Corporation of the City of Cambridge

Cambridge Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee Meeting Agenda

Meeting Number: 04-24

Date: April 18, 2024, at 7 p.m.

Location: Hybrid Meeting at City Hall and via Zoom

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

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

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

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

Meeting Called to Order

Roll Call

Disclosure of Interest

Approval of Minutes

THAT the Minutes of the March 21, 2024 meeting of the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee be considered for errors and omissions and be adopted.  

PP 004
Presentations:

Jenna Brown-Jowett, Director of Corporate Strategy, will give a presentation regarding the City of Cambridge Strategic Plan.

Slobodanka Lekic, Manager of Building Design & Construction will give a presentation on work scheduled for the City-owned Heritage buildings Landreth Cottage and Cambridge Arts Theatre.

Emily Guy, Research & Policy Lead of TRACE architectures Inc will give a presentation on the Hespeler Heritage Conservation District (HCD) Study.

Delegations:

Agenda Items:

1. 24-011 (MHAC) Updated Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) Terms of Reference PP 010

THAT Report 24-011 (MHAC) Updated Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) Terms of Reference - be received;

AND FURTHER THAT the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee recommends that Council approve the updated HIA Terms of Reference, which also includes terms of references for a conservation plan and documentation and salvage plan.

2. 24-012 (MHAC) Hespeler Heritage Conservation District Study Report PP 043

THAT Report 24-0012 (MHAC) Hespeler Heritage Conservation District Study Report be received;

AND THAT the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC) accepts the Hespeler Heritage Conservation District (HCD) Study Report, its recommendations, and its conclusions outlined within Appendix B;

AND THAT the MHAC recommend that Council endorse the recommended HCD boundaries, as outlined within Appendix A;

AND FURTHER THAT the MHAC recommend that Council approve the recommendations and conclusions of the HCD Study Report and approve the preparation of a Hespeler HCD Plan and Guidelines in accordance with Section 41 of the Ontario Heritage Act.
3. **24-007 (MHAC) Delegated Authority By-law for Heritage Permits**

**PP 225**

**THAT** Report 24-07 (MHAC) Delegated Authority By-law for Heritage Permits be received;

**AND THAT** the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC) recommend that Council approve the proposed power to consent to certain alterations to properties designated under the Ontario Heritage Act to the Chief Planner, subject to consultation with MHAC;

**AND FURTHER THAT** the Draft By-law, attached as Appendix A to Report 24-007 (MHAC), be supported by MHAC.

**Other Business**

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

**Next Meeting:**

Date & Time: May 16, 2024, at 7 p.m.
Hybrid at City Hall and via Zoom

**Close of Meeting**

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

**Distribution:**

Committee Members in Attendance: Susan Brown, Michelle Goodridge, Kimberly Livingstone, Rosemary Minella, Megan Oldfield, and Councillor Corey Kimpson.


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

Meeting Called to Order

The meeting of the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee was held in person at Cambridge City Hall, virtually via Microsoft Zoom and live streamed to the City of Cambridge YouTube channel. Kimberly Livingstone, MHAC Chairperson, welcomed everyone and she advised those present that in its advisory role, MHAC makes recommendations that then go to Council for a decision. The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. and the meeting adjourned at 8:45 p.m.

Maria Barrantes-Barreto explained the process for the annual election, who is eligible to vote and how the balloting will take place to ensure accurate and confidential results.

Election of Chairperson for 2024

Maria Barrantes-Barreto called for nominations for Chairperson.

Susan Brown nominated Kimberly Livingstone

Kimberly Livingstone agreed to stand for nomination.

There being no further nominations;

Moved by: Susan Brown
Seconded by: Megan Oldfield

Kimberly Livingstone was unanimously voted as Chairperson for 2024

Election of Vice-Chairperson for 2024
Maria Barrantes-Barreto called for nominations for Vice-Chairperson.

Kimberly Livingstone nominated Susan Brown

Susan Brown agreed to stand for nomination.

There being no further nominations;

Moved by: Megan Oldfield
Seconded by: Rosemary Minella

Susan Brown was unanimously voted as Vice-Chairperson for 2024.

**Declarations of Interest – NIL**

**Presentation**

**Delegations:**

Evan Sugden, President of Bright Past Heritage Inc., was present to delegate to the recommendation to designate the stone residence at 201 Water Street South under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act. He provided a presentation noting the property location and historic development of the site. He further explained the current site had a former rail corridor to the front and various outbuildings in use when it was a farm along with the stone residence. The largest of these outbuildings was more recently used as storage. The building has been modified over the years and is proposed to be removed. He noted alterations to the stone house including an addition in the 1990’s which is proposed to be removed. Evan further provided his evaluation under Reg 9/06, impacts to shadows, obstruction of views, land disturbances and changes in use. He maintains his position that the stone house meets one of nine criteria but that the owners are open to its designation. He noted the proposal is to keep the original stone house while allowing the interior to be reconfigured for a new purpose.

Andrew Rowbotham, owner of 79 Old Mill Road was present to speak to the Heritage Permit Application request to erect a permanent structure on his property within the Blair Village Heritage Conservation District. He noted the gothic window on the main house and that they are asking for a variance for building height through the Committee of Adjustment to be able to replicate the same type of gothic window in the new building.
Minutes of Previous Meeting

Moved by: Michelle Goodridge
Seconded by: Rosemary Minella

THAT the minutes of the January 18, 2024 meeting of the Cambridge Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee be considered for errors and omissions and be adopted.

CARRIED

Reports:

1. Recommendation to Designate the Stone Residence at 201 Water Street South under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act

Laura Waldie, Senior Planner Heritage provided a brief overview of the file noting that the property is currently listed on the City’s Heritage Register. She explained that a Heritage Impact Assessment was submitted by Bright Past Heritage Consulting Inc on behalf of the owners which stated the property met only one of nine criteria for designation under O. Reg 9/06. Upon receipt of the HIA, staff undertook a separate analysis which showed the property did warrant designation by meeting five of nine criteria.

Moved by: Michelle Goodridge
Seconded by: Megan Oldfield

The Committee discussed the proposed distance from the house to the new development, possible uses of the stone house, and heritage attributes. Further discussion was held regarding the wording of the designation. Laura Waldie advised that the intention was always to designate the exterior of the building and that staff is happy to work with the developer to renovate the interior of the building while ensuring the exterior heritage attributes are protected.

THAT Report 24-006 (MHAC)- Recommendation to Designate the Stone Residence at 201 Water Street South under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act – be received;

AND THAT the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC) receive the Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) prepared by Bright Past Heritage Consulting Inc.;

AND FURTHER THAT the MHAC recommend to Council that the Clerk be authorized to publish a Notice of Intention to Designate (NOID) the stone residence, in its entirety,
on the property located at 201 Water Street South in accordance with Section 29 of the Ontario Heritage Act for its cultural heritage value.

CARRIED

2. 24-008 (MHAC) 79 Old Mill Road: Heritage Permit Application, Request to Erect a Permanent Structure within the Blair Village Heritage Conservation District

Jeremy Parsons provided a brief overview of the proposed construction of a new ARU on the property. He noted the proposed design is sensitive to the design of the 1884 heritage building on the property and will not have a negative impact on either the existing dwelling nor the streetscape. He further provided information on the location, policy of the Blair Village HCD Plan as it pertains to the materials, colour and streetscape.

Moved by: Susan Brown
Seconded by: Michelle Goodridge

The Committee noted they are happy to see that this project is very sympathetic to the existing structure and fully support the project.

THAT Report 24-008 (MHAC) – 79 Old Mill Road: Heritage Permit Application, Request to Erect a Permanent Structure within the Blair Village Heritage Conservation District be received;

AND FURTHER THAT the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee recommend that Council approve the Heritage Permit application for the proposed construction of a new detached structure at 79 Old Mill Road as outlined in Report 24-008 (MHAC), subject to the following conditions:

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

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

CARRIED
3. **24-001 Memo (MHAC) – Memo on Letter Received from ACO Cambridge and North Dumfries Branch on Section 27 of the Ontario Heritage Act**

Jeremy Parsons gave a brief explanation of the memo provided and noted that the City of Cambridge has previously met with representatives of the Province requesting an extension regarding proposed changes to the Ontario Heritage Act and that they plan to continue communication with the Province in regards to the proposed changes and deadlines.

**Information Items:** NIL

**Other Business - NIL**

**Chair's Comments:**

Kimberly Livingstone thanked the Committee for electing her as Chair for the coming year. She also provided follow up from the previous meeting regarding city owned retaining walls. She advised the Committee that Asset Management has confirmed that they keep up maintenance of City owned retaining walls through a regular inspection program.

**Council Report/ Comments:**

Councillor Kimpson noted that Council had approved the development for the former Preston Springs site and had worked hard for a balanced concept that will work with the site and at a location that will be a major transit area.

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

Jeremy Parsons advised the Committee that the Hespeler Heritage Conservation Draft Study report will be coming next month.

**Next Meeting**

**Date & Time:** April 18, 2024, 7:00 p.m.

**Location:** Hybrid

**Close of Meeting**

Moved by: Michelle Goodridge
Seconded by: Rosemary Minella
THAT the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee meeting does now adjourn at 8:45 p.m.

CARRIED

______________________    ____________________
Kimberly Livingstone   Karin Stieg-Drobig
MHAC Chairperson       Recording Secretary
To: Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee
Meeting Date: 4/18/2024
Report Title: 24-011 (MHAC) Updated Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) Terms of Reference
Report Author: Laura Waldie, Senior Planner-Heritage
Department Approval: Joan Jylanne, Manager of Policy Planning
Department: Community Development
Division: Policy Planning
Report No.: 24-011(MHAC)
File No.: R01
Ward: All Wards

RECOMMENDATION(S):

THAT Report 24-011(MHAC) – Updated Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) Terms of Reference - be received;

AND FURTHER THAT the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee recommends that Council approve the updated HIA Terms of Reference, which also includes terms of references for a conservation plan and documentation and salvage plan.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

Purpose

This report has been prepared to consult with the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC) on the updated Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA), Conservation Plan, and Documentation and Salvage Plan Terms of References that were prepared by WSP dated June 29, 2023.

Key Findings

- The HIA Terms of Reference was last updated in 2012 and does not reflect current best heritage industry practices for HIAs compared to other local municipalities such as the City of Kitchener and the City of Waterloo.
- Conservation Plan, and Documentation and Salvage Plan Terms of References were also produced as the City of Cambridge did not have Terms of References for these types of plans.
Financial Implications

The cost of preparing a Heritage Impact Assessment, Conservation Plan, and/or a Documentation and Salvage Plan is the responsibility of the property owner/developer. The cost of updating the HIA Terms of References was $3,328 which was covered by the Streamline Development Approval Fund (SDA).

STRATEGIC ALIGNMENT:

☐ Strategic Action; or
☒ Core Service

Objective(s): Not Applicable

Strategic Action: Not Applicable

Program: Community Development

Core Service: Heritage Conservation

BACKGROUND:

As per Section 4.10 of the Official Plan, a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) is required for a development application on, or adjacent to, a property on the Heritage Register, whether designated or listed. An HIA may also be requested, at the discretion of the City, for a designated property on the Heritage Register that is undergoing significant alterations that would require the designation by-law to be revised. A HIA may also be required to justify the demolition of any property on the Heritage Register, whether designated or listed. The HIAs are submitted to the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee for review and are made available upon request by members of Council when considering staff recommendation reports for development applications, alterations or demolitions, as legislated by the Ontario Heritage Act.

The HIA Terms of Reference is one of the actions the city pursued as part of the City’s Housing Pledge to the Province to meet the targeted goal of supplying 19,000 new homes in the City of Cambridge by 2031. Specifically, the City’s housing pledge action is to simplify development approvals and reduce processing time by updating Development Agreements, Terms of References for required studies, and template development conditions. The City used funding from the Province through the Streamline Development Approval Fund (SDAF) to produce the HIA Terms of Reference as a tool to help support improvements to the planning process.

ANALYSIS:

The Ontario Heritage Act does not mandate the requirement for heritage impact assessments (HIAs), conservation plans, or documentation and salvage plans. These
assessments and plans are built into a municipality’s Official Plan. The City of Cambridge has mandated the requirement for HIAs in the Official Plan since before 2012, when the current HIA Terms of Reference was created. Section 4.10.7 of the Official Plan states the HIA Terms of Reference for HIAs are approved by Council with input from the MHAC.

In the Fall of 2022, heritage planning staff identified the need to update the 2012 HIA Terms of Reference to bring it in line with current industry best practices. A heritage planning consultant from WSP Group was retained to research the HIA Terms of References from local area municipalities and prepare an updated terms of reference, which would also include terms of references for preparing conservation plans, and documentation and salvage plans, which the City did not have. Conservation plans, and documentation and salvage plans are common appendices of modern HIAs. City staff had noticed that increasing numbers of HIAs submitted for review with development applications had started including plans for conservation, and/or documentation and salvage of heritage features on a property. Therefore, staff felt it was necessary to also prepare a terms of reference for conservation plans, and documentation and salvage plans.

Local municipalities consulted for their HIA terms of reference included the Cities of Kitchener, Waterloo, and Hamilton. The attached Terms of Reference for HIAs, Conservation Plans, and Documentation and Salvage Plans (Appendix 1) closely aligns with what other municipalities in Waterloo Region have for their Terms of Reference. Streamlining HIAs across the Region would help simplify the HIA process for developers and property owners if the guidelines were similar in each community.

The updated Terms of References will bring HIAs in the City of Cambridge in line with other area municipalities in terms of industry best practices.

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.

FINANCIAL IMPACT:

The property owner/developer is responsible for any costs associated with submitting a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) to the City. The cost of updating the HIA Terms of References was $3,328 which was covered by the Streamline Development Approval Fund (SDA).

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 the consultant and Regional staff on the process of updating the Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) Terms of Reference. Both Regional staff and the consultant advised on including terms of references for conservation plans, and documentation and salvage plans to be included in all HIAs where relevant.

CONCLUSION:

For the reasons outlined in this report, heritage planning staff recommends that the MHAC recommends Council approve the updated Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) Terms of Reference.

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:

MEMO

TO: Joan Jylanne, Manager of Policy Planning, Planning Services, Community Development, City of Cambridge

FROM: Lindsay Benjamin, MAES, MCIP, RPP, CAHP, Senior Cultural Heritage Specialist; Michael Teal, MES, Archaeology Team Lead

SUBJECT: City of Cambridge Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment Terms of Reference, Conservation Plan Terms of Reference, and Documentation and Salvage Plan Terms of Reference Memo

DATE: June 29, 2023

BACKGROUND

WSP Canada Inc. (WSP) was retained by the City of Cambridge (the “City”) to assist with updating the City’s existing 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), as well as preparing new Terms of Reference for Conservation Plans (CP) and Documentation and Salvage Plans. This work is being undertaken as a result of a City initiative to streamline the development approvals process, which includes updating Terms of References (ToR) for various studies.

This memo will outline the methodology undertaken to complete the updated Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment (CHIA) ToR and new CP and Documentation and Salvage Plan ToRs, notably consisting of a gap analysis for the CHIA ToR. ToRs for five municipalities were reviewed to assist with identifying portions of the City’s guidance document that could be improved as well as best practices in the preparation of the CP and Documentation and Salvage Plan ToRs. New policy recommendations and a rationale for a recommended approach to updating and preparing the ToRs will also be detailed in this memo. The updated CHIA ToR and new CP and Documentation and Salvage Plan ToRs are appended to this memo as Attachment 1.

METHODOLOGY

CHIA Terms of Reference Gap Analysis

To aid in the preparation of an updated CHIA ToR for the City of Cambridge, similar municipal documents were reviewed to identify content gaps, areas requiring update or opportunities for improvement. CHIA ToRs were reviewed for the following five municipalities:

- City of Waterloo
- City of Kitchener
- City of Toronto
- City of Hamilton
- Town of Aurora
These municipalities were selected as they represent large urban cities with established cultural heritage policies and processes. In particular, the City of Waterloo and City of Kitchener’s CHIA ToRs were reviewed as, where possible, the City of Cambridge would like to use similar documents for development applicants across the three cities in the Region of Waterloo. The City of Waterloo’s CHIA ToR is informed by the City of Toronto and City of Hamilton’s ToR.

Below, Table 1 provides an overview of a gap analysis completed for the five municipal CHIA ToRs and is structured to reflect the presence or absence of common guidance and requirements. The City of Cambridge’s existing *Detailed Guidelines for the Preparation of Cultural Heritage Impact Assessments* is also included to note helpful or absent content.

### Table 1: Gap Analysis of Municipal CHIA Terms of Reference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHIA ToR Content</th>
<th>City of Cambridge</th>
<th>City of Waterloo</th>
<th>City of Kitchener</th>
<th>City of Toronto</th>
<th>City of Hamilton</th>
<th>Town of Aurora</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy Context</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When is a CHIA required?</td>
<td>✓ minimal</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notification</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualifications</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principles and guidelines</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario Regulation 9/06 criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHIA requirements:</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Executive Summary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Background Information</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Historical Research</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Written and photographic description of property and cultural heritage resource</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Measured drawings required</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- only for resources proposed for demolition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Identification/evaluation of cultural heritage value or interest</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHIA ToR Content</td>
<td>City of Cambridge</td>
<td>City of Waterloo</td>
<td>City of Kitchener</td>
<td>City of Toronto</td>
<td>City of Hamilton</td>
<td>Town of Aurora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Summary of integrity and condition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Description of proposed development/alteration</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Impact Assessment</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Consideration of alternatives</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Mitigation and conservation methods</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Implementation and monitoring plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Summary statement and conservation recommendations</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Conservation recommendations for regionally significant properties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Listing/designation recommendation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- List of cited material</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Links/resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review/approval process</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Includes Conservation Plan guidance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Includes documentation and/or salvage guidance</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

018
This review indicates the City’s existing *Detailed Guidelines for the Preparation of Cultural Heritage Impact Assessments* is not as comprehensive as other municipal CHIA ToRs, with notable gaps observed in guidance related to: proponent notification; principles and guidelines; cultural heritage evaluation criteria; CHIA requirements including an executive summary, details of historical research, a Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest, discussion of integrity and condition, an implementation and monitoring plan, and conservation recommendations for regionally significant properties. The CHIA ToR also does not provide guidance detailing the completion of CPs or Documentation and Salvage Plans.

**Conservation Plan ToR Review**

Few municipal examples of CP ToRs were identified in Ontario, with two identified for the Town of Aurora and City of Kitchener. As the City of Cambridge does not currently have a guidance document for CPs, a gap analysis was not completed, rather the two municipal ToRs were reviewed and used to inform the City of Cambridge CP ToR included as Attachment 2 to this memo.

**Documentation and Salvage Plan ToR Review**

Similarly, few municipal examples of Documentation and Salvage Plan ToRs were identified in Ontario, with two identified for the City of Hamilton and Town of Aurora. As such, provincial guidance was also relied upon in the Ministry of Transportation’s *Environmental Guide for Built Heritage and Cultural Heritage Landscapes* (2017), which includes direction for documentation and salvage of cultural heritage resources. As the City of Cambridge does not currently have a ToR for documentation and salvage, a gap analysis was not completed. Rather the two municipal ToRs and provincial guide were reviewed and informed the City of Cambridge Documentation and Salvage Plan ToR, included as Attachment 3 to this memo.

**RESPONSE TO UPDATED POLICY CHANGES**

On January 7, 2023, Ontario Regulation (O. Reg.) 9/06 was amended by the new O. Reg. 569/22: *Criteria for Determining Cultural Heritage Value or Interest* under subsection 5 (1) of Schedule 6 to the *More Homes Built Faster Act, 2022*. The amended O. Reg 9/06 still requires an evaluation of a potential cultural heritage resource, which is used to inform the preparation of a Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest and list of heritage attributes. In addition, for a potential cultural heritage resource to be designated under Part IV of the *Ontario Heritage Act*, it must now meet two of the criteria of O. Reg. 9/06, as amended by O. Reg. 569/22, rather than one, as previously required. For listing properties on the Municipal Heritage Register, they must only meet one criteria.

The City’s updated CHIA ToR has been revised to reflect this legislated change (see Attachment 1).

**RECOMMENDED APPROACH / RATIONALE**

The following provides a summary of the significant changes and updates reflected in the City of Cambridge CHIA ToR as a result of the gap analysis and request of City staff:

019
• MHAC authority to scope, waive and approve CHIAs was removed. Staff’s authority to scope, waive and approve CHIAs was noted and MHAC’s role to review per its consultation duties was clarified.

• Reference to the MHAC subcommittee has been removed.

• Reference to Section 4.10 of the Official Plan has been revised (see the Next Steps section below for recommendations to revise these OP policies).

• Specific details on opportunities to scope a CHIA have been included along with alternative reporting requirements where staff is of the opinion potential impacts to a resource will be minor.

• In terms of minimum CHIA content requirements:
  o An executive summary section has been added, detailing the CHIA’s contents to aid staff, MHAC and Council’s ease of review.
  o As per guidance taken from the City of Toronto and City of Hamilton CHIA ToRs, clarity on the use of approved Statements of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest and list of heritage attributes to inform the impact assessment or guidance on the preparation of new Statements was added.
  o More detailed guidance has been provided on the assessment of impacts to on-site and adjacent cultural heritage resources consistent with provincial guidance and best practice.
  o Details of specific requirements for alternatives and mitigation measures have been clarified in more detail, along with content requirements for a conservation strategy.
  o Links to useful resources that may aid proponents in the preparation of a CHIA have been provided.

As discussed in previous sections of this memo, new ToRs have been provided for CPs and Documentation and Salvage Plans. The inclusion of guidance for CPs and documentation and salvage within the CHIA ToR was determined to be ineffective as the guidance document became too lengthy and clarity between deliverable requirements was challenging to clearly express. WSP recommends individual ToRs are prepared for each deliverable to avoid any confusion, as per the guidance documents included in Attachment 1, Attachment 2 and Attachment 3. Using this approach, only relevant ToRs will be issued to a proponent, dependant upon their proposed project, and is a best practice observed at the City of Kitchener, City of Hamilton and Town of Aurora.
NEXT STEPS

City staff have reviewed this memo and the draft ToRs and provided comments and revisions, which have been incorporated into the final ToRs.

As a future step, to ensure the CHIA ToR is consistent with the Official Plan, it is recommended that staff prepare an update to Section 4.10.5 of the Official Plan to remove reference to MHAC’s authority to scope, waive and approve CHIAs and clarify the Committee’s role to review CHIAs per their consultation duties. Staff’s authority to scope, waive and approve CHIAs should be clarified in Section 4.10.5.

WSP Canada Inc.

Mike Teal, MES  Lindsay Benjamin, MAES, MCIP, RPP, CAHP
Archaeology Team Lead  Senior Cultural Heritage Specialist
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Attachment 1 – City of Cambridge Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment Terms of Reference
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.
• Current digital images documenting all building elevations and identified exterior and interior heritage attributes, as appropriate.
• 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.

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:
  o Designation under Part IV and Part V of the Ontario Heritage Act;
  o Listing as a non-designated property on the Municipal Heritage Register;
  o Location within a municipally-identified cultural heritage landscape;
  o Regionally significant cultural heritage resource;
  o A heritage easement agreement with the City or Ontario Heritage Trust;
  o Inclusion in Parks Canada National Historic Sites of Canada; and
  o Inclusion on any Provincial or Federal heritage registries.

• 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.
  o 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.
• 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.
  o 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:
  o Restoration of building, including replacement of missing attributes;
  o Restoration of a historic streetscape or enhancement of the quality of the place; and
  o Adaptive re-use of a built heritage resource to ensure its ongoing viability; and
  o 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):
  o 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:
  o Preservation/conservation in situ;
o Adaptive re-use;
o Integration of all or part of the heritage resource;
o Relocation; and
o Documentation and salvage.

- Methods to prevent and minimize adverse impacts to a heritage resource(s) includes, but are not limited to:
  o Alternative development approaches/designs that result in compatible development and limit adverse impacts;
o 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;
o 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;
o Including reversible interventions to heritage resources;
o 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:
A mitigation strategy including the proposed methods. Mitigation options should be ranked from most to least preferred;

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:
     - The significance and heritage attributes of the built heritage resource(s)/cultural heritage landscape(s);
     - 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;
     - An explanation of recommended conservation or mitigative measures, and alternative development/site alteration approaches;
     - Clarification as to why specific conservation or mitigative measures, or alternative development/site alteration approaches are not appropriate; and
     - 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:
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.
Attachment 2 – City of Cambridge Conservation Plan Terms of Reference
Conservation Plans
A Conservation Plan provides specific and in-depth recommendations regarding how a cultural heritage resource will be conserved and is typically submitted separate and subsequent to an approved Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment (CHIA). Conservation Plans may reference a CHIA for the same development or site alteration regarding historical research, the identification of cultural heritage resources, mitigation recommendations, etc.

The contents of a Conservation Plan typically include:

- Present owner contact information for the property proposed for development and/or alteration;
- A thorough inventory, description, and documentation of the heritage resource(s) and a clear Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest, including a bullet point List of Heritage Attributes;
- Identification of the conservation principles and guidelines to be applied for the type of heritage resource/attributes being conserved and specific conservation work to be undertaken in order to repair, maintain and protect the heritage resource/attributes. These conservation principles and guidelines may be found in publications such as: Parks Canada’s Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada: Eight Guiding Principles in the Conservation of Built Heritage Properties and the Ontario Heritage Tool Kit (former Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport). These publications are all available online;
- An in-depth assessment of the current condition of the cultural heritage resource(s) and its heritage attributes, along with discussions of the historical, current and proposed use. The Conservation Plan must assess the physical condition, deficiencies and integrity of the cultural heritage resource(s) and their heritage attributes, with a view toward making recommendations regarding appropriate repair and maintenance, in keeping with good conservation practice; and
- Identification of the short-, medium- and long-term vision for the conservation of the heritage resource(s), and the specific conservation measures and
interventions to be undertaken through the short-, medium-, and long-term
maintenance programs. Such measures shall describe the documentation,
stabilization, repair, monitoring and maintenance strategies required to be
undertaken for each phase and shall reference the qualifications for anyone
responsible for undertaking such work.

This section may include, but is not limited to, the following:

**Short-Term Conservation Work**

- Documentation (through detailed description and photographs) of heritage
  attributes proposed to be demolished, removed, salvaged or otherwise
  irreversibly damaged;
- Description of specifications for work required to be undertaken to
  conserve heritage attributes in need of immediate repair and stabilization
  to prevent further deterioration, damage and the potential loss of such
  attributes; and
- Monitoring strategy to protect the property from vandalism or fire (i.e.,
  methodology for monitoring; frequency of monitoring; and process to
  address issues that arise through monitoring).

**Medium-Term Conservation Work**

- Description and specifications for work required to be undertaken for
  heritage attributes as part of the proposed development and/or
  rehabilitation (to include demolition, removal and salvage of heritage
  attributes; the stabilization, repair and cleaning of heritage attributes; and
  the reconstruction or replacement of heritage attributes). Such work may
  be divided into phases.

**Long-Term Conservation Work**

- Identification of a monitoring program addressing appropriate measures
  for the ongoing maintenance of the heritage resources and attributes,
  post-development/rehabilitation; and
- Provide a recommended schedule for conservation work, inspections,
  monitoring, maintenance, associated costs and phases of work (short-,
  medium-, and long-term).

**Letter of Credit**

To ensure implementation of a Conservation Plan, the City may require an owner to
post a letter of credit, bond or certified cheque as part of the development approval
process.

**Qualified Heritage Conservation Professional**

A Conservation Plan 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 Conservation Plan must be included in the report in the form of a Curriculum Vitae.
Attachment 3 – City of Cambridge Documentation and Salvage Plan Terms of Reference
Documentation and Salvage Plan

Consistent with City of Cambridge Official Plan Policy 4.2.2, where it has been adequately demonstrated that the conservation, rehabilitation and reuse of cultural heritage resources is not viable, the City may require the affected resource(s) be thoroughly documented for archival purposes in a Documentation and Salvage Plan. A Documentation and Salvage Plan is a type of scoped Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment that may be required for the submission of an application under the Planning Act. The requirement for a Documentation and Salvage Plan may also be triggered by a process under the Ontario Heritage Act, including a Heritage Permit Application or a requirement of giving Notice of Intention to Demolish a property listed on the Municipal Heritage Register to ensure the resource is recorded and any salvageable material gathered prior to demolition. The City’s decision will be based on the significance of the property’s cultural heritage value and site conditions.

Documentation includes the identification of architectural materials of significant cultural heritage value worthy of salvage, at the expense of the applicant, prior to demolition or removal.

Documentation

Where a cultural heritage resource is to be relocated or demolished, full historical site research, photographic and map recording and documentation of the resource to be displaced or disrupted should be prepared. The City staff may scope some requirements, particularly if they have already been submitted in previous Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment reporting.

The documentation of a cultural heritage resource should include:

- A written description of the context of the property, including adjacent properties and/or landscapes;
- A written general description of the history of the study area as well as a detailed historical summary of property ownership and building(s) development;
- A written description of the resource, both exterior and interior for a building, and if a bridge or engineering work, its structural design and materials;
• Overall dimensional measurements of the exterior of a building or structure. Measured drawings will include dimensions for building footprint, height, window and door openings, and roof details;

• If the interior of the resource contains significant heritage attributes, overall dimensional measurements for principal rooms (all floors) in the interior and any interior heritage attribute details to aid in the building description;

• Representative photographs of the exterior (each elevation) of a building or structure;

• Detailed photography of architectural heritage attributes or elements on the exterior and interior of a building;

• Photographs of the exterior and interior of the building or structure;

• A site plan.

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.

Salvage

The purpose of salvaging heritage building materials is to preserve portions or features of buildings or structures that have significant historical, architectural, or cultural value and divert them from becoming landfill material. It should be noted that documentation and salvage is a last resort only after the following options have been considered by the City and property owner:

• Retention of the entire heritage resource or a portion of it on the original site; and

• Relocation of the entire heritage resource or a portion of it to a different site.

Materials considered for salvage should have significant physical attributes associated with a cultural heritage resource, be architectural in nature and suitable for re-use in other buildings or projects. Material must not be irreparably damaged or infested and should be extracted in a manner that continues to ensure they are not irreparably damaged.

