Tuesday, April 19, 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 Bejnar
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:

Telephone (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. Minutes – Brampton Heritage Board – March 15, 2016

The minutes were considered by Planning and Infrastructure Services Committee on April 4, 2016 and the recommendations were approved by Council on April 13, 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 Churchville Public School re: Original Bell from the Former Churchville Public School:
   1. Janice Crofoot, Principal
   2. Ann Piscione, Teacher/Committee Member

6. Sub-Committees

7. Designation Program

7.1. Proposed Designations

See attached list.
8. **Heritage Impact Assessments (HIA)**

9. **Correspondence**

10. **Other/New Business**

10.1. Report from Stavroula Kassaris, Heritage Coordinator, Planning and Infrastructure Services, dated April 5, 2016, re: **Heritage Permit Application – 15 Main Street North – Ward 1 (HE.x)**.

   **Recommendation**

10.2. Report from Stavroula Kassaris, Heritage Coordinator, Planning and Infrastructure Services, dated April 8, 2016, re: **Heritage Permit Application – 280 Main Street North – Ward 1 (HE.x)**.

   **Recommendation**

10.3. Report from Antonietta Minichillo, Heritage Coordinator, Planning and Infrastructure Services, dated April 8, 2016, re: **Heritage Permit Application – 11285 Creditview Road – Ward 6 (H.Ex)**.

   **Recommendation**

10.4. Report from Antonietta Minichillo, Heritage Coordinator, Planning and Infrastructure Services, dated April 5, 2016, re: **Designation under Part IV – Section 29 of the Ontario Heritage Act – 2472 Bovaird Drive West – Ward 6 (HE.x)**.

   **Recommendation**

10.5. Report from Antonietta Minichillo, Heritage Coordinator, Planning and Infrastructure Services, dated April 8, 2016, re: **Designation under Part IV – Section 29 of the Ontario Heritage Act – 2838 Bovaird Drive West (Laird House) – Ward 6 (HE.x)**.

   **Recommendation**
10.6. Discussion at the request of Paul Willoughby, Co-Chair, re: 2016 Ontario Heritage Conference

11. Referred/Deferred Items

12. Information Items


13. Question Period

14. Public Question Period

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

15. Adjournment

   Next Meeting: Tuesday, May 17, 2016 – 7:00 p.m.
Tuesday, March 15, 2016

**Members Present:**
- Peter Dymond, **Co-Chair**
- Paul Willoughby, **Co-Chair**
- Michael Avis
- Chris Bejnar
- Harry Blackburn
- Jeff Chalmers
- Herman Custodio
- Kathryn Fowlston
- Doug McLeod
- Anthony Simone (arrived at 7:22 p.m.)
- Ken Wilde

**Members Absent:**
- Steve Collie (regrets)
- David Whyte (regrets)
- City Councillor Doug Whillans – Wards 2 and 6 (personal)

**Staff Present:**
- Planning and Infrastructure Services Department:
  - Heather MacDonald, Director, Planning Policy and Growth Management, Planning and Infrastructure Services
  - Stavroula Kassaris, Heritage Coordinator
  - Antonietta Minichillo, Heritage Coordinator
- Corporate Services Department:
  - Matt Rea, Legal Counsel, Litigation
  - Earl Evans, Deputy City Clerk
  - Terri Brenton, Legislative Coordinator
The meeting was called to order at 7:05 p.m. and recessed at 7:09 p.m. The Board moved into Closed Session at 7:10 p.m. and recessed at 7:42 p.m. The Board reconvened in Open Session at 7:44 p.m. and adjourned at 8:23 p.m.

1. **Approval of Agenda**

   The following motion was considered.

   **HB020-2016** That the agenda for the Brampton Heritage Board Meeting of March 15, 2016 be approved as printed and circulated.

   **Carried**

   The following supplementary information was provided at the meeting.

   **Re:** Items 5.1 and 10.3 (Presentation and Report from Co-Chairs re: Heritage Theatre):
   - Memorandum from Donna-Lynn Rosa, Director, Recreation and Culture, Public Services, dated March 14, 2016

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

3. **Previous Minutes**

   3.1. **Minutes – Brampton Heritage Board – February 16, 2016**

   The minutes were considered by Planning and Infrastructure Services Committee on March 7, 2016 and the recommendations were approved by Council on March 9, 2016.

   The minutes were provided for the Board's information.

4. **Consent**

   The following items listed with an asterisk (*) were considered to be routine and non-controversial by the Board and were approved at one time.

   **(nil)**
5. **Delegations/Presentations**


Items 9.1 and 10.3 were brought forward and dealt with at this time.

Donna-Lynn Rosa, Director, Recreation and Culture, Public Services, requested the Board's consideration for a deferral of this matter to the next meeting, as outlined in her memorandum which was distributed at the meeting.

Board consideration of this matter included a suggestion that this subject be deferred for 60 days (to the Board’s May 2016 meeting) to provide time for Board Members to review the report by E.R.A. Architects Inc. dated May 2009, and for a tour of the Theatre for new Members.

A motion was introduced to defer this matter for 30 days. The motion was subsequently withdrawn.

The following motion was considered.

HB021-2016 1. That the memorandum from Donna-Lynn Rosa, Director, Recreation and Culture, Public Services, dated March 14, 2016, to the Brampton Heritage Board Meeting of March 15, 2016, re: *Heritage Report: Reasons for Heritage Designation – 82-86 Main Street North – Heritage Theatre – Ward 1* (File HE.x), be received; and,

2. That the following items be deferred to the Brampton Heritage Board’s May 2016 meeting:
   - Presentation by Peter Dymond and Paul Willoughby, Co-Chairs, re: *Heritage Report: Reasons for Heritage Designation – 82-86 Main Street North – Heritage Theatre – Ward 1* (File HE.x); and,

Carried
6. **Sub-Committees**

6.1. **Minutes – Heritage Resources Sub-Committee – February 11, 2016**

Paul Willoughby, Co-Chair, provided an overview of the subject minutes and discussions that took place at the meeting.

The following motion was considered.

**HB022-2016** That the *Minutes of the Heritage Resources Sub-Committee Meeting of February 11, 2016*, to the Brampton Heritage Board Meeting of March 15, 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**


*Dealt with under Item 5.1 – Recommendation HB021-2016*

10. **Other/New Business**


Stavroula Kassaris, Heritage Coordinator, Planning and Infrastructure Services, provided an overview of the subject report.
The following motion was considered.

HB023-2016

1. That the report from Stavroula Kassaris, Heritage Coordinator, Planning and Infrastructure Services, dated March 2, 2016, to the Brampton Heritage Board Meeting of March 15, 2016, re: Heritage Permit Application – 250 Main Street North (Thomas Dale House) – Ward 1 (File HE.x), be received; and,

2. That the Heritage Permit application by the property owner of 250 Main Street North to repair the stucco cladding, and to restore upper story wood window surrounds and the wood corner boards on the front façade be approved subject to the following condition:
   a. That the applicant provide details regarding the approach for the stucco repair to ensure it is appropriate for a heritage resource.

Carried


Antonietta Minichillo, Heritage Coordinator, Planning and Infrastructure Services, provided an overview of the subject report, and responded to questions from the Board about the Conservation Plan.

The following motion was considered.

HB024-2016

1. That the report from Antonietta Minichillo, dated March 2, 2016, to the Brampton Heritage Board Meeting of March 15, 2016, re: Heritage Conservation Plan – 11285 Creditview Road (Drinkwater Farmhouse) – Ward 6 (File HE.x), be received; and,

2. That the “Heritage Conservation Plan” attached as Appendix A to the report be approved; and,

3. That the owner undertake all work in accordance with the “Heritage Conservation Plan” for the 11285 Creditview Road (Drinkwater Farmhouse), in compliance with all applicable
law having jurisdiction and by retaining all necessary permits prior to the assumption of the subdivision; and,

4. That prior to the release of financial securities, the owner provide a letter of substantial completion, prepared and signed by a qualified heritage consultant, confirming that the required conservation work has been completed in accordance with the Heritage Conservation Plan and that an appropriate standard of conservation has been maintained, all to the satisfaction of the Heritage Coordinator, Planning and Infrastructure Services; and,

5. That the applicant provide and install heritage interpretive signage at their expense in a form and location satisfactory to the Heritage Coordinator, Planning and Infrastructure Services.

Carried


**Dealt with under Item 5.1 – Recommendation HB021-2016**


Stavroula Kassaris, Heritage Coordinator, Planning and Infrastructure Services, provided an overview of the subject report, and noted a correction was required to Recommendation #2 to accurately identify the property.

The following motion was considered.

HB025-2016 1. That the report from Stavroula Kassaris, Heritage Coordinator, Planning and Infrastructure Services, dated February 18, 2016, to the Brampton Heritage Board Meeting of March 15, 2016, re: Heritage Designation under Part IV, Section 29 of the Ontario Heritage Act – 11223 Torbram Road (Hewson Farmhouse) – Ward 10 (HE.x 11223 Torbram Rd – Hewson Farm), be received; and,
2. That designation of the Hewson Farmhouse 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 designation 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

10.5. Report from Antonietta Minichillo, Heritage Coordinator, Planning and Infrastructure Services, dated March 4, 2016, re: **Listing 29A Hartford Trail (Peel Village Golf Course) on the Municipal Register of Cultural Heritage Resources – Ward 3** (File HE.x).

Antonietta Minichillo, Heritage Coordinator, Planning and Infrastructure Services, provided an overview of the subject report.

The following motion was considered.

HB026-2016 1. That the report from Antonietta Minichillo, Heritage Coordinator, Planning and Infrastructure Services, dated March 4, 2016, to the Brampton Heritage Board Meeting of March 15, 2016 re: **Listing 29A Hartford Trail (Peel Village Golf Course) on the Municipal Register of Cultural Heritage Resources – Ward 3** (File HE.x), be received; and,

2. That 29A Hartford Trail be listed on the City of Brampton’s *Municipal Register of Cultural Heritage Resources*.

Carried
10.6. Verbal Update from Stavroula Kassaris, Heritage Coordinator, Planning and Infrastructure Services, re: Delegation and Submission from Dan O’Reilly, Wildfield resident, to the Brampton Heritage Board Meeting of October 20, 2015 – Proposal for Signage in Wildfield to Recognize the West Humber River (RML #2015-047).

Stavroula Kassaris, Heritage Coordinator, Planning and Infrastructure Services, provided a verbal update on this matter, which included:
- overview of Mr. O’Reilly’s proposal
- background on the Board’s consideration of the proposal
- the Region of Peel and Toronto and Region Conservation confirmed there is no funding, however the Region indicated a willingness to assist Mr. O’Reilly toward getting signage

The following motion was considered.

HB027-2016 That the verbal update from Stavroula Kassaris, Heritage Coordinator, Planning and Infrastructure Services, to the Brampton Heritage Board Meeting of March 15, 2016, re: Delegation and Submission from Dan O’Reilly, Wildfield resident, to the Brampton Heritage Board Meeting of October 20, 2015 – Proposal for Signage in Wildfield to Recognize the West Humber River (RML #2015-047), be received.

Carried

10.7. Discussion at the request of Antonietta Minichillo, Heritage Coordinator, Planning and Infrastructure Services, re: Scheduling of May 2016 Meeting of the Brampton Heritage Board.

Antonietta Minichillo, Heritage Coordinator, Planning and Infrastructure Services, requested the Board’s consideration for changing the May meeting date to May 17, 2016.

The following motion was considered.

HB028-2016 That the 2016 Brampton City Council and Committee Meeting Schedule be amended to change the Brampton Heritage Board’s May meeting to May 17, 2016.

Carried

11. Referred/Deferred Items – nil
12. **Information Items** – nil

13. **Question Period** – nil

14. **Public Question Period** – nil

15. **Closed Session**

The Board agreed to vary the order of business and dealt with this item before Item 5.1.

Earl Evans, Deputy City Clerk, Corporate Services, outlined the procedure for consideration of matters in Closed Session.

The following motion was considered.

HB029-2016 That the Brampton Heritage Board proceed into Closed Session to discuss matters pertaining to the following:

15.1 Litigation or potential litigation, including matters before administrative tribunals, affecting the municipality or local board – conservation review board matter

Carried

16. **Adjournment**

The following motion was considered.

