Tuesday, February 16, 2016
7:00 p.m. – Regular Meeting

Council Committee Room
4th Floor, City Hall

Members:  Peter Dymond, Co-Chair
          Paul Willoughby, Co-Chair
          Michael Avis
          Chris Bejnare
          Harry Blackburn
          Jeff Chalmers
          Steve Collie
          Herman Custodio
          Kathryn Fowlston
          Doug McLeod
          Anthony Simone
          David Whyte
          Ken Wilde
          City Councillor Doug Whillans – Wards 2 and 6

For inquiries about this Agenda, or to make arrangements for accessibility accommodations for persons attending (some advance notice may be required), please contact:

           Terri Brenton, Legislative Coordinator
           Phone 905.874.2106, TTY 905.874.2130, cityclerksoffice@brampton.ca

Note: Some meeting information may also be available in alternate formats, upon request
Please ensure all cell phones, personal digital assistants (PDAs) and other electronic devices are turned off or placed on non-audible mode during the meeting.

1. **Approval of Agenda**

2. **Declarations of Interest under the Municipal Conflict of Interest Act**

3. **Previous Minutes**
   3.1. **Draft Minutes – Brampton Heritage Board – January 19, 2016**

   The minutes are pending consideration by the Planning and Infrastructure Services Committee on February 22, 2016, and the recommendations are pending approval by Council on February 24, 2016.

   The minutes are provided for the Board’s information.

4. **Consent**

   * The following item(s) listed with an asterisk (*) are considered to be routine and non-controversial by the Committee and will be approved at one time. There will be no separate discussion of these items unless a Committee Member requests it, in which case the item will not be consented to and will be considered in the normal sequence of the agenda.

   **(12.1)**

5. **Delegations/Presentations**

   5.1. Delegations from DeFilippis Design, Agents for the Property Owners, re: **Heritage Permit Application – 7534 Creditview Road – Ward 6:**

   1. Nick DeFilippis
   2. Tejpaul Kaloe

   See Item 10.1

6. **Sub-Committees**

   6.1. **Minutes – Outreach and Marketing Sub-Committee – January 28, 2016**

   *To be received*
7. **Designation Program**

7.1. **Proposed Designations**

See attached list.

7.2. A heritage designation by-law for the following property was passed at the Council Meeting of January 27, 2016:

- 73 Main Street South - Ward 3 (By-law 5-2016)

A copy of the by-law is available on request from the City Clerk’s Office.

8. **Heritage Impact Assessments (HIA)**

9. **Correspondence**

10. **Other/New Business**


See Item 5.1

*Recommendation*

10.2. **Heritage Permit Application – 7611 Creditview Road – Ward 6** (File HE.x).

*Recommendation*


*Recommendation*

10.4. Verbal Update from Stavroula Kassaris, Heritage Coordinator, Planning and Infrastructure Services, re: **Public Open House – Draft Main Street South Heritage Conservation District Plan – Ward 3**
10.5. Verbal Update from Stavroula Kassaris, Heritage Coordinator, Planning and Infrastructure Services, re: Loss of Heritage Resource to Fire – 6791 Mayfield Road – Ward 10

11. Referred/Deferred Items

12. Information Items


13. Question Period

14. Public Question Period

  15 Minute Limit (regarding any decision made at the meeting)

15. Adjournment

Next Meeting: Tuesday, March 15, 2016 – 7:00 p.m.
Tuesday, January 19, 2016

Members Present:  
Paul Willoughby, Co-Chair  
Michael Avis  
Chris Bejnar  
Harry Blackburn  
Steve Collie  
Herman Custodio  
Kathryn Fowlston  
Doug McLeod  
Anthony Simone  
David Whyte  
Ken Wilde

Members Absent:  
Peter Dymond, Co-Chair (regrets)  
Jeff Chalmers (regrets)  
Gugni Gill (see Item 10.6)  
Mandeep Kundan (see Item 10.6)  
Debbi Visser (see Item 10.6)  
City Councillor Doug Whillans – Wards 2 and 6 (regrets – personal)

Staff Present:  
Planning and Infrastructure Services Department:  
Stavroula Kassaris, Heritage Coordinator  
Antonietta Minichillo, Heritage Coordinator  
Corporate Services Department:  
Terri Brenton, Legislative Coordinator
The meeting was called to order at 7:03 p.m. and adjourned at 8:42 p.m.

1. **Approval of Agenda**

   Discussion took place with respect to amendments to the agenda.

   The following motion was considered.

   HB001-2016 That the agenda for the Brampton Heritage Board Meeting of January 19, 2016 be approved as amended as follows:

   **To add resignations from the following Members to Item 10.6:**
   - Gugni Gill
   - Mandeep Kundan

   Carried

2. **Declarations of Interest under the Municipal Conflict of Interest Act** – nil

3. **Previous Minutes**

   3.1. Minutes – Brampton Heritage Board – November 17, 2015

   The minutes were considered by Planning and Infrastructure Services Committee on December 7, 2015, and the recommendations were approved by Council on December 9, 2015.

   The minutes were provided for the Board’s information.

4. **Consent**

   Items 12.1 and 12.2 were removed from Consent.

5. **Delegations/Presentations**

   5.1. Presentation by Rebecca Sciarra, Cultural Heritage Specialist Manager, ASI, re: **City of Brampton Cultural Heritage Policy Review** (File H.Ex. OP Review).

   Rebecca Sciarra, Cultural Heritage Specialist Manager, ASI, introduced Joel Konrad from ASI, and Richard Unterman from Unterman McPhail Associates.
Ms. Sciarra provided a presentation entitled “City of Brampton Cultural Heritage Policy Review”, which included the following:

- Agenda
- Reasons for the Review
- Process and Scope of the Review
- Work to Date
- Roundtable Question
- Contact Information

Ms. Sciarra requested feedback from the Board with respect to successes and challenges with heritage policies.

Board feedback included:

- balancing intensification and cultural heritage conservation, particularly in light of downtown Brampton being identified by the Provincial Government as an urban growth centre
- impact of development on cultural heritage resources in both urban and rural areas
- need for enhanced communication between City Council, senior staff and the Board on matters such as the future of the Heritage Theatre, potential impact of Light Rail Transit (LRT) on cultural heritage resources along Main Street South
- advantages of linking heritage with tourism
- benefits of having a single staff member working on all City-owned heritage resources to provide for dedicated stewardship and marketing of these resources
- need for concentrated marketing of City-owned heritage resources, e.g. Memorial Arena, Alderlea, reconstructed CPR Station
- impacts of the Province’s changes to the archaeological program on municipal Heritage Coordinators
- article in the Winter 2016 edition of the Community Heritage Ontario “CHO News” publication (included in the agenda for this meeting) outlining seven recommendations for strengthening the Ontario Heritage Act
- promoting heritage conservation to downtown business and home owners
- loss of farmland and agricultural heritage in the City over the past several years
- introducing students to Brampton’s heritage at the elementary school level, which could include student tours of heritage resources, and inclusion of local heritage in the school curriculum
- early identification and planning for potential future heritage sites
- benefits of the City’s financial incentive programs toward heritage conservation, i.e. Façade and Building Improvement Programs, Designated Heritage Property Incentive Grant, the need for permanent programs, and increases in grant amounts
• value of having a Heritage Property Tax Rebate Program toward encouraging owners to designate their properties
• suggestion that Provincial lottery funds be made available for heritage conservation
• impact of Ontario Municipal Board decisions on heritage preservation

Ms. Sciarra thanked Board Members for their input, and provided her contact information for Members to forward any additional comments.

The following motion was considered.

HB002-2016 That the presentation by Rebecca Sciarra, Cultural Heritage Specialist Manager, ASI, to the Brampton Heritage Board Meeting of January 19, 2016, re: City of Brampton Cultural Heritage Policy Review (File H.Ex. OP Review), be received.

Carried

6. **Sub-Committees**

6.1. **Minutes – Outreach and Marketing Sub-Committee – November 26, 2015**

Michael Avis, Sub-Committee Chair, provided an overview of the subject meeting, highlighting outreach activities at a Flowertown Probus Club meeting in December 2015, and the upcoming “Highlight on Heritage” event taking place on February 13, 2016 at the Bramalea City Centre.

The following motion was considered.

HB003-2016 That the Minutes of the Outreach and Marketing Sub-Committee Meeting of November 26, 2015, to the Brampton Heritage Board Meeting of January 19, 2016, be received.

Carried

7. **Designation Program**

7.1. **Proposed Designations**

A list of properties proposed for heritage designation was included with the agenda for this meeting. No updates were provided with respect to the properties on the list.
8. **Heritage Impact Assessments (HIA)** – nil

9. **Correspondence** – nil

10. **Other/New Business**


Stavroula Kassaris, Heritage Coordinator, Planning and Infrastructure Services, provided an overview of the subject report.

The following motion was considered.

**HB004-2016**

1. That the report from Stavroula Kassaris, Heritage Coordinator, Planning and Infrastructure Services, dated January 6, 2016, to the Brampton Heritage Board Meeting of January 19, 2016, re: Heritage Designation under Part IV, Section 29 of the Ontario Heritage Act – 27 Wellington Street East – Ward 3 (HE.x 27 Wellington St E), be received; and,

2. That designation of 27 Wellington Street East under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act, as a property of cultural heritage significance, be approved; and,

3. That staff be authorized to publish and serve the Notice of Intention to Designate in accordance with the requirements under the Ontario Heritage Act; and,

4. That, if there are no objections to the designation in accordance with the provisions of the Ontario Heritage Act, a by-law be passed to designate the subject property; and,

5. That, if there are any objections in accordance with the provisions of the Ontario Heritage Act, staff be directed to refer the proposed designation to the Ontario Conservation Review Board; and,
6. That staff be authorized to attend the Conservation Review Board hearing process in support of Council’s decision to designate the subject property.

Carried

10.2. Discussion at the request of Michael Avis, Board Member, re: **Highlight on Heritage – Saturday, February 13, 2016 – Bramalea City Centre**

Steve Collie, event organizer on behalf of the Board, highlighted that this is the 9th year of the event, and provided details on display location and set up requirements, other participating groups, roles and responsibilities for participating Board Members.

The following motion was considered.

HB005-2016 That the Brampton Heritage Board organize and participate in the “Highlight on Heritage” event taking place at Bramalea City Centre on Saturday, February 13, 2016.

Carried

10.3. Discussion at the request of Paul Willoughby, Co-Chair, re: **Delegation to Heritage Milton – Brampton’s Heritage Program**

Paul Willoughby, Co-Chair, indicated a Member from Heritage Milton requested his attendance at an upcoming meeting to provide information on Brampton’s Heritage Program, and the Board’s outreach activities.