If appropriate, a plan for salvage should be developed including, but not limited to:

• A list of building elements to be considered for salvage such as:
  o Window sashes and panes;
  o Doors, interior and exterior;
  o Interior trim and wainscoting, baseboards, casings, corner base blocks, brackets, columns, crown, chair and picture rails;
  o Timber framing and beams;
  o Wooden exterior cladding (vertical and horizontal planks, logs);
  o Floorboards;
  o Exterior trim, columns, posts, finials, barge boards, corbels, eaves, brackets, dentil moldings and gingerbread;
- Hardware;
- Fireplaces/mantles;
- Fences and gates;
- Shutters;
- Light fixtures;
- Historic brick, slate, marble, granite;
- Signage;
- Railings, balusters, spindles, columns, posts; and
- Tin ceiling tiles.

- The chosen contractor should propose specifications with instructions for the labelling, storage and reassembly of material in accordance with guidance taken from the *Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada*, Section 4: Guidelines for Materials.

- A requirement for expertise in cultural heritage resource removal; and

- The ultimate destination of salvaged materials.

**Salvage Prioritization**

Reuse and salvage can be achieved by identification, removal and repurposing through symbolic conservation, which allows for the recovery of heritage components of a property and reuses them to construct a visible record of the resource. This approach, along with the reuse of portions of a property, is often the recommended mitigation strategy when retention or relocation of a structure is shown not to be possible. This use of salvaged material onsite should be prioritized, where feasible, before exploring the relocation of materials.

Where on-site use is shown not to be feasible, these materials may then be removed off-site for use in other heritage structures as sourcing materials for repair and replacement can be challenging, especially if the materials are from an historic source that no longer exists, such as a quarry, an old-growth forest, or a manufacturing facility that has closed. As such, the careful salvage of materials from one historic structure can represent an opportunity for the in-kind replacement of quality historic materials in another. Where use in other heritage structures is not feasible, the salvaged material may be integrated into modern structures, on other properties (i.e., as landscape features), or may be taken for resale.

Should any material recommended for salvage not be harvested by a reputable contractor(s), donation to a teaching institution should be considered to allow the material to provide an educational opportunity rather than being sent to a landfill.

- A list of Conservation Programs in Ontario is available on the National Trust for Canada’s website: [https://archive.nationaltrustcanada.ca/resources/education/conservation-programs](https://archive.nationaltrustcanada.ca/resources/education/conservation-programs)
Any materials not deemed salvageable or suitable for educational purposes at teaching institutions, but which are still recyclable, should be recycled in an effort to reduce the amount of material sent to a landfill.

**Resources**

City of Cambridge staff maintain a dynamic list of salvage companies that can be shared upon request. The Architectural Conservancy of Ontario (ACO) North Waterloo Region also maintains a [Directory of Heritage Practitioners](#) that includes a list of companies located in Ontario dedicated to “Moving, Dismantling & Salvage.” This list could be referred to for salvage contacts, however, it is recommended that references and/or previous work be assessed before engaging with any of the listed businesses.

**Qualified Heritage Conservation Professional**

A Documentation and Salvage Plan 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. A reputable contractor(s) with proven expertise in cultural heritage resource removal should be obtained to salvage the identified building components. The qualifications and background of the professional completing the Documentation and Salvage Plan must be included in the report in the form of a Curriculum Vitae.
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RECOMMENDATION(S):

THAT Report 24-012 (MHAC) Hespeler Heritage Conservation District Study Report be received;  
AND THAT the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC) accepts the Hespeler Heritage Conservation District (HCD) Study Report, its recommendations, and its conclusions outlined within Appendix B;  
AND THAT the MHAC recommend that Council endorse the recommended HCD boundaries, as outlined within Appendix A;  
AND FURTHER THAT the MHAC recommend that Council approve the recommendations and conclusions of the HCD Study Report and approve the preparation of a Hespeler HCD Plan and Guidelines in accordance with Section 41 of the Ontario Heritage Act.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

Purpose

The purpose of this report is to consult with the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC) on the Hespeler Heritage Conservation District (HCD) Study Report. Consultation is required under Section 40(3) of the Ontario Heritage Act. Any comments will be incorporated into an updated version of the Study Report that is scheduled to be presented to Council on June 4, 2024.
Key Findings

- This project includes both a Study Phase and a Plan Phase. The purpose of the Study Phase is to evaluate and determine whether the Study Area should be designated as an HCD and to recommend district boundaries. The Plan Phase involves preparing a plan with policies and guidelines to help manage change and guide development in the district.

- A Study Area was established comprising approximately 524 properties which were evaluated for cultural heritage value. The Study Area includes a mix of commercial, industrial, civic, and residential land uses as well as open spaces connected to the area’s unique natural history centred on the Speed River.

- The Study Area contains a total of 67 properties that are listed and 16 properties that are designated under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act. The proposed HCD assists the City in its efforts to protect listed properties that will lose protection on January 1, 2025, due to changes implemented through Bill 23, the More Homes Built Faster Act.

- Public consultation was a key component in the Hespeler HCD Study. Consultation took place through an EngageCambridge project webpage, a project survey, a Public Information Centre (PIC), multiple MHAC meetings, and multiple community focus group meetings.

- Based on the analysis conducted within the Study, the consulting team on the project has concluded that the Study Area contains sufficient cultural heritage value to be considered for Part V designation. The recommended HCD boundaries comprise a total of 314 individual properties (Figure 1). It has also been determined that more than 25% of the properties within the recommended HCD boundaries meet at least two criteria under Ontario Regulation 9/06 (as amended by Ontario Regulation 569/22). The recommended HCD boundaries are included within Appendix A.

- Council approval is required to proceed to the Plan Phase of the project, and to prepare an HCD Plan and Guidelines for Hespeler. The Plan would outline policies for the conservation of heritage resources and guidelines for alterations and new development, to ensure that the heritage character of the district is maintained or enhanced.

Financial Implications

The Hespeler Heritage Conservation District Study and Plan project (A/00740-20) has an approved budget of $100,000 and is funded through the Capital Budget Levy. The Study
Phase comprises $55,535.00, or approximately half of the allocated project budget. A total of $38,338.64 has been issued for completed work so far. A total of $17,196.39 remains to be issued for work completed during the Study Phase. The total remaining cost for the Plan Phase is $30,520.00. The total combined project cost in the approved project budget is $97,242.15. Given that the current project is on time and on budget, no additional funds are anticipated to be requested to be allocated to this project.

STRATEGIC ALIGNMENT:

☑ Strategic Action; or
☐ Core Service

Objective(s): PLACEMAKING - Promote and create a wide range of destinations and activities that capitalize on the beauty of the rivers and heritage buildings

Strategic Action: Enhance opportunities to enjoy built and natural heritage

Program: Not Applicable

Core Service: Not Applicable

BACKGROUND:

In 2008, the City of Cambridge’s Heritage Master Plan recognized Hespeler Village as a “heritage character area” and recommended further evaluation. The Hespeler Streetscape Plan and Urban Design Guidelines also recognizes Hespeler Village as a special character area with heritage significance.

In 2020, Council directed staff to initiate the Hespeler HCD Study. The Hespeler HCD Study was subsequently included within the 2022 Approved Budget and Business Plan.

In January 2023, Heritage Planning staff issued a Request for Quotations (RFQ) and in February 2023 the project contract was awarded to TRACE Architectures Inc. The HCD Study began in April 2023.

With regards to public and advisory committee consultation, MHAC was consulted on the Study on October 19, 2023; a Public Information Centre (PIC) was held on October 30, 2023; and Community Focus Group meetings were held on January 10, February 14, and March 13, 2024. Council is scheduled to review and decide on the recommendations of the Study Report on June 4, 2024. The Study Phase of this project has taken approximately thirteen (13) months after project launch.

After project initiation, during Spring and Summer 2023, Heritage Planning staff created project timelines and established an EngageCambridge project website. The consultant
team began to conduct background research, initiated property surveys, and began to evaluate area character.

During Fall 2023, residents located within the Study Area were notified of the project through direct mail. An online public survey was also released to begin to collect community perspectives on the Study Area and on the concept of an HCD in Hespeler. Public comments and analysis of survey data are included in Section 4 of the Study Report, attached as Appendix B. On April 4, 2024, the consultant team provided a draft copy of the HCD Study Report to Heritage Planning staff who have reviewed and provided comments.

EXISTING POLICY / BY-LAW(S):
Ontario Heritage Act (R.S.O. 1990, c. O.18)

Area study

40 (1) The council of a municipality may undertake a study of any area of the municipality for the purpose of designating one or more heritage conservation districts. 2005, c. 6. s. 29.

Scope of study

(2) A study under subsection (1) shall,

(a) examine the character and appearance of the area that is the subject of the study, including buildings, structures and other property features of the area, to determine if the area should be preserved as a heritage conservation district;

(b) examine and make recommendations as to the geographic boundaries of the area to be designated;

(c) consider and make recommendations as to the objectives of the designation and the content of the heritage conservation district plan required under section 41.1;

(d) make recommendations as to any changes that will be required to the municipality’s official plan and to any municipal by-laws, including any zoning by-laws. 2005, c. 6. s. 29.

Consultation

(3) If the council of a municipality has established a municipal heritage committee under section 28, the council shall consult with the committee with respect to the study. 2005, c. 6. s. 29.
Ontario Regulation 569/22: Criteria for Determining Cultural Heritage Value or Interest

Criteria, s. 41 (1) (b) of the Act

3. (1) The criteria set out in subsection (2) are prescribed for the purposes of clause 41 (1) (b) of the Act.

(2) Subject to subsection (3), in the case of a by-law passed under subsection 41 (1) of the Act on or after the day subsection 5 (1) of Schedule 6 to the More Homes Built Faster Act, 2022 comes into force, a municipality or any defined area or areas of it may be designated by such a by-law as a heritage conservation district under subsection 41 (1) of the Act if the municipality or the defined area or areas of it meets the following criteria:

1. At least 25 per cent of the properties within the municipality or defined area or areas satisfy two or more of the following:

   i. The properties have design value or physical value because they are rare, unique, representative or early examples of a style, type, expression, material or construction method.

   ii. The properties have design value or physical value because they display a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit.

   iii. The properties have design value or physical value because they demonstrate a high degree of technical or scientific achievement.

   iv. The properties have historical value or associative value because they have a direct association with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization or institution that is significant to a community.

   v. The properties have historical value or associative value because they yield, or have the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of a community or culture.

   vi. The properties have historical value or associative value because they demonstrate or reflect the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer or theorist who is significant to a community.

   vii. The properties have contextual value because they define, maintain or support the character of the district.

   viii. The properties have contextual value because they are physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to each other.
ix. The properties have contextual value because they are defined by, planned around or are themselves a landmark.

City of Cambridge Official Plan (consolidated 2018)

Chapter 4: Cultural Heritage Resources

4.2 Priorities for Cultural Heritage Resources

e) Pass by-laws under the Ontario Heritage Act to establish and regulate Heritage Conservation Districts designated in accordance with Section 4.7 of this Plan.

4.7 Designation of Heritage Conservation Districts

1. The City will regulate as fully as possible the demolition, removal or inappropriate alteration or erection of buildings, which, in the opinion of Council, constitute or impact on a cultural heritage resource within a Heritage Conservation District as shown on Schedules 1, 2 and 3.

2. Council, after having consulted with MHAC, may pass by-laws pursuant to the Ontario Heritage Act to define one or more potential Heritage Conservation Districts to be examined for future designation as a Heritage Conservation District.

3. Council may, after consultation with the owners of properties included in a defined potential Heritage Conservation District, pass by-laws pursuant to the Ontario Heritage Act to designate all or part of the defined potential Heritage Conservation District as a Heritage Conservation District and apply to the Ontario Municipal Board for the approval of such by-laws.

4. The provisions of Policies 4.7.1 to 4.7.3 shall apply in respect of any building or structure and the land that is situate within the area that has been designated as a Heritage Conservation District.

5. With consultation from the MHAC, Council may pass by-laws of intent for a maximum period of one year that defines one or more areas to be examined for future designation as a Heritage Conservation District. During this period, alteration works including erection, demolition or removal of heritage buildings or structures shall be prohibited or limited.

6. For the purposes of defining a potential Heritage Conservation District in accordance with Policy 4.7.2, a study will be prepared which identifies the following:

   a) the composition of the area;
b) the incidence of buildings or structures of cultural heritage value included on the Register of Cultural Heritage Resources referred to in Section 4.3;

c) the heritage significance, character and appearance of the selected study area, including buildings, structures, contextual elements, landscapes, vistas and other properties;

d) the possible geographic boundaries of the study area;

e) the structural soundness of buildings or structures; and

f) the feasibility of restoring, using or maintaining buildings or structures.

7. Where Council determines that the establishment of a Heritage Conservation District is appropriate and feasible, the study prepared pursuant to Policy 4.7.6 shall form the basis of the Heritage Conservation District Plan. The Heritage Conservation District Plan shall include:

a) a statement of objectives for the District;

b) a statement explaining the cultural heritage value or interest of the District;

c) description of properties in the District and of the heritage attributes of the District;

d) policy statements, guidelines, and procedures for achieving the stated objectives and for managing change in the District;

e) a description of the types of alterations that will require a City permit and a description of minor alterations that will be permitted without the need for a City permit;

f) a map identifying the boundaries of the District; and

g) a communication plan for dialogue with the public, particularly the residents and landowners in the proposed Heritage Conservation District, identifying the intent and scope of the District.

8. Where it is proposed to designate a Heritage Conservation District in which properties have already been designated pursuant to Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act, the property may be included in an area designated as a Heritage Conservation District. A property that is included in an area designated as Heritage Conservation District may subsequently be designated under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act.

9. Pursuant to the Ontario Heritage Act, Council may pass by-laws to designate all or part of the lands set out in Section 4.7 as a Heritage Conservation District. Such a
designation shall not require an amendment to this Plan. The designating by-law shall identify the extent of the area, contain procedures and timelines for alterations to and demolition of existing buildings and/or structures as well as the erection of new buildings and/or structures based on the criteria established in the Heritage Conservation District Plan, and outline the appeal process to the Ontario Municipal Board or other Provincial appeal body.

10. Prior to designating a Heritage Conservation District, Council will undertake a public consultation/information process.

11. Where a Heritage Conservation District is in effect, public works shall be carried out and by-laws passed only if they complement/enhance the objectives set out in the Heritage Conservation District Plan.

ANALYSIS:

The Hespeler HCD Study was undertaken using methodology outlined by the Ontario Heritage Act and the Ministry of Culture and Multiculturalism’s Toolkit. This methodology included four main areas of research:

- An area history based upon archival research outlining significant themes and events that have shaped Hespeler’s evolution;

- An on-the-ground survey to create a cultural heritage inventory in which individual properties were documented and the characteristics of buildings, landscapes, and streetscapes were noted;

- An analysis of existing City and Regional policies to identify if any changes are required to support a future HCD; and,

- Public consultation to determine levels of support for a potential HCD and to give members of the public an opportunity to identify what they value and would like to see conserved in a potential HCD.

The evaluated Study Area includes approximately 524 properties within downtown Hespeler and includes the commercial section of Queen Street, industrial areas, civic spaces, historic residential neighbourhoods, and natural corridors. The evaluated Study Area contains 67 properties that are currently listed on the Municipal Heritage Register and 16 properties that are currently designated under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act.
The consultant team has determined that the Study Area contains sufficient cultural heritage value to be considered for Part V designation. The HCD boundaries recommended, included as Appendix A, are smaller than the original Study Area and comprise a total of 314 individual properties. The consultant team has also determined that more than 25% of the properties within the recommended HCD boundaries meet at least two criteria under Ontario Regulation 9/06.

The consultant team proposed the recommended HCD boundaries because of the “concentration of heritage resources creating a compelling and unique sense of place that is distinct from other communities” and the “significant number of properties which reveal broad architectural, cultural, social, and economic patterns of the region’s history.” The recommendations further add, “there is a wealth of high-value heritage residential, industrial and institutional buildings, waterscapes and natural and man-
made landscapes that are an integral part of the identity of Hespeler” (1.4.2. Recommended Boundary).

Heritage Planning staff support the recommended boundaries which appropriately cover significant areas of cultural heritage value within downtown Hespeler. These include areas with significant concentrations of historic building stock and areas which touch on themes related to the industrial, commercial, civic, residential, and natural history of Hespeler. The recommended HCD is anchored on the Speed River and includes a portion of Guelph Avenue, an industrial spine running north-south across the river; commercial areas along Queen Street, civic properties in the downtown; portions of mature residential neighbourhoods south of Queen Street; and naturalized spaces in the Mill Pond and Chilligo Conservation Area.

The Study Phase of the project is now complete. The purpose of the Study Phase was first to evaluate the Study Area to determine if it contained sufficient heritage value to be designated under Part V of the Ontario Heritage Act. Secondly, the Study Phase is intended to make recommendations on the geographic boundaries of the area to be designated, on the objectives and contents of a future HCD Plan, and on any changes that will be required to the City’s Official Plan and municipal by-laws [Section 40(2)].

Council is required under the Ontario Heritage Act to consult with the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee as part of the Study process. MHAC is requested to provide a recommendation to Council to approve the contents and conclusions of the Study Report and to request that an HCD Plan and Guidelines be prepared in accordance with Section 41 of the Ontario Heritage Act.

Should Council decide to move the project ahead, the Plan Phase will involve the development of policies, guidelines, and procedures to help guide future changes to the HCD so that the area’s character and heritage value is conserved.

**FINANCIAL IMPACT:**

The Hespeler Heritage Conservation District Study and Plan project (A/00740-20) has an approved budget of $100,000 and is funded through the Capital Budget Levy. The Study Phase comprises $55,535.00, or approximately half of the allocated project budget. A total of $38,338.64 has been issued for completed work so far. A total of $17,196.39 remains to be issued for work completed during the Study Phase. The total remaining cost for the Plan Phase is $30,520.00. The total combined project cost in the approved project budget is $97,242.15. Given that the current project is on time and on budget, no additional funds are anticipated to be requested to be allocated to this project.
PUBLIC VALUE:
Transparency:
To ensure transparency, MHAC meeting agendas are posted on the City’s website.

PUBLIC INPUT:
The following public consultations were held as part of the Hespeler HCD Study:

- October 30, 2023: Public Information Centre Open House
- January 10, 2024: Community Focus Group Meeting #1
- February 14, 2024: Community Focus Group Meeting #2
- March 13, 2024: Community Focus Group Meeting #3

The following MHAC meeting dates were held to discuss the Hespeler HCD Study:

- October 19, 2023
- April 18, 2024

Meetings of MHAC are open to the public via the City’s YouTube channel. Feedback received during each of these sessions noted above has informed the findings and recommendations of the Study.

INTERNAL / EXTERNAL CONSULTATION:
Heritage planning staff have notified the following community groups and agencies as part of the HCD Study consultation process:

- Architectural Conservancy of Ontario, Cambridge and North Dumfries Branch;
- Black Bridge Community Association;
- Canadian Pacific Railway;
- Friends of Chilligo Conservation Area;
- Garden Hespeler (Hespeler Horticultural Society);
- Grand River Conservation Area (GRCA);
- Grand Bridge Energy;
- Hespeler Village Neighbourhood Association;
- Hespeler Village Business Improvement Association;
- Hespeler Heritage Centre;
- Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation;
- Ontario Ministry of Transportation;
- Silverheights Neighbourhood Association;
Six Nations of the Grand River First Nation;
Waterloo Region;
Waterloo Region District School Board; and,
Waterloo Catholic District School Board.

Formal comments were not received from any community group or agency. Comments from the GRCA and the Friends of Chilligo Conservation Area are anticipated but not received at the time of writing this report.

Internal consultation has also taken place with staff from Operations, Infrastructure Services, and Parks.

CONCLUSION:
For the reasons outlined in this report, Heritage Planning staff recommend that MHAC recommend that Council endorse the proposed HCD boundaries and approve the recommendations and conclusions provided within the HCD Study Report. Further, it is recommended that MHAC recommend that Council authorize the preparation of an HCD Plan and Guidelines for Hespeler in accordance with Section 41 of the Ontario Heritage Act.

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

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

ATTACHMENTS:
1. 24-012 (MHAC) Appendix A: Hespeler HCD Recommended Boundaries
2. 24-012 (MHAC) Appendix B: Hespeler HCD Study Report
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Authors Note:

TRACE architectures is pleased to present this Draft Heritage Conservation District Study to the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC) for review ahead of the presentation on April 18, 2024. This draft presents a comprehensive analysis of the Hespeler Heritage Conservation District (HCD) Study Area and includes details of the Public Consultation and Policy Review that has taken place. Please note, with regards to Public Consultation, additional feedback from the Community Focus Group sessions (January 10, February 14 and March 13, 2024), and the final Survey Results, will be added to the final submission ahead of the Council Presentation. This feedback will also be used in other sections of this report.

While we have included several appendices, the final report will include other resources, consultant credentials, and other information.

Finally, the Consultant Team has an additional meeting planned with the Grand River Conservation Authority (GRCA) regarding the Chilligo Conservation Area, scheduled in April after submission of this Draft. Input received will be addressed in the presentation to MHAC on April 18, 2024 and in the final version of the Study.

Please note that property evaluation information provided in this document is subject to change, as more information and feedback is received.

We look forward to the feedback from the MHAC and welcome their contributions toward the final version of this report.
1

INTRODUCTION

1.1. INTRODUCTION & BACKGROUND

Urban sprawl and intensification have been advancing at increasing rates across Canada, particularly in Ontario. Urbanization, along with unchecked development, presents a challenge that frequently poses a threat to the integrity of the heritage character of small towns and villages, and often overlooks the delicate balance between growth and conservation. Architectural landmarks, historic streetscapes, and rich landscapes are vulnerable to expansion and are at risk of erasure of both built and natural heritage. The conservation of these areas is not rooted in the desire to “halt” progress or development, rather, it is about establishing a framework to guide development in a way that integrates well with existing heritage resources, as well as historic context. Formally recognizing and protecting these heritage assets is an important and powerful tool for maintaining and safeguarding the unique essence of our collective past, while also ensuring future enrichment of our communities.

In 2020, Council for the City of Cambridge directed staff to commence the preliminary work for the Heritage Conservation District (HCD) Study for Hespeler. This was done to determine suitability for a designated Heritage Conservation District. Staff identified a portion of downtown Hespeler as a draft Study Area and began the study process under the Ontario Heritage Act.

In 2023, the City of Cambridge retained TRACE architectures, to conduct the HCD Study of Hespeler and to assess a Study Area comprising of over 500 properties. Having completed three other HCDs within the municipality, including Blair Village, Dickson Hill, and Main Street, the City of Cambridge had already determined that the quantity and concentration of heritage resources in Hespeler was more than enough to proceed with an HCD Study. The Study Area, along with an initial list of properties situated within the Study Area, served as a guide for TRACE to proceed with property research and documentation.
1.2. SCOPE OF THE HCD STUDY

1.2.1. HCD DESIGNATION PROCESS

HCD STUDY

The first step for the consideration of an HCD in a community, neighbourhood, or district in Ontario, is to begin with initial information gathering and documentation about the physical and geographical characteristics, cultural history, heritage character, and assets. This information is then analyzed holistically to gain an overall sense of the uniqueness the community possesses. This process is guided by a Study Area, which is sometimes determined at the onset of the HCD Study. However, in this case the Study Area was predetermined by the City of Cambridge, to allow for sufficient time to focus on the extensive list of properties included within. The HCD Study involves the development of a database to store a detailed property inventory, policy, and historical research (including archival documents), preparation of maps, as well as photos (historic, satellite, and from site visits), plans, and other documentation.

Once this information is gathered, and public consultation takes place, the Consultant Team proceeds to analyze and determine the recommended boundaries of the given area and whether the given area warrants consideration for Heritage Designation under the Ontario Heritage Act. This includes assessing the eligibility of the proposed area, based on the new requirements of O. Reg. 9/06: Criteria for Determining Cultural Heritage Value or Interest (updated as of 1 January 2023 via Bill 23).

HCD PLAN & GUIDELINES

If, based on the results of the HCD Study, Council, with input from the community and stakeholders, determine that the area should be formally considered for designation, the next step in the process is the development of an HCD Plan & Guidelines. This phase involves even more detailed research in order to obtain a more in-depth and precise understanding of the historic place within a given boundary.

An HCD Plan is created to address practical concerns relating to the implementation and enforcement of the HCD and is developed within the context of existing planning documentation, such as Official Plans, Community Improvement Plans, Urban Design Guidelines, as well as the Ontario Heritage Act.
The companion set of HCD Guidelines is developed by the heritage consultants to design and curate a set of practical guidelines for managing change within the HCD boundary, including changes to streetscapes, open spaces, development, and renovations to publicly visible building façades. The guidelines are designed to be flexible to allow for practical application, but also specific enough that they can be easily incorporated into municipal planning policy and zoning by-laws for the community, in a way that is useful and effective.

**HCD DESIGNATION**

Following completion and review of the HCD Plan & Guidelines, the municipality designates the district by passing a by-law. Provided there are no objections submitted during the appeal timeframe, the by-law is registered on property titles. The designation by-law is also submitted to the Ontario Heritage Trust for their database.

1.2.2. **SCOPE OF THE HCD STUDY**

This HCD Study is the first document in the HCD process. It analyzes whether the entirety or a portion of the defined Study Area under review warrants proceeding to the subsequent HCD Plan & Guidelines phase.

The scope of this Study is as follows:

**Historic and Physical Overview**

- Mapping & imagery;
- Research & reporting - origins, periods, themes of development; and
- History & analysis of built form, streetscape, open space, and natural areas.

**Statement of Heritage Character and Significance**
• Description and reasons for potential designation;
• Mapping of evaluation results and recommendations; and
• Development of proposed boundaries within the defined Study Area.

Property Survey, Inventory, and Evaluations

• Documentation of all individual properties within the Study Area;
• Documentation of all public spaces, landscapes, and natural features; and
• Development of a database to store and organize documentation.

Public Engagement

• Overall coordination and dissemination of info to community;
• Facilitation and management of community feedback;
• Stakeholder and Public meetings and consultations; and
• Presentation to Council to conclude HCD Study.

Administration and Coordination

• Meetings and coordination with City Council;
• Document review; and
• Preparation of presentations, reports, and database.
1.3. WHAT IS A HERITAGE CONSERVATION DISTRICT?

The *Ontario Heritage Act* (Subsection 41. (1)) enables municipalities to designate Heritage Conservation Districts (HCDs). A Heritage Conservation District is an area which contains a concentration of heritage resources, with special character and/or historical association that distinguishes the area from its surroundings. The designation of an HCD affords the municipality the ability to enforce the protection of the character of an area by designating character-defining elements, as well as the public realm, under Part V of the *Ontario Heritage Act*. The municipality can then guide future changes and development within a carefully designed framework document called the HCD Plan & Guidelines. This protection is not meant to hinder or prevent change, but rather to manage change in ways that are positive for the district and for the wider community. Many people now consider an HCD to be one of the most effective tools, not only for historic conservation, but also for effective and sound urban design, planning, and development.

For additional details about the designation process specific to Hespeler please refer to:

https://www.engagewr.ca/hespeler-heritage-conservation-district-study-and-plan

For information on the existing Heritage Conservation Districts within the broader City of Cambridge, please refer to:


For more detailed information related to HCDs, please refer to the *Ontario Heritage Toolkit: Heritage Conservation Districts* which is available for download from the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport:

https://ero.ontario.ca/notice/019-2770

*Please note these websites may be updated throughout the ongoing Study Phase.*
1.4. THE BENEFITS OF A HERITAGE CONSERVATION DISTRICT

Establishing a HCD in Ontario offers several benefits, both tangible and intangible, that contribute to preserving the cultural, historical, and architectural significance of a particular area. HCDs can help safeguard the unique character and identity of a community, by conserving historically significant buildings, landscapes, and streetscapes. Furthermore, an HCD Plan is a change management tool, assisting a place with planning tools that regulate alterations, demolitions, and new construction within the district. These measures help ensure that any changes are sensitive to the area’s heritage values and maintain its overall character that has been established through the extensive HCD Study Process.

As of March 2020, 134 HCDs are already in existence in Ontario, with the earliest designations dating back to 1980. In the Waterloo region alone, there are 10 HCDs, encompassing over 1300 individual properties. Three of those HCDs are within the City of Cambridge: Blair Village, Dickson Hill, and Main Street (Galt).

While more HCDs are being planned and proposed every year in Ontario, due to their success, there is also a movement toward pursuing HCD designations because of Bill 23. On November 28, 2022, Bill 23, the More Homes Built Faster Act 2022, received royal assent and proposed extensive changes to the various pieces of legislation, including the Ontario Heritage Act. On January 1, 2023, the amendments to the Act came into effect. While there are numerous impacts on the Act because of this Bill, one of the most significant is a two-year time limitation on the listing of non-designated heritage properties on Municipal Registers. All listed properties are subject to this new time limitation, whereby, if the council of the municipality does not give a notice of intention to designate the property under subsection 29 (1) of the Ontario Heritage Act on or before the second anniversary of the day the property was included in the Register, Council must remove the property from the Register and cannot list it again for a period of five years. Therefore, municipalities are forced to designate listed properties ahead of the January 1, 2025 two-year time limit since the enactment of the Bill in 2023.

Despite new HCDs coming into force every year due to their success, it is also important to recognize the residual resistance to HCDs in some instances. Typically, concerns are centered around issues pertaining to a perceived loss of control over one’s property, impact on property values and insurance, and burdensome bureaucratic processes (The Architectural Conservancy of Ontario, 2009). HCDs may not necessarily be the right option for all historic places,
however there are several myths about HCDs that have been disproven for years, with decades of proven track record in Ontario.

Some of the benefits of an HCD include:

- Sense of Place and Identity;
- Creation of a unique planning framework which protects and upholds the heritage values of the place;
- Supports sustainable, resilient communities;
- Provides stability and/or increased property values;
- Potential financial incentives for property owners;
- Bolsters community pride; and
- Tourism and Economic Development.
1.5. THE STUDY AREA BOUNDARY

The goal of the Study is to assess the heritage characteristics of the Study Area and determine if the area, or any parts thereof, merit designation as a Heritage Conservation District(s), pursuant to the *Ontario Heritage Act* and *Ontario Regulation 569/22.*

2. Google Map showing extents of the Region of Waterloo.

3. Google Map showing extents of the City of Cambridge.
HESPeler

Hespeler is part of the City of Cambridge, which is located north of Hwy 401 and east of Hwy 24, within the broader Region of Waterloo. Hespeler is situated nine kilometres north of downtown Cambridge, 18km east of Kitchener, and 15km south of Guelph. Hespeler, located along the Speed River in the most northeasterly section of the City of Cambridge, is known for its early industrial base, primarily from woolen and textile mills, contributing to its historical development. Today, Hespeler’s landscape is marked by industrial heritage, natural heritage areas, a well-defined downtown core, and surrounded by residential areas. It is these key areas which served as the basis for determining the initial HCD Study Area shown in the map below.