HB030-2016 That the Brampton Heritage Board do now adjourn to meet again on Tuesday, April 19, 2016 at 7:00 p.m. or at the call of the Chair.

Carried

Co-Chair – Peter Dymond

Co-Chair – Paul Willoughby
### Delegation Request

Please complete this form for your request to delegate to Council or Committee on a matter where a decision of the Council may be required. Delegations at Council meetings are generally limited to agenda business published with the meeting agenda. Delegations at Committee meetings can relate to new business within the jurisdiction and authority of the City and/or Committee or agenda business published with the meeting agenda. **All delegations are limited to five (5) minutes.**

**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  
- [ ] Corporate Services Committee  
- [ ] Planning & Infrastructure Services Committee  
- [ ] Economic Development Committee  
- [x] Community & Public Services Committee  
- [ ] Other: Brampton Heritage Board

**Meeting Date Requested:** April 19, 2016  
**Agenda Item (if applicable):** Original Churchville School Bell

**Name of Individual(s):** Churchville Public School Staff Members – Janice Crofoot and Ann Piscione

**Position/Title:**
- Janice Crofoot – Principal  
- Ann Piscione – Teacher/Committee Member

**Organization/Person being Represented:** Peel District School Board/Churchville PS

**Full Address for Contact:**  
90 Bonnie Braes Drive  
Brampton, ON  
**Telephone:** 905-796-4445  
**Email:** ann.piscione@peelsb.com

**Subject Matter to be Discussed:** Plans for the original school bell from the former Churchville PS.

**Action Requested:** The school bell be permanently housed at the new Churchville Public School in the Peel District School Board.

A formal presentation will accompany my delegation:  
- [ ] Yes  
- [x] No

**Presentation format:**
- [ ] PowerPoint File (.ppt)  
- [ ] Adobe File or equivalent (.pdf)  
- [ ] Other:

**Additional printed information/materials will be distributed with my delegation:**  
- [ ] Yes  
- [x] No  
- [ ] Attached

**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) the electronic file of the presentation to ensure compatibility with corporate equipment.

Once this completed form is received by the City Clerk’s Office, you will be contacted to confirm your placement on the appropriate meeting 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 the agenda and publicly available at the meeting and on the City’s website. 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.
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 (George W. Packham House – Ward 3
- Cole Farmhouse – Ward 10
- 11223 Torbram Road – Hewson Farm – Ward 10
Date: 2016-04-05

Subject: Heritage Permit Application - 15 Main Street North - Ward 1 (HE.x 15 Main Street North)

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 April 5, 2016, to the Brampton Heritage Board Meeting of April 19, 2016, re: Heritage Permit Application - 15 Main Street North - Ward 1 (HE.x 15 Main Street North), be received; and,

2. That the Heritage Permit application by the agent of the owner of 15 Main Street North to amend the original Heritage Permit issued on October 14, 2014 for façade improvement and restoration work be approved.

Overview:

- The property at 15 Main Street North is designated under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act.
- In accordance with Section 33 of the Ontario Heritage Act, alterations to a designated property likely to affect its heritage attributes requires written consent from the Council of the municipality (i.e. a Heritage Permit)
- In October 2014, a Heritage Permit was issued for 15 Main Street North for façade improvement work.
- On April 5, 2016, the City received an application to amend the Heritage Permit application with regard to changes to the new storefront, and the rear patio.
- This report recommends the approval of the amendments to the original Heritage Permit application.
- This report achieves the Strategic Plan priorities by preserving and protecting heritage environments with balanced, responsible planning.
Background:

The property at 15 Main Street North is located on the west side of Main Street North, north of Queen Street, and contains a three-storey commercial building. The property was designated under Part IV of the *Ontario Heritage Act* as a property of cultural heritage value or interest by By-law 62-2009.

In accordance with Section 33 of the *Ontario Heritage Act*, alterations to a designated property likely to affect its heritage attributes requires written consent from the Council of the municipality (i.e. a Heritage Permit).

In August 2014, Council approved a Heritage Permit application for façade improvement and restoration work at 15 Main Street North, subject to several conditions (refer to Appendix A). The applicant fulfilled the conditions, and a Heritage Permit was issued in October 2014. This work was associated with Downtown Brampton Façade Improvement Program application P75CE FA13-007.

Current Situation:

The agent of the property owner of 15 Main Street North submitted a Heritage Permit application to amend the original Heritage Permit for the façade improvement works. The changes proposed focus on the design and details of the new storefront, the rear second storey patio, and additional door opening on the second storey rear façade to access the patio. The complete application was submitted on April 5, 2016, and is included as Appendix B. In accordance with the *Ontario Heritage Act*, Council must respond to the application by July 4, 2016.

The new storefront proposed in the subject application replaces the non-original storefront of the building, and complements the heritage character of the structure. The rear patio proposed is located on the roof of the two-storey rear portion of the building. A new door opening is proposed to allow access to the patio, and will require the removal of original brick. However, this new opening is limited in size, on a rear façade and not easily visible from the public realm.

It is recommended that the Heritage Permit application be approved without conditions.

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 Heritage Permit application for 15 Main Street North proposes amendments to an existing Heritage Permit regarding façade improvement works, and is recommended for approval.

Original approved by:  
David Waters, MCIP, RPP, PLE  
Manager Land Use Policy

Original approved by:  
Heather MacDonald, MCIP, RPP, CHRL  
Acting Executive Director of Planning

Attachments:

Appendix A - Approval of Heritage Permit application for 15 Main Street North from 2014

Appendix B - Heritage Permit Application - 15 Main Street North

Report authored by: Stavroula Kassaris
Date: August 11, 2014

To: H. MacDonald   D. Waters   S. Kassaris   K. Guy

From: T. Brenton

The following recommendation from the Brampton Heritage Board Meeting of June 24, 2014 was approved by Council on August 6, 2014:

HB069-2014  1. That the Heritage Permit Application from Pauline Dinner, dated June 6, 2014, to the Brampton Heritage Board Meeting of June 24, 2014, re: 15 Main Street North – Blain’s Block – Ward 5 (File G33) be received; and,

2. That the subject application for the façade improvement and restoration work be approved subject to the following condition:
   • That final details and specifications regarding the windows, new storefront, lighting, signage, and rear patio be submitted to staff for final approval; and,

3. That staff be directed to process the application in accordance with legislative requirements and subject to any applicable City approvals.

Terri Brenton
Legislative Coordinator, City Clerk’s Office
Tel: 905.874.2106 / Fax: 905.874.2119 / TTY: 905.874.2130
e-mail: terri.brenton@brampton.ca

(HB-L 4)
PART TWO - HERITAGE PERMIT APPLICATION:

HERITAGE PERMIT APPLICATION FORM

In accordance with the Ontario Heritage Act a heritage permit must be issued by City Council for all proposals to erect, remove or alter the exterior of buildings, structures or other features described as heritage attributes within the scope of a heritage designation by-law.

City staff and the Brampton Heritage Board review all applications and then submit them to City Council for approval.

City Council has the authority under the Ontario Heritage Act to approve any heritage application either with or without conditions or to refuse the permit application entirely.

Please provide the following information (type or print)

A. REGISTERED OWNER
NAME OF REGISTERED OWNER(S) Rosalia Petryshyn, Walter Petryshyn, Olesia Bicky

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

E-MAIL ADDRESS:

MAILING ADDRESS:

B. AGENT
(Note: Full name & address of agent acting on behalf of applicant; e.g. architect, consultant, contractor, etc)

NAME OF AGENT(S) Pauline Dinner

TELEPHONE NO. HOME ( ) BUSINESS: (647)992-3311 FAX: ( )

E-MAIL ADDRESS:

MAILING ADDRESS:

Note: Unless otherwise requested, all communications will be sent to the registered owner of the property.
C. LOCATION / LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF SUBJECT PROPERTY

15 Main Street North

LOTS(S) / BLOCK(S)  PLAN BR 23 PT LOTS 4&5

CONCESSION NO.  REGISTERED PLAN NO.

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

ROLL NUMBER:

PIN (PROPERTY IDENTIFICATION NO.)

D. OVERALL PROJECT DESCRIPTION / SUMMARY OF PROPOSAL

This Heritage Permit application is being requested to amend the previous Heritage Permit issued for the facade improvement of 15 Main Street North. The primary differences between this proposal and the original proposal are:

- Materials for the storefront, including sign band
- Size of sign band
- Profile of cornice
- Profile of decorative brackets
- Location of the main entrance door
- Design of windows north of the main entrance door
- Location and size of columns
- Design of north door
- Details regarding the rear patio
- New door opening on second storey of rear facade for access to patio
E. DESCRIPTION OF WORKS
(Please briefly describe the proposed works as they fit within one or more of the categories below; note the specific features that would be affected. Use separate sheets as required; attach appropriate supporting documentation; point form is acceptable):

Rehabilitation and/or Preventative Conservation Measures (e.g. repointing masonry; note which heritage attributes and features would be impacted and where, materials to be used, specifications and techniques):

Refer to attached drawings

Major Alterations, Additions and/or New Construction (note which attributes to be impacted, location of work, materials to be used, specifications and techniques):

Refer to attached drawings

Restoration (i.e. replicating or revealing lost elements and features; note which attributes to be impacted and where, materials to be used, specifications and techniques):

N/A
F. SCOPE OF WORK IMPACTING HERITAGE PROPERTY
(Check all that apply)

NEW CONSTRUCTION IS PROPOSED □
DEMOLISH □         TER □         EXPAND □ LOCA □ TE □

G. SITE STATISTICS (For addition and construction of new structures)
LOT DIMENSIONS      FRONTAGE ________________ DEPTH ________________
LOT AREA            ________________ m2
EXISTING BUILDING COVERAGE ________________ %
BUILDING HEIGHT     EXISTING ________________ m
                     PROPOSED ________________ m
BUILDING WIDTH      EXISTING ________________ m
                     PROPOSED ________________ m
ZONING DESIGNATION __________________________

OTHER APPROVALS REQUIRED: (Check off only if required)
MINOR VARIANCE (COA) ________________
SITE PLAN APPROVAL ________________
BUILDING PERMIT ________________
CONSERVATION AUTHORITY ________________
SIGN BYLAW APPROVAL ________________

(Note: IF YES, other approvals should be scheduled after the Heritage Permit has been approved by City Council)
H. CHECKLIST OF REQUIRED INFORMATION SUBMITTED
(Check all that apply)

☐ REGISTERED SURVEY

☐ SITE PLAN (showing all buildings and vegetation on the property)

☐ EXISTING PLANS & ELEVATIONS - AS BUILT

☑ PROPOSED PLANS & ELEVATIONS

☐ PHOTOGRAPHS

☐ MATERIAL SAMPLES, BROCHURES, ETC

☐ CONSTRUCTION SPECIFICATION DETAILS

I. AUTHORIZATION / DECLARATION
I HEREBY DECLARE THAT THE STATEMENTS MADE HEREIN ARE, TO THE BEST OF MY BELIEF AND KNOWLEDGE, 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 ALLOW THE APPROPRIATE STAFF OF THE CITY OF BRAMPTON TO ENTER THE SUBJECT PROPERTY IN ORDER TO FULLY ASSESS THE SCOPE AND MERITS OF THE APPLICATION.

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

Signature of Applicant or Authorized Agent ___________________________ Date of Submission ___________________________

Heritage Permit applications are submitted to the Planning, Design and Development Department, 3rd Floor Counter, Brampton City Hall,

The personal information on this form is collected under the authority of the Ontario Heritage Act, RSO 1990. The information will be used to process the Heritage Permit Application. Questions about the collection of personal information should be directed to the Heritage Coordinator, 2 Wellington Street West, Brampton, Ontario L6Y 4R2, 905-874-3825.
1. All measurements & areas indicate on this drawing must not be scaled.
2. Contractors are responsible to verify and obtain all measurements on site prior to bidding, preparation of shop drawings, approval of shop drawings, ordering, delivery and installation of any material and/or system.
3. Consultant's review of shop drawings does not relieve the contractor of the responsibility to perform the work accurately and in compliance with all contract documents. Contractor shall maintain a set of approved drawings on site at all times.
4. All work shall be performed in strict accordance of and meet the requirements of the Ontario Heritage Act, and all other authorities having jurisdiction.
5. All paint colors to be determined by the applicant in consultation with the city.
6. All wood used on new storefront will be exterior grade wood.

