CEC for the exclusive use of our client, in evaluating the structural adequacy of the existing structure. This assessment was conducted in accordance with the scope of work, direction provided by the client, and generally accepted structural assessment practices. No other warranty, expressed or implied is made. CEC shall not be responsible for use of, reliance on, or decisions or actions made on this report by any third party.

Observations and Comments:

1. The roof framing was constructed using 2½"x3½" rafters with spacing ranging from 30" o/c to 44" o/c. The typical rafters are in line with each other on opposite sides of the ridge with no ridge board or beam. These rafters appear to be undersized based on the requirements of the 2012 Ontario Building Code (OBC). Refer to Figure 01.01.
2. Holes were observed drilled through the undersized roof rafters to allow for wiring pass-through. Refer to Figure 01.02.
3. The roof framing was sheathed with rough wood boards. The boards appeared to have water damage in various locations. The board thickness appeared undersized to span between roof rafters based on the requirements of the 2012 OBC. Additional layers of roof sheathing were visible over the boards, but the total roof assembly was not able to be determined. Refer to Figure 01.03.
4. The primary structural system for the building appeared to be post-and-beam type construction. Significant notches and checks were observed in all visible structural beams and posts. Refer to Figure 01.04 & Figure 01.05.
5. Where multiple beams share a support at the roof level, the beams were notched to share bearing on the post. Cuts in the wood members appeared to extend further into the member at the notches locations (over-cut) which will further reduce the shear capacity of the member at these points. Refer to Figure 01.06.

6. The floor framing was constructed using 3"x6" joists spaced at 22" o/c. These joists are undersized based on the requirements of the 2012 Ontario Building Code (OBC).

7. The floor joist framing was notched at the ends to allow for connection into the supporting beams. Refer to Figure 01.07.

8. The primary beams spanning front-to-rear and left-to-right supporting the floor framing at the stair opening have notches in several locations. Where the front-to-rear beam ties into the beam spanning left-to-right, both beams have approximately half of their cross-sectional depth notched out to allow for the connection. Refer to Figure 01.08.

9. In various locations, water damage was observed in main structural post and beam members. Refer to Figure 01.09.

10. In one location, a main structural post was found to be overhanging the concrete foundation. Refer to Figure 01.10.

11. Wood members are in direct contact with the concrete foundation. The 2012 OBC requires wood members that are not pressure-treated to be separated from the concrete with a protective film/barrier.

12. The connection for the wood-framed addition to the heritage stone building was not visible. CEC was not able to confirm that the beams bearing in this location are adequately supported.

13. The foundation for the structure was found to be a concrete slab on grade varying from 12” thick to 24” thick. Refer to Figure 01.11.

14. The slab on grade foundation did not show signs of any frost protection measures. The 2012 OBC would not permit a slab on grade foundation for a building with these characteristics supported on undefined soils.

15. The slab on grade foundation did not show any signs of additional provisions for footing supports below the main structural posts.

16. The slab on grade foundation showed a full-depth crack at the front left corner of the building. The foundation appears to have displaced slightly at the crack location. Refer to Figure 01.12.

17. The slab on grade foundation showed a full-depth crack at the rear middle of the building. Refer to Figure 01.13.

18. The exterior cladding for the building showed signs of water damage and deterioration. Figure 01.14.

19. Due to the extensive issues noted in the wood framed structure above the foundation level, it may be unfeasible to underpin the foundation to provide frost protection without causing further damage to the wood frame.

20. In its current condition, the building does not appear to be suitable to be used for residential or commercial occupancies. The structural wood frame is appears to be compromised in several areas due to notched framing members, water damage, and potentially undersized framing members. The slab-on-grade foundation system does not appear to be adequate for a building of this type. If the building is finished, the lack of frost protection for the foundation makes it possible for the building to move due to frost heave and damage interior and exterior finishes.
Attachments/Pictures:
Refer to Appendix A.

Copies to:
Corey Wehrle - Orchard Design Studio

End of Site Review Report SR-01

Centric Engineering Corporation

Edward Gomez, P.Eng.

Mazen Jaber, M.Eng., EIT
Appendix A
Figure 01.13: Crack in Foundation Slab at Middle of Building

Figure 01.14: Exterior Finishes With Water Damage
Appendix D: Window Inspection and Assessment Report

The house at 415 Water Street in Cambridge Ontario was visited in order to carry out an inspection of the windows.

The property includes a one-and-half storey, limestone, Georgian style farmhouse structure constructed c.1841. There is an attached one-storey summer kitchen and an attached two-storey garage to the east of the main building. The three sections act as one building. There are no additional historic outbuildings on the property.

By-Law No. 55-16

Statement of Cultural Heritage Value:

This residence was constructed c. 1841 of limestone in the Georgian style, which was a common farmhouse style between 1830 and 1870 in Ontario. True to its architecture style, this residence is a one and half storey, five bay design with gabled ends and a chimney at either end. The covered porch on the east elevation was the original summer kitchen while the garage is believed to be the original heavy timber-framed dwelling which pre-dates the limestone farmhouse. The garage structure and farmhouse were constructed for David Potter who acquired the property from William Dickson in 1831 for $115. The property remained in the Potter family until 1924. In 1945, Raymond Munro Myers, the Member of the

Furlan Conservation
765 Barton Street E, Hamilton ON
905-383-3704 | furlanconservation@gmail.com
Windows Inspection and Assessment Report
415 Water Street Cambridge Ontario
August 12th 2023


DESCRIPTION

Several different forms of windows were observed, from two distinct eras.

See attached window floor plans for location of all windows.

As this site is not currently occupied and break ins had occurred in the past, the windows were mostly hoarded with plywood for security reasons. Because of this it was difficult to inspect all the windows fully. There are no storm windows on any of the windows nor were any found on site.

WINDOW TYPE “A”

There are 5 historic windows that date to the mid 19th century.

These windows are relegated to the 2-storey garage portion of the complex. The mouldings, construction details, multi light pattern, glass defects and waviness are all typical of this period. No period hardware was present on these windows. W1-24 is a horizontal sliding window, the rest are fixed and do not operate. They vary from 4 to 6 lights per sash. The frame and sill that surround the sash are made of wood. The construction detail is typical of mid 19th century sash manufacturing. Joinery detail is through tenoned pegged and wedged with wood and coped to stile. The sash appear to be hand made with sash planes. The muntin bars are a delicate 9/6” wide.

Window Type “A” C1840

Window W2-11 c1840

Window W1-25

Muntin bar showing cut for wedge.

Furlan Conservation
765 Barton Street E, Hamilton ON
905-383-3704 | furlanconservation@gmail.com
Windows Inspection and Assessment Report
415 Water Street Cambridge Ontario
August 12th 2023

WINDOW TYPE "B"

These windows are not original, but because the glass is flat, the balances are spiral, and the detail of the moulding profiles, it is believed they date from after the second world war.

There is a combination of double hung wood sash windows and casement sash windows that are located in the main stone portion of the house on the first and second floor. On the second floor are 3 dormers with casement windows in each. There are a series of fixed sidelights beside the door on the north first floor elevation. There is some hardware present on the casement windows only. None of the windows that have the tube balances were operable. There is no wavy glass present in any of these windows.

There is also a fanlight and transom over the door on the south first floor elevation. The transom over the south door, labelled in the plan as D1-02, appears to be an early window, original to the house, with very thin muntin bars. The transom is the only original transom remaining in the Georgian part of the house. The fanlight was provided to allow for sunlight to the second floor.

The double hung windows are 6 over 6 configuration and counterweighted with spiral tube balances. According to Caldwell manufacturing in Rochester New York they developed their first spiral balance product for windows in 1948 called Spirex. This is about the time that we see this counter weight system used widely throughout North America to counter weight sash windows.

The casement windows are 6 light. The muntin bars are 3/4" wide on all these windows. The frame surrounding the casement sash on the second floor is made from dressed lumber. The rough sawn timber framed original roof trusses have been cut out to accommodate 3 new dormers on the second floor. This was most likely altered mid twentieth century. The exterior sills have been replaced with cast cement sills.

There are a total of 12 windows on the first floor and 8 including the fanlight on the second floor. All windows inspected are through tenon construction pegged with steel sash pins called gudgeons. Construction details are typical of the 1st and 2nd quarter of the 20th century.
Windows Inspection and Assessment Report  
415 Water Street Cambridge Ontario  
August 12th 2023

6 over 6 double hung sash windows  
W2-02

6 light casement window W2-06

Fanlight W2-05

2nd floor dormers showing cut out timber frame  
and constructed with mid twentieth century framing lumber

Window type “B” C1950

Furlan Conservation  
765 Barton Street E, Hamilton ON  
905-383-3704 | furlanconservation@gmail.com
Windows Inspection and Assessment Report
415 Water Street Cambridge Ontario
August 12th 2023

Hardware (stays) for casement windows 2nd floor

WINDOW TYPE “C”

These are casement sash windows with 8 lights in each sash. They are all located at the south east corner of the site at the summer kitchen and garage area. Amongst this collection of windows are 3 doors that are in 2 separate access points. They contain 10 lights each. They are commonly referred to as French doors. These windows are identical in construction detail as the windows in the main house (type B). The difference being only the width of the muntin bars in which they measure 1” across.

Image credit: Amy Barnes, Heritage Impact Assessment November 2016
Windows Inspection and Assessment Report
415 Water Street Cambridge Ontario
August 12th 2023

Image credit - Amy Barnes, Heritage Impact Assessment November 2016

Door D1-05 A & B

CONDITION

ORIGINAL HISTORIC SASH WINDOW A

These have broken muntin bars, failed finishes and are non operable. The putty has failed on most of these windows either missing, cracked badly and falls out easily. Some original glass exists. The wood appears to be in good condition with no rot observed. There are some unknowns with the condition as they were all hoarded up. But overall, the meeting joinery at the stiles and rails seem to be in good condition.

