Corporation of the City of Cambridge

Special Cambridge Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee Meeting Agenda

Meeting Number: 03-24

Date: April 4, 2024, at 7 p.m.

Location: Virtually via Zoom

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

Agenda Items:

1. 24-009 (MHAC) HIA for 82-88 Beverly Street

THAT Report 24-009 (MHAC) – Heritage Impact Assessment for Redevelopment of 82-88 Beverly Street be received;

AND THAT the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee receives the Heritage Impact Assessment prepared by MHBC Planning dated May 2023;

AND THAT the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee recommends that protective fencing be put up along the north side of the school along the driveway access and along the rear of 119 Wellington Street to protect those properties during the construction phase of the proposed townhouse development;

AND FURTHER THAT the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee recommends the submission of a vibration study for both the school at 82 Beverly Street and 119 Wellington Street, to the satisfaction of the Chief Planner, prior to construction should Council approve the development application.
2. 24-010 (MHAC) 84 Chalmers Street North, Heritage Impact Assessment  PP 060

THAT Report 24-010 (MHAC) 84 Chalmers Street North, Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) be received;

AND FURTHER THAT the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee support the contents and conclusions of the scoped HIA.

Close of Meeting

THAT the MHAC meeting does now adjourn at ______p.m.
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RECOMMENDATION(S):

THAT Report 24-009(MHAC) – Heritage Impact Assessment for Redevelopment of 82-88 Beverly Street be received;

AND THAT the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee receives the Heritage Impact Assessment prepared by MHBC Planning dated May 2023;

AND THAT the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee recommends that protective fencing be put up along the north side of the school along the driveway access and along the rear of 119 Wellington Street to protect those properties during the construction phase of the proposed townhouse development;

AND FURTHER THAT the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee recommends the submission of a vibration study for both the school at 82 Beverly Street and 119 Wellington Street, to the satisfaction of the Chief Planner, prior to construction should Council approve the development application.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

Purpose

This report has been prepared to consult with the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC) on a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) that was submitted to the City for review on a development application at 82-88 Beverly Street; a non-designated, listed property on the City’s Heritage Register (Figure 1).
Key Findings

- The proposed redevelopment will have no physical impact to the school and the school will remain and continue to be run as a school.
- The school property is listed on the City’s Heritage Register. City staff are working with the owner to have the school designated at a later date.
- Heritage Planning staff support the findings and recommendations in the HIA and are satisfied the proposed townhouse development will have no impacts on the adjacent school.

Figure 1: Map of 82-88 Beverly Street with listed and designated properties nearby
Financial Implications

The owner is responsible for the cost of any Council approved development on the site.

STRATEGIC ALIGNMENT:

☐ Strategic Action; or
☒ Core Service

Objective(s): Not Applicable

Strategic Action: Not Applicable

Program: Community Development

Core Service: Heritage Conservation

BACKGROUND:

Figure 2: The former St. Patrick’s School. The 1938 school is to the right with the 1950s addition on the left. (Ontario Muslim Academy)

The owner of the subject properties is proposing to develop a portion of the land with two blocks of three storey townhouses for a total of 48 units with a driveway/parking area. The plan is also to sever the balance of the property at 82 Beverly Street post development.

The school at 82 Beverly Street was first named St. Patrick’s Roman Catholic School and is believed to have been associated with St Patrick’s Church still located at 53 Wellington Street. St Patrick’s School was constructed in approximately 1938 from red
brick, with two additions added in 1950 and again in 1970 (Figure 2). The original designer of the 1938 portion of the school is unknown. The building is still used today as a school, most recently as an Islamic school known as the Ontario Muslim Academy.

**ANALYSIS:**

The subject lands are comprised of two abutting properties addressed as 82 and 88 Beverly Street in the former village of Galt. Both properties are owned by the Muslim school. The subject lands are east of the Kerr Street and Beverly Street intersection, on the north side of Beverly Street. The property at 88 Beverly Street is occupied with a detached dwelling with driveway access from Beverly Street. This dwelling is not on the City’s Heritage Register and is proposed for demolition to extend the driveway access into the development off Beverly Street.

The property at 82 Beverly Street contains the Muslim school, a parking area and open space. The Muslim school has two access points, one from Kerr Street and one from Wellington Street. Collectively 82 and 88 Beverly Street form the development site.

![Aerial picture of the location of the proposed development. A partial view of the school is located at the far top right side of the picture (Ontario Muslim Academy)](image-url)

**Figure 3** above shows the location on the lot where the proposed townhouse development will be situated. Once the development has been completed, the new development will be severed off 82 Beverly Street and a new lot and address will be created for the townhouse development.
Figures 4 and 5 below show where the development will be placed and what the proposed design of the townhouses may look like.

Figure 4: Location of the development on site (MHBC Planning)
The proposed townhouse development is appropriate in size for the neighbourhood, provides much needed housing for the community and preserves the use of the school by the community. The development is far away enough from the school that there will be no adverse physical impacts to the school. However, Heritage Planning staff agree with the recommendation in the HIA to have a vibration study submitted for the school as well as 119 Wellington Ave, which will abut the proposed townhouse development. Staff also recommend that protective fencing be erected to protect the school along the north side along the driveway access and at the rear of 119 Wellington Ave, to protect them during the construction phase.

Planning staff are working with the property owner on having the school designated under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act. A separate report addressing the designation will come to the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee in the future.

EXISTING POLICY / BY-LAW(S):

City of Cambridge Official Plan (2018)

4.10 Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment

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

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

The Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee must be consulted on the findings of the HIA before a development application can go forward to Council for consideration.

FINANCIAL IMPACT:

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

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 and are livestreamed to the City’s YouTube channel.

INTERNAL / EXTERNAL CONSULTATION:

Heritage planning staff liaised with development planning staff on the application. Development staff have been working directly with the property owner on the application, including any heritage items.

CONCLUSION:

For the reasons outlined in this report, heritage planning staff recommend that the MHAC accept the Heritage Impact Assessment for 82-88 Beverly Street and that the MHAC recommends the construction of protective fencing plus the submission of a vibration study for both the school at 82 Beverly Street and 119 Wellington Street, to the satisfaction of the Chief Planner, prior to construction should Council approve the development application.
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. 24-009(MHAC) Appendix A Heritage Impact Assessment prepared by MHBC Planning, May 2023
Heritage IMPACT ASSESSMENT

82-88 Beverly Street, Galt, City of Cambridge

Date: May 2023

Prepared for: Greentown Development Corp.

Prepared by: MacNaughton Hermsen Britton Clarkson Planning Limited (MHBC)

200-540 Bingemans Centre Drive
Kitchener, ON N2B 3X9
T: 519 576 3650
F: 519 576 0121

Our File: '16181 L'
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Acknowledgement

This Heritage Impact Assessment acknowledges that the property located at 82 Beverly Street, Cambridge, is situated within territory of the Haudenosaunee, Anishinabewaki, Attiwowonderonk (Neutral), Mississaugas of the Credit First Nation, Mississauga. These lands are acknowledged as being associated with the following treaties (accessed from www.native-land.ca):

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

MHBC Planning has been retained to complete a Heritage Impact Assessment for a proposed development located at 82-88 Beverly Street, Cambridge (subject lands). The owner of the subject lands is proposing to develop a portion of the lands with two blocks of townhouses and a driveway/parking area, and sever the balance of the property at 82 Beverly Street.

The property addressed as 82 Beverly Street is listed on the Municipal Heritage Register. Additional heritage resources surround the subject lands. During a pre-consultation meeting with the City, it was determined that a Heritage Impact Assessment would be required. The purpose of the Heritage Impact Assessment is to determine if the proposed development will result in adverse impacts to any of the heritage resources, and provide mitigation measures and recommendations, if necessary.

This report concludes that the proposed development will not negatively impact the subject property or any of the adjacent heritage properties. There is potential for impacts as a result of construction activities. As a precaution, it is recommended that a temporary protection fence be installed around the existing school building, as well as the rear property line of 119 Wellington Street. Additionally, it is recommended that a vibration monitoring plan be considered for 119 Wellington Street to avoid land disturbances associated with construction.
1.0 Introduction

The subject lands consist of two contiguous properties, being 82 and 88 Beverly Street. The owner is proposing to develop the entirety of 88 Beverly Street, and a portion of 82 Beverly Street, with the balance of the property at 82 Beverly Street (subject property) being severed.

The subject property is listed on the heritage register, and there are a number of listed and designated heritage properties adjacent to the subject property:

- 82 Beverly Street (listed)
- 58 Beverly Street (designated)
- 14 Kerr Street (listed)
- 119 Wellington Street (listed)

The purpose of this Heritage Impact Assessment (‘HIA’) is to determine if the proposed development will result in adverse impacts to the identified heritage resources, and provide alternative development options and mitigation measures, as required.

1.1 Subject Lands

The subject lands are comprised of two abutting properties addressed as 82 and 88 Beverly Street in the former village of Galt. The subject lands are east of the Kerr Street and Beverly Street intersection, on the north side of Beverly Street. The property at 88 Beverly Street is occupied with a detached dwelling with driveway access from Beverly Street. The property at 82 Beverly Street consists of a private school, parking area and open space. The private school has two access points, one from Kerr Street and one from Wellington Street. Collectively 82 and 88 Beverly Street form the development site.

