Corporation of the City of Cambridge
Council Meeting
Addendum

Date: Tuesday, June 25, 2024, 6:30 p.m.
Location: Council Chambers

To increase delegate accessibility, this meeting will be held as a hybrid meeting with both in-person and virtual attendance options. Register to appear as a delegation by visiting: https://forms.cambridge.ca/Delegation-Request-Form. Members of the public can choose to delegate in-person or by telephone. Alternative formats and communication supports are available upon request.

Closed Session will occur at 5:00 p.m.

Members of the public wishing to speak at Council may complete the Delegation Request Form no later than 12:00 p.m. on the day of the meeting for Council Meetings occurring at 6:30 p.m.

All written delegation submissions will form part of the public record.

4. Presentations

*4.2 Toula Theocharidis, Planner re: 24-078-CD Recommendation Report for Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment - 777 Laurel Street and 308 Dolph Street North

*4.3 Emily Guy, Trace Architectures re: 24-057-CD Hespeler Heritage Conservation District Study Final Report

5. Delegations and Consideration of Related Reports

*5.1 Daniel Kirshner re: 24-078-CD Recommendation Report for Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment - 777 Laurel Street and 308 Dolph Street North

*5.2 Tony Schmidt, Preston BIA re: 24-078-CD Recommendation Report for Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment - 777 Laurel Street and 308 Dolph Street North

*5.3 Marilyn Scott, Riverside Print Group re: 24-102-CD 19 Cambridge Street - Arts & Culture Hub

*5.4 Karen Scott Booth re: 24-102-CD 19 Cambridge Street - Arts & Culture Hub
6. **Closed Session**

That in accordance with section 239 (2) (e), (f), (j), and (k) of the Municipal Act, 2001, Council to convene in Closed Session to consider the following subject matters:

- (e) litigation or potential litigation, including matters before administrative tribunals, affecting the municipality or local board (Confidential Litigation Updates);

- (f) advice that is subject to solicitor-client privilege, including communications necessary for that purpose (Confidential Litigation Updates);

- (j) a trade secret or scientific, technical, commercial or financial information that belongs to the municipality or local board and has monetary value or potential monetary value (Confidential Sponsorship Update);

- (k) a position, plan, procedure, criteria or instruction to be applied to any negotiations carried on or to be carried on by or on behalf of the municipality or local board (Confidential Litigation Updates) (Confidential Potential Transaction).

9. **Consideration of Reports**

9.3 Community Development

*9.3.1* 24-078-CD Recommendation Report for Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment - 777 Laurel Street and 308 Dolph Street North

*Note: Report 24-078-CD was deferred by Council during the meeting on May 28th, 2024, to allow for a neighbourhood meeting. A summary of the meeting outcome and staff responses is included in Appendix 'H'.*

13. **Correspondence**

*13.2* Tim Marshall re: 24-078-CD Recommendation Report for Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment - 777 Laurel Street and 308 Dolph Street North

*13.3* Lammer Development Group re: 24-057-CD Hespeler Heritage Conservation District Study Final Report

*13.4* Brad McEwen re: 24-102-CD 19 Cambridge Street - Arts & Culture Hub
Summary

May 28, 2024 Council Meeting

• Recommendation Report (24-078-CD) for proposed Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment presented.

• Council’s Decision on the applications was deferred and staff were directed to facilitate a Neighbourhood Meeting to update residents on the proposed revisions to the original applications.

June 13, 2024 Neighbourhood Meeting

• Residents’ comments were summarized in Neighbourhood Meeting Notes.

• Staff Responses to comments included in APPENDIX H to the Recommendation Report.
### Neighbourhood Meeting Follow Up

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concerns</th>
<th>Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traffic and speeding on Laurel Street, parking concerns</td>
<td>• Traffic calming measures via Radar Message Board installed this summer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Traffic Impact Study and Parking Justification Study completed to Staff’s satisfaction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site contamination</td>
<td>• A Record of Site Condition (RSC) requirement prior to lifting the Holding provision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timing of development</td>
<td>• Holding Provision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Site Plan Application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Demolition Permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable housing</td>
<td>• Council requested a contribution to the City’s Affordable Housing Fund in the amount of $1000 per unit or 20 affordable housing units be included as a condition of future Site Plan Approval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land use compatibility / height and density</td>
<td>• Recommendation Report 24-078-CD assesses appropriateness of proposal within the context of Provincial, Regional and City Official Plan policies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notification on application and plan changes / Development page not updated</td>
<td>• All individuals on the notification list were notified of this application being scheduled before Council on May 28 and June 25, 2024, with access to staff Recommendation Report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Current Development Applications webpage was updated with additional submissions and revised studies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommendation

It is the opinion of Planning Staff that the proposal is consistent with Provincial, Regional and City policy.

The proposal represents good planning by adding to the rental housing supply.

Planning Staff recommends approval of the proposed Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendments.
WHAT IS A HERITAGE CONSERVATION DISTRICT (HCD)?

A Heritage Conservation District is a **geographically defined area** within a municipality that is noted for its **distinct heritage character** and is protected under Part V of the Ontario Heritage Act.

An HCD may be defined by **neighbourhoods** or other locations with unique **features, styles, themes, or characteristics** identified to have heritage value.

Municipalities protect the character of these heritage areas through **designation**. **District plans** providing detailed guidance for changes and redevelopment.

Designation **does not freeze** an area or building in the past, it **guides its evolution**.
The Initial Study Area included 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 contained 524 properties.
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 two or more of the nine criteria. This change is reflected in the updated Ontario Heritage Act, Section 41(1).

- 190, or 36%, of properties in the Study Area meet at least two of the nine 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 potential designation.
Field Survey Visit was conducted in August 2023 and included a full survey of the Study Area boundary, photography and property detailing of over 500 properties.

Research 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.

Public Consultation

Evaluation of inventory under Ontario Heritage Act 41(1)
PUBLIC CONSULTATION

- Public Information Centre October 30, 2023.
- Engage Cambridge Survey.
- Municipal Heritage Advocacy Committee (MHAC) presentations, October 18, 2023 and April 18, 2024.
- Community Focus Group Meetings, January, February, March, 2024.
- Meeting with the Grand River Conservation Authority.
- Reviews, comments and questions.
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.
Based on this 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 309 individual properties and the Chilligo Conservation Area. As of the current evaluation, 250 individual properties and the Chilligo Conservation Area contribute to the heritage character of the area as per the requirements of the OHA and the 9 criteria previously noted.

The breakdown in the Recommended HCD Boundary is as follows:

- 224 properties in the recommended boundary meet 2 or more criteria.
- 41 properties meet at least 1 criterion.
- 44 properties do not meet at least 1 criterion.
311 PROPERTIES IN THE RECOMMENDED BOUNDARY

224 ARE VALUED AS CONTRIBUTING (CAT: 1,2,3)
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 be one of the best policy tools available to Ontario municipalities for meeting their conservation goals and objectives.
QUESTIONS & FEEDBACK

Thank you!
Congratulations to members of Cambridge City Council for adopting the new Arts and Culture Master Plan.

Report Key Findings:

• The use of 19 Cambridge Street for the purpose of an Arts and Culture Hub will fulfill the obligations from the purchase of the property through the Core Area Transformation Fund (CATF).

• Lack of affordable art studio space and cultural connectivity was a key concern voiced during the Arts and Culture Action Plan engagement.

• An Arts and Culture Hub would activate several recommendations from the 2024 Arts and Culture Action Plan that was recently approved by Council.
• The Riverside Print Group (RPG) is an artist collective that shares the desire to perfect all aspects of the art of printmaking.

• Individually, and pre collective, the novice printmakers took lessons in makeshift studio space at the main branch at Queen’s Square.

• In 2004, Cambridge Galleries (now Idea Exchange Art Galleries) partnered with the UWaterloo School of Architecture and launched its well-appointed print studio.
• In early fall 2019, Idea Exchange management announced that the print studio at Design at Riverside would be reverting to the School of Architecture in December 2019.

• The printmaking studio was dismantled and emptied, with its contents given to the RPG.

• With the assistance of city staff, the “Studio in a Box” has been in storage ever since awaiting relocation…
Cambridge Galleries established the state-of-the-art Mary Misner Print Studio (MMPS) in response to the pressure for more space and more ambitious printmaking instruction.

The MMPS was decommissioned while still a highly active and viable printmaking space.

Cambridge’s artists are travelling out of town to continue practicing this art form.

Printmaking is inclusive, and accessible for all ages and all abilities.

All the equipment given to the Riverside Print Group to re-establish a print studio is still in the city’s storage facilities.
The BIG Print
Featured at Hespeler’s A Day & A Night
Art meets Music
2013
The Art of the Possible
A Business Case
AND
A Case for Community Engagement
Members of the RPG request that Council *vote in favour* of staff’s recommendation to provide a business case for the use of 19 Cambridge Street as an Arts and Culture Hub, and especially devote space to a printmaking studio, as part of the 2025 budget process.
June 13, 2024 Neighbourhood Meeting Outcome and Staff Responses

The Recommendation Report 24-078-CD for the proposed Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment was deferred by Cambridge Council at their May 28, 2024 Council meeting and staff were directed to facilitate a neighbourhood meeting to update the residents on the proposed revisions to the original applications.

As per Council’s request, a neighbourhood meeting was held on June 13, 2024 in the Bowman Room at City Hall. Following the meeting, the residents’ comments were included in the Neighbourhood Meeting Notes and posted on the City’s Current Development Applications webpage (access notes here).

In addition, two written submissions from the public were also received and these are included on the Addendum for the June 25th Council meeting.

The comments provided by the residents at the neighbourhood meeting and through the additional written submissions can be summarized into several themes outlined in bold text, followed by staff responses to these comments.

Residents were not notified of the application or changes to the proposal and the City’s current development applications webpage is not updated with the revised proposal

- For this application, a Notice of the September 5th, 2023 public meeting was provided in accordance with the requirements of the Planning Act. The Notice was circulated to all property owners within 120 metres of the subject property (which resulted in 132 notices being mailed out); the Notice was posted in the Cambridge Times newspaper; and a development sign was posted on the subject property. The original application with supporting studies was also posted on the City’s Current Development Applications webpage. The City’s current practice for issuing a public meeting Notice is above the Planning Act requirements for such Notice.
- Following the public meeting, a neighbourhood meeting was held on September 21st, 2023.
- As per the City’s current practice, all individuals who provided their contact information on the sign-in registry at the September 5th public meeting and at the September 21st neighbourhood meeting or requested through other means to be kept informed about the application, were added to the Notification List for this application.
- All individuals on the Notification List were sent a Notification Letter about this application being scheduled before Council on May 28, 2024 with instructions on attending the meeting and speaking before Council and how to obtain the staff Recommendation Report on this application or additional information. The
Recommendation Report provided details on the proposed changes to the application from what was presented at the public meeting.

- All individuals on the Notification List received a Notice of the June 13, 2024 neighbourhood meeting.
- Staff requested that all those in attendance at the June 13th neighbourhood meeting provide their name and contact information (email and/or mailing address) on the sign-in registry.
- Following the neighbourhood meeting, the Current Development Applications webpage was updated with additional submissions and revised studies submitted by the applicant for this application.
- All individuals on the Notification List received a Notification Letter about this application being scheduled before Council on June 25, 2024, with instructions on attending the meeting and speaking before Council, including instructions on how to obtain the staff Recommendation Report on this application.

**Traffic and speeding on Laurel Street, not enough parking**

- As noted in the Public Input section of the Recommendation Report 24-078-CD, a Traffic Impact Study (TIS) was completed to the satisfaction of City staff and the recommendations within the TIS will be implemented as part of the development at the time of the future Site Plan application. A Parking Justification Study was also completed and parking is addressed in the Analysis section of the Recommendation Report.
- Traffic calming measures are implemented per the Council approved Traffic Calming Policy when data that is collected suggests that it is warranted. In 2023, Laurel Street was evaluated for speeding and Level 1 – Soft Calming was warranted. As a result, a Radar Message Board was installed and will again be installed this summer. These boards are rotated throughout the City in locations where traffic calming measures are warranted for a period of two weeks at a specific location.

**Site contamination**

- A Record of Site Condition (RSC) will be required through the Holding provision as part of the proposed Zoning By-law for this application. The Holding will not be lifted until the site is assessed for contamination, cleaned up if required, and an RSC is filed with the Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks.
Timing of development

- If Council approves this application, the adopted Official Plan Amendment will be forwarded to the Region for a decision. The Region is the approval authority for Official Plan Amendments.
- The applicant will be required to satisfy the requirements of the Holding provision.
- The submission and approval of a Site Plan application will be required as the final step in the planning process before a building permit can be issued for the proposed development.
- Planning staff cannot confirm how long it will take for the applicant to obtain Site Plan Approval and subsequently a building permit for the proposed residential development on this site. Staff note that operations continue in the industrial building on this site and a demolition permit application has not yet been submitted to the City’s Building division.

Not affordable housing

- The proposed development is for rental housing. At the May 28, 2024 Council meeting, Council has requested that the applicant provide as a condition of future Site Plan Approval a contribution to the City’s Affordable Housing Fund in the amount of $1000 per unit or 20 affordable housing units be included within this development. The applicant can respond to this request.

Land use compatibility / excessive height and density of the development

- Comments and concerns provided in regard to the excessive height and density of the development and it not fitting in with the neighbourhood are addressed in the Analysis Policy Overview and Public Input sections of the Recommendation Report 24-078-CD. These sections highlight the Provincial, Regional and City Official Plan policies that are applicable to the proposed development and assess the appropriateness of the proposed development.
- The concept plan submitted for the proposed development can change at the time of the future Site Plan application. The proposed Amendments are to remove the industrial land use and replace with a high density residential land use and to include the site specific policies and regulations for the site to guide the future development of these lands.
Thank you. It's difficult for me to attend these (especially impromptu) meetings, and I don't always articulate my thoughts well vocally. However, I want to make my concerns shared. I'm not sure if any of this will be heard by developer, but I am strongly against what is being proposed. It's bad enough as it is that their initial development proposal DOES NOT fit in with the neighborhood (primarily two story century homes), but now they are looking at building up to 19 stories high and adding additional parking, increasing tenant capacity?!? The infrastructure on Laurel Street isn't there to accommodate the increase in both human and vehicular volume. All I got from Corey (who I see voted against delaying approval for these) was assurance that our street would get a survey done to reduce speed limit (people are already doing 80-100 Km/hr down our street) and traffic calming measures. Now we are having an additional 1000+ cars added to the neighborhood, on a street that already cannot handle the current traffic. I've been ignored reporting these concerns to the WRPS. I am not against adding housing to these to lots, if it were to fit in with the neighborhood, ie. two story homes or townhomes. These highrises are not appropriate for the immediate area, more suited for a main street (such as Hespeler Road, Eagle Street).

I also do not believe our neighborhood has been apprised of these proposals. Some of my immediate neighbors had not even heard about what was being proposed, I found out via Facebook group of all places. There's been no communication with people in the neighborhood, and I also highly doubt that anyone has been asked their opinions on what is being planned for these two sites. All I am seeing is a push by the city to get this approved and moved ahead. We purchased our home on Laurel within the past 3 years and were not aware of what was being planned for these locations. We would have potentially had alternative ideas for purchase if we had known. I personally hope that both lots are contaminated enough with oil/chemicals, that this will delay builds for the next 10-20 years.

I'm not happy at all with these proposals and lack of public input. (which seems if there is any, it's just being ignored by money greedy developer, and the city)

Please share this on my behalf, and if I have to start taking time off of work to try to join these meetings, I may just need to in order to make it very clear that people are not happy with the developer's plans.
Mayor Jan Liggett and Members of City of Cambridge Council

c/o City of Cambridge Clerk’s Department
50 Dickson Street
1st Floor
Cambridge, ON
N1R 8S1

Re: 24-057-CD Hespeler Heritage Conservation District Study Final Report
City of Cambridge Council Meeting – June 26, 2024
241 Queen Street West, Cambridge, Ontario

Corbett Land Strategies Inc. (“CLS”) submits this letter to the City of Cambridge Council on behalf of our client, Lammer Development Group (“Owner”) who owns the properties municipally known as 241 Queen Street West, Cambridge, Ontario (“subject property”). We submit the enclosed comments with respect to 24-057-CD Hespeler Heritage Conservation District Study Final Report (“HCD Report”) and its impact on the subject property.