MID TWENTIETH CENTURY WINDOWS B & C

These have broken muntin bars, failed finishes and are non operable. The putty is in fair condition on most of the windows. The glass is clear and not wavy, as would be expected in pre-war glass. The glass is 3mm thick. The wood appears to be in good condition with no rot observed. There are some unknowns with the condition as they were all hoarded up. But overall, the meeting joinery at the stiles and rails seem to be in good condition. All the tube balances were heavily painted and non were operable. Casement windows on the second floor have window stay hardware. There is no weatherstripping on any of the windows.

FRAMES EXTERIOR

Generally, all window frames are in similar condition. The wooden frames appear to be original to the house. There are many finish layers, and some frames have missing finishes exposing bare wood. There is good slope to the sills to throw off the weather. The double hung windows have their sills replaced.

Furlan Conservation
765 Barton Street E, Hamilton ON
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Windows Inspection and Assessment Report
415 Water Street Cambridge Ontario
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with cement cast sills. They may very well have been originally wood sills that had rotted away over time. There are tooled limestone door sills at the main entrances to the house. Finishes have failed on most of the window frames and bare wood is visible.

FRAMES INTERIOR

The window surrounds on the original windows both on the ground floor and the 2nd floor are of exceptional quality of craftsmanship and form. Especially noteworthy are the decorative extensions that run past the stool and apron at the bottom of the trim work, as well as the decorative corner blocks. Many layers of finishes exist on all the running trim obscuring the fine details in many cases.

SUMMARY

There are 5 original historic windows, which I refer to as Type A. Window W1-24 is a horizontal sliding window. The other 4 windows are fixed. How significant the windows are to the site is debateable. The kitchen and garage portion at the east side of this site does not appear to be a significant attribute of the heritage designation, however the windows are the last remaining attributes of the original 1840 period. This is important because of the evidence of the sash technology. These sashes positioned one over the other in a 6 over 6 configuration would have been most likely what existed in the main house.

Of note is the transom over door D1-02 which does appear to be an original attribute of the main building.

The south side of the building appears to have been originally the dominant faced as it contains the 5 bay façade with a transom over the door and fanlight. Compared to the north elevation containing 3 bay façade.

When we look at window types B and C it is clear to me that these were reproductions made sometime in the early to mid twentieth century. The moulding profile, thickness of the muntin bars and construction details including float glass and tube balances all appear in wood sash window after 1900. But in this case the use of spiral tube balances and clear float glass indicate that these windows were installed after the second world war. The house was sold by the original family to Mr. In 1945, Raymond Munro Myers, the Member of Provincial Parliament for South Waterloo from 1951-1963, acquired the property and remained here until his death in 1980. It appears most likely that most of the windows, dormers and doors were replaced at this time. Further I believe that the dormers were installed in this period.

This could be viewed as another historic layer and discussion should take place as to the relevance of these attributes to its cultural heritage value.

Furlan Conservation
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APPROACH and COSTS

This is a layered site with 2 distinct eras. The original 1841 era which remained in the family until 1945 where interventions were undertaken. Vested stakeholders will need to determine the cultural and heritage significant of the wood windows at 415 Water Street. Please note that wood windows with storms, constructed with period joinery have been shown to perform as well as modern replacement windows in A440 blow tests.

Any conservation plan should be undertaken in accordance with the Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada. With special attention given to reversibility of processes and minimal intervention. This should be undertaken by a heritage window conservation specialist. It is recommended that an architectural paint analysis be undertaken of the elements, especially the original sash windows and transom over the door so that a permanent record of all finishes is recorded.

Conservation of the wood sash would require a specification and scope of work consistent with proper heritage guidelines. Many of the windows are damaged badly and some are in better condition.

COSTS

Generally full conservation costs would vary from $4,000.00 to $6,000 per 6 over 6 window and frame. To construct period-appropriate replica windows, including period storm windows, $4,000 to $6,000 per window. This would include specially made cope and stile router bits, period wavy cylinder glass and an experienced traditional sash maker.

Timelines for the conservation of the sash windows could be as long as 1 year. To replicate new period windows and install could take 6 months.

As mentioned earlier, a specification and scope of work is required for either of the options above.
Windows Inspection and Assessment Report
415 Water Street Cambridge Ontario
August 12th 2023

AS FOUND WINDOW PROFILES

MUNTIN BARS
A - WI-24+25
W2-0910+11(5) C 1840
B - WI-01 to WI-12 (12)
W2-01 to W2-08 (8) C 1950
C - WI-13 to WI-23 (11) C 1950
D1-04 & D1-05(2)

STILES

SEE WINDOW PLAN
FURLAN CONSERVATION
JULY 29 2023

Furlan Conservation
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Appendix E: Correspondence with Wood Window Specialists

HERITAGE RESTORATION INC.

From: Sean Leigh
Sent: Tuesday, August 1, 2023 2:37 PM
To: Carlos Moura
Subject: RE: windows for heritage building -ADDRESS 415 WATER STREET SOUTH ,CAMBRIDGE ,ONTARIO

Hi Carlos,

See attached revised budget price to include wood storm windows.

Thanks and Regards,

Sean Leigh, CAHP
Senior Project Manager
Building Envelope and Historical Rehabilitation Division

---

HRI Group
14 Paisley Lane, Uxbridge, ON, L9P 0G5
416-757-5556 (Main) | 416-578-6997 (Cell) | 905-642-2323 (Fax)
Visit us Online at www.hrigroup.ca

From: Carlos Moura <chrisviewcustomhomes@hotmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 25, 2023 10:27 AM
To: Sean Leigh <Sean.Leigh@hrigroup.ca>
Subject: RE: windows for heritage building - ADDRESS 415 WATER STREET SOUTH, CAMBRIDGE, ONTARIO

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Hi thanks for the info, are you able to give me a rough quote to do storm windows as well as the heat loss will we tremendous, thanks again

Sent from Mail for Windows

From: Sean Leigh
Sent: Friday, July 21, 2023 2:27 PM
To: chrisviewcustomhomes@hotmail.com
Subject: FW: windows for heritage building - ADDRESS 415 WATER STREET SOUTH, CAMBRIDGE, ONTARIO

Hi Carlos,

Please see attached budget quote, feel free to give me a call with any questions.

Thanks

Sean Leigh, CAHP
Senior Project Manager
Building Envelope and Historical Rehabilitation Division

HRI Group
14 Paisley Lane, Uxbridge, ON, L9P 0G5
416-757-5556 (Main) | 416-578-6997 (Cell) | 905-642-2323 (Fax)
Visit us Online at www.hrigroup.ca

From: Carlos Moura <chrisviewcustomhomes@hotmail.com>
Date: Thursday, July 20, 2023 at 3:01 PM
To: Chris Huntley <Chris.Huntley@hrigroup.ca>
Subject: RE: windows for heritage building - ADDRESS 415 WATER STREET SOUTH, CAMBRIDGE, ONTARIO

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Hi, thanks for getting back to me, see attached elevations drawings and window list (as on the building) and actual pictures of existing, thanks again

Sent from Mail for Windows
From: Carlos Moura <chrisviewcustomhomes@hotmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 19, 2023 4:00 PM
To: Myra Sider <admin@hrigroup.ca>
Subject: windows for heritage building -ADDRESS 415 WATER STREET SOUTH, CAMBRIDGE, ONTARIO

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Hi, my name is Carlos owner of Chrisview Custom Homes Ltd. I am currently working on a property with an existing heritage designated house (zoned residential and or commercial) the City of Cambridge provided me a list of professionals that specialized on repairing wood windows or replicating them. I am reaching out to your company for your service on whether these windows can be repair (as these windows are 150 plus years) and cost and timeline, and or if you can replicate them if they are not repairable, thanks
To: Chrisview Custom Homes  
Date: 23-Jan-08

Quote #: 2023243R1

Attn: Carlos Moura  
Contact #: 
Cell #: 
Re: 415 Water Street South, Cambridge  
Email: 

We are pleased to present the following budget quotation for your review and consideration. If you have any questions please do not hesitate to contact us.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>BUDGET QUOTE</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mobilization/Demobilization/Access</td>
<td></td>
<td>$15,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Window Restoration as per the plans and dimensions provided</td>
<td></td>
<td>$123,750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supply and Install new wood storm windows</td>
<td></td>
<td>$76,500.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HST No. 885487413  
Total $215,250.00  
Plus HST
Conditions of the Quotation

General Exclusions:
- No winter heat and/or tarping included.
- Hydro and water to be supplied by others.
- Any line wrapping is to be supplied by the client.
- No controlled substances were reported by the client prior to this quotation.
- Work to be completed between (7am-5pm - Mon-Fri)
- Work outside regular hours may be considered overtime.
- Washroom facilities to be provided by others.
- Site protection and security to be provided by others.
- Dewatering by others.
- Quote is valid for 30 days.

Job Specific Exclusions:

Terms:
- Work completed will be billed every 30 Days or upon completion.
- Invoice payment is due in 30 days.
- Outstanding balances will be charged prime plus 4% fee compounding monthly.
- This work or its payment is not subject to holdbacks.
Hi thanks for getting back timeline is fine probably tru the winter months (waiting for approval from heritage people), if you can price storm windows as well as heat loss is a concern thanks again.

Sent from Mail for Windows

---

From: Dave Wylie
Sent: Tuesday, July 25, 2023 9:44 PM
To: Carlos Moura
Subject: Re: windows for heritage building ADDRESS 415 WATER STREET SOUTH, CAMBRIDGE, ONTARIO

Hello Carlos,

dthis looks like an interesting building.