1.2 Heritage Properties

In Ontario there are several ways of recognizing heritage resources. Part IV, Section 27 of the Ontario Heritage Act requires that each municipality keep a public register of properties that are of cultural heritage value or interest. Municipalities can also designate entire neighbourhoods as Conservation Districts, or recognize certain areas as Cultural Heritage Landscapes.

The City of Cambridge maintains a Heritage Register that contains both listed properties and Part IV designated properties. There are a total of three heritage properties that abut the subject lands and which are either listed or designated on the register. Included on the register is the subject property at 82 Beverly Street. Table 1.0 provides an overview of the heritage status of the properties.
### Table 1.0: Heritage Property Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Status on Register</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>82 Beverly Street</td>
<td>Listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Known as St. Patrick’s School. It is a three storey institutional building constructed of red brick.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58 Beverly Street</td>
<td>Designated (2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Galt Chemical Products Lt. Constructed in 1902 of granite in the Georgian style for the ‘Beaver Manufacturing Company’. Included in the granite is heart shaped fossil unique to the local area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Kerr Street</td>
<td>Listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Two storey buff brick dwelling constructed in 1886 in the Gothic Revival style.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119 Wellington Street</td>
<td>Listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One and a half storey red brick dwelling.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The heritage properties are not identified by the City of Cambridge as being part of a cultural heritage landscape ("CHL") and are not located in a Heritage Conservation District. The City is currently undertaking a Conservation District Study for the Galt Core Area, however, the subject lands are outside of the Conservation District area. Note that while there are a number of surrounding heritage properties listed on the Cambridge Heritage Register, this HIA will only assess those properties which are adjacent to the subject property. A location map of the heritage properties is included as Appendix B.
1.3 Surrounding Context

The subject lands are located north/east of Kerr Street, south of Wellington Street, north of Beverly Street, and west of Dundas Street. The surrounding area has a range of land uses including commercial, residential, institutional and open space. A detailed description of surrounding land uses is provided below.

**North:** Low density residential uses are located north of Wellington Street. Many of the dwellings are identified on the heritage register and represent late 19th early 20th century residential development. Further north is the rail line.

**West:** The Kerr Street and Beverly Street intersection is located to the west. Past this intersection are some low density residential uses as well as St. Patrick’s Parish located on Wellington Street W. Opposite the Church is downtown Galt, consisting of a range of commercial, institutional and residential uses. This area to the west also forms part of the Galt Heritage Conservation District study area.

**South:** There are some detached dwellings on the south side of Beverly Street. Further south is a gas station on the south corner of Kerr Street and Beverly Street. Further south is a rail trail, municipal parking lot, a vacant parcel of land and the Salvation Army.

**East:** East of the residential dwellings on Beverly Street is the Galt Arena, some detached dwellings, as well as Soper Park and Mill Creek.
2.0 Policy Context

2.1 The Planning Act and PPS 2020

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The following definitions are provided in Section 6.0 of the PPS:

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

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

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

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

### 2.2 Ontario Heritage Act

The *Ontario Heritage Act*, R.S.O, 1990, c.0.18 remains the guiding legislation for the conservation of significant cultural heritage resources in Ontario. The Ontario Act provides under section Part IV that Municipalities are to maintain public registers of listed or designated properties.

### 2.3 City of Cambridge Official Plan (2018)

The City of Cambridge recognizes the importance of cultural heritage and provides policies regarding conservation in Chapter 4 of the Official Plan where it is encouraged to “support the conservation, restoration and prominence of the city’s heritage as a key identifying feature of the community;” and “promote built heritage as a key component of the city’s local tourism and quality of life for existing new residents”. Section 4.2 of the Official Plan encourages the conservation of heritage resources when development is proposed which encourages,

- Incorporation of cultural heritage resources and their surrounding context into development applications in a manner which does not conflict with the cultural heritage resource;
- Promotion of the use of scale and design which blends harmoniously with existing cultural heritage resources when development occurs;

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

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

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

3.1 82 Beverly Street

The property addressed as 82 Beverly Street is an institutional building and formerly known as St. Patrick's School. The former school was related to St. Patrick's Church, located at 53 Wellington Street. The School was originally founded by Rev. Emmett Doyle and the Board of Trustees of the Roman Catholic Separate Schools of City of Galt. Emmet Doyle was the Reverend of St. Patrick's Parish and agent on behalf of the Roman Catholic Episcopal of the Diocese of Hamilton.

The 1929 Fire Insurance Plan for Galt shows the property at 82 Beverly Street as consisting of detached dwellings. Land Title records show that a portion of what comprises the property now, was purchased by “The Board of Trustees of the Roman Catholic Separate Schools” in January of 1935. The Topographic Survey’s from 1929, 1936, and 1938 also indicate minimal development on the property, until 1968 when the School appears on the Topographic Survey.

![Figure 1: Fire Insurance Plan c. 1929 (Courtesy of McMaster University Library)](image)

![Figure 2: Historical record of purchase of property (OnLand Historical Books)](image)
The property located at 82 Beverly Street contains a three storey building with a brick façade and concrete foundation. The building is comprised of its original form, with two south additions. The original portion of the building was constructed after 1938, when the Roman Catholic Church purchased a portion of the property. There are two contemporary additions constructed between 1950 and 1970.
The building is associated with the Edwardian and Classicism architectural styles. Original built features include a platform roof, decorative banding, and segmented window arches with pronounced keystones.

The building generally maintains its original features, including window openings door entrances and decorative elements. However, the original doors and windows have been replaced. As seen in figure x, the original transom window as been covered over, and the roof of the front entrance did originally host a cross and year of construction. This feature has since been removed. While slightly visible in figure x, the year of construction is not legible.
St. Patrick’s School was closed in 2010 by the Waterloo Catholic District School Board and the property was sold. The property has been maintained as private institutional, and most recently as the Ontario Muslim Academy private school.

### 3.2 58 Beverly Street

The property addressed as 58 Beverly Street contains a two storey stone building and prefabricated metal and concrete addition. The property is located adjacent to the subject lands at the intersection of Kerr Street and Beverly Street. The property is designated under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act and is known as the Galt Chemical Products Ltd Industrial Building. The stone portion of the building was constructed in 1902 in the Georgian Style. The Beaver Manufacturing Company operated out of the building until 1922. Unique to the building is the hearstone exterior which is a material local to the area.
The property at 14 Kerr Street is located north of the Beverly Street and Kerr Street intersection and contains a 2 storey brick dwelling. The property is listed on the municipal heritage register and is adjacent to the subject lands. The dwelling was originally constructed of buff (yellow) brick, common for the area. The dwelling has some representation of the Gothic Revival architectural style, however, is a vernacular style for the area. The simple gable roofline, pair of sash windows, and decorative bargeboard in the gable are common design features for this area. The estimated date of construction is 1886. The dwelling does appear on the 1929 Fire insurance plan as a brick house.
The dwelling generally maintains its original form in terms of scale, exterior materials, window openings, roofline and ox-eye window within the front gable. Some alterations have occurred, including painting over the original yellow brick, removal of decorative bargeboard in front gable and removal of original front sash windows.

3.4 119 Wellington Street

The property addressed as 119 Wellington Street contains a one and a half storey brick dwelling. Wellington Street runs parallel to Beverly Street. The property at 119 Wellington Street is located on the south side of Wellington Street, and the rear yard of the property is
adjacent to the subject school property. The property is listed on the Cambridge Heritage Register, noted as a brick dwelling with a gable roof centred by wide arched window.

![Fire Insurance Plan c. 1929 (Courtesy of McMaster University Library)](image1)

**Figure 14:** Fire Insurance Plan c. 1929 (Courtesy of McMaster University Library)

![Front of house (MHBC, 2023)](image2)

**Figure 15:** Front of house (MHBC, 2023)

The dwelling was originally clad in redbrick, which has been painted yellow. The dwelling has bargeboard decorating the gable, a front porch with Tuscan order columns, a front entrance with transom and sidelights, and twin arched centred windows on the upper storey. The twin windows are four over four windows with wood openings and a dripmold above.
4.0 Proposed Development

4.1 Concept Plan

The development site is comprised of the properties located at 82-88 Beverly Street. The owner of the lands is proposing to redevelop 88 Beverly Street as well as a vacant portion of 82 Beverly Street with two blocks of stacked townhouses providing 48 dwelling units. The balance of the site, including St. Patrick’s School at 82 Beverly Street will be retained and severed, continuing to function as a private school.