Background Information

The subject property is located in the Hespeler Community Improvement Area, south of the Speed River, west of 215 Queen Street West, east of the Region of Waterloo’s wastewater treatment plant, and north of the CN Rail corridor. The Subject Property was acquired by the Lammer Development Group in 1987 from the City of Cambridge. The Subject Property was owned by the City and the intent of the sale was to facilitate the development of the lands for a minimum of 260 purpose built residential rental units.

Since acquisition, the Lammer Development Group has been engaged with City staff and Council to obtain development approvals for the redevelopment of the lands, including several Planning Act applications in the 1990s and 2000s, as well as the preparation of a Minister’s Zoning Order request in 2021 (which remains on hold). Lammer Development Group is proposing to redevelop the Subject Property for a multi-residential mid- and high-rise neighbourhood with between an estimated 1500 to 1800 residential units and is...
actively engaged in the preliminary approvals stage of the development process and
detailed technical work. Ultimately, the comprehensive development of the subject
property assists the City to achieve its housing pledge as well as kick-start the
revitalization of this stretch of Queen Street in a manner which recognizes the historical
nature of the area. Further, it honours a historical commitment made to the Owner by the
City on January 15th, 1987, as per Clause 15.01 below:

ARTICLE 15
MUTUAL ASSISTANCE

15.01 The parties agree to provide full mutual assistance and
coop-eration in attempting to secure the necessary
Municipal, Regional and other approvals required for
the development of the Lammer Lands. This includes
obtaining the approval of the appropriate railroad
authority to permit the removal of any railway lines.

Cultural Heritage Assessment – Hespeler Pedestrian Bridge

A Cultural Heritage Assessment Report: Existing Conditions and Preliminary Impact
Assessment was completed in support of the Hespeler Pedestrian Bridge Environmental
Assessment, dated November 2022. This report assess the subject property among other
surrounding properties as the pedestrian bridge is proposed to be located to the north of
the subject property, crossing the Speed River. We note that through this assessment,
the subject property was not identified as an Identified Cultural Heritage Resource and
was not recommended to be listed or designated. For additional information, please refer
to the attached Report prepared by WSP, dated November 2022.

Request

The subject property is partially located within the proposed Hespeler Heritage
Conservation District Boundary, as presented in the HCD Report (Figure 1). The subject
property were identified within the HCD Report as meeting 2 or more criteria under the
Ontario Heritage Act. The subject property is currently vacant and does not contain any
built heritage features. It is also located within the “Regeneration Area” designation under
the City of Cambridge Official Plan. Regeneration Areas are identified as strategic growth
areas and planned to contribute towards intensification and redevelopment targets.

We submit to Council that the inclusion of the subject property within the proposed
Hespeler Heritage Conservation District Boundary does not benefit the overall function
and intention of the Heritage Conservation District and as such, we request that Council
exclude the subject property from within the proposed Boundary. On behalf of our client,
CLS will continue to participate in stakeholder engagement as part of Phase 2 of the Heritage Conservation District Study. We will also be retaining a cultural heritage consultant to complete an independent Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment for the subject property specifically. We look forward to sharing the results of the Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment with you and staff and continuing discussions regarding the inclusion and role of the subject property in the Heritage Conservation District.

If you have any questions or require additional information, please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned.

Sincerely,

Alicia Monteith, BES
Manager of Development Planning
Corbett Land Strategies Inc.
alicia@corbettlandstrategies.ca
(519) 589-8417

Nick Wood, MCIP, RPP, MES(Pl)
Vice President, Development Planning
Corbett Land Strategies Inc.
nick@corbettlandstrategies.ca
(416) 420-5544
Figure 1: Aerial Photo from Hespeler Heritage Conservation District Study Report (subject property outlined in orange) (2024).
WSP E&I Canada Limited prepared this report solely for the use of the intended recipient in accordance with the professional services agreement. The intended recipient is solely responsible for the disclosure of any information contained in this report. The content and opinions contained in the present report are based on the observations and/or information available to WSP E&I Canada Limited at the time of preparation. If a third party makes use of, relies on, or makes decisions in accordance with this report, said third party is solely responsible for such use, reliance or decisions. WSP E&I Canada Limited does not accept responsibility for damages, if any, suffered by any third party as a result of decisions made or actions taken by said third party based on this report. This limitations statement is considered an integral part of this report.

The original of this digital file will be conserved by WSP E&I Canada Limited for a period of not less than 10 years. As the digital file transmitted to the intended recipient is no longer under the control of WSP E&I Canada Limited, its integrity cannot be assured. As such, WSP E&I Canada Limited does not guarantee any modifications made to this digital file subsequent to its transmission to the intended recipient.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

WSP E&I Canada Limited (WSP; formerly Wood Environment & Infrastructure Solutions Canada Limited) was retained by the City of Cambridge to complete a Cultural Heritage Assessment Report (CHAR) as part of the Schedule ‘B’ Municipal Class Environmental Assessment for the proposed Hespeler Pedestrian Bridge across the Speed River in the City of Cambridge, Ontario. The bridge would link the existing Mill Run trail on the north side of the Speed River (south of Chilligo Conservation Area) and the new proposed trail on the south side of the Speed River along Queen Street West, between Guelph Avenue and Winston Boulevard. The Project Study Area is broadly defined as the Speed River and lands abutting the Speed River between the Mill Run trail to the north and Queen Street West to the south. For the purposes of this report the Cultural Heritage Study Area (Study Area) is defined as the Project Study Area plus a 25 m buffer (Figure 1 to Figure 3).

The Study Area was historically located on Part of Lot 9 Beasley Lower Block Concession 2 and Lot 10 Beasley Lower Block Concessions 2 and 3 in the former Geographic Township of Waterloo, Waterloo County (Appendix A: Figures 1, 2 and 3). Approximately 26.3 hectares (“ha”) in size, the Study Area includes private lands and lands owned by the City of Cambridge and the Grand River Conservation Authority (GRCA).

As part of the development of this report, a meeting was held with the Six Nations of the Grand River (SNGR). The Nation shared their perspective of cultural heritage and noted that the natural environment has a deep meaning to Indigenous Peoples as it is the place and space where the Nation’s livelihoods occur, the place for hunting and gathering foods and medicines, the place where cultural and life activities took place in history and, in some places, continue to take place. Therefore, the natural environment itself is understood in the SNGR perspective to have cultural heritage significance. In addition, waterbodies, such as the Grand River, are places where Indigenous Peoples conduct livelihoods and practice culture and need recognition as heritage sites within cultural heritage reports.

Background research, consultation, and a field review determined that there are 17 potential and protected heritage properties within the Study Area (CHR1-CHR17). Of these, one is listed as a National Historic Site of Canada and is designated under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act, one is designated as part of a Canadian Heritage River, and one is listed on the City of Cambridge Heritage Register. The remaining 14 were identified during the field review as having potential cultural heritage value or interest.

Drawings of the proposed bridge and trail connection were reviewed to determine whether the project has the potential to result in direct or indirect impacts to the identified built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes. Overall, WSP found that the proposed bridge and trail pose a minimal impact to cultural heritage resources given the small scale of the bridge and reuse/adaptation of existing circulation routes for the trail. Both the bridge and trail have been designed in a sensitive and compatible manner that is supportive of the general heritage character of the area. In addition, the proposed bridge and trail were designed to integrate with the approved Conceptual Site Plan, Official Plan Amendment, and Zoning By-law Amendment for 211-21S Queen Street West (CHR 16) that have been developed for a separate project to guide the redevelopment of this site.

To conserve the CHVI and heritage attributes of the known and potential heritage resources within the Study Area, WSP recommends the following actions:
1 Indirect negative impacts related to a change in land use and land disturbance are predicted for CHR2 and
CHR5. Since CHR2 was identified as having potential CHVI through Indigenous engagement and CHR5 is a
Canadian Heritage River with recognized Indigenous heritage values, Indigenous Nations with an interest in
the project should be engaged when developing the post-construction landscape plan.

2 Potential indirect impacts related to construction vibration have been identified for CHR 16. To avoid or
reduce adverse impacts from heavy equipment vibration during the proposed bridge, trail and associated
construction, a qualified vibration specialist should be consulted to assess the vibration risks and develop and
appropriate vibration monitoring protocol.

3 The view at CHR 3 from the Mill Race outlet at the Silknet Dam facing towards the Forbes Textile Mill has been
identified as culturally significant and is anticipated to be affected by introduction of the new bridge. To
mitigate this impact, the significant view should be documented prior to construction through photography
and written description.

4 The location of all identified resources (CHR1-CHR17) should be clearly marked on project mapping and their
significance communicated to all project personnel.

The above recommendations were prepared using the proposed development plans contained defined in Section
4.4.1 and depicted in Appendix C. Should the proposed work be updated or changed, then this CHAR should be
revised to confirm impacts and recommended mitigation measures.
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## Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BHR</td>
<td>Built Heritage Resource</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHER</td>
<td>Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHL</td>
<td>Cultural Heritage Landscape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHVI</td>
<td>Cultural Heritage Value or Interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIA</td>
<td>Heritage Impact Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCM</td>
<td>Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHA</td>
<td><em>Ontario Heritage Act</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHP</td>
<td>Provincial Heritage Property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPS</td>
<td>Provincial Policy Statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHVI</td>
<td>Statement of Cultural Heritage Value of Interest</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Glossary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adjacent lands</strong></td>
<td>Those lands contiguous to a protected heritage property or as otherwise defined in the municipal official plan (PPS 2020).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Built Heritage Resource:</strong></td>
<td>Means a building, structure, monument, installation or any manufactured or constructed part or remnant that contributes to a property's cultural heritage value or interest as identified by a community, including an Indigenous community [Indigenous Nations]. Built heritage resources are located on property that may be designated under Parts IV or V of the Ontario Heritage Act, or that may be included on local, provincial, federal and/or international registers (PPS 2020).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conserved:</strong></td>
<td>Means the identification, protection, management and use of built heritage resources, cultural heritage landscapes and archaeological resources in a manner that ensures their cultural heritage value or interest is retained. This may be achieved by the implementation of recommendations set out in a conservation plan, archaeological assessment, and/or heritage impact assessment that has been approved, accepted or adopted by the relevant planning authority and/or decision maker. Mitigative measures and/or alternative development approaches can be included in these plans and assessments (PPS 2020).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cultural Heritage Landscape:</strong></td>
<td>Means a defined geographical area that may have been modified by human activity and is identified as having cultural heritage value or interest by a community, including an Indigenous community [Indigenous Nations]. The area may include features such as buildings, structures, spaces, views, archaeological sites or natural elements that are valued together for their interrelationship, meaning or association. Cultural heritage landscapes may be properties that have been determined to have cultural heritage value or interest under the Ontario Heritage Act, or have been included on federal and/or international registers, and/or protected through official plan, zoning by-law, or other land use planning mechanisms (PPS 2020).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Heritage Attributes:</strong></td>
<td>Means the principal features or elements that contribute to a protected heritage property’s cultural heritage value or interest, and may include the property’s built, constructed, or manufactured elements, as well as natural landforms, vegetation, water features, and its visual setting (e.g. significant views or vistas to or from a protected heritage property) (PPS 2020).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Protected Heritage Property: Means property designated under Parts IV, V or VI of the *Ontario Heritage Act*; property subject to a heritage conservation easement under Parts II or IV of the *Ontario Heritage Act*; property identified by the Province and prescribed public bodies as provincial heritage property under the *Standards and Guidelines for Conservation of Provincial Heritage Properties*; property protected under federal legislation, and UNESCO World Heritage Sites (PPS 2020).

Significant: In regard to cultural heritage and archaeology, resources that have been determined to have cultural heritage value or interest. Processes and criteria for determining cultural heritage value or interest are established by the Province under the authority of the *Ontario Heritage Act* (PPS 2020).
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1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 PROJECT CONTEXT

WSP E&I Canada Limited (WSP; formerly Wood Environment & Infrastructure Solutions Canada Limited) was retained by the City of Cambridge to complete a Cultural Heritage Assessment Report (CHAR) as part of the Schedule 'B' Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (Class EA) for the proposed Hespeler Pedestrian Bridge across the Speed River in the City of Cambridge, Ontario. The bridge would link the existing Mill Run trail on the north side of the Speed River (south of Chilligo Conservation Area) and the new proposed trail on the south side of the Speed River along Queen Street West, between Guelph Avenue and Winston Boulevard. The Project Study Area is broadly defined as the Speed River and lands abutting the Speed River between the Mill Run trail to the north and Queen Street West to the south. For the purposes of this report the Cultural Heritage Study Area (Study Area) is defined as the Project Study Area plus a 25 m buffer (Figure 1 to Figure 3).

The purpose of this CHAR was to establish the historical context of the Study Area, identify known and potential heritage properties through information gathering and fieldwork, and develop an inventory of built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes within the Study Area. From this understanding of the Study Area, preliminary recommendations were developed; once drawings of the proposed work are received, an impact assessment and recommended mitigation measures will be prepared.

1.2 OBJECTIVES

The tasks completed for the preparation of this CHAR included:

- Background research, including consultation of primary and secondary sources and review historical maps/aerial imagery to gain an understanding of the historical evolution of the Study Area;

- Online data collection and submission of agency information requests to the City of Cambridge, Ontario Heritage Trust, and Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism (MCM) to determine the presence of protected and potential built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes within the Study Area;

- Meeting with the Six Nations of the Grand River to understand their perspective of natural heritage as cultural heritage. Incorporation of the feedback from the Nation to inform the identification on known or potential cultural heritage landscapes and built heritage resources.

- Conducting a field investigation to document the Study Area’s existing conditions, confirm the presence of protected heritage properties, and identify potential built heritage resources and/or cultural heritage landscapes;

- Compile Statements of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest (SCHVI) and heritage attributes (or Statement of Significance and Character-defining Elements, where applicable) for known built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes, and inventory potential heritage properties with a preliminary SCHVI and list of heritage attributes; and,

- Assess the potential impacts from the proposed work to identified built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes and recommend conservation and mitigation measures where impacts are anticipated.
Figure 3: Topographic Map Showing the Location of the Study Area
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2 METHODOLOGY

2.1 REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS


2.1.1 PROVINCIAL POLICY STATEMENT

The PPS provides policy direction on matters of provincial interest related to land use planning and development (Government of Ontario 2020:1). Under the PPS, the conservation of cultural heritage is identified as a matter of provincial interest. Section 2.6 of the PPS gives direction on the consideration of cultural heritage and archaeology (Government of Ontario 2020:31). Specifically, the following direction is given regarding built heritage resources, cultural heritage landscapes, and protected heritage properties:

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

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

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

(Government of Ontario 2020)

The PPS includes definitions of built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes (Government of Ontario 2020). The definitions are as follows:

*Built Heritage Resource*: means a building, structure, monument, installation or any manufactured or constructed part or remnant that contributes to a property's cultural heritage value or interest as identified by a community, including an Indigenous community [Indigenous Nations]. *Built heritage resources* are located on property that may be designated under Parts IV or V of the Ontario Heritage Act, or that may be included on local, provincial, federal and/or international registers (PPS 2020).

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

(PPS 2020).
2.1.2 ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT ACT

The *Environmental Assessment Act (EAA)* sets out planning and decision-making processes so that potential environmental effects are identified before a project begins (Government of Ontario 1990b). The EAA applies to provincial ministries and agencies, municipalities, and public and private bodies. Under the EAA, there are two types of assessments: Individual EAs and Streamlined EAs. Individual EAs are large-scale, complex projects with the potential for significant environmental effects. Streamlined EAs are routine projects that have predictable and manageable environmental effects. There are different types of Streamlined EA processes, depending on project type. Municipal infrastructure planning projects fall under the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (MCEA) which are classified in terms of Schedules, depending on the magnitude of effects. The Schedule A, B and C Municipal Class EAs are defined within the MCEA Manual as follows:

**Schedule A:** These projects generally apply to normal, or emergency operational/maintenance procedures and the resulting effects are usually minimal and, therefore, these projects are pre-approved.

**Schedule A+:** These projects, similarly to the Schedule ‘A’, are pre-approved and typically involved minimal effects/impacts. Unlike the Schedule ‘A’ these projects require the public to be notified prior to the planned work.

**Schedule B:** These projects generally include improvements and minor expansions to existing facilities and there is a potential for some adverse environmental impacts.

**Schedule C:** These projects generally include the construction of new facilities and/or major expansions to existing facilities. As a result these projects have the potential for significant environmental effects.

(MCEA 2015)

Section A.3.7 of the MCEA Manual identifies Indigenous Nations as an important group for municipal consultation. It directs the municipal proponents to contact the Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks for direction on consultation with the Indigenous Nations.