REGION OF WATERLOO

The Regional Municipality of Waterloo, known as Waterloo Region, is situated in Southern Ontario, Canada, and encompasses the cities of Cambridge, Kitchener, and Waterloo (collectively referred to as the Tri-Cities), along with the townships of North Dumfries, Wellesley, Wilmot, and Woolwich. Covering an area of 1,369 square kilometers, the region had a population of 587,165 according to the 2021 Canada census. Historically known as Waterloo County until 1973, the region's development was significantly influenced by early German-speaking settlers, leading to a rich cultural heritage that includes the famous Oktoberfest celebration. The Region features a blend of urban and rural landscapes, with the Grand and Speed Rivers flowing through it, enhancing the region's natural beauty. It has a varied topography, including farmlands, parks, and conservation areas, contributing to its scenic diversity.

CITY OF CAMBRIDGE

Cambridge Ontario, located at the confluence of the Grand and Speed Rivers, was formed in 1973 from the amalgamation of Galt, Preston, Hespeler, Blair, and a portion of the surrounding townships. Cambridge is characterized by its historical development, with each former municipality having well-documented histories. The city’s geographic setting contributes to its scenic beauty and features a diverse landscape beyond its urban centres, that include historic sites and natural heritage areas.

PURPOSE OF STUDY AREA

The initial Study Area encompasses much of the downtown area of Hespeler. It includes the commercial precinct anchored on Queen Street, the industrial area located along the Speed River, and residential areas south of Queen Street. The initial Study Area boundaries are outlined on the map found below and contain approximately 524 properties. The generous size of initial Study Area is to
ensure that a broad area is taken into consideration for potential inclusion within the future HCD.

The Study Area includes a unique community within the City of Cambridge, notable for its mix of commercial, industrial, and residential land uses, its important cultural and civic institutions, its distinctive architecture, and its relationship to the Speed River. The Study Area is characterized by a concentration of nineteenth and early twentieth-century structures, notably industrial buildings. The area is also defined by several major civic properties designated under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act, such as the former Hespeler Town Hall, the Forbes Textile Mill, and the former Hespeler Hotel.
Aerial Photo of Hespeler. Study Area as defined by the City of Cambridge in Purple. TRACE
HISTORY AND EVOLUTION OF THE STUDY AREA

2.1. INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents key periods and themes identified as significant in Hespeler’s development, growth, and as part of its ultimate evolution into the City of Cambridge. This historical analysis is intended to provide context around the physical, cultural, and economic aspects of Hespeler, including the community’s relationship with the Speed River, its establishment as a settlement, as a Town, and the industrial past that has shaped the place. It also speaks to the significance of the social and cultural elements that have reinforced Hespeler’s sense of place over time.

2.2. HISTORIC OVERVIEW

Hespeler is a community on the Speed River in southwest Ontario. The settlement of Bergeytown was founded in 1832 and was named after its earliest settler, Michael Bergey. The settlement was renamed New Hope in 1835 and was then incorporated as the Village of Hespeler in 1859, named after influential industrialist Jacob Hespeler, and subsequently as the Town of Hespeler in 1901. In 1973, along with Preston and Galt, Hespeler was amalgamated into the City of Cambridge.

Hespeler is located in the Speed River Valley, a river tributary of the Grand River. Hespeler was settled by Pennsylvanian Mennonites, beginning in the 1830s with Michael Bergey. Hespeler’s namesake, Jacob Hespeler, arrived in 1845 and established an industrial complex that would foster the growth of Hespeler into a prominent industrial centre. The arrival of the railway in 1859, and the growth of manufacturing, particularly textiles, would make Hespeler one of the leading industrial areas in the country.

Industry continued to thrive, adapt, and expand throughout the first half of the 20th century and during the First and Second World Wars. Notably, Hespeler textile mills would supply the uniforms for the Canadian military in both World Wars, in addition to producing other wartime supplies. The post war period,
however, would see the decline in some industries, particularly textiles, while other manufacturing would remain stable and diversify.

In 1973, the amalgamation of Hespeler with Galt and Preston, as well as Blair and parts of the Townships of Waterloo and North Dumfries, created the City of Cambridge and the Regional Municipality of Waterloo. Many Hespeler residents felt, and continue to feel, tied to their former community, and as a result, still very much identify with Hespeler and its distinct history.

The history of Hespeler and the development of its built heritage and cultural landscapes can be understood by looking at the following historical themes.

**PRE-CONTACT AND EARLY SETTLEMENT**

The history of Indigenous peoples in the area now known as Cambridge, Ontario, is deeply rooted and spans thousands of years. The region has been inhabited by various Indigenous groups long before European settlers arrived. These groups include Iroquoian people from Western New York and Pennsylvania, particularly the Huron (Wendats), Neutrals (Attiwandaronks) and the Anishinaabe (Ojibwe, Odawa, and Potawatomi). Archaeological excavations carried out in the vicinity of Cambridge, as well as surface finds, show that the Grand River valley has had a long history of Indigenous settlement, and camp sites and chipping stations have been excavated and documented, especially in the Hespeler and Preston area, which date from about 1,000 BCE (Bray, 2008). Since the Speed River provided an excellent environment for hunting and fishing, the concentration of find spots around Hespeler (and Preston) was significant (Brewster, Langan, 2001).

In 1784 a tract of land six miles wide on each side of the Grand River was granted to the Six Nations by the British Crown, and in 1798 Block 2 of the Six Nations Land Grant (over 90,000 acres) was deeded to Richard Beasley, James Wilson, and John Baptiste Rousseau. Beasley quickly bought out Wilson and Rousseau, and the future settlement of Hespeler would grow around lots 9 and 10 of Beasley's Second Concession.

While the area attracted settlers from a variety of areas, including England, Ireland and Scotland, the present-day Hespeler lands were attractive to Pennsylvania German Mennonite farmers. Settlers were looking for cheaper land, as well as guaranteed freedom to practice Mennonite worship and beliefs (Bray, 2008). In 1816, the German Company Tract became the Township of Waterloo, and language, cultural, and religious tolerance of the Mennonites served to attract other German speaking immigrants from Europe. As a result, a period of high immigration occurred between 1820 and 1870. In 1832, Michael Bergey and his wife Susanna, arrived from Pennsylvania, establishing a homestead on land deeded to Susanna by her brother. They purchased
additional lots along the eastern side of the Speed River on what was known as
the Indian Trail. The settlement would become ‘Bergeytown’. Industrialization
started to take hold, and sawmills, foundries, and other manufacturing began to
take shape.

As more immigrants started to populate the area, the settlement is renamed
New Hope, and with growing industrialization, a modest commercial area
started to emerge. New Hope would see its first general store erected on the
corner of Adam and Queen Streets in 1840, and various religious organizations
would establish congregations, and later schools. Jacob Hespeler arrived in
Hespeler from Pennsylvania in 1845 and purchased a sawmill on the Speed
River.

**JACOB HESPELER**

Jacob Hespeler came to Preston around 1835. He was born in 1809 in
Württemberg, Germany, and immigrated to the United States at an early age.
Early on, Hespeler was an entrepreneur and industrialist. In 1845, he purchased
Abraham Clemens’ mill on the Speed River in New Hope, which would begin his
influential involvement in the settlement’s industrial and social life.

Between 1845 and 1853, Jacob Hespeler made several land purchases, and had
acquired 145 acres on the Speed River. In 1847 he erected the large stone dam
on the River at the former Clemens sawmill, as well as a stone grist mill and
flouring mill. He later added a sawmill, a distillery, a woolen mill, and a
cooperage to the large industrial complex. Hespeler was also involved in politics
and served as a member of the Legislative Assembly of Upper Canada. The
settlement of New Hope was proclaimed in 1858 as the incorporated Village of
Hespeler on January 1, 1859. Jacob Hespeler became the first Reeve.

After the incorporation of the Village of Hespeler in 1858, the town began to
grow at a rapid pace. The advantages of an influx of skilled artisans and
entrepreneurs from Pennsylvania, Great Britain, and central Europe, combined
with improved transportation links to major markets, put Hespeler in the
forefront of industrialization in Upper Canada in the 19th century. Various
religious congregations also began to establish themselves in the settlement,
including the Roman Catholics (1833), the Wanner Mennonite Church (1837),
the Methodists (1837), and the Evangelical Association of Canada (1840). The
Presbyterians would later arrive (1855), as well as the Lutheran congregation
(1860).
Jacon Hespeler was central to the majority of the development taking place, and was the largest landholder in the area, and continued to broaden his business ventures. The commercial centre of New Hope continued to expand on Queen Street with the construction of new shops, the Hespeler Hotel was built in 1847, and the first post office, in Jacon Hespeler’s store on Queen and Chapel streets, in 1851. The arrival of various railway lines in the 1850s facilitated settlement and industrialization, specifically the Galt-Guelph Railway (1858) and subsequently, industry flourished.

Hespeler’s first bakery operated by George Ellis in the Orton Block, on the corner of Queen and Guelph Avenue opened (1858), the Germania Hotel is completed (later known as the Smellie Block) in 1864, and Hespeler’s first drug store operated by George Wright is opened in the Glick Block (1870). The Hespeler Hotel was built in 1847 and the Queen’s Hotel at the northwest corner of the main intersection of town was built in 1891.
The railway brought temporary workers to fill jobs in the growing number of mills along the river. It also allowed for a real boom in industry, and an industrial area grew in Hespeler around the tracks. Men, and later women, worked in the factories to produce lumber, knitwear, furniture, and other manufactured goods. In 1861, Jacob Hespeler built the stone housing block known as Riverside Terraces as housing for people that worked in his factories.
Around 1869, Hespeler sold portions of his property and moved to California. Hespeler would return to the village just before his death in 1881 and was buried in Hespeler’s New Hope Cemetery.

**COMMERCIAL CORE & INDUSTRIAL PROSPERITY**

The woolen mill built by Jacob Hespeler ran successfully until 1863, when he sold the property to his son-in-law, Herbert M. Farr and two others, George Randall & Shubel H. Randall. The Randall, Farr and Company oversaw the business until 1874, when Randall and Farr deeded the buildings and land to the J. Schofield Company, which became a partnership between Jonathan Scholfield and Robert Forbes. In 1880, Robert Forbes bought out his partner Jonathan Schofield, and continued his expansion of the business. The company became the R. Forbes and Co. Ltd.

In 1888, the company was incorporated, and Robert’s son, George “Duthie” Forbes took over as President. He was joined in running operations with his brother James. Under the management of James & George Forbes, the company grew and thrived. James Forbes unexpectedly died in February 1891, followed by his father Robert in 1895, leaving the company completely under the control of George D. Forbes (Dominion Woollens).

---

8 George D. Forbes. Referred to as the “Chief”, presided over the industrial backbone of Hespeler, and what was at one time the largest textile mill in the British Empire. *Dominion Woollens.*
Historically, the Forbes family played an important role within the history of Hespeler. When Hespeler was incorporated as a town in January 1901, George D. Forbes became Hespeler’s first mayor, while being the owner of the town’s large textile mill, and the single most important employer in Hespeler. In 1928, George Forbes sold the business, and the company would be merged to form Dominion Woollens and Worsted. This merger included mills in Hespeler, Milton, Orillia, Peterborough, and Toronto. The enterprise was one of the largest woollen mills in the British Empire and it was probably the largest in Canada producing a high-quality textile.
Although the textile mill dominated the industrial sector of Hespeler, a variety of other operations capitalized on Hespeler’s location on the Speed River. The area North of the Speed River quickly industrialized, with various companies establishing themselves in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. This included the production of furniture, rubber goods, and agricultural implements. The diversity of industries helped to create a resilient economy and provided employment opportunities for the growing population. Hespeler’s industrial sector has embraced innovation and technological advancements throughout its history. Companies invested in new machinery and production methods to increase efficiency and output. The introduction of electric power in the late 19th century further fueled industrial growth, allowing factories to expand their operations.

Example of this are the founding of the Stamped and Enamelware Company in the old Canadian Woollen Mills building, formerly the Jacob Hespeler industrial complex. The Hespeler Furniture Company was founded in 1901 by C.A. Gruetzer.
A.B Jardine Co., which was originally established in 1870 by Andrew Bell Jardine, expanded and relocated to the stone plant on Avenue Street (now Guelph Avenue).

The Kribs family business also expanded during this time, diversifying with demand. The business, originally established as a sawmill and lumber yard around 1860 by Lewis Kribs, father of William Kribs, would expand and move from Forbes Street to Avenue Road (Guelph Avenue) in 1902, when a new plant was built. A lumber and sawmill business were established here until 1914 – supplied many local factories with materials.
As a result of the industry, increased work, and population, Hespeler would see a substantial growth in commercial and residential building during this period. Many of Hespeler’s larger estate homes were constructed over this period. First, the construction of 152 Guelph Avenue, overlooking the industrial core, built by Jacob Hespeler, as his residence. Charles Karsh, of the Karch Foundry on Queen Street West built 120 Queen Street West, overlooking the family
business, in 1870, and the Kribs house, owned by William Kribs lumber and sawmill owner was built in 1900 on Guelph Avenue.

16 Residence of W. A. Kribs (ca. 1900) 151 Guelph Avenue. Hespeler, Canada: a souvenir of the factory town, 1901.

“HUSTLING HESPELER”

The Daily Telegraph, Waterloo County Edition printed an article in October 1911 entitled “Hustling Hespeler”. The article declared Hespeler as one of the most beautiful locations in the country due to its location on the Speed River, while also elaborating on the manufacturing industry in the Town. The article functioned more as an advertisement, highlighting the abundance of potential in Hespeler, including incentives the Town offered for new industry – sites, moderate taxes, cheap power, moderate rents to working people, and splendid railroad facilities. The article also states over two-hundred new homes had been built in a two-year period, between 1909-1911.

A new streetcar system, the Galt, Preston and Hespeler electric railway, later called the Grand River Railway Company, began to operate in 1894, connecting Preston and Galt. In 1911, the line reached Hespeler, which further accelerated growth possibilities.

20 Bird’s Eye View from St. James’ Lutheran Church, looking westwards. Hespeler, Canada: a souvenir of the factory town (1901).
During this time, prominent civic buildings began to get established and civic life became more organized. Town Hall construction began in 1914, which included Hespeler Fire Department, the town jail, the offices of the Mayor, Town Clerk, Chief of Police, assessor, and Tax Collectors, and the Board of Health and Welfare Office. This was designed by architect John Evans of the firms Evans and Fulford of Galt. The building was opened in November 1915. That same year, the Town Council also authorized an application to the Carnegie Foundation for the purpose of building a Carnegie Library.

As civic buildings were established, so were public greenspaces and parks. The Hespeler Board of Parks Commissioners was created by Council in 1907. All Hespeler’s parks originate after this period. In 1915, the same year the Town Hall officially opened, George D. Forbes donated land known as Victoria Park to the town of Hespeler for a “Public Park, Garden and Walk” – this would become Forbes Park.
Social organizations grew, as did religious establishments and churches. Hespeler Women’s Institute organized at Sunnyhill, the residence of David Rife in 1916. Old Boys’ Reunions had been taking place since 1906, including parades and presentations in the downtown. Hespeler Minor Hockey Association first appeared in Ontario Minor Hockey Association competition, The Shamrocks, as early as the 1936-37.

The construction of Queen’s Theatre, which began in 1920, completed in 1921, as was the Post Office Building. As the local industry and factories continued to succeed, new residences were completed, and the community grew. Queen Street developed a fashionable commercial and civic centre at that time.
THE WAR YEARS

During the late 19th century, textile workers from Scotland were enticed to settle in Hespeler with the promise of steady employment at the mills, and new subdivisions were developed in order to provide housing for the mill workers during the 1920s. During both World Wars, Dominion Woollens produced much of the khaki for soldier’s uniforms and wool for socks. The wartime boost to the local labour market necessitated construction of workers’ housing, especially for the many young women who filled the factory jobs while the men were in the armed forces. Distinctive dormitories, such as Gordon Hall and Winston Hall, were designed and built with a full range of facilities, including comprehensive social and recreational programs (Bray, 2008). These residences were often used in Mill recruitment efforts, to advertise an exciting new lifestyle to possible recruits.

Workers from other parts of Canada, notably from Newfoundland and Labrador, were recruited to work in the mills during the labour shortage experienced throughout the war years in the 1940s. Dominion Woollens sent recruiters to Ontario and Newfoundland to attract young women to employment at the Mill, which operated 24 hours a day, six days a week, producing for clothing, household items, and Canadian military uniforms. While mill work was physically demanding, the factory advertised an extensive recreation and social program, including dances, picnics, sports teams, and others, as a means of enticing potential recruits, and entertaining the workers once they moved to Hespeler.

Image of workers at the Dominion Woollens Mill, 1931. Notice the number of women in the image. Hespeler Heritage Centre.
While some women returned to Newfoundland and Labrador after the war, many stayed in Hespeler and the Cambridge area. It is estimated that there are between 12,000 and 15,000 people in the Cambridge area whose families came from Newfoundland during the period between World War II and the 1960s. It is believed by the 1970s, one in every four residents was from Newfoundland.

**POST WAR HESPELER**

Like many industrial towns, Hespeler faced challenges in the latter half of the 20th century due to economic shifts and changes in manufacturing practices. In 1958, the Dominion Woolens and Worsteds went into receivership. The company was purchased by the Toronto based Silknit, and eventually closed in 1984. Consolidation of companies within the manufacturing sector, increased foreign competition, and globalization of both corporations and markets are influences common to most of the industrialized world, and shared with many other Canadian communities.

Other industry, however, was still successful and was able to adapt to changes in manufacturing. The population of Hespeler continued to grow throughout the 1960s and 70s and the Town remained known for its industries. As an example of this, in 1969, American Standard purchased the assets of the Stamped and Enameled Ware and began production of enameled steel bathtubs and sinks. W.A. Kribs, who at that time had shifted to making washing machines, changed their name to Simplicity Products Limited, after their popular and iconic brands of washers and dryers. Also, Hespeler Hockey Stick Company, which had existed in some form since 1905, would see a surge in popularity in its innovative and iconic hockey sticks, particularly as hockey flourished in Southern Ontario.
The brand was established by George Sleeman in Hespeler, Ontario, Canada, in the early 1900s. Sleeman, an entrepreneur and sports enthusiast, initially began producing hockey sticks in his basement before expanding operations into a full-fledged manufacturing facility. Hespeler hockey sticks gained popularity among players due to their quality craftsmanship and performance on the ice. The brand became known for producing durable sticks with innovative designs that appealed to players of all skill levels, from beginners to professionals. In the 1960s and it would be a challenge to find someone that did not use a Hespeler brand hockey stick made at the Sheffield Street plan in Hespeler. (HMHA History).

While Wayne Gretzky, born in nearby Brantford, had a long standing history in Hespeler, including legendary moments in Hespeler Minor Hockey, he also was a significant brand ambassador for Hespeler Hockey Sticks and equipment throughout his career.
In 1960, the MacDonald Cartier Freeway, or the 401, opened on November 17. While this was met with some excitement and necessity, the highway ultimately cut Hespeler off from Galt and Preston.
While Hespeler was successful in attracting new businesses in the latter half of the 20th century, it remained in the shadow of its larger neighbours, including Galt. Like many industrial towns, Hespeler faced challenges in the 20th century, including economic downturns, changes in consumer preferences, and increased competition. Some industries declined or closed, resulting in job losses and economic hardship for the community. For Hespeler, being so closely tied to several key industries, the loss of these enterprises, meant the loss of local identity. Demolition of the factory buildings removed visual evidence of this important past, and the rise of new forms of economic activity that had little to do with manufacturing, further strained connections with the city’s industrial origins.

When, in the late 1960s, the provincial government proposed the amalgamation of Hespeler with its larger neighbours Galt and Preston, to form a single city, the idea was not well accepted. However, in the end amalgamation could not be resisted and on January 1, 1973, the Town of Hespeler disappeared as a separate political entity with its amalgamation with Galt and Preston to form the new City of Cambridge.

While traditional manufacturing industries faced difficulties, Hespeler began to see a transition towards new sectors. Service industries, technology, and retail became increasingly important parts of the local economy. Some former
industrial sites were repurposed for commercial or residential use, contributing to the diversification of the local economy.

In recent years, there have been efforts to revitalize the community, including the redevelopment of former industrial sites for commercial and residential purposes.

The spirit of place in Hespeler remains strong however, and it is a vibrant community within the city of Cambridge. It has become known for its historic charm, civic pride, cultural events, and outdoor recreational opportunities. One of the most iconic events is the Hespeler Santa Clause Day Parade. Hespeler has maintained its tradition of hosting its own Parade, even after the amalgamation with Cambridge. This initiative was done within the community, and in a treasured tradition for those that live, as well as visit, Hespeler. While its industrial heyday may be in the past, the legacy of its industrial pioneers still shapes its identity, and efforts to preserve its history and heritage continue.
3 POLICY FRAMEWORK

3.1. LEGISLATION, OFFICIAL PLAN POLICIES, BY-LAWS

3.1.1. PROVINCIAL POLICY STATEMENT (2020)

The Provincial Policy Statement 2020 (PPS 2020) is a document issued by the provincial government that provides policy direct on land use planning and development. The statement is an important part of Ontario’s planning system, designed to guide municipal decision-making, development approvals, and planning activities across the province. The PPS is periodically revised to reflect changes in government policies, priorities, and societal needs. At time of this HCD Study, PPS 2020 remains the most current version, however an updated version is expected sometime later this year (2024).

The PPS 2020 is built upon several focus areas to promote sustainable economic growth, protect the environment and resources, and encourage efficient land use and development patterns. Key principles and policy areas include:

1. **Building Strong Communities**: Encourages the development of healthy, livable, and safe communities that are accessible offer a mix of housing, are efficient in terms of land use and support public transit and active transportation.

2. **Wise Use and Management of Resources**: includes policy’s for the protection of agricultural resource is natural resource is and the conservation of water and energy resources.

3. **Protecting Public Health and Safety**: addresses risk management and mitigation related to natural heritage such as flooding and erosion.

4. **Integrated and Long-Term Planning**: encourages integrated planning approaches that take into account the interaction between multiple jurisdictions and accommodates the needs of current and future generations.

5. **Economic Development**: Supports a diverse and competitive economy by providing opportunities for development and investment in urban and rural areas.
The PPS provides a broad framework, requiring that all decisions related to land use planning “shall be consistent with” the provincial policy statement. Municipalities and decision makers must interpret and apply these policies within their local context, considering other provincial interests and policies, as well as local circumstances and priorities. The PPS is intended to balance flexibility for local decision making with provincial interests, ensuring that the growth and development across Ontario occur in ways that are sustainable, resilient, and aligned with provincial goals.

NATURAL HERITAGE PROTECTION & THE PPS

The provincial policy statement provides comprehensive policy direction on the management of natural heritage systems and areas, emphasizing their protection for biodiversity, natural processes, and ecological functions. The PPS outlines policies for protecting natural heritage areas, especially in relation to managing development and land use changes to conserve the ecological integrity and heritage character of communities.

The PPS establishes a robust framework for safeguarding natural heritage areas, balancing ecological preservation with responsible development. It outlines several key elements to guide municipalities and developers in protecting biodiversity and ecosystem health, while maintaining community character.

The following are the essential aspects of the PPSS approach to natural heritage protection:

- The PPS mandates the identification and safeguarding of significant natural features such as wetlands and woodlands. Development is generally restricted to ensure the integrity of these features.
- Advocates for planning that respects ecological connections, aiming to sustain or enhance the health and diversity of natural systems.
- Encourages municipalities to map and protect interconnected natural spaces, thereby preserving ecological functions across landscapes.
- Supports the establishment of protective buffer zones around natural features to further protect these areas from the impacts of adjacent land uses and development.
- Development near natural heritage features is subject to detailed impact assessments, with a general prohibition unless no negative impacts are proven.
- Recognizes the intrinsic value that natural heritage features and landscapes contribute to the character and identity of communities.
- Promotes natural heritage conservation as means to mitigate and adapt to climate change, enhancing environmental resilience.
The PPS addresses the conservation of natural heritage areas through distinct policies focused on conserving ecological values of these areas while also integrating considerations for the broader context of community heritage character and sustainable development. This policy framework strategically facilitates a balance between development pressures and the need to protect Ontario’s valuable natural heritage resources.

**HERITAGE CONSERVATION DISTRICTS & THE PPS**

In addition to the focus areas noted above, the Provincial Policy Statement also provides policy guidance on the conservation of cultural heritage resources. When it comes to the designation of a Heritage Conservation District (HCD) under the *Ontario Heritage Act*, the PPS sets a broader policy framework that encourages the conservation of cultural heritage and built heritage resources as part of promoting sustainable and healthy communities.

The PPS supports the conservation of these heritage resources by:

- Encouraging the conservation, use, and management of resources in a manner that maintains their heritage, cultural, and archaeological value for present and future generations.
- Advising on integrated planning approaches that consider cultural heritage and archaeological resources as part of making decisions on land use planning.
- Encouraging adaptive reuse of heritage buildings and structures to maintain their heritage value while accommodating new functions, which can contribute to reducing urban sprawl and promoting more efficient land use.

While the PPS provides the policy framework, the actual designation, protection, and management of heritage conservation districts are more directly governed by the *Ontario Heritage Act*, which empowers municipalities to enact by-laws for the designation of these Districts. The PPS reinforces the importance of these districts within the broader context of provincial land use planning objectives, ensuring that their conservation is considered alongside other provincial interests such as economic development, environmental protection, and the efficient use of land and infrastructure.

**3.1.2. ONTARIO HERITAGE ACT (2023)**

The *Ontario Heritage Act* (OHA) is a provincial statute that provides a framework for identifying, preserving, and protecting cultural heritage properties and archaeological sites. Enacted in 1975, the Act enables municipalities and the provincial government to designate properties of
historical, architectural, archaeological, or cultural significance to ensure their conservation for future generations.

Key components of the *Ontario Heritage Act* include:

- **Designation of Heritage Properties (Part IV):** the Act allows for the designation of properties as being of cultural heritage value or interest. This can be done either individually or as part of a heritage conservation district. A designated property is subject to legal protections and restrictions to ensure its preservation.

- **Heritage Conservation Districts (Part V):** The Act enables the creation of heritage conservation districts within municipalities. These districts are areas with a concentration of heritage properties that are protected and managed through district plans to maintain their historical integrity.

- **Heritage Permits:** For designated heritage properties or properties within heritage conservation districts, owners must obtain consent from the local municipal heritage committee or the municipality before making significant alterations, demolitions, or new constructions that might affect the properties heritage attributes.

- **Municipal Heritage Committees:** The Act encourages the establishment of municipal heritage committees, which advise local councils on heritage matters, including property designations, alterations to designated properties, and heritage conservation district plans.

- **Heritage Easements:** The Act allows for heritage easements, which are agreements between property owners and the Ontario Heritage Trust or municipalities to protect and preserve the heritage attributes of a property.

- **Ontario Heritage Trust:** The Act established the Ontario Heritage Trust, an agency of the provincial government with a mandate to identify, preserve, protect, and promote Ontario’s built, cultural, and natural heritage.

- **Archaeological Sites:** The Act provides a framework for the conservation and protection of archaeological sites, requiring reporting and assessment of sites where archaeological resources are discovered or expected.

The *Ontario Heritage Act* represents an important tool for heritage conservation, empowering local communities and the provincial government to work together in preserving Ontario’s rich historical and cultural legacy.

**PART V: HERITAGE CONSERVATION DISTRICTS**

A Heritage Conservation District is a specific area within a municipality that is recognized for its special character and heritage value, which is protected and
managed through policies and guidelines under the *Ontario Heritage Act*. The Act allows municipalities to designate areas as heritage conservation districts to conserve and enhance the character of historic neighbourhoods, landscapes, or areas, including their built heritage, cultural heritage landscapes, and archaeological resources.

HCDs are geographically defined areas within a municipality recognized for their distinct heritage character. They can vary greatly in size and character, from single properties to large neighborhoods, and are designated under local bylaws to conserve their heritage attributes. These districts can include a mix of residential, commercial, institutional, and natural heritage features, each contributing to the overall heritage character of the area.

**O.REG. 9.06: CRITERIA FOR DETERMINING CULTURAL HERITAGE VALUE OR INTEREST**

The Criteria for Determining Cultural Heritage Value or Interest (O. Reg. 9/06), amended by O. Reg. 569/22, part of the *Ontario Heritage Act*, sets standardized criteria for assessing cultural heritage value, which municipalities must apply when designating properties. It was introduced to bring consistency to the designation process, ensuring that properties meet a comprehensive set of heritage value criteria before being designated. This regulation along with O. Reg. 10/06, has significantly influenced heritage conservation practices in Ontario, guiding both municipal decisions and the Ontario Land Tribunal (OLT) evaluation of heritage properties.

For an HCD to be designated under the updated regulations, at least 25% of the properties within the district or defined area must satisfy 2 or more of a set criterion. These criteria assess various aspects of the properties, including their design or physical value, historical or associative value, and contextual value. This means that not all properties within an HCD need to meet the heritage criteria individually. However, a significant portion (i.e. 25%) must meet these standards to collectively uphold the district’s heritage value.

In order for a property to be considered as a contributor to heritage character of an area, it must meet 2 or more of the following criteria:

1. **Design Value or Physical Value**: Properties that are rare, unique, representative, or early examples of a style, type, expression, material, or construction method.
2. **Design Value or Physical Value for Craftsmanship**: Properties that display a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit.
3. **Design Value or Physical Value for Technical Achievement**: Properties that demonstrate a high degree of technical or scientific achievement.
4. **Historical Value or Associative Value for Direct Association:** Properties that have a direct association with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization, or institution that is significant to a community.

5. **Historical Value or Associative Value for Potential to Yield Information:** Properties that yields, or have the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of a community or culture.

6. **Historical Value or Associative Value for Work or Ideas:** Properties that demonstrate or reflect the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer, or theorist who is significant to a community.

7. **Contextual Value for Character:** Properties that define, maintain, or support the character of the district.

8. **Contextual Value for Linkage:** Properties that are physically, functionally, visually, or historically linked to each other.

9. **Contextual Value for Landmark Status:** Properties that are defined by, planned around, or are themselves a landmark.

**ONTARIO HERITAGE TOOLKIT**

The Ontario Heritage Toolkit is a collection of guides designed to assist municipalities, heritage professionals, and the public in understanding and implementing the provisions of the *Ontario Heritage Act*. The Toolkit provides practical advice and detailed procedures for identifying, preserving, and managing cultural heritage resources in Ontario. It is particularly useful for those involved in heritage conservation at the local level, offering clear explanations of the legal and policy frameworks, as well as best practices. It should be noted that the Toolkit is currently being updated by the Ontario Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism (MCM) and the old version will be replaced.