A portion of the property at 88 Beverly Street will serve as the driveway access and parking for the townhouse units. The north-east quadrant of 82 Beverly Street is currently vacant and this area will accommodate the two Blocks of townhouses as well as the remainder of the parking. The driveway access and parking will be oriented closest to the School, with the townhouses located further east (farthest from the school). Generally, the townhouses will be oriented away from adjacent heritage resources. The concept plan proposes the following elements:

- 2 blocks of townhouses, each 3 storeys in height
  - Block 1 providing 20 units
  - Block 2 providing 28 units
- Vehicular and pedestrian access provided from Beverly Street
- 59 parking spaces, including resident and visitor
  - 48 for residents
  - 9 for visitors
  - 2 barrier free
- Common amenity areas and landscaping
4.2 Design

The design of the townhouses will be contemporary. The buildings will maintain a neutral colour palette, consisting of greys and browns. The building is proposed to be mostly clad in neutral (grey) brick veneer, with brown siding and aluminum cladding for detailing and visual variety. The roof will be a platform, which will be flat and reduce massing. Whereas a gable or hip roof would create a point in the roof which would increase the total height of the building, a platform/flat roof will maintain the height at 3 storeys. There will be a variety of window sizes, and balconies with glass and metal railings.
Figure 17: Rendering of front façade (prepared by Orchard Design Studio, 2023)

Figure 18: Rendering of rear façade (prepared by Orchard Design Studio, 2023)

The site plan, elevations and renderings are included as Appendix C.
5.0 Impact Analysis

The Ontario Heritage Toolkit Infosheet #5 provides criteria for evaluation impacts to heritage resources. Impacts of a proposed development or change to a cultural heritage resource may be direct or indirect, occur over a short or long term duration, and may occur during a pre-construction phase, construction phase or post-construction phase. The criteria that is recommended for the evaluation of impacts include:

- Destruction or alteration of heritage attributes: destruction of any or part of any significant heritage attributes or features; Alterations that are not sympathetic with the historic appearance;
- Shadows: the creation of shadows that alter the appearance of a heritage attribute or change the viability of natural features;
- Isolation: the heritage attribute is isolated from its surrounding environment, context, or significant relationship;
- Direct/indirect obstruction of views: significant views or vistas within, from, or of built or natural features;
- Change in land use: new development or site alteration that is not compatible with historical character. For example, rezoning a battlefield from open space to residential;
- Land disturbances: activities which involve disturbances to soils or drainage patterns which may cause harm to heritage attributes.

The below tables provide an assessment of the proposed developments impact on the adjacent heritage resources using the above criteria.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Destruction / alteration of heritage attributes</td>
<td>No impact. The proposed development does not propose to alter or otherwise destruct the School building. A portion of an undeveloped area of the school property will accommodate the stacked townhouse development. This portion of the subject property is not identified as a heritage attribute and its removal from the school property will not impact the heritage resource. The balance of the school site will be severed and continue to function as a school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadows</td>
<td>No impact. The townhouses will be located north of the school building. At three storeys, no shadow impacts are expected.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Isolation

No impact. The new development is at the centre of the block and does not isolate the school from its frontage on Beverly Street or the surrounding area.

Direct or Indirect Obstruction of Views

No Impact. The prominent view of the school can be seen from the front façade along Beverly Street. The proposed development will not obstruct this view of the school.

A Change in Land Use

No Impact. The school will remain in its current use. Only a vacant portion of the school site will be developed. The school will be severed from the development site and remain. Additionally, the abutting lands to the school consist of residential uses. There is no change in land use proposed.

Land Disturbance

No Impact. The proposed school building is located a sufficient distance from the development area. As a precaution, mitigation measures are provided to ensure land disturbances do not impact the school building during construction.

Summary for 82 Beverly Street

No adverse impacts are anticipated as a result of the proposed development. As a precaution, mitigation measures are provided in section 6.0 to ensure no impacts related to construction activities occur.
### Table 3.0 – Impact Analysis for 58 Beverly Street

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Destruction / alteration of heritage attributes</td>
<td>No impact. The proposed development does not involve this property. No destruction or alteration to the heritage property is proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadows</td>
<td>No impact. The townhouses will be located north of the building. At three storeys, no shadow impacts are expected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolation</td>
<td>No impact. The surrounding context consists of residential uses. There is no change proposed to the context of the building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct or Indirect Obstruction of Views</td>
<td>No Impact. The prominent view of the building can be seen from the front façade along Beverly and Kerr Streets. The proposed development will not obstruct this view.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Change in Land Use</td>
<td>No Impact. No change in land use is proposed for this property. The surrounding area consists of residential development. The construction of townhouses will not change the land uses of the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Disturbance</td>
<td>No Impact. The property at 58 Beverly Street is located a sufficient distance from the development area. There is no development proposed adjacent to the heritage property. No mitigation measures are required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Summary of Impacts for 58 Beverly Street

No adverse impacts are anticipated as a result of the proposed development. The proposed development is located over 100 metres from 58 Beverly Street and is not adjacent to the building. This is a sufficient distance that will not result in adverse impacts. No mitigation measures are warranted.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Destruction / alteration of heritage attributes</td>
<td>No impact. The proposed development does not involve this property. No destruction or alteration to the heritage property is proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadows</td>
<td>No impact. The townhouses will be located north of the dwelling. At three storeys, no shadow impacts are expected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolation</td>
<td>No impact. The surrounding context consists of residential uses. There is no change proposed to the context of the dwelling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct or Indirect Obstruction of Views</td>
<td>No Impact. The prominent view of the dwelling can be seen from the front façade along Kerr Street. The proposed development will not obstruct this view.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Change in Land Use</td>
<td>No Impact. No change in land use is proposed for this property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Disturbance</td>
<td>No Impact. The property at 14 Kerr Street is located a sufficient distance from the development area. There is no development proposed adjacent to the heritage property. No mitigation measures are required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Impacts for 58 Beverly Street**

No adverse impacts are anticipated as a result of the proposed development. The proposed development is located over 100 metres from 14 Kerr Street and no development will be located adjacent to the dwelling. No mitigation measures are warranted.
## Table 5.0 – Impact Analysis for 119 Wellington Street

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Destruction / alteration of heritage attributes</strong></td>
<td>No impact. The proposed development does not involve this property. No destruction or alteration to the heritage property is proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shadows</strong></td>
<td>No impact. The proposed townhouses are proposed to be three storeys which is not a tall building. At three stories, shadows will be minimal and will not negatively impact heritage resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Isolation</strong></td>
<td>No impact. The surrounding context consists of residential uses. There is no change proposed to the context of the dwelling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direct or Indirect Obstruction of Views</strong></td>
<td>No Impact. The significant view of the dwelling is the front façade on Wellington Street. The proposed development will not obstruct this view as it will be located behind the dwelling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A Change in Land Use</strong></td>
<td>No Impact. No change in land use is proposed. The surrounding area consists of residential development. The construction of townhouses will not change the existing residential land use of the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Disturbance</strong></td>
<td>Possible Impact. The proposed development will be located adjacent to 119 Wellington Street (+/-6m). Block 1 will be in close proximity to the heritage property and land disturbances may impact the dwelling during the construction of the townhouses. Mitigation measures are provided in section 6.0.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Summary of Impacts for 119 Wellington Street

There is a possible impact arising from construction activities which may cause land disturbances. The mitigation measures are provided in section 6.0 below.
6.0 Mitigation Measures

It is not expected that the proposed development will negatively impact the heritage properties. As a precaution, it is recommended that a temporary protection fence be installed to protect the school building during construction. This will ensure that no construction equipment or activities occur within a reasonable distance of the school building.

The property at 119 Wellington Street is also adjacent to the development area, and is approximately +/- 6 metres from Block 1 of the townhouses. As a result there is potential for impacts related to vibration and construction activity. A temporary construction fence should be installed at the rear property line to ensure that no construction equipment or activities occur within a reasonable distance of the dwelling. Further, a vibration monitoring plan may be required during construction to monitor land disturbances associated with excavation or site works. It is recommended that this option be explored to determine if a vibration and monitoring plan is necessary.
7.0 Conclusion

The proposed development concept contemplates the removal of the existing dwelling at 88 Beverly Street and development of two blocks of stacked townhouses on an un-used portion of the 82 Beverly Street property. The surrounding area consist of several listed and designated heritage properties. This HIA has evaluated the level of impact the proposed development will have on the subject property as well as the abutting heritage properties.

It is not expected that the proposed development will negatively impact the subject property or any of the adjacent heritage properties. There is potential for impacts as a result of construction activities. As a precaution, it is recommended that a temporary protection fence be installed around the existing school building, as well as the rear property line of 119 Wellington Street. Additionally, it is recommended that a vibration monitoring plan be considered for 119 Wellington Street to avoid land disturbances associated with construction.
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DETAILED GUIDELINES
FOR THE PREPARATION OF

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

Endorsed by
Cambridge Council
on May 7, 2012
1. **INTRODUCTION**

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

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

2. **CULTURAL HERITAGE RESOURCES**

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

---

1 Development means the creation of a new lot, a change in land use, or the construction of a building(s) or structure(s), requiring approval under the Planning Act, but does not include activities that create or maintain *infrastructure* authorized under an *environmental assessment* process or works subject to the Drainage Act. (Planning Act, revised)

2 Community Plan is a plan which is prepared for a specific geographic area of residential designated land containing detailed policies to guide future development. (New)

3 Cultural heritage resource means physical remains which include, but are not limited to: buildings (residential, commercial, institutional, industrial and agricultural); *cultural heritage landscapes* (designed, organic/evolved); structures (water tower, bridge, fence and dam); monuments (cenotaph, statue, cairn); *archaeological resources*; cemeteries; scenic roads; vistas/views; culturally significant *natural features* (tree and landforms); movable objects (archival records and artifacts); and cultural traditions (language, stories, music, dance, food, celebrations, arts and crafts. (ROP, revised).
The City will make available any other relevant information that it maintains, including archival records.