The requirement to consider cultural heritage in Class EAs is discussed in the MCEA Manual (2015) where the cultural environment is identified as one of the key considerations in the MCEA process (MEA 2015: B.1.1). Under Section B of the MCEA Manual, the cultural environment includes archaeological resources, areas of archaeological potential, built heritage resources, and cultural heritage landscapes (MEA 2015: B.1.1[4]). Further, the MCEA Manual (2015: B1.1[4]) gives the following direction regarding the cultural environment:

*Significant cultural heritage and archaeological resources features should be avoided where possible. Where they cannot be avoided, then effects should be minimized where possible, and every effort made to mitigate adverse impacts, in accordance with provincial and municipal policies and procedures. Cultural heritage features should be identified early in the process in order to determine significant features and potential impacts.*

In order to account for anticipated environmental effects to identified built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes, WSP recommends the following approaches for each Schedule MCEA:

- **Schedule A:** no additional buffer added to the Study Area given the normally minimal impacts/effects to resources with CHVI.
Schedule A+: no additional buffer added to the Study Area given the normally minimal impacts/effects to resources with CHVI.

Schedule B: 25 m buffer added to the Study Area given the potential for direct/indirect adverse impacts to resources with CHVI.

Schedule C: 50 m buffer added to the Study Area given the potential for significant direct/indirect adverse impacts to resources with CHVI.

Since this project falls under the Streamlined EA process as a Schedule ‘B’ Municipal Class EA, WSP added a 25 m buffer to the Project Study Area to account for the risk of potential adverse impacts to resources with CHVI resulting from improvements and minor expansions to existing facilities (MCEA 2015: A-4).

2.1.3 ONTARIO HERITAGE ACT

The Ontario Heritage Act, R.S.O. 1990, c.018, provides a framework for the protection of cultural heritage resources in the Province. It gives municipalities and the provincial government powers to protect heritage properties and archaeological sites. The Ontario Heritage Act includes two regulations for determining Cultural Heritage Value or Interest (CHVI): Ontario Regulation (O. Reg.) 9/06 and O. Reg. 10/06. O. Reg. 9/06 provides criteria to determine the CHVI of a property at a local level while O. Reg. 10/06 provides criteria to determine if a property has provincial significance.

2.1.4 CITY OF CAMBRIDGE OFFICIAL PLAN

Development in the City of Cambridge is guided by the City of Cambridge Official Plan (Official Plan) (City of Cambridge 2018). The Official Plan contains policies for cultural heritage in Chapter 4, Cultural Heritage Resources (City of Cambridge 2018: 4.1 to 4.14). Policies relevant to this CHRA include:

4.2. Priorities for Cultural Heritage Resources

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

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

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

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

Where the priority conservation actions of Policy 4.2.1 cannot be achieved, the City will implement the following measures in order of preference:

a) promote the re-use of the resource, building, or building elements where a cultural heritage resource cannot be conserved intact;

b) require, prior to approving a development application which would result in the destruction of a cultural heritage resource, that the proponent provide to the City architectural measured drawings, a land history,
photographs and other available documentation of the cultural heritage resource in its surrounding context and, if feasible, relocate the cultural heritage resource; and

c) promote the salvaging and reuse of building materials where a cultural heritage resource cannot be conserved intact to discourage construction materials from entering landfill sites and incorporation of building materials in the new development or redevelopment.

(City of Cambridge 2018)

2.1.5 CAMBRIDGE HERITAGE MASTER PLAN


As per Section 3.5 of the plan, while there is no updated Archaeological Master Plan for the Cambridge area, it is assumed that lands alongside the Grand River have high potential for both pre-and-post-contact archaeological remains (Bray Heritage 2008; GRCA 2021).

2.2 GUIDANCE DOCUMENTS

The Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism (MCM) is responsible for the administration of the Ontario Heritage Act and has developed checklists, information bulletins, standards and guidelines, and policies to support the conservation of Ontario’s cultural heritage resources, including built heritage resources, cultural heritage landscapes, and archaeological sites. For Cultural Heritage, the Criteria for Evaluating Potential for Built Heritage Resources and Cultural Heritage Landscapes: A Checklist for the Non-Specialist (the Checklist) is utilized to determine if project areas/properties have either known or potential CHVI. The Checklist includes screening criteria for local or Indigenous knowledge (MCM 2016).


2.3 BACKGROUND RESEARCH

Background research was carried out during the preparation of this CHAR to gain a thorough understanding of the historical context of the Study Area. Primary sources, secondary sources, historical maps, and aerial photographs were consulted, as appropriate, to identify historical themes relevant to the Study Area. Specifically, research regarding the physiography, Indigenous land use, survey and settlement, 19th century land use, and 20th century land use of the Study Area. A review of historical mapping and aerial photographs was also conducted to identify settlements, structures, and landscape features within, and adjacent to, the Study Area. Historical maps from 1861, 1877, 1916, 1923, 1929, 1936 and 1938 were reviewed. In addition, historical imagery from 1945 and recent Google Earth imagery were reviewed to identify changes within, and adjacent to, the Study Area.
The results of the background research are presented in Section 3 of this report.

2.4 INFORMATION GATHERING

Information gathering was carried out to identify known and potential built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes in the Study Area. For this CHAR, the City of Cambridge, Ontario Heritage Trust, Parks Canada, and the MCM were contacted directly via email and/or phone to determine the presence of listed, designated, or protected heritage properties within, and adjacent to, the Study Area.

As part of the Indigenous engagement component of the Class EA process, local Indigenous Nations were contacted to participate in the planning of the project. Based on the meeting requests received, meetings were held with the Six Nations of the Grand River and Haudenosaunee Development Institute.

The results of the information gathering activities are presented in Section 4.1 of this report.

2.5 FIELD REVIEW

A field review of the Study Area was completed to identify known and potential built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes. During the field review, the 40-year “rule of thumb” was used to identify properties with the potential to have CHVI. The 40-year rule is generally accepted by federal and provincial agencies as a preliminary screening measure for CHVI. It should be noted, however, that the 40-year threshold is a guide only and does not imply that all properties of 40 years of age have CHVI. Nor does it exclude properties that are less than 40 years of age and exhibit CHVI. The professional judgement of WSP’s Cultural Heritage Specialist was used during the field review to apply the 40-year rule and identify properties with potential CHVI.

The results of the field review are presented in Section 4.2 of this report.

2.6 INVENTORY OF BUILT HERITAGE RESOURCES AND CULTURAL HERITAGE LANDSCAPES

Following the completion of the background research, information gathering, and field review, an inventory of built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes within, and adjacent to, the Study Area was created. The inventory of cultural heritage resources is presented in Section 4.3 of this report.

2.7 PRELIMINARY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

A preliminary impact assessment (hereafter referred to as “impact assessment”) was completed to determine impacts—direct or indirect—to identified built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes by the proposed work. The impact assessment for this CHVI was prepared using the impact examples provided in the MCM InfoSheet #5: Heritage Impact Assessment and Conservation Plans (InfoSheet #5) (Government of Ontario 2006b). The following impacts to cultural heritage resources were considered:

- Destruction of any, or part of any, significant heritage attributes or features
- Alteration that is not sympathetic, or is incompatible, with the historic fabric and appearance;
• Shadows created that alter the appearance of a heritage attribute or change the viability of a natural feature or plantings, such as a garden;
• Isolation of a heritage attribute from its surrounding environment, context or a significant relationship;
• Direct or indirect obstruction of significant views or vistas within, from, or of built and natural features;
• A change in land use such as rezoning a battlefield from open space to residential use, allowing new development or site alteration to fill in the formerly open spaces; and,
• Land disturbances such as a change in grade that alters soils, and drainage patterns that adversely affect and archaeological resource.

In addition, mitigation measures outlined in MCM InfoSheet#5 were used to guide the preparation of considered alternatives, mitigation and conservation methods. These include methods of minimizing or avoiding a negative impact to cultural heritage resources, such as:

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

The results of the impact assessment and recommended mitigation measures are contained in Section 5.0
3  HISTORICAL CONTEXT

To gain a thorough understanding of the history of the Study Area, its physiography, Indigenous land use, survey and settlement, 19th century land use, and 20th century land use was reviewed. Historical mapping and aerial photographs were consulted to identify settlements, structures, and landscape features within, and adjacent to, the Study Area. Historically, the Study Area is located on Part of Lot 9 Beasley Lower Block Concession 2 and Lot 10 Beasley Lower Block Concessions 2 and 3 in the former Geographic Township of Waterloo, Waterloo County.

3.1  PHYSIOGRAPHY

The Study Area (Figure 1 to Figure 3) is situated in the Guelph Drumlins Field physiographic region of Ontario (Chapman and Putnam 1984:113). The Guelph Drumlins physiographic region spans an area of approximately 82,880 hectares (204,799 acres) and includes portions of greater Hamilton, Wellington County, and the Regional Municipalities of Waterloo and Halton. The till is pale brown in colour, loamy and calcareous and contains fragments of the underlying red shale (Chapman and Putnam 1984: 137). It is underlain by dolostones of the Amabel and Guelph Formations. The landform pattern consists of “drumlins fringed by gravel terraces and separated by swampy valleys” with flowing tributaries and “several gravel ridges or eskers cross the plain in the same general direction with meltwater spillways cutting through” (Chapman and Putnam 1984: 138). The Speed and Eramosa Rivers are two glacial spillways located within this physiographic region.

The dominant surface soil type within the Study Area is Farmington (OMAFRA 2006). This soil is characterized as coarse and medium textured soils overlying bedrock with good drainage and level topography.

According to the Ministry of Northern Development and Mines Map 2556 Quaternary Geology Southern Sheet map this immediate area includes glaciofluvial outwash deposits and Port Stanley Till deposits.

3.2  HISTORICAL CONTEXT

3.2.1  INDIGENOUS LAND USE

The cultural history of southern Ontario began approximately 11,000 years ago when the glaciers had melted, and the land was re-exposed. The land was quickly settled by bands of hunters and gatherers who are thought to have been large game hunters. This period is referred to as the Paleo-Indian Period and it is thought to have lasted until approximately 9,000 years ago.

After 9,500 years ago, there was a long period when the climate was variable and the bare lands left by the glaciers were becoming re-forested, resulting in patchier, more diverse ecozones. This period is referred to as the Archaic Period and it is thought to have lasted until 3,000 years ago as people were adapting to diverse environmental settings. The Archaic adaptation is generally thought to have centered on localized resources, often forest resources, and groups of people are thought to have been less mobile, an adaptation that continued to develop until the arrival of Europeans.

In southern Ontario, the Archaic Period is divided into the Early, Middle and Late Archaic. The Archaic Period is followed by the Woodland Period. The major technological change in the Early Woodland Period is the
introduction of pottery. During this time, people are thought to have developed more community organization and the manufacture of clay pottery is thought to indicate less residential mobility. The Early Woodland Period transitioned into the Middle Woodland Period approximately 2,400 years ago. During the Middle Woodland Period in southern Ontario community and kin identity became more deeply entrenched, and more sedentary communities developed. By around 500 Common Era (CE), maize cultivation had been widely adopted in Ontario, marking the transition between the Middle Woodland and Late Woodland Periods.

The Late Woodland Period saw the development of recognizable Iroquoian and Anishnaabe cultures in southern Ontario, as well as intensified cultivation of crops such as corn, beans, squash, sunflower and tobacco. Greater sedentism led to increasing settlement populations and greater complexity of settlement organization. Village sites dating to this time are often found on terraces overlooking the floodplains of large rivers, though settlements were also located near smaller watercourses. Iroquoian villages tended to be small, palisaded compounds with longhouses occupied by families. As the Late Woodland Period progressed, more intercommunity communication and integration became necessary to maintain the sedentary agricultural way of life. Later Iroquoian villages were larger and more heavily palisaded, and longhouses were larger also. Algonquian settlements tended to be less populous and temporary.

When French explorers, missionaries, and fur traders arrived in southern Ontario in the early 17th century, they met diverse communities across the Great Lakes region, such as the nations of the Iroquoian Wendat (Huron), Attawandaron (Neutral), Tionnontaté or Khionontateronon (Petun), and Haudenosaunee (Six Nations), and Anishnaabe Ojibwe, Odawa, Nipissing, and Algonquin. Contact with Europeans disrupted the traditional Indigenous political dynamics, allegiances, and ways of life at different times and to varying degrees throughout Ontario. By the mid-17th century, European disease and conflict had driven the Wendat, Attawandaron, Tionnontaté or Khionontateronon from their traditional territories and they were forces to relocate to other regions as way of survival for their Nations.

Indigenous lifeways adapted in complex and varied ways as European colonization intensified from the 18th century onwards, and after the British colonial regime gained control of Canada in 1763, Treaties were established between the Crown and Indigenous Nations for lands across Ontario. It is now recognized that the British — and later Canadian governments — and Indigenous Nations had different understandings of these treaties, but they remain legally binding agreements that “form the basis of the relationship between Indigenous and non-Indigenous people” (Government of Ontario 2022). Presently, there are ongoing land claims between Indigenous Nations and the Government of Canada related to differing perspectives on treaty lands and traditional territory in Ontario (Sault 2021; Six Nations of the Grand River 2022; Mississaugas of the Credit First Nation 2022; and Haudenosaunee Confederacy 2022). Indigenous perspectives on land rights and treaties from the three Nations engaged as part of this project can be found here:

- Six Nations of the Grand River: [Key Issues, Lands and Resources](#)
- Mississaugas of the Credit First Nation: [Treaty Lands & Territory](#)
- Haudenosaunee Confederacy: [Land Acquisition](#)

The Study Area is within the Haldimand Tract, a corridor “six miles deep [wide]” on each side of the Grand River from its mouth to its source that Kanienkahagen (Mohawk) chief Thayendanegea (also known as Joseph Brant) had purchased from the Mississaugas and negotiated with Governor Frederick Haldimand as compensation for the military support the Six Nations Iroquois had provided British forces in New York during the American War of Independence (Hill 2017). Today, the Region of Waterloo has developed the following land acknowledgement:
3.2.2 IMPORTANCE OF NATURAL FEATURES IN INDIGENOUS CULTURE

The Speed River, a major tributary of the Grand River, transects the Study Area. The Grand River was historically and is presently of critical importance to Indigenous Nations and is the focus for traditional land use activities, such as fishing and hunting, and was also used as a travel and trade route. Natural heritage elements, such as native flora and fauna, are known to have cultural heritage significance to Indigenous Nations. The presence of the Speed River indicates that the Study Area has historical land use connections to Indigenous Nations. This has been documented in the literature. As noted in the Cambridge Heritage Master Plan:

“Camp sites and chipping stations have been excavated and documented from the Archaic and Woodland periods, especially in the Hespeler and Preston area, which date from about 1,000 B.C. The concentration of find spots around Preston-Hespeler was due to the fact that the Speed River was “the major watercourse in the area at this time” which provided a desirable environment for these hunters and fisherman” (Dilse 1981:3).

The results of engagement with Indigenous Nations utilized to information the identification of known or potential cultural heritage landscapes and built heritage resources is provided in Section 4.1.

3.2.3 TOWNSHIP SURVEY AND SETTLEMENT

The Study Area is within Waterloo Township, once one of the largest townships in southwestern Ontario. Consisting of 94.012 acres, the lands had been purchased from Joseph Brant by Richard Beasley, John Baptiste Rousseaux, and James Wilson in 1796 (Hayes 1997:3). The Township was also one of the earliest settled townships. By 1800, more than 14,000 acres of land were sold to German Mennonites from Pennsylvania and surveyed by August Jones in 1805. In order to not interfere with previously established settlers, the new lots were laid out in an irregular manner (Moyer 1971). In 1817, Waterloo Township was named to commemorate the British victory over Napoleon at the Battle of Waterloo, fought near Waterloo, Belgium on 18 June 1815 (Mika & Mika 1983) and it was bordered to the north by the Township of Woolwich, to the east by the Townships of Guelph and Puslinch, to the south by the Township of Dumfries, and to the west by the Township of Wilmot (H. Parsells & Co. 1881).

Several roads were constructed throughout this area during the first quarter of the 19th century, including Bleams Road, which was constructed by Philip Bleam in the 1820s to link the Township of Wilmot and the Township of Waterloo to his business at German Mills near the Grand River (Bloomfield 1995: 74). By 1851 the Township population numbered 8,871 (H. Parsells & Co. 1881; Hayes 1997: 16).