The toolkit is divided into several volumes, each focusing on a different aspect of heritage conservation as outlined in the *Ontario Heritage Act*. These volumes cover topics such as:

- Designating properties under Part IV (Individual Designations) and Part V (Heritage Conservation Districts) of the Act
- Heritage property evaluation and inventory processes
- Legal and procedural aspects of heritage conservation
- Conservation strategies and best practices

**VOLUME ON HERITAGE CONSERVATION DISTRICTS**

The volume dedicated to heritage conservation districts under Part V of the *Ontario Heritage Act* is an essential resource for understanding and implementing HCD’s.
The volume covers:

- An overview of what Heritage Conservation Districts are, their purpose, and their importance in preserving the character and heritage of broader areas beyond individual buildings or sites.
- Detailed explanation of the legal basis for HCDs under the *Ontario Heritage Act*, including the roles and responsibilities of municipalities, property owners, and other stakeholders in the designation and management process.
- Step by step guidance on how to establish an HCD, from initial study and research, through public consultation and engagement, to the adoption of the bylaw that formally designates the area as an HCD.
- Insights into creating an effective district plan, which is a critical component of an HCD. This includes guidelines for permitted alterations, new constructions, and other interventions within the district to ensure they maintain or enhance its heritage value.
- Best practices for the ongoing management, conservation, and enhancement of heritage conservation districts, including advice on maintenance, funding, and heritage impact assessments.
- Real world examples and case studies that illustrate the successful implementation of HCD’s, providing practical insights and lessons learned.
- Additional resource is, such as templates, checklists, and reference materials, to assist municipalities and stakeholders in effectively managing HCDs.

This volume is an invaluable tool for municipalities considering the designation of HCDs, providing a comprehensive framework for the protection and management of areas with significant heritage value. It emphasizes a collaborative approach, involving community stakeholders in the preservation of their heritage, and provides a road map for balancing heritage conservation with sustainable development and change.
3.1.3. REGION OF WATERLOO OFFICIAL PLAN (2015)

The Region of Waterloo Official Plan is an extensive planning framework intended to guide growth and development within the Region of Waterloo up to the year 2031. The plan replaces the previous Regional Official Policies Plan approved in 1995 and addresses growth management, environmental protection, infrastructure development, and land use in response to anticipated population growth and changing social, economic, and environmental conditions.

Key highlights of the plan include:

- **Growth Management:** The plan outlines a strategy for managing anticipated population growth, with Waterloo Region’s population expected to reach approximately 729,000 by 2031. This represents an increase of around 38 percent from the 2009 population, necessitating careful planning to accommodate this growth sustainably.

- **Planned Community Structure:** The plan emphasizes a balanced approach to growth, directing a significant portion of new development towards existing built-up areas to optimize the use of land and existing infrastructure. This approach aims to create more compact, vibrant, and complete communities that support a mix of employment, housing, shopping, and services.

- **Urban and Township Growth:** The plan distinguishes between the Urban Area, which includes the primary urban areas of the cities of Cambridge, Kitchener, and Waterloo, and Township Urban Areas, which are the main urban areas within the townships of North Dumfries, Wellesley, Wilmot, and Woolwich. Both areas are intended to accommodate the majority of the region’s growth, with policies in place to ensure developments contribute to complete communities and are supported by adequate infrastructure.

- **Environmental Protection and Sustainability:** The plan incorporates policies aimed at protecting the natural environment and promoting sustainability. This includes managing water resources, conserving energy, and enhancing the region’s natural and cultural heritage.

- **Infrastructure Development:** The plan addresses the need for strategic investment in physical and community infrastructure to support growth. This includes transportation systems planning, wastewater treatment, water supply management, and waste management, ensuring that infrastructure development is financially and environmentally sustainable.

- **Consultation and Implementation:** The plan underscores the importance of public consultation and collaboration with various
stakeholders, including area municipalities, to achieve its goals. It also highlights the use of planning tools and resources for effective implementation.

**OP SECTIONS RELEVANT TO HESPELER HCD STUDY**

**CHAPTER 2: SHAPING WATERLOO REGION’S URBAN COMMUNITIES**

- **Planned Community Structure:** Emphasizes the main urban zones in Cambridge, Kitchener, Waterloo, and parts of Woolwich Township, targeting these areas for significant regional growth. The infrastructure includes municipal water, wastewater systems, and transit services. Hespeler, identified as a Built-Up and Greenfield Area on Map 3a, is designated for development, contributing to complete communities with mixed land uses and minimum density targets.

- **Re-Urbanization Target:** Mandates that at least 45% of new residential developments annually should occur within the Built-Up Area from 2015 onwards, promoting efficient land use and infrastructure reuse. Hespeler is part of this target area.

- **Urban Designated Greenfield Areas:** Designates new development areas within the Urban Area but outside the built boundary, targeting a mix of land uses to create complete communities with emphasis on walking, cycling, and transit use.

- **Special Policies for Urban Areas:** Tailored policies for unique areas like the Stockyards Industrial/Commercial Area, allowing specific developments such as Power Centres under certain conditions while ensuring compatibility with broader urban design objectives.

**CHAPTER 3: LIVEABILITY IN WATERLOO REGION**

- **Range and Mix of Housing:** Focuses on providing a diverse range of housing options in terms of form, density, and affordability, including intensification in residential neighborhoods and incentives for affordable housing.

- **Cultural Heritage:** Utilizes legislation for conservation, maintains municipal registers for cultural heritage resources, and promotes the conservation and compatibility of cultural heritage with new developments. This section of the OP details the utilization of existing legislation for conservation, regional implementation guidelines, municipal registers for cultural heritage resources, region-wide heritage inventory maintenance, conservation of cultural heritage landscapes, development and implementation of an Archaeology Master Plan, development application assessments near cultural heritage resources, the establishment of a heritage planning advisory committee, cultural
heritage impact assessments, conservation promotion and research, as well as assistance in heritage resource documentation.

CHAPTER 7: THE GREENLANDS NETWORK

- **Greenlands Network**: Includes a comprehensive network of environmental features aiming to enhance the region’s ecological integrity. Hespeler is part of a Significant Valley, contributing to the scenic and recreational value of the area.

- **Landscape Level Systems**: Identifies and conserves significant valleys and environmentally sensitive landscapes, with policies aimed at enhancing the character and cultural heritage of these areas.

- **Core Environmental Features**: Protects significant environmental assets, with strict guidelines limiting development and requiring Environmental Impact Statements for any allowed alterations.

- **Supporting Environmental Features and Stewardship**: Emphasizes the conservation of non-core features that contribute to ecological functions and biodiversity, integrating them into development planning to preserve ecological connectivity.

OFFICIAL PLAN MAPS

The Region of Waterloo OP maps that are relevant to Hespeler include:

- Map 3A: Urban Area
- Map 4: Greenlands Network
- Map 5A: Regional Transit Network
- Map 5C: Regional Cycling Routes
3.1.4. CITY OF CAMBRIDGE OFFICIAL PLAN (2018)

The City of Cambridge’s 2018 Consolidated Official Plan is a strategic policy document that directs general land use within the city. It aims to support long-term growth and development, addressing community needs while conforming to the Region of Waterloo Official Plan and the Provincial Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe. The plan covers various areas including housing, commercial, industrial, cultural heritage, natural heritage, agricultural, parks and open space, and transportation and infrastructure. It’s a legal document periodically reviewed to meet the city’s evolving needs and to align with higher-level policies. Public input is sought before any changes are finalized, with the amendment process outlined in the Ontario Planning Act.

Additionally, the City of Cambridge has adopted several master plans since 2008, focusing on areas such as arts and culture, cycling, communications, core areas, corporate sustainability, technology, and economic development. Each plan contains specific goals, strategies, and actions tailored to improve different facets of city life, from enhancing cultural life to guiding investments in cycling infrastructure, promoting sustainable practices, and fostering economic growth.

OP SECTIONS RELEVANT TO HESPELER HCD STUDY

CHAPTER 4: CULTURAL HERITAGE RESOURCES

- **Section 4.1: Objectives:** These objectives support the conservation of the city’s built heritage, coordinate heritage interests with various stakeholders, and promote heritage as a component of tourism and quality of life.

- **Section 4.2: Priorities for Cultural Heritage Resources:** This section prioritizes the conservation of cultural heritage resources, promoting the integration of these resources into new developments in a way that preserves their heritage value.

- **Section 4.7: Designation of Heritage Conservation Districts:** This section outlines the process for designating areas as Heritage Conservation Districts, including the preparation of a study to identify the character, significance, and boundaries of the area. It also describes the contents of a Heritage Conservation District Plan, which includes objectives, heritage value statements, descriptions of properties, policy statements for managing change, and procedures for alterations and demolitions within the district.

- **Section 4.8: Cultural Heritage Landscapes:** Although this section primarily addresses larger landscapes, it’s relevant to Heritage Conservation Districts as it involves the identification, conservation, and
designation of significant landscapes, which may include or overlap with Heritage Conservation Districts

- **Section 4.9: Heritage Character Areas:** This section introduces the concept of Heritage Character Areas as geographical areas of heritage significance. It mentions that policies for recognizing these areas will be developed and incorporated into the Plan.

- **Section 4.10: Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment:** This section requires a Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment for developments that could affect designated properties, cultural heritage landscapes, or non-designated resources of cultural heritage value.

### OFFICIAL PLAN MAPS

The City of Cambridge OP maps that are most relevant to Hespeler include:

- Map 5: Hespeler Village
- Map 6: Regeneration Areas
- Map 7A: Major Transportation Facilities and Hydro Corridors
- Map 7B: Regional Transit Network
- Map 8: Provincially Identified Former Waste Disposal Sites
- Map 9: Regional Environmental Features
- Map 10: Floodplains
- Map 11: Preston, Hespeler and Groff Mill Creek Two-Zone Floodplain Policy Areas
- Map 13: Subwatersheds and Drainage Areas
- Map 15: Source Water Protection Areas
3.1.5. CITY OF CAMBRIDGE ZONING BY-LAW (2012)

The City of Cambridge Zoning By-Law outlines the comprehensive zoning regulations within the City of Cambridge, including definitions, classifications, and general and specific zoning rules that govern land use and development. It is structured into various sections and appendices, each addressing different aspects of zoning and planning within the city. The document is designed to guide developers, property owners, and city planners in understanding and complying with the zoning requirements to ensure orderly and sustainable urban development.

ZONING MAPS

The zoning by-law maps that are relevant to Hespeler include:

- Map Z6: Special Regulations in the Hespeler Village
- Map Z9: Regeneration and Transition Areas
3.1.6. **CITY OF CAMBRIDGE PROPERTY STANDARDS BY-LAW NO. 181-04 (2004)**

By-law No. 181-04, enacted by the Corporation of the City of Cambridge, serves as a comprehensive framework for the maintenance, safety, and occupancy standards of properties within Cambridge, replacing the previous By-law 38-04. It aligns with the city’s Official Plan and adheres to the Building Code Act, S.O. 1992, c.23, to ensure properties meet specific standards for human habitation and use.

This by-law is an important regulatory document for the City of Cambridge, aiming to enhance the quality of life, safety, and aesthetic appeal of the community by ensuring properties are well-maintained, safe, and suitable for occupancy.
3.2. MASTER PLANS, CONSERVATION PLANS AND STRATEGIC PLANS

3.2.1. CITY OF CAMBRIDGE: CORE AREAS COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT PLAN (2022)

The Core Areas Community Improvement Plan (CIP) presents a comprehensive strategy for revitalizing the core areas of Cambridge. The document outlines the rationale, legal framework, and historical context for the current CIP, building upon past initiatives and lessons learned to foster community improvement and sustainable development.

LEGISLATIVE FRAMEWORK

This section details the legal foundations for the CIP, anchored in the Municipal Act and the Planning Act, which enable the city to undertake such planning and development efforts.

PREVIOUS PLANS, PROGRAMS, AND INITIATIVES

A review of past strategies highlights what has been effective and what hasn’t, setting a context for the new plan. It notes the evolution of CIPs since the 1980s and various financial incentives aimed at stimulating private investment, such as the Design Guide Program and Building Revitalization Program.

SUPPORTING POLICIES

The CIP aligns with provincial, regional, and local policies to ensure a cohesive approach to community improvement, touching on land development regulations, growth management, and the city’s strategic objectives towards "People, Place, and Prosperity."

COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT PROJECT AREAS

Focusing on Cambridge's three core areas (Hespeler Village, Preston Towne Centre, Galt City Centre), this section delineates the designated zones for the CIP, emphasizing mixed-use development, accessibility, and the promotion of cultural and tourist activities.

GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

The document sets forth ambitious goals, such as creating safe and vibrant areas, supporting local businesses, preserving cultural heritage, and promoting
affordable housing. The objectives include enhancing residential and commercial spaces, facilitating redevelopment, improving infrastructure and aesthetics, and offering financial incentives for private investment.

PROGRAMS

Detailed provisions for grants and loans are outlined to support eligible projects that contribute to the CIP’s goals, such as developing new residential or commercial units, renovating existing spaces, and preserving heritage properties.

OTHER STRATEGIES

Additional supportive measures include relief from fees and charges, partnerships with the private sector, capital improvements for public spaces, promotion of arts and culture, and strategic property acquisition and disposition to bolster redevelopment efforts.

3.2.2. CAMBRIDGE CONNECTED STRATEGIC PLAN (2016)

The Cambridge Connected Strategic Plan outlines a comprehensive framework aimed at fostering community development across various sectors. The plan is structured around seven key goals, each with specific objectives designed to address different aspects of community life and infrastructure.

The goals are as follows:

1. **Community Well-being:** The first goal emphasizes enhancing community well-being to enable residents to establish strong connections and lead safe, healthy, and productive lives. The objectives under this goal focus on creating a safe and inclusive environment, facilitating access to health and wellness services, and promoting vibrant neighborhoods.

2. **Governance and Leadership:** This goal aims to foster open, transparent, and innovative leadership to improve the effectiveness of local governance and service delivery. The objectives include increasing public participation in decision-making processes, enhancing communication between the city and its residents, fostering innovation in governance, collaborating with other government entities, and managing financial resources responsibly.

3. **Arts, Culture, Heritage, and Architecture:** The third goal is dedicated to cultivating a creative environment that appreciates and promotes arts, culture, heritage, and architectural assets. Objectives involve advancing arts and culture initiatives, conserving heritage districts and buildings,
and supporting a wide array of events and festivals to enrich community life.

4. **Environment and Rivers**: This goal underscores the city's commitment to being responsible stewards of the natural environment, including rivers and waterways. Objectives aim to integrate sustainability into decision-making processes, promote innovative environmental solutions, educate the public about natural heritage, and manage city resources sustainably.

5. **Parks and Recreation**: The plan emphasizes providing accessible and diverse recreational opportunities to meet the community's needs. Objectives include engaging with the community to understand and address diverse needs, enhancing care for natural spaces, and developing strategic approaches to programs and services in parks and recreational areas.

6. **Economic Development and Tourism**: This goal focuses on supporting a dynamic, robust, and innovative local economy. Objectives include fostering job creation and retention, promoting vibrant downtown areas, and leveraging local economic strengths through strategic partnerships.

7. **Transportation and Infrastructure**: The final goal aims to develop a sustainable, effective, and coordinated infrastructure and transportation network that goes beyond traditional car use. Objectives encompass exploring new transportation methods, coordinating infrastructure planning and communication, leading innovatively in asset management, and enhancing the accessibility and usability of built infrastructure.

### 3.2.3. CAMBRIDGE HERITAGE MASTER PLAN (2008)

The Cambridge Heritage Master Plan serves as both a visionary and policy framework aimed at conserving and celebrating Cambridge's heritage resources. It articulates the community's shared values as manifested in buildings, landscapes, and cultural practices, set against the historical backdrop of the Grand River's pivotal role in shaping the area's settlement and industrial growth.

Key aspects of the plan include:

- **Diverse Heritage Resources**: The plan emphasizes the significance of built heritage, cultural heritage landscapes, and archaeological sites, proposing strategies for their preservation and integration into the city's future.
• **Strategic Initiatives:** Recommendations focus on building community support, providing heritage "products," establishing an implementation framework, and fostering cooperation among stakeholders.

• **Principles and Priorities:** The plan sets forth principles such as focusing on character areas and promoting heritage-friendly development. Priority actions include enhancing the heritage resource inventory and incorporating the plan’s recommendations into official policies.

**HESPELER & THE HERITAGE MASTER PLAN**

Specifically, in Hespeler, the plan highlights:

• **Industrial Heritage:** Hespeler's growth was significantly influenced by its industrial roots, with key industrialists adopting a “paternalistic” approach towards the community, which is reflected in the preservation of many important buildings.

• **Community Fabric:** The strong sense of local pride among Hespeler residents is attributed to the shared history of industrial employment, notably at Dominion Woollens and Worsteds, which shaped the community's cohesion.

• **Socio-cultural Evolution:** The integration of newcomers, particularly during and after WWII, contributed to the development of modern-day Cambridge, with the Newfoundland Club being a testament to this enduring influence.

• **Architectural and Urban Character:** Hespeler's heritage character is marked by a mix of land uses reflecting its industrial past and the community's evolution, with the downtown core showcasing a modest collection of mid-late 19th-century buildings.

The Cambridge Heritage Master Plan envisions a future where the city reclaims its natural and rural landscapes, embraces its historical narratives, and enhances the quality of life through vibrant downtown cores and integrated new developments. Hespeler, with its rich industrial heritage and strong community fabric, exemplifies the unique character and potential for heritage conservation within Cambridge.

**3.2.4. THE GRAND STRATEGY FOR MANAGING THE GRAND RIVER AS A CANADIAN HERITAGE RIVER (1994)**

Developed in 1994, the Grand River Management Strategy outlines a visionary management philosophy that underscores the river's value and outlines goals and guidelines for sustainable heritage and recreational resource management, emphasizing shared responsibility and community engagement.
The strategy is built on the belief in the enduring value of the Grand River watershed's resources, highlighting the river's role as a barometer of civilization's impact on the natural environment. It identifies critical challenges such as improving water quality and fostering greater appreciation and protection of heritage and recreational resources. The governance model stresses stakeholder participation, clear communication, and effective conflict resolution.

The strategy sets forth goals to enhance knowledge, stewardship, and enjoyment of the watershed's resources, underpinned by values such as integrity and accountability. Actions include strengthening partnerships, encouraging community involvement, and enhancing the watershed's well-being through shared responsibility.

**CANADIAN HERITAGE RIVERS SYSTEM: GRAND RIVER NOMINATION**

The Grand River's nomination as a Canadian Heritage River underscores its significant natural, human heritage, and recreational values, illustrating the river's integral role in the cultural and ecological landscape of Southern Ontario. Key points include:

- **Purpose and Criteria:** The nomination aims to recognize the Grand River's outstanding contributions to Canada's natural and cultural heritage, ensuring its preservation and enjoyment for future generations. A river must exhibit significant natural, cultural, or recreational values to qualify for this designation.

- **Human Heritage and Recreational Values:** The Grand River, spanning 290 kilometers, is noted for its rich mosaic of cultural heritage, including its significance to Indigenous peoples, its 19th-century industrial architecture, and its association with prominent Canadian figures. The river offers extensive recreational opportunities, from water sports to trails and heritage appreciation, facilitated by a comprehensive protective framework led by the Grand River Conservation Authority.

- **Role in the Canadian Heritage Rivers System (CHRS):** The river's inclusion in the CHRS highlights its exceptional qualities within developed areas, its representation of Great Lakes Lowlands ecology, its historical and current adaptive management of river flows, and its contributions to Canada's industrial and cultural development. Additionally, the nomination aims to enhance public awareness of the Indigenous peoples' historical and ongoing relationship with the river.
In the context of Hespeler Village and the current HCD Study, it is important to note that the Speed River is a tributary and is therefore an integral part of the overall Grand River System.

THE GRAND RIVER: CHRS 10 YEAR MONITORING REPORT (2014)

This report assesses the developments and initiatives from 2004 to 2014 aimed at preserving and enhancing the Grand River's status as a Canadian Heritage River, focusing on heritage conservation, recreational opportunities, and environmental stewardship. The report includes:

- **Management and Recreational Activities**: The report covers the managed system of dams and reservoirs operated by the Grand River Conservation Authority, highlighting the watershed's role in supporting a diverse range of recreational activities. It emphasizes the rich cultural heritage and the various opportunities for community engagement and education about the river's significance.

- **Heritage River Surveys**: Conducted in 2012 and 2014, these surveys aimed to assess changes in the river's human heritage and recreational features. Feedback from a wide array of stakeholders informed the ongoing management and preservation efforts.

- **Grand River Water Management Plan Update**: Initiated in 2008, this update focuses on sustainable water management, enhancing river health, and supporting the watershed's recreational and cultural uses in alignment with its heritage status. The plan sets water quality and flow targets to support recreational activities and the ecological and cultural integrity of the river.
3.3. GUIDELINES

3.3.1. STANDARDS & GUIDELINES FOR THE CONSERVATION OF HISTORIC PLACES IN CANADA (2011)

The Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada (SGCHPC) serve as the first Canadian benchmark for heritage conservation practices. They provide comprehensive guidance from making informed decisions regarding the planning, intervention, and utilization of historic places, aiming to establish a consistent set of principles and guidelines across Canada. This document is especially important for ensuring sound conservation practices and is widely adopted by various levels of government for assessing conservation interventions on historic places.

The document underwent revisions for its second edition, which was issued by Parks Canada in 2011. These revisions aimed to address feedback in order to clarify the relationship between the standards and guidelines and statements of significance, enhance the explanation of the conservation decision-making process, provide a clearer interpretation of the 14 standards, add guidance for sustainability related interventions, and address new topics such as cultural landscapes and the conservation of modern materials. The guidelines also expanded to offer more comprehensive advice for archaeological sites and engineering works, among other areas.

The Standards and Guidelines emphasize a three-phase conservation decision making process: understanding the historic place through research and investigation, planning for its conservation while considering all factors affecting its future, and intervening in a manner that respects and protects the site's heritage value. The document outlines specific standards for general conservation practices, rehabilitation, and restoration, ensuring that any physical changes to Character Defining Elements are minimized and compatible with the historic places overall character.

THE STANDARDS & HCDS

The Standards and Guidelines significantly support and reinforce the establishment of heritage conservation districts by providing a detailed framework for the conservation of cultural landscapes, including heritage districts. This document helps in understanding, planning, and intervening in historic places to maintain their heritage value, which is imperative for the conservation of HCDs. The guidelines offer practical advice and a consistent set of principles that can be applied to the diverse character and requirements of
each CDs, whether they're residential, commercial, institutional, or a mix of these, often incorporating natural heritage features such as green spaces and waterways.

Municipalities across Ontario use the Standards and Guidelines as a reference point when reviewing heritage permit applications for alterations, demolitions, or new construction within HCDs. The document ensures that any changes respect the heritage values and character defining elements of the district, maintaining the district's overall heritage integrity. This approach is visible in the detailed processes and requirements set out for permit applications within HCDs, which include providing comprehensive plans, drawings, and specifications that clearly show how the proposed changes align with heritage character of the area.

The Standards and Guidelines provide a foundational framework that supports the establishment, management, and conservation of heritage conservation districts, ensuring that the heritage and character of these districts are preserved for future generations.

3.3.2. HESPELER VILLAGE STREETSCAPE PLAN & URBAN DESIGN GUIDELINES (2013)

The Streetscape Plan and Urban Design Guidelines are tailored for Hespeler Village within Cambridge, anticipating significant demographic changes by 2031. This comprehensive approach integrates the area's rich industrial heritage with contemporary needs, aiming to enhance both the pedestrian experience and economic vitality.

STUDY AREA INVENTORY & ANALYSIS

The analysis highlights Cambridge's projected population growth, emphasizing its impact on the Hespeler Study Area. The area boasts a diverse mix of industrial history alongside modern retail, residential, and leisure activities.

CHARACTER AREAS

The plan delineates three key character areas within Hespeler Village:

1. **Village Core Area**: This area stands as the compact heart of Hespeler, showcasing a blend of retail, commercial, and residential spaces along Queen Street East and is distinguished by historic facades that lend a unique identity.

2. **Milling Road Adaptive Reuse Area**: Milling Road reflects the industrial past, spotlighting opportunities for repurposing historic mill buildings along the Speed River.
3. **Queen Street West**: This area presents a less dense development pattern with varied uses, yet it lacks the cohesive character of the village core.

**NODES & GATEWAYS**

Active hubs like Forbes Park and Old Towne Hall Parkette are central to community events and need to be seamlessly integrated into the streetscape. The plan underscores the importance of cohesive wayfinding and establishing defined gateways to highlight culturally significant areas.

**ARCHITECTURAL FAÇADE AND HERITAGE ASSETS**

The guidelines emphasize the preservation of Hespeler's Character Defining Elements, including heritage buildings, public spaces, and natural assets like the Speed River. Specific historical buildings are acknowledged, alongside the need for a facade improvement program to enhance the village's aesthetic appeal.

**LIGHTING CONSIDERATIONS**

The plan identifies issues related to the height of light standards and fixture types, which contribute to light pollution. Recommendations include retrofitting existing fixtures with energy-efficient options to reduce costs and environmental impact.

**POLICY REVIEW**

The Streetscape Plan aligns with various policy frameworks, advocating for sustainable land use, growth within designated areas, and the promotion of mixed-use development. This involves a detailed review of Provincial, Regional, and Municipal policies, including the City of Cambridge Official Plan and Zoning By-Law.

**“COMPLETE STREETS” PHILOSOPHY**

The concept of "Complete Streets" is promoted, emphasizing the need for streets to accommodate all users safely and effectively. This includes considerations for pedestrians, cyclists, motorists, and transit riders, ensuring equitable access for all.

**“SWOT” ANALYSIS**

The analysis reveals:

- **Strengths**: The natural beauty of Forbes Park and the compact development conducive to a pedestrian-friendly environment.
• **Weaknesses**: Challenges related to the constrained right of way on Queen Street and the maintenance of public infrastructure.

• **Opportunities**: Enhancing the area’s cultural and heritage appeal and improving connectivity.

• **Threats**: Traffic congestion and the lack of a unified streetscape character.

### STREETSCAPE CONCEPT

The concept outlines strategies for enhancing connectivity, developing a cohesive streetscape, and preserving the area’s heritage. Recommendations extend to material selection, pedestrian safety enhancements, and the incorporation of cultural and recreational opportunities.

### TRAFFIC & PEDESTRIAN CIRCULATION

The plan proposes maintaining efficient traffic flow along Queen Street while significantly improving pedestrian access and safety. This includes better connections from surrounding neighborhoods to the urban core.

### REDEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITIES

Opportunities for redevelopment are discussed in the context of mixed-use development, heritage preservation, and public space enhancement. This encompasses areas within the Urban Core, along Queen Street, and the Milling Road/River Front.

### DESIGN GUIDELINES

Detailed guidelines are provided for managing heritage properties and facade improvements, with specific attention to the Milling Road area. The aim is to maintain the industrial character while allowing for modern architectural elements that complement the historic context.

### IMPLEMENTATION PHASING

The plan’s implementation is phased, beginning with Queen Street and expanding to include Adam Street, Guelph Avenue, and other key areas. It also outlines options for developing public squares and revitalizing Milling Road to enhance public engagement and activity.
3.3.3. MILLING ROAD STREETSCAPE PLAN & URBAN DESIGN GUIDELINES (2021)

This document outlines a comprehensive approach for the redevelopment of Milling Road in Hespeler Village. Initiated in January 2020, the plan builds upon the 2013 Hespeler Streetscape Plan & Urban Design Guidelines, focusing on creating a unique and pedestrian-friendly destination while enhancing the historical character of the area.

The location of Milling Road along the Speed River and its proximity to various residential, commercial, and industrial properties offer a unique opportunity to create a distinctive sense of place, drawing inspiration from successful models such as Toronto’s Distillery District.

The document provides an inventory and analysis of the current conditions, including the architectural and landscape character, land use, and existing amenities. Key features such as Jacob’s Landing Park, Mill Run Trail, and the industrial heritage of the area are highlighted. The analysis also addresses challenges related to pedestrian and vehicular circulation, parking, and the condition of the city-owned building at 30 Milling Rd.

The guidelines emphasize streetscape improvements on city-owned land and potential partnership opportunities for development on adjacent parcels. Specific design guidelines are divided into built form, streetscape design, park design, and phasing and costing. Key recommendations include:

- Future developments should complement the traditional industrial facade of the area, with renovations encouraging public use and flexibility. Preservation and adaptive reuse of existing structures are emphasized, particularly the city owned building at 30 Milling Rd.
- The plan suggests modifications to traffic circulation to prioritize pedestrian movement and enhance the streetscape with planting, seating, lighting, and other amenities.
- Enhancements to Jacob’s Landing and connections to the Mill Run Trail are proposed to increase utilization and accessibility of green spaces.
- The document outlines a phased approach for implementation, considering practical and financial feasibility.

3.3.4. HESPELER VILLAGE RIVER ACTIVATION MASTER PLAN PHASE III (2003)

The River Activation Master Plan was a comprehensive initiative aimed at revitalizing the Hespeler Village Core Area centered around the Hespeler Mill.
Pond and Speed River. The master plan seeks to transform the Hespeler Mill Pond and Speed River into a focal point for community revitalization, emphasizing the protection and enhancement of the area's historical significance.

However, it should be noted that the Plan never became formalized and the committee in charge of its oversight dissolved many years ago. For this reason, and for the purpose of this HCD Study, the Plan is used as a guiding document only and is understood to not be an official policy document.

**MASTER PLAN CONCEPTS**

Two primary concepts were proposed:

- **Concept A**: Focuses on environmental enhancements such as dredging the Mill Pond, creating wildlife habitats, improving trail connections, and establishing recreational areas.

- **Concept B**: Combines economic development with environmental improvements, including the adaptive reuse of industrial buildings, public open spaces, and extensive trail/boardwalk systems.

The final plan integrates aspects from both concepts, aiming to strengthen the downtown core, provide public open spaces, and enhance the urban landscape through mixed-use developments and environmental conservation efforts.

**PROJECT PHASING STRATEGY**

The implementation strategy outlines a phased approach over a ten-year period, emphasizing linkages with other initiatives, the retention of the Mill Pond dam, and the enhancement of public spaces and infrastructure. Noting, as mentioned above, that the Plan unfortunately never became formalized, thus the 10-year plan was only partially executed.
“NEW URBAN IDENTITY” IMPLEMENTATION

This strategy envisions transforming the industrial lands west of Guelph Ave into a vibrant urban area, expanding the Hespeler Village Core Area, and making it eligible for financial incentives under the City of Cambridge’s revitalization program. Concerns were raised about preserving the historical industrial buildings in the southern portion of the area.