Project Name and Address:
Historic Exterior Wall Rehabilitation at
15 Main Street North, Brampton, ON, Canada

Lead Consultant:
technoarch
220 Sweeny Drive E., Suite 200
Brampton, ON L6S 3C9, Canada

Structure Consultant:

MEP Consultant:

Drawing Title:
Revised Front Elevation

Drawn by:

Checked by:

Approved by:

Scale: 1/4" = 1'-0"

Sheet No: A02

https://www.technoarch.ca/
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EXISTING LINTEL

2"X8" WOODEN MEMBER

NEW TRANSOM WINDOW WITH TRANSPARENT GLASS

2"X8" WOODEN MEMBER

NEW DOUBLE GLAZED ALUMINUM FRONT WINDOWS

PAINTED WOODEN SILL

BULKHEAD IN EXTERIOR GRADE PLYWOOD (CREZON)

CILL STONE ON CONCRETE BASE

GROUND FLOOR LEVEL

LVL: ±0

EXISTING CONCRETE FOUNDATION TO REMAIN AS IS

SECTION & DETAIL

DETAIL AT B

NEW DOUBLE GLAZED STOREFRONT ALUMINUM WINDOWS

PAINTED WOODEN SILL

NEW ALUMINUM BULKHEAD

CILL STONE ON CONCRETE BASE

DETAIL AT C

NEW 1'-0" HIGH EXTERIOR GRADE WOOD CORNICE TO BE PAINTED IN EXTERIOR GRADE PAINT

NEW DECORATIVE BRACKET MADE OF EXTERIOR GRADE WOOD WITH EXTERIOR PAINT FINISH.
NOTES:
1. ALL MEASUREMENTS & AREAS INDICATE ON THIS DRAWING MUST NOT BE SCALED.
2. CONTRACTORS ARE RESPONSIBLE TO VERIFY AND OBTAIN ALL MEASUREMENTS ON SITE PRIOR TO BIDDING, PREPARATION OF SHOP DRAWINGS, APPROVAL OF SHOP DRAWINGS ORDERING, DELIVERY AND INSTALLATION OF ANY MATERIAL AND/ OR SYSTEM.
3. CONSULTANT'S REVIEW OF SHOP DRAWINGS DOES NOT RELIEVE THE CONTRACTOR OF THE RESPONSIBILITY TO PERFORM THE WORK ACCURATELY AND IN COMPLIANCE WITH ALL CONTRACT DOCUMENTS. CONTRACTOR SHALL MAINTAIN A SET OF APPROVED DRAWINGS ON SITE AT ALL TIMES.
4. ALL WORK SHALL BE PERFORMED IN STRICT ACCORDANCE OF AND MEET THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE ONTARIO HERITAGE ACT, AND ALL OTHER AUTHORITIES HAVING JURISDICTION.
5. ALL PAINT COLORS TO BE DETERMINED BY THE APPLICANT IN CONSULTATION WITH THE CITY.
6. ALL WOOD USED ON NEW STOREFRONT WILL BE EXTERIOR GRADE WOOD.

REAR ELEVATION

REPLACE EXISTING ASPHALT SHINGLE ROOF WITH BLACK TIN ROOF
COVER EXISTING SIDE BRICK WALLS WITH BLACK TIN ROOFING MATERIAL
REPLACE EXISTING ALUMINUM EAVESTROUGH WITH BLACK COLOR ALUMINUM EAVESTROUGH
NEW EVENTS ABOVE ROOF TOP PATIO FLOOR
NEW PERSOL. 9" ABOVE ROOF TOP PATIO FLOOR
EXISTING PLASTER WALL AT THE BACK TO REMAIN AS IS
NEW PATIO EXIT DOOR
NEW 24" HIGH METAL RAILING
NEW 8" HIGH EXTERIOR TYPE GRADE WOODEN POSTS
NEW 42" HIGH EXTERIOR TYPE GRADE WOODEN RAILING ALONG PERIMETER OF ROOF TOP
NEW EXTERIOR TYPE GRADE WOODEN CLADDING
FINISHED TERRACE LEVEL
TERRACE LEVEL (~22")

REMOVE, ALL PAINTED AND UNPAINTED PARTS FINISH FROM EXISTING BRICK MASONRY WALLS WITH THE METHOD SENSITIVE TO HISTORIC MASONRY, PAINT USING A LAQUER PENETRABLE PAINT THAT IS: 1. PREVENT LIQUID WATER FROM PENETRATING WHILE ALLOWING WATER VAPOR TO ESCAPE FROM THE BRICK.
2. WINDOWS TO RESTORE WHERE POSSIBLE OR REPLACED IN SIMILAR WOOD MATERIAL.
3. FIRST FLOOR LEVEL (~12")
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Date: 2016-04-08

Subject: Heritage Permit Application - 280 Main Street North - Ward 1 (HE.x 280 Main Street North)

Contact: Stavroula (Stav) 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 April 8, 2016, to the Brampton Heritage Board Meeting of April 19, 2016, re: Heritage Permit Application – 280 Main Street North - Ward 1 (HE.x 280 Main Street North), be received; and,

2. That the Heritage Permit application by the agent of the owner of 280 Main Street North for the replacement of the front door and sidelights, replacement of the porch rail, balusters, newel post, steps and floor, restoration of porch columns, and cleaning of the brick be approved subject to the following condition:
   i. That the proposed date for the steam cleaning of the masonry be approved by Heritage staff prior to the commencement of the procedure.

Overview:

- The property at 280 Main Street North is designated under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act.
- In accordance with Section 33 of the Ontario Heritage Act, alterations to a designated property likely to affect its heritage attributes requires written consent from the Council of the municipality (i.e. a Heritage Permit).
- The City has received a Heritage Permit application for the replacement of the front door and sidelights, replacement of the porch rail, balusters, newel post, steps and floor, restoration of porch columns, and cleaning of the brick.
- This report recommends the approval of the Heritage Permit application
for 280 Main Street North, subject to a minor condition.

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

Background:

The property at 280 Main Street North is located on the east side of Main Street North, north of Sproule Drive, and contains a two-storey single detached dwelling that has been converted to commercial use, as well as a large parking area at the rear of the house. The property was designated under Part IV of the *Ontario Heritage Act* as a property of cultural heritage value or interest by By-law 45-2015.

In accordance with Section 33 of the *Ontario Heritage Act*, alterations to a designated property likely to affect its heritage attributes require written consent from the Council of the municipality (i.e. a Heritage Permit).

Current Situation:

The agent of the property owner of 280 Main Street North submitted a Heritage Permit application to replace the front door and sidelights; replace of the porch rail, balusters, newel post, steps and floor; restore the porch columns; and steam clean the brick cladding. The complete application was submitted on April 8, 2016, and is attached hereto as Appendix A. In accordance with the *Ontario Heritage Act*, Council must respond to the application by July 7, 2016. This work is also associated with Downtown Brampton Façade Improvement Program application P75CE FA15-004.

The proposed work on the front porch involves removing select non-original elements, and replacing them with new wood elements that are compatible with the character of the building. The restoration work on the existing columns will contribute to their long-term conservation.

The proposal also includes steam cleaning the masonry to improve the appearance of the building by removing unattractive dirt or soiling materials. Low pressure water cleaning methods are generally the gentlest means possible, and they can generally be used to safely remove dirt from all types of historic masonry. However, any cleaning method involving water should never be done in cold weather or if there is any likelihood of frost or freezing because water within the masonry can freeze, causing spalling and cracking. Therefore, it is recommended that the proposed date for the steam cleaning be approved by Heritage staff prior to the commencement of the cleaning.
The steam water cleaning at 280 Main Street North will be undertaken by Everest Restoration, which is a qualified heritage restoration contractor with over 30 years of experience in masonry restoration.

**Corporate Implications:**

**Financial Implications:**

None.

**Other Implications:**

No further 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 Heritage Permit application for 280 Main Street North enhances the character of the heritage resource, and helps with the long-term conservation of the building’s heritage attributes. It is recommended that the application be approved subject to the condition that the proposed date for the steam cleaning be approved by Heritage staff.

Original approved by: 

David Waters, MCIP, RPP, PLE  
Manager Land Use Policy

Heather MacDon, MCIP, RPP, CHRL  
Acting Executive Director of Planning

**Attachments:**

Appendix A - Heritage Permit Application - 280 Main Street North

Report authored by: Stavroula Kassaris
PART TWO - HERITAGE PERMIT APPLICATION:

HERITAGE PERMIT APPLICATION FORM

In accordance with the Ontario Heritage Act a heritage permit must be issued by City Council for all proposals to erect, remove or alter the exterior of buildings, structures or other features described as heritage attributes within the scope of a heritage designation by-law.

City staff and the Brampton Heritage Board review all applications and then submit them to City Council for approval.

City Council has the authority under the Ontario Heritage Act to approve any heritage application either with or without conditions or to refuse the permit application entirely.

Please provide the following information (type or print)

A. REGISTERED OWNER

NAME OF REGISTERED OWNER(S) Clever Monkey Holding
c/o Sanjeev Goel

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

E-MAIL ADDRESS:

MAILING ADDRESS: 247 Main St N, Brampton, ON L6X 1N3

B. AGENT

(Note: Full name & address of agent acting on behalf of applicant; e.g. architect, consultant, contractor etc)

NAME OF AGENT(S) Michelle Rodrigues, HQIC

TELEPHONE NO. HOME ( ) BUSINESS: (289-323-0776) FAX: ( )

E-MAIL ADDRESS:

MAILING ADDRESS: 280 Main Street North, Brampton ON, L6V 1P9

Note: Unless otherwise requested, all communications will be sent to the registered owner of the property.
C. LOCATION / LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF SUBJECT PROPERTY  

280 Main Street North

LOTS(S) / BLOCK(S)  PLAN C88 LOT 10

CONCESSION NO.  REGISTERED PLAN NO.

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

ROLL NUMBER:

PIN (PROPERTY IDENTIFICATION NO.)

D. OVERALL PROJECT DESCRIPTION / SUMMARY OF PROPOSAL

The proposed work involves the following:

1) Removal and replacement of existing non-original front doors and sidelights

2) Removal and replacement of existing non-original porch rail, balusters and newel post

3) Restoration of original porch columns

4) Removal and replacement of porch steps, floor (deck)

5) Steam cleaning of brick
E. DESCRIPTION OF WORKS
(Please briefly describe the proposed works as they fit within one or more of the categories below; note the specific features that would be affected. Use separate sheets as required; attach appropriate supporting documentation; point form is acceptable):

Rehabilitation and/or Preventative Conservation Measures (e.g. repointing masonry; note which heritage attributes and features would be impacted and where, materials to be used, specifications and techniques):

- Restoration of existing porch columns
  - Remove existing paint, complete wood repair (Dutchman) as needed

- Steam cleaning of brick
  - Gentle surface cleaning using low-pressure hot water washing and no harsh agents
  - Everest Restoration will be completing the works, including the brick cleaning. The company has nearly 30 years of experience in restoration, and have worked on projects alongside heritage consultants.