The Study Area is located approximately 200 m southwest of the Village of Hespeler. This area had been within lands granted to the Six Nations Iroquois in 1793 as part of Treaty 4, also known as the Haldimand Tract, in recognition of their support of the British during the American War of Independence (Government of Ontario 2021a). In 1798, a block of land known as Block 2 measuring over 90,000 acres was sold to Richard Beasley, who then began to sell the land in smaller parcels (City of Cambridge 2021).
One of these parcels was 515 acres sold to Abram Clemens, who had emigrated from Pennsylvania in 1818. In 1833, Joseph Oberholtzer acquired land across from the Clemens estate and he deeded some of it to his brother-in-law Michael Bergey. The Bergey family subsequently built a log cabin, sawmill, and a small foundry. The settlement that grew around this small industrial complex was originally known as Bergeytown, and by 1830 the population had reached 100; five years later the settlement was renamed New Hope (Rayburn 1997:156; City of Cambridge 2021).

Ten years later, New Hope had three sawmills, a tannery, a pail factory, two blacksmiths, two shoemakers and a tavern. German emigrant Jacob Hespeler moved to New Hope in 1845 and purchased the Clemens sawmill which he would replace in 1847. Hespeler operated a distillery and built a woolen mill — the first in the area — on the site of what would become the Forbes Textile Mill at 215 Queen Street West, within the current Study Area (Mika & Mika 1981). Hespeler became the community’s first postmaster in 1851 and in 1858 New Hope was renamed the Village of Hespeler in his honor (Mika & Mika 1981; City of Cambridge 2021). He was then appointed as the Village’s first Reeve.

By 1901 the Village was incorporated as a town and in 1958 the Great Western Railway was extended from Galt through Preston and Hespeler to Guelph. On 1 January 1973 the Town of Hespeler was amalgamated with Galt and Preston to form the new City of Cambridge. Prior to amalgamation the population of the Town of Hespeler was 6,300 (Mika & Mika 1981).

### 3.2.4 HISTORICAL PLAQUES

There are no historical plaques located within a 1-km radius of the Study Area (Ontario Heritage Trust 2021).

### 3.3 REVIEW OF HISTORICAL MAPPING

#### 3.3.1 19TH CENTURY LAND USE

Historical records and mapping were examined to gain an understanding of 19th-century land use in the Study Area. A summary of these historical records is presented below in Table 3.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIGURE NO.</th>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>MAP TITLE</th>
<th>HISTORICAL FEATURE(S)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Figure 4   | 1861 | Tremaine’s Map of the County of Waterloo (Tremaine 1861) | • The Study Area is listed under the ownership of the following:  
1) Jacob Hespeler and H. Warner (Lot 9, Concession II Beasley Lower Block),  
2) Jacob Hespeler and William E. Ellis (Lot 10, Concession II Beasley Lower Block) and,  
3) Jacob Hespeler (Lot 10, Concession III Beasley Lower Block)  
• Speed River transects the Study Area |
3.3.1 HESPELLER TEXTILE MILL

The property at 215 Queen Street West was originally the site of a stone mill which was later reconfigured and repurposed as both a knitting and woolen mill and was one of the largest mills in the Grand River textile region (Leung 1986:122). The mill complex contained several structures including the Main Mill No. 1 building which is believed to be the stone mill constructed in 1864 by Randall Farr and Hespeler (Leung 1986:123). Later additions to the complex occurred in 1877 when the main building was constructed and again in 1887 when the plant was enlarged. Further additions were made in 1893, 1902 and 1909.

By 1909 several of these buildings were joined together to make one large structure approximately 1,600 feet in length. These structures and modifications are illustrated on the 1910 Fire Insurance Plan and by this point the mill employed approximately 600 people (Leung 1986:122-123; Figure 6). The mill was originally water powered but converted to steam in 1889 and by 1928 and 1937 ran on both water and electric power. By 1941 the mill was solely electric powered (Leung 1986:122-124).

During the 20th century the Dominion Woollens and Worsted company employed approximately 1,200 people, or 40% of the population of the town, and for this reason it was dubbed “The Company of Neighbours” (Bray Heritage 2008).
At some point prior to 1988 a fire broke out at the mill which damaged portions of the structures. Photographs taken on 14 July 1988 provided by Matt Holland from the City illustrate the damages and indicate that majority of the mill structures appear to be steel beam and concrete block (Appendix B: Plate C7 to Plate C10). On 26 September 1995 a secondary fire broke out at the mill that destroyed several structures, including the three-and-a-half storey and T-shaped Main Mill No. 1 (Hespeler Heritage Centre 2020; FAC 2020). Main Mill No. 1, was the oldest part of the mill complex and is depicted on the 1910 Fire Insurance Plan (Figure 6). Historical photographs of the mill between 1866 and 1995 have been provided in Appendix B: Plate C1 to Plate C14.

At present the property at 211-215 Queen Street West is currently undergoing a proposed redevelopment by a private developer of the textile factory and its associated buildings. The proposed development includes the development of a waterfront trail and 260 parking spaces (MHBC 2021a; City of Cambridge 2021d).

### 3.3.3 20TH CENTURY LAND USE

Historical records and mapping were examined to gain an understanding of 20th-century land use in the Study Area. While Fire Insurance and National Topographic Series mapping from 1910 to 1998 were examined, the maps from 1910, 1916, 1938, 1968, 1975, and 1998 were found to best illustrate the Study Area’s evolution. A summary of these maps is presented in Table 3.2.

#### Table 3.2 Review of 20th Century Historical Maps and Aerial Photographs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>FEATURE(S)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1910 Fire Insurance Plan, Revised in 1917 (Library and Archives Canada 2021) | The Study Area is located within the R. Forbes Co. Ltd. Woollen Mill  
The following features are illustrated within the Mill complex: |
| BUILDING NO. | BUILDING TYPE | STOREYS | COMMENT(S) |
| 1 | Main Mill and Wing | 3 with basement | Main Mill  
-1st Machine Room and Carding;  
-2nd Mule Spinning twist and reeling;  
-3rd Finishing packing, knitted goods and yarn storage  
-Scouring & yarn storage (basement)  
Wing  
-Scouring and pulling (basement)  
-1st Cloth finishing  
-2nd Carping and mule spinning  
-3rd Knitting |
| 2 | Main Mill | 3 with basement |  
-1st Gilling, combing and drawing  
-2nd Spinning and Twisting  
-3rd Finishing knitted goods, storage of yarn, knitted goods, resting and shipping  
-Storage top and boving pins (basement) |
| 3 | Main Mill | 3 with basement |  
-1st Weaving  
-2nd Wrapping winding and cloth shipping room  
-3rd Storage for finished goods and packing  
-Storage (Basement) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>FEATURE(S)</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Main Mill</td>
<td>4 with basement -1st Wool Carding -2nd Spinning -Wood scouring (basement) -3rd and 4th unoccupied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Office and Sample Room</td>
<td>2 illegible note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Picker House and Engine House</td>
<td>1 n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Boiler House</td>
<td>1 ½ n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Dye House</td>
<td>2 -1st Dyeing -2nd Cyclone drying and wool storage -Southern addition for soap making and cotton dyeing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Scouring and Cloth Drying</td>
<td>2 n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Pump House</td>
<td>n/a n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Store House B</td>
<td>3 with basement -1st, 2nd, and basement Wool storage -3rd Wool sorting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Store House C</td>
<td>3 with basement -1st, 2nd, and 3rd Wool storage -Barrel and lard storage (basement)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Water (illegible note) plant and Bleach House</td>
<td>1 with basement and 1 ½ n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Store House D</td>
<td>1 ½ n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Store House E</td>
<td>2 n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Store House F</td>
<td>1 ½ n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Store House H</td>
<td>n/a n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Store House G</td>
<td>1 ½ n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Additional features indicated on the map include:
- One (1) cool shed
- One (1) tower
- One (1) engine house
- One (1) pump house
- One (1) raised steel tank
- One (1) tail race
- One (1) dam
- Concrete passage
- Three (3) wooden tanks on concrete bases
- Covered bridge
- One (1) additional structure with an illegible description

### 1916 Topographic Map of Ontario, Galt Sheet
(Department of Militia and Defense 1916)
- The Study Area is located within the Village of Hespeler
- Speed River transects the Study Area
- The Galt and Guelph branch of the Great Western Railway transects the Study Area
- A roadway running northeast-southwest is illustrated approximately 25 m to the south of the Study Area;
- Mill including three stone or brick buildings and one wood building located within the Study Area
- One bridge located within the Study Area

### 1938 Topographic Map of Ontario, Galt Sheet
(Department of Militia and Defense 1938)
- No change noted from the 1919 mapping

### 1945 (Appendix A: Plate B1)
- The footprint of the mill is significantly larger and includes an addition on the western side of the structure and a T-shaped structure on the northern side.
- A dam is depicted within the Study Area

### 1955 (Appendix A: Plate B2)
- No change from the 1945 aerial

### 1968 Topographic Map of Ontario, Preston Hespeler Sheet
(Department of Energy Mines, and Resources 1968)
- No change from the 1955 aerial
### 3.4 PREVIOUS INVESTIGATIONS

#### 3.4.1 DESIGNATED UNDER PART IV OF THE ONTARIO HERITAGE ACT

The property at 215 Queen Street West, also known as the Forbes Textile Mill, was designated in 1987 by municipal By-law 353-87, enabled under Part IV of the *Ontario Heritage Act* (Ontario Heritage Trust 1987). The designation included the exterior of the Lower Mill Complex at 215 Queen Street West, excluding the window sash, and identified it as a property of historic and architectural significance.

#### 3.4.2 NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE OF CANADA

In 1989, the property at 215 Queen Street West was designated by the Historic Sites and Monuments Board of Canada as a National Historic Site of Canada under the *Historic Sites and Monuments Act* R.S.C., 1985, c. H-4 (Parks Canada 2021). Historical research and material on the Forbes Textile Mill are detailed within the 1986 *Catalogue of Significant Extant Textile Mills Built in Canada Before 1940* research report.

---

1 While published in 1998 topographic map contains information and boundaries/toponyms that were current as of 1990 and 1996 respectively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>FEATURE(S)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1975 Topographic Map of Ontario, Preston Hespeler Sheet (Department of Energy Mines, and Resources 1975)</td>
<td>• A channel is visible between Speed River to the mill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970 (Appendix A: Plate B3)</td>
<td>• Two water reservoirs to the southeast of the Forbes Mill footprint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998 Topographic Map of Ontario, Cambridge Sheet (Natural Resources Canada 1998)</td>
<td>• The channel located on the 1975 topographic map is no longer visible • In addition, several buildings previously illustrated on the southwest portion of the property are no longer visible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various (2006 to 2019 Online Google Earth Aerial Imagery – Reviewed but not contained within Appendix B due to copyright)</td>
<td>• Footprint of the Mill has changed significantly from the 1998 topographic map as a result of the 26 September 1995 fire</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.4.3 GRAND RIVER – CANADIAN HERITAGE RIVER DESIGNATION (1994)

In 1994 the Grand River and its major tributaries, the Nith, Conestogo, Speed and Eramosa, between Georgian Bay and Lake Erie, a total of 290 km, were together designated as a Canadian Heritage River. The nomination identified the Grand River valley as a place with a long-standing history beginning over 10,000 years during the Paleo-Indian Period. The nomination notes the presence of several 19th century industrial structures such as factories, mills, foundries, dams, and canals found along the river and also identifies its natural and human heritage value (Ministry of Natural Resources 1990).

As part of this designation a Heritage River Inventory for the Grand River Watershed was created. This inventory includes cultural features and values that support the Grand as a Canadian Heritage River. As of 2013 the Forbes Textile Mill and Silknet dam were both listed within the inventory (GRCA 2013).

Recognized recreational activities within the Grand River watershed offered as part of the Canadian Heritage River designation include:

- **Boating** - canoeing, kayaking, rafting, motorized boating
- **Angling** - fly fishing, ice fishing, fishing vacations
- **Water sports** - swimming, water skiing, stand-up paddleboarding
- **Water associated activities** - hiking, hunting, camping
- **Winter activities** - dog sledding, skiing
- **Natural heritage appreciation** - wildlife viewing, scenic views
- **Human heritage appreciation** - sporting events, visiting historic sites (GRCA 2021a)

Indigenous peoples have lived in the Grand River watershed for more than 10,000 years. To this day, the Six Nations of the Grand River and the Mississaugas of the Credit First Nation have a strong presence in the Grand River watershed.

Information gathering results with Six Nations of the Grand River identified the Grand River as having historical and continued cultural heritage. The results of information gathering are discussed in further detail in Section 4.1.

3.4.4 HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT REPORT (MHBC 2021B)

In 2020, MacNaughton Hermsen Britton Clarkson Planning Ltd. (MHBC) was retained in 2020 by Blacks Point Development Inc. to undertake a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) for the property at 211-215 Queen Street, in the City of Cambridge. This assessment was completed in support of the application for Official Plan amendment and/or Zoning By-law amendment under for the proposed redevelopment of the textile factory and associated buildings located at 211-215 Queen Street West (City of Cambridge 2021d).

MHBC identified that the property had historic and contextual relationships to the Speed River, the railway corridor, and the mill works housing structures. The proposed developed was divided into two distinct phases: Phase 1 included the retention of all existing heritage buildings located on the subject lands for future residential/mixed-use and phase 2 includes the construction of two (2) new residential buildings. As part of the Study MHBC made the following recommendations for future works:

1. **Details of alterations to the existing buildings in Phase 1 of the proposed development should be advised through a Conservation Plan**
2 The existing building should be documented with photographs to supplement the historic record

3 Future Site Plan and Landscape Plans include consideration for commemoration of the history and cultural heritage value of the site

4 Designation By-law No. 353-87 should be amended following the completion of the proposed development in order to conform to the Ontario Heritage Act and must provide a revised site description, summary of cultural heritage value or interest, and a revised list of heritage attributes.

5 There is potential for vibration impacts due to grading and construction therefore a temporary protection plan may be required to inform recommendations of the Conservation Plan

(MHBC 2021b)
Figure 8: 1938 Topographic Map of Ontario, Galt Sheet Showing the Location of the Study Area
Figure 10: 1975 Topographic Map of Ontario, Galt Sheet Showing the Location of the Study Area
4 RESULTS

4.1 INFORMATION GATHERING RESULTS

The City of Cambridge, Ontario Heritage Trust, Parks Canada, and the MCM were consulted to gather information on the Study Area.

Matt Holland from the City of Cambridge provided historical photographs taken on 14 July 1988 to illustrate the damages sustained from a fire that broke out at the mill. To date, no responses have been received from the City of Cambridge heritage planners.

Kevin DeMille, Natural Heritage Coordinator at the Ontario Heritage Trust, reported that the Study Area does not contain any Trust conservation easements or Ontario Heritage Trust-owned properties. Mr. DeMille did confirm that the Study Area contains one property that was listed on the Ontario Heritage Trust’s register within the Study Area:

- 215 Queen Street West

Damien Busi, Program Officer, Registries at Parks Canada provided the HSMBC Research Report 1986-SUC Catalogue of Extant Textile Mills which includes a detailed analysis of the Forbes Textile Mill Property.

Karla Barboza, Acting Team Lead at the MCM, reported that there are no properties designated under the *Ontario Heritage Act* by the Minister within, or adjacent to, the Study Area. Ms. Barboza also identified that the MCM is not aware of any provincial heritage properties within or adjacent to the Study Area. However, Ms. Barboza did note that the Grand River and its major tributaries, the Nith, Conestogo, Speed and Eramosa, were together designated as a Canadian Heritage River in 1994.

An online meeting between the Six Nations of the Grand River and WSP was completed on 15 July 2021 to discuss the Project. The Six Nations of the Grand River identified that Speed River as having cultural heritage significance and also indicated that natural heritage should be considered as part of the cultural heritage assessment. A subsequent meeting was held with the Six Nations of the Grand River on 09 December 2021 to further discuss and learn about their perspectives on cultural and natural heritage to better inform WSP’s preparation of the Cultural Heritage Assessment Report for the Project. Cultural heritage guidance documents were discussed and WSP provided a rationale for how the ‘Inventory of Built Heritage Resources and Cultural Heritage landscapes was established for the Study Area’. SNGR shared their perspective of cultural heritage as it relates to natural heritage. The points below summarize the views shared in the meeting:

- Cultural heritage as defined by the MCM often references ‘cultural heritage’ as being a built structure / building that may be impacted by a change in environment or project that may affect the built structure. Typically, these structures are of significance to a municipality for historical and heritage importance tied to settler worldview and history and place of significance in the settler story associated with the land.