FACTORS FOR FURTHER STUDY

The Plan highlights the need for a proactive landscape development strategy focusing on environmental rehabilitation, including the creation of new wetland habitats and the improvement of water quality in the Mill Pond.

3.3.5. GALT CORE AREA – BUILDING HEIGHT GUIDELINES (2022)

The Building Height Guidelines for the Galt Core Area, provide a detailed framework aimed at guiding future developments in Cambridge's downtown. The guidelines are designed to balance the need for urban intensification with the preservation of the area's unique heritage and character. The guidelines cover various aspects of urban development, including building heights, design principles, public realm contributions, and the impact on the city's skyline.

The guidelines were developed in response to the anticipated growth and the need for intensified development within the Galt Core Area, particularly with the proposed extension of the LRT line and provincially mandated intensification targets. The study emphasizes the importance of enhancing the pedestrian-focused public realm, revitalizing heritage structures, and ensuring a vibrant downtown through the strategic placement of taller buildings and the careful consideration of building massing, height, and siting.

URBAN DESIGN PRINCIPLES

A set of urban design principles underpins the guidelines, focusing on the compatibility of new developments with the existing urban context, the protection of view corridors, the enhancement of the public realm, and the sensitivity towards heritage structures. Key principles include:

- **Compatibility with Urban Context**: Ensuring new developments harmonize with adjacent buildings in terms of massing and height.
- **Protection of View Corridors**: Buildings along Main Street should maintain a consistent scale, with taller elements set back to preserve east-west views.
• **Enhancement of the Public Realm:** The base of buildings should contribute positively to the pedestrian experience, with considerations for setbacks and ground-floor uses.

• **Minimization of Visual Impact:** Taller buildings should be positioned to reduce their visual impact on existing neighborhoods and contribute aesthetically to the city's skyline.

**BUILDING HEIGHTS AND GUIDELINES**

The guidelines propose a conceptual height plan that restricts taller buildings along Main Street and its immediate adjacencies, promoting increased building heights further from the street to preserve the character of the riverfront and heritage areas. The plan acknowledges the trend towards taller developments and aims to integrate these within the urban fabric without compromising the area's heritage assets.

The guidelines were grouped into the following three categories:

• **Mid-Rise Buildings:** The guidelines recommend a base portion of 2 to 3 stories, consistent with adjacent structures, with upper portions stepped back to maintain a clear relationship with neighboring massings. Ground-floor setbacks are advised for commercial activity or landscaped transitional spaces, enhancing the streetscape and pedestrian comfort.

• **Tall Buildings:** Tall buildings should feature a set back tower from the base to ensure a slender profile and minimize wind and shadow impacts. The design of the building base is crucial, with an emphasis on high-quality materials, transparency, and active ground-floor uses to enhance the pedestrian realm.

• **Parking Structures:** Parking integrated into the upper floors of buildings should be attractively screened and contribute to the overall building appearance. Stand-alone parking structures, if necessary, must also be of high quality and visually engaging.
3.4. OTHER PLANNING STUDIES

3.4.1. ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT FOR HESPELER PEDESTRIAN BRIDGE (2023)

As part of the City of Cambridge’s Cycling Master Plan established in 2020, an Environmental Assessment (EA) was conducted for the proposed construction of a pedestrian bridge and associated trail across the Speed River in Hespeler. The bridge aims to connect the existing Mill Run Trail on the north side of the river with a new trail proposed along Queen St W on the south side, enhancing access to Hessler’s core and linking to future public facilities.

The EA, completed under the Ontario Environmental Assessment Act, aimed to confirm the projects need, identify and evaluate the best location and design for the pedestrian bridge and trail, and assess potential environmental impacts along with mitigation measures. Key aspects covered in the EA include technical considerations such as trail connection length, structural requirements, implementation, and utilities. Other considerations include social and economic factors such as public safety, accessibility, economic development, cultural environment assessments including archaeological and heritage resources, as well as natural environment concerns focusing on flooding hazards and climate change factors.

Notable issues raised include unauthorized use of a nearby railroad bridge, safety concerns, and considerations regarding local heritage properties, indigenous cultural significance, and environmental sensitivities. The proposed trail alignment and bridge location involve A3 metre wide trail starting from Queen St. West and Winston Blvd. designed to minimize environmental disturbance, including plans for boardwalk sections and tree preservation.

Public consultations demonstrated overall support for the bridge, with survey results indicating strong favourability towards the proposed location and design, primarily for hiking in cycling uses. The document also highlights ongoing considerations for integrating the project within the broader context of regional transportation and Environmental Conservation efforts.

It should also be noted, however, that during the Community Stakeholder Group meetings for this HCD Study phase that community members were not in agreement with this determination and felt that the location of the bridge was not conducive to the realities of how people in the community wish to connect to and access both sides of the river. Particularly that the proposed location was too far west of the downtown core and would not prevent people from using the rail bridge as an alternative crossing.
3.4.2. CITY OF CAMBRIDGE GROWTH & INTENSIFICATION STUDY (2017)

The City of Cambridge’s Growth & Intensification Study, as presented in a stakeholder session on June 26th, 2017, was conducted by a collaborative effort from Dillon Consulting Limited, Watson & Associates Economists, Curtis Planning Inc., and Tim Welch Consulting Inc. The study focuses on the Hespeler Village and Queen Street West Node, covering a broad spectrum of planning contexts, issues, opportunities, and a forward-looking vision for the area.

PLANNING CONTEXT

The Study Area encompasses 3 primary components:

- **Hespeler Village Community Core Area**: Identified as the historic centre of the area, it plays a significant role in the overall character and cultural heritage of the community.

- **Queen St. West Community Node**: This is a commercial zone situated adjacent to the highway, offering a different character and utility compared to the community core area.

- **Regeneration Area**: Spanning 146 hectares (360 acres), this area serves as a connective link to community nodes with the core, holding significant potential for redevelopment and growth.

A notable part of the planning context is the inclusion of certain areas within the regulated floodplain by the Grand River Conservation Authority (GRCA), which adds a layer of complexity to any development considerations.

ISSUES AND OPPORTUNITIES

Hustler Village presents a historically rich community with an appealing pedestrian realm, cultural assets, and a public space conducive to community events and activities. The Main Street, characterized by 3-4 storey mixed-use buildings, and its proximity to the Speed River, highlight the area’s attractiveness and the budding interest in development, especially near the riverfront.

However, the presence of extensive industrial uses along the riverfront, covering nearly 30% of the Study Area, poses a challenge to public accessibility and may necessitate environmental cleanup for redevelopment.

On the other hand, the Queen Street West Node, offers a contrasting setting with its highway commercial “big-box” layout with the area being recognized for its potential for intensification, being adjacent to Highway 401.
VISION

The vision for Hespeler Village and the Queen Street West Node is based on 4 key priorities:

- **Preservation of Historic Character**: Maintaining the historical essence of the hustler village community core ensuring that development respects and integrates the area’s rich heritage.
- **Leveraging Community Assets and Natural Features**: the plan aims to capitalize on the unique assets and natural beauty of the area, enhancing its appeal and livability.
- **Strategic Intensification and Redevelopment**: Focus is placed on directing growth towards underutilized sites, particularly those near the Speed River and the highway, to optimize land use and foster economic vitality.
- **Enhanced Access to the Riverfront**: A key objective is to improve public access to the riverfront, making it an integral part of the community’s recreational and aesthetic landscape.

3.4.3. GROWTH MANAGEMENT STRATEGY LAND INVENTORY AND CAPACITY ANALYSIS (2009)

The document outlines a comprehensive approach to managing growth within the city. This strategy involves assessing the city’s land inventory, identifying opportunities for intensification within the existing urban boundary, examining residential greenfield areas, evaluating employment lands, and offering conclusions and recommendations.

HESPELER CORE

The following structured approach aims to provide a clearer understanding of the potential and challenges for intensification within this key area of Cambridge:

- **Location and Composition**: The Hespeler Core is strategically located around the intersection of Guelph Avenue and Queen Street West, extending along the Queen Street corridor. This area predominantly features commercial uses with some industrial uses to the west of Guelph Avenue, surrounded by residential zones primarily consisting of single-family detached houses.
• **Intensification Opportunities:** The analysis identifies nineteen sites covering approximately 14 hectares within the Hespeler Core that hold significant potential for intensification. These include:
  o **Riverfront Sites:** A large concentration of potential development sites exists along the Queen Street corridor, particularly on the north side of Queen Street, fronting the river.
  o **Other Potential Sites:** Additional opportunities for intensification are identified in areas currently underutilized or serving as surface parking lots.

• **Environmental Concerns:** Flood plain restrictions and the presence of potential brownfield sites among the industrial areas could limit development opportunities.

• **Compatibility with Existing Built Form:** The existing built environment within the core area necessitates that any new development be compatible in scale and massing, which may constrain opportunities for high-density development.

• **Suitable Built Forms:** Given the area’s characteristics and challenges, the most appropriate forms of development include townhouses, stacked townhouses, and possibly some apartments.
PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT

4.1. INTRODUCTION

Public engagement plays a crucial role in the establishment and successful conservation of heritage districts. Involving the community in decision-making processes fosters a sense of ownership and ensures that the conservation efforts align with local values and aspirations. This collaborative approach is instrumental in ensuring that the strategies and measures put in place for conservation resonate deeply with the local community’s values, history, and plans, thereby enhancing the likelihood of their success and sustainability. Successful implementation of a district will ultimately depend on wide-spread public support for district designation based on a clear understanding of the objectives for designation and appreciation of the proposed HCD plan, policies, and guidelines.

During the Study Phase, the Consultant Team and the City implemented a diverse array of consultation and engagement strategies to maximize opportunities for inclusive and diverse community participation. This component was critical, and the comprehensive insights and inputs from various stakeholders within the community was a critical factor in the evaluation of the HCD Study Area.

A range of consultation sessions and activities have been held throughout the study and are the public engagement opportunities are summarized in the following sections.
4.3. **PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT CENTRE**

4.3.1. **COMMUNITY CONSULTATION #1 – 30 OCTOBER 2023**

**LOCATION: HESPELER LEGION BRANCH 272**

The first Public Consultation Centre (PIC 1) for the Hespeler Conservation District Study was held on Monday, October 30, 2023, from 7:00 PM to 9:30 PM at the Hespeler Legion located at 26 Schofield St. The event saw a commendable turnout of approximately 50 community members, alongside municipal representatives and the Consultant Team from TRACE architectures. The City of Cambridge was represented by two Planners, Jeremy Parsons, Senior Planner for Heritage, and Joan Jylanne, Manager of Policy Planning. Additionally, three City Councillors from Wards 2, 5, and 8 were in attendance, underscoring the importance of this initiative.

**PRESENTATION OVERVIEW & HIGHLIGHTS**

The evening included various interactive and informative materials:

- Four poster boards showcasing the Study Area, with a preliminary analysis of the Core and Expanded Boundaries.
- An opportunity for attendees to leave comments on the poster boards using Post-it notes.
- A comprehensive PowerPoint presentation delivered by TRACE architectures.
- Facilities for attendee feedback, including a Comment Box, a Sign-in Sheet, and a Sign-up Sheet for the HCD Study Community Focus Group.

The presentation covered topics such as:

- The fundamentals of heritage legislation in Ontario.
- The capabilities and limitations of Heritage Conservation Districts (HCDs).
- The proven benefits of HCDs for homeowners, business owners, and the community.
- The current phase of the Study, expected to conclude in 2024, followed by Council decisions on developing a full HCD Plan & Guidelines and the potential designation under Part V of the *Ontario Heritage Act*. 
ADJUSTED AGENDA

To accommodate the extensive inquiries, the meeting agenda was slightly modified. It featured a presentation by the Consultant Team, a robust Q&A session, and an informal period for personal interactions with the Consultants and municipal representatives. This setup allowed for in-depth discussions, viewing of maps boards, submission of comments, and Community Focus Group sign-ups.

COMMUNITY FEEDBACK

Discussions and individual conversations yielded valuable insights, notably:

- Concerns over the impact of Provincial density targets on established neighborhoods.
- Calls for stricter recommendations within Heritage Conservation Districts.
- Alarming loss of heritage buildings in Hespeler, exacerbated by large-scale developments.
- Advocacy for broader HCD study boundaries to include more areas.
- Suggestions to integrate the Hespeler Village River Activation Master Plan (circa 2005) into current considerations.
- Strong opposition to specific developments and the loss of significant properties and facilities.
- Queries about HCD Plans’ role in protecting heritage buildings from natural and developmental threats.
- Recommendations to draw lessons from successful HCD implementations for compatible development.
- Traffic concerns linked to inadequate road infrastructure to support increased development.

CULTURAL AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

The unique culture and traditions of the community were also celebrated, with mentions of:

- Lary Turner’s Tales.
- Themed Weekend Tours.
- The iconic “Hespeler Girls” Calendar.
- Vibrant community initiatives and annual events.

MAPPING EXERCISE

With the assistance from the City, the Consultant Team presented three enlarged versions of the Study Area, illustrating sample zones of interest,
intended to foster conversation. These areas presented the overall Study Area, a Core Area, and an Extended Area. Participants were invited to add notes and comments to the maps.
4.4. **COMUNITY FOCUS GROUP**

As part of the HCD Study, the City of Cambridge assembled a Community Focus Group (Community Focus Group) as part of the requirements outlined in the Hespeler Heritage Conservation District (HCD) Project RFQ. Committee membership was eligible to Hespeler residents on a volunteer basis, with Council members being permitted to attend but encouraged to avoid direct participation in order to ensure more resident involvement. The intent of the Committee was to act as a voice for the local community, without formal voting procedures. The Focus Group met three times during the Study Phase. Should Council decide that the project move into the second Plan & Guidelines Phase, these meetings will recommence in Summer 2024. (For more information, please refer to the Terms of Reference for the Focus Group on the project website: https://www.engagewr.ca/hespeler-heritage-conservation-district-study-and-plan)

A Community Focus Group in the context of a Heritage Conservation District (HCD) study serves several key purposes aimed at guiding, overseeing, and facilitating the successful completion of the study. Functions included:

- **Guidance and Consultation:** The Community Focus Group provides leadership and sets the direction for the HCD study, ensuring that it aligns with broader conservation goals, community interests, and legislative requirements.

- **Stakeholder Representation:** The committee often includes representatives from various stakeholder groups, including local government officials, community members, heritage experts, and sometimes property owners within the proposed district. This diverse membership ensures that multiple perspectives are considered, promoting a holistic approach to heritage conservation.

- **Decision-Making and Problem Solving:** Community Focus Groups help inform key decisions throughout the study, from initial planning stages to final recommendations for district designation. This includes decisions on the boundaries of the proposed district, criteria for heritage designation, conservation strategies, and guidelines for future development within the district. Challenges and conflicts are common in the planning and execution of HCD studies, especially when balancing heritage conservation with development interests. The Community Focus Group plays an important role in addressing these challenges and finding solutions that respect heritage values while accommodating growth and change.

- **Coordination and Communication:** The committee facilitates coordination between different parties involved in the study, including consultants, local experts, and municipal staff. They also ensure
effective communication among stakeholders, keeping the community informed and engaged throughout the process.

- **Advocacy and Support:** Members of the Community Focus Group often act as advocates for the HCD, promoting its benefits to the community and garnering support for its implementation.

### 4.4.1. **MEETING #1 – 10 JANUARY 2024**

#### PRESENTATION OVERVIEW

**MEETING AGENDA**

The agenda for the January 10, 2024, meeting includes a brief introduction, presentation of Study Area and survey results, discussion on the downtown Queen Street core, breakout groups focusing on 3 case studies, summary, and next steps.

**STUDY AREA**

The initial Study Area covers much of downtown Hespeler, encompassing commercial, industrial, and residential areas, with approximately 542 properties considered for potential inclusion in the future Heritage Conservation District (HCD).

**HERITAGE CONSERVATION DISTRICT STUDY – PHASE 1**

This phase involves examining the character and appearance of the area, recommending boundaries, objectives, and changes to the Official Plan and municipal bylaws. It focuses on areas with cohesive, harmonious streetscapes and significant historical associations.

The study process includes historical research, field studies, public participation, evaluation of cultural heritage resources, and delineation of HCD boundaries, with findings and recommendations presented to the Council.

**PUBLIC PARTICIPATION AND SURVEY RESULTS**

The presentation details the public engagement process, including a presentation to the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee, a Public Information Centre, an online survey, and community focus group meetings. The survey, completed by both residents and non-residents, provided insights into the community's views on areas of cultural heritage value.

Selected answers and comments from the survey are shared, indicating strong feelings about various locations within Hespeler and emphasizing the
significance of the downtown core. See Section 4.5 Online Engagement/Survey for an overview of the survey results.

**KEY BUILDINGS AND SPACES**

Specific buildings and spaces noted in the survey include Queen Street's commercial and residential areas, the Fashion History Museum, churches, row housing on Spring Street, the former American Standard Building, and several other significant locations.

**CHARACTER OF DOWNTOWN CORE**

One of the goals of this presentation was to identify the key elements that comprised the character of Hespeler’s downtown core. These were sorted into Intangible and Built Heritage examples, including:

- Intangible heritage examples include local traditions and events such as Lary Turner’s Tales, weekend tours by individuals dressed as Jacob Hespeler, the "Hespeler Girls" calendar, the Old Boys Reunion, Hespeler’s reputation as a "Beehive of Activity," the close-knit community dubbed "Company of Neighbours," and holiday celebrations like Christmas treats for kids at the Old Town Hall and the local Santa Claus Parade.

- Built heritage examples focus on the small yet well-preserved commercial center, especially the Queen Street block between Tannery and Cooper streets. Also noted are repurposed industrial buildings such as the original Hespeler Mill, the American Standard Building, the Hespeler Furniture Co., the Jardine Enamelware, and the Karch Foundry. The presentation observes that beyond the core commercial area, the streetscape transitions to residential use, particularly after the Cooper Street Node to the east and Adam Street to the west.

These examples were derived from community feedback, particularly from discussions at a Public Information Centre held on October 30th. The slide also prompts discussion on the downtown core’s perceived boundaries, the coexistence of industrial, commercial, and residential zones, and how these elements contribute to the character and perception of downtown Hespeler.

Another goal of this discussion was to determine what the community felt were the “extents” of the downtown core, with discussion focused on Queen Street East (Commercial and Residential) versus Queen Street West (Commercial, Residential, and Industrial).
CASE STUDIES

The presentation discussed three case studies involving key properties in the area, focusing on aspects like scale, materials, and the modern response to heritage buildings. The presentation encouraged discussion on the positives and negatives of recent developments, their impact on the downtown core, and the potential role of an HCD in addressing concerns related to these developments.

The three case studies were:

- Hespeler Library / Idea Exchange (5 Tannery St E)
- American Standard / Riverbank Lofts (19 Guelph Ave & 49 Queen St E)
- Queen Street Apartments (2-10 Queen St W)

COMMITTEE FEEDBACK

RIVER ACTIVATION PLAN AND DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

- The 20-year-old River Activation Plan's concepts were generally seen as positive, with the group acknowledging that the goals have mostly stood up over time.
- There was a discussion around the failure to purchase land for recreational spaces, which has now been sold to possible developers, affecting the Parks Master Plan and the envisioned wildlife sanctuary.
- The concept of intensification in the core area was supported, with the need for new developments to bring vitality without compromising heritage character.

HERITAGE CONSERVATION AND ADAPTIVE REUSE

- Opinions varied on heritage conservation, with some attendees emphasizing that "heritage has to be beautiful" and questioning the role of added height in protecting heritage.
- Adaptive reuse was preferred over the demolition of heritage buildings, but there were concerns about new constructions not respecting the heritage character.

CASE STUDIES

- **Library**: The redevelopment concept was critiqued for obscuring the original building with glass that wasn’t as translucent as expected, suggesting alternative approaches like building on top of the existing structure could have been explored.
- **Riverbank Lofts**: Few complaints were directed at the building itself, but there were remarks about the lack of walkability and the excessive allocation for parking over public or amenity space.
• **New Build on Queen:** Mixed feelings were expressed about the approved height, with some desiring a taller structure. There were doubts about the feasibility of reusing the existing building and comments on the attractiveness of the wood and stone in the renders. Concerns were raised about the gardens being smaller than depicted in the renderings.

**DOWNTOWN AND HCD BOUNDARY & ZONES**

• The current Official Plan (OP) boundary for the downtown core area was seen as acceptable, with distinctions made between Queen St E (more residential with natural heritage) and Queen St W (commercial/residential mix).
• There was a question about whether HCD zones need to be physically contiguous and whether the river itself should be included in the boundary, highlighting the river's central role in Hespeler's heritage and community identity.

### 4.4.2. MEETING #2 – 14 FEBRUARY 2024

**PRESENTATION OVERVIEW**

**MEETING AGENDA**

The February meeting focused on three main topics:

• Natural Landscapes
• Village Gateways
• Heritage Conservation Districts

**LANDSCAPES AND PUBLIC OPEN SPACES**

Emphasis was placed on the importance of including public spaces like sidewalks, roads, parks, rivers, and shorelines in heritage conservation efforts. These spaces not only provide contexts for buildings but are also intrinsic to the community's original planning.

**HESPELER'S NATURAL LANDSCAPES & VALUE**

The natural landscapes of Hespeler, are integral to the area’s character and heritage. Notable features include the Speed River, Little Riverside Park, the Railroad Bridge over Speed, Jacob’s Landing, Forbes Park, and the Mill Pond. These landscapes are not only historically significant but also offer recreational opportunities and aesthetic value to the community. The discussion raised concerns about the future value of these landscapes as the town faces potential development pressures, pointing to the importance of maintaining these areas
for recreational and communal use. The intertwining of natural heritage with the urban environment was noted as a unique opportunity, offering residents a blend of historical and natural beauty.

MILL POND

The Mill Pond was highlighted as a significant natural feature within Hespeler, noted for its strategic opening to the Speed River, which provides a substantial advantage for the community. This aspect emphasizes the pond’s role not just as a water body but as a vital part of the area’s recreational and aesthetic landscape, enhancing the connection between the town’s residents and its natural heritage.

CHILLIGO CONSERVATION AREA

Managed by the Grand River Conservation Authority, this area is noted for its deciduous forests, meadows, marshlands, and Ellis Creek, demonstrating the significance of natural heritage in the heart of Hespeler.

THE SPEED RIVER

Discussion on the river’s historical industrial use and its present potential as a recreational and leisure asset, underscoring opportunities for improving quality of life and attracting new residents.

VILLAGE GATEWAYS

Examination of Hespeler’s gateways from historical and contemporary perspectives, focusing on physical features that define the district’s boundaries and offer significant vistas. Insights into Queen Street East, Cooper Street, Queen Street West, and Guelph Avenue as part of the district’s gateways, providing specific viewpoints and historical contexts.

COMMITTEE FEEDBACK

COMMUNITY RESPONSIBILITY FOR SAFEGUARDING LANDSCAPE VALUE

- Attendees universally agreed on the community’s pivotal role in determining the value of natural landscapes, asserting that while consultants could provide expertise, the final valuation should reflect community sentiment.
- There was a consensus that landscapes should be appreciated for their current value rather than speculative future worth, acknowledging their dynamic nature, including changes due to seasonality and natural progression.
CONSERVATION VS DENSIFICATION

- The conversation revealed a tension between accommodating growth and preserving Hespeler’s natural beauty. Participants stressed the need for strategies to manage densification without compromising the area’s core values.
- The challenge of densification while preserving Hespeler’s character extended to discussions on gateways. Stakeholders stressed the importance of maintaining the town’s core values and natural beauty in the face of growth, emphasizing strategic management to avoid compromising the area’s heritage.

RIVER ACCESS, PUBLIC ACCESS AND PROTECTED VIEWS

- Public access to the river and protecting views were highlighted as critical issues. The discussion pointed towards a shared desire to ensure that development does not obstruct public vistas or access to natural amenities, especially around the heart of the town and significant areas like the Mill Pond and Speed River.
- The importance of maintaining public access and protecting views, especially near gateways, resonated with participants. There was a collective push to ensure that new developments around entry points into Hespeler do not hinder access to natural spaces or obstruct key views, particularly those of the river and Mill Pond.

MILL POND AND SPEED RIVER

- The Mill Pond's enhancement of local paths was praised, with some suggesting collaboration with the Grand River Conservation Authority to safeguard its surroundings. Others highlighted the calming effect of natural riverbanks and advocated for protective measures against development encroachment.
- A few participants voiced concerns about increasing density along the waterfront, fearing it could diminish residents’ enjoyment and views, particularly behind certain properties. The idea of height restrictions and careful density planning in these areas was suggested to preserve the scenic and recreational value.

ECOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS AND HISTORICAL STUDIES

- Queries were raised about the ecological impact of potential development, with a strong call to consider previous studies like the Hespeler Village Activation Plan, which contains pertinent recommendations on Open Space Management.
- The lack of enforcement and the relevance of past plans were points of contention. Some participants felt previous studies had been
overlooked, suggesting that key recommendations, particularly those related to ecology and environment, be integrated into current discussions.

**VIEWS ON NATURAL SPACES**

- Discussions around the Mill Pond emphasized not just the visual aspects but the full sensory experience it offers, including the sounds and smells of nature, which many felt were integral to the community’s character. There was a shared interest in maintaining public access and the natural ambiance that attracts families and outdoor enthusiasts.
- The debate extended to the broader Speed River area, where participants expressed a desire to see derelict industrial buildings repurposed or integrated into the natural landscape, balancing heritage conservation with ecological restoration.

**SPECIFIC FEEDBACK ON VILLAGE GATEWAYS**

- Participants pointed out specific gateway areas needing attention, such as Guelph Ave and the approach from the 401, highlighting the opportunity to enhance these entry points to reflect Hespeler’s unique character.
- Concerns were voiced about traffic and safety near gateways, especially where heavy traffic might deter comfortable access to key intersections and entry points into the town, thus affecting the pedestrian experience.
- The potential for gateway features in site plan approvals for developments was discussed, with a focus on integrating these features to enhance the sense of arrival in Hespeler and to contribute positively to the town’s aesthetic and heritage value.
- The idea of enhancing natural and extended green spaces within and around gateway areas was suggested, including the enhancement of existing laneways and paths that could serve as green links between streets and natural areas.
- While there was a general consensus on the need to enhance village gateways, views on how to achieve this varied. Some participants focused on historical preservation and the enhancement of natural elements, while others suggested modern interventions could be integrated sensitively to mark entry points into Hespeler.
- The concept of a pedestrian bridge and other infrastructure improvements was floated as a means to improve connectivity and the overall aesthetic of gateway areas, with inquiries about the status of environmental assessments and potential implementations.
4.4.3. MEETING #3 – 13 MARCH 2024

PRESENTATION OVERVIEW

MEETING AGENDA

- The agenda includes discussions on the Hespeler River Activation Master Plan, Conservation Area/Pedestrian Bridge Environmental Assessment (EA), SW/SE Study Area, and Heritage Conservation Districts, focusing on their significance, uniqueness, and history.

HESPENER RIVER ACTIVATION MASTER PLAN

- Central to the master plan is the Hespeler Mill Pond and Speed River, aiming to enhance the village core’s social, environmental, and economic aspects while preserving its existing attributes. The plan incorporates feedback from numerous committee meetings and emphasizes improving water quality in the Mill Pond.
- The draft master plan concept aims to strengthen the downtown core, introduce urban aesthetic improvements, revitalize existing buildings, and create a wildlife sanctuary along with an interpretive boardwalk system.
- The goal is to expand the core area, offer financial incentives for development, and establish a "New Urban Identity" through redevelopment and new uses, balancing historical preservation with modern needs.
- Refer to the Policy Framework section of this report for a more detailed overview of this document.

PEDESTRIAN BRIDGE AND TRAIL PROJECTS

- A new pedestrian bridge and trail system identified in the City’s Cycling Master Plan aims to improve connectivity and encourage recreational activities, with considerations for environmental, social, economic, and cultural impacts.
- The Hespeler Bridge EA has been completed and the City is hoping to move into the Bridge design starting in 2024 and carry into next year.
- The City has run into some property constraint issues in regard to the trail that are currently being addressed. Once resolved, the City would be looking to have the 60% design completed and then continue in the process with a Public Consultation and final design submission.

HERITAGE CONSERVATION DISTRICTS

- The discussion emphasized identifying the most cohesive collection of heritage resources that tell Hespeler’s story and contribute to its
character. The focus was on preserving architectural details, landscapes, and historical buildings that reflect the village’s industrial history and community spirit.

- Notable highlights of Hespeler’s heritage resources include:
  - Hespeler’s well-preserved street layouts, lotting patterns, and architectural diversity.
  - The role of the Speed River as a natural feature pivotal to the village's development and quality of life.
  - The industrial heritage, particularly the Dominion Woollens/Silknit/Forbes textile building, is noted for its significant impact on the village's identity and cultural history.
  - The community’s pride in their heritage and the collective spirit.

COMMITTEE FEEDBACK

RIVER ACTIVATION PLAN

- Recognition that the environment has naturally evolved to what was once a visionary idea of a wildlife sanctuary, indicating a correct direction in past planning.
- There is a consensus on the necessity for the downtown core's intensification, highlighted by the positive reception of new spaces like apartments and coffee shops that bring vibrancy while being mindful of heritage preservation.

PEDESTRIAN BRIDGE CONCERNS

- Doubts were raised about the pedestrian bridge's effectiveness in enhancing the downtown core due to its perceived distant location.
- The bridge's potential to divert traffic from the historically used railroad bridge was questioned, with suggestions that its placement should consider practical routes for residents, especially students.

HERITAGE PRESERVATION AND ADAPTIVE REUSE

- There's a tension between preserving Hespeler's heritage through adaptive reuse and accommodating new developments.
- The community stresses the importance of retaining the character and architectural integrity in any new construction, with adaptive reuse being favored over demolishing historic structures.
- Concerns were voiced over specific developments perceived as undermining heritage preservation efforts.

CONSERVATION AND NATURAL HERITAGE

- The community values the natural heritage areas, expressing a desire for remedial work and enhanced accessibility for recreational use.
• The richness in biodiversity, evidenced by bird watching reports, underscores the importance of these areas.
• Suggestions for interpretive elements to enrich visitors' understanding of Hespeler's natural and historical landscape were well-received.