Major Alterations, Additions and/or New Construction (note which attributes to be impacted, location of work, materials to be used, specifications and techniques):

- Removal and replacement of existing non-original front doors and sidelights (original transom to remain)
  - New door and sidelights will be wood and a complementary design

- Removal and replacement of existing non-original porch rail, balusters and newel post
  - New rail, balusters and newel post will be wood (pine) and a complementary design
  - New rail will connect to masonry pier

- Removal and replacement of porch steps, floor (deck)
  - New steps and floor will be wood (pine), and flooring will be tongue and groove

Restoration (i.e. replicating or revealing lost elements and features; note which attributes to be impacted and where, materials to be used, specifications and techniques):
F. SCOPE OF WORK IMPACTING HERITAGE PROPERTY
(Check all that apply)

NEW CONSTRUCTION IS PROPOSED □

DEMOLISH □ TER □ EXPAND □ LOCA □ TE □

G. SITE STATISTICS (For addition and construction of new structures)
LOT DIMENSIONS FRON TAGE ______________ DEPTH ____________

LOT AREA ______________ m2

EXISTING BUILDING COVERAGE ______________ %

BUILDING HEIGHT EXISTING ______________ m

PROPOSED ______________ m

BUILDING WIDTH EXISTING ______________ m

PROPOSED ______________ m

ZONING DESIGNATION __________________________

OTHER APPROVALS REQUIRED: (Check off only if required)

MINOR VARIANCE (COA) ______________

SITE PLAN APPROVAL ______________

BUILDING PERMIT ______________

CONSERVATION AUTHORITY ______________

SIGN BYLAW APPROVAL ______________

(Note: IF YES, other approvals should be scheduled after the Heritage Permit has been approved by City Council)
H. CHECKLIST OF REQUIRED INFORMATION SUBMITTED
(Check all that apply)

☐ REGISTERED SURVEY

☐ SITE PLAN (showing all buildings and vegetation on the property)

☐ EXISTING PLANS & ELEVATIONS - AS BUILT

☐ PROPOSED PLANS & ELEVATIONS

☑ PHOTOGRAPHS

☐ MATERIAL SAMPLES, BROCHURES, ETC

☐ CONSTRUCTION SPECIFICATION DETAILS

I. AUTHORIZATION / DECLARATION
I HEREBY DECLARE THAT THE STATEMENTS MADE HEREIN ARE, TO THE BEST OF MY BELIEF AND KNOWLEDGE, 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 ALLOW THE APPROPRIATE STAFF OF THE CITY OF BRAMPTON TO ENTER THE SUBJECT PROPERTY IN ORDER TO FULLY ASSESS THE SCOPE AND MERITS OF THE APPLICATION.

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

[Signature]

Signature of Applicant or Authorized Agent

Date of Submission

Heritage Permit applications are submitted to the Planning, Design and Development Department, 3rd Floor Counter, Brampton City Hall,

The personal information on this form is collected under the authority of the Ontario Heritage Act, RSO 1990. The information will be used to process the Heritage Permit Application. Questions about the collection of personal information should be directed to the Heritage Coordinator, 2 Wellington Street West, Brampton, Ontario L6Y 4R2, 905-874-3825.
EXISTING CONDITIONS

Front Door
Front Porch
Brick
Dear Michelle:

Quotation: 9153

We would like to present our quotation for heritage restoration, masonry cleaning and painting at the above-noted location.

- Remove existing door system.
- Install new door system as per design.
- New entrance hardware.
- Repair and trim interior
- Prime and paint.

Transom will remain in place

9,499.00+HST

March 31, 2016
Michelle Rodrigues
HQIC
280 Main Street North
Brampton, ON L6V 1P9
Remove existing porch and step framing.
New stair case, landing and railing.
New floor and steps with 5/4” T & G pine.
Pine balustrade and hand rails as per above details
Primed and painted
Floor joint will be inserted into mason and install brick masonry as needed.

$15,985
Railing components will be similar to those illustrated. Columns will be scraped, patched, “Dutchman” repairs and made ready for paint.

Brick cleaned with steam (patina to remain)

Area where paint will be done
Date: 2016-04-08

Subject: Heritage Permit Application, 11285 Creditview Road – Ward 6 (H.Ex. 11285 Creditview Road)

Contact: Antonietta Minichillo, Heritage Coordinator, Planning 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 April 8, 2016 to the Brampton Heritage Board Meeting of April 19, 2016, re: Heritage Permit Application for 11285 Creditview Road – Ward 6 (HE.x. 11285 Creditview Road), be received; and

2. That the Heritage Permit application by the agent of the owner of 11285 Creditview Road for conservation work outlined in the approved Heritage Conservation Plan be approved.

Overview:

- The property at 11285 Creditview Road is approximately 42 acres (17 hectares) and is located on the northeast corner of Creditview Road and Wanless Drive.
- The property is currently listed on the City of Brampton’s “Municipal Register of Cultural Heritage Resources”, and is in the process of being designated under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act.
- The property is associated with an application by Argo (Wanless) Ltd, Mattamy (Wanless) Ltd and Mattamy (Mount Pleasant) Ltd - C03W16.002 (21T-11008B) for a residential subdivision.
- In accordance with Section 33 of the Ontario Heritage Act, alterations to a designated property likely to affect its heritage attributes requires written consent from the Council of the municipality (i.e. a Heritage Permit).
- The City has received a Heritage Permit application for commencement of the conservation work outlined in the previously approved Heritage Conservation Plan.
- This report recommends the approval of the Heritage Permit application.
- This report achieves the Strategic Plan priorities by preserving and
Background:

The property at 11285 Creditview Road is approximately 42 acres (17 hectares) and is located on the northeast corner of Creditview Road and Wanless Drive. The property is currently listed on the City of Brampton’s “Municipal Register of Cultural Heritage Resources”, and is in the process of being designated under Part IV of the *Ontario Heritage Act*.

In accordance with Sections 30 and 33 of the *Ontario Heritage Act*, alterations to a designated property likely to affect its heritage attributes require written consent from the Council of the municipality (i.e. a Heritage Permit).

The City required that Mattamy Homes submit a Heritage Conservation Plan (HCP). The purpose of the HCP is to provide Mattamy and any future owners with a management plan and guidelines for the long-term conservation of the property’s cultural heritage value.

Research for this HCP was based on the 2013 Golder Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) and includes additional archival and secondary source research. A field assessment was undertaken on July 15, 2014 to:

a) visually assess the condition of the heritage attributes of the property;

b) photographically document the current conditions; and,

c) undertake measurements for measured drawings to be included in the plan.

Based on the findings of the visual conditions assessment and engineering assessment commissioned by Mattamy, a management plan and implementation strategies were prepared for the conservation of the Drinkwater House.

Rehabilitation is the preferred conservation approach for the Drinkwater House. Significant rehabilitation and renovation work will be required to return the house to residential use.

Current Situation:

Mr. Palvinder Gill, an agent of the owner of 11285 Creditview Road, submitted a Heritage Permit application for exterior restoration work outlined in a previously approved Conservation Plan. The complete application was submitted on April 1, 2016, and is attached hereto as Appendix A. In accordance with the *Ontario Heritage Act*, Council must respond to the application by June 30, 2016.

Mr. Gill, is finalizing negotiations with the owner, Mattamy Homes, to purchase the property at 11285 Creditview Road. Should the deal be finalized, Mr. Gill intends to proceed with the restoration works immediately. All work will be undertaken in
accordance to the approved Heritage Conservation Plan. The addition, proposed garage and landscape components do not form a part of this application and will be subject to a future Heritage Permit application.

Should Mr. Gill fail to acquire the property, and a future applicant wish to pursue the conservation works outlined in the Heritage Conservation Plan, the Heritage Permit will remain valid.

Corporate Implications:

None.

Strategic Plan:

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

Conclusion:

The preservation of cultural heritage resources by is a critical component of Brampton’s heritage strategy. The Heritage Permit application should be approved so that the restoration work outlined in the approved Heritage Conservation Plan can commence.

Respectfully submitted by:

Original approved by:  
David Waters, MCIP, RPP, PLE  
Manager Land Use Policy

Original approved by:  
Heather MacDonald, MCIP, RPP, CHRL  
Acting Executive Director of Planning

Authored by:  
Antonietta Minichillo, MES, MCIP, RPP, CAHP  
Heritage Coordinator

Attachments:

Appendix A – Heritage Permit Application & Excerpt from the Heritage Conservation Plan for the Drinkwater Farmhouse located at 11285 Creditview Road
PART TWO - HERITAGE PERMIT APPLICATION:

HERITAGE PERMIT APPLICATION FORM

In accordance with the Ontario Heritage Act a heritage permit must be issued by City Council for all proposals to erect, remove or alter the exterior of buildings, structures or other features described as heritage attributes within the scope of a heritage designation by-law.

City staff and the Brampton Heritage Board review all applications and then submit them to City Council for approval.

City Council has the authority under the Ontario Heritage Act to approve any heritage application either with or without conditions or to refuse the permit application entirely.

Please provide the following information (type or print)

A. REGISTERED OWNER

NAME OF REGISTERED OWNER(S): Dunlop (Warne) Ltd.

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

E-MAIL ADDRESS:

MAILING ADDRESS:

B. AGENT

(Note: Full name & address of agent acting on behalf of applicant; e.g. architect, consultant, contractor, etc)

NAME OF AGENT(S): Palvinder Gill

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

E-MAIL ADDRESS:

MAILING ADDRESS: Brampton, L6V 5E2

Note: Unless otherwise requested, all communications will be sent to the registered owner of the property.
C. LOCATION / LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF SUBJECT PROPERTY

11285 Greenwood Rd

LOTS(S) / BLOCK(S) Pl43m1989 Blk144

CONCESSION NO. REGISTERED PLAN NO.

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

ROLL NUMBER:

PIN (PROPERTY IDENTIFICATION NO.)

D. OVERALL PROJECT DESCRIPTION / SUMMARY OF PROPOSAL

To execute the restoration works outlined in the Conservation Plan prepared by Golder & Associates as approved by the Brampton Heritage Board on February 16, 2016.
E. DESCRIPTION OF WORKS
(Please briefly describe the proposed works as they fit within one or more of the categories below; note the specific features that would be affected. Use separate sheets as required; attach appropriate supporting documentation; point form is acceptable):

Rehabilitation and/or Preventative Conservation Measures (e.g. repointing masonry; note which heritage attributes and features would be impacted and where, materials to be used, specifications and techniques):

Please refer to conservation plan.

Major Alterations, Additions and/or New Construction (note which attributes to be impacted, location of work, materials to be used, specifications and techniques):

Garage and proposed addition will be submitted as part of a future heritage permit.

Restoration (i.e. replicating or revealing lost elements and features; note which attributes to be impacted and where, materials to be used, specifications and techniques):

As required by the approved conservation plan.
F. SCOPE OF WORK IMPACTING HERITAGE PROPERTY
(Check all that apply)

NEW CONSTRUCTION IS PROPOSED ☐
DEMOLISH ☐ ALTER ☑ EXPAND ☐ RELOCATE ☐

G. SITE STATISTICS (For addition and construction of new structures)
LOT DIMENSIONS          FRONTAGE          DEPTH
LOT AREA                  m²
EXISTING BUILDING COVERAGE %
BUILDING HEIGHT
EXISTING m
PROPOSED m
BUILDING WIDTH
EXISTING m
PROPOSED m
ZONING DESIGNATION

OTHER APPROVALS REQUIRED: (Check off only if required)
MINOR VARIANCE (COA)
SITE PLAN APPROVAL
BUILDING PERMIT
CONSERVATION AUTHORITY
SIGN BYLAW APPROVAL

(Note: IF YES, other approvals should be scheduled after the Heritage Permit has been approved by City Council)
H. CHECKLIST OF REQUIRED INFORMATION SUBMITTED
(Check all that apply)

☐ REGISTERED SURVEY

☐ SITE PLAN (showing all buildings and vegetation on the property)

☐ EXISTING PLANS & ELEVATIONS - AS BUILT

☐ PROPOSED PLANS & ELEVATIONS

☐ PHOTOGRAPHS

☐ MATERIAL SAMPLES, BROCHURES, ETC

☐ CONSTRUCTION SPECIFICATION DETAILS

I. AUTHORIZATION / DECLARATION
I HEREBY DECLARE THAT THE STATEMENTS MADE HEREIN ARE, TO THE BEST OF MY BELIEF AND KNOWLEDGE, 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 ALLOW THE APPROPRIATE STAFF OF THE CITY OF BRAMPTON TO ENTER THE SUBJECT PROPERTY IN ORDER TO FULLY ASSESS THE SCOPE AND MERITS OF THE APPLICATION.

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


Signature of Applicant or Authorized Agent


Date of Submission

Heritage Permit applications are submitted to the Planning, Design and Development Department, 3rd Floor Counter, Brampton City Hall,
4.0 THE MANAGEMENT PLAN

4.1 Conservation Plans and Approaches – General Principles

4.1.1 Aims and Objectives

Conservation plans attempt to address all factors that affect the future use of a historic place, and to incorporate the needs of owners and users, community interests, the potential for environmental impacts, available resources, and external constraints. The planning process should be flexible to allow for change, yet ensure that change is managed in a way that respects the heritage resource.