- In an Indigenous worldview, specifically SNGR’s, the natural environment has a deep meaning to the Indigenous Peoples as it is the place and space where Nation’s livelihoods occur, the place for hunting and gathering foods and medicines, the place where other cultural and life activities took place in history and in some places continue to take place. Therefore, the natural environment itself is understood in the SNGR perspective to be a place of cultural heritage as well as modern day society-built structures. Because the time
spent near and, on the water, waterbodies like rivers hold meaning. Waterbodies are places where Indigenous Peoples conduct livelihoods and practice culture and need recognition as heritage sites within cultural heritage reports.

- SNGR noted that the significance of the Grand River having been in existence as of the last ice age, is a longer timeline than current MCM and municipal concepts of cultural heritage sites, which consider built structures of the past 100 + years and this is important to be recognized.

4.2 FIELD REVIEW RESULTS

The field review was completed by Chelsea Dickinson, Cultural Heritage Specialist at WSP, on Friday, August 13, 2021, and Thursday, September 9, 2021. The field review documented the Study Area as comprised of Speed River, and abutting lands, which included the Lens Mill Building surrounded by a naturalized green space with recreational trails. Adjacent to the Study Area is a mix of residential and commercial properties dating to the late 19th and early 20th century, as well as those built more recently (Plate 1-Plate 12).

A total of 17 cultural heritage resources were identified within the Study Area as having known or potential cultural heritage value or interest (CHVI). This includes 12 built heritage resources (BHRs) and five cultural heritage landscapes (CHLs), including Speed River and Chilligo Conservation Area. As discussed in Section 4.1, natural features, such as, water, wildlife, wooded areas were identified to retain cultural heritage value for the Indigenous Nations.

Plate 1: Queen Street West facing northeast

Plate 2: Queen Street West facing southwest
Plate 3: Queen Street West facing northeast

Plate 4: Speed River facing southwest from the Guelph Avenue bridge

Plate 5: Example of recent residential construction on the southern side of Queen Street West

Plate 6: Queen Street West facing northeast

Plate 7: Speed River from the Mill Race outlet at the Silknet Dam along the Mill Run Trail facing southwest

Plate 8: Speed River from the Mill Race outlet at the Silknet Dam along the Mill Run Trail facing southeast
4.3 INVENTORY OF BUILT RESOURCES AND CULTURAL HERITAGE LANDSCAPES

Following the completion of the background research, information gathering, and field review, an inventory of built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes within the Study Area was compiled. The inventory of cultural heritage resources is presented in Table 4.1. The inventory has been arranged north to south and the locations of identified resources in relation to the Study Area are depicted in Figure 12.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHR NO.</th>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>HERITAGE RECOGNITION</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY</th>
<th>PHOTOGRAPHS/DIGITAL IMAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHR 1</td>
<td>CHL</td>
<td>Grand River Railway (Galt to Guelph Route)</td>
<td>Identified during field review</td>
<td>This potential cultural heritage landscape consists of the Grand River Railway an interurban electric railway which contained 15 stations on the rail line located within the communities within Galt, Preston and Hespeler (later combined as Cambridge in 1973), Kitchener, Waterloo and Wellesley. In 1895 it was reincorporated and renamed and subsequently leased to the Canadian Pacific Railway in 1903. Passenger service lasted on the rail line until 1955 and in 1961 the Canadian Pacific Railway switched all electric lines to diesel. A portion of the line remains as a spur line to the Toyota plant in Cambridge (Canada Rail 2021).</td>
<td><img src="image1.jpg" alt="Grand River Railway" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| CHR 2  | CHL   | Chilligo Conservation Area                    | Identified during field review | This property was identified during field review and the following property description is based on field observations.  
Property Description  
This property features the Chilligo Conservation Area which is owned and managed by the GRCA. The property is located directly adjacent to the Speed River and is comprised primarily of deciduous Carolinian forest, grassy meadows, and thick marshlands (Friends of Chilligo 2021). Also located within the conservation area is the Mill Run Trail, which begins at Chilligo Conservation Area and ends in Riverside Park (City of Cambridge 2021b).  
Landscape Elements  
- Mature Trees  
- Circulation Routes  
Summary  
This property features an irregular parcel of land as part of the Chilligo Conservation Area and circulation routes/trails. The area includes forest, meadows and marshlands. Natural environment was identified as having potential CHVI through engagement with Six Nations of the Grand River First Nation. | ![Chilligo Conservation Area](image2.jpg) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHR NO.</th>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>HERITAGE RECOGNITION</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHR 3</td>
<td>CHL</td>
<td>Mill Run Trail</td>
<td>Identified during field review</td>
<td>This property was identified during field review and the following property description is based on field observations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Property Description**

The Mill Run Trail is approximately 6.5 km in length and is located on the original 1895 railbed of the Galt, Preston, and Hespeler and passes through the Chilloo Conservation area and the former Idylwild Park (City of Cambridge 2021c). The trail surface is mainly stone dust with stretches of boardwalks offering a footbridge crossing and river vistas, within the Study Area there are five distinct footbridges (Ontario Trails 2021).

The City of Cambridge has identified 10 distinct sites located along the trail including 1) a Mill Run 2) Riverside Park 3) Pedestrian Bridge over Speed River 4) a footbridge under highway 401 5) Idylwild Park 6) the remnants of the old Beaverdale railway station 7) the 80m boardwalk and 22m Ellis Creek bridge 8) the Mill Race outlet at the Silknet Dam, facing the Forbes Textile Mill 9) the square tower of the site of Jacob Hespeler's 1847 grist mill dam, also known as Jacob's Landing 10) Hespeler mill pond dam (City of Cambridge 2021c).

Of the above sites three (3) are located within the current Study Area including the 80m boardwalk and 22m Ellis Creek bridge, the Mill Race outlet at the Silknet Dam and the square tower of the site of Jacob Hespeler's 1847 grist mill dam, also known as Jacob's Landing.

**Summary**

This landscape contains a 6.5 km with 10 distinct sites located along the trail, three of which are located within the Study Area. As a result, this property may have design/physical, historical/associative, and/or contextual value for its connection to the former rail line.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHR NO.</th>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>HERITAGE RECOGNITION</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY</th>
<th>PHOTOGRAPHS/DIGITAL IMAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHR 4</td>
<td>BHR</td>
<td>Hespeler Railway Bridge</td>
<td>Identified during field review</td>
<td>The Hespeler Railway bridge is a plate girder type noted for its stone substructure that may be from a previous bridge. It spans the Speed River within the Study Area. While the builder/contractor is unknown the bridge is listed as having dimensions of 50 by 406 feet (Historic Bridges 2021a). The Historic Bridges resource indicates this bridge has a historical significance rating of six (6) which is described as standard and traditional designs that are clearly rare and have significant historic value (Historic Bridges 2021b). Summary This resource features a plate girder bridge noted for its stone substructure with a historical significance rating of six (6). As a result, this property may have design/physical, historical/associative, and/or contextual value.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHR 5</td>
<td>CHL</td>
<td>Speed River</td>
<td>Designated as a Canadian Heritage River as part of the Grand River</td>
<td>This property was designated as a part of the Grand River Canadian Heritage River in 1994 along with its major tributaries including the Conestogo, Eramosa, Nith and Speed rivers (GRCA 2021a). The property description provided below is based on field observations. Property Description Speed River is a major tributary of the Grand River that flows through Wellington County and the Region of Waterloo. The Grand River was designated as a part of the Grand River Canadian Heritage River in 1994 based on the river’s outstanding human heritage and recreational values of national significance (GRCA 2014; Canadian Heritage Rivers System 2021). The designation of the Grand River and its tributaries as a Canadian Heritage River was marked with a ceremony in Cambridge on September 26, 1994. A plaque was unveiled to commemorate the designation (GRCA 2021b). The Grand River, flowing 290 kilometres from the Dundalk Highlands to Lake Erie, is aptly named for its valley and is the largest in Southern Ontario. Heritage River plaque in Cambridge ONA mosaic of Aboriginal and European cultures combined to shape the valley’s character. Fine examples of nineteenth century architecture still remain in many rural and urban communities. Winding its way through marshes, woods and Carolinian forests, the river provides the common thread that links a harmonious blend of natural and cultural landscapes. The designation of the Grand as a Canadian Heritage River was built on a local tradition of cooperative watershed management to preserve the valley's natural beauty, cultural diversity, and recreational opportunities. This plaque is testimony to all those people who are working together to make the Grand River an ever better place in which to live, work and play. This plaque, which is written in English, French and Mohawk, have been placed in the following locations: 1. Grand River: Cambridge (Galt) 2. Conestogo River: St. Jacobs 3. Nith River: New Hamburg 4. Speed River: Guelph 5. Eramosa River: Halton Hills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As part of the designation process the GRCA has created a Heritage River inventory of the Grand River Watershed. One of the resources identified within the inventory and located within the Study Area is the Forbes Textile Mill (CHL 4).

Furthermore, this landscape was identified as having potential CHVI through engagement with Six Nations of the Grand River First Nation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHR NO.</th>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>HERITAGE RECOGNITION</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY</th>
<th>PHOTOGRAPHS/DIGITAL IMAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHR 6</td>
<td>BHR</td>
<td>67 Queen Street West</td>
<td>Identified during field review</td>
<td>This property was identified during field review and the property description provided below is based on field observations. Property Description: This property features a residence with a rectangular shaped plan and cross gable roof likely constructed prior to 1945 (University of Waterloo 1945a). Unfortunately, this property was not visible via the right of way however due to the fact that it appears on the 1945 aerial it may have significant design/physical, historical/associative, and/or contextual value.</td>
<td>Microsoft Bing Maps 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHR NO.</td>
<td>TYPE</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td>HERITAGE RECOGNITION</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| CHR 7   | BHR  | 77 Queen Street West | Identified during field review | This property was identified during field review and the property description provided below is based on field observations.  
**Property Description**  
This property includes an Ontario Vernacular style residence that was built prior to 1945 based on a review of arials, but likely dates late 19th/early 20th century based on architectural style and materials (University of Waterloo 1945a). The residence is a simple two storey structure with an L-shaped plan, a cross gable roof with projecting eaves that is clad in a mix of brick and stucco. The front façade (south elevation) features a centered entrance with two doorways and a wood awning supported by two freestanding and two engaged pilasters with decorative footings.  
The fenestration includes three (3) sash one over one rectangular windows with moulded trims and one (1) sash one over one square window with a plain lug sill trim. Landscape elements on the property include grass and a concrete sidewalk/walkway.  
**Exterior Elements**  
- Ontario Vernacular style residence  
- L-shaped plan  
- Cross gable roof  
- Brick and stucco siding  
- Three (3) sash one over one rectangular windows with moulded trims  
- One (1) sash one over one square window with a plain lug sill trim  
- Wood awning supported by two freestanding and two engaged pilasters with decorative footings  
**Summary**  
The residence on the property is a built heritage resource with potential design/physical, historical/associative, and/or contextual value. |
| CHR 8   | BHR  | 81 Queen Street West | Identified during field review | This property was identified during field review and the property description provided below is based on field observations.  
**Property Description**  
This property includes Queen Anne architectural style former residence that was likely constructed in the late 19th/early 20th century based on architectural styles and materials. The residence is a two storey structure with an irregular shaped plan with a cross gable roof and projecting eaves. The front façade (south elevation) is clad in a mix of painted brick, stucco and plywood and an upper and lower storey entrance with a curved staircase and balcony with square balustrades. The fenestration includes a two storey six over six sash bay window and two (2) multi-light windows. Landscape elements on the property include concrete sidewalk/walkway, two signposts and a bench.  
**Exterior Elements**  
- Queen Anne architectural style residence former residence  
- Irregular shaped plan  
- Cross gable roof  
- Painted brick, stucco and plywood siding  
- Two storey six over six sash bay window and two (2) multi-light windows  
**Summary**  
The former residence on the property is a built heritage resource with potential design/physical, historical/associative, and/or contextual value. |
CHR NO. | TYPE | LOCATION | HERITAGE RECOGNITION | DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY | PHOTOGRAPHS/DIGITAL IMAGE
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
CHR 9 | BHR | 83 Queen Street West | Identified during field review | This property was identified during field review and the property description provided below is based on field observations. Property Description This property includes Queen Anne architectural style residence that was likely constructed in the late 19th/early 20th century based on architectural styles and materials. The residence is a simple two storey structure with an irregular shaped plan, cross gable roof and projecting eaves. The front façade (south elevation) is clad in a mix of biochromatic brick and clapboard with and offset (right) entrance covered by a shed style awning supported by pilasters. The house also features a two storey bay window with six segmental windows and plain lug sills, three on the upper and three on the lower level. Two (2) additional segmental windows on located the upper level of the front façade not associated with the bay window. Landscape elements on the property include a garden, a concrete sidewalk/walkway and wooden fence (left). Exterior Elements • Queen Anne architectural style residence • Irregular Shaped plan • Cross gable roof • Biochromatic brick and clapboard siding • Two storey segmental style bay window with plain lug sills • Two (2) additional segmental windows on the upper level of the front façade Summary The residence on the property is a built heritage resource with potential design/physical, historical/associative, and/or contextual value. |
CHR 10 | BHR | 91 Queen Street West | Identified during field review | This property was identified during field review and the property description provided below is based on field observations. Property Description This property includes a Classical Revival style residence that appears on the 1916 topographic mapping but likely dates to the late 19th century based on architectural style and materials (Department of Militia and Defense 1916). The residence is a simple two storey structure with a t-shaped plan, cross gable roof, projecting eaves and what appears to be original foundations. The front façade (south elevation) is clad in stone and features an offset (right) multi-light entrance with side lights while the second story includes a wooden balcony (right) supported by pilasters and features square balustrade posts and a lattice fence. The fenestration includes three (3) sash one over one windows with plain lug sill trims (two on upper level and one on lower level) and one (1) three casement light bay window with a mansard roof (lower level). Landscape elements on the property include grass and a concrete sidewalk/walkway. Exterior Elements • Classical Revival style residence • T-Shaped plan • Cross gable roof • Stone siding and original foundations • Three (3) sash one over one windows with plain lug sill trims • One (1) three casement light bay window with mansard roof Summary The residence on the property is a built heritage resource with potential design/physical, historical/associative, and/or contextual value. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHR NO.</th>
<th>BHR 11</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>DESCRIBED UNDER</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHR 11</td>
<td>BHR</td>
<td>103 Queen Street West</td>
<td>Identified during field review</td>
<td>This property was identified during field review and the property description provided below is based on field observations. Property Description: This property includes an industrial factory building that appears on aerial imagery from 1945 but likely dates to the late 19th/early 20th century based on architectural style and materials (University of Waterloo 1945a). The structure is a simple one storey structure with a rectangular-shaped plan, flat roof and pronounced and projecting eaves. The front façade (south elevation) is clad in painted brick with two separate entryways, the first is a segmental doorway and the second a simple rectangular entryway. The fenestration includes seven (7) segmental sash one over one windows with plain lug sill trims. Landscape elements on the property include a concrete sidewalk/walkway and ground floor steps. Exterior Elements: • One-storey industrial factory building • Rectangular plan • Flat roof • Painted brick siding • Seven (7) segmental sash one over one windows with plain lug sill trims • One segmental entryway Summary: The structure on the property is a built heritage resource with potential design/physical, historical/associative, and/or contextual value.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| CHR 12  | BHR    | 113-115 Queen Street West | Identified during field review | This property was identified during field review and the property description provided below is based on field observations. Property Description: This property includes a semi-detached Neoclassical Colonial Revival residence that appears on the 1945 historical aerials but likely dates to the early 20th century based on architectural style and materials (University of Waterloo 1945a). The residence has undergone recent updates including a new roof, eavestroughs and new front porch all built in 2016 (Premier Real Estate Listing Service 2021). The residence is a simple two storey structure with a T-shaped plan, a low cross-gable roof and projecting eaves. The front façade (southern elevation) is clad in stucco and vinyl siding and is symmetrically arranged with two entrances and an awning supported by eight Doric style columns. The fenestration features eight (8) sash one over one windows with plain lug sill trims, four on the upper level and four on the lower level. The windows on the upper level also feature wooden shutters. Landscape elements on the property include grass and a concrete sidewalk/walkway. Exterior Elements: • Ontario Vernacular style residence • T-shaped plan • Low cross-gable roof • Stucco and vinyl siding • Eight (8) sash one over one windows plain lug sill trims, four of which feature wooden shutters Summary: The residence on the property is a built heritage resource with potential design/physical, historical/associative, and/or contextual value. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHR NO.</th>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>HERITAGE RECOGNITION</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY</th>
<th>PHOTOGRAPHS/DIGITAL IMAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| CHR 13  | BHR  | 119 Queen Street West | Identified during field review | This property was identified during field review and the property description provided below is based on field observations.  
**Property Description**  
This property includes a two story Edwardian Classicism residence possibly constructed in the first quarter of the 20th century based on architectural style and material (University of Waterloo 1945a, 1955a). The residence is a simple two storey structure with a square-shaped plan and hip roof with projecting eaves and verges. The front façade (south elevation) is clad in load bearing brick with two (2) two-light rectangular windows with stone lintels and trims on the east bay, and entrances on the upper and lower levels in the west bay. The gabled dormer is a multi-light Venetian-style window. The ground floor entrance has side lights while the upper-level entryway is glazed. The upper-level entryway opens to a balcony with metal balustrade over the open veranda supported by three columns.  
**Exterior Elements**  
- Edwardian Classicism residence  
- Square plan  
- Hip roof  
- Brick siding  
- Gable style dormer with multi-light Venetian style window  
- Two (2) two-light rectangular windows with stone lintels and trims on the east bay  
- Ground floor entrance with side lights  
- Upper-level entrance opening to a fenced balcony with metal balustrade over the open veranda  
- Open veranda supported by columns  
**Summary**  
The residence on the property is a built heritage resource with potential design/physical, historical/associative, and/or contextual value. | ![Image](image1.png) |
| CHR 14  | BHR  | 127 Queen Street West | Listed on the City of Cambridge Heritage Register (Dilse p. 38) | This property is listed on the City of Cambridge Heritage Register. The property description provided below is based on field observations.  
**Property Description**  
This property includes a storey-and-a-half Gothic Revival style residence possibly constructed in the last quarter of the 19th century based on architectural style and materials. It has a rectangular-shaped plan, a central cross-gable and medium gable roof with projecting eaves and verges. The front façade (south elevation) is clad in a vinyl siding and has tall one-over-one sash windows in the outer bays and a lancet or Gothic window with plain trim in the cross gable. The central entrance has panelled and glazed door and covering the full length of the south façade is a low hip roofed veranda supported by plain wood posts and enclosed with a plain wood balustrade.  
**Exterior Elements**  
- Gothic Revival style residence  
- Rectangular plan  
- Central cross-gable and medium gable roof  
- Vinyl siding  
- Two (2) tall one-over-one sash windows  
- One (1) centered lancet or Gothic window with plain trim in the cross gable  
**Summary**  
The residence on the property is a built heritage resource listed on the City of Cambridge Heritage Registrar and may have design/physical, historical/associative, and/or contextual value. | ![Image](image2.png) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHR NO.</th>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>HERITAGE RECOGNITION</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY</th>
<th>PHOTOGRAPHS/DIGITAL IMAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHR 15</td>
<td>BHR</td>
<td>147 Queen Street West</td>
<td>Identified during field review</td>
<td>This property was identified during field review and the property description provided below is based on field observations. Property Description This property includes a storey-and-a-half Ontario vernacular residence possibly constructed in the last quarter of the 19th century based on architectural style and material. The residence features a rectangular-shaped plan, stone foundations and a medium gable roof with projecting eaves and verges. The front façade (south elevation) is clad in brick and stucco with two one-over-one sash segmental arch headed windows with plain lug sills and a rectangular addition with a low gable roof covering the central entrance. Exterior Elements • Ontario vernacular style residence • Stone foundations • Projecting eaves and verges • Rectangular plan • Medium gable roof • Brick and stucco siding • Two one over one sash segmentally arch headed windows with plain lug sills and original trim Summary The residence on the property is a built heritage resource with potential design/physical, historical/associative, and/or contextual value.</td>
<td><img src="image1.jpg" alt="Photo" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHR 16</td>
<td>CHL</td>
<td>211-215 Queen Street West</td>
<td>National Historic Site - Designated Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act - Listed in the Heritage River Inventory for the Grand River Watershed</td>
<td>The property at 215 Queen Street West, as previously discussed in section 3.4.1 and 3.4.2 is designated under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act and by the Historic Sites and Monuments Board of Canada as a National Historic Site of Canada under the Historic Sites and Monuments Act R.S.C., 1985, c. H-4 (Parks Canada 2021). The property is also identified as a resource within the Heritage River Inventory for the Grand River Watershed (GRCA 2013). A full copy of the designation By-law can be found <a href="http://example.com">online</a>. The following ‘Architectural Description’, ‘Historical Description’, ‘Statement of Heritage Value’ and ‘Description of Heritage Attributes’ are contained within the By-Law Architectural Description The subject buildings, referred to as the Lower Mill Complex, are comprised of the following sections outlined on the 1901 Fire Insurance Map as the “Robert Forbes Co. Ltd. Buildings” (See attached Schedule “C”). All sections are constructed of lime-stone rubblestone with the exception of the exterior staircase which is board and batten. 1. Main mill (No. 1) is constructed parallel to the Speed River and runs northeast to southwest • 2. No. 1 wing is attached to the southwest end of the No. 1 Main Mill. It is constructed perpendicular to the Speed River and runs from northwest to southeast. 3. The stone tower (circa 1900) is a five storey limestone structure attached to the southeast corner of the No. 1 Wing. 4. The enclosed exterior staircase is attached to the southeast façade of No. 1 Main Mill. The designated features of the buildings are as follows: 1. all exterior wall materials and treatment including; roughly coursed limestone rubblestone with stucco relief joints; string courses on the tower; board and batten cladding on the stair tower; 2. all stone quoining; wide flat relief joints on tower lintels; 3. all existing roof profiles and features including the stone cap on the tower; flared metal eaves with simple cornice lines; 4. all existing openings including associated voussoirs, keystones and lug sills; 5. all tie rod rondels. The architectural features of the building are detailed in the LACAC Building Description dated June, 1987. Historical Description</td>
<td><img src="image2.jpg" alt="Photo" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The site on which the Mill is located was deeded to Joseph Oberholtzer in 1833. He constructed a frame saw mill there in the 1840's. Jacob Hespeler purchased the property in 1863 and re-deeded it to George and Shubert Randall and Herbert Marshall Farr. The frame mill (then known as the Kribs Mill) was moved to Forbes street by Lewis Kribs in 1864 to make room for the construction of a new stone mill.