From what I can see in the photos, these windows are certainly candidates for restoration. What is your timeline for the project? I ask because we are pretty busy this fall.

Thanks, Dave

On 2023-07-21 11:15 a.m., Carlos Moura wrote:

Hi, I put some pictures together and actual window list and elevations thanks again

Sent from Mail for Windows
From: Carlos Moura  
Sent: Wednesday, July 19, 2023 4:03 PM  
To: wyliea@primus.ca  
Subject: windows for heritage building: ADDRESS 415 WATER STREET SOUTH, CAMBRIDGE, ONTARIO

HI, MY NAME IS CARLOS OWNER OF CHRISVIEW CUSTOM HOMES LTD., I AM CURRENTLY WORKING ON A PROPERTY WITH AN EXISTING HERITAGE DESIGNATED HOUSE (ZONED RESIDENTIAL AND OR COMMERCIAL). THE CITY OF CAMBRIDGE PROVIDED ME A LIST OF PROFESSIONALS THAT SPECIALIZED ON REPAIRING WOOD WINDOWS OR REPLACIING THEM. I AM REACHING OUT TO YOUR COMPANY FOR YOUR SERVICE ON WHETHER THESE WINDOWS CAN BE REPAIR (AS THESE WINDOWS ARE 150 PLUS YEARS) AND COST AND TIMELINE, AND IF YOU CAN REPLICATE THEM IF THEY ARE NOT REPAIRABLE, THANKS

--
Dave Wylie Restorations Ltd.  
8944 County Rd 12, Lisle, Ontario L0M 1M0  
416 407 9698  
wyliea@primus.ca  
Member of the Window Preservation Alliance  
windowpreservationalliance.org
OGILVIE’S PLAINING MILL

From: Carlos Moura
Sent: Friday, July 21, 2023 10:51 AM
To: Reg Ogilvie
Subject: RE: windows heritage house - address 415 water street south Cambridge ontario

Hi, try this, should be better and I also sent you a window list of sizes that are on the buildings as well, as I want to get all the option to repair (if repairable) or replace with wood (does the wood windows come with warranty) or aluminum clad as I want all the option to present to the the heritage people, if you can price with muntin bars on inside of windows or simulated bars as well, thanks again.

Sent from Mail for Windows

From: Reg Ogilvie
Sent: Thursday, July 20, 2023 4:43 PM
To: Carlos Moura
Subject: RE: windows heritage house - address 415 water street south Cambridge ontario

Hi Carlos

Please send us a few images. Please under 12MB per email total file size.

The link requires a sign in google account to view.

Reg Ogilvie

PO BOX 70
189 Huron Rd
Sebringville, ON, Canada
N9K 1X0
519 393 5101
www.hoffmeyersmill.com

From: Carlos Moura <chrisviewcustomhomes@hotmail.com>
Sent: July 20, 2023 9:34 AM
To: sales@hoffmeyersmill.on.ca
Subject: windows heritage house-address 415 water street south Cambridge Ontario

https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1klw7Csa-crETENN9WLx0UZJW9hlxvOg?usp=drive_link

Hi, I believe I was talking to Reg yesterday afternoon and he had me to send some info tru email , see link to pictures above. Hi, My name is Carlos owner of Chrisview Custom Homes Ltd. I am CURRENTLY WORKING ON A PROPERTY WITH A EXISTING HERITAGE DESIGNATED HOUSE (ZONED RESIDENTIAL AND OR COMMERCIAL). The city of Cambridge provided me a list of professionals that specialized on repairing wood windows or replicating them. I am reaching out to your company for your service on whether these windows can be repair (as these windows are 150 plus years) and cost and timeline, and or if you can replicate them if they are not reparable. Thanks
EUAN LOWSEON

No response received to date.

From: Carlos Moura
Sent: Wednesday, July 19, 2023 4:24 PM
To: euanis@rogers.com
Subject: windows for heritage building -ADDRESS 415 WATER STREET SOUTH CAMBRIDGE,ONTARIO

Hi, my name is Carlos owner of Chrisview Custom Homes Ltd. I am currently working on a property with a existing heritage designated house (zoned residential and or commercial) the city of Cambridge provided me a list of professionals that specialized on repairing wood windows or replicating them. I am reaching out to your company for your service on whether these windows can be repair (as these windows are 150 plus years) and cost and timeline, and or if you can replicate them. If they are not repairable, thanks.
From: Historic Building Co  
Sent: Friday, July 21, 2023 11:29 AM  
To: Carlos Moura  
Subject: Re: windows for heritage building -ADDRESS 415 WATER STREET SOUTH CAMBRIDGE ONTARIO

Hello Carlos,
I’d have to inspect and assess each window individually in order to determine whether they can be repaired.

Often times it’s less costly to replace them entirely.

However anything is possible.
We’ve restored much here since 1946.

Based upon your list, I’d estimate $60,000 to reproduce them.

Otherwise to assess and repair individually is $175/hour.

Happy to assist any way possible.

Don’t hesitate to call

HistoricBuilding.ca

On Jul 21, 2023, at 11:12 AM, Carlos Moura <chrisviewcustomhomes@hotmail.com> wrote:

Hi, just some info, see attached pictures and actual window list and elevation thanks again
Sent from Mail for Windows

From: Historic Building Co
Sent: Wednesday, July 19, 2023 11:01 PM
To: Carlos Moura
Subject: Re: windows for heritage building - ADDRESS 415 WATER STREET SOUTH CAMBRIDGE ONTARIO

Hello,
This is within our normal scope
Here to help.
John
HistoricBuilding.ca

On Jul 19, 2023, at 3:54 PM, Carlos Moura <chrisviewcustomhomes@hotmail.com> wrote:

HI , MY NAME IS CARLOS OWNER OF CHRISVIEW CUSTOM HOMES LTD., I AM CURRENTLY WORKING ON A PROPERTY WITH A EXISTING HERITAGE DESIGNATED HOUSE (ZONED RESIDENTIAL AND OR COMMERCIAL). THE CITY OF CAMBRIDGE PROVIDED ME A LIST OF PROFESSIONALS THAT SPECIALIZED ON REPAIRING WOOD WINDOWS OR REPLICATING THEM. I AM REACHING OUT TO YOUR COMPANY FOR YOUR SERVICE ON WHETHER THESE WINDOWS CAN BE REPAIR (AS THESE WINDOWS ARE 150 PLUS YEARS) AND COST AND TIMELINE, AND OR IF YOU CAN REPLICATE THEM IF THEY ARE NOT REPAIRABLE, THANKS

Sent from Mail for Windows

<ext window pictures.zip>
<415 window list.pdf>
<elevation drawings.pdf>
### Correspondence:

- **From:** Carlos Moura  
  **Sent:** Tuesday, August 15, 2023 10:40 AM  
  **To:** Walter Furlan  
  **Subject:** RE: windows for heritage building - ADDRESS 415 WATER STREET SOUTH CAMBRIDGE.ONTARIO

> Hi, one more thing is there any warranties on this work thanks

Sent from Mail for Windows

---

- **From:** Walter Furlan  
  **Sent:** Tuesday, August 15, 2023 9:37 AM  
  **To:** Carlos Moura  
  **Subject:** Re: windows for heritage building - ADDRESS 415 WATER STREET SOUTH CAMBRIDGE.ONTARIO

> Hi Carlos
> Have you had the chance to review the report?
> Thank you, Walter

On Sat, Aug 12, 2023 at 4:38 PM Walter Furlan <furlanconservation@gmail.com> wrote:

> Hi Carlos

> Here is the window assessment report.

> I have also included the invoice for this work.

> Please let me know if you have any questions.

> Thank you for the opportunity to work with you.
> Walter

---
On Wed, Aug 9, 2023 at 12:06 PM Walter Furlan wrote:

Hi Carlos

Draft report is complete. I will get it to you this week.
Walter

On Sat, Jul 22, 2023 at 2:47 PM Walter Furlan wrote:

See you Monday at 9:30.

On Sat, Jul 22, 2023 at 9:55 AM Carlos Moura wrote:

Hi yes that’s okay, thanks

Sent from Mail for Windows

From: Walter Furlan
Sent: July 22, 2023 7:08 AM
To: Carlos Moura
Subject: Re: windows for heritage building - ADDRESS 415 WATER STREET SOUTH CAMBRIDGE, ONTARIO

Hi Carlos

I can be on site on Monday morning 9:30 am. Let me know if this works for you.

Walter

On Fri, Jul 21, 2023 at 11:08 AM Carlos Moura wrote:

Hi okay that’s fine let me know time and day and I will meet you there, see new link with existing window pictures as I had problems opening it, and actual window list and sizes. thanks again

Sent from Mail for Windows

From: Walter Furlan
Sent: Friday, July 21, 2023 11:05 AM
To: Carlos Moura
Subject: Re: windows for heritage building - ADDRESS 415 WATER STREET SOUTH CAMBRIDGE, ONTARIO
Hi Carlos

As I mentioned in the previous email I will need to come to the site to assess the heritage windows.

I will create a site plan that will identify all of the windows. It will contain images with my overall comments on condition and repairs if necessary on the heritage windows. Any period replication windows would require a spec with drawings. This would not be part of this report.

With approximately 20 or so being the number of windows my fee for the site visit and condition assessment report would be $850+HST.

It takes about a week to complete the report after the site visit. I am available next week if you wish to proceed with this plan.

Thank you

On Thu, Jul 20, 2023 at 11:21 AM Carlos Moura <chrisviewcustomhomes@hotmail.com> wrote:

Hi sorry ,see if this is better

Sent from Mail for Windows

From: Walter Furlan
Sent: Thursday, July 20, 2023 10:46 AM
To: Carlos Moura
Subject: Re: windows for heritage building -ADDRESS 415 WATER STREET SOUTH CAMBRIDGE,ONTARIO

I am unable to open the link.