The aims and objectives of this plan are to

- Conserve and enhance the cultural heritage value or interest of Drinkwater House, and its character-defining elements and heritage attributes by:
  - Identifying the appropriate conservation approach – preservation, restoration, or rehabilitation (Sections 4.2);
  - Providing a set of recommendations and proposed interventions (Section 5.0);
  - Implementing short-term and long-term monitoring and maintenance programs to enable the continued use of 11285 Creditview Road as a residential dwelling.

4.1.2 Conservation Plan Guidance

In addition to the Parks Canada Standards and Guidelines, Golder has also consulted a number of other authoritative sources to inform this conservation plan for Drinkwater House. These are the:

- Burra Charter for the Protection and Enhancements of the Built Environment (ICOMOS);
- Appleton Charter for the Protection and Enhancement of the Built Environment (ICOMOS);
- Eight Guiding Principles in the Conservation of Historic Properties (MTCS);
- Well-Preserved: The Ontario Heritage Foundation’s Manual of Principles and Practices for Architectural Conservation (Ontario Heritage Trust);
- Ontario Heritage Tool Kit series (Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport);
- How to Write Conservation Reports (UK Prince’s Regeneration Trust);
- Conservation Plan: A Guide to the Preparation of Conservation Plans for Places of European Cultural Significant, Seventh Edition (Australia ICOMOS); and,
4.1.3 Conservation Standards

The Parks Canada Standards and Guidelines identify nine conservation principles to be applied to a historic place such as Drinkwater House. The nine standards are:

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

4.1.4 Conservation Approaches

The Parks Canada Standards and Guidelines identify three conservation approaches to inform the decision-making process for conservation treatments or interventions. In theory, a singular conservation approach is pursued when undertaking a conservation project, although in reality a combination of approaches is employed.

The Parks Canada Standards and Guidelines define conservation as:

All actions or processes that are aimed at safeguarding the character-defining elements of an historic place so as to retain its heritage value and extend its physical life. This may involve Preservation, Rehabilitation, Restoration, or a combination of these actions or processes.
Each conservation approach is then defined:

Preservation: the action or process of protecting, maintaining, and/or stabilizing the existing materials, form, and integrity of an historic place, or of an individual component, while protecting its heritage value.

Rehabilitation (or adaptive reuse): the action or process of making possible a continuing or compatible contemporary use of an historic place, or an individual component, while protecting its heritage value.

Restoration: the action or process of accurately revealing, recovering, or representing the state of an historic place, or of an individual component, as it appeared at a particular period in its history, while protecting its heritage value.

4.2 Conservation Approach for Drinkwater House

Of the three conservation approaches, rehabilitation is the most applicable to the heritage conservation of Drinkwater House. Sympathetic rehabilitation will allow for changes to be made to the building that accommodate contemporary living, while protecting the property’s cultural heritage attributes and value.

For rehabilitation projects, the Parks Canada Standards and Guidelines identify three additional conservation standards, which are:

- Repair rather than replace character-defining elements.
  - However, if character-defining elements or heritage attributes cannot be repaired, and sufficient physical evidence exists to recreate the original, the new elements should match the forms, materials and detailing of the original. If there is insufficient evidence to accurately reconstruct the element, the form, material and detailing of the new elements should be compatible with the existing character-defining elements or heritage attributes.

- Conserve the heritage value and character-defining elements when adding new elements.
  - The new work should be physically and visually compatible with, subordinate to, and distinguishable from, the original historic place.

- New additions or related new construction should not impair the essential form and integrity of an historic place if the new work is removed in the future.
5.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

Significant rehabilitation and renovation work will be required to return the house to residential use. This section provides a series of recommendations, in priority order, to enact immediately (Section 5.1), as part of the rehabilitation (Section 5.2), as future options (Section 5.3), and for ongoing maintenance (Section 5.4). It should be stressed that conservation of the property’s heritage attributes is regarded as the highest priority and reference to conservation of Drinkwater’s heritage attributes and their specific conservation treatments are provided in many of the recommendations provided below.

Conservation work for the property should be undertaken by conservation professionals familiar with heritage properties. Technical heritage conservation professionals should be members in good standing of the Canadian Association of Heritage Professionals (CAHP) and/or members of the Association for Preservation Technology (APT). For a list of qualified heritage professionals please refer to the Craft and Trade Specialists listed on the Directory of Professionals for CAHP (www.cahp-acep.ca). The trades and expertise for each action are also included under each recommendation sub-heading.

The proposed schedule to carry out the recommendations provided below is outlined in Section 5.5 and Appendix G.

5.1 Recommendations for Immediate Action

A number of actions are critical for stabilizing the heritage attributes and building fabric, and preventing undue deterioration of the resource.

5.1.1 Comply with Vacancy Requirements

Until the rehabilitation effort can begin, the house should be maintained according to the provisions of the City’s Vacant Building Bylaw 155-2012. This includes:

- Ensuring the building is secured against unauthorized entry; and,
- Protecting the building against the risk of fire, accident, or other danger.

Section 4.5 of Bylaw 155-2012 prescribes the requirements when boarding up the building, but this plan also recommends to:

- Surround the house with interlocking construction site protection fencing (see also under Recommendation 5.1.3); and,
- Continue monitoring the site weekly to ensure that the property has not suffered further damage as a result of vandalism or severe weather.
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Additional advice relevant to the care of Drinkwater House while it is vacant can be found in the Historic England guide Vacant Historic Buildings: An Owner’s Guide to Temporary Uses, Maintenance and Mothballing.⁶

Required Trades and Expertise:

- No special expertise or skills are required.

5.1.2 Remove water from the basement and regularly monitor for flooding

The Zaretsky Remedial Structural Work Engineering Report (Appendix D) notes that at the time of the inspection on October 13, 2015 there was up to 5 cm of standing water in the basement even though Mattamy had recently pumped out the basement. Until resources are available to repair the foundation (see Recommendation 5.2.2), it is recommended that:

- The basement be regularly monitored for flooding and pumped if necessary;
- Care should be taken to ensure that the water being pumped from the basement is piped as far as possible from the house to ensure it does not run back toward the basement; and,
- Any areas of standing water near the house should be excavated to ensure water drains away from the house foundation.

Required Trades and Expertise:

- No special expertise or skills are required.

5.1.3 Protect from adjacent construction

As mentioned under Section 3.2.4, masonry is particularly vulnerable to vibration. The following actions should be taken to ensure the house is protected during adjacent construction:

- A buffer of at least 15 feet (5 m) should be maintained around the structure to minimize the potential for vibration damage. The boundaries of this buffer should be demarcated on construction plans (and accompanied by briefings to construction supervisors) and by interlocking construction site protection fencing.

- Temporary roads anticipated to have heavy equipment traffic should not be routed in the vicinity of the house.

- If this cannot be avoided, the section of temporary road nearest the house should be underlain with rig mats to further dampen vibration. Further, the building should be monitored at every two weeks for new cracks or subsidence. If any changes are noted, equipment operation in the area should be suspended.

---

During the construction period, the site should be monitored bi-weekly to ensure that the structural integrity of the building is not being compromised by adjacent construction.

Mattamy staff or a designate should keep brief inspection reports recording the date, any changes to the building's status, and actions taken.

Required Trades and Expertise:

- No special expertise or skills are required.

### 5.2 Recommendations for Rehabilitation

#### 5.2.1 Repair or replace the roof

A sound roof and associated drainage is one of the most significant components for ensuring the long-term survival of a heritage building. Therefore it is integral that initial investments focus on sealing the roofing and ensuring the downspouts channel water a distance from the house.

A detailed assessment has not been carried out, but it may be possible to repair the existing roof. This is the most economical approach, and the roof is appropriate for Drinkwater's architectural style and history.

However, if the existing roof is found to be in poor condition, or is prohibitively expensive to repair, the preferred option is to replace the roof with new materials. There are several options for re-cladding: ribbed metal sheet, tin plate, wood shingle, and, to a lesser degree, slate were all commonly used in the 19th century, as was asphalt for the c. 1900 period. A new roof in any of these materials is therefore appropriate for Drinkwater, although the selection of roof material should also consider what is the most sustainable economically and practically.

New metal gutters, downspouts and rain water leaders should also be installed. Historically, these elements would have been square, larger than 20th century systems, and often made of copper. For the purposes of rehabilitation, a system should be selected that can be easily maintained or repaired, does not impact the original construction, and compliments the historic appearance of the building.

Regardless of whether the roof will be repaired or replaced, care should be taken to ensure that the cornice and cornice returns, which are heritage attributes, are not damaged during roof repairs or replacement, are repaired if necessary, and are protected and visible when the roof work is complete.

Replacing the roof will provide an opportunity to ensure it is properly vented, sealed, insulated, and that all rot is removed. To reduce a visual impact, venting can be moved from the roof faces and installed in the masonry of the gables; although this will require removing small sections of the original construction, it will contribute to the long-term preservation of the house. Replacing the roof also presents an opportunity to install skylights. If this design choice is made, the skylights should be placed between the rafters to reduce the impact to the original construction and only be installed on the façades that do not face the street.

Required Trades and Expertise:

- A heritage carpenter, particularly for the cornice and cornice return repairs and possibly to repair rot in the roof system.
A roofing contractor with experience on historic structures; and,

- A heritage architect to assess whether the roof can sustain the loads of the material selected, and ensure that the roof is properly vented, insulated, and drained.
  - Depending on the architect’s opinion regarding venting, a heritage mason will be required to install vents on the brick wall gables.

5.2.2 Repair or replace the foundation

As is the case with roofs, a sound foundation is critical to the survival of a historic structure. For Drinkwater House, the Remedial Structural Work Engineering Report (Appendix D) indicated that the foundation is ‘no longer structurally acceptable’ since water is entering through gaps in the rubble stone wall. To address this there are two options:

1) Repair the rubble stone foundation and install water barrier technology such as dimpled membranes; or

2) Raise and move the house over a new poured concrete foundation.

Under a rehabilitation program the typical approach would be to repair the foundation, however, in the case of Drinkwater House the preferred option is to move the house over a new poured concrete foundation. This option is preferable because:

- The current foundation is failing and may require extensive and logistically challenging repair;
- The structural integrity of the house is sufficient for it to be relocated without threatening the resource;
- It will rectify the difference in elevation between Drinkwater House and the grade level of the surrounding development (see Recommendation 5.3.2);
- It will make the basement useable space; and,
- It will aid the long-term preservation of Drinkwater House both structurally and as a desirable property for future buyers.

In either case, the first step is to address the drainage surrounding Drinkwater House. Water seeping into the existing foundation is damaging the masonry, and this will have an equally negative effect on the concrete of a newly constructed foundation. French drains, impermeable membranes, or other approaches may be necessary to prevent water from pooling near the building.

The decision to raise and move Drinkwater House over a new poured concrete foundation, should be accompanied by decisions on other elements of this conservation plan, primarily Recommendation 5.2.3 ‘Inspect and repair the basement timber beams’ and Recommendation 5.3.5 ‘Repair or remove the c. 1900s wing’. Repair of the basement timber beams will have to precede the relocation operation, and there may be less economic or logistical challenges if the c. 1900s wing is demolished prior to relocation. However, careful

---

consideration of the historic value of the wing should precede the decision to remove it (see Recommendation 5.3.5). Additionally, although not a recognized heritage attribute, it is recommended that the building should remain on a high point of the original lot, since this contributes to its contextual value.

To retain Drinkwater’s historic appearance, it is important that any new foundation or repair in concrete not be visible from the exterior. Importantly, the squared and dressed ashlar stone of the west façade should be used to face the new foundation, since this stone construction is a recognized heritage attribute of Drinkwater House.

Required Trades and Expertise for Drainage:

- A civil engineer or landscape architect to design solutions for preventing water infiltration and ensure adequate drainage of the Drinkwater Property.
- Specialized contractors may be required to meet the recommendations of the civil engineer or landscape architect.

Required Trades and Expertise for Repairing the Foundation:

- A heritage architect to design solutions for preventing water infiltration and ensuring adequate drainage.
- A heritage mason for the stone work reconstruction and repair, and other work as recommended by the heritage architect.
- Specialized contractors may be required to install materials such as membranes.

Required Trades and Expertise for Raise Drinkwater House and Construct a Concrete Foundation:

- A structural engineer to oversee the house relocation effort.
- A specialized contractor with expertise in raising and relocating historic masonry structures.
- A heritage mason to carry out restoration of the stone and brick work at the interface of the new foundation and the original masonry, and to face the above-grade foundation with the existing ashlar stone.