The general contract for the new mill was awarded to Lewis Kribs and the masonry contract to Halle and Pabst, both of Hespeler. Shafts and running gears were supplied by Goldie and McCulloch of Galt. The mill which operated as Randall, Farr and company was sold to Robert Forbes and Jonathan Schofield in 1874. It continued to operate as Jonathan Schofield and co. until Schofield's retirement in 1880 when it became the Robert Forbes co. Ltd.

### Reasons for Designation

(a) **Historical Significance**

i. It dates from an early period in the development of the city's communities.

ii. It is associated with a person who is recognized as having made a significant contribution to the city's social, cultural, political, economic, technological or physical development or as having materially influenced the course of local, regional, provincial, national, or international history.

iii. It is a well preserved example and illustration of the city's social, cultural, political, economic or technological development history.

(b) **Architectural Significance**

i. It is a well preserved, representative example of a method of construction now rarely used.

ii. It is a good, well-preserved and representative example of its architectural style or period of building.

It terminates a view or otherwise makes an important contribution to the urban composition or streetscape of which it forms a part.

---

### Property Description

This property was identified during field review and the property description provided below is based on field observations.

**Property Description**

This property includes a Georgian style residence that was constructed prior to 1916 based on a review of historic topographic maps but likely dates to the late 19th/early 20th century based on architectural style and material (Department of Militia and Defense 1916). The residence is a two storey structure with an L-shaped plan, hipped roof and projecting eaves. The front façade (south elevation) features the original structure (left) and an eastern addition. The fenestration includes four (4) sash one over one windows with wood shutters and an exterior brick chimney. The central entrance on the original structure was not visible from the right-of-way however the upper-level entryway opens to a balcony supported by four pilasters. Two later additions are visible from the right-of-way, the first located to the east is clad in a mix of stone and clapboard with a gable roof and features a second entrance with glass panels and a five casement window. The southern addition features a cross gable roof and appears to be clad in clapboard siding. Landscape elements on the property include grass, a concrete sidewalk/walkway with ground floor steps with a single open railing.

A second structure resides on the property with a rectangular footprint, gable roof and pronounced projecting eaves clad in stucco with an offset garage door.

---

**Photographs/Digital Image**

Microsoft Bing Maps 2021
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHR NO.</th>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>HERITAGE RECOGNITION</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY</th>
<th>PHOTOGRAPHS/DIGITAL IMAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Exterior Elements</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>◦ Ontario vernacular style residence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>◦ L-shaped plan with two additions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>◦ Hipped roof and projecting eaves</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>◦ Mixture of brick, stucco, and clapboard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>◦ Four (4) sash one over one windows with wood shutters on the original structure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>◦ An exterior brick chimney on the original structure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>◦ Upper-level Balcony supported by two pilasters and separate entrance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The residence on the property is a built heritage resource with potential design/physical, historical/associative, and/or contextual value.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4 PRELIMINARY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

The MCM InfoSheet #5 gives guidance on how to complete impact assessments for built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes in the land use planning process. As discussed, the purpose of the preliminary impact assessment is to determine if identified built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes are impacted by the proposed work. This assessment will consider two categories of impacts:

- **Direct Impact:** A permanent or irreversible negative affect on the CHVI of a property that results in the loss of a heritage attribute. Direct impacts include destruction or alteration.
- **Indirect Impact:** An impact that is the result of an activity on or near a cultural heritage resource that may adversely affect the CHVI and/or heritage attributes of a property. Indirect impacts include shadows, isolation, direct or indirect obstruction of significant views or vistas, a change in land use, or land disturbances.

It should be noted that land disturbances, as defined in MCM InfoSheet #5, and described above, also apply to archaeological resources. An archaeological assessment is beyond the scope of this study since recommendations regarding archaeological resources must be made by a professional archaeologist licensed by the MCM. An archaeological assessment for this project has been undertaken under separate cover by WSP.

4.4.1 DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED WORK

4.4.1.1 PROPOSED TRAIL ALIGNMENT AND BRIDGE LOCATION

The proposed trail alignment includes a 3 m wide trail connection starting at the intersection of Queen Street West and Winston Boulevard and connecting with the Mill Run Trail approximately 20 metres west of the Silknit Dam. It runs in westerly direction from its starting point and then in a northerly direction immediately west of the Lens Mill Building until it meets with the Mill Run Trail. This alignment has a shorter length of trail (~375 metres) and will require a bridge span of ~57 metres. The proposed trail alignment is shown in Appendix C.

Due to the medium length bridge span, the proposed trail will not require a pier for the bridge structure and will be constructed as a single span bridge. As shown in the profile view (Appendix C), this alignment maintains a gradient ratio of 1:20 (5%) at the trail approach to the bridge on the north side of Speed River. To the south side, both alignments maintain the existing ground profile, which is generally flat. This is consistent with the requirement outlined in City’s Facility Accessibility Design Manual (City of Cambridge, 2014).

To avoid negative impacts on the floodplain, sections of the proposed trail connection through depressed areas were designed to include boardwalks, instead of earth fill. Additional benefit of this approach is that it will greatly reduce the footprint of the disturbance by avoiding the need for approximately four (4) metres of embankment footprint in addition to the footprint of the trail (3 m). This will significantly reduce removal of tree and vegetation in an area designated Provincially Significant Wetland. In addition, the proposed trail alignment utilizes areas immediately downstream of Silknit Dam that were previously disturbed as a result of installation of temporary bridge as part of the Hespeler Trunk Sanitary Sewer Rehabilitation project in 2017. This further greatly reduces the impact on natural environment.

There is an existing boardwalk that carries Mill Run Trail across the Ellis Creek tributary immediately downstream of Silknit Dam. This boardwalk will potentially need to be reconstructed to match the grade of the north approach to the bridge structure.
It is important to note that the proposed trail alignment considered the Conceptual Site Plan for 211-215 Queen Street West prepared by MHBC and an application for Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendment has been adopted and approved by the City of Cambridge for the redevelopment of CHR 16 (211-215 Queen Street West) under a separate project (City of Cambridge 2022). This application proposes to change the land use of this site from industrial to high-density residential (MHBC Planning 2021).

As part of the development application, a Conceptual Site Plan was submitted to the city. WSP has reviewed the Conceptual Design Plan and the proposed design of the trail and bridge are in line with the approved future use and concept for this property.

### 4.4.1.2 PROPOSED BRIDGE STRUCTURE - BOWSTRING ARCH TRUSS BRIDGE

The proposed bridge structure is a prefabricated steel bowstring arch truss bridge. A bowstring arch truss is recognizable by the “arch” shape of the top main steel chord member. The structure deck is connected to the truss vertical members, allowing the bridge to be constructed without lateral bracing overhead. The bridge will have a steel deck with a waterproofing and wearing surface system, bicycle height railing, and will be constructed of either galvanized or coated steel. A prefabricated truss bridge is fabricated in whole, or in sections in a shop, and then delivered to site to be installed with a large crane. This bridge alternative will follow the preferred trail alignment discussed in the section above. This proposed bridge structure is shown in Appendix C.

### 4.4.2 ASSESSMENT OF POTENTIAL IMPACTS

Table 4.2 provides an assessment of the Project’s potential impacts (based on the proposed work depicted in Appendix C) on the built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes identified within the Study Area. The preliminary impact assessment determined that indirect impacts are anticipated to three potential heritage properties (CHR 1, 3 and 5) and one known heritage property (CHR 16).
### Table 4.2 Impact Assessment and Mitigation Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHL/BHR No.</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Heritage Recognition</th>
<th>Anticipated Impacts</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHR 1</strong></td>
<td>CHL</td>
<td>Grand River Railway (Galt to Guelph Route)</td>
<td>Identified during field review</td>
<td>- Potential direct adverse impact from the Project</td>
<td>The proposed development includes a new 3-m wide trail that will cross the existing Grand River Railway. However, the proposed trail will not result in destruction of any part of the railway alignment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Destruction of any, or part of any, significant heritage attributes or features.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Alteration that is not sympathetic, or is incompatible, with the historic fabric and appearance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHR 2</strong></td>
<td>CHL</td>
<td>Chilligo Conservation Area</td>
<td>Identified during field review</td>
<td>- Potential direct adverse impact from the Project</td>
<td>The proposed bridge and trail are not anticipated to create shadows that will alter the appearance or viability of any potential natural features on the landscape.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Destruction of any, or part of any, significant heritage attributes or features.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Alteration that is not sympathetic, or is incompatible, with the historic fabric and appearance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHR 3</strong></td>
<td>CHL</td>
<td>Mill Run Trail</td>
<td>Identified during field review</td>
<td>- Potential direct adverse impact from the Project</td>
<td>The proposed bridge and trail will connect with the existing trail network and not result in destruction of any part of the Mill Run Trail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Destruction of any, or part of any, significant heritage attributes or features.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### CHL/BHR No.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHR 4</th>
<th>BHR</th>
<th>identified during field review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hespeler Railway Bridge</td>
<td>Identified during field review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Heritage Recognition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Heritage Recognition</th>
<th>Anticipated Impacts</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHR 4</td>
<td>BHR</td>
<td>Hespeler Railway Bridge</td>
<td>Identified during field review</td>
<td>• Alteration that is not sympathetic, or is incompatible, with the historic fabric and appearance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Potential indirect adverse impact from the Project

- **Destruction of any, or part of any, significant heritage attributes or features.**
  - The proposed development is more than 500 m from the structure and therefore will not result in the destruction of any, or part of any, significant heritage attributes or features of this resource.

- **Alteration that is not sympathetic, or is incompatible, with the historic fabric and appearance.**
  - The proposed development will not result in alteration that is not sympathetic, or incompatible, with the historic fabric and appearance of the resource. The proposed development is more than 500 m from the structure.

### Potential direct adverse impact from the Project

- **Shadows created that alter the appearance of a heritage attribute or change the viability of a natural feature or plantings, such as a garden.**
  - The proposed development is more than 500 m from the structure; therefore, the proposed development will not create shadows that will alter the appearance of any heritage attributes of the resource.

- **Isolation of a heritage attribute from its surrounding environment, context or a significant relationship.**
  - The proposed development is more than 500 m from the structure and not anticipated to isolate the resource.

- **Direct or indirect obstruction of significant views or vistas within, from, or of built and natural features.**
  - No significant views or vistas were noted to or from this bridge.

- **A change in land use such as rezoning a battlefield from open space to residential use, allowing new development or site alteration to fill in the formerly open spaces.**
  - The proposed development is not anticipated to result in a change in land use of the resource.