Mr. Willoughby requested the Board’s consideration for his delegation to Heritage Milton.

The following motion was considered.

HB006-2016 That Paul Willoughby, Co-Chair, be authorized to delegate at an upcoming Heritage Milton meeting, on behalf of the Brampton Heritage Board, to provide information about Brampton’s Heritage Program and the Board’s outreach activities.

Carried
10.4. Verbal Update from Antonietta Minichillo, Heritage Coordinator, Planning and Infrastructure Services, re: Churchville Public Art for 200th Anniversary – Ward 6

Antonietta Minichillo, Heritage Coordinator, Planning and Infrastructure Services, provided a verbal update on this matter, which included:
- background on the project
- results of a survey completed by over 60 members of the community
- Terms of Reference
- selected location (Sid Manser Park)
- Request for Proposal process
- lead Department (Public Services – Recreation and Culture)

Ms. Minichillo responded to questions from the Board with respect to the earlier informal process, the proposed budget, and inclusion of a special one-page insert in the Brampton Heritage Times newsletter for distribution to the Churchville community.

The following motion was considered.

HB007-2016 That the verbal update from Antonietta Minichillo, Heritage Coordinator, Planning and Infrastructure Services, to the Brampton Heritage Board Meeting of January 19, 2016, re: Churchville Public Art for 200th Anniversary – Ward 6, be received.
Carried

10.5. Verbal Update from Antonietta Minichillo, Heritage Coordinator, Planning and Infrastructure Services, re: Community Mailbox Upgrade in Churchville – Ward 6

Antonietta Minichillo, Heritage Coordinator, Planning and Infrastructure Services, provided a verbal update on this matter, which included:
- Indication that Canada Post contacted staff about upgrading the existing community mailboxes
- photograph of the existing location
- proposed locations considered and final location selected

Ms. Minichillo responded to questions about design options for the community mailboxes.

The following motion was considered.
HB008-2016

That the verbal update from Antonietta Minichillo, Heritage Coordinator, Planning and Infrastructure Services, to the Brampton Heritage Board Meeting of January 19, 2016 re: **Community Mailbox Upgrade in Churchville – Ward 6**, be received.

Carried

10.6. Verbal advisory from the City Clerk's Office, re: **Resignations from Membership on the Brampton Heritage Board**

Terri Brenton, Legislative Coordinator, Corporate Services, provided a verbal update from the City Clerk's Office advising that the following Members submitted resignations from membership on the Board:
- Gugni Gill
- Mandeep Kundan
- Debbi Visser

Ms. Brenton confirmed that a recruit will be undertaken to fill the resulting vacancies.

The following motion was considered.

HB009-2016

1. That the verbal advisory from Terri Brenton, Legislative Coordinator, City Clerk’s Office, Corporate Services, re: **Resignations from Membership on the Brampton Heritage Board**, be received; and,

2. That the resignations from the following Members be accepted:
   - Gugni Gill
   - Mandeep Kundan
   - Debbi Visser

Carried

11. **Referred/Deferred Items** – nil

12. **Information Items**

12.1. **2016 Brampton City Council and Committee Meeting Schedule**
In response to a question from the Board about there being no scheduled meeting in August 2016, staff indicated that a meeting could be held, if required, at the call of the Chair.


Paul Willoughby, Co-Chair, encouraged Board Members to read the article by Carla Mackie, from Friends of Vineland Public School and the Town of Lincoln Municipal Heritage Committee, outlining seven recommendations for strengthening the *Ontario Heritage Act*.

13. **Question Period**

Staff responded to questions from the Board with respect to:
- potential re-use of the bell from the old Churchville School House
- availability of the former Churchville Fire Hall for community meetings

14. **Public Question Period** – nil

15. **Adjournment**

The following motion was considered.

HB010-2016 That the Brampton Heritage Board do now adjourn to meet again on Tuesday, February 16, 2016 at 7:00 p.m. or at the call of the Chair.

Carried

____________________________  ____________________________
Co-Chair – Peter Dymond   Co-Chair – Paul Willoughby
5.1 Corporate Services

Council and Administrative Services

Request for Delegation

Attention: City Clerk's Office, City of Brampton, 2 Wellington Street West, Brampton ON L6Y 4R2
Email: cityclerksoffice@brampton.ca Telephone: (905) 874-2100 Fax: (905) 874-2119

Meeting: ☐ City Council ☐ Planning & Infrastructure Services Committee
☐ Corporate Svcs. Cmtee ☐ Community & Public Services Committee
☐ Economic Dev. Committee ☐ Other: HERITAGE COMMITTEE

Meeting Date Requested: Jan 19, 16
Agenda Item (if applicable):

Name of Individual(s): NICK DAFILIPPIS / TAJAULI MILLER

Position/Title: OWNER'S AGENTS

Organization/Person being Represented: DAFILIPPIS DESIGN

Full Address for Contact: 201-687 FARTON ST.
STEVEN CREEK DR. LE9 5L9

Telephone No. ___________________________ Email/Fax No. dafilippisdesign@bellnet.ca

Subject Matter to be Discussed: APPROVAL OF GARAGE ADDITION TO EXISTING
TWO STORY SINGLE FAMILY DWELLING

Action Requested: ADDRESS HERITAGE COMMITTEE

Note: a delegation is limited to not more than five minutes.

I am submitting a formal presentation to accompany my delegation: ☐ Yes ☑ No

I will require the following audio-visual equipment/software for my presentation:
☐ Computer Notebook ☐ DVD Player ☐ PowerPoint
☐ Other - please specify: N/A

Note: Delegates are requested to provide to the City Clerk’s Office well in advance of the meeting date: (i) 25 copies of all background material and/or presentations for publication with the meeting agenda and/or distribution at the meeting, and (ii) for PowerPoint and other visual presentations, an electronic copy of the presentation (e.g., DVD, CD, .ppt file) to ensure compatibility with corporate equipment.

Once the above information is received by the City Clerk’s Office, you will be contacted by a Legislative Coordinator to confirm your placement on the appropriate agenda.

Personal information on this form is collected under authority of the Municipal Act, SO 2001, c.25 and/or the Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, c.P.13 and will be used in the preparation of the applicable council/committee agenda and will be attached to that agenda. Questions about the collection of personal information should be directed to the Deputy City Clerk, Council and Administrative Services, 2 Wellington Street West, Brampton, Ontario, L6Y 4R2, tel. 905-874-2115.
Present:  Katherine Fowlston, Michael Avis, Peter Dymond, Herman Custodio, Paul Willoughby, Antonietta Minichillo

Regrets:  Doug McLeod, David Whyte, Steve Collie, Jeff Chalmers

1. Heritage Times

Antonietta Minichillo brought copies of the Heritage Times for review before it goes to the printer.  Several suggestions were made on how it could be changed.  The aim is to have it ready to hand out at Highlight on Heritage.

The 2017 issue of the Heritage Times was discussed.  It is the 150th anniversary of Confederation, Alderlea, Grace United Church and the former Peel County Courthouse.  It was decided to make this an anniversary related issue.

2. Outreach

Michael Avis and Paul Willoughby will be doing a presentation on February 22, 2016 at 7:00p.m. at the Mount Pleasant Library.

Antonietta Minichillo announced that the downtown walking tour will be available online, as a mobile app and in Punjabi in 2016.

3. Highlight on Heritage

Michael Avis reported that Highlight on Heritage will be held in the Old Navy Court at Bramalea City Centre on February 13, 2016.  Agreements have been signed and insurance has been arranged.  There will be questionnaires available about the City’s Heritage Official Plan Review.  Michael Avis will send out an e-mail, with time slots, requesting help.  All Board members are encouraged to participate.  Herman Custodio and Jeff Chalmers are going to take some new photographs for our display boards for future events.
4. **Bike the Creek Event**

Heritage Board members will be set up at Memorial Arena.

5. **Prince of Wales Award – 2017**

The sub-committee decided to recommend to the Board that an awards sub-committee be set up to handle this application and other potential award submissions.

6. **Annual Heritage Report**

Antonietta Minichillo said that Heritage staff is preparing an annual report of what the Board and staff have done over the year. The report for 2015 is in its draft form and staff hopes to circulate it in the near future.

7. **Ontario Heritage Planners Meeting**

Antonietta Minichillo informed the sub-committee that the meeting will be held in Brampton on Wednesday March 23, 2016. More information will follow.
Proposed Heritage Designations

- Downtown Heritage Conservation Districts
- All Heritage Cemeteries in the City of Brampton
- 3864 Countryside Drive – Pendergast Log House – Ward 10
- 86 Main Street North – Heritage Theatre – Ward 1
- 7715 Kennedy Road South – Graham-Rutledge Property – Ward 3 (cultural heritage landscape designation)
- 70 Main Street North – Robson Block – Ward 1
- 23 Centre Street South – Kilpatrick-Young House – Ward 3
- 4585 Mayfield Road – Peter Archdekin Farmhouse – Ward 9
- 1985 Bovaird Drive West – McCandless Plank House – Ward 6
- 19 John Street – formerly St. Mary’s Church – Ward 3
- 12061 Hurontario Street (former Snelgrove Baptist Church) – Ward 2
- 10955 Clarkway Drive – Pinebrook Farm – Ward 10
- 7 English Street – Ward 5
- 11285 Creditview Road – Drinkwater Farmhouse – Ward 6
- 22 William Street – Ward 1
- 73 Main Street South – Ward 4
- 51 Chapel Street – Ward 3
- 3448 Castlemore Road (Squire Thomas Burrell Grist Mill Site/Burrell’s Hollow) – Ward 10
- 27 Wellington Street East – Ward 3
Date: 2016-02-05

Subject: Heritage Permit Application – Part V of the *Ontario Heritage Act* for 7534 Creditview Road – Ward 6 (H.Ex. 7534 Creditview Road, Churchville)

Contact: Antonietta Minichillo, Heritage Coordinator
Planning Services and Infrastructure Services
905-874-3744 antonietta.minichillo@brampton.ca

Recommendations:

1. That the report from Antonietta Minichillo, Heritage Coordinator, Planning and Infrastructure Services, dated February 5, 2016 to the Brampton Heritage Board Meeting of February 16, 2016, re: Heritage Permit Application – Part V of the *Ontario Heritage Act* for 7534 Creditview Road – Ward 6 (H.Ex. 7534 Creditview Road, Churchville) be received; and,

2. That the Heritage Permit application for the property owner at 7534 Creditview Road for the construction of a new garage be approved subject to the following conditions:
   a) That the height of the proposed structure be significantly lowered to reduce the overall massing;
   b) That the current driveway width be maintained and substantial vegetation, including large caliper trees, be incorporated in the front lawn on both the north and south sides of the driveway;
   c) That the overhang in front of the proposed garages be removed;
   d) That details regarding cladding, windows, doors and garage doors be submitted; and
   e) That the conditions be fulfilled to the satisfaction of the Heritage Coordinator, Planning and Infrastructure Services.