CHARACTER AND IDENTITY OF HESPÉLER

• The community cherishes Hespeler's historical and visual identity, emphasizing the need to maintain its small-town ambiance amidst development pressures.
• The river's centrality to Hespeler's identity and development was highlighted, with calls to focus on enhancing riverfront access and for residents and visitors.
• The conversation also touched on allowing food-based commercial ventures to enhance Hespeler's appeal as a destination while preserving open spaces and low-rise building profiles to protect the village's character.

DEVELOPMENT CONCERNS

• There are significant concerns about potential overdevelopment, particularly in sensitive areas like Chilligo and along the riverfront, where there's fear of natural heritage being compromised.
• The community is sensitive to development activities that may not align with the Heritage Conservation District's objectives, advocating for a careful review of new projects to ensure they harmonize with Hespeler's heritage and natural setting.
4.5. **ONLINE ENGAGEMENT/SURVEY**

4.5.1. **OVERVIEW**

The City of Cambridge created a project website for the Hespeler Heritage Conservation District Study via the Engage Cambridge website:

https://www.engagewr.ca/hespeler-heritage-conservation-district-study-and-plan

241 respondents took part in the City of Cambridge’s Hespeler HCD Survey which ran to 1 February 2024.

4.5.2. **RESULTS**

**RESIDENCY**

**LIVING IN HESPENER**

- **Residents**: Out of the total respondents, a significant majority (205) confirmed living in Hespeler, indicating a strong local engagement in the survey.
- **Non-residents**: A smaller segment (36) indicated they do not live in Hespeler, suggesting some interest or stake in the area from those outside the community.

**LIVING IN THE HCD STUDY AREA**

- **Inside HCD**: 77 respondents live within the designated HCD Study Area, highlighting a direct interest in the heritage conservation discussions.
- **Outside HCD**: 161 respondents live outside the HCD Study Area, reflecting wider community interest and potential impacts of the HCD designation beyond its immediate boundaries.

**AWARENESS OF HCD & IMPLICATIONS**

**FUNDING FOR PROPERTY ALTERATIONS**

- Only 73 respondents are aware of the potential for funding eligibility for external property alterations, suggesting a gap in communication or awareness regarding the benefits of the HCD designation.
- A larger group (168) is unaware of these funding opportunities, indicating a need for targeted outreach to ensure property owners understand the financial support available for heritage conservation efforts.
HERITAGE PERMIT REQUIREMENTS

- 173 respondents are aware that major external alterations in an HCD may require heritage permit approval, indicating a fair level of understanding of the regulatory implications of the HCD designation.
- 68 respondents indicated they were not aware of the permit requirements, underscoring the importance of educational initiatives to ensure compliance and conservation goals are met.

CULTURAL HERITAGE VALUE & IMPORTANT FEATURES

KEY AREAS OF CULTURAL HERITAGE VALUE

- **Forbes Park and Queen Street**: These areas are most frequently recognized for their cultural heritage value, highlighting their significance within the community.
- **Library, Churches, and Guelph Avenue**: Other areas like the Library, Churches, and Guelph Avenue also hold considerable heritage value for the respondents, pointing to a diverse appreciation of Hespeler's historical landscape.

IMPORTANT FEATURES OF DOWNTOWN HESPÉLER

- **Natural Heritage Features**: The Speed River and Hespeler Mill Pond are overwhelmingly valued, with 224 mentions, emphasizing the community's connection to its natural heritage.
- **Historic Buildings and Commercial Core**: The former Town Hall building, Library, commercial core, Forbes Park, and the former Post Office are also highly valued, indicating a strong appreciation for Hespeler's historic architecture and public spaces.

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT AND EDUCATION

INFORMATION DISSEMINATION AND OUTREACH

- **Unaware of Funding**: 146 respondents are not aware of funding opportunities for property alterations, suggesting a gap in communication. This indicates a crucial need for targeted outreach programs to inform property owners about available support.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

- **Feedback Provided**: 83 respondents provided additional comments or feedback, demonstrating a vested interest in the heritage conservation process and a potential pool of engaged citizens for future initiatives.
HERITAGE CONSERVATION PRIORITIES & CHALLENGES

EMPHASIS ON NATURAL VS. BUILT ENVIRONMENT

- **Natural Features Valued:** The Speed River and Hespeler Mill Pond were highlighted by 191 respondents, showing a strong community preference for preserving natural heritage alongside 164 mentions for the commercial core and historic buildings.

STRATEGIC CONSERVATION PLANNING

- **Areas of Cultural Heritage Value:** Forbes Park and Queen Street each received 17 mentions as key areas of cultural heritage value, suggesting these as focal points for preservation efforts.

REGULATORY AWARENESS AND COMPLIANCE

- **Awareness of Permit Requirements:** 173 of respondents are aware of the heritage permit requirements, indicating a foundational understanding within the community but also highlighting the need for further education to reach the 63 respondents who are unaware.

BALANCING DEVELOPMENT AND CONSERVATION

- Feedback on this aspect can be derived from the general comments section, where respondents may express concerns or views on development versus conservation, providing a qualitative dataset for analysis.

FUTURE VISIONS & ASPIRATIONS

COMMUNITY VISION FOR HESPELER'S HERITAGE

- The 83 pieces of feedback provided can be analyzed for common themes, revealing the community's collective vision for Hespeler's heritage conservation and development.

ENHANCING HERITAGE TOURISM AND EDUCATION

- The value placed on natural and historic features suggests potential for heritage tourism. The high appreciation for areas like Forbes Park and historic buildings could serve as anchors for developing educational and tourism-related initiatives.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS & FEEDBACK

- **General Feedback:** 83 respondents took the opportunity to provide additional comments or feedback, indicating a proactive engagement
and interest in shaping the future of Hespeler’s heritage conservation efforts.
4.6. **MUNICIPAL HERITAGE ADVISORY COMMITTEE (MHAC)**

The following meetings took place virtually with the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC) for the City of Cambridge.

4.6.1. **MEETING #1 – 19 OCTOBER 2023**

**PRESENTATION OVERVIEW**

The consultant team gave a presentation that introduced the Consultant Team and updated the MHAC on the work completed to date. The presentation also included information about Heritage Conservation Districts and objectives and benefits of the Study.

The Consultant Team presented the methodology and overview of the results of the Study Area Field Study, which included an initial site visit in June 2023, and a three-day comprehensive Field Survey in August 2023. The Survey included a full documentation of the Study Area boundary, photography and property detailing of over 500 properties. The survey also included context photography and landscape survey. Examine the character and appearance of the area that is the subject of the study, including buildings, structures and other property features of the area, including landscapes, landmarks, and significant views that define the Study Area to determine if the area should be conserved as a heritage conservation district. Property information and photographs have been compiled into a database.

During this presentation, the Consultant Team also presented the MHAC with a series of initial area maps, drawn from the preliminary results of the Field Survey. These maps explored various configurations of boundaries and areas of heritage concentration.

**MHAC COMMENTS**

Due to the nature of the meeting, MHAC did not provide the consultant team with feedback immediately after the presentation. Limited feedback was provided, however the Consultant Team was made aware that the Committee was satisfied with the Field Survey and the volume of properties surveyed, in addition to supporting the work done thus far.
4.6.2. MEETING #2 – 18 APRIL 2024

This section will be updated following the final presentation of the HCD Study to MHAC on April 18. The results will be included in this section and feedback will be incorporated into the final report.

4.7. GRAND RIVER CONSERVATION AUTHORITY (GRCA)

This section will be updated following a meeting with GRCA on April 10, 2024. The GRCA is an important stakeholder for this HCD Study as they are they own and safeguard the Chilligo Conservation Area, which has been identified as a major natural feature contributing to the overall heritage character of Hespeler. Feedback from this meeting will also be incorporated into the final report.
5

HERITAGE CHARACTER ANALYSIS

5.1. CONTEXT

Hespeler is located on the Speed River, tributary of the Grand River, in southwestern Ontario. The small-town character of Hespeler is also seen through its lower-scale buildings, extensive greenspace, mature trees, parks, natural areas, and views to the Speed River. A unique element of Hespeler’s visual quality is the presence of institutional, industrial, residential, and natural landscape, all within the central core Study Area.

Architecturally, Vernacular, Georgian, Edwardian and Victorian-era architecture are the predominant styles in Hespeler, often as interpreted by the builder. Hespeler has by far the greatest concentration of older intact industrial buildings in the greater municipality of Cambridge, including a few that are still in industrial use. As Hespeler was once home to several textile mills and factories, remnants of this industrial heritage can still be seen in the form of old mill buildings and warehouses. These structures often feature sturdy brick construction with large windows and heavy timber framing.

Like many southern Ontario towns, Hespeler has an historic downtown core characterized by Victorian and Edwardian commercial architecture. These buildings were constructed primarily in the late 19th and early 20th centuries during the town's industrial boom. The civic centre of Hespeler on Tannery Street East has a collection of institutional and public buildings, including the Hespeler Public Library, the historic Fire Hall, and Old Town Hall (Hespeler Heritage Centre). The former Post Office/Fashion History Museum, and architecturally significant places of worship on Cooper Street and Queen Street East, contribute significantly to the Hespeler streetscape and skyline.

The residential architecture in Hespeler ranges from historic Vernacular, Georgian, neo-Gothic, Victorian and Edwardian homes, to more modern styles. In the older parts of town, you’ll find charming single-family homes with features like gabled roofs, bay windows, dormers, and front porches, reflecting the village's history of growth and development over time. Some early
residential homes remain on Queen Street West, including the Bergey Log Cabin, ca. 1830.

Due to the steep slopes of the river valley at that location, Hespeler’s core developed in a very compact fashion, with residential, commercial, institutional, and industrial land uses crowded together on the hillsides and in the narrow valley. The hills and topography result in many interesting views and vistas along the streets, particularly from the higher residential areas north and south of the Speed River ‘valley.’

While the original Village has remained relatively intact, Hespeler has seen some modern development in recent years, predominantly on the outskirts of the central core area. There have also been significant changes in the downtown core. This includes contemporary residential subdivisions, high-rise apartments, retrofit of heritage buildings, commercial developments, and institutional buildings constructed in a variety of architectural styles. Presently, Hespeler is a mixed used destination, combining a strong industrial past with parks, trail connections, retail, institutional, residential, and leisure activities found within its boundaries.
5.2. LANDSCAPE AND PUBLIC OPEN AREAS

Landscapes often play roles as important as those of buildings and provide settings for the built heritage. These spaces are often features of the original plan or survey of a settled community. These landscapes may include a combination of natural features, built structures, and intangible elements that together contribute to their cultural value.

The greater Cambridge area hosts a rich diversity of natural heritage features, due to its location at the intersection of several major environmental systems integral to the Cultural Heritage of the place. Hespeler has a significant natural environment that is the focus and geographic centre upon which the Hespeler community has been established (River Activation Plan).

The Hespeler Core Area is uniquely situated adjacent to natural areas and the Speed River. Its proximity to the River, the numerous connections to parks (Forbes Park, Little Riverside Park, and Mill Pond), and trail connections, provide the opportunity to promote active transportation. Residents and visitors alike avail of Hespeler’s trails, parks and access to the River for leisure and recreation.
The Speed River, a major tributary of the Grand River, transects the Study Area. Historically, the Grand River was of critical importance to Indigenous Nations and was the focus for traditional land use activities, such as fishing and hunting. It was also used as a travel and trade route. The River played a significant role in the development of Hespeler, providing waterpower for mills and factories during the industrial era. Today, the Speed River area is popular for recreational activities such as walking, cycling, kayaking, and fishing. The Hespeler section of the Speed River is particularly scenic, with tree-lined banks and picturesque views.
JACOB’S LANDING

Jacob’s Landing is a 2.7 hectare Park divided by Guelph Avenue. The portion of park included in the Study Area is west of Guelph Avenue and on the south side of Milling Road. With riverfront access, Jacob’s Landing features a canoe/boat launch, fishing opportunities, and views across the river.

LITTLE RIVERSIDE PARK

A small quiet park with benches, accessible via Queen Street East and Spring Street. There is a canoe/kayak/board launch. This park has excellent views of the Mill Pond, Queen Street East, and along the River eastward.
ELLACOTT LOOKOUT

In this natural area in Cambridge, you can find the Ellacott Lookout which provides a view of the two rivers. A gazebo provides a lookout, and a stone staircase takes you down to river level.

FORBES PARK

This 1.4 hectare park is located in the core of Hespeler’s downtown area. The Park was created following the donation of land by George Duthie Forbes in 1915. The existing bandstand structure was constructed ca. 1924, when the Women’s Institute commissioned its construction to honour Hespeler soldiers who died in the First World War. The bandstand was originally built in Little Riverside Park in 1919, but after it was destroyed by fire, new plans moved it to Forbes Park.
Historically, Forbes Park has been a space of public gathering, and is presently home to the annual Hespeler Village Music Festival, which takes place each July. Forbes Park is designated under Part IV of the *Ontario Heritage Act*.

**THE CHILLIGO CONSERVATION AREA**

The Chilligo Conservation Area is located next to the Speed River in Cambridge. The area includes forest, meadows, and marshlands. The Mill Run Trail runs through Chilligo Conservation Area and ends in Riverside Park.

41 Chilligo Conservation Area Trail. *TRACE*

42 View of former Forbes/Dominion Woolens/Silk Knit Textile Mill and National Historic Site and Silk Knit Dam from Chilligo Conservation Area. *TRACE*
MILL RUN TRAIL

The Mill Run Trail is a 6.5 km, woodland natural dust trail that connects Hespeler to Preston. It runs along the Speed River, crossing through the Chilligo Conservation Area, and terminates at Riverside Park. Much of the trail sits on the original 1895 rail bed of the “Galt, Preston, and Hespeler Street Electric Railway”.

Mill Run Trail (accessed via Sheffield, looking west). TRACE
5.3. VILLAGE STRUCTURE

Hespeler, located within the amalgamated city of Cambridge, has a distinct structure influenced by its historical and industrial development, which is reflected in its urban planning. Mills and church steeples define the skyline, and the prevailing three storey height of the commercial and industrial buildings lining Queen Street creates a narrow-like effect. At the heart of Hespeler is its downtown core, which developed around the intersection of Queen Street West (Regional Road 46) and Guelph Avenue (Regional Road 24). This area serves as the commercial and central hub of the village.

The downtown area of Hespeler is characterized by its historic buildings, many of which date back to the 19th and early 20th centuries. These buildings feature a variety of architectural styles, with stone and brick construction, and distinctive storefronts. Some of these historic buildings have been preserved and repurposed, while others still serve their original functions.

Perhaps the key feature of Hespeler is the Speed River. The riverfront area offers scenic views and recreational opportunities, with parks, trails, and green spaces lining the water’s edge. Additionally, Hespeler is surrounded by natural and park landscapes. The community boasts several riverside parks and open spaces that contribute to Hespeler’s livability and sense of community. These areas are outlined in the previous section.

5.3.1. STREETSCAPE CHARACTER IN HESPELER

Heritage Conservation Districts (HCDs) conserve areas of interest such as residential, commercial, combination of residential/commercial, institutional, rural, and “main street,” and they often incorporate natural heritage features such as green open space, trees, parkland, and waterways. Whole neighbourhoods, streetscapes, or areas may be significant. These areas are noteworthy not only because of the buildings, but also because of the streetscape features – trees, open spaces, patterns of historical development, vistas, and even typography – collectively forming a distinct and integrated character that can be conserved through heritage conservation district designation.

Hespeler’s streetscape character is varied and tells the story of its evolution from settlement to industrial hub, commercial core, civic buildings, and residential neighbourhoods. The following streetscapes provide examples of the varied landscape in Hespeler. Queen Street East and West form the main axis of the town running east-west and run parallel to the Speed River. There are a number of access points to Hespeler Village from Hespeler Rd. and other adjacent areas, namely: Queen Street from the west, Guelph Ave. from the north, Queen Street from the east, and Cooper Street from the southwest. One
unique challenge for Hespeler Village is that Highway 401 separates this area from the rest of Cambridge and the core area has been by-passed by Hespeler Road. This challenge could be a positive feature, as it feels more like an “isolated historic village” and could perhaps be better preserved because of this fact.

**QUEEN STREET CORRIDOR**

The Queen Street Corridor in the Study Area is a mixed industrial, commercial, and residential area, anchored in the West by Hespeler’s largest, and longest serving Textile Mill, and in the East by the residential area around the Ellacott Lookout. The area features a combination of architectural styles, including a wide range of house types.

This mixed variety of building style and type is very pronounced on Queen Street West, with early residential mixed with industrial, and several modern commercial additions. Most of the early commercial and residential properties were built in the two decades between 1840 and 1910 and reflect the dominant architectural styles of those periods - High Victorian Gothic, Queen Anne, and Edwardian Classicism – as interpreted by the working-class owners. Moving eastward on Queen Street West, the street remains residential, with some notable modern changes such as gas stations and banks. Numerous significant properties line the street, such as “The Castle,” Charles Karch house, at 120 Queen Street West, as well as 39 Queen Street West (c. 1840) Samuel Bergey House, and 41 Queen Street West (early 1830s) log home built by Michael Bergey, likely Hespeler's first residence.

The street leads into the Commercial Core of Hespeler, predominantly traditional vernacular commercial, including the striking red brick of the former Queen’s Hotel (1891), presently Ernie’s Roadhouse. The street also has an assortment of other contemporary structures, including a large new apartment complex on the corner of Adam Street. This intersection divides Hespeler east and west.
Hespeler’s compact commercial core has a variety of retail, restaurants, and other commercial uses located near each other. This means that it is easy and convenient to walk to many different types of destinations within a relatively short period of time.
46 Queen Street East streetscape, looking west. TRACE

47 7 Queen Street East. TRACE

48 Queen Street East streetscape looking east toward Cooper Street intersection. Riverbank Loft apartment complex is on the left. TRACE
The spectrum of residential housing off Queen Street East is large. The historic worker’s housing built by Jacob Hespeler ca. 1862, known as the Riverside Terrace on Spring Street, is tucked behind the Anglican Church and the recent apartment dwelling included as part of the Riverbank Loft development. The connection to the River and the parkland remains through a path to Little Riverside Park.

Heading east, the predominantly religious and civic buildings serve as iconic markers of Hespeler’s streetscape, particularly at the corner of Queen East and Cooper Street. The three church steeples of St. Andrews’s, St Mary’s and the former St. James Lutheran Church, now the Dayalbagh Radhasoami Satsang gur, are historic and visible markers when entering the Town of Hespeler from all directions, and at various viewpoints along the Speed River.
51 Streetscape view westward from 111 Queen Street East. TRACE

52 179 Queen Street East (near Panabaker). Views to the River between houses from Queen Street East are common on the north side of the street. TRACE

53 212 Queen Street East. Limestone Italianate 2-storey house structure built for veterinarian and Hespeler Councillor, John C. Green. 1865-1875. TRACE
54 Queen Street East, at Panakaber. Looking west. TRACE

55 Queen Street East at Renwick Street, view from Ellacott Lookout. TRACE
INSTITUTIONAL CORE

56 View of Old Town Hall, Tannery Street East. TRACE

57 View of Cenotaph and Old Town Hall (now the Heritage House Museum) from Queen Street East walkway. TRACE

58 View of Cenotaph. TRACE
Forbes Park gateway off Tannery Street East. TRACE

View of Library (Idea Exchange) from Franklin Avenue. Old Town Hall visible in the background. TRACE
Guelph Avenue is a mixed residential and former industrial neighbourhood developed primarily in the late 19th and early 20th centuries to house the prosperous middle class and, in several cases, the owners of the major local industries. The overall neighbourhood has a wide variety of housing ages and styles, from the mid-19th century to the mid-late 20th century, and a variety of materials, from limestone rubblestone, plaster, clapboard, and brick. It is characterized by large houses on large lots. The north end of the Study Area, on Guelph, is characterized by large residential properties and developments, and heavy tree canopy. Much of the land east of Guelph Avenue was owned by the Forbes family, owners of the largest mill in Hespeler. This land is now part of a residential subdivision on the lands of the former Forbes Estate.

61 Former Forbes Estate, 171 Guelph Avenue. Built in 1912, Beaux-Arts, 2½ storeys, yellow brick with stone details, Ionic columns on full-width 2-storey porch, flared hipped roof with dormers, porte-cochere. TRACE

62 Former Jacob Hespeler House and Coombs Orphanage, 152 Guelph Avenue, built 1858. TRACE
Moving south down Guelph Avenue, the area quickly becomes a combination of mixed industrial and greenspace. The east side of the street maintains a strong tree canopy, with mixed former industrial, such as the Four Fathers Brewery. The western side of Guelph Avenue is industrial, particularly as it crosses Sheffield and the train tracks.
The approach to the Speed River/Mill Pond presents a natural gateway to Hespeler, with the bridge over the river, the properties on the east and west riverfront, and access points to the Mill Run Trail and Jacob’s Landing park space. On the eastern flank 5 and 19 Guelph, Jacob Hespeler’s Grist and Cotton Mills/Stamped and Enamelled Ware Ltd./American Standard (1847-61, 1870, 1881), is the oldest industrial building standing, although re-purposed as an apartment complex, the Riverbank Lofts. The western view, the former industrial with Milling Road complexes in the background.
67  Looking South Guelph Avenue. Sparrow Brewing & Roasting Co. located on West side of the street. TRACE

68  Mill Pond and the Riverbank Lofts. Sections of this complex are the Jacob Hespeler’s Grist and Cotton Mills which would later become Stamped and Enamelled Ware Ltd./American Standard. TRACE

69  Bridge on Guelph Avenue, looking south toward the Queen Street East and West intersection. TRACE
MILLING ROAD

The Milling Road Area comprises industrial buildings owned by both private ownership and by the City of Cambridge. Historically, it is Hespeler's industrial centre, containing many of the factories that drove the economy of Hespeler, and is concentrated south of the residential sections of Guelph Avenue. Milling Road is not a long street and contains relatively few buildings; however, most are of pre-WWII vintage. These industrial buildings are set close to the road, with limited curb and sidewalk, typical of industrial spaces that also often had loading docks. Sections along the southern side of the street have been landscaped and lead to the eastern side of Jacob's Landing park space.
Across Milling Road and sitting on the bank of the Speed River is an industrial building currently owned by the City of Cambridge. It is utilized for storage for maintenance vehicles and replacement parts for City infrastructure.
RESIDENTIAL NEIGHBOURHOODS IN HESPELER

Residential neighbourhoods in Hespeler include a wide range of house types and streetscapes. These areas grew both organically, or as planned housing policies, such as neighbourhoods where mill owners encouraged workers financially to build their own homes. As a result, neighbourhoods in Hespeler often include homes of varied architectural styles, as well as different construction dates. The older residential homes in Hespeler were built as early as the 1830s, such as the Bergey Log Home.

Between the 1860s and 1900s, residential neighbourhoods started to take shape, such as Cooper Street, where residents built heavily mortared rubblestone homes with Georgian and Victorian influences. Earlier versions such as 66 Cooper Street (1870) are more Georgian in style, whereas later versions such as 60 Cooper (1890) street incorporate Victorian elements, such as wood porches and verandahs with ‘gingerbread’ trim details.
Several of Hespeler’s Industrial leaders established estate-like properties as the community’s industrialization started to take shape during this time period.

The older properties are often interspersed residential homes built between 1890 and 1915 and reflect the dominant architectural styles of that period, High Victorian Gothic, Edwardian Classicism, and Italiante influences. These included properties like arched windows, as well as the use of yellow or buff brick such as 22 Harvey Street (1890s). Later styles would incorporate a variety of other design influence, red brick and picturesque vernacular style such as the “Big Cottage” residence at 132 Walker (see image 79).

In addition to stately brick homes, there are a variety of late 19th and early 20th century homes built in range of architectural styles and exterior building materials local materials such as wood, that range between 2 and 1.5 storeys. While some of these residences have been re clad with modern materials, such as vinyl siding, and additions added, they contribute to the varied and eclectic
landscape of most residential streets in Hespeler. Both vernacular and contemporary residences typically have gable roofs and siding.
The incremental growth of the Hespeler is evidenced by a range of architectural styles in the residential areas, from the early stone construction to 1960s bungalows, and many in between.

The overall skewed street grid, caused by the steep hillside topography, provides interesting views toward the Speed River, the downtown, and the Industrial core.
81 Intersection at Courtney and Harvey, looking north downhill toward Queen Street West. *TRACE*

82 St. Matthew’s Cathedral, Ecclesiological Gothic Revival style, yellow brick, originally St. James Anglican, Harvey Street. *TRACE.*

83 Intersection at Shamrock and Keffer Street. *TRACE*
55 Keffer Street. TRACE

Tannery Street West. TRACE
WALKER STREET

Walker Street contains several turn-of-the-century urban residential development, as well as a variety of fine architectural styles. There are deeper setbacks on many properties, larger lots, and mature tree canopy and sidewalks on both sides.

86 Brick residence on Walker Street with deep hill setback, ca. 1914. TRACE

87 167 Walker Street Residence. TRACE.
COOPER STREET

As one of the original entranceways or gateways to Hespeler, Cooper Street contains numerous traditional homes on large properties, some of which back onto Forbes Park. Arriving from the south and proceeding north, Cooper Street bends slightly at the top of the hill, providing an excellent perspective of the downtown. The incremental growth of the town is evidenced by a range of architectural styles, from the mid 1800s, to modern bungalows. Architecturally, there is a mix of High Victorian, Gothic, and Georgian influences. There are many notable heritage properties on Cooper Street and a significant number built between 1850 and 1870.

Homes are set back from the road and demonstrate a mix of limestone, brick, and siding, with gable and hipped roofs. Sidewalks line both sides of the street through the Study Area. Most of Cooper Street is lined with mature trees. While there is less tree canopy as Cooper Street approaches Queen Street East, there is significant greenery on the eastern side of the street, where homes are set further back.
Cambridge has little remaining farmland and very few agricultural buildings left within its municipal boundaries. What few agricultural buildings remain include former farmhouses and mills, now incorporated into the urban fabric. The large trees in the southern portion Cooper Street provide a reminder of previous farm paths and laneways. This is also evident in the larger farmhouse-style properties.

As Cooper Street winds closer to Queen Street East, the Forbes Park entrance is a significant landmark on the western side of the street. This park was named in honour of the Forbes family, who donated the land for public use. Finally, the street culminates into one of the most iconic streetscapes in the Hespeler, at the intersection of Queen Street West and the three iconic church and civic buildings, particularly St. Andrews, St. Mary’s, and the Old Post Office/Fashion History Museum.
It is important to note that starting in 2025 the city is looking to completely reconstruct a 1.1 km stretch of Cooper Street after replacing underground infrastructure. This segment includes Cooper Street, Phin Avenue, Queen Street East, and Chapel Street, all the way to the storm water outlet at the Speed River.

A painted bicycle lane will also be incorporated into this project between Richmond and Hammet Street as part of the proposed Bike-way network outlined in the 2020 City's Cycling Master Plan.
EARLY TO MID 19TH CENTURY: COLONIAL SETTLEMENT AND EARLY INDUSTRIALISATION

Early bankside trails soon became formalized into roadways and road improvements figure prominently in the early development of the region. The land on which the town of Hespeler grew was part of the Six Nations Land Grant, deeded by the British Government in 1784. This original tract of Six Nations lands was purchased by land speculator Richard Beasley, and subsequently, this area came to the attention of a group of Pennsylvania Mennonites wishing to establish a new agricultural community.

By the 1830s, this group had built the community named Bergeytown, flanking the Speed River. By 1835, the settlement had grown, at which time the name was changed to New Hope. The first general store in New Hope was established in 1840 by John Gingerich at the corner of Adam and Queen Streets. This small settlement grew to become the core of Hespeler, largely due to the efforts of industrialist and businessman Jacob Hespeler, who purchased 145 acres along the banks of the Speed River in 1845. Records from 1846 indicate a population of only one hundred inhabitants, a grist and a sawmill, a tannery, a tavern, one store, one pail factory, two blacksmiths, two tailors, and two shoemakers.

The town grew quickly with the industrial development, augmented by the introduction of the Great Western Railway Line into the village in 1859. This period saw the construction of key industrial buildings and worker housing to accommodate the growing workforce. In 1869, the population had multiplied to
1200 and the community contained several large manufacturers, including a knitting mill and a woolens factory.

**LATE 19TH CENTURY TO EARLY 20TH: EXPANSION AND URBAN GROWTH**

Spurred on by the arrival of the railway and the industrial push, Hespeler continued to grow rapidly, in both population and geographic coverage. A vibrant commercial core developed at the intersection of Queen Street and Guelph Avenue, and the town had grown in all directions from its concentrated hub around the core. Construction activities included the development of residential neighborhoods, commercial buildings, schools, churches, and civic amenities to support the growing population and industrial workforce. The distinctive architecture of many heritage buildings in Hespeler reflects the construction styles prevalent during this period. Continued growth allowed Hespeler to be incorporated as a town in January 1901. A wide variety of vernacular worker’s buildings were punctuated by the few large houses of the mill owners and managers.

Hespeler’s industrial base expanded significantly over the following years. In addition to the expansive Forbes Mill, this included the growth of an Industrial Sector north of the Speed River, and the establishment of the Hall, Zryd Foundry Limited, the Hespeler Machinery Company, The Universal Lighting Rod Company, and the Hespeler Hockey Stick Company, to name a few. By 1911 the electric railway system between Preston and Galt had reached Hespeler as well as Berlin (later called Kitchener) and Waterloo.
Development of an Industrial and Manufacturing Sector north of the Speed River. Arrow indicates location of the Jardine + Co. Plant in the image above. *Fire Insurance Maps, 1910*

A composite of the Fire Insurance Maps from 1910 superimposed on the present satellite image of Hespeler. The Study Area is defined in purple. This map indicates the growth patterns of Hespeler. It also indicates that the Town Plan has remained relatively unchanged in the core. *TRACE*
WARTIME/MILL RECRUITMENT:

The War years represented an interesting period in Hespeler, as Dominion Woollens & Worsted Co. Ltd, who had purchased the Forbes Mill in 1928, was awarded large contracts from the Department of Supply & Services to manufacture cloth for military uniforms. At this time, despite the growth over the last one hundred years, housing in Hespeler was in very short supply during the period when the Second World War began.

The solution for the company, was to purchase housing for their employees. Dominion Woollens & Worsted Co. Ltd. first purchased the former Lester Weaver house, across Queen St. West, which was renamed “Gordon Hall” and renovated to house 70 young women, who were employed on the night shift. The Company finally purchased three additional residences to house workers. At this time, the textile mills in Hespeler were among the largest in the word.