- **Land disturbances such as a change in grade that alters soils, and drainage patterns that adversely affect an archaeological resource.**
  - The built heritage resource is over 500 m from the proposed development and therefore beyond the reasonable and conservative distance threshold of 150 m for potential vibration effects (Wilson, Ihrig & Associates, Inc. 2012: 33).

### CHR 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHL</th>
<th>Speed River</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Potential direct adverse impact from the Project

- **Shadows created that alter the appearance of a heritage attribute or change the viability of a natural feature or plantings, such as a garden.**
  - The proposed development includes a 3 m wide trail connection from the new bridge to the existing Mill Run Trail approximately 20 metres west of the Silknet Dam. The trail connection is compatible with the current trail and will not result in an alteration that will negatively impact the Mill Run Trail.

- **Isolation of a heritage attribute from its surrounding environment, context or a significant relationship.**
  - The proposed development is not anticipated to isolate any heritage attributes of the resource from its surrounding environment, context or a significant relationship.

- **Direct or indirect obstruction of significant views or vistas within, from, or of built and natural features.**
  - The view from the Mill Race outlet at the Silknet Dam facing towards the Forbes Textile Mill is identified as culturally significant and will be altered by the introduction of the new bridge. While the bridge design is sensitive and compatible with the general character of the area, it is recommended that this view be documented prior to construction per Recommendation 3.

- **A change in land use such as rezoning a battlefield from open space to residential use, allowing new development or site alteration to fill in the formerly open spaces.**
  - The proposed development is not anticipated to result in a change in land use.

- **Land disturbances such as a change in grade that alters soils, and drainage patterns that adversely affect an archaeological resource.**
  - The proposed development will result in land disturbance. To mitigate this impact, see Recommendation 1.
### CHL/BHR No.  CHR 6
**BHR** 67 Queen Street West  Identified during field review  
**Designated as a Canadian Heritage River as part of the Grand River**

#### Anticipated Impacts
- **Potential indirect adverse impact from the Project**
  - Shadows created that alter the appearance of a heritage attribute or change the viability of a natural feature or plantings, such as a garden;
  - Isolation of a heritage attribute from its surrounding environment, context or a significant relationship;
  - Direct or indirect obstruction of significant views or vistas within, from, or of built and natural features.

#### Mitigation Measures
- The proposed development will not result in any change in the property's land use.
- The proposed development will not isolate any of the property's heritage attributes from their surrounding environment, context or a significant relationship.

### CHL/BHR No.  CHR 7
**BHR** 77 Queen Street West  Identified during field review  
**Designated as a Canadian Heritage River as part of the Grand River**

#### Anticipated Impacts
- **Potential indirect adverse impact from the Project**
  - Shadows created that alter the appearance of a heritage attribute or change the viability of a natural feature or plantings, such as a garden;
  - Isolation of a heritage attribute from its surrounding environment, context or a significant relationship;
  - Direct or indirect obstruction of significant views or vistas within, from, or of built and natural features.

#### Mitigation Measures
- The proposed development will not result in any change in the property's land use.
- The proposed development will not isolate any of the property's heritage attributes from their surrounding environment, context or a significant relationship.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHL/BHR No.</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Heritage Recognition</th>
<th>Anticipated Impacts</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| C086       | BHR  | 81 Queen Street West   | Identified during field review | • Alteration that is not sympathetic, or is incompatible, with the historic fabric and appearance.  
• Shadows created that alter the appearance of a heritage attribute or change the viability of a natural feature or plantings, such as a garden;  
• Isolation of a heritage attribute from its surrounding environment, context or a significant relationship;  
• Direct or indirect obstruction of significant views or vistas within, from, or of built and natural features.  
• A change in land use such as rezoning a battlefield from open space to residential use, allowing new development or site alteration to fill in the formerly open spaces.  
• Land disturbances such as a change in grade that alters soils, and drainage patterns that adversely affect an archaeological resource.  
• Alteration that is not sympathetic, or is incompatible, with the historic fabric and appearance.  
• Shadows created that alter the appearance of a heritage attribute or change the viability of a natural feature or plantings, such as a garden;  
• Isolation of a heritage attribute from its surrounding environment, context or a significant relationship;  
• Direct or indirect obstruction of significant views or vistas within, from, or of built and natural features.  
• A change in land use such as rezoning a battlefield from open space to residential use, allowing new development or site alteration to fill in the formerly open spaces.  
• Land disturbances such as a change in grade that alters soils, and drainage patterns that adversely affect an archaeological resource.  
• Alteration that is not sympathetic, or is incompatible, with the historic fabric and appearance.  
• Shadows created that alter the appearance of a heritage attribute or change the viability of a natural feature or plantings, such as a garden;  
• Isolation of a heritage attribute from its surrounding environment, context or a significant relationship;  
• Direct or indirect obstruction of significant views or vistas within, from, or of built and natural features.  
• A change in land use such as rezoning a battlefield from open space to residential use, allowing new development or site alteration to fill in the formerly open spaces.  
• Land disturbances such as a change in grade that alters soils, and drainage patterns that adversely affect an archaeological resource.  
• Alteration that is not sympathetic, or is incompatible, with the historic fabric and appearance. | The proposed development is more than 630 m from the property and therefore will not result in any alteration that is not sympathetic, or is incompatible, with the historic fabric and appearance of this resource.  
The proposed development will not isolate the property from its surrounding environment, context or a significant relationship.  
No significant views or vistas were noted for this property.  
The proposed development will not change the land use of the property.  
The built heritage resource is over 675 m from the proposed development and therefore beyond the reasonable and conservative distance threshold of 150 m for potential vibration effects (Wilson, Ihrig & Associates, Inc. 2012: 31).  
The proposed development is more than 630 m from the property and therefore will not result in alteration that is not sympathetic, or is incompatible, with historic fabric and appearance of the built heritage resource’s environment, context or a significant relationship.  
The proposed development is more than 630 m from the property and therefore will not result in alteration that is not sympathetic, or is incompatible, with the historic fabric and appearance.  
The proposed development is more than 630 m from the property and therefore will not result in alteration that is not sympathetic, or is incompatible, with the historic fabric and appearance.  
The proposed development is more than 630 m from the property and therefore will not result in alteration that is not sympathetic, or is incompatible, with the historic fabric and appearance.  
The proposed development is more than 630 m from the property and therefore will not result in alteration that is not sympathetic, or is incompatible, with the historic fabric and appearance. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHL/BHR No.</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Heritage Recognition</th>
<th>Anticipated Impacts</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHR 10</td>
<td>BHR</td>
<td>91 Queen Street West</td>
<td>Identified during field review</td>
<td>• Alteration that is not sympathetic, or is incompatible, with the historic fabric and appearance.</td>
<td>The proposed development is more than 620 m from the property and will not result in alteration that is not sympathetic, or is incompatible, with the historic fabric and appearance of this resource.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Potential indirect adverse impact from the Project</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Shadows created that alter the appearance of a heritage attribute or change the viability of a natural feature or plantings, such as a garden;</td>
<td>The proposed development is more than 620 m from the property and will not create shadows that will alter the appearance of any heritage attributes of this resource.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Isolation of a heritage attribute from its surrounding environment, context or a significant relationship;</td>
<td>The proposed development is more than 620 m from the property and will not result in isolation of any heritage attributes of the property from their surrounding environment, context or a significant relationship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Direct or indirect obstruction of significant views or vistas within, from, or of built and natural features.</td>
<td>No significant views were noted for the property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• A change in land use such as rezoning a battlefield from open space to residential use, allowing new development or site alteration to fill in the formerly open spaces.</td>
<td>The proposed development is more than 620 m from the property and will not result in a change in the property’s land use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Land disturbances such as a change in grade that alters soils, and drainage patterns that adversely affect an archaeological resource.</td>
<td>The built heritage resource is over 620 m from the proposed development and therefore beyond the reasonable and conservative distance threshold of 150 m for potential vibration effects (Wilson, Ihrig &amp; Associates, Inc. 2012: 31).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHR 11</td>
<td>BHR</td>
<td>103 Queen Street West</td>
<td>Identified during field review</td>
<td>Potential direct adverse impact from the Project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Destruction of any, or part of any, significant heritage attributes or features.</td>
<td>The proposed development is more than 600 m from the property and therefore will not result in the destruction of any, or part of any, significant heritage attributes or features of this resource.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Alteration that is not sympathetic, or is incompatible, with the historic fabric and appearance.</td>
<td>The proposed development is more than 600 m from the property and will not result in alteration that is not sympathetic, or is incompatible, with the historic fabric and appearance of this resource.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Potential indirect adverse impact from the Project</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Shadows created that alter the appearance of a heritage attribute or change the viability of a natural feature or plantings, such as a garden;</td>
<td>The proposed development is more than 600 m from the property will not create shadows that will alter the appearance of any of the property’s heritage attributes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Isolation of a heritage attribute from its surrounding environment, context or a significant relationship;</td>
<td>The proposed development is more than 600 m from the property and therefore will not result in isolation of any heritage attributes of the property from their surrounding environment, context or a significant relationship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Direct or indirect obstruction of significant views or vistas within, from, or of built and natural features.</td>
<td>No significant views or vistas were noted for the property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• A change in land use such as rezoning a battlefield from open space to residential use, allowing new development or site alteration to fill in the formerly open spaces.</td>
<td>The proposed development is more than 600 m from the property and will not result in a change in the property’s land use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Land disturbances such as a change in grade that alters soils, and drainage patterns that adversely affect an archaeological resource.</td>
<td>The built heritage resource is over 600 m from the proposed development and therefore beyond the reasonable and conservative distance threshold of 150 m for potential vibration effects (Wilson, Ihrig &amp; Associates, Inc. 2012: 31).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHR 12

CHL/BHR No. | Type | Location | Heritage Recognition | Anticipated Impacts | Mitigation Measures
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
 | BHR | 113-115 Queen Street West | Identified during field review | • Alteration that is not sympathetic, or is incompatible, with the historic fabric and appearance. | The proposed development is more than 540 m from the property and will not result in alteration that is not sympathetic, or is incompatible, with the historic fabric and appearance of this resource. |
| **Potential indirect adverse impact from the Project** | | | • Shadows created that alter the appearance of a heritage attribute or change the viability of a natural feature or plantings, such as a garden; | The proposed development is more than 540 m from the property and will not create shadows that will alter the appearance of any of the property’s heritage attributes. |
| | | | • Isolation of a heritage attribute from its surrounding environment, context or a significant relationship; | The proposed development is more than 540 m from the property and will not result in isolation of any heritage attributes of the property from their surrounding environment, context or a significant relationship. |
| | | | • Direct or indirect obstruction of significant views or vistas within, from, or of built and natural features. | No significant views or vistas were noted for the property. |
| | | | • A change in land use such as rezoning a battlefield from open space to residential use, allowing new development or site alteration to fill in the formerly open spaces. | The proposed development is more than 540 m from the property and will not result in a change in the property’s land use. |
| | | | • Land disturbances such as a change in grade that alters soils, and drainage patterns that adversely affect an archaeological resource. | The built heritage resource is over 540 m from the proposed development and therefore beyond the reasonable and conservative distance threshold of 150 m for potential vibration effects, excluding blasting (Wilson, Ihrig & Associates, Inc. 2012: 31). |

CHR 13

CHL/BHR No. | Type | Location | Heritage Recognition | Anticipated Impacts | Mitigation Measures
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
<p>| BHR | 119 Queen Street West | Identified during field review | • Alteration that is not sympathetic, or is incompatible, with the historic fabric and appearance. | The proposed development is more than 540 m from the property and will not result in alteration that is not sympathetic, or is incompatible, with the historic fabric and appearance of this resource. |
| <strong>Potential indirect adverse impact from the Project</strong> | | | • Shadows created that alter the appearance of a heritage attribute or change the viability of a natural feature or plantings, such as a garden; | The proposed development is more than 540 m from the property and will not create shadows that will alter the appearance of any of the property’s heritage attributes. |
| | | | • Isolation of a heritage attribute from its surrounding environment, context or a significant relationship; | The proposed development is more than 540 m from the property and will not result in isolation of any heritage attributes of the property from their surrounding environment, context or a significant relationship. |
| | | | • Direct or indirect obstruction of significant views or vistas within, from, or of built and natural features. | No significant views or vistas were identified for the property. |
| | | | • A change in land use such as rezoning a battlefield from open space to residential use, allowing new development or site alteration to fill in the formerly open spaces. | The proposed development is more than 540 m from the property and will not result in a change in the property’s land use. |
| | | | • Land disturbances such as a change in grade that alters soils, and drainage patterns that adversely affect an archaeological resource. | The built heritage resource is over 540 m from the proposed development and therefore beyond the reasonable and conservative distance threshold of 150 m for potential vibration effects, excluding blasting (Wilson, Ihrig &amp; Associates, Inc. 2012: 31). |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHL/BHR No.</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Heritage Recognition</th>
<th>Anticipated Impacts</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| CHR 14      | BHR  | 127 Queen Street West | Listed on the City of Cambridge Heritage Register  
(Dilse p. 38) | **Potential direct adverse impact from the Project**  
- Alteration that is not sympathetic, or is incompatible, with the historic fabric and appearance.  
- Destruction of any, or part of any, significant heritage attributes or features.  
- Isolation of a heritage attribute from its surrounding environment, context or a significant relationship;  
- Direct or indirect obstruction of significant views or vistas within, from, or of built and natural features.  
- A change in land use such as rezoning a battlefield from open space to residential use, allowing new development or site alteration to fill in the formerly open spaces.  
- Land disturbances such as a change in grade that alters soils, and drainage patterns that adversely affect an archaeological resource. | The proposed development is more than 475 m from the property and therefore will not result in alteration that is not sympathetic, or is incompatible, with the historic fabric and appearance of this resource. The proposed development is more than 475 m from the property and therefore will not result in isolation of any heritage attributes of the property from their surrounding environment, context or a significant relationship. The proposed development is more than 475 m from the property and therefore will not result in alteration that is not sympathetic, or is incompatible, with the historic fabric and appearance of this resource. No significant views or vistas have been noted for the property. The proposed development is more than 475 m from the property and therefore will not result in a change in the property’s land use. The built heritage resource is over 500 m from the proposed development and therefore beyond the reasonable and conservative distance threshold of 150 m for potential vibration effects (Wilson, Ihrig & Associates, Inc. 2012: 31). |
| CHR 15      | BHR  | 147 Queen Street West | Identified during field review | **Potential direct adverse impact from the Project**  
- Alteration that is not sympathetic, or is incompatible, with the historic fabric and appearance.  
- Destruction of any, or part of any, significant heritage attributes or features. | The proposed development is more than 400 m from the property and therefore will not result in the destruction of any, or part of any, significant heritage attributes or features of this resource. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHL/BHR No.</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Heritage Recognition</th>
<th>Anticipated Impacts</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHL</td>
<td>CHL</td>
<td>211-215 Queen Street West</td>
<td>National Historic Site Designated Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act Listed in the Heritage River Inventory for the Grand River Watershed</td>
<td>• Alteration that is not sympathetic, or is incompatible, with the historic fabric and appearance.</td>
<td>While the proposed development is within the boundaries of this property, it will not result in the destruction of any significant heritage attributes or features of the property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Shadows created that alter the appearance of a heritage attribute or change the viability of a natural feature or plantings, such as a garden;</td>
<td>The proposed development will not cast shadows that will alter the appearance of any of the property’s heritage attributes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Isolation of a heritage attribute from its surrounding environment, context or a significant relationship;</td>
<td>The proposed development will not isolate any heritage attributes of the property from their surrounding environment, context or a significant relationship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Direct or indirect obstruction of significant views or vistas within, from, or of built and natural features.</td>
<td>No significant views or vistas have been noted for the property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• A change in land use such as rezoning a battlefield from open space to residential use, allowing new development or site alteration to fill in the formerly open spaces.</td>
<td>The proposed development is more than 400 m from the property and will not result in a change in the property’s land use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Land disturbances such as a change in grade that alters soils, and drainage patterns that adversely affect an archaeological resource.</td>
<td>The heritage attributes of the property are approximately 5 m from the proposed location of the bridge and at risk of impact from construction vibration. To mitigate this impact, see Recommendation 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Identified during field review</td>
<td>• Alteration that is not sympathetic, or is incompatible, with the historic fabric and appearance.</td>
<td>The proposed development is more than 445 m from the property and will not result in alteration that is not sympathetic, or is incompatible, with the historic fabric and appearance of this resource.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Shadows created that alter the appearance of a heritage attribute or change the viability of a natural feature or plantings, such as a garden;</td>
<td>The proposed development will not alter the appearance of any of the property’s heritage attributes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Isolation of a heritage attribute from its surrounding environment, context or a significant relationship;</td>
<td>The proposed development will not create shadows that will alter the appearance of any of the property’s heritage attributes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Direct or indirect obstruction of significant views or vistas within, from, or of built and natural features.</td>
<td>No significant views or vistas have been noted for the property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• A change in land use such as rezoning a battlefield from open space to residential use, allowing new development or site alteration to fill in the formerly open spaces.</td>
<td>The proposed development is more than 400 m from the property and will not result in a change in the property’s land use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Land disturbances such as a change in grade that alters soils, and drainage patterns that adversely affect an archaeological resource.</td>
<td>The built heritage resource is over 400 m from the proposed development and therefore beyond the reasonable and conservative distance threshold of 150 m for potential vibration effects (Wilson, Ihrig &amp; Associates, Inc. 2012: 31).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHR 16</td>
<td>BHR</td>
<td>345 Queen Street West</td>
<td>Identified during field review</td>
<td>• Alteration that is not sympathetic, or is incompatible, with the historic fabric and appearance.</td>
<td>The built heritage resource is over 400 m from the proposed development and therefore beyond the reasonable and conservative distance threshold of 150 m for potential vibration effects (Wilson, Ihrig &amp; Associates, Inc. 2012: 31).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mitigation Measures**