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

3. CONTENTS OF HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENTS

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

Policy: identification and evaluation of the built heritage resource:

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

Policy: graphic and written inventory of the heritage resource:

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Policy:** alternatives to the proposal

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

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

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

4. **QUALIFICATIONS**

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

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

5. FORMAT

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

6. PROCESS

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

Should you have any questions about these guidelines please contact:

Senior Planner - Heritage

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

THAT Report 24-010 (MHAC) 84 Chalmers Street North, Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) be received;

AND FURTHER THAT the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee support the contents and conclusions of the scoped HIA.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

This report has been prepared to consult with the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC) on a scoped HIA received for a proposal to demolish a single-detached dwelling and erect new semi-detached dwelling units on the subject property, which is adjacent to a listed heritage property.

Key Findings

- The property does not have any status under the Ontario Heritage Act nor is it identified as a property of interest or located within a cultural heritage landscape.

- A scoped HIA was required by Heritage Planning staff as part of a pre-consultation application. It was received by Heritage Planning staff on February 9, 2024.

- The scoped HIA did not identify any direct impacts to the adjacent listed property as a result of the proposed development.
• Heritage Planning staff have no concerns with the proposed development and support the proposal, as submitted.

Financial Implications

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 west side of Chalmers Street North, within East Galt (Figure 1). The property is 0.20 acres (837 square metres) in size and is located within a mature residential neighbourhood with a variety of housing construction dates. The property is zoned R4 (Residential) and is classed as Low-Medium Density Residential within the City’s Official Plan.

The subject property contains a small, one-and-a-half storey cottage built in the early to mid-twentieth century. MPAC data provides an estimated date of construction of ca. 1920. The subject property also contains a small one-storey garage and several mature trees.

The subject property is adjacent to a non-designated property listed on the City’s Heritage Register: 78 Chalmers Street North. This Victorian era stone house is clad in grey granite and features a central bay window within the front gable section. This property is estimated to have been built ca. 1878, according to MPAC. The impact of the proposed development on the adjacent property was assessed by ERA Architects in their scoped HIA (Appendix A). The HIA was reviewed by Heritage Planning staff on February 23, 2024, and comments were provided to the applicant.
EXISTING POLICY / BY-LAW(S):

City of Cambridge Official Plan (2018)

4.10 Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment

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

   a) identification and evaluation of the cultural heritage resource;

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

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

   d) means to mitigate impacts, in accordance with the cultural heritage resources priorities established in Policy 4.2.1 of this Plan;
e) alternatives to the proposal; and f) identification of and justification for the preferred option.

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. A Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment may be scoped or waived by either Council or MHAC.

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

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

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

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

ANALYSIS:

On May 10, 2023, an HIA was required by Heritage Planning staff as part of Pre-Consultation application D04-23. The HIA was scoped by Heritage Planning staff (scoped Terms of Reference included in the HIA, attached as Appendix A) and the
applicant was provided with the following suggested mitigation recommendations on August 21, 2023:

- Maintain the large deciduous tree at the front of the property, including maintaining as much of a dripline as possible.
- Maintain or enhance the vegetative buffer between your property and the adjacent listed property at 78 Chalmers Street North.
- The building design should be reviewed to ensure compatibility with the adjacent listed property and the overall character of the area. This may or may not result in design changes but things like style, materials, colours, setbacks, etc. should all be reviewed closely.

An HIA was prepared by ERA Architects Inc. and was issued December 7, 2023. Heritage Planning staff were notified of the HIA on February 9, 2024. The HIA evaluates the impact of the proposed development on the adjacent property at 78 Chalmers Street North, which is listed on the City’s Heritage Register and the adjacent potential East Galt Cultural Heritage Landscape (CHL).

1. The HIA confirms that the subject property does not meet the criteria outlined in Ontario Regulation 9/06 (amended by Ontario Regulation 569/22). As such, the HIA did not provide an evaluation of the impacts of the proposed development on the cultural heritage value of the subject property, despite it being estimated to be early-to-mid twentieth century construction.

2. The HIA did not determine any clear heritage impacts on the adjacent listed property at 78 Chalmers Street North. The HIA identified that the proposed building is set back from Chalmers Street North and is staggered or stepped back on the southern side of the property, creating an open space buffer between the two buildings. The proposed development is further separated from the adjacent heritage property by a two-metre-tall wood fence. One large deciduous tree is proposed to be retained at the southeastern corner of the property.

3. The HIA did not determine any clear heritage impacts to the adjacent potential East Galt CHL. The HIA identified that there is an existing row of trees along the western property line (rear of property) that will be retained and that will provide a vegetative buffer between the subject property and the potential East Galt CHL.

4. Given the evaluation outlined above, the HIA did not offer any alternatives, mitigation measures, or conservation recommendations.
Heritage Planning staff have reviewed the proposed application, and the associated HIA, and have provided the following comments:

- Heritage Planning staff support the HIA, as submitted, and support the retention of the character-supporting deciduous tree at the front of the property.

- Heritage Planning staff support the proposed staggered or stepped back design of the building in order to minimize massing contrast with the adjacent property at 78 Chalmers Street North and create more buffer space.

- Heritage Planning staff request that the applicant introduce vegetative plantings along the southern property line to further provide screening between the subject property and the adjacent property at 78 Chalmers Street North, given that existing trees and shrubs are proposed to be removed for site grading and preparation.

- In accordance with Official Plan policies, the HIA must be reviewed by MHAC. MHAC comments should be duly considered and incorporated into the final design.

Through the development application process, Heritage Planning staff are working with the applicant on the above-noted comments. Through the consultation process, Heritage Planning staff have also requested that any comments provided by MHAC be considered and incorporated by the applicant.

**FINANCIAL IMPACT:**

There are no financial implications to the City as a result of this application.

**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 submitting and reviewing an HIA.

**CONCLUSION:**

For the reasons outlined in this report, Heritage Planning staff support the proposal, as submitted, and the contents and conclusions of the scoped HIA.
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. 24-010 (MHAC) Appendix A: 84 Chalmers Street North, Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment
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Purpose

ERA Architects Inc. (“ERA”) has prepared this Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment (“CHIA”) for the property at 84 Chalmers Street North in the City of Cambridge (the “Site”). The Site is not designated under Part IV or V of the Ontario Heritage Act (the “OHA”), nor is it listed on the City of Cambridge’s Heritage Register. This report assesses the impact of the proposed development in relation to the adjacent property located at 78 Chalmers Street North, which is listed on the City of Cambridge’s Heritage Register (August, 2020).

Proposed Development

The proposed development involves the construction of a new two-storey building with four residential units. The existing structures on-site will be demolished.

Impacts and Mitigation Strategies

The proposed development has no direct physical or visual impacts on the adjacent property at 78 Chalmers Street North and responds to the surrounding context. The proposed development includes setbacks, massing strategies and landscape features that maintain the legibility of the adjacent property.

Conclusion

There are no anticipated heritage impacts associated with the proposed development on the adjacent property.
2 BACKGROUND INFORMATION

2.1 Scope of the Report

ERA Architects Inc. (“ERA”) has prepared this Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment (“CHIA”) for the property at 84 Chalmers Street North in the City of Cambridge (the “Site”). The purpose of a CHIA, as per the City of Cambridge CHIA Terms of Reference (2023) is to:

“... evaluates the impact of a proposed development, building alteration or site alteration on a built heritage resource(s) or a cultural heritage landscape(s) and recommends mitigative measures or alternative development approaches to conserve the heritage attributes of that resource/landscape. CHIAs are an important planning tool to ensure the heritage values, attributes and integrity of cultural heritage resources are considered in the land development process.”

Various provincial and municipal heritage policies that provide for the conservation of cultural heritage resources have been considered in the preparation of this report. Multiple sources of data have been collected, sorted and analyzed for this assessment. Both primary and secondary sources have been drawn upon, including: historical maps, atlases, city directories, aerial photographs, archival photographs, and from observations made during site visits.

The scope of the CHIA has been narrowed in consultation with City of Cambridge staff. A copy of the scoped CHIA Terms of Reference is included in Appendix A.

2.2 Property Owner

Mark Longo
84 Chalmers Street North
Cambridge, ON N1R 5B8
P: 226-600-3883
E: mark@mlongo.com
2.3 Statement of Professional Qualifications

ERA specializes in heritage conservation, architecture, planning and landscape as they relate to historical places. This work is driven by our core interest in connecting heritage issues to a wider considerations of urban design and city building, and a broader set of cultural values that provide perspective to our work at different scales.

In our 30 years of work, we’ve provided the highest level of professional services to our clients in both the public and private sector out of offices in Toronto, Montreal and Ottawa. We have a staff of more than 100, and our Principals and Associates are members of associations that include: the Ontario Association of Architects (“OAA”), the Ontario Professional Planner’s Institute (“OPPI”), the Canadian Association of Heritage Professionals (“CAHP”) and the Royal Architectural Institute of Canada (“RAIC”).