Overview:

- The property at 7534 Creditview Road is located in the Churchville Heritage Conservation District (HCD), which is designated under Part V of the *Ontario Heritage Act*. 
In accordance with Section 42 (1) of the Ontario Heritage Act, a permit is required for the alterations, new construction and demolition on property within an HCD.

The historic residence, built circa 1870, was relocated into the Village of Churchville as part of the development of Highway 407.

A Heritage Permit application for the construction of a three bay garage was endorsed by the Churchville Heritage Committee in December 2004 and approved by Council in early 2005. The City issued the Heritage Permit in February 2005, however, the garage was never built.

The new owner of the subject property has submitted a Heritage Permit application for an attached three bay garage. This proposal shares some similarities with the 2004 proposal, however, it contains a number of changes that require the need for a new Heritage Permit.

Background:

- The property at 7534 Creditview Road is located in the Churchville Heritage Conservation District (see Appendix A for photographs of the dwelling).
- The historic residence, built circa 1870, was relocated into the Village of Churchville as part of the development of Highway 407.
- The purpose of implementing a Heritage Conservation District (HCD) is to conserve and enhance the character of the neighbourhood. A Heritage Conservation District Plan, which is adopted as part of District designation, guides physical change over time in order to maintain the District's heritage value and character.
- In accordance with Section 42 (1) of the Ontario Heritage Act, a permit is required for the alterations, new construction and demolition on property within an HCD.
- In 2004, a Heritage Permit application was submitted for a new three-bay garage on the subject property. The application was endorsed by the Churchville Heritage Committee in December 2004 in accordance with the following motion:
  “THAT the heritage application to erect an attached, three-car garage to the house at 7534 Creditview Road be approved as outlined in the heritage permit application. The garage will have matching brick front façade and boar-batten cladding on the other facades. Approval of the application is recommended without conditions.”
- The Heritage Permit application was approved by Council in January 2005 and a Heritage Permit was issued in February 2005, however, the applicant did not pursue a Building Permit and the garage was never built.
- A copy of the 2004 Heritage Permit application and the Heritage Permit are attached as Appendix B.
Current Situation:

- In November 2015, the current owner of 7534 Creditview Road provided the Heritage Coordinator a proposal for a new attached three-bay garage. The complete Heritage Permit application was submitted on February 5, 2016 (see Appendix C).
- In accordance with the *Ontario Heritage Act*, Council must respond to the application by May 6, 2016.
- The proposal conforms with the Churchville Heritage Conservation District Plan with regard to the following:
  - Exterior cladding materials. The new addition should read as different yet complimentary to the original 1870 residence - the proposed material choices achieve this goal. Further, the proposed material choices were approved in the 2004 Heritage Permit application.
  - Setback from the original house.
- The proposal does not conform with the District Plan with regard to the following:
  - Detached garages are preferred.
  - Additions should be located in a way that will not result in widening the appearance of the front façade.
  - Ancillary buildings should be located toward the rear of the lot, and garages in particular should not form part of the front façade.
  - The proposed space above the garage adds to the overall scale and massing of the proposal, and it visually competes with the original dwelling.
- The primary differences between the 2004 proposal and the current proposal are that:
  - The 2004 proposal was approximately 17 feet to the ridge of the roof, while the current proposal is 27 feet to the ridge.
  - The current proposal includes a second storey above the garage and an overhang in front of the garage doors, which reduces the visual benefit of the setback of the garage.

Given the above considerations, Heritage staff recommends that the Heritage Permit application be approved subject to the following conditions:

- That the second storey be eliminated and/or reduced in height and width;
- That the driveway width be maintained and substantial vegetation including large caliper trees, be incorporated in the front lawn on both the north and south sides of the driveway;
- That the overhang in front of the proposed garages be removed;
- That details regarding cladding, windows, doors and garage doors be submitted.
Phillip H. Carter Architect, the consultant currently retained by the City to review and update the guidelines in the Churchville Heritage Conservation District Plan, reviewed the subject Heritage Permit application and stated that while the 2004 proposal and the current proposal share the same footprint, they are not comparable. He explained that the 2004 proposal was a simple form, while the current proposal is a complex form with a deep ‘carport’ verandah in front, a mix of materials, and a large shed dormer at the rear. Mr. Carter also expressed concern about the increased height of the current proposal, and that the overall mass of the proposed garage is comparable to the house. He concludes that the current proposed garage addition is not sympathetic to the design of the dwelling.

**Corporate Implications:**

**Financial Implications:**

None.

**Other Implications:**

None.

**Strategic Plan:**

This report achieves the Strategic Plan priorities by preserving and protecting heritage environments with balanced, responsible planning.

**Conclusion:**

Certain elements of the current Heritage Permit application for 7534 Creditview Road are not in compliance with the guidelines of the Churchville Heritage Conservation District Plan. The Heritage Permit Application should be approved with conditions that will enable the proposal to conform with the District Plan, as outlined in this report.
Attachments:

Appendix A: Photographs of the Historic Residence
Appendix B: 2004 Heritage Permit Application and Heritage Permit
Appendix C: Heritage Permit Application

Report authored by: Antonietta Minichillo, MES, RPP, CAHP
Appendix A: Photographs of the Historic Residence
HERITAGE PERMIT

OWNER'S NAME: K. P. Ruttan
TYPE OF PROJECT: Construction of Garage
PERMIT NO.: 29
LOT NO.: P. Lot 3
PLAN NO.: 43R-2257

Issued in accordance with Council Resolution HB-010-2005 as approved by Council on: February 14, 2005

CONDITIONS:
- NO CONDITIONS -

Heritage Planner

POST CARD IN CONSPICUOUS PLACE
The Village of Churchville is a designated Heritage Conservation District under Part V of the Ontario Heritage Act. In accordance with the Act, a permit is required to be issued by City Council for all applications proposing to erect, demolish, remove or alter the exterior of buildings or structures or other cultural heritage attributes within the District.

The Churchville Heritage Committee, in its advisory role to Brampton City Council, reviews development applications for properties located within the Village of Churchville Heritage Conservation District. Comments from the Churchville Heritage Committee are forwarded to the Brampton Heritage Board for review. The Brampton Heritage Board reviews the application, considers the submitted comments, and makes a recommendation that is brought forth to Brampton's City Council. City Council has the authority under the Ontario Heritage Act to approve any heritage application either with or without conditions or to reject the permit application entirely.

Please provide the following information (type or print)

A. REGISTERED OWNER (Note: full Name & Address)

NAME OF REGISTERED OWNER(S) Devinder Panase, Ramandeep Dhiman, Balbir Pan

TELEPHONE NO. HOME ( ) BUSINESS: FAX: ( )

MAILING ADDRESS 7534 Credit View Rd

Brampton, ONT POSTAL CODE L6Y 0H4

B. AGENT (Note: Full name & address of Agent acting on behalf of applicant where applicable)

NAME OF AGENT(S) Nick Defilippis Design

TELEPHONE NO. HOME ( ) BUSINESS: FAX: 905 643-7085

MAILING ADDRESS 687 Barton St E

Stoney Creek, ONT POSTAL CODE L8E 5L6

Note: Unless otherwise requested, all communications will be sent to the agent.

C. LOCATION / LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF SUBJECT PROPERTY

LOTS(S)/BLOCK(S) PT LT 13

CONCESSION No. 4 REGISTERED PLAN No.

PART(S) NO. (S) 4 REFERENCE PLAN No. 48R-223 77

MUNICIPAL ADDRESS 7534 Credit View Rd, Brampton, ONT

PIN (PROPERTY IDENTIFICATION No.) 14852647

Heritage Permit Application Form Page 1 of 4 April 2005
D. PROJECT DESCRIPTION / SUMMARY OF PROPOSAL
(Describe as many details as possible. Include any further details on a separate sheet of paper, if required.)

Any changes to the landscape (grading, plant materials, etc) must also be outlined in detail

No existing landscape being removed
Additional plantings proposed, no change to existing grading
Add attached three car garage (live floor) Max. Ht. 27'6".

E. SCOPE OF WORK (Check one answer in each row)
The Building is: Proposed ___________ Already Existing 
The Request is to: Erect _ Demolish __ Alter __ Relocate __ Addition __

F. SITE STATISTICS (For additions and/or construction of new buildings and accessory structures)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOT DIMENSIONS</th>
<th>FRONTAGE</th>
<th>DEPTH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>123'7&quot; ft</td>
<td>200'8&quot; ft</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOT AREA</th>
<th>EXISTING BUILDING COVERAGE</th>
<th>EXISTING GROSS FLOOR AREA</th>
<th>PROPOSED GROSS FLOOR AREA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3,140.49 m²</td>
<td>4.78 %</td>
<td>m²</td>
<td>proposed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BUILDING HEIGHT</th>
<th>EXISTING</th>
<th>PROPOSED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>28'7&quot;</td>
<td>ft</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BUILDING WIDTH</th>
<th>EXISTING</th>
<th>PROPOSED (TOTAL)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>25'0&quot;</td>
<td>ft</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ZONING DESIGNATION
By-Law 243-2007, Zoning?

COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT APPROVAL REQUIRED? ___________ YES* ___________ NO

*(NOTE: COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT HEARINGS SHOULD BE SCHEDULED AFTER HERITAGE PERMIT HAS BEEN APPROVED).

G. REQUIRED INFORMATION SUBMITTED

- Registered Survey
- Site Plan (The plan should show outline of all buildings and vegetation on the property)
- Existing Plans & Elevations
- Proposed Plans & Elevations
Churchville Heritage Conservation District

Photographs (i.e., if building exists)

Outline of Material Specifications (i.e., building materials and sample colours)

H. Authorization / Declaration

I hereby declare that the statements made herein are to the best of my belief and knowledge, and a true and complete presentation of the proposed application. I understand that this Heritage Permit does not constitute a building permit pursuant to the Ontario Building Code.

I also hereby agree to permit the Churchville Heritage Committee and the appropriate staff of the City of Brampton to enter the subject property to fully assess the application.