Demographically, a major shift was also happening, as companies were looking to immigration to fulfill the demand. They actively recruited labourers from further afield, initially from Scotland and, during WWII, from Newfoundland and Labrador. Women from northern Ontario were also brought in to replace men taken for the war effort, and many of these women were provided lodging in specially built company dormitories. In this way, the mills provided a social setting that extended beyond working hours and helped the newcomers blend with the existing population.
POST-WORLD WAR II ERA (1940S TO 1960S):

As in other parts of southern Ontario, Hespeler witnessed post-World War II suburbanization and residential development. Construction during this period focused on the expansion of suburban neighborhoods, the construction of single-family homes, and the development of amenities such as schools, parks, and shopping centers, to accommodate returning veterans and their families. During the 1920s, Highway 8 was illuminated and properly paved. Somewhat later during the 1950s and 1960s, Highways 24 and 401 were constructed and paved. These highways fostered greater suburban growth and industrial activity in the vicinity of Preston and Hespeler.

The textile industry still pursued housing development during the war years, including the creation of new housing subdivisions to sell to employees. Dominion Woolens housing developments were constructed on Woodsdale, Cedar, Oak, Weaver, Millvue, Walnut, Edward, and Beech Streets. Between 1949 and December 1955, the company was faced with stiff competition from imported textiles and their workforce shrank considerably.
Walnut Street Development. Hespeler Heritage Centre
On November 17, 1960, the four-lane Highway 401 to Highway 8 at Preston was officially opened, connecting what was then Waterloo County with Toronto. One unique challenge for Hespeler Village is that Highway 401 separates this area from the rest of Cambridge, as the core area was by-passed by Hespeler Rd.

101 Aerial photo of Hespeler (1945), with Study Area and Hespeler Road location outlined in red. TRACE

Hespeler 1945

102 Aerial photo of Hespeler (1955), with Study Area and Hespeler Road location outlined in red. TRACE

Hespeler 1955

103 Aerial photo of Hespeler (1966). Unfortunately, the original image is cut-off. Study Area outlined in red. TRACE

Hespeler 1966
INDUSTRIAL DECLINE AND REDEVELOPMENT (1970S TO PRESENT):

Hespeler, along with other manufacturing towns in the region, faced challenges due to industrial decline in the latter half of the 20th century. Many industrial facilities closed or relocated, leading to economic restructuring and shifts in land use. Construction efforts during this period included adaptive reuse of former industrial buildings, brownfield redevelopment, and efforts to diversify the local economy through commercial and residential projects. During World War II, the mill supplied Canada with most of its wool for uniforms. Other textile companies also opened in the early 1900s and continued to be successful until the late 1940s, when they began to decline. Dominion Woolens, for example, was facing bankruptcy by 1959 and was sold to Silknit, which eventually closed the plant in 1984. Other industry was still quite successful, and by 1969, Hespeler's population had grown to 6,000.

After the peak of local employment was reached in the mid-20th century, local industries declined, and the village is now sustained largely as a bedroom community for regional urban centres. In 1973, Hespeler amalgamated with Preston and Galt, to form the new city of Cambridge.
5.5. **ARCHITECTURAL STYLES**

A range of architectural styles are present in the Study Area, reflecting the various periods of construction. A concentration of Georgian, Renaissance Revival, and Edwardian Classical style buildings are located within the commercial area in the centre of the Study Area, which corresponds with the 19th century dates of construction in that area. Several of the buildings in the Study Area have been documented as designed and built by notable residents, foundational in the history of Hespeler, such as Micheal Bergey, Jacob Hespeler, Charles Karch, and George Duthie Forbes, to name a few.

**HESPÉLER VERNACULAR ARCHITECTURE**

Ontario vernacular architecture refers to the variety of building styles and construction methods that emerged over time in the province’s rural and small-town communities. It embodies the practical responses of settlers and later generations to the local climate, available materials, cultural influences, and functional needs. Across the province, vernacular architectural styles tend to reflect the unique characteristics of a region. In Hespeler, this is typically a compact form, 1 ½ or 2-storeys high with a rectangular or ‘L’-shaped floor plan, gable roof, and often a porch, and can be seen in single-family homes, churches, and commercial buildings.

Vernacular Architecture also borrows from a variety of other styles and can have significant ornamentation and unique features. However, vernacular structures often exhibit simple, functional designs adapted to local needs and environmental conditions.
Efforts to preserve and interpret Ontario's vernacular architecture have grown in recent decades, driven by a recognition of its cultural significance and historical value. Heritage conservation initiatives seek to protect vernacular buildings from demolition and degradation, while also promoting an appreciation of their architectural and cultural heritage.
GEORGIAN (1784-1860)

This period coincides with the time when Upper Canada was being settled by British immigrants, and Georgian architecture was popular in Britain during this era. Georgian architecture in Upper Canada reflected the architectural tastes and styles brought over by British settlers. Key characteristics of Georgian architecture include symmetry; brick construction; classical influences such as columns, pediments, and pilasters; multi-pane windows, arranged in a grid pattern and symmetrical floorplans.

In Hespeler, Pennsylvanian Mennonite influences are embedded in some residential buildings. After the American Revolution, many Mennonites left southern Pennsylvania for inexpensive land in southwestern Ontario. The influence of the German farmhouse style is evident in the hilly landscape of Hespeler, where many properties follow the Georgian form; however, do not follow all the British characteristics. Mennonite architecture in Pennsylvania and surrounding areas is characterized by simplicity, functionality, and adherence to traditional building methods. Mennonite homes typically feature modest designs with practical layouts, often constructed using locally available materials such as stone, brick, or timber. The architecture tends to reflect the Mennonite values of simplicity and humility, with minimal ornamentation and decoration.

Row, or terrace houses, were introduced into Ontario in anticipation of fulfilling the need for higher density housing with the growth of industry. One of the best examples of this is Jacob Hespeler’s Workers Row Houses on Spring Street, built ca. 1862. These houses were built by Jacob Hespeler and are named the Riverside Terrace. They housed workers who worked in his Mill, located next to the homes. They are made of heavily mortared limestone rubblestone and are influenced by Georgian style. Hespeler’s first Town Hall stands at the top of this
row of houses in section 61-63. This section of the row is built of tooled ashlar limestone.

**GOTHIC REVIVAL 1750 – 1900**

Since a great many of the early settlers in Ontario were from the United Kingdom, it is not surprising that their buildings often contain details found in English Gothic and neo-medieval architecture. Many elements of stone buildings in England are translated into wood on cottages and smaller residences in Ontario Gothic Revival buildings. The overall effect is eclectic and usually ornate. This style, characterized by its pointed arched windows, steeply pitched roofs, and ornate decorative elements, was popularized during the Victorian Era and reflected a romanticized interest in medieval architecture. Gothic Revival architecture played a significant role in shaping the built environment of southwestern Ontario. While the neo-Gothic Cottage is probably the most pervasive Ontario residential style prior to 1950, Gothic Revival Architecture found a strong foothold in ecclesiastical buildings and institutional buildings, such as schools, libraries, and public buildings.
The three gable Gothic style was prevalent throughout southern Ontario. The yellow brick produced in western Ontario gives the towns a distinctive style. Red and orange brick was shipped in from the east.

VICTORIAN (1840-1900)

In Ontario, a Victorian style building can be seen as any building built between 1840 and 1900 that does not fit into any of the aforementioned categories. It encompasses a large group of buildings constructed of brick, stone, and timber, using an eclectic mixture of Classical and Gothic motifs. 19th century urban centres are packed with lovely residences and small commercial buildings made with bay windows, stained glass, ornamental string courses, and elegant entrances. Victorian homes are prevalent throughout southwestern Ontario, especially in cities and towns that experienced significant growth during the 19th century. Victorian architecture encompasses a range of styles that were popular during the reign of Queen Victoria (1837-1901) in Britain, and
these styles were often adapted and interpreted by architects and builders in Ontario.

Victorian homes in southwestern Ontario can be found in various architectural styles, including Italianate, Second Empire, Queen Anne, Gothic Revival, and others. Each style has its own distinctive features, such as ornate detailing, asymmetrical façades, steeply pitched roofs, and decorative elements like bay windows, brackets, and intricate woodwork. These homes were typically constructed using locally available materials, including brick, stone, and wood. Brick was a common choice for urban homes, while stone was more prevalent in rural areas. Wood was often used for decorative elements such as trim, gingerbread detailing, and ornate porch columns.

In addition to traditional building types, the most outstanding examples of "new purpose" buildings were the industrial and railway facilities and their related hotels and out-buildings.
SECOND EMPIRE

Second Empire architecture had a notable presence in Ontario during the 19th century, particularly from the 1860s to the 1880s. This style, characterized by its mansard roof, dormer windows, and ornate detailing influences many residential and commercial buildings in Ontario from this period. Commercial buildings often featured tall, narrow façades with decorative elements such as pilasters, cornices, and arched windows.

Second Empire elements were sometimes combined with other architectural styles such as Italianate or neo-Gothic; or adapted to suit local preferences and climates. This produced a more North American version of the style.
The Beaux-Arts architectural style had a notable presence in Ontario, particularly during the late 19th and early 20th centuries. This style, originating in France, was characterized by grandiosity, classical symmetry, and ornate detailing. It became popular in North America during the late 19th century and was often associated with public buildings, institutions, and monuments. Beaux-Arts architecture found expression in government buildings, particularly those associated with civic pride and authority.

Another example is the Forbes Estate, one of the most impressive homes in Hespeler. The house was built with yellow brick in the Beaux-Arts style with a flat-topped ornate portico. A two-storey porch with classical detailing, such as ionic-composite double-height columns, displays the family’s social standing.
ART DECO

Art Deco architecture made its mark in southwestern Ontario during the early to mid-20th century and is characterized by its geometric shapes, streamlined forms, and decorative motifs, which became popular during the interwar period, particularly in downtown cores. Art Deco influenced the design of public buildings and civic structures in southwestern Ontario, including libraries, courthouses, and municipal buildings. These buildings often feature streamlined forms, decorative friezes, and stylized motifs that convey a sense of modernity and progress.

118 74 Queen Street East, the former Post Office, presently the Fashion History Museum, built in 1928. This building is the most prominent feature looking eastward down Queen Street. Although not an Art Deco building, it has some early Art Deco influence. TRACE
INDUSTRIAL/FUNCTIONAL 1840S-1960S

While not a specific architectural style per-se, it is important to note that the industrial and functional buildings in Hespeler are an important part of the architectural fabric. Hespeler has a significant number of original industrial buildings in the region, some of which still serve an industrial purpose. Architecturally, these buildings are an example of purpose-built architecture. Industrial buildings with heritage character in Ontario reflect the province's rich industrial history, encompassing a wide range of structures that played vital roles in various sectors such as manufacturing, transportation, and resource extraction.

They often feature sturdy brick or stone construction, expansive open floor plans, and large windows for natural light. These buildings also include warehouses, characterized by their utilitarian design, with large open spaces, loading docks, and tall ceilings. Excellent examples of this are seen in former textile mills, such as those in Hespeler.

119 211 Queen Street West. Lens Mills/Dominion Woollens and Worsted Ltd. ca. 1864. TRACE

120 25 Milling Road. Hespeler Furniture Co. Founded in 1901, the Hespeler Furniture Factory was operational until the 1970s. This famous location was one of the largest of its kind. TRACE
5.6. MATERIALS

The dominant cladding materials used in the traditional architecture of the Town of Hespeler are yellow brick and limestone, likely sourced in the region, as well as plaster and wood siding. There is the use of aluminum and vinyl siding as well, particularly in more recent residential areas. Painted metal and asphalt shingles are the most common roofing materials, although there are a number of houses which have pressed metal or tile roofs. Porches, “gingerbread,” balustrades, and other features and detailing are typically constructed of wood. The post-war buildings use more contemporary materials including hard-fired brick, stone veneer, vinyl and metal siding, and exterior insulation stucco. Reddish brick from other areas of Ontario is also fairly common.

LOCALLY MANUFACTURED BUILDING MATERIALS INCLUDE:

YELLOW BRICK

In southwest Ontario, particularly in regions such as Windsor, London, and the surrounding areas, yellow brick, also called buff brick, is commonly used in construction. These bricks share many characteristics with those found in other parts of southern Ontario, including their yellowish hue and durability. The colouration of the brick can vary from light to dark, depending on the mineral content of the clay, and the temperature at which the bricks are fired. Historically, the denser clay of yellow bricks has been favored for its ability to better withstand harsh weather conditions, including frost and moisture, making the bricks suitable for use in the Canadian climate.

In addition to their durability, yellow bricks are prized for their aesthetic appeal, lending a warm, lighter, and inviting look to buildings. There are a significant number of built heritage resources in Hespeler that showcase the use of yellow brick.

LIMESTONE

The use of limestone in southwest Ontario dates back centuries and has played a crucial role in shaping the region's architectural heritage, infrastructure, and economy.

Limestone was one of the primary building materials used by early settlers in southwest Ontario. This was thanks to the region’s abundant limestone that provided a durable material for constructing homes, barns, churches, and other structures. Also, immigration from places such as Scotland, brought many masons familiar with the material.

Historic buildings, such as churches, courthouses, and government buildings, often highlight intricate limestone detailing, including carvings, columns, and
façades. These structures reflect the craftsmanship and architectural styles of their respective periods and serve as cultural and historical landmarks in the region.

WOOD

The most common building material in early use in the region was wood, due to its availability, its use for both structure and cladding, and the abilities in carpentry that were reasonably common. Opportunity to paint it a range of different colours also appealed to early homeowners. Wood was also the dominant material for decorative elements such as cornices, brackets, dormers, and porches.
6.1. **EVALUATION OF SIGNIFICANCE AND DETERMINATION OF CULTURAL HERITAGE VALUE**

The initial Study Area for the HCD Study, as directed by the City of Cambridge, encompasses much of the downtown area of Hespeler, including approximately 524 properties. It includes the commercial precinct anchored on Queen Street, the industrial area located along the Speed River, and residential areas south and north of Queen Street. While the City expected that this area would be scoped further by the consultants, the generous size of the initial Study Area provided the consultant team with a broad territory to consider for potential inclusion within a future HCD, if proposed.

The Study Area encompasses a unique community, notable for its mix of commercial, industrial, and residential land uses, its important cultural and civic institutions, its distinctive architecture, and its relationship to the Speed River and Mill Pond. The Study Area is characterized by a concentration of 19th and early 20th century structures, notably large industrial buildings. The area is also defined by a number of major civic and residential properties designated under Part IV of the *Ontario Heritage Act*.

Of the 524 properties reviewed, 67 are Listed under Section 27, Part IV of the *Ontario Heritage Act* on the City of Cambridge Municipal Heritage Register and 16 have been designated under Section 29, Part IV of the OHA. The former Forbes Textile Mill is also a National Historic Site of Canada under the Historic Sites and Monuments Act. The inventory and historical research conducted for this HCD Study have shown that there are additional properties that may also have individual cultural heritage value or interest.
DEFINING HERITAGE CHARACTER

Evaluation of cultural heritage value of a prospective Heritage Conservation District (HCD) is guided primarily by O.Reg. 9/06 (as amended by O.Reg. 569/22) as well as the Ontario Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) of 2020. It is also supported by the guidelines included in the Ontario Heritage Toolkit’s Heritage Conservation Districts: A Guide to District Designation Under the Ontario Heritage Act (2006). The evaluation of heritage attributes for an HCD will usually involve an aggregate of buildings, streets, and open spaces that, as a group, is a collective asset to the community. The purpose of a HCD Study is to assess the significance of the whole ensemble of buildings and landscapes — of place - not just individual properties. HCDs aim to maintain the unique character and ambiance of a particular neighborhood, district or community. This includes conserving the architectural style, streetscapes, and overall visual identity that contribute to its historical or cultural value or interest.

By conserving heritage resources, HCDs help foster a sense of place and identity within communities. They contribute to local pride and serve as reminders of the area's history and evolution over time. The evaluation is not an arbitrary process.

In the Ontario Provincial Policy Statement of 2020, heritage resources are defined within the broader context of cultural heritage. Heritage resources include, but are not limited to, cultural heritage landscapes, archaeological resources, built heritage resources, and cultural heritage resources identified under the Ontario Heritage Act. Built heritage resources may include buildings, structures, monuments, engineering works, gardens, and cemeteries. Heritage attributes of a resource may include materials, forms, location, spatial configurations, uses, cultural associations, meanings, and traditions, and may be tangible or intangible.

This definition encompasses various aspects of cultural heritage that are considered significant and worthy of preservation within the planning and development framework of Ontario. It recognizes not only physical structures and landscapes but also intangible aspects such as cultural associations and traditions.

**Built Heritage Resources** are generally located on property that may be designated under Parts IV (individual property) or V (district) of the Ontario Heritage Act, or that may be included on local, provincial, federal, and/or international registers.

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

As described in the *Ontario Heritage Tool Kit (2006)*, general character of Heritage Conservation Districts may include the following four characteristics, each of which is found in the subject Hespeler Study Area as a whole:

- A concentration of heritage buildings, sites, structures, designed landscapes, and natural landscapes that are linked by aesthetic, historical, and socio-cultural contexts or use;
- A framework of structured elements including major natural features such as topography, land form, landscapes, water courses, and built form such as pathways and street patterns, landmarks, nodes or intersections, approaches, and edges;
- A sense of visual coherence through the use of such elements as building scale, mass, height, material, proportion, colour, etc. that convey a distinct sense of time or place; and
- A distinctiveness which enables districts to be recognized and distinguishable from their surroundings or from neighbouring areas.
6.2. PROPERTY INVENTORY

Ultimately, the integrity of the District depends on the management of all the individual parts of which it is comprised. Therefore, each property within the Study Area is individually evaluated for its potential significance and contribution to the values of the Study Area.

Properties are evaluated based on the following criteria described in the *Ontario Heritage Toolkit*:

**Design or physical values:**

- Is a representative, unique or early example of architectural style, type, expression, material, or construction method; or
- Displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit; or
- Demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement.

**Associative or historical values:**

- Has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization, or institution that is significant to a community; or
- Yields or has potential to yield important information about the community or culture; or
- Demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer, or theorist who is significant to the community.

**Contextual values:**

- Is important in defining, maintaining, or supporting the character of an area; or
- Is physically, functionally visually, or historically linked to its surroundings; or
- Is a landmark or well-known site. Properties displaying a high degree of integrity score higher than those which have been heavily altered.

**Bill 23 Changes to Prescribed Criteria to Designate Heritage Conservation Districts**

Ontario Bill 23 (in effect since January 1, 2023) prescribed additional criteria that a municipality must meet in order to designate an area as a Heritage Conservation District.

These changes require criteria in O. Reg. 9/06 under Part V of the *Ontario Heritage Act* to be used in the heritage evaluation of an HCD to determine if an HCD Study Area merits designation. At least 25% of the properties within this HCD Study Area must satisfy 2 or more of the 9 criteria. This change is reflected in the updated Ontario Heritage Act, Section 41(1). The 9 criteria are:
i. The properties have design value or physical value because they are rare, unique, representative or early examples of a style, type, expression, material, or construction method;

ii. The properties have design value or physical value because they display a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit;

iii. The properties have design value or physical value because they demonstrate a high degree of technical or scientific achievement;

iv. The properties have historical value or associative value because they have a direct association with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization, or institution that is significant to a community;

v. The properties have historical value or associative value because they yield, or have the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of a community or culture;

vi. The properties have historical value or associative value because they demonstrate or reflect the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer, or theorist who is significant to a community;

vii. The properties have contextual value because they define, maintain, or support the character of the district;

viii. The properties have contextual value because they are physically, functionally, visually, or historically linked to each other; and

ix. The properties have contextual value because they are defined by, planned around, or are themselves a landmark.

To measure the 25% threshold, steps were required in the evaluation process, the following process was completed during the Field Study (Section 6.3):

- The consultant team completed individual property heritage evaluations of the 524 properties within the Study Area using the criteria for determining the cultural heritage value or interest of individual properties of O. Reg. 9/06 (section 1) under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act.
- Each the individual property evaluation was completed in a database in order to provide an analytical platform. This was used to calculate percentages; and
- A proposed boundary was established based on contributing properties in the Study Area. In order to measure the 25% threshold in the proposed HCD boundary, the percentage of contributing properties was measured, and presented in map form.
6.3. FIELD SURVEY & EVALUATION

As required by Section 40(a) of the *Ontario Heritage Act*, the Hespeler HCD Study included the completion of a built form and landscape survey of the Study Area. The survey serves as an evaluative record used to collect information about the historical and physical characteristics of the Study Area. The field survey in a HCD study involves a systematic approach to documenting and evaluating the historic fabric of the district. Built form and landscape survey activities were conducted in the Summer of 2023. An initial site visit was conducted in June 2023, involving a walk-through of the Study Area, photography, a visit to the Hespeler Heritage Centre, and the City of Cambridge Archives.

This was followed by a three-day Field Survey Visit conducted in August 2023 and included a full survey of the Study Area boundary, photography, and property detailing of over 500 properties. The survey also included context photography and landscape survey.

The overall objective of the Field Survey was to:

- Examine the character and appearance of the area that is the subject of the study, including buildings, structures, and other features of the area, including landscapes, landmarks, and significant views that define the Study Area, to help determine if the area should be conserved as a heritage conservation district; and

- Property information and photographs have been compiled into a database, to facilitate the evaluation of over 500 individual properties.

Due to the geographic size of the Study Area, and volume of properties, the Consultant Team established five survey zones, to better understand the development patterns and architectural characteristics of each. The Consultant Team labelled these as Character Areas; however, they do not represent independent sections of the potential HCD; rather, they represented an initial organization method of a significant volume of properties.
EVALUATION RESULTS

For the Field Study Evaluation, the consultant team considered the criteria under 41(1) and used this to determine four possible levels of contribution to the overall heritage value of the Study Area:

- **Category 1: Designated or key property**
  These properties are critical to maintaining the values of the place and require the highest level of protection.

- **Category 2: Strongly contributing property**
  These properties significantly contribute to values of the place.

- **Category 3: Somewhat contributing property**
  These properties make a minor contribution to the values of the place. All properties which back onto the Speed River or which have mature trees score a minimum of Category 3, regardless of their architectural contributions.

- **Category 4: Non-contributing property**
  These properties do not contribute to the values of the place.

These criteria are evolving, and will be re-evaluated throughout the remaining Study Phase, especially as more information is received. Presently, in the **Study Area**, the breakdown is as follows:

- **Category 1**: 16 Designated or Key Properties
- **Category 2**: 89 Strongly Contributing Properties
- **Category 3**: 199 Somewhat Contributing Properties
- **Category 4**: 220 Non-Contributing Properties

190 or 36% of properties in the **Study Area** meet at least 2 of the 9 criteria according to the updated requirements under O. Reg. 9/06 affecting Part V of the *Ontario Heritage Act*. Therefore, the Study Area overall merits a possible designation.

Property categorization is likely to be adapted, and this percentage by the finalization of the HCD Study Phase. An updated percentage will be provided at the MHAC presentation on April 18, 2024.
6.4. RECOMMENDED HERITAGE CONSERVATION DISTRICT BOUNDARY AND ANALYSIS

6.4.1. DETERMINING THE BOUNDARY

Boundary delineation is a critical task during the HCD Study Phase; some Study Areas have obvious character and a clear set of boundaries; others are more difficult to define. Determining the appropriate boundary for the proposed HCD requires careful consideration of the heritage character as well as the extent of cultural heritage resources within different parts of the Study Area. The Ontario Heritage Tool Kit outlines criteria for determining a boundary. They include:

- Historic factors;
- Visual factors;
- Physical features; and
- Legal or planning factors.

Boundaries should be drawn to include not only buildings and structures of interest, but also the whole property on which they are located. Vacant land, infill sites, public open space, and contemporary buildings may also be included within the district to ensure that their future development is in keeping with the character of the area. Buildings and structures of less obvious historical or architectural merit, but that also contribute to the scale or scenic amenity of the area, may also be included (Ontario Heritage Toolkit, 2006).

6.4.2. RECOMMENDED BOUNDARY

Hespeler has a long history which pre-dates colonial settler-contact with Indigenous peoples, who had a long-term migratory relationship with this region and within this river basin. The growth of the settlement allowed for a significant industrial boost and the development of a thriving commercial centre and diverse residential neighbourhoods. The Study Area contains a significant number of properties which reveal broad architectural, cultural, social, and economic patterns of the region’s history. The concentration of heritage resources creates a compelling and unique sense of place that is distinct from other communities within greater Cambridge. There is a wealth of high-value heritage residential, industrial, and institutional buildings, waterscapes, and natural and man-made landscapes that are an integral part of the identity of Hespeler. Based on the analysis of Hespeler, its surroundings, historic development, physical attributes, social and cultural character, and the inventory and evaluations of individual properties, this Study identifies a
large portion of the Study Area which merits designation as a Heritage Conservation District. The proposed HCD comprises 314 individual properties and the Chilligo Conservation Area. As of the current evaluation, 158 individual properties and the Chilligo Conservation Area contribute to the heritage character of the area. The contributing properties are presently categorized as (These categories are defined in the previous section):

- Category 1: Designated or key property
- Category 2: Strongly contributing property
- Category 3: Somewhat contributing property

A list of property addresses is included is available in the Appendix.

Please note that this boundary, the properties included, and their degree of contribution will continue to be evaluated over the course of the Study Phase, and this list is subject to modification.

Based upon the findings of this HCD Study, the authors recommend that the City of Cambridge proceed to the next stage in the process for the potential designation of the Hespeler Heritage Conservation District under Part V of the Ontario Heritage Act. The community meetings and questionnaire revealed that residents have a strong connection to the place, and strongly value the ambiance and character of the place. This is particularly seen in the town’s relationship with the Speed River and its natural landscape. Specific buildings, historic features, historic sites, and the Commercial Core are also valued by residents. A recurring message heard throughout the public consultation process is that “as large of an area as possible” should be included within the HCD.
The proposed district boundary is centred on the river and surrounding historic natural, commercial, industrial, institutional and residential cores of Hespeler. While this is a substantial area, the intent of protecting key views, streetscapes, and first impressions when entering Hespeler, and protecting the existing sense of place that is predominant, and rooted in the relationship to the River, determines it. This is the area with the greatest concentration of heritage resources and where substantial future development pressure can be anticipated. Through careful management of change, the heritage value can be conserved while incorporating sensitive new development and/or reusing/repurposing existing properties.

6.4.3. REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED BOUNDARY

The HCD Study has determined where the greatest concentrations of cultural heritage resources are found within Hespeler and has focused the inventory and evaluation process on those areas. While the Consultant Team has included a significant geographic area in the proposed HCD boundary, we feel this was an opportunity to provide a better physical and historical context for the Study area. It includes commercial, institutional, industrial and residential areas that are important in Hespeler’s evolution; it also focused extensively on highlighting the significance of the Speed River waterfront.
The rationale for designation can be summarized as follows:

- The Hespeler Heritage Conservation District Study Area has a significant heritage character as found in its built heritage resources, cultural landscapes, natural landscapes and associations with important people and events in the history of the area;
- The inventory and evaluation of the study area have shown that these heritage resources merit conservation, while meeting updated designation criteria in O. Reg. 9/06 under Part V of the Ontario Heritage Act and over 25% of the properties within this HCD Study Area must satisfy 2 or more of the 9 criteria under the Act;
- The area shows evidence of the major stages of its evolution;
- The area has potential for intensification and redevelopment that could affect the cultural heritage resources;
- There appears to be public support for designation.
- District designation has proven to one of the best policy tools available to Ontario municipalities for meeting their conservation goals and objectives.

This area includes significant sections of Queen Street East, Queen Street West, Cooper Street, Guelph Avenue, Milling Road, as well as some sections of Tannery Street West, Keffer Street, Harvey Road, Shamrock Street, Franklin Avenue, Forbes Street, and Kribs Street. The area includes all of the institutional properties on Tannery Street East and Forbes Park. This area also includes portions of the Speed River, its shoreline, and the Chilligo Conservation Area.
While there are many properties within these areas that do not appear to contribute to the heritage character of the rest of the street and village. Any properties of heritage value within these areas can be conserved through individual designation instead of being included in a District.

The choice of the recommended boundary still allows the municipality scope for extending the District in a later phase, if desired. In the meantime, it should be kept in mind that properties abutting an HCD District boundary have some degree of municipal regulation. This regulatory power is granted under the umbrella planning policies set by the Province in the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS). Section 2.6 of the PPS deals with cultural heritage resources and requires adjacent properties to be developed in ways that are compatible with the heritage character of the properties next to it, within the HCD. It is also recommended that the City of Cambridge expedite designation of recognized properties on the register that fall outside this suggested boundary, and outside the Study Area, in advance of January 1, 2025, due to the changes to the OHA under Bill 23.
6.5. PRELIMINARY STATEMENT OF DISTRICT SIGNIFICANCE:

STATEMENT OF CULTURAL HERITAGE VALUE

The draft Statement of Cultural Heritage Value summarizes the heritage value and attributes of the Recommended HCD Area. The Statement also played a key role in determining the boundary for the potential HCD and is the basis for the evaluation of the level of contribution of individual properties found within the Study Area. Upon acceptance of the HCD Study, as part of the Heritage Conservation District Plan & Guidelines, this Statement would need to be refined in the next phase.

STATEMENT OF CULTURAL HERITAGE VALUE OR INTEREST UNDER OHA PART IV

DESCRIPTION OF HESPELER ONTARIO

Hespeler is located on the Speed River, within the City of Cambridge, in the Region of Waterloo. Downtown Hespeler contains the commercial and industrial heart of the town, which was established when the area was settled as a mill town in the mid 1800s. This gave life here to the early industrial development, and subsequently, a truly mixed village development of multiple industries, residential enclaves, a commercial High Street (Queen Street), and significant institutional and recreational attributes as well. This organic development pattern is clearly defined and supports the inspiring unique mixed village character. It derives its charm from the interesting topography, the river and views to it, and the vitality of early North American villages that have survived exponential growth and the spectre of modern zoning, with its demolitions and siloed separation of uses.

The Study Area includes commercial, residential, industrial, and institutional buildings located on the north and south sides of the Speed River. The street grid is also skewed by Hespeler’s hilly topography, resulting in many interesting views and vistas throughout the elevated residential areas. The commercial core, that developed on the south side of the Speed River is dominated by Queen Street, divided east and west by Adam Street and Guelph Avenue, and runs parallel to the Speed River. The small commercial core is a modest collection of retail and residential buildings, punctuated by more architecturally expressive institutional buildings such as churches, the former Post Office, the former Town Hall, and the Library. Spring Street includes workers’ housing, built in the mid 19th century, for those who worked in the mills. Queen Street West is marked by early commercial buildings, such as the Queen’s Hotel and the larger commercial blocks on the south side, transitioning quickly to historic,
vernacular residential properties. The former Forbes Textile Mill and National Historic Site anchors the suggested district’s western boundary.