On Thu, Jul 20, 2023 at 9:49 AM Carlos Moura <chrisviewcustomhomes@hotmail.com> wrote:

Hi thanks for the reply ,there is 19 windows and I door/sidelite,see link below of some of the windows ,thanks again
https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1khw7Csa-crETENN9WLx0UZJWK9hixOz?usp=drive_link

From: Walter Furlan  
Sent: Wednesday, July 19, 2023 5:30 PM  
To: Carlos Moura  
Subject: Re: windows for heritage building - ADDRESS 415 WATER STREET SOUTH CAMBRIDGE, ONTARIO

Hi Carlos

Many municipalities require a report. Some do not. I am not sure what Cambridge heritage committee and planners would want to see.

I provide assessment and condition reports in relation to historic windows in designated properties under the Ontario heritage act.

It requires me to have a site visit to inspect the window systems, take photos, and then write a report on the findings. Takes about 1 week to produce the report. This report would detail the era of the windows and recommendations on any conservation treatment as necessary.

Cost for the assessment and report would be determined by the amount of windows in the property. How many windows are in this property?

Thanks, Walter

On Wed, Jul 19, 2023 at 4:22 PM Carlos Moura <chrisviewcustomhomes@hotmail.com> wrote:

HI, MY NAME IS CARLOS OWNER OF CHRISVIEW CUSTOM HOMES LTD., I AM CURRENTLY WORKING ON A PROPERTY WITH A EXISTING HERITAGE DESIGNATED HOUSE [ZONED RESIDENTIAL AND OR COMMERCIAL]. THE CITY OF CAMBRIDGE PROVIDED ME A LIST OF PROFESSIONALS THAT SPECIALIZED
ON REPAIRING WOOD WINDOWS OR REPLICA THEM. I AM REACHING OUT TO YOUR COMPANY FOR YOUR SERVICE ON WHETHER THESE WINDOWS CAN BE REPAIR [AS THESE WINDOWS ARE 150 PLUS YEARS] AND COST AND TIMELINE, AND OR IF YOU CAN REPLICATE THEM IF THEY ARE NOT REPAIRABLE, THANKS

--
Furlan Conservation
765-767 Barton Street East
Hamilton, ON L8L 3A9
905 383 3704
furlanconservation.com

--
Furlan Conservation
765-767 Barton Street East
Hamilton, ON L8L 3A9
905 383 3704
furlanconservation.com

--
AUTHENTIC WINDOWS AND DOORS

Correspondence:

From: MICHAEL PETERS
Sent: Wednesday, August 2, 2023 10:07 AM
To: Carlos Moura
Subject: 415 Water Street South

Good Morning Carlos

Please find attached, quotation and section drawings for the above project. Thank you for your interest and please call me with any questions.

Best Regards and Stay Safe!
Michael Peters
Authentic Windows and Doors
Cell: 416-402-1031

----- Forwarded Message ----- 
From: scanner@authenticwindows.com <scanner@authenticwindows.com>
To: "michael@authenticwindows.com" <michael@authenticwindows.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 2, 2023 at 09:56:10 a.m. EDT
Subject: Scanned image from 1625100 ONTARIO LTD.

Reply to: scanner@authenticwindows.com <scanner@authenticwindows.com>
Device Name: 1625100 ONTARIO LTD.
Device Model: MX-3071
Location: 882 PROGRESS AVE., SCARBOROUGH, ON, M1H 2X7

File Format: PDF (Medium)
Resolution: 200dpi x 200dpi

Attached file is scanned image in PDF format.
Use Acrobat(R)Reader(R) or Adobe(R)Reader(R) of Adobe to view the document.
Adobe(R)Reader(R) can be downloaded from the following URL.
Quote:

Authentic Windows and Doors
882 Progress Avenue Scarborough On. M1H 2X7
Independently Owned and Operated Since 1989

Date: August 2, 2023
Client: Chrisview Custom Homes
Jobsite: 415 Water St. S Cambridge
Via: Our Truck
Your Quotation Includes:

- **Supply Only**, All Exterior Solid Hardwood windows and doors as per client supplied dimensions and specifications and approved shop drawings.
- Solid 1 1/4” x 6 3/4” jambs with solid hardwood sash, styles and rails – Installed Period brick mould.
- White primer applied throughout.
- Maestro shoot bolt hardware and handles on all inswing casements. All operating windows with “Viper” screens as per plan.
- Single Hung Windows included and to have no visible side balances. Solid brass locks and lifts (choice of colour)
- Doors included and to be solid unfinished Mahogany. Design as per Existing. No Lockset. Primed as required.
- Doors to be 2 1/4” thick with bronze/hardwood interlocking sill and ball bearing hinges (choice of finish).
- 1 1/8” True Divided OG Lites OR 3/4” Simulated Period Putty on OG with aluminum spacer bar as per existing.
- 1” 3/4” overall sealed units/Tempered glass on doors. Low-E Glass throughout 1.4 U-value or better.
- Final on-site inspection and adjustment at job completion

Total Price Stone Section 1 1/8” True Divided Lite Option #1: $78,000.00 plus HST
Total Price Stone Section 3/4” Simulated Divided Lite Option #2: $65,000.00 plus HST
Total Price Siding Section 1 1/8” True Divided Lite Option #1: $44,000.00 plus HST
Total Price Siding Section 3/4” Simulated Divided Lite Option #2: $36,000.00 plus HST

Terms: 50% Deposit 50% Due Upon Completion

All products supplied remain the property of Authentic Windows and Doors until balance of contract is paid in full. Installation and Warranty policy and procedure available upon request.

Thank you for the opportunity to quote your project

Michael Peters
Cell: 416-402-1031

QUOTE VALID FOR 30 DAYS

Proudly Built in Ontario

Tel: (416) 292-5400
or cass@rogers.com  michael@authenticwindows.com
www.authenticwindows.com
Heritage Permit Application Form

The following application form is pursuant to the Ontario Heritage Act, R.S.O 1990, Sections 33, 34, and 42. The City of Cambridge will issue a Notice of Receipt within the receipt of a complete application, including all required supporting documentation. Please attach to this form any photographs, plans, drawings, studies, etc. required to fully describe and support the proposed alterations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part A – Heritage property information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address: 415 Water Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postal Code: N1R5S6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Province: Ontario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By-law:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part B – Applicant information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Property Owner: Chrisview Custom Homes Ltd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address: 1661 Morrison Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City: Cambridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postal Code: N1R5S2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Province: Ontario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone Number: 519-622-0393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:chrisviewcustomhomes@hotmail.com">chrisviewcustomhomes@hotmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part C – Agent information (if applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agent: Andrew Head, Dryden, Smith &amp; Head Planning Consultants Ltd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address: 54 Cedar Street North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City: Kitchener</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postal Code: N2H2X1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Province: Ontario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone Number: 519-745-3540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:andrewh@dsh.ca">andrewh@dsh.ca</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part D – Scope of work:

A. Select which types(s) of work apply in the boxes below:

✔ Alteration (including landscape alterations and signage)
✔ Demolition (partial or full)
✔ New Construction or Addition
☐ Relocation

B. Clearly describe all the changes you are undertaking to the property and which heritage features will be impacted. Attach additional pages if needed.

Please see option 5 as noted in the attached ARA Heritage Report 09/25/2023 and supporting Structural Engineering Report as provided by Centric Engineering 2022-11-11

The full removal of the garage and summer kitchen to be replaced with new buildings of the same size (footprint), shape (height) and form (overall massing).
The proposed new structure will have a 6/12 roof pitch to be clad in asphalt shingles with a prefinished aluminum eavestrough, fascia and soffit, prefinished aluminum clad frieze trim, pre-finished white horizontal wood siding, 4” prefinished corner/window trim, finished grade, concrete foundation and concrete footing below grade.
The garage will have French doors and a single rectangular window on the north elevation.
All openings on the east elevation are proposed to be closed in.
The south elevation of the garage portion is proposed to include two rectangular windows, rhythmically placed, along the first storey and one single rectangular window in the upper storey.

Part E – List of supporting documentation:

Check all that apply:

✔ Photographs (existing and historical)
✔ Plans, Drawings, and Sample Materials
✔ Historical Documentation
✔ Contractor Quotes
✔ Heritage Impact Assessment or Conservation Plan

☐ Documentation for Building Code or Planning Act applications (Pre-Consultation, Site Plan, Minor Variance, Consent, Zoning By-law Amendment, Official Plan Amendment, etc)
Part F – Declaration

Check the appropriate statement:

☒ I, the Applicant, am the sole owner of the property for which this application is made.

☐ I, the Applicant, am one of the owners of this property and have received express authorization from all other property owners to make this application for alteration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Carlos Moura</th>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>2023-10-18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Signature:</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Site Review Report

Centric Engineering Corporation (CEC) was retained by Chrisview Custom Homes LTD. to perform a visual site review in regards to the existing exposed structural elements of the structure referenced above. CEC was not retained to perform any design work relating to any new structure or required structural remediation/reinforcing as a result of the new intended loading or use of the existing structure.

As requested, we conducted our site review on the morning of October 27th, 2022 at 9:00am.

In accordance with the scope of work, no physical or intrusive testing was undertaken to determine the condition of the existing structure. The recommendations of this report were based on the visual examination of the existing structure exposed to view. CEC attempted to identify any deficiencies with the existing structure for the purpose of this report, however, in accordance with standard engineering practice, CEC shall not be responsible for conditions arising from deficiencies not noted.

CEC shall not be responsible for conditions arising from information not provided or fully disclosed to CEC at the time of the review.