(Property entry, if required, will be organized with the applicant or agent prior to entrance)

I, [Applicant's Name]

(Address)

(Postal Code) (Area Code & Mobile Number)

solemnly declare that all statements contained in this application are true.

(signature of Applicant or Authorized Agent) (signature of City Heritage Planner or Staff Member accepting application)

Complete application submitted on Feb. 5/16 via email.

CHC Comments to Heritage Planner:

CHC Comments Forwarded to RBH:

Recommendations to Council:

City Council Decision: Date: Appealed:

Heritage Permit No. Date Permit Issued:

* technically missed the deadline, however, processing application to accommodate applicant.
SITE STATISTICS

LOT AREA
EXIST. HOUSE
EXIST. PORCH W/STAIRS
TOTAL:

NEW GARAGE
PROPOSED NEW CARPORT
PROPOSED NEW PORCH W/STAIRS
TOTAL NEW:
EXISTING
TOTAL COVERAGE:
LOT COVERAGE

EXISTING FIRST FLOOR
EXIST. SECOND FLOOR
EXIST. GROSS FLOOR AREA

NOTE:
ALL SURVEY INFO AS PROVIDED BY OWNER AND DETAILED ON.

NOTE:
1. CONTRACTOR TO VERIFY AND CHECK ALL ORDINANCES AND SPECIFIC RULES TO AID IN OBTAINING CONSTRUCTION PERMITS AND OTHER STAFF REQUIREMENTS.
2. ANY ADDITIONAL STRUCTURES OR DEVIATIONS MUST BE APPROVED IN WRITING FROM THE ENGINEER PRIOR TO CONSTRUCTION.

DEILIPPIS DESIGN
744 CREDITVIEW ROAD
BRAMPTON, ON

DATE: APR 2013

SHEET 1/4

CREDITVIEW ROAD
Date: 2016-02-05

Subject: Heritage Permit Application - 7611 Creditview Road - Ward 6 (HE.x 7611 Creditview Rd)

Contact: Antonietta Minichillo, Heritage Coordinator, Planning and Infrastructure Services, 905-874-3744, antonietta.minichillo@brampton.ca

Recommendations:

1. That the report from Antonietta Minichillo, dated February 5, 2016, to the Brampton Heritage Board Meeting of February 16, 2016, re: Heritage Permit Application - 7611 Creditview Road - Ward 6 (HE.x 7611 Creditview Rd), be received; and

2. That the Heritage Permit application by the property owner of 7611 Creditview Road for the demolition of an existing detached garage with attached shed, and the construction of a new garage and storage area be approved subject to the following conditions:
   a) That elevations drawings be revised to include details regarding the eaves and fascia;
   b) That material samples of the stucco be submitted;
   c) That the final details regarding the garage door be submitted; and
   d) That the conditions be fulfilled to the satisfaction of the Heritage Coordinator, Planning and Infrastructure Services.
Overview:

- The property at 7611 Creditview Road is located within the Churchville Heritage Conservation District (HCD), which is designated under Part V of the Ontario Heritage Act.
- In accordance with Section 42 (1) of the Ontario Heritage Act, a permit is required for alterations, new construction and demolition on property within an HCD.
- The property owner of 7611 Creditview Road submitted a Heritage Permit application for the demolition of an existing detached garage with attached shed, and the construction of a new garage and storage area.
- The proposal conforms to the Churchville Heritage Conservation District Plan, and is being recommended for approval subject to minor conditions as set out in this report.

Background:

The property at 7611 Creditview Road is located within the Churchville Heritage Conservation District, which is designated under Part V of the Ontario Heritage Act.

The purpose of implementing a Heritage Conservation District (HCD) is to conserve and enhance the character of the neighbourhood. A Heritage Conservation District Plan, which is adopted as part of District designation, guides physical change over time in order to maintain the District's heritage value and character.

In accordance with Section 42 (1) of the Ontario Heritage Act, a permit is required for the alterations, new construction and demolition on property within an HCD. On February 3, 2016, the property owner of 7611 Creditview Road submitted a Heritage Permit application for the demolition of an existing detached garage with an attached shed, and the construction of a new garage and storage area (see Appendix A). In accordance with the Ontario Heritage Act, Council must respond to the application by May 3, 2016.

The existing garage and shed are not identified as buildings of heritage significance in the Churchville Heritage Conservation District Plan, therefore, their removal would not negatively impact the cultural heritage value and character of the District.
**Current Situation:**

The proposal conforms with the District Plan through locating the detached garage to the rear of the dwelling, the use of stucco as the cladding material, the gable roofline at low to medium pitch, and the lower profile than the residential dwelling.

The elevations submitted as part of the Heritage Permit application lack sufficient detail with regard to the garage door, eaves and fascia. Therefore, it is recommended that Heritage Permit be approved with the condition that these details be provided to the satisfaction of the Heritage Coordinator, Planning and Infrastructure Services.

**Corporate Implications:**

**Financial Implications:**

None.

**Other Implications:**

No other implications have been identified.

**Strategic Plan:**

This report achieves the Strategic Plan priorities by preserving and protecting heritage environments with balanced, responsible planning.

**Conclusion:**

The work proposed in the Heritage Permit application generally conforms to the Churchville Heritage Conservation District Plan and does not negatively impact the cultural heritage value and character of the Village. Heritage staff recommends that application be approved subject to minor conditions as set out in this report.

Antonietta Minichillo, MES, RPP, CAHP  
Heritage Coordinator

Heather MacDonald, MCIP, RPP, CHRL  
Acting Executive Director of Planning and Infrastructure Services
Attachments:

Appendix A - Heritage Permit Application

Report authored by: Antonietta Minichillo, Heritage Coordinator
The Village of Churchville is a designated Heritage Conservation District under Part V of the Ontario Heritage Act. In accordance with the Act, a permit is required to be issued by City Council for all applications proposing to erect, demolish, remove or alter the exterior of buildings or structures or other cultural heritage attributes within the District.

The Churchville Heritage Committee, in its advisory role to Brampton City Council, reviews development applications for properties located within the Village of Churchville Heritage Conservation District. Comments from the Churchville Heritage Committee are forwarded to the Brampton Heritage Board for review. The Brampton Heritage Board reviews the application, considers the submitted comments, and makes a recommendation that is brought forth to Brampton’s City Council. City Council has the authority under the Ontario Heritage Act to approve any heritage application either with or without conditions or to reject the permit application entirely.

Please provide the following information (type or print)

A. REGISTERED OWNER (Note: full Name & Address)

NAME OF REGISTERED OWNER(S) ANDRZEJ PATEJCKUK

TELEPHONE NO. HOME BUSINESS: ( )

MAILING ADDRESS 7611 Creditview Rd. Brampton

ON Canada POSTAL CODE L6X 0H4

B. AGENT (Note: Full name & address of Agent acting on behalf of applicant where applicable)

NAME OF AGENT(S)

TELEPHONE NO. HOME BUSINESS: ( )

MAILING ADDRESS

POSTAL CODE

Note: Unless otherwise requested, all communications will be sent to the agent.

C. LOCATION / LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF SUBJECT PROPERTY

LOTS(S)/BLOCK(S)

CONCESSION NO. REGISTERED PLAN NO.

PART(S) NO. (S) REFERENCE PLAN NO.

MUNICIPAL ADDRESS 7611 Creditview Rd. Brampton L6X 0H4

PIN (PROPERTY IDENTIFICATION NO.)
D. PROJECT DESCRIPTION / SUMMARY OF PROPOSAL
(Describe as many details as possible. Include any further details on a separate sheet of paper, if required.)

Demolition of existing garage & attached shed
Construction of new garage in its place. New garage to be 4 ft wider than existing.

E. SCOPE OF WORK (Check one answer in each row)
THE BUILDING IS: PROPOSED [ ] ALREADY EXISTING [ ]
THE REQUEST IS TO: ERECT [ ] DEMOLISH [ ] ALTER [ ] RELOCATE [ ]

F. SITE STATISTICS (For additions and/or construction of new buildings and accessory structures)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOT DIMENSIONS</th>
<th>FRONTAGE</th>
<th>DEPTH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>58' 10&quot;</td>
<td>190' 9&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOT AREA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXISTING BUILDING COVERAGE</td>
<td>14 %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXISTING GROSS FLOOR AREA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPOSED GROSS FLOOR AREA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUILDING HEIGHT</td>
<td>EXISTING</td>
<td>PROPOSED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13' 6&quot;</td>
<td>18' 4&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUILDING WIDTH</td>
<td>EXISTING</td>
<td>PROPOSED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13'</td>
<td>17'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ZONING DESIGNATION

COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT APPROVAL REQUIRED? [ ] YES* [ ] NO

*(NOTE: COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT HEARINGS SHOULD BE SCHEDULED AFTER HERITAGE PERMIT HAS BEEN APPROVED).

G. REQUIRED INFORMATION SUBMITTED

☑ REGISTERED SURVEY
☑ SITE PLAN (The plan should show outline of all buildings and vegetation on the property)
☑ EXISTING PLANS & ELEVATIONS
☑ PROPOSED PLANS & ELEVATIONS
☑ PHOTOGRAPHS (i.e. if building exists)
☑ OUTLINE OF MATERIAL SPECIFICATIONS (i.e. building materials and sample colours)
H. AUTHORIZATION / DECLARATION

I HEREBY DECLARE THAT THE STATEMENTS MADE HEREIN ARE TO THE BEST OF MY BELIEF AND KNOWLEDGE, AND A TRUE AND COMPLETE PRESENTATION OF THE PROPOSED APPLICATION. I UNDERSTAND THAT THIS HERITAGE PERMIT DOES NOT CONSTITUTE A BUILDING PERMIT PURSUANT TO THE ONTARIO BUILDING CODE.

I ALSO HEREBY AGREE TO PERMIT THE CHURCHVILLE HERITAGE COMMITTEE AND THE APPROPRIATE STAFF OF THE CITY OF BRAMPTON TO ENTER THE SUBJECT PROPERTY TO FULLY ASSESS THE APPLICATION.
(Property entry, if required, will be organized with the applicant or agent prior to entrance)

I, [Name of applicant – please print]

(Address)

(City) (Province) (Postal Code)

solemly declare that all statements contained in this application are true.