Residential streets offshoot the main core – including many named after the industrial founders of the Hespeler. The skewed street grid on the western side of Hespeler is marked by the steep hillside topography. As a result, the orientation of the streets offers views toward the Speed River ‘valley’, with mixed architectural styles and several early stone and wood homes built in the late 19th Century. Eastern residential areas such as Cooper Street, present a southern gateway into the village, with larger stone homes and farmhouses, mixed with modest and modern housing, large lots, and a slope culminating in iconic religious and institutional buildings at the corner of Cooper and Queen Street East. Walker Street is another residential neighbourhood, with architecturally significant homes that once belonged to prominent members of the local community, such as merchants, executives, and artists.

North of the Speed River, up Guelph Avenue, includes the bulk of impressive surviving mills and factories, with the historic residential neighbourhoods set north of the industrial sector. Hespeler has by far the greatest concentration of older industrial buildings in the Cambridge area, with many buildings still intact, and several still in industrial use. This industrial area is characterized by the factories that made Hespeler a prosperous centre.

Uphill from the industrial core, the residential section of Guelph Avenue contains the former homes of historically significant members of Hespeler’s industrial elite, such as the Forbes Estate, Kribs Home, and the original home of Jacob Hespeler. Set on a hill, overlooking the industrial area, these stately homes are built of ashlar limestone, red and yellow brick, and their grandeur display these families’ influence and prominence in Hespeler.

THE SPEED RIVER

Hespeler developed over time on both sides of the Speed River. The river runs through Hespeler, and is characterized by two man-made structures, including the Speed River Dam, built by Jacob Hespeler in the mid 19th century, immediately to the east of Guelph Avenue and the Silknit Dam, (adjacent to the former Forbes Textile Mill), built in 1906. The Mill Run trail runs along the northern shoreline, approximately 6.5 km along the Speed River, crosses through the Chilligo Conservation Area, and terminates at Riverside Park. The river features both natural and cultural elements and is divided east and west by the bridge on Guelph Avenue. The riverbanks on the east are mostly characterized by their natural appearance. The river bed includes natural ledges, park space, substantial waterfront vegetation, and boat launches for watersports. The western section of river has a layering of industrial installations, including some stone and concrete retaining walls, former
industrial buildings, a railroad bridge, in addition to some naturalized vegetation.

**CULTURAL HERITAGE VALUE**

The history of Indigenous peoples in the area now known as Cambridge, Ontario, is deeply rooted and spans thousands of years. The region had been inhabited by various Indigenous groups long before European settlers arrived. These groups include the Anishinaabe (Ojibwe, Odawa, and Potawatomi), Haudenosaunee (Iroquois), and Neutral peoples. Colonial settlement in Hespeler began along the shores of the Speed River in the mid 19th century. Today, the natural appearance of the river, in combination with its cultural edges and surviving industrial, commercial, institutional, and residential architecture, create a compelling and unique sense of place. The cultural heritage value of Hespeler lies in its history as a 19th century mill town, its strong sense of place, and its river-based cultural landscape.

The cultural heritage value of downtown Hespeler lies in its historical significance as an example of a 19th century mill town on the Speed River, its strong sense of place, its association with community well-being, its aesthetic value as a picturesque townscape, and its river-based cultural landscape. These elements express a unique small-town character that is distinct from surrounding areas.

Hespeler’s origins are directly linked to the river, beginning with the construction of the first mills, the continued growth of the industrial sector, and the arrival of the railway in 1859, which expanded its market reach and resulted in prosperity of the textile and other industries. Throughout its growth, Hespeler has maintained its small-town atmosphere, in part the result of a tightly composed urban form consisting of a commercial/industrial core surrounded by residential areas.

The cultural heritage value is also reflected in the industrial buildings, bridges, and pathways oriented around the river, as well as its public green spaces, including significant greenspace around the river bed, and natural and man-made park space throughout the district. The open spaces of the river and the unique urban configuration, captured by the hilly topography of the town, afford significant views and vistas of key heritage attributes. Combined, these elements and their associated intangible activities, make it a healthy, vibrant, and liveable community. The river is an important cultural landscape corridor that offers a recreational setting and a backdrop to the adaptive reuse of industrial sites for residential, commercial, and recreational use.
DESCRIPTION OF HERITAGE ATTRIBUTES

• The geography of the river, which allowed for the siting of many industrial buildings to take advantage of the natural flow of the river, harness water power, and establish prosperous factories along the Speed River and supporting settlement and growth;

• The collection of 19th and early-20th century commercial architecture along Queen Street East and West, in stone, brick and wood-frame construction, and a rhythm of individual storefronts with independent entrances, that reflects the commercial development of these streets during the late 19th century;

• Limited setbacks and sections of continuity along Queen Street West and East commercial buildings, characterized by the typical placement of commercial buildings at the lot-lines and the sidewalk frontage, of two- or three-storey heights, with flat and mansard roofs;

• Unique architecture of Queen Street East and West residential, featuring vernacular construction, mixed materials, projecting balconies, gothic style windows, limited setbacks, river access on the north side of the street, and large lots providing access to the river via rear yards, especially on Queen Street East;

• Landmark buildings in late-19th and early 20th century architectural styles in the commercial area, that reflect key civic and religious buildings;

• The collection of residential buildings built during the key periods of Hespeler’s development between 1830 and 1930, reflecting its growth and prosperity, including examples of worker’s cottages, Ontario Vernacular, Gothic-Revival, and Edwardian styles, as well as fine stone and yellow brick construction;

• Significant views of key heritage attributes from a distance, including views of the town’s rooflines, steeples, and smoke stacks from streets descending into the District;

• The presence of open and green landscape spaces that permit public enjoyment of heritage resources and commemorations, including a network of pedestrian paths, riverfront parks, linear parks, and bridges oriented around the river;

• Residential neighbourhoods on Cooper and Walker Streets with mature tree canopy and a variety of architectural styles, deeper setbacks, larger lots, and large homes, gently sloping towards the commercial core downtown;

• Its hilly site precluded the laying out of extensive public open spaces in the downtown core, but over time, the natural setting, as well as former industrial sites, became venues for informal recreation;

• The presence of industrial infrastructure in the river, including the vehicle and railroad bridges, the dams, and the Mill Pond;
• Large-scale industrial buildings along the River’s edge and surrounding area that serve as a tangible reminder of the origins of Hespeler’s industrial foundations and prosperity; and

• A variety of social and cultural activities hosted in downtown Hespeler, which are facilitated by the commercial core and central gathering spaces of Forbes Park, that have served community-based initiatives, ceremonial, and parade routes as well as commemorative devices that integrate Hespeler’s historical events with the everyday experience of place. Examples include the Santa Claus Parade and the Bee Hives on lamp posts.
The City of Cambridge has identified that Hespeler, as a part of the municipality, merits consideration for designation as a Heritage Conservation District (HCD). The purpose of the Hespeler HCD Study was to provide an overall understanding of the area’s history and heritage character and to determine if an HCD would be an appropriate heritage planning tool for the area. Through the Study Phase, which included evaluation of cultural heritage attributes, delineation of a boundary and public consultation, the Consultant Team has confirmed a Hespeler HCD, under Part V of the Ontario Heritage Act, is the most appropriate way for the municipality to conserve the area’s cultural heritage resources, and that Council should authorize staff to proceed with preparation of a Heritage Conservation District Plan. This Study is the first step in describing the area’s heritage character and identifying the various heritage resources that comprise it. If Council approves the Study recommendations, the next step is to prepare a Heritage Conservation District Plan and Guidelines document containing the policies and guidelines required to properly manage conservation and development.

This study also concludes that areas outside of the recommended boundary contain individual properties of known or potential cultural heritage value, including several listed on the City of Cambridge Heritage Register. These should be protected through an alternative recognition, such as designation under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act.

### 7.1. DRAFT STATEMENT OF HCD PLAN GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

HCDs provide for the conservation of cultural heritage resources policies and guidelines that will assist in the protection and enhancement of the cultural heritage value of a district. District designation enables City Council to manage
and guide future change in the area. HCDs take many different forms and variations, depending on the location and its history, however they form an integral part of Ontario’s cultural heritage and contribute to an understanding and appreciation of the cultural identity of the place, and as a collection, the province.

In accordance with Subsection 40 (2) of the Ontario Heritage Act, the HCD Study is to consider and recommend objectives of the recommended designation and the content of the future HCD Plan, should Council move forward with the adoption of an HCD. Therefore, the following objectives should be re-confirmed for continued relevance throughout the Plan Phase. This includes additional consultation with the public, completion of the landscape analysis and heritage evaluation, a formal statement of significance and an updated boundary property inventory.

Based on the results of this HCD Study, the prospective HCD Plan for Hespeler should consider addressing the following possible objectives:

- **Overall Heritage:** Conserve and enhance the cultural heritage value and heritage attributes of the HCD, including built forms, street and landscape elements, and landmarks that contribute to Hespeler’s sense of place;
- **Natural Heritage:** Maintain and enhance the natural landscape and public realm of Hespeler that contribute to the HCD, including, but not limited to the Speed River, retention of park spaces, open green spaces and public River access;
- **Natural Heritage:** Protect the existing natural features of the watercourses and encourage the creation of new trails or other amenities to promote assessable, public access and enjoyment of these natural resources;
- **Built Heritage:** Encourage the conservation, rehabilitation, adaptive reuse, and maintenance of existing buildings that express the heritage character of the HCD while providing guidelines on appropriate change to the buildings;
- **Built Heritage:** Develop alteration, infill, and new development guidelines with the primary goal of promoting compatible development that appropriately manages and preserves the cultural heritage value of the area’s history;
- **Built Heritage:** Ensure that new construction and development on vacant, underdeveloped lots and on large parcels responds to the character of those buildings through their retention and the compatible design of new structures;
- **Natural/Built Heritage:** Encourage the revitalization of vacant and underdeveloped lots such as, but no limited to, former industrial
properties along the waterfront, in an effort to safeguard the natural landscape and its associated cultural heritage value.

- Natural/Built Heritage: Reinforce and conserve the District’s significant built forms, streetscapes, materiality, and character that reflect its historical commercial, civic, institutional, and industrial uses and cultural heritage values by:
  
  o developing appropriate setbacks and step backs for new development;

  o maintaining and establishing architectural details and consistent street walls where appropriate and which support accessible, vibrant and walkable pedestrian environments;

  o maintain, conserve, and enhance the historic residential character of the streets and neighbourhoods adjacent to the commercial core, particularly as exemplified in its intact historic streetscapes, through the use of harmonious materials, height limits, architectural details or other design measures, enhanced and protected tree canopy, and views to the river or park space;

  o Encourage the enhancement and conservation of natural gateways to Hespeler, including the Guelph Avenue bridge entry, the Queen Street West entry, Cooper Street entry and Queen Street East entry;

  o Promote the enhancement of the public realm, through the commemoration of historical themes, including, but not limited to the industries that have shaped Hespeler, such as the textile industry.

- Incorporate the policies and guidelines of the HCD Plan into the regulatory framework of the City of Cambridge, and other studies and programs to encourage the conservation and enhancement of the HCD;

- Establish a Heritage Permitting process to assist property owners with conservation, maintenance, alteration efforts and provide guidance for appropriate restoration, repair and on-going maintenance of all buildings within the District;

- Encourage active participation from residents, property owners, and businesses, in the promotion and implementation of the HCD, including development of a streamlined and proactive heritage permitting process with the City to ensure that requirements of property owners are understood early in the process and revisions to project plans are mitigated and reduced.
7.2. PROPOSED CONTENT OF THE HCD PLAN AND GUIDELINES

The HCD Plan should provide information for those seeking to understand the cultural heritage value of the HCD as well as provide policies and guidelines to achieve the stated objectives. The general layout of the Plan is as follows:

- Introduction (results of the HCD Study, public engagement summary for the Plan);
- Legislative and policy framework that will support the HCD and outlines the cultural heritage values, attributes and the statement of objectives of the Plan;
- Statement of District Significance and Heritage Attributes;
- Statement of Objectives (Each of the objectives should be linked to policies, and subsequently the guidelines);
- District Boundary;
- Policies and Guidelines (Contributing and Non-Contributing Properties, Public Realm); The policies and guidelines direct both the conservation and alteration of existing resources, the public realm and new construction;
- Implementation: an overview of how the Plan is intended to be implemented through the heritage permit process and when a heritage permit is required;
- Recommendations for financial incentives.

7.3. ADDITIONAL RECOMMENDATIONS

Ontario’s provincial policy documents support the conservation of built heritage resources, cultural heritage landscapes and archaeological resources, and enable planning authorities to implement plans to protect these resources.

The City of Cambridge municipal policy documents conform to provincial and regional plans and contain policies which prioritize heritage conservation and authorize the municipality to establish new HCDs, following a study process prior to designation. However, several modifications to City of Cambridge policy documents or municipal by-laws are required should Council approve the initiation of a Hespeler HCD Plan. For example, the Cambridge Official Plan (OP) will require another schedule for the Hespeler HCD. Other sections of the Official Plan that reference the Cambridge Heritage Conservation Districts, such as Section 4.1 (e), will also require update.
Additionally, there is a potential future need to consolidate by-laws and ongoing planning projects within the future HCD to ensure appropriate harmonization and implementation. While this can occur during or after the Plan phase, a preliminary analysis completed as part of the HCD Study, the following by-laws and plans may require updates or amendments dependent on the contents of the prospective HCD Plan:

- Development Charges By-law
- Zoning By-laws
- Property Standards By-law
- The Blackbridge Cultural Heritage Landscape.
- Review Building Height Guidelines that apply to Hespeler

While the proposed boundary has captured a wide range of properties, there remains properties and landscapes of local interest were identified outside the proposed HCD boundary.

Therefore, it is also recommended that the City of Cambridge consider assessing properties inside the Study Area, and its environs, that are not in the proposed HCD boundary, particularly those on the City of Cambridge Heritage Register, for possible Part IV designation as soon as possible.
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RECOMMENDATION(S):

THAT Report 24-007(MHAC) Delegated Authority By-law for Heritage Permits be received;

AND THAT the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC) recommend that Council approve the proposed power to consent to certain alterations to properties designated under the Ontario Heritage Act to the Chief Planner, subject to consultation with MHAC;

AND FURTHER THAT the Draft By-law, attached as Appendix A to Report 24-007 (MHAC), be supported by MHAC.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

This report has been prepared to consult with the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC) on a proposed delegated authority by-law to consent to the approval of minor alterations to designated properties by the Chief Planner, subject to consultation with MHAC.

Delegating minor heritage approvals to staff will enable the City to provide good customer service to the public, reduce unnecessary wait times for applicants, and better direct resources to properties and projects requiring staff attention, including Part IV and V designations.

Major alterations would still require Council approval as well as minor alterations not supported by the MHAC. Council would also be able to decide whether they would want to consider a minor alteration for a designated property.
Key Findings

- In accordance with the Ontario Heritage Act and the Municipal Act, Council can delegate certain authority to staff.
- Heritage Planning staff are proposing the delegation of minor heritage permits to staff; excluding major work, demolitions, and permit refusals.
- The delegation of minor heritage permits will save significant staff time by streamlining our processes, reducing the number of reports to Council, and enabling staff to focus on other priorities, including Part IV and V designations.
- The delegation of minor heritage permits will also mean reduced wait times for the public to receive permit approvals.
- All delegated heritage permits would still be reviewed, as per current procedures, by MHAC within the legislative timelines permitted under the Ontario Heritage Act.
- All delegated heritage approvals would remain subject to Council’s approved policies and guidelines, including Official Plan policies and heritage conservation district studies and plans.
- Council would retain the ability to pull specific applications as desired, through MHAC, from delegated authority for review and approval at Council.

Financial Implications

Although there are no direct financial implications to the City as a result of this report, the proposed delegated authority by-law would result in more efficient use of staff time and resources.

STRATEGIC ALIGNMENT:

☐ Strategic Action; or
☒ Core Service

Objective(s): Not Applicable

Strategic Action: Not Applicable

Program: Community Development

Core Service: Heritage Conservation

BACKGROUND:

Under Sections 33 and 42 of the Ontario Heritage Act, the power to consent to alterations to property designated under Part IV or V can be delegated staff, provided that MHAC has been consulted on the delegation of approval authority.
Delegated authority by-laws are tools that are commonly used by municipalities across Ontario. Several examples of municipalities with successful delegated authority by-laws in place for heritage permits include Guelph, Hamilton, Kitchener, Markham, Mississauga, Oakville, Richmond Hill, and Waterloo. A full list of municipalities employing delegated authority by-laws can be found in the Analysis section below.

The Ontario Heritage Act currently allows only 90 days for Council to make a decision on a heritage permit application, upon confirmation of a complete application. This restricted timeline was one of the measures that was introduced as part of the *More Homes Built Faster Act* (Bill 23) in an effort to decrease development approval timelines. Issuing heritage permits within the legislated 90-day timeline, while ensuring committee consultation, is a challenge for municipalities across Ontario, including at the City of Cambridge.

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

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

**Alteration of property (Part IV)**

**Delegation of council’s consent**

33(15) The power to consent to alterations to property under this section may be delegated by by-law by the council of a municipality to an employee or official of the municipality if the council has established a municipal heritage committee and has consulted with the committee prior to delegating the power. 2019, c. 9, Sched. 11, s. 11.

**Scope of delegation**

33(16) A by-law that delegates the council’s power to consent to alterations to a municipal employee or official may delegate the power with respect to all alterations or with respect to such classes of alterations as are described in the by-law. 2019, c. 9, Sched. 11, s. 11.

**Erection, demolition, etc. (Part V)**

**Delegation**

42(16) The council of a municipality may delegate by by-law its power to grant permits for the alteration of property situated in a heritage conservation district designated under this Part to an employee or official of the municipality if the council has established a municipal heritage committee and consulted with it before the delegation. 2005, c. 6, s. 32 (6).
Inclu sive n e ss Respect Integrity Service

Same

42(17) A by-law under subsection (16) may specify the alterations or classes of alterations in respect of which power to grant permits is delegated to the employee or official of the municipality. 2005, c. 6, s. 32 (6).

ANALYSIS:

Delegated Authority in Other Municipalities

Delegated authority by-laws are commonly used by municipalities across the province to streamline heritage planning processes. Heritage Planning staff have canvassed heritage planners across Ontario to compare processes and compile a list of responses showing the approach of various other municipalities, including those that employ a delegated authority by-law for heritage permits. The responses have been organized in Table 1 below.

Table 1: Delegated Authority in Other Jurisdictions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Alteration process</th>
<th>Delegation by-law?</th>
<th>Approval authority scope</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kitchener</td>
<td>Heritage permit application form</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Delegated authority given when heritage planning staff recommends approval, when refusal is recommended by staff, heritage committee comments and the final decision rests with Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td>Heritage permit application form</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Heritage staff and the chair of the heritage committee can approve minor alterations within 10 business days of submission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississauga</td>
<td>Heritage permit application form</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Delegated authority for applications once the heritage committee has been consulted. Delegated authority does not include the right to refuse an application for an alteration. Where the Director refuses an application, he or she shall advise Council who retains all decision-making power for the application.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guelph</td>
<td>Heritage permit application form</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Minor and major applications of alteration are approved by delegated authority. This delegation excludes applications for demolitions and new buildings/structures. The delegate does not have the authority to refuse heritage permit applications, which would go to Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipality</td>
<td>Alteration process</td>
<td>Delegation by-law?</td>
<td>Approval authority scope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaughan</td>
<td>Heritage permit application form</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Minor alterations, and additions are delegated to staff with advice from the heritage committee. Demolition or new construction is not delegated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windsor</td>
<td>Heritage permit application form</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Minor heritage permits are approved through delegated authority. Major permits require review from the Development and Heritage Standing Committee and approval from Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>Heritage permit application form</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Delegated approval for alterations made by staff. Can be approved or approved with conditions by staff. If denial is recommended or, at the discretion of the heritage planner, Council makes decision on application.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>Heritage permit application form</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Delegated authority to staff, except in the case where an application is refused, in which case approval authority remains with Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>Heritage permit application form</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Delegated authority to approve, with conditions as needed, alteration applications to staff. The heritage committee must be consulted. Council retains authority when the Director advises to refuse an alteration(s).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingston</td>
<td>Heritage permit application form</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Delegated authority to staff for heritage permit applications for Part IV designated properties. Applications for alterations to Part V designated properties require Council approval. A Council decision is also required if an applicant does not agree with the permit recommendations or conditions supported by staff and the heritage committee. Some minor alterations can be approved without heritage committee review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ottawa</td>
<td>Heritage permit application form</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Delegated authority for minor heritage permit applications and for heritage permit applications considered emergency applications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brampton</td>
<td>Heritage permit application form</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Delegated authority to consent to alterations to designated properties if Council has no scheduled meetings before the expiration of 90 days from receipt, in the case of emergency applications, and for minor interior alterations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipality</td>
<td>Alteration process</td>
<td>Delegation by-law?</td>
<td>Approval authority scope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brantford</td>
<td>Heritage permit application form</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Minor heritage permits, as defined within the by-law, are approved by delegated authority. Major heritage permits are approved by the heritage committee. Where the heritage committee does not approve the permit, it is referred to Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Catharines</td>
<td>Heritage permit application form</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Delegated authority to Director of Planning and Building Services for all permit applications except for applications for demolition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakville</td>
<td>Heritage permit application form</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Delegated authority to Director of Planning Services when alterations are supported and minor (specific activities are listed). For major applications, or when staff recommends refusing the application, Council approval is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond Hill</td>
<td>Heritage permit application form</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Delegated authority to staff with some alteration permits, Council decision required for major alterations. Unclear on demolitions and refusals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Markham</td>
<td>Heritage permit application form</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Delegated authority to Heritage Section staff for non-controversial heritage permits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peterborough</td>
<td>Heritage permit application form</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Delegated authority to staff for minor alterations, major alterations to the property and demolition proposals are decided by Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrie</td>
<td>No application form in place</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No heritage permit process in place and no delegated authority, not compliant with Act.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goderich</td>
<td>Heritage permit application form</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Council approval only, no delegated authority to staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oshawa</td>
<td>Heritage permit application form</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>If alterations are proposed that impact the reasons for designation Council approval is required. For listed properties, MHAC comments on the building permit application.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newmarket</td>
<td>Heritage permit application form</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Council approval only, no delegated authority to staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milton</td>
<td>Heritage permit application form</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Council approval only, no delegated authority to staff.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The majority of municipalities that provided responses do employ delegated authority by-laws within their heritage permit process. Of the 23 municipalities who provided responses, 18 (or 78%) currently have delegated approval processes in place. The type of alterations that are delegated tend to be minor alterations, non-controversial alterations, and approvals. Generally, where staff are not supportive of the alteration, the decision rests with Council and is not delegated to staff.

**Proposed Heritage Permit Process**

Heritage Planning staff are proposing that minor alterations to designated heritage properties be delegated to the Chief Planner, including the following:

- Repair or restoration of windows, doors, chimneys, verandahs, roof material, cladding, or other external elements;
- New signage;
- Refinishing exterior heritage elements;
- Additions that do not remove identified cultural heritage attributes;
- Construction of a new building or structure on a Part IV designated property without any identified cultural heritage value or interest;
- Maintenance or upkeep that may require a permit;
- Sheds, porches, decks, and steps;
- New signage;
- Landscape modifications within an HCD (soft landscaping, such as plantings, is exempt); and
- Any other forms of minor alteration not listed.

Heritage Planning staff are proposing that major alterations to designated heritage properties not be delegated to the Chief Planner, including the following:

- Removing any identified cultural heritage attributes;
- Demolition of any building or structure within an HCD;
- Demolition of a building or structure on a Part IV designated property that has been identified to have cultural heritage value or interest; and
- Construction of a new building or structure within an HCD.

In addition, alterations that meet any one of the following situations are not proposed to be delegated to the Chief Planner:

- Cases where staff have recommended heritage permit refusal;
- Cases where MHAC does not support staff recommendations; and
- Cases where Council has requested approval authority.
It should be noted that all timelines applicable to heritage permits within the Ontario Heritage Act would continue to apply to all applications, whether eligible for delegated approval or requiring full Council approval. All delegated heritage permit applications would still be reviewed, as per current procedures, by MHAC and MHAC would retain the ability to comment on all heritage permit applications and associated studies or plans.

Not all alterations to designated properties require heritage permit applications. The following alterations are exempt from the review process:

1. All interior work, except where specifically designated by designation by-law or easement passed under the Ontario Heritage Act.

2. Landscaping which does not require heavy machinery, and which will not significantly alter the appearance or character of the property.

3. Basic and routine maintenance, as determined on a case-by-case basis by Heritage Planning staff.

4. Minor exterior alterations as may be described within individual heritage conservation district plans as required by Section 41.1 of the Ontario Heritage Act.

5. Replacement of non-heritage features or materials with the same material (eg. replacing asphalt roofing material with new asphalt roofing material).

It should also be noted that all delegated heritage approvals would remain subject to Council’s approved policies and guidelines, including Official Plan policies and heritage conservation district plans.

**Heritage Permit Approval Data**

Within the City of Cambridge, a total of seventeen (17) heritage permit applications were received between January 2022 and April 2024, as outlined in Table 2 below. Of these applications, all were reviewed by MHAC. A total of fifteen (15), or 88%, were approved by Council, with recommendations from Heritage Planning staff, with support from MHAC. Two (2) were placed on hold due to Council concerns.

With the proposed delegated authority by-law in place, ten (10) of the seventeen (17) heritage permit applications submitted, or 58%, would have been delegated to staff for approval, in consultation with MHAC over the fifteen-month period.

This demonstrates that the proposed delegated authority by-law would not change the outcome of Heritage Permit decisions within the City of Cambridge. Instead, having a delegated authority process in place would lessen the number of Council reports being
prepared by staff, streamline approvals, and allow for staff to direct efforts towards other heritage activities.

### Table 2: Heritage Permit Applications Between November 2022 and April 2024

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Address</th>
<th>Designation Status</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>Council Decision</th>
<th>Eligible for Delegated Approval?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30 Park Hill Road West (Dickson Park)</td>
<td>Part V (Dickson Hill)</td>
<td>Grandstand improvements</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99 Wentworth Avenue (Victoria Park)</td>
<td>Part V (Dickson Hill)</td>
<td>Installation of permanent netting system in park</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Main Street</td>
<td>Part IV</td>
<td>Replacing exterior windows, door, and light fixtures</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Blenheim Road</td>
<td>Part IV</td>
<td>Repairing damaged fence and posts</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4800 Fountain Street North</td>
<td>Part IV</td>
<td>Construction of landscape feature with salvaged stone</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Main Street</td>
<td>Part V (Main Street)</td>
<td>Alteration of storefront</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 Main Street</td>
<td>Part V (Main Street)</td>
<td>Alteration of storefront</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 Lansdowne Road North</td>
<td>Part IV</td>
<td>Addition to dwelling in rear yard</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71 Cowan Boulevard</td>
<td>Part IV</td>
<td>Replacement of cedar shake roof material with asphalt</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>223 King Street East</td>
<td>Part IV</td>
<td>Installation of wheelchair ramp and window replacement</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49 Meadowcreek</td>
<td>Part V (Blair Village)</td>
<td>Construction of new detached dwelling</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane</td>
<td>Part/Village</td>
<td>Work Details</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 Morningside Drive</td>
<td>Part V (Blair Village)</td>
<td>Demolition detached dwelling and construction of new detached dwelling</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91 Old Mill Road</td>
<td>Part V (Blair Village)</td>
<td>Demolition and construction of new house</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82 Langdon Drive</td>
<td>Part V (Blair Village)</td>
<td>Construction of new detached dwelling</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 Blair Road</td>
<td>Part V (Dickson Hill)</td>
<td>Demolition and replacement of stone retaining wall</td>
<td>On hold</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dickson Hill globe lights</td>
<td>Part V (Dickson Hill)</td>
<td>Replacement of globe lights</td>
<td>On hold</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>415 Water Street South</td>
<td>Part IV</td>
<td>Replacing frame garage, replacing windows and doors</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The new, proposed delegated approval processes would significantly reduce the amount of time spent by staff in the preparation, processing and review of reports, and the amount of time spent by Council in the review of staff reports. This will allow staff to focus on other heritage activities. This streamlining would also have a positive impact on the public perception of heritage planning and its various approval processes, while continuing to support the conservation of Cambridge’s significant cultural heritage resources.

**FINANCIAL IMPACT:**

Although there are no direct financial implications to the City as a result of this report, the proposed delegated authority by-law would result in more efficient use of staff time and resources.

**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:
N/A

CONCLUSION:
For the reasons outlined in this report, Heritage Planning staff recommend that MHAC recommend Council approve the proposed delegated authority by-law to consent to minor heritage permits for the approval of alterations to designated properties, by the Chief Planner.

REPORT IMPACTS:
Agreement: No
By-law: Yes
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. 24-007 (MHAC) Appendix A: Draft Delegated Authority By-law for Heritage Permits
THE CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF CAMBRIDGE

By-law 24-XXX

Being a by-law to delegate authority to issue heritage permits for alterations to properties designated under the Ontario Heritage Act, RSO 1990, Chapter O. 18

WHEREAS the Ontario Heritage Act, R.S.O. 1990 C. O.18 Section 33(15) authorizes the Council of a municipality to enact by-laws delegating authority to consent to alterations to Part IV designated properties to a municipal official;

AND WHEREAS the Ontario Heritage Act, R.S.O. 1990 C. O.18 Section 42(16) authorizes the Council of a municipality to enact by-laws delegating authority to consent to alterations to Part V designated properties to a municipal official;

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

1. THAT Council hereby delegates to the Chief Planner or their designate Council’s authority to consider and consent to all applications for alterations to designated properties, with the exception of “major works” (defined below).

   Major Works (ineligible for delegated approval, require Council approval)
   - Removing any identified cultural heritage attributes
   - Demolition of any building or structure within an HCD
   - Demolition of a building or structure on a Part IV designated property that has been identified to have cultural heritage value or interest.
   - Construction of a new building or structure within an HCD

2. AND THAT Council hereby delegates to the Chief Planner or their designate Council’s authority to consider and consent to all applications for alterations to designated properties, with the exception of “ineligibility cases” (defined below).

   Ineligibility Cases (cases deemed ineligible for delegated approval; require Council approval)
   - Cases where staff have recommended heritage permit refusal
   - Cases where MHAC does not support staff recommendations
   - Cases where Council has requested approval authority.
Enacted and Passed this X day of April, 2024.

________________________________
MAYOR

________________________________
CLERK