5.2.3 Inspect and repair the basement timber beams

The Remedial Structural Work Engineering Report (Appendix D) noted rot in some of the basement timber beams. This rot should be assessed and a strategy devised for its repair, which may include capping with new material. Beginning this work is dependent on first solving the basement water infiltration issue, as otherwise these repairs will be susceptible to deterioration through rot, or the decision to construct a new foundation, in which case the timber repairs must precede any relocation operation (see Recommendation 5.2.2).

Required Trades and Expertise:

- A heritage architect to assess the timber rot and determine the method for repair.
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- A heritage carpenter to carry out timber beam repairs as recommended by the heritage architect.

5.2.4 Install a new front door and repair the surround

As a prominent heritage attribute of Drinkwater, repair of the front entrance should involve retaining as many surviving elements as possible. Elements that cannot be repaired should be replaced in kind, and these new sections documented in the form of notes and sketches. Glazing should also match the original although this can include non-intrusive methods to environmentally seal the construction and prevent draft. Flashing may also be required.

The front door should have a Classical Revival panel design. Although the requirement for a fire-proof door may preclude installing a wood panel door, there are Building Code approved doors now being manufactured that approximate historic design and construction. However, a metal door that attempts to replicate the texture of wood should be avoided.

Required Trades and Expertise:

- A heritage carpenter to: assess what can be salvaged from the existing construction; carry out repairs, glazing, sealing, and add replacement elements; and, document where new material has been added.

5.2.5 Install new windows and sills

The existing windows are in poor condition and not worth repairing. New windows should therefore be installed, and this can include re-establishing the openings that are currently blocked up with masonry.

Given the age of the house, six-over-six or two-over-two double hung windows are both appropriate. When the c. 1840s portion was built, six-over-six pane windows were still common, but by the mid-19th century the two-over-two window was the most popular. One-over-one may be appropriate for the c. 1900s wing, although six-over-six windows had returned to popularity by that period. Therefore, the preferred option is to install new six-over-six, separated pane, double-hung windows for all openings.

Wood is by far the preferred material for historic house windows, but these can be expensive, difficult to acquire, and require additional maintenance. Nevertheless, their aesthetic quality far outweighs other types and modern wood windows match or exceed the efficiency performance of PVC inserts.

Regardless of the window material, the panes should be vertically proportioned or square, and made using true-divided lights. Interior muntins can sometimes approximate multi-pane windows, although the effect is noticeably less authentic and can actually detract from the historic appearance of the house.

Any rotted wood sills or surrounds should be replaced in wood and be protected from water damage by flashing or sealants that are not visually prominent.

Required Trades and Expertise:

- If wood windows are selected a heritage carpenter should be retained for their installation. The wood sill repair and replacement will also require the services of a heritage carpenter.
No special skills are required to install PVC window inserts, although this is not a preferred option.

5.2.6 Remove the wood frame extensions

The wood frame extensions are in poor condition and do not contribute to the historic appearance of Drinkwater. Care should be taken when removing these structures to ensure the masonry or other elements of the historic fabric is not damaged.

New exterior doors and surrounds for the c. 1900 wing will be required once the extensions are removed. For these a historic panel design should be selected.

Required Trades and Expertise:

- No special expertise or skills are required.

5.2.7 Renovate the interior

As a result of the fire and smoke damage, rehabilitating Drinkwater House will require extensive interior renovation. Many of the interior finishes will need to be replaced, but attempts should be made to retain and restore the historic building fabric identified in Table 1. Since the central staircase and the centre-hall plan are both significant heritage attributes, and their structural integrity is assessed as sound (see Appendix C), rehabilitation efforts should endeavor to retain as much as possible of these character-defining elements.

Required Trades and Expertise:

- A property restoration specialist to assess what can be salvaged from the interior elements and carry out the restoration and mitigation work;

- A heritage carpenter to install carry out repairs and add replacement elements, and to document where new material has been added to the central staircase.

5.2.8 Repair and repoint the brick masonry

The most important ‘safety valve’ to ensure the long-term conservation of masonry is a stable, soft, and flexible mortar which allows ‘moisture to migrate and evaporate through the mortar, not the brick’. Repointing should be undertaken where necessary and other repairs can include filling cracks with mortar, making dutchman repairs, or re-facing eroded masonry with replacement brick or mortar mixed with brick dust. It should be noted, however, that a complete re-pointing effort is rarely necessary since water infiltration is most often caused by failure in the flashing, roof covering, gutters, or window seals (see Recommendations 5.2.1 and 5.2.5).

---

Required Trades and Expertise:

- A heritage mason to prepare and submit a record of an appropriate mortar mixture, and to determine which portions of the walls require repointing.

5.3 Optional Rehabilitation Actions

5.3.1 Repaint the brick masonry

A chemical analysis has not been conducted, but the paint covering found on Drinkwater may have been applied historically; during the 19th century, paint was used as a form of waterproofing when only soft brick was available.

Even if the paint was applied more recently, removing it carries a high degree of risk. Abrasive methods such as sandblasting should be avoided, and even cleaning with water or chemical methods can cause undue damage. As Richard Pieper writes in the US National Park Service publication *Caring for Your Historic House*: ‘Generally, cleaning is an aesthetic concern rather than maintenance requirement, although it can be important in cases where significant contamination from sulphates or other salts is causing recurrent damage’.\(^{10}\) Unless a heritage architect finds sulphate or salt contamination to be an issue on Drinkwater House, any cleaning should be approached with a high degree of caution. Only a qualified specialist or firm should be retained to carry out the work, and they should agree to do a sample area before embarking on the whole project.

This said, repainting the brick can be considered as there are now permeable paints specifically designed for covering masonry. Nevertheless, these may not adhere to the covering currently on Drinkwater, so a cleaning operation may be ultimately required to prepare the masonry for repainting.

Required Trades and Expertise:

- A heritage architect to determine if paint removal is necessary.
- A masonry cleaning expert with experience removing paints from heritage structures.
- A painter with experience using modern, specially designed masonry coverings.

5.3.2 Grade the surrounding area

The grading plan for the proposed subdivision will make Drinkwater House approximately one metre higher than the adjacent new development, and higher than the City’s new grades on Creditview and other surrounding roads. If the decision is made to construct a new foundation, Mattamy may decide to lower the house to better fit the structure with the adjacent development.

The proposed lowering of the house is approximately 0.85 m. In combination with the lowering of the house, the use of a rear deck and transition grading will be required to address with the change in grade on the Drinkwater

house block. With appropriate landscaping and construction methods, the grade transition will help provide a clear distinction between the heritage house and the rest of the community.

Some modern landscape enhancements have also been proposed to accommodate for the grade change. These treatments, such as patio stones, should be located at the rear of the house to allow for the west façade (i.e. the front of the house) to remain the focal point of the heritage property. The appropriate materials and placement of retaining walls on the property may facilitate improved open space on the lot. The adjacent development will likely consist of residential dwelling with attached garages. A detached garage would be more suitable for Drinkwater House, and should remain at the rear of the property.

**Required Trades and Expertise:**

- A landscape architect or landscaping firm, but no special expertise or skills in historic landscape design is required.

**5.3.3 Improve circulation on the front (west) façade**

The historic front (west) façade with its main decorative door surround have been identified as heritage attributes of the property. For the circulation of the property to remain consistent with its historic use, landscape treatments should be designed in such a way as to accommodate and encourage the use of the front door on the west façade, and the retention of the frontage onto Creditview Road.

**Required Trades and Expertise:**

- A landscape architect or landscaping firm, but no special expertise or skills in historic landscape design is required.

**5.3.4 Remove spruce trees and replace with heritage vegetation**

The nine spruce trees at the front of the house will likely be removed for the development. Future planting on the property and on the block should be consistent with the heritage character of the Drinkwater property. Examples of historic plant species that are also tolerant to urban conditions include:

- Sugar Maple (*Acer saccharum*);
- Red Oak (*Quercus rubra*).
- Honey Locust (*Gleditsia triacanthos var. inermis*)

**Required Trades and Expertise:**

- A landscape architect or landscaping firm, but no special expertise or skills in historic landscape design is required.
5.3.5 Remove the c. 1900s wing

Demolition of the wing is not a preferred option under rehabilitation as it will remove a representative phase of Drinkwater's structural development. However, demolition of the wing is warranted in order to meet the minimum, 3-metre exterior side yard setback requirements (City of Brampton Zoning By-Law 252-2013, Section 2451.2-5).

Brick from the c. 1900s wing should be salvaged to rebuild the rear façade of the c. 1840s portion, and this reconstruction should follow a design that is sympathetic to the existing exterior of the c. 1840s portion.

Required Trades and Expertise:

- A heritage mason to ensure bricks of the highest quality are salvaged from the demolition and to reconstruct the rear façade of Drinkwater House.

5.3.6 Build a compatible new addition

Whether added to the existing c. 1900s wing or to replace it, a new addition should be complimentary in design to the c. 1840s portion and not exceed it in scale, massing and ornamentation. Although additions to Drinkwater are not constrained by municipal heritage design guidelines, best practice is to create an addition not larger than 25% of the footprint of original 1840s portion.

Required Trades and Expertise:

- A heritage architect to draft an addition design that compliments but does not replicate the original construction.

5.4 Future Action

5.4.1 Develop and follow a maintenance and monitoring program

Cyclical building maintenance is vital for the short and long-term conservation of any building and historic structures are no exception. In addition to cyclical maintenance schedules, heritage properties should also have a detailed monitoring program to establish a baseline condition for the property and monitor any deterioration that may require more frequent maintenance or periodic repair. The schedule described in Appendix F, Monitoring Program, is provided as preliminary guidance, with other necessary or additional monitoring programs specific to Drinkwater House to be added as required. For additional monitoring and maintenance manuals for the conservation of heritage buildings, please refer to the resources listed in Section 6.

5.5 Implementation Schedule

The block plan for the development allows for Drinkwater House to be reused as a residential dwelling in a manner consistent with the proposed subdivision. It is recommended that rehabilitation of the house follow five phases so as to meet critical priorities, rationalize planning and execution of the conservation actions, and to
ensure that an iterative understanding of the building can be incorporated into the plans of each successive phase.

The Gantt chart provided in Appendix G proposes a timeline for the conservation effort, though it should be stressed that this phasing is based on the current understanding of the building; Mattamy should prepare a more detailed schedule and phase concept when funds for the conservation program become available. The phased approach is as follows:

- **Initiation Phase – Stabilization (first 3 months)**
  - Recommendation 5.1.1 – Comply with Vacancy Requirements (90 days)
  - Recommendation 5.1.2 – Remove water from the basement and regularly monitor for flooding (90 days)
  - Recommendation 5.1.3 – Protect from adjacent construction (90 days)

- **Rehabilitation Phase 1 (dependent on completion of Initiation Phase and 3 months duration)**
  - Recommendation 5.2.1 – Repair or replace the roof (60 days)
  - Recommendation 5.2.2 – Repairs or reconstruct the foundation (60 days)
  - Recommendation 5.2.3 – Inspect and repair the basement timber beams (30 days)
  - Recommendation 5.2.4 – Install a new front door and repair the surround (30 days)
  - Recommendation 5.2.5 – Install new windows and sills (60 days)
  - Recommendation 5.2.6 – Remove the wood frame extensions (10 days)

- **Rehabilitation Phase 2 (dependent on completion of Rehabilitation Phase 1 and 6 months duration)**
  - Recommendation 5.2.7 – Renovate the interior (182 days)
  - Recommendation 5.2.8 – Repair and repoint the masonry (30 days)

- **Rehabilitation Phase 3 (optional but dependent on completion of Rehabilitation Phase 2 and 7 months duration)**
  - Recommendation 5.3.1 – Repaint the brick masonry (30 days)
  - Recommendation 5.3.2 – Grade the surrounding area (30 days)
  - Recommendation 5.3.3 – Improve circulation on the front (west) façade (10 days)
  - Recommendation 5.3.4 – Remove spruce trees and replace with heritage vegetation (10 days)
  - Recommendation 5.3.5 – Repair or remove the c. 1900s portion (30 days)
  - Recommendation 5.3.6 – Build a compatible new addition (182 days)
- Long-term Management Phase (dependent on completion of Rehabilitation Phase 2 and continuous)
  - Recommendation 5.4.1 – Develop and follow a maintenance and monitoring program (continuous)
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## Cyclical Maintenance Considerations for the Drinkwater House