(signature of Applicant or Authorized Agent)

(signature of City Heritage Planner or Staff Member accepting application)

OFFICE USE ONLY

DATE RECEIVED BY HERITAGE PLANNER: BUILDING FILE #

CIRCULATED TO CHC: CHC COMMENTS TO HERITAGE PLANNER:

CHC COMMENTS FORWARDED TO BHB: RECOMMENDATIONS TO COUNCIL:

CITY COUNCIL DECISION: DATE: APPEALED:

HERITAGE PERMIT NO. DATE PERMIT ISSUED:

CHC = Churchville Heritage Committee BHB = Brampton Heritage Board
PLAN OF SURVEY OF
PART OF LOT 4 ACCORDING TO A REGISTERED
PLAN OF SUBDIVISION OF THE VILLAGE OF
CHURCHVILLE BY H.P. SAVIGNY, PLS DATED
FEB. 7, 1959 AND NOW REFERRED TO AS PLAN TOR-11.
CITY OF BRAMPTON
REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF PEEL
FORMERLY TOWNSHIP OF TORONTO
COUNTY OF PEEL
SCALE 1" = 30'
GORDON S. GOOD, G.L.S
1987

SURVEYOR'S CERTIFICATE
GORDON S. GOOD, G.L.S.
PLAN OF SURVEY OF
PART OF LOT 4 ACCORDING TO A REGISTERED
PLAN OF SUBDIVISION OF THE VILLAGE OF
CHURCHVILLE BY H P SAVIGNEY, PL, DATED
FEB 7, 1869 AND NOW REFERRED TO AS PLAN TOR-11
CITY OF BRAMPTON
REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF PEEL
FORMERLY TOWNSHIP OF TORONTO
COUNTY OF PEEL
SCALE 1" = 30'
GORDON S GOOD, QLS
1967

BEARINGS HEREIN ARE ASTROMOMIC,
DERIVED FROM PLAN 423-6451,
ARE REFERRED TO THE E. LIMIT OF
CREDITVIEW RD. 46 N 45°W.

SURVEYOR'S CERTIFICATE
I CERTIFY THAT:
THE FIELD SURVEY REPRESENTED ON THIS PLAN
WAS COMPLETED ON THE 31ST DAY OF JANUARY, 1987
GORDON S GOOD
ONTARIO LAND SURVEYOR
STUCCO

14"x8" 0.H.D
AS PER HERITAGE

18'-4"

8'-0"

NEW 8" CONC.BLOCK
FOUNDATION
WALL

NEW 16"x8"
FOOTING

10.2-15

PROPOSED
GARAGE & STORAGE
FRONT
ELEVATION

CREDITVIEW
BRAMPTON, ONT

KIRIS
02/05/16

02/05/16

A3
STUCCO

1'-0"

1'-0"

4'-0"

18'-4"

4'-0"

NEW 16''x8'' FOOTING

NEW 8'' CONC.BLOCK FOUNDATION WALL
Date: 2016-02-08
Subject: Recommendation Report: Designation under Part IV, Section 29 of the Ontario Heritage Act - Cole Farmhouse - Ward 10 (HE.x 10690 Highway 50)
Contact: Stavroula Kassaris, Heritage Coordinator, Planning and Infrastructure Services, 905-874-3825, stavroula.kassaris@brampton.ca

Recommendations:

1. That the report from Stavroula Kassaris, Heritage Coordinator, Planning and Infrastructure Services, dated February 8, 2016, to the Brampton Heritage Board Meeting of February 16, 2016, re: Heritage Designation under Part IV, Section 29 of the Ontario Heritage Act – Cole Farmhouse – Ward 10 (HE.x 10690 Highway 50), be received;

2. That designation of Cole Farmhouse under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act as a property of cultural heritage significance, be approved;

3. That staff be authorized to publish and serve the Notice of Intention to Designate in accordance with the requirements under the Ontario Heritage Act;

4. That, if there are no objections to the designation in accordance with the provisions of the Ontario Heritage Act, a by-law be passed to designation the subject property;

5. That, if there are any objections in accordance with the provisions of the Ontario Heritage Act, staff be directed to refer the proposed designation to the Ontario Conservation Review Board; and,

6. That staff be authorized to attend the Conservation Review Board hearing process in support of Council’s decision to designate the subject property.
Overview:

- This report recommends that Council designate the Cole Farmhouse under Part IV, Section 29 of the Ontario Heritage Act for its cultural heritage value.
- Following research and evaluation by the City, it has been determined that the Cole Farmhouse satisfies Ontario Regulation 9/06, the provincial criteria prescribed for municipal designation under the Ontario Heritage Act.
- Upon Council approval, staff will proceed with the designation process in accordance with Ontario Heritage Act.

Background:

The Cole Farmhouse was originally located at 10690 Hwy 50 in northeast Brampton, and is in the process of being moved to a new location along Coleraine Drive, south of Countryside Drive. The one-and-a-half storey masonry residence is associated with the development of the Toronto Gore Township and the Coles, early settlers who played an important role in the community. The original property at 10690 Highway 50 is currently listed on the City of Brampton’s Municipal Register of Cultural Heritage Register.

The original location of the farmhouse forms part of a 369.35 acre site located within the Highway 427 Industrial Secondary Plan (Area 47), which was adopted by Council in September 2014, but has been appealed to the Ontario Municipal Board. The property is designated Logistics/Warehouse/Transportation in the Council approved Highway 427 Industrial Secondary Plan (Area 47). The lands are currently subject to an application to amend the Official Plan and Zoning By-law to permit industrial uses.

The Brampton Heritage Board endorsed and Council approved the conservation of the Cole Farmhouse through designation under the Ontario Heritage Act, relocation, and adaptive reuse (refer to resolutions HB0055-2015, HB047-2015, and HB062-2015). As noted above, the Cole Farmhouse is in the process of being relocated to a more sympathetic location outside of the business park that will provide a more appropriate context for the heritage resource. The new location of the Cole Farmhouse has not yet been assigned a final municipal address.

The Ontario Heritage Act enables municipalities to pass by-laws to designate properties of cultural heritage value or interest. Designation under Part IV of the Act is a way of publically acknowledging a property's value to a community, and ensures the conservation of important places for the benefit and enjoyment of present and future generations. It also allows municipalities to conserve and manage properties through the Heritage Permit process enabled under Sections 33 (alterations) and 34 (demolition or removal) of the Act.
The Cole Farmhouse meets the criteria for designation prescribed by the Province of Ontario under the *Ontario Heritage Act*, Regulation 9/06 for the categories of design/physical value, historical/associative value, and contextual value.

**Current Situation:**

The Cole Farmhouse has been evaluated using the Criteria for Determining Cultural Heritage Value or Interest, as defined in Regulation 9/06 of the *Ontario Heritage Act*. The property has design/physical value, historical/associative value, and contextual value, and should be designated under Part IV of the *Ontario Heritage Act*.

The Cole Farmhouse has design or physical value as a unique example of a vernacular Gothic Cottage with the subsequent incorporation of Italianate motifs, which is reflective of progressive farming practices in Brampton. The historic or associative value relates to its connection to the Cole family and the growth and evolution of the Toronto Gore Township. The property has contextual value as it defines, maintains and supports the character of the area. The complete Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest, including a list of heritage attributes, is outlined in the designation report attached as Appendix A, and will form part of the designation by-law.

Upon Council approval, staff will proceed with the designation process as required under the *Ontario Heritage Act*.

**Corporate Implications:**

**Financial Implications:**

Upon designation, the property will become eligible for the City of Brampton’s Designation Heritage Property Incentive Grant program, which offers funds to cover 50 percent of the cost of eligible conservation work up to a maximum of $5,000, subject to available funding, on the condition that the grant is matched by the property owner. A property owner can apply for the grant once every two years.

**Other Implications:**

No other implications have been identified.
Strategic Plan:

This report achieves the Strategic Plan priorities by preserving and protecting heritage environments with balanced, responsible planning.

Conclusion:

The Cole Farmhouse is of cultural heritage value or interest, sufficient to warrant designation under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act. It is recommended that the Cole Farmhouse be designated under Part IV of the Act according to the Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest and Description of Heritage Attributes included in Appendix A. Upon Council approval of the recommendation to designate, Staff will proceed with the process in accordance with the Ontario Heritage Act.

Stavroula Kassaris
Heritage Coordinator

Heather MacDonaln, MCIP, RPP, CHRL
Acting Executive Director of Planning and Infrastructure Services

Attachments:

Appendix A - Heritage Report: Reasons for Heritage Designation - Cole Farmhouse

Report authored by: Stavroula Kassaris
Heritage Report:
Reasons for Heritage Designation

Cole Farmhouse

February 2016
## Profile of Subject Property

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Municipal Address</strong></th>
<th>Originally located at 10690 Hwy 50, and being relocated to a new site approximately 700 meters northwest along Coleraine Drive, south of Countryside</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PIN Number</strong></td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Roll Number</strong></td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Legal Description</strong></td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ward Number</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Property Name</strong></td>
<td>Cole Farmhouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Owner</strong></td>
<td>Quarre Properties Inc., Heartland (Seven) Ltd, Orlando Corp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Owner Concurrence</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Zoning</strong></td>
<td>Agricultural (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Use(s)</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Construction Date</strong></td>
<td>Between 1861 and 1877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Notable Owners or Occupants</strong></td>
<td>William John O'Grady, Thomas Cole Sr., Thomas Cole Jr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Heritage Resources on Subject Property</strong></td>
<td>Residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional Information</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Current Situation:

The Cole Farmhouse is worthy of designation under Part IV of the *Ontario Heritage Act* for its cultural heritage value or interest. The property meets the criteria for designation prescribed by the Province of Ontario under the *Ontario Heritage Act*, Regulation 9/06 for the categories of design/physical value, historical/associative value, and contextual value.

2. Description of Property

The Cole Farmhouse was originally located at 10690 Hwy 50 in northeast Brampton. The property contained the farmhouse, a barn complex, five other farm outbuildings, and agricultural fields. The farmhouse is currently being relocated to a new location along Coleraine Drive, south of Countryside Drive.

The original location of the farmhouse forms part of a 369.35 acre site located within the Highway 427 Industrial Secondary Plan (Area 47), which was adopted by Council in September 2014, but has been appealed to the Ontario Municipal Board. The property is designated Logistics/Warehouse/Transportation in the Council approved Highway 427 Industrial Secondary Plan (Area 47). The lands are currently subject to an application to amend the Official Plan and Zoning By-law to permit industrial uses.

The Brampton Heritage Board endorsed and Council approved the conservation of the Cole Farmhouse through designation under the *Ontario Heritage Act*, relocation and adaptive reuse (refer to resolutions HB0055-2015, HB047-2015, and HB062-2015). As noted above, the Cole Farmhouse is in the process of being relocated to a more sympathetic location outside of the business park that will provide a more appropriate context for the heritage resource. The new location of the Cole Farmhouse has not yet been assigned a final municipal address.

3. Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest

Design/Physical Value:

Built between 1861 and 1877, the Cole Farmhouse has design or physical value as a unique example of a vernacular Gothic Cottage with the subsequent incorporation of Italianate motifs, which is reflective of progressive farming practices in Brampton. The Gothic Revival influence is exhibited in the one-and-a-half storey height, brick cladding, side gable roof, and a three bay front façade with a projecting central gabled bay. The
Italianate features are reflected in the central porch, the semicircular arch upper window, and the painted brick accents of the voussoirs, quoins, sills and frieze.

The house also has evidence of an earlier wrap-around porch with hipped roof, which can be seen through staining on the brick and exposed wood plates at the ground floor and the second storey underneath the window sills. Such a wrap-around porch was common to the Gothic Revival style. Other notable features of the Cole Farmhouse include the wood soffit, fascia and frieze board, return eaves, stone sills, triple wood window on side elevation, and main entrance wood door with transom and side lights.

The painted masonry may reflect (and cover) an earlier buff brick, which was intrinsic to the original ‘red-and-white’ Gothic Cottage. The brick quoins do not differ from the size of the rest of the masonry units, however, the pattern of masonry grouting suggests that a different type of masonry adjoins the corner finishing with the rest of the facade. The opaque finishing of the brick accents creates a deviation from its original and simpler Gothic styling, and adopts, with elaborate highlighting, and Italianate Style.

The farmhouse had a rear ‘ell’ addition that appeared to date from the later 19th century, but its heritage integrity was severely compromised by the various additions and alterations applied to it. As such, the addition was removed to facilitate the relocation of the dwelling.

**Historical/Associative Value:**

The Cole Farmhouse is associated with the growth and evolution of the former Toronto Gore Township, and its connection with the Cole family provides information on understanding settlement patterns in the Township.

**Brief History of the Toronto Gore Township**

The Toronto Gore Township was a wedge-shaped area of land of approximately 19,000 acres (7,689 hectares), about 15 miles (24 kilometres) northwest of Toronto. The township lands were originally surveyed in 1818, and due to the lands inaccessibility, there were only six private landowners prior to 1831. Property was also set aside for crown, clergy, and the military. Toronto Gore was still a part of the Chinguacousy Township until 1831 when it was established as a separate township.

The second development stage of land clearance and the creation of the agricultural landscape in Toronto Gore generally occurred between 1840 and 1875. Smith’s Canadian Gazetteer (1846) describes Toronto Gore Township as being,
...a wedge-shaped township, of small size, with its base towards the township of Albion. It is watered by the branches of the River Humber, and contains some good land. It is well settled, principally by Irish and Scotch, with a few Canadians; and a large portion of the township is under cultivation. There is one gristmill in the township. Population in 1842, 1,145.

By approximately 1852, changes in government policies led to competitive land acquisition and resulted in a boom of approximately 1,820 inhabitants. However, most lands were held by absentee or “non-resident” owners because the first property owners felt distant from York region markets and their neighbours.

The township developed from subsistence farming in the early 1800s to a wheat growing area by the mid-1800s. As the settlement of the land began to take place, small hamlets were established at strategic places along roads, close to watercourses and near farmsteads within the developing agricultural landscape to provide services to the local population. The Census Return (1851) indicates, for the most part, the dwellings in Toronto Gore Township were of log construction, with a few examples of brick, frame and stone construction. An economic boom associated with the wheat production occurred in the mid-1850s creating prosperity in the farming community.

Tremaine’s map (1859) depicts a settled landscape with the farmsteads generally established on the north-south concession roads and numerous settlements and hamlets including Tullamore, Grantsville, Coleraine, Castlemore, Grahamsville, Stanley’s Mills, Malton and Claireville.

As a reflection of its increasing prosperity, the Census Return (1861) reveals an increase in the number of houses of brick and frame, although log construction for farmhouses still prevailed. This change to a more substantial and permanent construction material marks a movement beyond the earlier subsistence farming to more established and prosperous farmsteads created by the economic boom associated with wheat production. More commodious and substantial barns were built on the farmsteads, alongside the new farmhouses. The small communities continued to prosper as local service areas for the farming community with post offices, schools, churches and some commercial and industrial businesses.

Although, the wheat economy of Peel County had ended by the 1880s, agriculture in Toronto Gore Township adapted. It continued to prosper throughout the remainder of the 19th century, despite a population loss in Peel County in the second half of the
century. Family farms were retained and worked with increasing mechanization. Second and third generation improvements included wind breaks, fence lines, hedgerows and maintained road allowances. Buildings were improved with new and larger barns and farmhouses.

Toronto Gore Township remained rural in use and character into the latter part of the 20th century. The agricultural economy was maintained throughout most of the 20th century, and the existing landscape was sustained. Landscape changes as a result of urban transformation of the land in Toronto Gore began to take place in the 1960s and accelerated in the 1970s. Changes have continued to the present with the introduction of non-agricultural land uses, residential suburban development into the landscape and modern improvements to roads and bridges. The Township of Toronto Gore ceased to exist as a municipal entity on January 1, 1974 when it was amalgamated into the new City of Brampton as part of the creation of the Regional Municipality of Peel was created.

**Brief History of the Cole Family**

The lands at 10690 Hwy 50 were sold to Thomas Cole in March of 1853. Thomas Cole’s arrival within the Township was already recorded in 1851 as part of a settlement cohort of 50 landowners, which expanded to 157 acres in 1861. Thomas Jr. was the original settler and founding member of the Coles in the Toronto Gore. He came from England with his parents, Thomas Sr. and Elizabeth, in 1833.

The history of the Cole family with the Toronto Gore Township and their property ownership contributes to the historical value of the residence and community. The original brick house was constructed between 1861 and 1877 and was occupied by Thomas Cole III, son of Thomas Cole Jr. and his wife, Sarah. The most prominent member of the family was Thomas Cole Jr., who was associated with the prosperous expansion of the farm during which period he also served as a Township Councillor in 1863 and 1874. The property at 10690 Hwy 50 was occupied and farmed by the Cole family for a continuous period from the mid-nineteenth century to the early twentieth century. It is believed that the Village of Coleraine directly south of the original Cole property derived its name from the combination of the two early settler families of this area - the Coles and the Raines.

The Cole family owned 157 acres of land until the early twentieth century. The last land transfer ended the seventy-two years of Cole farm ownership, from 1851 to 1923 when Thomas Cole III sold the farm to his brother-in-law, William Tomlinson. Prior to selling to Tomlinson, the Cole family rented the farm to John Clarkson for 11 years.
Contextual Value:

The Cole Farmhouse is important in defining and maintaining the rural character of the area as it is the primary component of a former farm complex, and therefore recalls and commemorates the agricultural character of the lands.

4. Description of Heritage Attributes/Character Defining Elements

The heritage attributes comprise all façades, architectural detailing, construction materials and associated building techniques, as well as significant landscape elements and important vistas. The detailed heritage attributes/character defining elements include, but are not limited to:

- One-and-a-half storey height
- Three-bay front facade
- Brick cladding
- Side gable roof
- Gabled central projecting bay on front facade
- Round arch window with voussoirs and keystone on front facade
- Flat (or jack) arch windows with soldier course voussoirs
- Quoining
- Hipped-roof, square entry porch with square columns
- Embedded wood plate at ground floor and second storey that may have supported a wrap-around porch
- Wood soffit, fascia and frieze board
- Return eaves
- Stone sills
- Triple wood window on side elevation
- Front entrance wood door with transom and side lights

5. Alteration History and Heritage Integrity

The following are the known alteration to the subject heritage resource:
- Removal of a hipped roof wraparound porch and installation of a hipped-roof, square entry porch with
- Removal of later rear additions
- Removal of original wood window
- White painted masonry accents such as quoins, sills, window voussoirs and frieze

6. Archaeological Potential

The original property of the Cole Farmhouse has archaeological potential because it has been recognized for its cultural heritage value.

7. Policy Framework

In the context of land use planning, the Province of Ontario has declared that the wise use and management of Ontario’s cultural heritage resources is a key provincial interest.

A set of Provincial Policy Statements (PPS) provides planning policy direction on matters of provincial interest in Ontario. These statements set the policy framework for regulating the development and use of land. The relevant heritage policy statement is PPS 2.6.1, which states that “significant built heritage resources and significant cultural heritage landscapes shall be conserved”. PPS 2.6.1 is tied to Section 3 of the Ontario Planning Act, which stipulates that land use planning decisions by municipalities “shall be consistent with” the Provincial Policy Statements.

The policy is also integrated with the Ontario Heritage Act. This piece of legislation grants municipalities powers to preserve locally significant cultural heritage resources through heritage designation. Decisions as to whether a property should be designated heritage or not is based solely on its inherent cultural heritage value or interest.

City Council prefers to designate heritage properties with the support of property owners. However, Council will designate a property proactively, without the concurrence of a property owner as required. These principles are reflected in Brampton’s Official Plan. The relevant policies are as follows:

Section 4.10.1.3: All significant heritage resources shall be designated as being of cultural heritage value or interest in accordance with the Ontario Heritage Act to help ensure effective protection and their continuing maintenance, conservation and restoration.

Section 4.10.1.5: Priority will be given to designating all heritage cemeteries and all Class A heritage resources in the Cultural Heritage Resources Register under the Ontario Heritage Act.
Section 4.10.1.6: The City will give immediate consideration to the designation of any heritage resource under the Ontario Heritage Act if that resource is threatened with demolition, significant alterations or other potentially adverse impacts.

In 2015, the City Council adopted a new Strategic Plan to guide the evolution, growth and development of the city. Heritage preservation is one of the goals of this new Strategic Plan.

These principles are also guided by recognized best practices in the field of heritage conservation.

8. Resources


Unterman McPhail Associates, History of Toronto Gore Township.