Personnel involved in the production of this report are listed as follows:

**Andrew Pruss** is a Principal with ERA. He has been involved in all aspects of architectural projects ranging from single-family residences and condominiums to institutional, commercial and hotel projects. He has previously been qualified by the Ontario Municipal Board, now continued as the Ontario Land Tribunal (“OLT”), the Conservation Review Board, and the Toronto Local Appeal Body in the field of heritage planning and architecture.

**Dan Eylon**, a Senior Associate and Planner at ERA, is a registered and active member of the CAHP. He received his Master of Arts in Planning from the University of Waterloo after completing a Bachelor of Fine Art at the Ontario College of Art & Design.

**Clara Shipman** is an Architect and Planner with ERA. She received her Master of Science in Planning from the University of Toronto after completing a Master of Architecture from McGill University. She is a candidate member of the Ontario Professional Planners Institute.

**Zeina Ahmed** is a Planner at ERA. She received her Master of Science in Planning from the University of Toronto and her undergraduate degree in Urban and Environmental Planning from the University of Virginia. Zeina is a Registered Professional Planner in Ontario and member of the Canadian Institute of Planners.
3.1 Location Plan

Figure 1. Context map of the Site (City of Cambridge Mapping Tool; annotated by ERA).

Figure 2. Aerial photograph of the Site (Google Earth, 2023; annotated by ERA).
3.2 Existing Site Survey

Figure 3. Survey with boundary of Site identified in blue (Vladimir Dosen Surveying, 2018; annotated by ERA).
3.3 Description of the Property

The Site is located on the west side of Chalmers Street North between McNaughton Street and Pollock Avenue in the City of Cambridge, formerly the Town of Galt, in Dumfries Township. The Site includes a rectangular lot with a one-storey detached houseform building set back from the street. The building is L-shaped in plan, with a mortar-based faux-stone finish and a gable roof covered in asphalt shingles. The street facing east elevation is symmetrical, with a raised central entrance covered by an awning and flanking punched windows. There is a chimney along the south elevation, centered on the roof ridge. There is a detached one-storey parking structure with an east-facing garage door to the south of the houseform building, further set back from the east property line.

The front yard contains a central walkway from the sidewalk to the building’s main entrance. A mature street tree is located at the southeast corner of the front yard, beyond the Site’s east property line. A gravel driveway along the south property line provides vehicular access to surface parking and the parking structure. A walkway along the north property line provides access to the rear yard. There is open space at the rear of the Site, with hedges and a chain-link fence running along the north property line, trees and a wood fence along the west property line, and trees, shrubs and a wood fence along the south property line.

The Owner has consulted with City of Cambridge staff and confirmed that the Site does not meet the criteria for heritage designation under Ontario Regulation 9/06 (“O.Reg 9/06”).
Current Photographs

The following pages include photographs taken from a visit to the Site on October 26, 2023.

Figure 4. East elevation (ERA, 2023).

Figure 5. Partial south elevation and east elevation (ERA, 2023).
Figure 6. North elevation (ERA, 2023).

Figure 7. South elevation and partial east elevation (ERA, 2023).
Figure 8. Rear yard, looking south-west (ERA, 2023).
3.4 Description of Context and Adjacent Property

This section provides a description of the context, adjacent property at 78 Chalmers Street North, and East Galt potential cultural heritage landscape currently under study. The definition of "adjacent," as excerpted from the City of Cambridge Official Plan, is "those lands contiguous to a cultural heritage resource."

Context
The Site is located in a residential neighbourhood with low-rise houseform buildings and mature trees. To the north of the Site is a one-storey brick houseform building. To the east of the Site across Chalmers Street North is a two-storey houseform building with horizontal siding. To the south of the Site is 78 Chalmers Street North, described below. To the west of the Site are the rear yards of various properties with houseform buildings that front onto streets to the north and west of the Site.

78 Chalmers Street North
78 Chalmers Street North is located on the west side of Chalmers Street North, between McNaughton Street and Pollock Avenue. The property includes a rectangular lot with a two-storey detached houseform building clad in stone and wood siding that is set back from the street.

The building has asymmetrical massing, a primary gable facing the street, and a cross-gable roof over a north side wing all covered with asphalt shingles. There is a single story open porch with a floor that extends beyond the north face of the building, covered with a shed roof filling the inside of the T-shaped plan. The southern portion of the building and the ground floor of the north wing is clad in stone with ashlar units on the east facades and rubble stone on the north and south. The front gable includes a one storey stone and frame bay window. The northern wing is clad with stone at the ground floor and wood board-and-batten siding at the second floor. The building includes segmental arched openings on the east and south elevations, and flat-headed openings on the north elevation. The east elevation includes two door openings, a bay window, and several window openings on the ground and second floor levels. The north elevation includes window openings and the ground and second floor levels, and the south elevation includes a window opening at the ground floor. The west elevation is not visible from the public right of way.

The front yard contains a walkway from the sidewalk to the porch. A gravel driveway with surface parking is located on the north portion of the property. There are trees, shrubs, and a wood fence running along the north property line. The front yard contains mature trees.

78 Chalmers Street North is listed on the City of Cambridge’s Heritage Register (August, 2020). A copy of the listing description can be found in Appendix B.

East Galt Potential Cultural Heritage Landscape
In 2020, City Council approved the start of a Heritage Study Project for the East Galt area to the west of the Site and bound by the lands located south of Cumming Avenue, west of Chalmers Street North, north of Concession Street, and east of Spruce Street. The Site is adjacent to area within this study boundary. The project is currently in the technical study phase, and the potential cultural heritage landscape ("CHL") is not in effect.
Context

Figure 9. Context photo of the Site from Chalmers Street North looking southwest (ERA, 2023).

Figure 10. Context photo of the Site from Chalmers Street North looking northwest (ERA, 2023).
Adjacent Property - 78 Chalmers Street North

Figure 11. East and north elevations (ERA, 2023).

Figure 12. Trees and shrubs along north property line (ERA, 2023).
Figure 14. East elevation of 78 Chalmers Street North (ERA, 2023).

Figure 15. Partial south elevation and east elevation (ERA, 2023).
East Galt Cultural Heritage Landscape Study Area

3.5 Historical Overview

The following section provides a brief summary of the history of the area, followed by archival maps and images.

Indigenous Past, Present, Future

Southern Ontario has been occupied by Indigenous peoples since time immemorial. The area we now know as Cambridge was traditionally used by the Haudenosaunee, Anishinaabeg and Neutral peoples. The territory was the subject of the Dish with One Spoon Wampum Belt Covenant, an agreement between the Haudenosaunee Confederacy and Anishinaabeg Confederacy and allied nations to peaceably share and care for the land, water, flora and fauna around the Great Lakes. Cambridge is situated on the Haldimand Tract, an agreement in 1784 granting approximately 10 km on either side of the Grand River to Six Nations of the Grand River. Negotiations about the title to this land continue between the Canadian government and Six Nations. Today, Cambridge is home to many diverse First Nations, Inuit and Métis peoples. Cambridge remains a city of historical and contemporary significance for Indigenous Peoples.

Colonial Settlement

The segment of Chalmers Street North which contains the Site is located within the former Town of Galt in Dumfries Township. The colonial settlement of Galt began in the early 18th century with the construction of grist mills near Mill Creek and the Grand River. Originally a community with Scottish origins, Galt became a textile and industrial centre. The area encompassing the Site was developed as a residential area located on a hill that overlooked Galt’s civic buildings below. The subdivision between Chalmers Street and Elgin Street North to the east of the Site began in the 1880s. In A Remarkable Heritage: Programmes and Policies for Heritage Conservation in Cambridge, Ontario, Paul Dilse describes the properties within this area as “distinguished by its predominantly mid to late nineteenth century, one or two storeys, middle and upper middle-class houses, a lot of which are made of course granite or yellow brick. Course grey granite, High Victorian Gothic builder’s houses, each with a bay window are typical on McNaughton Street, Chalmers Street North and Lowell Street”. In 1915, the Town of Galt was incorporated as a city. In 1973, the City of Galt was amalgamated with the Towns of Hespeler and Preston, along with parts of Water and North Dumfries Townships, to become the City of Cambridge.

Based on a high-level review of archival maps and the 1900 City directory, it appears that the adjacent property at 78 Chalmers Street North was occupied by 1900 and the stone houseform building was constructed by 1910. Based on an archival photograph, the second floor addition clad in wood siding was added at a later date.

---

2. Dilse, 99.
3.6 Visual Resources

Historic Mapping

1851: The Site and surrounding neighbourhood are part of a large undeveloped lot owned by James Strang.

Figure 17. 1851 Map of the Town of Galt (City of Cambridge Archives; annotated by ERA).

1867: The Site and surrounding neighbourhood are part of a large undeveloped lot owned by the Presbyterian Church.

Figure 18. 1867 Map of the Town of Galt (retrieved from York University Digital Archives; annotated by ERA).

1881: It appears that the area around the Site to the north, east and south may include development.