This report was prepared by CEC for the exclusive use of our client, in evaluating the structural adequacy of the existing structure. This assessment was conducted in accordance with the scope of work, direction provided by the client, and generally accepted structural assessment practices. No other warranty, expressed or implied is made. CEC shall not be responsible for use of, reliance on, or decisions or actions made on this report by any third party.

Observations and Comments:

1. The roof framing was constructed using 2¾”x3½” rafters with spacing ranging from 30” o/c to 44” o/c. The typical rafters are in line with each other on opposite sides of the ridge with no ridge board or beam. These rafters appear to be undersized based on the requirements of the 2012 Ontario Building Code (OBC). Refer to Figure 01.01.
2. Holes were observed drilled through the undersized roof rafters to allow for wiring pass-through. Refer to Figure 01.02.
3. The roof framing was sheathed with rough wood boards. The boards appeared to have water damage in various locations. The board thickness appeared undersized to span between roof rafters based on the requirements of the 2012 OBC. Additional layers of roof sheathing were visible over the boards, but the total roof assembly was not able to be determined. Refer to Figure 01.03.
4. The primary structural system for the building appeared to be post-and-beam type construction. Significant notches and checks were observed in all visible structural beams and posts. Refer to Figure 01.04 & Figure 01.05.
5. Where multiple beams share a support at the roof level, the beams were notched to share bearing on the post. Cuts in the wood members appeared to extend further into the member at the notches locations (over-cut) which will further reduce the shear capacity of the member at these points. Refer to Figure 01.06.

6. The floor framing was constructed using 3"x6" joists spaced at 22” o/c. These joists are undersized based on the requirements of the 2012 Ontario Building Code (OBC).

7. The floor joist framing was notched at the ends to allow for connection into the supporting beams. Refer to Figure 01.07.

8. The primary beams spanning front-to-rear and left-to-right supporting the floor framing at the stair opening have notches in several locations. Where the front-to-rear beam ties into the beam spanning left-to-right, both beams have approximately half of their cross sectional depth notched out to allow for the connection. Refer to Figure 01.08.

9. In various locations, water damage was observed in main structural post and beam members. Refer to Figure 01.09.

10. In one location, a main structural post was found to be overhanging the concrete foundation. Refer to Figure 01.10.

11. Wood members are in direct contact with the concrete foundation. The 2012 OBC requires wood members that are not pressure-treated to be separated from the concrete with a protective film/barrier.

12. The connection for the wood-framed addition to the heritage stone building was not visible. CEC was not able to confirm that the beams bearing in this location are adequately supported.

13. The foundation for the structure was found to be a concrete slab on grade varying from 12” thick to 24” thick. Refer to Figure 01.11.

14. The slab on grade foundation did not show signs of any frost protection measures. The 2012 OBC would not permit a slab on grade foundation for a building with these characteristics supported on undefined soils.

15. The slab on grade foundation did not show any signs of additional provisions for footing supports below the main structural posts.

16. The slab on grade foundation showed a full-depth crack at the front left corner of the building. The foundation appears to have displaced slightly at the crack location. Refer to Figure 01.12.

17. The slab on grade foundation showed a full-depth crack at the rear middle of the building. Refer to Figure 01.13.

18. The exterior cladding for the building showed signs of water damage and deterioration. Figure 01.14.

19. Due to the extensive issues noted in the wood framed structure above the foundation level, it may be unfeasible to underpin the foundation to provide frost protection without causing further damage to the wood frame.

20. In its current condition, the building does not appear to be suitable to be used for residential or commercial occupancies. The structural wood frame is appears to be compromised in several areas due to notched framing members, water damage, and potentially undersized framing members. The slab-on-grade foundation system does not appear to be adequate for a building of this type. If the building is finished, the lack of frost protection for the foundation makes it possible for the building to move due to frost heave and damage interior and exterior finishes.
Attachments/Pictures:
Refer to Appendix A.

Copies to:
Corey Wehrle - Orchard Design Studio

End of Site Review Report SR-01

Centric Engineering Corporation
Edward Gomez, P.Eng.

Centric Engineering Corporation
Mazen Jaber, M.Eng., EIT
Appendix A

Figure 01.01: Roof Rafter Framing

Figure 01.02: Hole Through Roof Rafter

Figure 01.03: Roof Sheathing

Figure 01.04: Notched Beam at Roof Level

Figure 01.05: Notched Post at Roof Level

Figure 01.06: Notched Beams at Shared Support
BY-LAW NO. 55-16

of the

CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF CAMBRIDGE

Being a by-law of the Corporation of the City of Cambridge to designate the exterior of the structure located at 415 Water Street South as a property of cultural heritage significance.

WHEREAS the Ontario Heritage Act, R.S.O. 2005 Chapter 0.18 authorizes the Council of a municipality to enact by-laws to designate real property including all buildings and structures thereon, to be of cultural value or interest;

AND WHEREAS Notice of Intention to Designate 415 Water Street South, Cambridge, Ontario, have been duly published and served;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Corporation of the City of Cambridge enacts as follows:

1. THAT there is designated, as being of cultural heritage significance, the exterior of the structure located on the real property, more particularly described in Schedule “A” attached hereto, known as 415 Water Street South, 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 Trust and to cause notice of this by-law to be published in a newspaper having general circulation in the City of Cambridge.

3. THAT it is Acknowledged and Directed that the office of the City Solicitor, or his/her designate, be authorized to register electronically any and all documents in connection with this transaction.

Read a First, Second and Third time

Enacted and passed this 15th day of March, 2016

CERTIFIED TRUE COPY

MAYOR

CLERK

CITY OF CAMBRIDGE
BY-LAW NO. 55-16

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 Galt) being comprised of PLAN 58M477 BLK 31 IRREG 46739.27SF 130.71FR D.
SCHEDULE “B”
TO BY-LAW NO. 55-16

of the

CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF CAMBRIDGE

The subject property, municipally known as 415 Water Street South, was designated because of its cultural heritage significance.

Description of Property

The subject property is a one and a half storey rough-cut limestone and lime mortar farmhouse located on a rise of a hill facing north on Water Street South. The property also has a summer kitchen addition and garage.

Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest

This residence was constructed c. 1841 of limestone in the Georgian style, which was a common farmhouse style between 1830 and 1870 in Ontario. True to its architecture style, this residence is a one and a half storey, five bay design with gabled ends and a chimney at either end. The covered porch on the east elevation was the original summer kitchen while the vinyl clad garage is believed to be the original heavy timber-framed dwelling which pre-dates the limestone farmhouse. The garage structure and farmhouse were constructed for David Potter who acquired the property from William Dickson in 1831 for $115. The property remained in the Potter family until 1924. In 1945, Raymond Munro Myers, the Member of Provincial Parliament for South Waterloo from 1951 – 1963, acquired the property and remained here until his death in 1980.

Description of Heritage Attributes

The key exterior attributes which characterize the cultural heritage value of the property at 415 Water Street South are the:

- location looking north on Water Street South;
- rough cut limestone and lime mortar construction;
- five bay façade on the south (rear) elevation;
- door, transom and fanlight on the south (rear) elevation;
- 6 over 6 wood windows and storms on all elevations;
- window keystones and sills on all elevations;
- dormers on the south (rear) and north (front) elevations;
- two limestone chimneys, including the protrusion on the east elevation;
- vestibule on the north (front) elevation
- summer kitchen on the east elevation
- garage on the east elevation; and
- size, shape and form of the entire structure, including additions.
To: Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee

Meeting Date: 11/16/2023

Report Title: 23-025(MHAC) - Recommendation to Designate the Property Located at 120 Shade Street and 40 Marion Way (Soper Park) under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act

Report Author: Laura Waldie, Senior Planner-Heritage

Department Approval: Joan Jylanne, Manager of Policy Planning

Department: Community Development

Division: Policy Planning

Report No.: 23-025 (MHAC)

File No.: R01.01.150

Ward: Ward 4

RECOMMENDATION(S):

THAT Report 23-025(MHAC) - Recommendation to Designate the Property located at 120 Shade Street and 40 Marion Way (Soper Park) under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act – be received;

AND THAT the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC) advise that Council approve the recommendation to designate the property municipally known as 120 Shade Street and 40 Marion Way (Soper Park) under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act;

AND FURTHER THAT the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC) recommend to Council that the Clerk be authorized to publish a Notice of Intention to Designate (NOID) for the property municipally known as 120 Shade Street and 40 Marion Way (Soper Park) in accordance with Section 29 of the Ontario Heritage Act for its cultural heritage value.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

Purpose

This report has been prepared to provide a recommendation to the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC) in support of the designation of the property municipally known as 120 Shade Street and 40 Marion Way under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act.
Key Findings

- In 2021, Ward 4 Councillor, Jan Liggett (now Mayor Jan Liggett), requested that staff undertake an evaluation of Soper Park to determine its eligibility for designation under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act.
- The property is not currently on the Heritage Register.
- Heritage Planning staff have determined the property contains sufficient cultural heritage value to warrant designation under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act, satisfying several criteria under Ontario Regulation 9/06 (amended by 569/22).

Financial Implications

There is no cost to property owners associated with designating a property in Cambridge. The City does provide and pay for the installation of a heritage landmark plaque at a cost of approximately $500. The City also pays to register the bylaw on title to the property, which costs approximately $75. As the property is municipally owned, the City is not eligible to apply for a Designated Heritage Property Grant.