Pope, J.H. Illustrated Historical Atlas of the County of Peel, Ont. Toronto: Walker & Miles, 1877.
9. Appendix

Figure 1: Aerial view of original location of Cole Farmhouse and final location, fall 2015 (Source: Brampton Maps)
Figure 2: Bird’s eye view of farm complex at 10690 Highway 50 before the removal of all structures (Source: Bing Maps)

Figure 3: Bird’s eye view showing original location of the Cole Farmhouse and its final location. (Source: Bing Maps)
Figure 4: 1877 map with the Cole Farm at 10690 Hwy 50 marked in red (Source: Pope, J.H, 1877)
Figure 5: Front façade of Cole Farmhouse in its original location at 10690 Hwy 50, 2014 (Source: City of Brampton)

Figure 6: Side façade of Cole Farmhouse, including additions, 2014 (Source: City of Brampton)
Figure 7: Original front door with transom and sidelights, 2014 (Source: City of Brampton)

Figure 8: Eave return, soffit and fascia, 2014 (Source: City of Brampton)
Figure 9: Embedded wood plate that was likely used for a wraparound porch, 2014 (Source: City of Brampton)

Figure 10: Embedded wood plate that was likely used for a wraparound porch, 2014 (Source: City of Brampton)
Figure 11: Rear ‘ell’ addition from later 19th century with various additions and alterations applied to it, 2014. All additions have been removed to accommodate the relocation of the main portion of the house. (Source: City of Brampton)
Introduction

On Monday, November 23rd, 2015 the Ontario Heritage Trust held a one-day symposium to encourage discussion of and inspire contributions to Ontario’s Culture Strategy. Harvey McCue, Vice-Chair of the Ontario Heritage Trust Board of Directors welcomed participants. Beth Hanna, Chief Executive Officer of the Trust began the day with an overview of the breadth and scope of heritage, cultural and natural, tangible and intangible. Kevin Finnerty, Assistant Deputy Minister of the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport’s Culture Division, spoke on behalf of the province and provided an update on the creation of Ontario’s first Culture Strategy.

The symposium explored five topics through panel presentations and discussion: Cultural Landscapes, City Building, Tangible Heritage, How the Public Engages with Heritage, and Conserving the Intangibles. Panels were comprised of professionals working within public, private and not-for profit sectors, from a range of fields, including municipal heritage planning, museums and archives, education and research, architecture and urban design, media, archaeology, and physical restoration. Participants included more than 100 sector leaders, colleagues, professionals and thinkers from equally diverse perspectives.

This report highlights ideas and best practices explored during the symposium. We believe it provides useful feedback in support of a strong, vibrant, inclusive heritage sector that is well integrated into the culture of Ontario.
Highlights from the Ontario Heritage Trust
Cultural Heritage Symposium
Monday, November 23, 2015

**Agenda**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:00 am</td>
<td>Coffee and Registration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30 am</td>
<td>Welcome – Harvey McCue, Vice-Chair, <em>Ontario Heritage Trust Board of Directors</em> Introduction – Beth Hanna, Chief Executive Officer, <em>Ontario Heritage Trust</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:45 am</td>
<td>Ontario’s Culture Strategy: An Update – Kevin Finnerty, Assistant Deputy Minister – Culture Division, <em>Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 9:00 am | Cultural Landscapes – Panel Presentations & Discussion              | Moderator: Mike Sawchuck, *Town of Ajax*  
Panellists: Lisa Prosper, *Centre for Cultural Landscapes, Willowbank*  
Matt Setzkorn, *Ontario Farmland Trust*  
Philip Evans, *ERA Architects Inc.* |
| 10:00 am | Break                                                           |         |
| 10:30 am | City Building – Panel Presentations & Discussion                  | Moderator: George F. Dark, *Urban Strategies Inc.*  
Panellists: Harold Madi, *Urban Design, City of Toronto*  
Alex Speigel, *Windmill Development Group*  
Matt Blackett, *Spacing Magazine* |
| 11:30 am | Tangible Heritage – Panel Presentations & Discussion                | Moderator: David O’Hara, *Fort York National Historic Site*  
Panellists: Dima Cook, *FGMDA Architects*  
April Hawkins, *Royal Ontario Museum*  
John Wilcox, *Vitreous Glassworks* |
| 12:30 pm | Lunch and Networking                                                |         |
| 1:00 pm  | How the Public Engages with Heritage – Panel Presentations & Discussion | Moderator: Melony Ward, *Canada’s History Magazine*  
Panellists: Rebecka Sheffield, *Canadian Lesbian and Gay Archives (CLGA)*  
Annemarie Hagan, *Peel Art Gallery, Museum and Archives (PAMA)*  
Karen Carter, *Myseum of Toronto* |
| 2:30 pm  | Conserving the Intangibles – Panel Presentations & Discussion       | Moderator: David Rayside, *Mark S. Bonham Centre for Sexual Diversity Studies, University of Toronto*  
Panellists: Blair Newby, *Multicultural History Society of Ontario*  
Bryan Prince, *Author*  
Janis Monture, *Woodland Cultural Centre* |
| 3:30 pm  | Concluding Comments & Wrap-up Discussion                             |         |
| 4:00 pm  | Adjournment                                                        |         |
Highlights from the Day

The public has an appetite for increased understanding and connection to their surroundings, and people are actively seeking opportunities to participate in their communities. David O’Hara shared an example of this excitement through his retelling of a recent archaeological discovery in the former 1833 Queen’s Wharf. The public was captivated as the story of uncovering the remains of a 50-foot long hull from a double-masted ship unfolded, proving that public interest, appreciation and engagement with heritage is growing. Discussions throughout the day were rooted in the concept of legacy, in terms of the sense of history and place communicated through tangible evidence and intangible histories, but also in terms of the resiliency of communities, the built environment and ecological systems passed forward to the next generation.

Recognizing Diversity and Interconnectivity

Cultural heritage is manifested in environments, objects and narratives. Throughout the day, panellists and participants made reference to the notions of diversity and interconnectivity as being at the centre of cultural heritage. There was broad recognition that cultural heritage is an organic system of different components that interact with one another and are continually changing, and agreement that we should ‘look at the whole, rather than the sum of its parts.’ Panellists recognized a shift toward, what Bryan Prince referred to as, a “diversity of focus,” expressed through definitions, interpretations, representations and approaches to cultural heritage.

The current definition of heritage has led to its formal consideration as a standalone sector, but in practice heritage is a system of interrelated parts that span several different disciplines. Cultural heritage encompasses both tangible and intangible heritage, and interconnections between natural and human environments. As Dima Cook reflected, the physicality of a place or object brings stories to life, and the tangible can be an anchor in the face of changing intangible values, and in turn, tangible heritage is enriched through narrative and story. Participants emphasized that maintaining this connection can add value to the conservation of cultural landscapes, and city building, engagement and educational activities by deepening the public’s awareness, understanding, knowledge and experience of heritage.

In his introduction to the Cultural Landscapes session, Michael Sawchuck stressed the value of considering natural and cultural elements in combination and reflected that there is little commentary on how to manage and conserve these complex environments. The notions of diversity and interconnectivity were reflected in how panellists and participants approach cultural landscapes—by looking at the “ecology of a place” as Lisa Prosper aptly put it. An ‘ecological approach’ to cultural landscapes
recognizes that natural and cultural environments coexist and interact with one another, and prioritizes ‘species’ diversity in planning and conservation activities. Collectively, participants referred to the importance of multi-faceted cultural landscape conservation approaches that incorporate past and present uses and users, including natural heritage elements and fauna, as well as built form and evidence of human interventions.

Several panellists observed that lack of a consistent, clear, inclusive definition results in misinformation, fear and resistance to conservation efforts. For instance, Cultural Landscapes panellist Matt Setzkorn commented that many farmers fear cultural landscape theory and recognition as an additional burden of regulation, and are wary of its potential to restrict their businesses and livelihood.

Participant Recommendations

- Expand the definition of ‘heritage’ to include natural and human environments, and tangible and intangible heritage with equal weighting, and ensure this definition is applied throughout all provincial legislation, regulation and policy.
- Due to the reach of ‘heritage’ and ‘culture’, broaden the scope of the Culture Strategy to other Ministries beyond the Ministry of Culture, Tourism and Sport.
- Facilitate integration between different levels of government to support enforcement of legislation, regulation and policy for the conservation of cultural and natural, tangible and intangible heritage.

Panellists also called for a ‘diversity of focus’ in how heritage is interpreted and represented. Ontario is a demographically diverse province, home to hundreds of distinct cultures and ethnic communities from across the globe with different experiences, knowledge and interpretations of their environment. A strong call was made for reflecting the diversity of Ontario’s communities in the interpretation and representation of heritage, and the methods used to engage the public in its shared heritage. The call includes expanding the typical definition of diversity beyond ethnicity to include other connection points such as age or similar life experiences (e.g. the experience of political and civil unrest or war).

Blair Newby explained how the Multicultural History Society of Ontario (MHSO) actively works to share stories about the diverse range of cultures present in Ontario through its Strangers No More: Immigrant History and Multicultural Canada collection. MHSO’s collection includes over 2,525 oral history recordings, and a substantial holding of explanatory and contextual materials including interview transcripts, translations, biographical notes and historical photographs. Along with integrating a more inclusive sense of history into the definition of cultural heritage, discussion also focused on connecting
the definition to the notion of resiliency, which includes cultural, economic, environmental and social considerations. Examples to illustrate the connection between cultural heritage and resiliency were shared throughout the day. Philip Evans emphasized the economic role that cultural values can play in improving community resiliency through discussion of place-making activities in small communities. The economic and environmental benefits of revitalizing heritage buildings and sites through adaptive reuse were also discussed. Existing resources are given new life through reuse, and, as John Wilcox suggested, conservation practitioners can incorporate sustainable practices, such as passive lighting, local materials and local skills and labour, as they conserve.

**Increasing Relevance through Cultural Reciprocity**

The decision to conserve is rooted in value—the value that individuals and groups place on a landscape, object or story, and the value held for cultural heritage as an asset that can produce value. Participants acknowledge that value is inherently subjective—tied to personal understanding, experience, knowledge and interpretation—and it continually shifts over time for several reasons including movement, appropriation and broader trends. Discussions continually circled back to the importance of maintaining a diversity of focus, to ensure that multifaceted interpretations of culture, heritage and value are considered.

Throughout the symposium, panellists and participants agreed that for heritage to have value, it has to be relevant to current society. Relevance was top of mind for panellists—for Harold Madi “the human dimension of what occupies these buildings is fundamental.” Melony Ward spoke about how in the face of intense competition for audience interest, the magazine industry has moved away from a top-down, one-way style of communication towards bottom-up, audience led content development. Panellists agreed that increasing heritage relevancy for the public could allow the sector to shift its focus toward “preventative conservation,” and avoid reactive conservation activities or “firefighting.” Several examples of how panellists are establishing heritage’s relevancy were shared throughout the day, such as by providing opportunities for cultural exchange, continually using heritage structures and sites, and increasing access to heritage.