Figure 19. 1881 Map of North Dumfries Township (retrieved from McGill University mapping project; annotated by ERA).
1910: The Site and surrounding neighbourhood have been subdivided. Several stone, wood and brick veneer buildings have been constructed along Chalmers Street North, including a brick veneer house at 84 Chalmers Street North, and a stone house at 78 Chalmers Street North.

1941: A brick veneer building has been constructed to the north of the Site.

2023: It appears that another houseform building has been constructed to the north of the Site.
Figure 23. Archival photograph of the adjacent heritage building at 78 Chalmers Street North, year unknown (retrieved from Dilse, 1981).
4 IDENTIFICATION OF THE SIGNIFICANT HERITAGE ATTRIBUTES OF THE BUILT HERITAGE RESOURCE

Ontario Regulation 9/06 (“O.Reg. 9/06”) sets out Criteria for Determining Cultural Heritage Value or Interest, for the purpose of determining candidacy for designation under Part IV, Section 29 of the OHA. The OHA requires that properties must meet two or more criteria out of the nine criteria under O.Reg. 9/06 to be eligible for designation under Part IV of the Act.

The Site does not contain a property listed on the City of Cambridge Heritage Register nor designated under Part IV or Part V of the OHA. As confirmed by City of Cambridge staff, the property does not meet the criteria for designation under O. Reg 9/06 of the OHA.

The adjacent property at 78 Chalmers Street North is listed on the City of Cambridge’s Heritage Register (August, 2020). The Heritage Register describes the property as a “high Victorian Gothic house, grey granite.” City of Cambridge heritage staff noted that the adjacent property meets the basic criteria for physical/design value. ERA has evaluated the property in previous sections by doing background research, a site visit, and review of visual resources (refer to Section 3). An evaluation of the adjacent heritage property under the criteria of O. Reg. 9/06 is beyond the scope of this report.
DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT OR SITE ALTERATION

The proposed development involves the demolition of the existing structures on the Site, and the construction of a new two-storey building which contains four residential units. The proposed building includes setbacks to the north and south property lines, and larger setbacks to the east and west property lines for the front and rear yards. The design of the building includes a rhythm of four bays along the east and west elevations which are staggered incrementally in plan. The front setback increases from a smaller setback between the northernmost bay and the east property line, to a larger setback between the southernmost bay to the east property line. Each bay has a side gable roof. The exterior envelope will be clad in clapboard siding, with a brick wall near the front entrances. The roof will be covered with a light-coloured corrugated metal.

Along the primary east elevation, the bays alternate between a bay that appears more solid with a garage door and window, and a bay that appears to include more voids with a balcony, recessed entrance and window. Overall, the east elevation facing the street includes two raised residential entrances, two second-storey balconies, two garage doors, and several flat-headed window openings. Vehicular and pedestrian access is provided from Chalmers Street North with two paved driveways. The front yard will include landscaped open space between the two paved driveways, as well as at the south portion of the Site. The large mature tree located beyond the property lines at the southeast corner of the Site will be retained. The rear yard of the Site will include landscaped open space and can be accessed from grass-covered walkways running along the north and south property lines. The trees along the west property line will be retained. Along the south property line, the existing two metre wood fence will be retained, along with existing shrubs along the east portion between the fence and the sidewalk.

The Site is identified as "low/medium density residential" in the City of Cambridge Official Plan’s general land-use plan (Map 2). The proposed development contributes to the intensification objectives as outlined in Section 2.2 of the Official Plan and the cultural heritage resources objectives as outlined in Section 4.1. The Site is not located within a heritage conservation district or a secondary plan area. The Site is adjacent to area in the potential East Galt CHL currently under study.

Select plans and elevations from the architectural package by Jon Cummings Architecture are provided over the following pages to illustrate the proposed development.
Site Plan

Figure 25. Site plan (Jon Cummings Architecture, 2023).
Elevations

Figure 26. East elevation (Jon Cummings Architecture, 2023).

Figure 27. South elevation (Jon Cummings Architecture, 2023).
Figure 30. North elevation (Jon Cummings Architecture, 2023).

Figure 31. West elevation (Jon Cummings Architecture, 2023).
Renderings

Figure 32. Bird’s eye view looking south-west from above Chalmers Street North (Jon Cummings Architecture, 2023)

Figure 33. Pedestrian view looking south-west from Chalmers Street North (Jon Cummings Architecture, 2023)
Given that the Site is not listed on the City of Cambridge’s Heritage Register or designated under the OHA, and that the Site is not currently recognized as having cultural heritage value or interest, an evaluation of the impacts of the proposed development on the cultural heritage value of the Site is not required. This section evaluates the impacts and mitigation of the proposed redevelopment on the potential cultural heritage value of the adjacent property and potential adjacent CHL.

Adjacent Property

There is one adjacent property that is listed on the City of Cambridge Heritage Register: 78 Chalmers Street North. The proposed development is located directly to the north of 78 Chalmers Street. The new two-storey building on the Site has been designed to respond and provide a compatible relationship to the adjacent property.

The proposed development is physically and visually separated from 78 Chalmers Street North. The proposed building is set back from the Site’s south property line, and the existing building at 78 Chalmers Street North is set back from its north property line, creating an open space buffer between the two buildings. Landscape features are proposed for the Site which include the retention of existing...
shrubs along the south property line which will provide a vegetative buffer to the adjacent heritage property. The Site is further separated from the adjacent heritage property by an existing 2-metre-tall wood fence. The existing tree outside the Site property lines at the southeast corner will be retained.

The proposed development will employ massing strategies to maintain the legibility of the adjacent listed property from the public realm in its existing context. The proposed development is designed to be of a similar height as existing buildings on the street. The building employs a staggered design with a gradual stepback from the east property line, with a gradual transition to the property to the south. The design of the building with its rhythm of four bays which are staggered incrementally in plan and break up the building massing. The design of the proposed development and the use of contemporary materials will provide a juxtaposition to the stone and traditional design utilized in the adjacent building, allowing for visual distinction.

The construction of the proposed development will not impede the ability to stand on the east or west side of Chalmers Street North and view the heritage resource at 78 Chalmers Street North and its context. It should be noted that existing mature trees near the Site and adjacent property currently obscure portions of the building when viewed from the public realm.

ERA has reviewed the listing description for 78 Chalmers Street North. There are no anticipated heritage impacts on the adjacent heritage resource and its integrity will be maintained.

Adjacent Potential Cultural Heritage Landscape

The adjacent potential East Galt CHL is currently under study and not in effect. Nevertheless, there are no anticipated heritage impacts on the potential CHL. The proposed development includes a large setback from the west property line that functions as a rear yard and provides an open space buffer to the adjacent area. There is an existing row of trees along the west property line that will be retained and that provide a vegetative buffer between the Site and the potential CHL area.
7 CONSIDERATION OF ALTERNATIVES, MITIGATION AND CONSERVATION METHODS

Refer to Section 6 of this CHIA.

8 SCHEDULE AND REPORTING STRUCTURE FOR IMPLEMENTATION AND MONITORING

Not applicable.

9 A SUMMARY STATEMENT AND CONSERVATION RECOMMENDATIONS

This HIA considers the impacts of the proposed development at 84 Chalmers Street North on the potential cultural heritage value of the adjacent property at 78 Chalmers Street North.

The Site is not listed on the City of Cambridge's Heritage Register or designated under the OHA. The proposed development will not have an impact on the adjacent property. As such, there are no heritage impacts associated with the proposed development.

The proposed development responds to the surrounding context and intensification objections in the City of Cambridge Official Plan. The proposed development retains a residential use and provides for additional units on the Site.

ERA finds the proposed development to be in general compliance with all relevant municipal and provincial heritage policies, and to have respect for recognized professional standards and best practices in the field of heritage conservation in Canada.

10 CONSERVATION RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PROPERTIES OF REGIONAL SIGNIFICANCE

Not applicable.
11 CITED RESOURCES


Appendix A: City of Cambridge Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment Terms of Reference (Scoped)
Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment Terms of Reference
2023

A Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment (CHIA) evaluates the impact of a proposed development, building alteration or site alteration on a built heritage resource(s) or a cultural heritage landscape(s) and recommends mitigative measures or alternative development approaches to conserve the heritage attributes of that resource/landscape. CHIAs are an important planning tool to ensure the heritage values, attributes and integrity of cultural heritage resources are considered in the land development process.

Policy Context
Municipalities are enabled by the Provincial Planning Statement (PPS) (2023) under the Planning Act (R.S.O. 1990) to use CHIAs in the planning process. Section 4.6.1 of the PPS states, “Protected heritage property, which may contain built heritage resources or cultural heritage landscapes, shall be conserved” and the mechanisms defined for conservation include the implementation of recommendations, mitigative measures and alternative development approaches set out in a conservation plan, archaeological assessment, and/or heritage impact assessment.

The City of Cambridge Official Plan Section 4.10 requires a CHIA for all development applications, or site alteration permit applications that: (1) include or are adjacent to a designated property, or (2) include a non-designated property listed on the Municipal Heritage Register. Adjacency is defined in the Plan as “contiguous to” a cultural heritage resource.