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 at 120 Shade Street and 40 Marion Way in Cambridge, Ontario (legal description is Plan D8 LOT 62 City of Cambridge). The property begins on the south side of Dundas Street and beside the Galt Arena on Shade Street. It extends across to the north side Dundas Street, where the address changes to Marion Way, and ending at Elgin Street to the north (Figure 1). The property lies east of the Grand River.
Soper Park is one of the oldest parks in Cambridge. The property currently is not on the Heritage Register. In 2021, Ward 4 Councillor Jan Liggett (now Mayor as of 2022) requested that heritage planning staff conduct an analysis of Soper Park under O. Reg.
9/06 (as amended by O. Reg 569/22) to determine its eligibility for designation under part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act.

ANALYSIS:

In 1833, Andrew and Janet Jackson and their two toddler children, Agnes and William, packed up what belongings they could carry and left Paisley, Scotland for a new life in Upper Canada. In the first two decades after the end of the War of 1812, the governments of Upper and Lower Canada embarked on a campaign to improve the infrastructure along the lands bordered with the US to facilitate an increase in emigration from Great Britain. Promises of land grants and new infrastructure assisted to populate the borderlands in an attempt to negate the chances of an American attack on Canada, which was a constant fear of the governments of Upper and Lower Canada until the beginning of the American Civil War in 1861. This fear of invasion from the US was one of the factors that led to the unification of the Canadas in 1840 and the eventual Confederation of Canada in 1867.

The Jacksons arrived in Galt in about 1834 and took possession of land along the Macadamied Road (now called Dundas Street) in what is now East Galt. The Jacksons farmed the land which included a dairy. In 1860, Andrew Jackson passed away at the age of 58, followed a few short months later by Janet at the age of 60. The farm was now the responsibility of their son William, who continued to run the dairy farm into the early 20th century.

In 1899, the Town of Galt was looking to create a park that would include an area for swimming. Therefore, the best place to create that park would be along side a natural water course. The Mill Creek area in East Galt was one of the areas the Town Council had listed as a potential park site. But before that could happen, the Town needed to secure the land. The Town officials approached William Jackson about purchasing some of his acreage to create the park. On June 2, 1902, the citizens voted in favour of the Town spending $1,600 (the equivalent of about $52,500 in 2023) to purchase 10 acres of land from Jackson on the south side of Dundas Street to create the park. In appreciation of Jackson selling the Town his land for less than the going rate per acre, the park would be named Jackson Park.

On January 9, 1903, William Jackson’s wife of 45 years, Helen, died at the age of 65. Despite William and Helen having 15 children, only two daughters and one son lived past the age of 30. Son Robert Jackson became a machinist in Kitchener and did not take over the farmstead. Therefore, after farming alone for several months after Helen’s passing, William approached the Town and offered them first rights to purchase his remaining 42 acres as he was looking to retire. The Town agreed, though it is unknown whether there was another vote regarding the purchase or what the offer price was.
Jackson Park was then increased to take in Jackson’s lands on the north side of Dundas to Elgin Street.

Jackson left his dairy farm and retired to Kitchener to live with his son Robert. William Jackson passed away on July 31, 1921 in Kitchener at the age of 92. He was buried three days later at Mountview Cemetery in Galt.

In 1905, the Galt Parks Commission was formed, and Jackson Park was one of the first Town assets it acquired. Prior to the lands on the north side of Dundas being acquired by the Town, Jackson allowed the lands to be used by travelling circuses that usually came to the area every summer. The land was low lying with rocky soil solid enough to support the circus’ various tents and Mill Creek provided ample water for the circus animals. However, the Town wanted to make improvements to the land to provide the best experience for its residents and visitors. In the spring of 1905, the Parks Commission retained landscape architect Frederick Todd to turn the farmland into a park oasis.

Originally from Concord, New Hampshire and educated in landscape architecture at Amherst College, Massachusetts, Todd relocated to Canada in 1900 where he became renowned as Canada’s first landscape architect with projects completed from British Columbia to Newfoundland. Todd’s recommendations for Jackson Park included keeping the park as natural as possible in most areas by planting numerous native species trees and shrubs. Todd also recommended that flower beds not be planted as they needed to be maintained from year to year whereas trees and shrubs required less maintenance. However, for the north end of the park, Todd recommended against naturalization. The north end near Elgin Street was swampy and was not an inviting area for walks. Here, Todd recommended that the creek channels be deepened and reinforced with boulders. Two pavilions and a system of carriage driveways and walkways through the park were also planned as part of Todd’s improvements. One of the pavilions was to be erected near the entrance to the park at Shade St. while the other was to be built in the north part of the park on the terrace overlooking the Mill Creek pond. The Shade Street pavilion was built, however available research at the City Archives suggests that the north pavilion was never constructed. The Shade Street pavilion disappeared by the 1960s.

Todd’s plans also discussed the need to address the conservation of the stone bridge over Mill Creek. Todd describes this stone bridge in his recommendation report as one of the most artistic and picturesque bridges he had ever seen in Canada. He said conservation efforts should be carefully undertaken on the bridge and should be done before other park work commenced. The construction date of the stone bridge over Mill Creek (Figure 2) is not known for certain. It shows up on the maps of Galt as early as
1851. There is also a smaller stone bridge a few metres east of the Mill Creek bridge that appears to be as old (Figure 3).

Figure 2: Stone arch over the Mill Creek  
Figure 3: Small stone arch beneath Dundas Street

It is feasible to assume that both bridges existed in the mid-1830's when the macadamized toll-road from Dundas to Waterloo County was built by provincial authorities in 1837 (Figure 4). However, they may have existed earlier as there was a dirt road here prior to this. James Young, in his "Reminiscences of Early Galt" mentions the burial of four men killed in the cholera epidemic "in one grave near the eastern end of the stone bridge on the macadamized road (Dundas St.)". The cholera outbreak occurred in Galt in 1834. Young did not mention which bridge he was referring to, but Heritage Planning staff are of the opinion the graves would have been placed near the
smaller of the two tunnels because the Mill Creek was a wider watercourse in the early 19th century than it appears today, making burials beside the tunnel difficult if not impossible to do.

Figure 4. Close up of Soper Park lands from the 1867 Map of Galt. A denotes the location of the stone arch over Mill Creek whereas B represents the location of the small stone arch. The Mill Creek and a foot path are both shown running beneath Dundas Street.
The Town of Galt began to enact some of Todd's recommendations by the spring of 1906, which included a substantial tree planting program through the north side of the park. An economic downturn in Canada in the early 1910s, the onset of the Great War, the Spanish Flu epidemic of 1918-19 and a lack of funding to continue with Todd's recommendations, stalled the park transformation plans for several years. Some of Galt's citizens were growing increasingly upset with Town officials for having spent money to purchase the land and hiring Todd, but showing no progress in transforming the farmland into a park. One resident, Dr. Augustus Soper, a physician who lived across from Jackson Park where the Gore Mutual Building is now located, would write regular opinion letters to the Galt Reporter newspaper complaining that “members of the Parks Board are too much engrossed with their private affairs to talk the Jackson Park matter over.” Soper went on to propose a challenge to Town officials as well as citizens in the October 1, 1920 edition of the Galt Reporter: “If the citizens of Galt will contribute $40,000, I will donate $10,000…The $40,000 may be raised by subscription, in sums of $5.00 up; or by debentures; it matters not to the writer, providing it is raised this year.” The Town of Galt took Soper up on his offer and also accepted his proposal to scrap Frederick Todd’s recommendations and reinforce the Mill Creek sides with armour stone, add flower gardens including a peony garden and formal walking paths through the park. Soper also recommended keeping the ship anchor that was located in the park at this time. The anchor has rested in the same location since at least the creation of the park in 1904 (Figure 5).

![Figure 5: The anchor located in Jackson Park c. 1920](image)
There is no known recorded history of the anchor located in the park. It is not known if it was relocated there right after the park was created or if it had existed prior to Jackson selling the land to the Town of Galt. It seems unlikely that Jackson would have placed it here. The likely scenario is that it was placed here as an object of interest for park visitors. Ship anchors were common features in private gardens of the 19th century as well as in some parks that had a connection to shipping. It is possible that someone donated the object to the Town to display in Jackson Park.

For Soper's donation, the park was renamed Soper Park in December 1920 (Figure 6). Additionally, the road that went through the park from Dundas to Elgin, was named Marion Way in honour of Soper's wife. Soper went on to promote the importance of visiting parks for exercise to his patients, especially children, whom he believed needed a clean air space with many lawns and walking paths to play upon.

![Figure 6: Historic Photo of Dr. Augustus Soper c. 1880](image)
He and Marion continued to live across from the park for a few more years. Marion was the daughter of Galt pioneer Henry McCrum. McCrum, as a wedding gift to Marion and Augustus Soper, built a house for the couple on land he owned across from the Jackson farm in 1873. The Sopers lived here until Marion’s passing in 1925. The Sopers had one daughter, Ida. Ida and her husband, Cecil Simpson, moved in with Soper after Marion’s passing. Soper passed away in October 1928. The Simpsons continued to live here until they sold the property to the Gore Mutual Fire Insurance Company in 1934. The Soper house was demolished shortly after, and the current Gore Mutual building began construction in 1935 and was completed in early 1936.

Several improvements were made over the years to Soper Park including the addition of splash pads and swimming areas in Mill Creek. The most extensive improvements to the park since 1920 took place in 1994. The park was returned to a more naturalized state with the removal of the armour stone blocks along the creek’s edge, extension of the walking paths, more tree plantings, the removal of the peony gardens and a reconfiguration of the entrance off Dundas onto Marion Way. From 2020-2022, Dundas Street underwent a road reconstruction project that had the infrastructure replaced and a new turn left lane added in front of the park.

**Evaluation of the Property under Ontario Regulation 9/06 (as amended by 569/22)**

Heritage Planning staff are of the opinion that the property warrants designation based on it satisfying eight (8) of the nine (9) criteria contained in Ontario Regulation 9/06 (as amended by 569/22). According to a suite of changes introduced to the Ontario Heritage Act through the More Homes Built Faster Act, 2022, properties must meet at least two (2) of nine (9) criteria under Ontario Regulation 9/06 (amended by 569/22) to be considered for designation.