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Feature</th>
<th>Short-Term (1-3 years)</th>
<th>Long Term (5-15 years)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roof</td>
<td>■ Repair/preserve cornice and cornice returns</td>
<td>■ Repoint chimneys, as per monitoring program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>■ Repair/preserve cornice and cornice returns</td>
<td>■ Repair/replace roof, as per monitoring program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exterior Walls</td>
<td>■ Repoint mortar joints where necessary</td>
<td>■ Replace flashings at around chimneys or any valleys on roof pitch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>■ Install water-run off devices</td>
<td>■ Repair/preserve cornice and cornice returns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windows and Doors</td>
<td>■ Repair/replace rotted sills and lintels</td>
<td>■ Repoint mortar joints, and consider any masonry unit replacement as per monitoring program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>■ Repair/replace missing windows</td>
<td>■ Paint/preserve all exterior wood features on windows and door</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>■ Repair/replace missing doors</td>
<td>■ Paint/preserve decorative door surround</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>■ Preserve/paint wooden decorative door surround on east facade</td>
<td>■ Paint/preserve any interior wooden features such as floors, as per monitoring program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation</td>
<td>■ Repoint mortar joints if necessary</td>
<td>■ Repoint mortar joints as per monitoring program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>■ Install water-run off devices to force water away from foundation</td>
<td>■ Replace any missing masonry units if necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>■ Replace any missing masonry units if necessary</td>
<td>■ Paint/preserve any interior wooden features such as floors, as per monitoring program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior Features</td>
<td>■ Remediate/repair interior features with fire or smoke damage</td>
<td>■ Paint/preserve any interior wooden features such as floors, as per monitoring program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>■ Repair/replace interior features required for rehabilitation of interior</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feature</td>
<td>Minimum Inspection Frequency</td>
<td>Season</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roof</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>Spring or fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chimneys</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>Fall, or prior to use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roof Drainage/Eaves</td>
<td>6 Months</td>
<td>Before and after wet seasons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exterior Walls</td>
<td>6 Months</td>
<td>Spring and Fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>Spring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation and Grade</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>Spring or wet season</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doors</td>
<td>6 Months</td>
<td>Spring and Fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attic</td>
<td>4 Months</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basement</td>
<td>4 Months</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Date: 2016-04-05

Subject: Recommendation Report: Designation under Part IV, Section 29 of the *Ontario Heritage Act* - 2472 Bovaird Drive West - Ward 6 (HE.x 2472 Bovaird Dr. W)

Contact: Antonietta Minichillo, Heritage Coordinator, Planning 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 April 5, 2016, to the Brampton Heritage Board Meeting of April 19, 2016, re: Heritage Designation under Part IV, Section 29 of the *Ontario Heritage Act* – 2472 Bovaird Drive West – Ward 6 (HE.x 2472 Bovaird Dr. W), be received;

2. That designation of 2472 Bovaird Drive West 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 property at 2472 Bovaird Drive West 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 property at 2472 Bovaird Drive West 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 as required under the Ontario Heritage Act.
- This report achieves the Strategic Plan priorities by preserving and protecting heritage environments with balanced, responsible planning.

Background:

The property at 2472 Bovaird Drive West is a narrow rectangular 0.84 acre (0.34 hectare) lot located near the northeast corner of Bovaird Drive West and Heritage Road. It contains a two-and-a-half storey red brick detached residential dwelling set back from Bovaird Drive. The property is currently listed on the City of Brampton’s Municipal Register of Cultural Heritage Resources.

The property is located in Heritage Heights (Secondary Plan Area 52 and 53) and is subject to secondary planning including the undertaking of a heritage study to identify heritage resources in the area. While the area is currently rural in nature it is identified as an urban area in the City’s Official Plan.

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 property at 2472 Bovaird Drive West 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 property at 2472 Bovaird Drive West 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 residence at 2472 Bovaird Drive West has design or physical value because it is a representative example of Queen Anne architecture. The residence contains many of the hallmarks of the Queen Anne style including elaborate brickwork, decorative terracotta panels, an irregular roofline, windows of varying shapes and sizes with rusticated sills, segmental arches and drip moulds, and a visible stone foundation.

The residence also displays a high degree of craftsmanship and artistic merit, evident in the design, material, and finishes of the building, particularly the detailed brickwork and woodwork which distinguishes the house. The historic or associative value relates to its connection with at least two prominent families in Norval: the Greenswords, an early settlement family, and the McMeekins. The property has contextual value as it maintains and supports the existing rural 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.

The property owners of 2472 Bovaird Drive West support the heritage designation.

Upon Council approval, staff will proceed with the designation process in accordance with the Ontario Heritage Act.

Corporate Implications:

Financial Implications:

Upon designation, the property becomes eligible for the City of Brampton’s Designation Heritage Property Incentive Grant program, which offers funds to cover half 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:

N/A

Strategic Plan:

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

The property located at 2472 Bovaird Drive West is of cultural heritage value or interest, sufficient to warrant designation under Part IV of the *Ontario Heritage Act*. It is recommended that 2472 Bovaird Drive West be designated under Part IV of the *Ontario Heritage Act* according to the Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest and Description of Heritage Attributes included in Appendix A. Staff will proceed with the designation process in accordance with the *Ontario Heritage Act*.

Respectfully submitted by:

Original approved by:  
David Waters, MCIP, RPP, PLE  
Manager Land Use Policy  
Heather MacDonald, MCIP, RPP, CHRL  
Acting Executive Director of Planning

Report authored by: Antonietta Minichillo, Heritage Coordinator

Attachments:

Appendix A - Heritage Report: Reasons for Heritage Designation – 2472 Bovaird Drive West
Heritage Report:
Reasons for Heritage Designation

2472 Bovaird Drive West

April 2016
### Profile of Subject Property

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Municipal Address</strong></th>
<th>2472 Bovaird Drive West</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PIN Number</strong></td>
<td>143630027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Roll Number</strong></td>
<td>10-06-0-003-07300-0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Legal Description</strong></td>
<td>CON 5 WHS PT LOT 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ward Number</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Property Name</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Owner</strong></td>
<td>L. J. C. Mendes, C. Lopes-Luis</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>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Construction Date</strong></td>
<td>Circa 1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Notable Owners or Occupants</strong></td>
<td>Greensword Family, McMeekin Family, Teramoto Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Heritage Resources on Subject Property</strong></td>
<td>Residential dwelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relevant Council Resolutions</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional Information</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Current Situation:

The property at 2472 Bovaird Drive West 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 property at 2472 Bovaird Drive West is a narrow rectangular 0.84 acre lot located by the northeast corner of Bovaird Drive West and Heritage Road. It contains a two-and-a-half storey red brick detached residential dwelling set back from the roadway.

3. Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest

Design/Physical Value:

The cultural heritage value of 2472 Bovaird Drive West is related to its design or physical value as a representative example of Queen Anne architecture. The Queen Anne style was popular during the late Victorian period, from approximately 1890 until the first two decades of the 20th century. The style is notable in its departure from the symmetry that characterized earlier buildings of the Victorian period. Queen Anne houses typically have an eclectic mix of design and materials. Their floor plans are extremely variable and they were often large enough to accommodate extended family and servants. The industrial era, with its economic boom, advances in technology and the growth of the railway system, lowered the cost of building materials and made houses affordable for the middle and lower classes. This spurred the construction of Queen Anne style houses, many of which were deliberately opulent to reflect the new status of their homeowners.

The dwelling at 2472 Bovaird Drive West contains many of the hallmarks of the Queen Anne style including elaborate brickwork, decorative terra cotta panels, an irregular roofline, windows of varying shapes and sizes with rusticated sills, segmental arches and drip moulds, and a visible stone foundation. Other architectural features include two projecting gabled bays, paired decorative, pierced wood brackets with drop finials.

The entrance, located in the centre bay, is protected by a reconstructed porch. Ghost markings around the entranceway on the brick in older photographs of the house suggest an earlier front porch, although its original appearance is unknown. A half-moon
window on the second storey of the centre bay is capped by red brick voussoirs with corbelled label stops. The house also has a number of Italianate features, including broad eaves and paired brackets, its brickwork, roof structure, and visible stone foundation are strongly indicative of the Queen Anne style.

The residence also displays a high degree of craftsmanship and artistic merit, evident in the design, material, and finishes of the building, particularly the detailed brickwork and woodwork which distinguishes the house. Decorative elements include the paired brackets, terracotta panels above the basement windows, voussoirs finished with an egg and dart design, brick banding at different levels of the house, and the dentilled cornices on the gables of the frontispieces. Many of the window openings are also delicately embellished. The paired windows on the first storey of the dual frontispieces are separated by a modillion in the form of a fluted pillar with a decorative cap and an ivy vine design in the window tympanum. Decorative brick banding separates the different levels of the houses.

**Historical/Associative Value:**

The property at 2472 Bovaird Drive West also has historical/associative value due to its connection with at least two prominent families in Norval: the Greenswords, an early settlement family, and the McMeekins. The property on which the house sits was originally associated with Alex C. Lawrence who then sold part of the property to the McNichol family. Archibald McNichol then sold the southwestern part of the land to Timothy Greensword in March 1839. He was located at Lot 11 C on 5 on the Tremaine Map.

Timothy Greensword was a farmer originally from England and his wife, Rhoda, was from Ireland. They had four sons and four daughters and at least two of their sons, Edward and Isaac, were born in Peel. Following Timothy's death in the mid-1870s, Isaac took over the land. Edward and his wife, Isabella Orr, granted a quit claim for the property to Isaac in June 1885, at which point in time there was a four room frame house on the site. According to the census records, by 1901 Isaac and his wife, Margaret, were living in a twelve room brick house on the property, likely the extant building, with their sons, Albert and Wellington. Edward and his wife moved to Norval Station.

The two brothers were well-known men in the area, staunch Conservative supporters, and members of the Methodist Church. Edward and Isaac were also involved with the Halton Rifles, now known as the Lorne Scots, during the mid-late 19th century. Edward Greensword in particular was involved in the fight against the Fenians. At the age of 23,
as part of the Norval Infantry Company of the Halton Rifles, he travelled under the command of Joseph Kyle to the Niagara area in 1866 to defend the border against the Fenians. He attended a memorial event at the site in 1898 and received a Fenian Raid Medal for his service in 1900. His brother Isaac attended the militia camp in Niagara in 1873 and is listed on the Halton Rifles acquaintance roll for that year.

In the spring of 1909, Isaac Greensword retired and moved to Brampton. He sold the family property to Archibald M.C. McMeekin for $7300. McMeekin lived in the house with his wife, Annie, and their son, Lorne. He was a charted member of the Jersey Cattle Club and a famed horse breeder who won numerous awards at fairs during the 1930s especially. One of his fillies, Lady Lee Axworthy, won the Grand Championship in 1931 at the Royal Winter Fair. Archibald McMeekin eventually sold the property in June 1956, not long before his death in 1961.

The Teramoto family, one of the first Japanese families in Peel, lived at the McMeekin farm for a time in 1945, according to Shirley Teramoto, who wrote a chapter on the family in the book From “Wolf's Den” to Huttonville and the Pioneers Who Made it Possible.” In a 2012 issue of Nikkei Images, Shirley Teramoto stated that they lived in an old frame house without any amenities and could be a reference to the original dwelling of the Greensword family. One could presume that the Teramoto’s resided in an earlier structure of the property’s history that continued to be on the property even after the red brick farm house was complete.

**Contextual Value:**

The property has contextual value as it maintains and supports the current rural character of the area. The Greensword/McMeekin house is closely linked with other cultural heritage resources in the area including the Greensword orchard, McNichol Cemetery, and the Laird Estate.