When is a Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment (CHIA) required?
At the discretion of staff, a CHIA is required for certain applications involving the following types of properties:

- Property designated under Part IV (individual designation) and Part V (located within a heritage conservation district) of the Ontario Heritage Act;
- Property listed on the Municipal Heritage Register as a non-designated property of cultural heritage value or interest;
- Property that is adjacent (contiguous) to individually designated properties, properties within a heritage conservation district, or properties listed on the Municipal Heritage Register; or
- Property identified as having cultural heritage value or interest through a preliminary site assessment or planning study.
In addition, it is recommended that applicants pre-screen any building 40 years of age or older on the development site as a routine part of pre-application due diligence, especially if demolition will be proposed.

The types of applications that may trigger the need for a CHIA for the above properties include but are not limited to the following:

- Official Plan Amendment;
- Zoning By-law Amendment;
- Site Plan Control;
- Draft Plan (Subdivision and Condominium);
- Consent or Minor Variance application under Section 45 of the Planning Act;
- Site Alteration;
- Heritage Permit Application; and
- Demolition Permit Application.

At staff’s discretion, the content of a CHIA may be scoped to reflect anticipated impacts to a heritage resource or waived if there is sufficient information to suggest there will be no impacts to a heritage resource (i.e., erection of a temporary structure). Where staff is of the opinion the potential impacts to a resource will be minor, the discussion of impacts may be integrated into an Urban Design Brief or Urban Design Study.

Notification

A CHIA is most effective when it is conducted early in the development application process and should form part of a complete application. The findings, conclusions and recommendations of the CHIA as well as the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee’s comments on the report should be reflected in the development concept advanced to the City, and thus should be implemented prior to final site plan or building permit approval. City of Cambridge staff will inform property owners and/or their representative of the need for a CHIA. Applicants considering development, building or site alterations are encouraged to contact one of the Senior Heritage Planners early in their project planning process to determine if a CHIA is required. If so, they will be provided a copy of this Terms of Reference.

Qualified Heritage Conservation Professional

A CHIA must be prepared by a qualified heritage conservation professional, such as a heritage planner, heritage architect and/or heritage landscape architect, with demonstrated knowledge of accepted heritage conservation standards, and experience with historical research and identification/evaluation of cultural heritage value. The professional should be registered with the Canadian Association of Heritage Professionals (CAHP) and be in good standing. The qualifications and background of the professional completing the CHIA must be included in the report in the form of a Curriculum Vitae (CV).
Principles
The CHIA must be impartial and objective, thorough, complete and sound in its analysis and demonstrate, through its conservation strategy, an understanding of all applicable provincial and municipal policies, heritage conservation district plans and recognized professional heritage conservation standards in Canada. Content and recommendations of the CHIA should be based on accepted conservation principles and guidelines, including those outlined in:

- Parks Canada’s *Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada*. In keeping with the *Standards and Guidelines*, minimal intervention will be the guiding principle for all work;
- Former Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport’s *Eight Guiding Principles in the Conservation of Historic Properties*; and
- *Ontario Heritage Tool Kit*.

Minimum CHIA Content Requirements
The CHIA will include but is not limited to the information below. City staff may waive, scope or expand the CHIA, in consultation with the applicant, to develop a modified terms of reference specific to the needs of the project.

1. **Executive Summary**
   - Outline and summarize all recommendations including mitigation strategies, the need for the preparation of follow-up plans such as Conservation Plans and Documentation and Salvage Plans and requirements as warranted. Mitigation options should be ranked from most preferred to least.

2. **Background Information**
   - Present owner contact information for the lands and buildings proposed for development and/or site alteration.
   - Name, qualifications and background of the qualified heritage conservation professional completing the CHIA.

3. **Historical research, analysis and evaluation of built heritage resource/cultural heritage landscape**
   - A location plan indicating the subject property (map and aerial photograph) and a buffer appropriate to demonstrate the existing area context and identify adjacent heritage resources.
   - A site plan showing lot dimensions and the location/setbacks of all existing buildings on the subject property, drawn at an appropriate scale to demonstrate the context of the buildings and site details.
   - A written and photographic description of the site identifying existing conditions, significant features, buildings, landscapes and landscape elements (mature trees, fences, walls, driveways), vistas, and any yet unidentified potential cultural heritage resources.
   
   J. Parsons: To be provided to heritage consultant by Mark Lieto.
   
   J. Parsons: Description of existing conditions can be brief.
• Current digital images documenting all building elevations and identified exterior and interior heritage attributes, as appropriate. J. Parsons: Not applicable

• A concise written and photographic description of the context including adjacent properties and their recognition, if applicable.

• A chronological history of the property’s development, including original construction dates, additions and alterations, if known.

• Relevant historic maps and atlases, drawings, photographs, sketches/renderings, permit records, land records, assessment rolls, city directories, etc. J. Parsons: Not required. Focus will be on impacts and design.

4. Identification of the significant heritage attributes of the built heritage resource/cultural heritage landscape

• Identification of any heritage recognition of the property and/or buildings/structures thereon, including descriptions of significant features or values, as available. Heritage recognitions could include:
  - Designation under Part IV and Part V of the Ontario Heritage Act;
  - Listing as a non-designated property on the Municipal Heritage Register;
  - Location within a municipally-identified cultural heritage landscape;
  - Regionally significant cultural heritage resource;
  - A heritage easement agreement with the City or Ontario Heritage Trust;
  - Inclusion in Parks Canada National Historic Sites of Canada; and
  - Inclusion on any Provincial or Federal heritage registries.

J. Parsons: Already provided. Subject property has no heritage status but adjacent property is listed.

• Where Council has previously adopted a Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest through municipal designation, using criteria set out in Ontario Regulation 9/06 (as amended by Ontario Regulation 569/22), the CHIA must be based on the Council approved Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest and List of Heritage Attributes. Properties designated prior to amendments made to the Ontario Heritage Act in 2005, which now require more fulsome Statements of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest and Lists of Heritage Attributes, will be subject to review and by-law amendment, as necessary.

• Comprehensive written research, analysis and graphical information related to the cultural heritage value or interest of the site will be compiled as per Ontario Regulation 9/06 of the Ontario Heritage Act. The analysis must include attributes that are already recognized and any that are newly identified. Significant heritage attributes may include any significant features, characteristics, context, and appearance of buildings, landscapes or vistas.

  - An evaluation using Regional Council’s 10 approved evaluation criteria for identifying a Regionally Significant Cultural Heritage Resource may also be required and should be confirmed with the Region’s Cultural Heritage Planner during stakeholder engagement. J. Parsons: Not applicable

J. Parsons: The evaluation of the adjacent property can be very brief and based on physical/design value of the building.

ERA: As confirmed by City staff, the property at 78 Chalmers does not meet O. Reg 9/06 criteria. ERA evaluated the property by doing background research, a site visit, and review of visual resources (refer to Section 3). A 9/06 evaluation of the adjacent property is beyond the scope of this report.
A clear statement of conclusions as to whether the subject property and/or buildings/structures thereon, if not already recognized, meet the criteria under Ontario Regulation 9/06 for listing or designation under the Ontario Heritage Act. If no, the rationale as to why the criteria for designation or listing are not met. If yes, a Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest and a bullet point list of heritage attributes of the property should be provided. This statement will be informed by current research and analysis of the site as well as pre-existing heritage descriptions. This statement is to follow the provincial guidelines set out in the Ontario Heritage Tool Kit. The Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest will be written in a way that does not respond to or anticipate any current or proposed interventions. The City may, at its discretion and upon review, reject or use the Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest, in whole or in part, in crafting its own Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest for the subject property.

A summary of the integrity and condition of the identified cultural heritage resource(s) and a timeline of when any changes or alterations occurred.

5. Description of the proposed development or site alteration
   A written description of the proposed development or site alteration, detailing the rationale and purpose of the development or works, a graphical layout (plans, drawings and specifications), and how the development fits with municipal planning objectives set forth in the City’s Official Plan and other municipal policy documents (such as a relevant secondary plan or heritage conservation district plan).

6. Assessment of development or site alteration impacts
   A clear and objective assessment identifying both (a) direct and/or indirect positive effects, and (b) direct and/or indirect adverse impacts resulting from the proposed development relative to the heritage value(s) of on-site and adjacent built heritage resources or cultural heritage landscapes.

   Positive impacts may include, but are not limited to:
   - Restoration of building, including replacement of missing attributes;
   - Restoration of a historic streetscape or enhancement of the quality of the place;
   - Adaptive re-use of a built heritage resource to ensure its ongoing viability; and
   - Access to new sources of funds to allow for the ongoing protection and restoration of the heritage resource.

   Adverse impacts may include, but are not limited to (refer to the Ontario Heritage Toolkit, former Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport):
   - Destruction of any, or part of any, significant heritage attributes;
o Alteration that is not sympathetic, or is incompatible, with the historic fabric and appearance of the heritage resource;

o Shadows created that alter the appearance of a heritage attribute or change the viability of a natural feature or plantings, such as a garden;

o Isolation of a heritage attribute from its surrounding environment, context or a significant relationship;

o Direct or indirect obstruction of significant views or vistas within, from, or of built and natural features;

o A change in land use that affects the property's heritage value; and

o Land disturbances such as a change in grade that alters soils, and drainage patterns that adversely affect a heritage resource.