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.**

   **YES** – The park dates to 1905 and its naturalization improvements undertaken in 1993 returned the park back to the vision Frederick Todd and the Town of Galt envisioned for the park. Marion Way, and the walking paths have changed little since the 1920s.

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

   **YES** – The property contains two picturesque stone arches underneath Dundas Street which display a high degree of craftsmanship and artistic merit and are considered unusual, rare and outstanding from this period.
4. The property has historical value or associative value because it has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization or institution that is significant to a community.

YES – The property is associated with important local figures including William Jackson, Frederick Todd and Dr. Augustus Soper. The grounds are indicative of the agricultural roots of Cambridge which make it an important cultural heritage resource to the community.

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

YES – The property documents well in local historical sources about how the park developed in the 1920s. This information leads to a greater understanding of the community.

6. The property has historical value 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.

YES – The property is known for its design elements associated with Canada’s first landscape architect, Frederick G. Todd.

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

YES – The property maintains and supports the parklike character of the area since 1905.

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

YES – The property is visually and historically linked to its surroundings by being a park property.

9. The property has contextual value because it is a landmark.

YES – The property terminates views from Shade Street, Elgin Street and Marion Way and is considered to be known to the community as an important landmark.

Cultural Heritage Attributes

The following is a sample of the key heritage attributes that embody the heritage value of Soper Park. The full list is found in Appendix 1.
• Original stone pillars and date plaques located at the entrance to Marion Way off Dundas Street;
• Width, length and direction of Marion Way;
• Paved pathways throughout the park;
• Both original stone bridges under Dundas Street;
• The ship anchor located in the park; and
• The association to William Jackson, Frederick Todd and Dr. Augustus Soper.

EXISTING POLICY / BY-LAW(S):

Section 29. (1) of the Ontario Heritage Act provides municipalities in Ontario the ability to designate individual properties shown to have cultural heritage value to the community.

Section 4.6.1 of the Cambridge Official Plan (OP) also states that the City will pass bylaws to designate properties of cultural heritage value.

FINANCIAL IMPACT:

There is no cost to property owners associated with designating a property in Cambridge. The City does provide and pay for the installation of a heritage landmark plaque at a cost of approximately $500. The City also pays to register the bylaw on title to the property, which costs approximately $75. As the property is municipally owned, the City is not eligible to apply for a Designated Heritage Property Grant.

PUBLIC VALUE:

Transparency:

The MHAC agenda is posted on the City’s website as part of the reporting process.

PUBLIC INPUT:

Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee meetings are open to the public.

INTERNAL / EXTERNAL CONSULTATION:

Heritage Planning staff has liaised with the property owner and with the City of Cambridge Archives.

CONCLUSION:

Based on the findings noted above, the subject property meets more than two (2) criteria under Ontario Regulation 569/22, staff are of the opinion that the property contains sufficient cultural heritage value to merit designation under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act. As such, staff recommend that the MHAC support the recommendation to designate the subject property and request that Council direct the
City Clerk to publish a Notice of Intention to Designate for the property at 120 Shade Street and 40 Marion Way in accordance with Section 29 of the Ontario Heritage 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 Departmental Manager.

ATTACHMENTS:
1. 23-025(MHAC) Appendix 1 – Statement of Cultural Heritage Value
STATEMENT OF CULTURAL HERITAGE VALUE

120 Shade Street and 40 Marion Way Property Description

The subject property is located at 120 Shade Street and 40 Marion Way in Cambridge, Ontario (legal description is Plan D8 LOT 62 City of Cambridge).

Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest

Soper Park is approximately 52 acres in size and is one of the oldest parks in not just Cambridge, but in the Region of Waterloo. The land was acquired by the Town of Galt who purchased 52 acres of land from dairy farmer, William Jackson. In his honour, the new park was named Jackson Park in 1904. In late 1904, the Town of Galt hired Frederick Todd, Canada’s first landscape architect, to submit a design to transform the farmland into a proper park. Several delays including the Great War and a lack of funding available to undertake Todd’s recommendations, stalled the project completely by 1918. In 1920, Dr. Augustus Soper, who lived adjacent to the Park on Dundas Street gave the Town of Galt $10,000 toward the refurbishment of the Park. In honour of his donation, the park was renamed Soper Park in early 1921.

Description of Heritage Attributes

Key heritage attributes that embody the historic value of Soper Park include:

- The connection to East Galt dairy farmer, William Jackson, who sold the Town of Galt 52 acres in total between 1901 and 1903 to create Jackson Park;
- The connection to Dr. Augustus Soper, who provided the Town of Galt with $10,000 to refurbish the park in 1919 whereby the park was renamed in his honour;
- The connection to famed Canadian landscape architect Frederick G. Todd, whose partial recommendations were adopted in 1920 for refurbishing Soper Park; and
- For being one of Cambridge’s oldest public parks.

Key heritage attributes that embody the architectural value of Soper Park include:

- The design, width, length and height of the large stone bridge arch over the Mill Creek beneath Dundas Street, and including the Mill Creek on either side of the arch;
- The design, width, length and height of the small stone bridge arch beneath Dundas Street east of the Mill Creek stone bridge arch and including the pathway on either side of the arch;
• The size, shape, materials and placement of the ship anchor near the parking lot off Marion Way.
• The size, shape and design of the four stone and mortar pillars with their date/name plaques located at the entrance to the park at Marion Way off Dundas Street;
• The width, length, design and materials of Marion Way from Dundas Street to Elgin Street; and
• The length, undulation and curvature of the walking paths throughout the park.

Key heritage attributes that embody the contextual value of Soper Park include:

• The views and vistas of the park from the bridge on Dundas Street;
• The views and vistas of the park terminating at Shade Street beside the Galt Arena;
• The views and vistas of the park from Elgin Street; and
• The views and vistas of the park from the Gore Mutual Building at 252 Dundas Street.
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RECOMMENDATION(S):  
THAT Report 23-027(MHAC) - Recommendation to Designate the Property located at 704 Eagle Street North under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act – be received;  
AND THAT the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC) advise that Council approve the recommendation to designate only the original Pattinson House at the property municipally known as 704 Eagle Street North under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act;  
AND FURTHER THAT the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC) recommend to Council that the Clerk be authorized to publish a Notice of Intention to Designate (NOID) only the original Pattinson House at the property municipally known as 704 Eagle Street North in accordance with Section 29 of the Ontario Heritage Act for its cultural heritage value.  
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:  
Purpose  
This report has been prepared to provide a recommendation to the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC) in support of the designation of only the original Pattinson House on the property municipally known as 704 Queen Street North under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act.
Key Findings

- In May, 2023, the property owner through their agent, WSP, contacted the City about the process for demolishing the buildings on site, including the Pattison House, and rebuilding a new nursing home and long-term care facility.
- The property is listed on the Heritage Register.
- Heritage Planning staff have determined the original Pattinson house contains sufficient cultural heritage value to warrant designation under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act, satisfying several criteria under Ontario Regulation 9/06 (as amended by 569/22).

Financial Implications

There is no cost to property owners associated with designating a property in Cambridge. The City does provide and pay for the installation of a heritage landmark plaque at a cost of approximately $500. The City also pays to register the bylaw on title to the property, which costs approximately $75.

The property owner of 704 Eagle Street North will be able to apply for a Designated Heritage Property Grant to support the costs of maintaining the heritage attributes of the property.

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 on the north side of 704 Eagle Street North in the Preston area of Cambridge, Ontario (legal description is CON BEASLEY'S BROKEN FRONT PT; LOTS 1 & 2 PLAN 716 PT LOTS; 247 & 248 City of Cambridge). The property is zoned Institutional and is adjacent to the Preston Town Centre Community Core Area and Natural Open Space System designations. The land is also within the Preston Regeneration Area.

The first building to have been constructed on this site was the original two storey brick house built for Frank Pattinson, owner of the Pattinson Woolen Mills, and his family in...
1924. Pattinson’s widow, Jennie, sold the property shortly after Frank passed away in 1963 to Kenneth and Beryl Langford, who operated Golden Years Nursing Home on Kitchener Road in Preston. They were looking for a larger building to house their patients. Golden Years has been operating here since 1963 and they are looking to increase their number of licensed care beds on this site.

Figure 1 - Location Map of 704 Eagle St N

ANALYSIS:

The original two storey brick former residence is connected to the Pattinson Woolen Mill site located at 498 Eagle Street North. George Pattinson started working at the mill when he was 16. By 1875, when he was 21, he became a part owner of the property. In
1896, with the passing of the last business partner, Pattinson became the sole owner of the milling operation.

George expanded the woolen operation at the mill after 1896 and by 1908, the mill reached its peak with 200 employees as one of Canada’s largest producers of wool garments and other wool products. Pattinson was able to secure federal contracts, particularly with the Ministry of Defense to produce woolen uniform coats and ration kit blankets for soldiers of the Boer War (1899-1902) and the Great War (1914-1918).

George’s residence was located at 600 Eagle Street North, which was named Joseph Street at the time (Figure 2).

Figure 2: Demolition Underway of 600 Eagle Street North, 1960. City of Cambridge

The former Pattinson residence had fallen into disrepair after the death of George in 1931. The house was a grand buff brick residence with a large brick columned front porch, bay windows, round moulded arch windows, detailed dentils along the second story frieze and a cantilevered wall on the structure’s east side. The house was demolished in 1960.