Outreach activities are an important way to engage the public, but panellists such as Karen Carter also spoke about the importance of reciprocity to heritage conservation, and the value that can be generated from facilitating exchange of knowledge, skills and resources. Annemarie Hagan shared a quote that captures the value of encouraging two-way dialogue:

> “Pursuing participatory models isn’t just about letting go of authority or expertise. It’s about opening up the institution to the possibilities of what visitors have to offer.”
Providing multiple opportunities for the public to actively contribute to heritage fosters engagement and can increase understanding, awareness and value for cultural heritage. Cultural reciprocity plays a key role in citizenship by fostering a shared sense of place and history—participants discussed the importance of inviting newcomers to document their stories and add to Ontario’s cultural mosaic. The Myseum of Toronto’s *Museum on the Move* initiative takes story gathering activities on the road to reach audiences who may not otherwise engage with heritage in traditional settings. From the museum and archives perspective, two-way interpretation and dialogue helps to build collections by providing opportunities for individuals and communities to contribute their personal histories and perspectives on broader narratives. Facilitation for cultural exchange can also build networks and capacity in the cultural heritage sector. The Peel Art Gallery, Museum and Archives’ (PAMA) annual exhibition for Sikh Heritage Month is a shining example of the ways in which networks can be built in the cultural heritage sector as a result of cultural exchange. Annemarie Hagan explained that PAMA’s collaboration within the Sikh Foundation of Canada has strengthened ties between the Sikh community and the Region of Peel’s cultural heritage sector; she affirmed that the greatest connections happen when people are able to share their stories in their own voice.

**Participant Recommendations**

- Improve or create grant programs that support cultural exchange, and facilitate collaboration and partnerships.

Relevance also comes from giving heritage an active role in contemporary society through continual use. Panellists shared several examples of how they maintain relevance, such as the Ontario Farmland Trust’s protection and preservation of active farmland and agricultural, natural and cultural features. Philip Evans reflected on how heritage gains relevance through community building activities, community building as a cultural practice leverages cultural assets for a more livable society. ERA Architect’s *small* project leverages the cultural resources of small communities through adaptive reuse and community building activities to support their transition away from dependence on natural resource industries.

Organizations and individuals are also working diligently to provide accessible engagement and participation opportunities developed with consideration for individual characteristics, abilities and learning styles, conditions and experiences. Rebecka Sheffield spoke about the Canadian Lesbian and Gay Archives’ intentional decision to locate in the Jared Sessions House, a designated heritage property,
to transform the archive into a community gathering place with a reading room, art gallery and meeting space.

**Embracing Creative Approaches**

Presentations and discussions encouraged adopting active public consultation and community engagement processes, and facilitating partnerships and collaboration to develop networks and connections between Ministries, organizations and individuals working in the cultural heritage sector and the broader public. Panellists agreed that creative approaches have a wide range of benefits; they can enrich participatory opportunities, ensure information is passed from generation to generation, increase the accessibility of cultural heritage and sector discussions, and breakdown barriers between related disciplines.

Overwhelmingly, panellists stressed that creative approaches emerge from knowing your audience, and are more impactful and richer when they come from the community. Strong emphasis was placed on the need for both top-down and bottom-up approaches to consultation, community engagement and opportunities for active participation. Enhanced consultation processes enable communities to engage in decision-making around cultural and natural heritage and can lead to conservation efforts that are inclusive of a diverse range of values. Inclusive conservation efforts can begin to weave a shared history that increases the relevance of heritage for the public, and their engagement with and ownership of conservation outcomes.

Collaboration amongst the public, private and not-for-profit sectors, as well as individual community members, is an important part of successful conservation. Panellists and participants spoke about the power of actively building relationships and networks through fostering discussions and providing opportunities for connection, engaging in collaborations, and uniting people with practice through place-making and community building activities. In her presentation about how Woodland Cultural Centre conserves intangible heritage, Janis Monture explained that Woodland supports collaboration by pairing youth with elders to facilitate sharing of Indigenous knowledge, values, language and traditions.

Establishing formal partnerships can bring collaboration one step further by providing sustainable support for conservation and interpretation activities. Specific reference was made to the importance of partnerships with the private sector, which can encourage knowledge sharing and mobilization and efficient use of resources. Through intentional design and purchasing, the private sector also plays a central role in supporting the continuance of skills and traditional knowledge of heritage practitioners, who John Wilcox called “keepers of the fabric,” by incorporating traditional techniques into projects.
Participant Recommendations

- Provide support for building the capacity of community members, local governments and private companies working within cultural and natural heritage conservation and interpretation.

The value of digitization for cultural heritage was also emphasized throughout the day. George Dark stated that “the digital revolution will become a mainstay for how we transfer culture.” Participants agreed that digitalization can be used as a tool for conservation, interpretation and presentation, facilitating connection, and building collective awareness and understanding of cultural heritage.

Participants referenced digitization as a tool for preservation that can ensure the continuity of material records and provide opportunities to transform fragile intangible heritage into tangible heritage. Digitization was also identified as a way to provide support for the continued creation and documentation of heritage. It allows cultural heritage, specifically the intangible, to be shared in the voice of the creator, ensuring authenticity and limiting the subjectivity inherent to curation. Digitizing collections and archives creates resources that can be used by cultural producers as well. Technological innovations have increased access to cultural production, David Rayside spoke about the new wave of information that will need to be archived, and the challenge this presents to conservators moving forward. As technology advances, and cultural production increasingly involves digital media, expressions of culture become more ephemeral—presenting challenges to preservation efforts. So while digital media and modes of transmission provide opportunities to conserve and improve access to cultural heritage, participants recognized that conservators need to be mindful of their impermanence and develop strategies and solutions to ensure the continuance of tangible and intangible heritage.

In terms of the ‘use’ aspect of conservation, digital tools can increase the relevance of collections and engagement with cultural heritage by speaking to the audience through the mediums they use and interact with in their everyday lives. April Hawkins shared how the ROM is increasing engagement with archaeology by using GoogleMaps to show the original location of archaeological assets featured in their First Story Toronto exhibit. Their initiative was so successful that before the exhibit opened the public map had over 26,000 visits. Presenting heritage on public digital platforms like GoogleMaps enables cultural heritage to be shared more broadly and with individuals who may not normally access institutional settings and heritage sites, such as marginalized communities, and new. Digital tools can also enable the creation of tangible objects that the public interact with on a daily basis. Matt Blackett described how Spacing Magazine uses consumer products such as coasters, buttons and art prints to bring heritage into the home and stimulate an emotive connection to the places that we interact with in our everyday lives.
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Participant Recommendations

- Support province-wide cultural mapping that encompasses both public and privately-operated and -held museums and resources.
- Encourage the use of digital tools (such as downloadable apps and graphic production) to connect cultural assets and experiences to tourism deliverables and consumables.

Engagement activities facilitate learning in an informal setting, but cultural heritage can also be shared by adopting creative approaches in formal education. Panellists and participants called for strengthening links with the Ministry of Education to develop curriculum, capitalize on existing linkages and assets within and outside of the cultural heritage sector, and include a broader diversity of heritage in training, curriculum delivery and programs. John Wilcox suggested that a cohesive strategy for heritage conservation training could also be developed by bringing operators of conservation education programs, such as Willowbank and Algonquin College, together for a symposium to discuss their experiences and opportunities in the sector.

The energy generated by Symposium presentations and discussion was palpable, and throughout the day suggestions were made about mechanisms that could support sustainability in the heritage sector. Presentations and discussions focused around three overarching frameworks or systems that greatly influence the heritage sector, these being the funding, education, and planning and taxation systems.

Participants spoke about existing funding programs, such as the Museum Operating Grant, and called for onerous application processes to be streamlined to facilitate access for organizations with less capacity. Panellists and participants also called for access to stable, annual funding opportunities that are not necessarily tied to specific events and celebrations, and are targeted to both the conservators and creators of culture. Beyond supporting operations and initiatives, funding programs were seen as a way to facilitate connections between heritage and related disciplines, for example, as Myseum of Toronto has done with its Intersections grant, incentives could be provided to encourage the use of collections in archives and museums by curators and cultural animators working primarily in the arts sector.

Support for active contribution to heritage extended to the topic of research and practice. Panellists and participants called for improved connections to active research networks embedded within post-secondary institutions and non-government organizations, by providing support for communication, the dissemination of data and information, and the presentation and publication of ideas and projects. Symposium presentations and discussions also called for continual support for education in skilled trades.
specific to heritage conservation (e.g. glass conservation, heritage masonry, fine carpentry, etc.) and opportunities for skill development, including but not limited to apprenticeships, training and post-secondary education.

Panellists and participants made specific recommendations for how the planning framework and taxation system could be changed to better support conservation.

From Harold Madi’s perspective, the number one priority is shifting the taxation structure so that heritage buildings are not taxed based on their development potential. Panellists and participants supported Madi’s statement, and specifically called for provincial powers to be used to address the disincentive for conservation created by the standard method of property valuation based on ‘highest-and-best-use.’ To ensure that urban environments do not become monotonous landscapes due to the current property valuation formula, Alex Speigel encouraged the creation of tiered development charges in high density areas to support a mixture of different scales and types of development, and, as Speigel put it, prevent “invasive species” from taking over an area.

Presentations and discussions called for the province, as well as individuals and organizations working in the heritage sector, to encourage conservation amongst private property owners by actively dispelling myths about the implications of heritage designations on property values and insurability. At the same time, panellists and participants called for providing incentives to private property owners for the conservation of heritage structures and sites, and landscape conservation and reclamation, to support conservation efforts. They also stressed the importance of tying incentives to conservation measures to ensure that proposed conservation commitments are realized.
Beth Hanna concluded the day by inviting participants to share one thing they want to see reflected in the Culture Strategy. Participants shared the following ideas:

- Breaking down the silos within the culture sector—it’s not just about culture or arts or heritage, but about all three and more, and the connections between them.
- Culture goes beyond the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport, all other Ministries and Agencies are part of realizing Ontario’s Culture Strategy.
- Increased consultation with the greater community to determine what they want and how they assign value.
- Genuine and authentic strategies to increase engagement with the non-connected public.
- Quantification of culture’s broad impact in terms of quality of life, economic costs and benefits, and in areas such as healthcare, industry, etc.
- A move towards a culture of conservation by flipping the burden of proof—groups and individuals that seek demolition and wish to exploit culture should be asked to disprove its value.
- Improved tools for successful stewardship that address a lack of industry experience with adaptive reuse at the structural and insurance level.
- Encouragement for education and curriculum delivery to include stories that are not commonly shared, including Indigenous histories.
- A call for a second round of funding for creating and realizing Municipal Cultural Plans, and for evaluation and updating of existing plans.
- Economic incentives alone may not ensure conservation, tie incentives to fulfillment of conservation commitments.