7. Consideration of alternatives, mitigation and conservation methods (Official Plan 4.2)

- Alternative options and mitigation measures are important components of the CHIA as they describe ways to avoid or reduce negative impacts to a cultural heritage resource. Mitigation might also be achieved through modifications to the design of the project to create a sympathetic context for the heritage resource and may include, but is not limited to:

  - Preservation/conservation in situ;
  - Adaptive re-use;
  - Integration of all or part of the heritage resource;
  - Relocation; and
  - Documentation and salvage.

- Methods to prevent and minimize adverse impacts to a heritage resource(s) includes, but are not limited to:

  - Alternative development approaches/designs that result in compatible development and limit adverse impacts;
  - Isolating or screening new development/works from significant cultural heritage resources to conserve heritage attributes including, but not limited to, their settings and identified views and vistas;
  - Limiting height and density or locating higher/denser components of a development in an manner that respects the existing heritage resources or the heritage conservation district;
  - Including reversible interventions to heritage resources;
  - Relocation of a heritage resource, to be employed only as a last resort, if conservation cannot be achieved by any other means.

- A conservation strategy will be presented to inform the decisions of City staff and Council. The preferred strategy recommended to best protect and enhance the cultural heritage value and heritage attributes of the on-site and adjacent cultural heritage resource(s) includes, but is not limited to:
o A mitigation strategy including the proposed methods. Mitigation options should be ranked from most to least preferred;
o Recommendations for additional studies/plans related to, but not limited to: conservation; site specific design guidelines; interpretation/commemoration; lighting; signage; landscape; stabilization; additional documentation and salvage prior to demolition; and long-term maintenance, as appropriate.

- Conservation strategies will take into account the existing condition of the cultural heritage resource and the constructability of the proposal. It is expected the project team will have undertaken sufficient investigation to confirm the capacity of the heritage resource to withstand the proposed intervention.
- Where there is the potential to affect known or potential archaeological resources, an Archaeological Assessment will be undertaken as an additional study prepared by a licensed archaeologist.

8. **Schedule and reporting structure for implementation and monitoring**
   - A schedule and reporting structure for implementing the recommended conservation/mitigative/avoidance measures and monitoring the heritage resource as the development or site alteration is undertaken.

9. **A summary statement and conservation recommendations**
   - The summary statement should provide a full description of:
     o The significance and heritage attributes of the built heritage resource(s)/cultural heritage landscape(s);
     o The identification of any impacts the proposed development/works will have on the heritage attributes of the resource(s)/landscape(s), including adjacent protected heritage property;
     o An explanation of recommended conservation or mitigative measures, and alternative development/site alteration approaches;
     o Clarification as to why specific conservation or mitigative measures, or alternative development/site alteration approaches are not appropriate; and
     o For development proposals that could result in the demolition of a designated or listed property, a CHIA must also require documentation of the heritage resource for archival purposes, including, at minimum, land use history and photographs provided prior to demolition or removal. The CHIA may recommend the completion of a Documentation and Salvage Report, which may include dimensioned drawings. See the *Documentation and Salvage Report Terms of Reference*.

    - For properties identified by the Region of Waterloo to have regional significance, conservation recommendations must, wherever feasible, aim to conserve heritage resources intact by:
      - J. Parsons: Not applicable
• Recognizing and incorporating heritage resources and their surrounding context into the proposed development in a manner that does not compromise or destroy the heritage resource;
• Protecting and stabilizing built heritage resources that may be underutilized, derelict, or vacant; and
• Designing development to be physically and visually compatible with, and distinguishable from, the heritage resource.

Where it is not feasible to conserve a heritage resource intact, the conservation recommendations shall:
• Promote the reuse or adaptive reuse of the heritage resource, building, or building elements to preserve the resource and the work of past artisans; and
• Require the owner/applicant to provide dimensioned drawings, a land use history, photographs and other required documentation of the heritage resource in its surrounding context, which may be compiled in a Documentation and Salvage Report.

11. Cited Material
• Provide a bibliography listing all sources used in the preparation of the CHIA.

Links
* City of Cambridge Cultural Heritage Mapping
* City of Cambridge Heritage Properties Register
* City of Cambridge Local History
* Parks Canada Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada
* Parks Canada National Historic Sites of Canada
* Canadian Register of Historic Places
CHIA Review Process

1. Notice
Staff will notify the property owner(s) and/or their representative in writing that a CHIA is required. The CHIA Terms of Reference will be included with the notice, or a subsequent follow-up, and may be scoped depending upon the proposed development.

2. Draft Submission
A PDF copy of the draft CHIA will be submitted to City staff for review. The report will be clearly marked as draft.

3. Completeness
The draft CHIA will be assessed by staff for completeness. Staff will provide the author of the CHIA with clear instructions regarding any additional information or analysis required before the CHIA is considered complete.

4. Review
Complete CHIAs must demonstrate, to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning, that significant impacts have been evaluated and recommendations of mitigative measures to conserve the heritage attributes of that resource/landscape will be reviewed by Planning staff and circulated to the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee for review and comment when the development is major in nature or where the City believes there will be a detrimental impact to the cultural heritage resource. For properties determined by the Region of Waterloo to be of Regional significance, the CHIA will be circulated to the Region for review. City staff may request to meet with the owner/applicant to discuss the CHIA and its recommendations.

5. Peer Review
In certain cases, the City may seek a peer review of the CHIA by a qualified heritage conservation professional. The peer review will be carried out by a consultant retained by the City, at the expense of the applicant.

6. Acceptance
Authors of complete CHIAs carried out to the satisfaction of staff will be provided with comments in writing along with a notification of acceptance or rejection of the CHIA.

   In the case of a rejected CHIA, the applicant will have been notified of the deficiencies in order to have them corrected by their heritage consultant or to re-write the CHIA. Where revisions have not been made and/or a new CHIA has not been submitted, staff may reject the CHIA due to not meeting the City’s requirements. The applicant may choose to submit a new CHIA or revise their proposal to achieve acceptance.

   In cases where MHAC is not supportive of the CHIA, the applicant is encouraged to amend their proposal and revise the CHIA in order to accommodate MHAC comments and concerns. In the event MHAC maintains a lack of support for the CHIA, despite
revisions, it will be brought before Council as part of a staff report for a final decision.

7. Final Submission

A PDF copy of an accepted CHIA will accompany the final application made under the Planning Act or Ontario Heritage Act and will be considered as part of the complete application. The CHIA’s recommendations may be secured through development-related legal agreements and regulations at the discretion of the City or authority having jurisdiction.
Appendix B: Excerpt from City of Cambridge Heritage Properties Register for 78 Chalmers Street North
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32 Cedar Street</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Landmarks article)</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Center Street</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Landmarks article)</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 Center Street</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Landmarks article)</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Chalmers Street North</td>
<td></td>
<td>High Victorian Gothic house, grey granite (Dilse p. 104)</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Chalmers Street North</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ontario Cottage, grey granite (Dilse p. 103, Landmarks article)</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Chalmers Street North</td>
<td></td>
<td>High Victorian Gothic house, pink granite (Dilse p. 103)</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>78 Chalmers Street North</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>High Victorian Gothic house, grey granite (Dilse p. 103)</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93 Chalmers Street North</td>
<td>c. 1870</td>
<td>DESIGNATED (2012) – Gothic Revival, red and yellow brick</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122 Chalmers Street North</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ontario Cottage, heavily mortared grey granite (Dilse p. 103)</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 Charles Street</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>J.H. Bennett Sr. House, Ranch with Colonial details, Architect Ray Hall (Landmarks article)</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90 Chilligo Road</td>
<td>by 1847</td>
<td>Globe Hotel, later grocery now house, stucco 2-storey, ownership included distiller Joseph Seagram (Landmarks article)</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>355 Chilligo Road</td>
<td>c. 1819</td>
<td>House, Mennonite style, stone, 2½ storeys with additions (Landmarks article)</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>745 Chilligo Road</td>
<td>c1870-M</td>
<td>Mennonite Georgian house, 2-storey, red brick, symmetrical, 2-storey verandah (Landmarks article)</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Chisholm Street</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Landmarks article)</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Chisholm Street</td>
<td></td>
<td>High Victorian Gothic house, granite rubblestone (Dilse p. 108)</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Chisholm Street</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Landmarks article)</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Chisholm Street</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vernacular Picturesque Revival country home (Dilse p. 109)</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 and 30 Chisholm Street</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Landmarks article)</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155 Chopin Drive</td>
<td>c. 1880</td>
<td>Weiler House, one and a half story vernacular with Georgian elements. (King/Chopin)</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225 Chopin Drive</td>
<td>c. 1905</td>
<td>2 storey wood frame/brick façade, Queen Anne Revival. (King/Chopin)</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>237 Chopin Drive</td>
<td>c. 1880</td>
<td>One storey wood frame (King/Chopin)</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251 Chopin Drive</td>
<td>c. 1870</td>
<td>One storey wood frame with yellow brick façade. (King/Chopin)</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>258 Chopin Drive</td>
<td>c. 1910</td>
<td>Szwojkowski House, 1½ storey, yellow brick Edwardian. (King/Chopin)</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236 Church Street North</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Landmarks article)</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>