Frank Hedley Pattinson took over the Pattinson Woolen Mills business in 1933 after settling his father’s estate.
Frank and his wife Jennie had two children Mary and Alice. After Alice’s birth, Frank began construction of a new home in 1924 at what is now 704 Eagle Street North. George Pattinson was still living in the home at 600 Eagle Street North, which facilitated the need for Frank and his family to construct a new home. The house Frank constructed is a red brick vernacular structure that has some Flemish style influences as seen in the Flemish bond brick patterning, the tall front gabled ends on the south and east facing façades as well as the box bay windows at the southwest corner of the house with the six over six segmented windowpanes on the first floor. It is not known for certain why the house displays Flemish influences. However, it is interesting to note that Frank’s older bother, John Lynn Pattinson, was killed in the trenches at Flanders, Belgium in 1915 while serving with the Canadian Expeditionary Force during the First World War.

Frank continued to operate the business until the mill ceased operations and closed its doors in 1958. Frank moved the business overseas because the cost of producing woolen garments was becoming increasingly cheaper to produce offshore. His health was beginning to decline and he was no longer able to keep up with the day to day operations of the business.

Jennie cared for Frank in the home where he was confined to bed for the last few years of his life. Frank passed away at the age of 77 at home on July 19, 1963. The house had become a financial burden to keep up in the years since Frank was forced to sell
the mill property in 1958. Jennie was unable to maintain the home on her own, so she placed the home up for sale. On August 13, Jennie began the process of transferring the property to new purchasers, Kenneth and Beryl Langford. This transaction was completed by December 6, 1963 to the sum of $59,000 for the property.

The Langfords emigrated to Canada from England in the 1950s where Beryl was a nurse in long term care facilities. Upon arriving in Ontario, they operated a couple of different nursing homes in Preston. In 1963, they were looking to relocate a nursing home facility they owned on Kitchener Road called Golden Years Nursing Home because they needed more room. The Pattinson House at 704 Eagle Street North had the room to take on more residents. As more demand for nursing and long term care increased in Cambridge, Golden Years had several wings and additions built onto the Pattinson House starting in 1970 to the 1990s. According to the Ministry of Health and Long Term Care’s information page about Golden Years Nursing Home, the current facility houses 88 licensed beds and as of August 31, 2023, there are 112 individuals on the waiting list waiting to receive care.

In March 2023, WSP who is the agent for the current property owners, contacted the City enquiring about the process to apply for the demolition of all structures, including the Pattinson House, in order to build a newer facility that would meet current Building Code requirements for mobility aids such as wheelchairs, walkers and newer hospital beds. As of the writing of this report, no application to demolish the structures nor an application to redevelop the property has been submitted to the City.

The state of long term care and senior citizen care is in crisis in Ontario. More facilities are required to meet the rising demand of both independent and assisted living for seniors in all areas of Ontario. The provincial government, in encouraging municipalities to increase long term care housing, has been awarding grants to property owners to either increase the number of current facility beds or to build new facilities. Heritage Planning staff want to strike a balance between increasing long term care beds in Cambridge with conserving its built cultural heritage assets. Therefore, Heritage Planning staff are recommending that only the original 1924 red brick Pattinson house be designated under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act and that the remaining additions dating back to the mid 1960s and later, be permitted to be demolished to facilitate the construction of modern additions to suit the future needs of long term care in Cambridge.

**Evaluation under Ontario Regulation 9/06 (as amended by 569/22)**

Heritage Planning staff are of the opinion that the property warrants designation based on a determination that the property satisfies seven (7) of the nine (9) criteria contained in Ontario Regulation 9/06 (as amended by 569/22). According to legislative changes
introduced to the Ontario Heritage Act through the More Homes Built Faster Act, 2022, properties must meet at least two (2) of nine (9) criteria under Ontario Regulation 9/06 (amended by 569/22) to be considered for designation under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act.

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.

   YES – The subject property contains physical and design value as a representative example of a vernacular heritage residence with Flemish architectural influences, which is a rare commodity in Cambridge.

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

   YES – The property does display a high degree of craftsmanship and artistic merit because Flemish influenced features are considered to be unusual or outstanding during the 1920s.

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

   YES – The subject property is associated with several well-known individuals who have been influential in the industrial development of the region and the City of Cambridge, namely the Pattinson and Langford families. The home is also associated with the development of nursing home care in Cambridge. There have only been three owners of the property: Frank and Jennie Pattinson and Golden Years Nursing Home with various members of the Langford family.

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

   YES – The property is well known to the residents of Preston although it has limited known historical resources. Prior to this cultural heritage evaluation, a comprehensive historical assessment of the property has not taken place. This evaluation has compiled historical and archival sources to document the historical evolution of the site and the various owners and their connections to the community. Further study could yield additional information that could lead to a greater understanding of Preston, including the role and identities of those who worked in the home as long term care health providers.
5. The property has contextual value because it is important in defining, maintaining, or supporting the character of an area.

YES – The property maintains and supports the character of the area, having been the location of a nursing and long term care home for many decades. The original home builder, Frank Pattinson, received long term and hospice care in the home before his death, and his estate sold the home to a nursing homeowner who expanded her business here which continues to operate and is still owned by the same family.

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

YES – The property is historically linked to its surroundings, with the original structure being built in 1924 and expanded upon since 1965. The property’s current character maintains these historical linkages.

7. The property has contextual value because it is a landmark.

YES – Because the house and property has been home to several generations of Preston residents since 1924, and especially after 1963, the property has contextual value because many residents of Preston see it as a landmark and as part of their families’ histories.

EXISTING POLICY / BY-LAW(S):

Section 29. (1) of the Ontario Heritage Act provides municipalities in Ontario the ability to designate individual properties shown to have cultural heritage value to the community.

Section 4.6.1 of the Cambridge Official Plan (OP) also states that the City will pass by-laws to designate properties of cultural heritage value.

FINANCIAL IMPACT:

There is no cost to property owners associated with designating a property in Cambridge. The City does provide and pay for the installation of a heritage landmark plaque at a cost of approximately $500. The City also pays to register the bylaw on title to the property, which costs approximately $75.

The property owner of 704 Eagle Street North will be able to apply for a Designated Heritage Property Grant to support the costs of maintaining the heritage attributes of the property.
PUBLIC VALUE:

Transparency:
Posted publicly as part of the report process.

PUBLIC INPUT:

Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee Meetings are open to the public.

INTERNAL / EXTERNAL CONSULTATION:

Heritage Planning staff have liaised with development planning staff on the heritage status of the property and its eligibility for designation under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act. These comments have been circulated to the agent for the property owners.

CONCLUSION:

Based on the findings that the subject property meets more than two (2) criteria under Ontario Regulation 9/06 (as amended by 569/22), staff are of the opinion that the original brick two storey former Pattinson residence on the property contains sufficient cultural heritage value to merit designation under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act. As such, staff recommend that the MHAC support the recommendation to designate the subject property and request that Council direct the City Clerk to publish a Notice of Intention to Designate the brick structure at 704 Eagle Street North in accordance with Section 29 of the Ontario Heritage 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:

1. 23-027(MHAC) Appendix A – Statement of Cultural Heritage Value
STATEMENT OF CULTURAL HERITAGE VALUE

704 Eagle Street North Property Description

The subject property is located on the north side of 704 Eagle Street North in the Preston area of Cambridge, Ontario (legal description is CON BEASLEYS BROKEN FRONT PT; LOTS 1 & 2 PLAN 716 PT LOTS; 247 & 248 City of Cambridge).

Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest

The original two storey brick former residence is connected to the Pattinson Woolen Mill site located at 498 Eagle Street North. Frank Hedley Pattinson took over the Pattinson Woolen Mills business in 1933 after his father died two years prior.

Frank began construction of a new home in 1924 at what is now 704 Eagle Street North. The house has some Flemish architectural influences. It is not known for certain why the house displays Flemish influences. However, it is interesting to note that Frank’s older bother, John Lynn Pattinson, was killed in the trenches at Flanders, Belgium in 1915 while serving with the Canadian Expeditionary Force during the Great First World War.

Jennie cared for her husband Frank in the home where he was confined to bed for the last few years of his life. Frank passed away at the age of 77 at home on July 19, 1963. Jennie was unable to maintain the home on her own, so she placed the home up for sale. On August 13, Jennie began the process of transferring the property to new purchasers, Kenneth and Beryl Langford. This transaction was completed by December 6, 1963 to the sum of $59,000 for the property.

The Langfords were looking to relocate a nursing home facility they owned on Kitchener Road in Preston called Golden Years Nursing Home. The Pattinson House at 704 Eagle Street North had the room to take on more residents. As more demand for nursing and long-term care increased in Cambridge, Golden Years had several wings and additions built onto the Pattinson House from the 1960s to the 1990s. According to the Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care’s information page about Golden Years Nursing Home on August 31, 2023 the facility houses 88 licensed beds and there are 112 individuals on the waiting list waiting to receive care.

Description of Heritage Attributes

Key heritage attributes that embody the historic value of the original Pattinson house at 704 Eagle Street North include:
The connection to Frank and Jennie Pattinson, who had the house constructed in 1924;
The connection to Kenneth and Beryl Langford, who purchased the property in 1963 and moved their Golden Years Nursing Home to this location where it has remained at the time of designation;
For being one of Cambridge's longest running licensed nursing homes.

Key heritage attributes that embody the architectural value of the original Pattinson house at 704 Eagle Street North include:

- The design, width, length and height of the two-storey red brick structure;
- The Flemish bond brick pattern;
- The high front facing gables on all façades;
- The three original brick chimneys;
- The stone surrounds around each window on the original structure;
- The stone and brick constructed box bays on the second and first floors of the southwest side of the house; and
- The stone foundation.

Key heritage attributes that embody the contextual value of the original Pattinson house at 704 Eagle Street North include:

- The views and vistas of the original house to Eagle Street North.