- The proposed development is more than 445 m from the property and will not result in alteration that is not sympathetic, or is incompatible, with the historic fabric and appearance of this resource.
- The bridge and trail have been designed in a manner that is sympathetic and compatible with the historical character of this property. No alterations are proposed for the built heritage resources on the property.
- While the proposed development is within the boundaries of this property, it will not result in the destruction of any significant heritage attributes or features of the property.
- The proposed development will not cast shadows that will alter the appearance of any of the property’s heritage attributes.
- The proposed development will not isolate any heritage attributes of the property from their surrounding environment, context or a significant relationship.
- No significant views or vistas have been noted for the property.
- Although representing a change in land use from industrial to recreational, the proposed development will not result in an adverse impact from a change in land use.
- The proposed development is more than 400 m from the property and will not result in a change in the property’s land use.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHL/BHR No.</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Heritage Recognition</th>
<th>Anticipated Impacts</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Alteration that is not sympathetic, or is incompatible, with the historic fabric and appearance.</td>
<td>The proposed development is more than 445 m from the property and will not result in alteration that is not sympathetic, or is incompatible, with the historic fabric and appearance of this resource.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Potential indirect adverse impact from the Project</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Shadows created that alter the appearance of a heritage attribute or change the visibility of a natural feature or plantings, such as a garden;</td>
<td>The proposed development is more than 445 m from the property and will not create shadows that will alter the appearance of any of the property’s heritage attributes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Isolation of a heritage attribute from its surrounding environment, context or a significant relationship;</td>
<td>The proposed development is more than 445 m from the property and therefore will not result in isolation of any heritage attributes of the property from their surrounding environment, context or a significant relationship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Direct or indirect obstruction of significant views or vistas within, from, or of built and natural features.</td>
<td>No significant views or vistas have been noted for the property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• A change in land use such as rezoning a battlefield from open space to residential use, allowing new development or site alteration to fill in the formerly open spaces.</td>
<td>The proposed development is more than 445 m from the property and will not result in a change in the property’s land use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Land disturbances such as a change in grade that alters soils, and drainage patterns that adversely affect an archaeological resource.</td>
<td>The built heritage resource is over 445 m from the proposed development and therefore beyond the reasonable and conservative distance threshold of 150 m for potential vibration effects (Wilson, Ihlig &amp; Associates, Inc. 2012: 31).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5 RECOMMENDATIONS

WSP was retained by the City of Cambridge to conduct a CHAR as part of the development and design of a proposed pedestrian bridge across the Speed River in the City of Cambridge, Ontario. The bridge would link the existing Mill Run trail on the north side of the Speed River (south of Chilligo Conservation Area) and the new proposed trail on the south side of the Speed River along Queen Street West, between Guelph Avenue and Winston Boulevard. The property is located at 211/215 Queen Street West on the south bank of the Speed River, with portions within the Chilligo Conservation Area on the north bank (the “Project Footprint”). The Study Area encompasses the Project Footprint plus a 25m buffer.

The Study Area was historically located on Part of Lot 9 Beasley Lower Block Concession 2 and Lot 10 Beasley Lower Block Concessions 2 and 3 in the former Geographic Township of Waterloo, Waterloo County (Appendix A: Figures 1, 2 and 3). Approximately 26.3 hectares (“ha”) in size, the Study Area includes private land and lands owned by the City of Cambridge and the Grand River Conservation Authority (GRCA).

Background research, consultation, and a field review determined that there are 17 potential and protected heritage properties within the Study Area (CHR1-CHR17). Of these, one is listed as a National Historic Site of Canada and is designated under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act, one is designated as part of a Canadian Heritage River, and one is listed on the City of Cambridge Heritage Register. The remaining 14 were identified during the field review as having potential cultural heritage value or interest.

Drawings of the proposed bridge and trail connection were reviewed to determine whether the project has the potential to result in direct or indirect impacts to the identified built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes. Overall, WSP found that the proposed bridge and trail pose a minimal impact to cultural heritage resources given the small scale of the bridge and reuse/adaptation of existing circulation routes for the trail. Both the bridge and trail have been designed in a sensitive and compatible manner that is supportive of the general heritage character of the area. In addition, the proposed bridge and trail were designed to integrate with the approved Conceptual Site Plan, Official Plan Amendment, and Zoning By-law Amendment for 211-215 Queen Street West (CHR 16) that have been developed for a separate project to guide the redevelopment of this site.

To conserve the CHVI and heritage attributes of the known and potential heritage resources within the Study Area, WSP recommends the following actions:

1 Indirect negative impacts related to a change in land use and land disturbance are predicted for CHR2 and CHR5. Since CHR2 was identified as having potential CHVI through Indigenous engagement and CHR5 is a Canadian Heritage River with recognized Indigenous heritage values, Indigenous Nations with an interest in the project should be engaged when developing the post-construction landscape plan.

2 Potential indirect impacts related to construction vibration have been identified for CHR 16. To avoid or reduce adverse impacts from heavy equipment vibration during the proposed bridge, trail and associated construction, a qualified vibration specialist should be consulted to assess the vibration risks and develop and appropriate vibration monitoring protocol.

3 The view at CHR 3 from the Mill Race outlet at the Silknet Dam facing towards the Forbes Textile Mill has been identified as culturally significant and is anticipated to be affected by introduction of the new bridge. To mitigate this impact, the significant view should be documented prior to construction through photography and written description.
The location of all identified resources (CHR1-CHR17) should be clearly marked on project mapping and their significance communicated to all project personnel.

The above recommendations were prepared using the proposed development plans contained defined in Section 4.4.1 and depicted in Appendix C. Should the proposed work be updated or changed, then this CHAR should be revised to confirm impacts and recommended mitigation measures.
6 ASSESSOR QUALIFICATIONS

This report was prepared and reviewed by the undersigned, employees of WSP. The qualifications of the assessors involved in the preparation of this report are provided in Appendix D.
7 CLOSURE

This report was prepared for the exclusive use of the City of Cambridge and is intended to provide a Cultural Heritage Assessment Report of the Study Area. The property is located at 211/215 Queen Street West on the south bank of the Speed River and portions within the Chilligo Conservation Area on the north bank within the City of Cambridge, Ontario. The Study Area was historically located on Part of Lot 9 Beasley Lower Block Concession 2 and Lot 10 Beasley Lower Block Concessions 2 and 3 in the former Geographic Township of Waterloo, Waterloo County.

Any use which a third party makes of this report, or any reliance on or decisions to be made based on it, are the responsibility of the third party. Should additional parties require reliance on this report, written authorization from WSP will be required. With respect to third parties, WSP has no liability or responsibility for losses of any kind whatsoever, including direct or consequential financial effects on transactions or property values, or requirements for follow-up actions and costs.

The report is based on data and information collected during the cultural heritage assessment conducted by WSP. It is based solely a review of historical information, a property reconnaissance conducted in September 2020 and data obtained by WSP as described in this report. Except as otherwise maybe specified, WSP disclaims any obligation to update this report for events taking place, or with respect to information that becomes available to WSP after the time during which WSP conducted the cultural heritage assessment. In evaluating the Study Area, WSP has relied in good faith on information provided by other individuals noted in this report. WSP has assumed that the information provided is factual and accurate. In addition, the findings in this report are based, to a large degree, upon information provided by the current owner/occupant. WSP accepts no responsibility for any deficiency, misstatement or inaccuracy contained in this report as a result of omissions, misinterpretations or fraudulent acts of persons interviewed or contacted.

WSP makes no other representations whatsoever, including those concerning the legal significance of its findings, or as to other legal matters touched on in this report, including, but not limited to, ownership of any property, or the application of any law to the facts set forth herein. With respect to regulatory compliance issues, regulatory statutes are subject to interpretation and change. Such interpretations and regulatory changes should be reviewed with legal counsel.

This report is also subject to the further Standard Limitations contained in Appendix E.

We trust that the information presented in this report meets your current requirements. Should you have any questions, or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned.
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Appendix B

Historic Photographs
Plate C1: The Forbes Mill in 1866, Hespeler, Ontario (Toronto Public Library, Digital Archives 1866)

Plate C2: The Forbes Mill in 1899, Hespeler, Ontario (Toronto Public Library, Digital Archives 1899)
Plate C3: The Forbes Mill in 1900, Hespeler, Ontario (Toronto Public Library, Digital Archives 1900)

Plate C4: The Canadian Woollen Mills, Limited - Avenue Street Front, Hespeler, Ontario (Toronto Public Library, Digital Archives 1901)
Plate C5: The Canadian Woolen Mills, Limited - Avenue Street Front, Hespeler, Ontario (Toronto Public Library, Digital Archives 1954a)

Plate C6: Dominion Woollens and Worsted, Hespeler, Ontario (Toronto Public Library, Digital Archives 1954b)
Plate C7: Photographs of the Forbes Mill Complex taken 14 July 1988 (Holland 2021)
Plate C8: Photographs of the Forbes Mill Complex taken 14 July 1988 (Holland 2021)
Plate C9: Photographs of the Forbes Mill Complex taken 14 July 1988 (Holland 2021)
Plate C10: Photographs of the Forbes Mill Complex taken 14 July 1988 (Holland 2021)
Plate C11: Original building #1 of Farr and Randall, built by Lewis Kribs (Hespeler Heritage Centre 2020)

Plate C12: Hespeler Mill Fire 1995 (Hespeler Heritage Centre 2020)
Plate C13: Hespeler Mill Fire 1995 (Hespeler Heritage Centre 2020)

Plate C14: Remains of Building #2 (Hespeler Heritage Centre 2020)
Appendix C

Proposed Development
Appendix D

Assessor Qualifications
Assessor Qualifications

Heidy Schopf, MES, CAHP – Built and Landscape Heritage Team Lead - Heidy Schopf the Built and Landscape Heritage Team Lead at WSP. She has over ten years’ experience in Cultural Resource Management. She is a professional member of the Canadian Association of Heritage Professionals (CAHP) and is MTO RAQs certified in archaeology/heritage. She has worked on a wide variety of projects throughout Ontario, including: cultural heritage resources assessments, heritage impact assessments, documentation reports, cultural heritage evaluations, strategic conservation plans, heritage conservation district studies and plans and AAs. Ms. Schopf has extensive experience applying local, Provincial, and Federal heritage guidelines and regulations to evaluate protected and potential cultural heritage properties. She is skilled at carrying out impact assessments and developing mitigation measures to conserve the heritage attributes of properties where changes are proposed.

Henry Cary, Ph.D., CAHP, RPA – Senior Staff Archaeologist - Dr. Henry Cary has over 20 years of public and private-sector experience directing archaeological and cultural heritage projects in urban, rural, Arctic and Sub-Arctic environments in Canada as well as the Republic of South Africa, Italy, and France. His career has included positions as project archaeologist and cultural resource management specialist for Parks Canada’s Fort Henry National Historic Site Conservation Program and Western Arctic Field Unit, Heritage Manager for the Town of Lunenburg UNESCO World Heritage Site, and senior-level archaeologist and cultural heritage specialist for CH2M and Golder Associates. He currently holds a Professional Archaeology Licence (P327) issued by the Ontario MCM, is MTO RAQs certified in Archaeology/Heritage and is a member of the Canadian Association of Heritage Professionals (CAHP) and Register of Professional Archaeologists (RPA). His education includes a B.A. in Prehistoric Archaeology and Anthropology from Wilfrid Laurier University, a MA in Historical Archaeology from Memorial University, and a Ph.D. in War Studies from the Royal Military College of Canada. Currently, Henry also is an Adjunct Professor of Anthropology at Saint Mary’s University and for the past five years has lectured in the Anthropology, Classics, and Visual & Material Culture departments at Mount Allison University.

Chelsea Dickinson, BA Hons.- Cultural Heritage Specialist | Research Archaeologist - Ms. Dickinson holds an Honours B.A. Degree in Near Eastern and Classical Archaeology from Wilfrid Laurier University, and a Post-Graduate Certificate in Geographical Information Systems from Fanshawe College. She has been working in the field of cultural resource management since 2015 and holds an Applied Research license (License R1194) in Archaeology from the Ontario Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism. Ms. Dickinson has worked on a wide variety of projects throughout Ontario, including: Cultural Heritage Assessments Reports (CHARs), Cultural Heritage Reports (CHRs under TPAP), Heritage Impact Assessments (HIAs), Cultural Heritage Evaluation Reports (CHERs) using Ontario Regulation 9/06 and 10/06, Strategic Conservation Plans (SCP), and AAs (Stage 1-4) throughout Ontario. Ms. Dickinson has been the prime/co-author on a multitude of archaeological (i.e., Stage 1-4) and cultural heritage assessment reports (i.e., CHAR, CHER, HIA, CHDR), specializing in historical background research across Ontario. Ms. Dickinson has had the privilege of working alongside a multitude of First Nation community members while conducting AAs in both Northern and Southern Ontario. In addition, she has experience using ArcGIS/Collector and high precision GPS technologies, specifically Top Con Hi SR and FC5000 positioning systems, used to map in architectural features, diagnostic artifacts, as well as topographical anomalies and site boundaries.
Appendix E

Limitations
Limitations

1. The work performed in the preparation of this report and the conclusions presented are subject to the following:
   a. The Standard Terms and Conditions which form a part of our Professional Services Contract;
   b. The Scope of Services;
   c. Time and Budgetary limitations as described in our Contract; and
   d. The Limitations stated herein.

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

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

4. The environmental conditions at the Site were assessed, within the limitations set out above, having due regard for applicable environmental regulations as of the date of the inspection. A review of compliance by past owners or occupants of the Site with any applicable local, provincial or federal bylaws, orders-in-council, legislative enactments and regulations was not performed.

5. The Site history research included obtaining information from third parties and employees or agents of the owner. No attempt has been made to verify the accuracy of any information provided, unless specifically noted in our report.

6. Where testing was performed, it was carried out in accordance with the terms of our contract providing for testing. Other substances, or different quantities of substances testing for, may be present on-site and may be revealed by different or other testing not provided for in our contract.

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

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

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

10. This report is not to be given over to any third party for any purpose whatsoever without the written permission of WSP.
Provided that the report is still reliable, and less than 12 months old, WSP will issue a third-party reliance letter to parties that the client identifies in writing, upon payment of the then current fee for such letters. All third parties relying on WSP’s report, by such reliance agree to be bound by our proposal and WSP’s standard reliance letter. WSP’s standard reliance letter indicates that in no event shall WSP be liable for any damages, howsoever arising, relating to third-party reliance on WSP’s report. No reliance by any party is permitted without such agreement.
June 24 2024

Mayor and Councillors:

Last week I became aware of the proposed Arts Hub for 19 Cambridge St and was dismayed that this matter had not been brought before the Arts & Cultural Advisory Committee. As Chair of that committee, I feel that proposals such as this are definitely within our mandate. We feel that we should have been consulted before this being put on Council’s agenda.

I have discussed this with the other members of ACAC and, considering such short notice, I have not received responses from all the members of the committee. Although we do not have detailed information, those I managed to contact expressed support in principle, but if approved, then ACAC definitely needs to be part of the process whereby the business plan for the Arts Hub is created.

I must add that, due to the short notice, no vote was taken by the members of ACAC and therefore, I am speaking only as myself and not on behalf of the committee as a whole.

Brad McEwen