**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:

- Queen Anne architecture
- 2 1/2 storey height
- Projecting gabled bays on front facade
- Irregular roofline
- Visible stone foundation
- Broad eaves
- Wood soffit
- Wood fascia
- Paired and pierced wooden brackets
- Red brick construction
- Decorative brickwork and brick designs, including banding and voussoirs
- Design and placement of decorative terracotta panels
- Location, shape, and size of original window openings
- Wood window surrounds
- Rusticated stone sills
- South facing orientation

5. Alteration History

The following are the known alterations to the subject property:

- Board and batten addition to the rear of the house
- Removal of original front porch
- Removal of original windows, except for the rounded windows beneath gabled projecting bays

6. Archaeological Potential

The property has archaeological potential because it is within 300 meters of a secondary waters source and 100 meters of an early historic transportation route, and because the property is listed on the City of Brampton’s Municipal Register of Cultural Heritage Resources.

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

"Archibald McMeekin Noted as Horseman". Georgetown Herald, pg. 15. June 1, 1961: Georgetown, ON.


"Judge Standard Bred and Draught Horses". The Globe, pg. 17. Nov. 19, 1931: Toronto, ON.


"Obituary: Edward L. Greensword". Brampton Conservator, pg. 5. May 31, 1923: Brampton, ON.

"Obituary: Isaac Greensward". Georgetown Herald, pg. 1. April 30, 1924: Georgetown, ON.

"Over the Lake: Veterans of '66 in St. Catharines". The Globe, pg. 2. July 26, 1898: Toronto, ON.


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

Figure 1: Aerial view of 2472 Bovaird Drive West (Source: Brampton Maps)
Figure 2: 1877 map with the showing Greensword Farm (Source: Pope, J.H, 1877)
Figure 3: Front façade

Figure 4: West façade
Figure 5: Projecting bay on front façade and brick details

Figure 6: Wood soffit, fascia and paired pierced brackets
Figure 7: Wood door surrounds, brick segmental arch topped with egg and dart drip moulding

Figure 8: Decorative pressed brick on west projecting bay of front façade
Figure 9: Decorative pressed brick on east projecting bay of front façade

Figure 10: Stone window sill above decorative pressed brick on east projecting bay of front façade
Figure 11: Decorated drip moulding with egg-and-dart motif above segmental arch

Figure 12: Stone foundation
Date: 2016-04-08

Subject: Recommendation Report: Designation under Part IV, Section 29 of the Ontario Heritage Act – 2838 Bovaird Drive West (Laird House) - Ward 6 (HE.x 2838 Bovaird Dr. W)

Contact: Antonietta Minichillo, Heritage Coordinator, Planning 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 April 8, 2016, to the Brampton Heritage Board Meeting of April 19, 2016, re: Heritage Designation under Part IV, Section 29 of the Ontario Heritage Act – 2838 Bovaird Drive West – Ward 6 (HE.x 2838 Bovaird Dr. W), be received;

2. That designation of 2838 Bovaird Drive West 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 property at 2838 Bovaird Drive West 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 property at 2838 Bovaird Drive West 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 as required under the *Ontario Heritage Act*.
- This report achieves the Strategic Plan priorities by preserving and protecting heritage environments with balanced, responsible planning.

Background:

The property at 2838 Bovaird Drive West, known as the Laird House, is located on the north side of Bovaird Drive West at the top of the hill heading into Norval. It contains a two storey single detached dwelling, numerous outbuildings to the north including a barn and the remains of a fieldstone foundation, a long driveway on the east side, and mature trees. It is located within the Provincial Greenbelt Plan and is abutting Saint Nirankari Mission, a place of worship. The subject property is currently listed on the City of Brampton’s *Municipal Register of Cultural Heritage Register*.

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 *Ontario Heritage Act*.

The property at 2838 Bovaird Drive West 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 property at 2838 Bovaird Drive West 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 Laird House has design or physical value because it is a representative example of an Italianate style residence, and displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit, particularly the brick and wood work. The historic or associative value relates to its connection to the Laird family, who were pioneers of Peel County. 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 half 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:

N/A

Strategic Plan:

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

Conclusion:

The property located at 2838 Bovaird Drive West (Laird House) is of cultural heritage value or interest, sufficient to warrant designation under Part IV of the Ontario
Heritage Act. It is recommended that 2838 Bovaird Drive West be designated under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act according to the Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest and Description of Heritage Attributes included in Appendix A. Staff will proceed with the designation process in accordance with the Ontario Heritage Act.

Respectfully submitted by:

Original approved by: 
David Waters, MCIP, RPP, PLE
Manager Land Use Policy

Original approved by: 
Heather MacDonald, MCIP, RPP, CHRL
Acting Executive Director of Planning

Authored by: Antonietta Minichillo, MES, MCIP, RPP, CAHP
Heritage Coordinator

Attachments:

Appendix A - Heritage Report: Reasons for Heritage Designation – 2838 Bovaird Drive West (Laird House)
APPENDIX A

Heritage Report:
Reasons for Heritage Designation

Laird House
2838 Bovaird West Drive
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Profile of Subject Property</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Municipal Address</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PIN Number</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Roll Number</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Legal Description</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ward Number</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Property Name</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Owner</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Owner Concurrence</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Zoning</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Use(s)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Construction Date</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Notable Owners or Occupants</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Heritage Resources on Subject Property</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relevant Council Resolutions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional Information</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Current Situation

The property at 2838 Bovaird Drive West 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 property at 2838 Bovaird Drive West is located on the north side of Bovaird Drive West, west of Heritage Road. The 10.82 acre (4.379 hectares) lot contains a two storey house set back from the roadway, a large barn, four other outbuildings, mature vegetation and significant remnants of a large granite stone foundation. The east side of the property hosts a ravine containing a Credit River tributary creek. The property is also located within the Provincial Greenbelt Plan and adjacent to a place of worship.

3. Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest

Design/Physical Value:

The cultural heritage value of 2838 Bovaird Drive West is related to its design or physical value as a representative example of an Italianate style house. Its ornate detailing and decoration also displays the high degree of craftsmanship possessed by the Laird family who built the structure in 1886 and were known for building high-quality structures in the area.

The Italianate style, which was inspired by Tuscan and Italian Renaissance architecture, was popular for residential and commercial buildings in Ontario during the mid-late 19th century. Houses built in this style tend to be highly decorative with low-pitched roofs, broad eaves with brackets, tall and narrow arched windows, bay windows, quoins, belvederes, cupolas, and pedimented windows and doors.

The two-storey, red brick house at 2838 Bovaird Drive West contains many features of the Italianate style including the low pitched hipped roof, overhanging eaves, decorative paired brackets under an ornamental cornice, a decorative diamond-patterned frieze, bay windows, and a small, one-storey entry porch with decorative millwork. The building is also distinguished by its three bay front façade, voussoirs, wood window shutters, and a corbelled chimney. The entranceway is embellished by a muntin-divided, segmentally
arched transom with a buff brick voussoir and moulded double-doors with round-headed glass panels and uniquely decorated doorknobs.

The verandah on the east side of the house, now enclosed by glass, is also heavily decorated with fretwork but appears to be later in date. It is covered by a low-pitched roof and is supported by engaged posts and a turned-wood balustrade.

A board and batten rear addition was constructed at an unknown time, and is sympathetic in appearance to the original building. It has a separate entrance with an arched transom and sidelights, all of which is framed by a Classically inspired moulded door surround with pilasters and a keystone. The addition also features diamond-shaped windows to the right of the doorway on the first and second storeys, a two-over-two arched window on the second storey above the door, and a wooden cornice and diamond-patterned frieze. The frieze has a slightly different profile to that of the original house but is similar in design.

Located to the north of the house are numerous outbuildings, the most significant of which is a beautiful red gambrel-roofed barn as well as the remains of a granite fieldstone wall, approximately ten feet in height, which is close to the barn. It appears as though the courtyard created by this stone wall is currently being used as a picnic space on the property. Part of a door frame is still attached to the wall on the west side. Due to the proximity of this fieldstone wall to the extant house, which sits on the footprint of the original house, it is surmised that the wall was once part of an earlier barn which likely burned down in 1885 at the same time as the original house.

In form and function, Canadian barns are classified as Pennsylvanian, Dutch and English. The gambrel-roofed barn, which is often associated with Dutch Colonial design, became popular in Ontario near the turn of the 20th century when agricultural productivity increased and larger barns became necessary. The shape of the gambrel roof provided a larger loft capacity than other barn styles.

The barn on this property is clad in metal and has a stone foundation. The upper level of the interior was presumably originally accessed from the outside via an earth ramp on the north side. The difference in the weather pattern on the foundation supports this theory. Doors on the upper level of the barn on the east and west sides likely facilitated hay slings. Two barn cupolas/vents on the east and west gables of the roof as well as vents under the fascia provided ventilation for the building.
Historical/Associative Value

The property at 2838 Bovaird Drive West has historical or associative value for its connection to the Laird and Lucy Maud Montgomery families. As a homestead for one of the first families in the area, it also contributes to the understanding and history of the agricultural community of Norval.

The subject lands were occupied throughout most of the 19th and 20th centuries by the Laird family of Norval. The Lairds, a well-known United Empire Loyalist farming family, owned the property for over 140 years, beginning with Peter Laird who came to Upper Canada from Montpelier, Vermont in 1833. Peter Laird was a building contractor and the son of a shipbuilder who emigrated to the United States from Perthshire, Scotland.

Peter Laird purchased the west half of Lot 11 on Concession 6 in West Chinguacousy from Lewis Bradley in 1840, and was one of the first settlers of Norval. By 1851, he lived in a brick house with his wife, Catherine Miller, and his children. This home was lost to fire in 1885.

Peter Laird and his sons, Alfred, John, Peter, Louis, and Nelson constructed the present house at 2838 Bovaird Drive West in 1886 on the footprint of the original homestead. According to Murray Laird, the grandson of Peter Laird, the year 1886 was carved into the plaster of one of the windows. The Lairds, who operated a carpentry business for a time in Norval, were known for building homes and barns in the area and were paid as much as $1000 for their work.

Alfred Miller Laird, Peter's youngest son, inherited the land from his father and lived at the ancestral residence, "Lairdholme", until his death in 1934. During this time, the Lairds grew a variety of crops including grain, barley, oats, wheat, turnips, and cow feed, and also raised poultry, sheep, dairy, and beef cattle, and pigs. Alfred Laird was a well-known resident, and in his later years became heavily involved in the community as Chairman of the School Board. He was also a loyal Liberal supporter like his father.

Following Alfred’s death, the property was taken over by his son, Murray Laird, the last of the family to farm on the property. Murray was a breeder of Jersey cattle and specialized in fruit growing. Shortly after his father’s death, he married Marion Webb, the cousin of Lucy Maud Montgomery. She was a native of Green Gables, Prince Edward Island and met Murray during a stay in Norval with Lucy Maud. Murray Laird passed away in 1987. The family is also connected through marriage to other significant Peel families including the McClures and Haggerts.
Contextual Value

The property at 2838 Bovaird Drive West has contextual value as it helps to maintain and support the rural character of the area and is located in the Provincial Greenbelt Plan. It is also historically linked to the historic hamlet of Norval just west of the property. Other properties in the area also bear the Laird name, such as Laird's Hill along the road to Norval which is considered a cultural heritage landscape.

4. Description of Heritage Attributes

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:

- Italianate architectural style
- Two storey height
- Low pitched hipped roof
- Red brick cladding
- Overhanging eaves
- Paired wood brackets
- Wood soffit
- Wood frieze with detailing
- Wood fascia
- Wood dentil bedmould
- Wood sash windows
- Wood shutters
- Voussoirs
- Corbelled chimney
- Bay windows with bell cast roof and decorative paired brackets
- Porch with square columns and decorative millwork
- Side porch with square posts and decorative millwork
- Gambrel-roofed barn
- Fieldstone wall
- Setback of house from Bovaird Drive West
- Mature trees and vegetation
5. Alteration History and Heritage Integrity

The following are the known alterations to the subject property:

- An addition was put onto the rear (north side) of the house at an unknown time.
- Some of the windows appear to have been replaced.
- The porch on the east side of the house was encased in glass to extend the interior space of the house.
- The chimney on the west side has been removed and the chimney on the east side has been shortened below the pitch of the roof.

6. Archaeological Potential

The subject property has archaeological potential because it is within 300 meters of a secondary water source, it is within 100 meters of an early historic transportation, and it is “listed” on the City of Brampton’s Municipal Register of Cultural Heritage Resources.

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

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

2838 Bovaird Dr. W. Real Estate Ad. http://www.collierscanada.com/15278

"April 6, 2010 2838 Bovaird Drive West," In Built Heritage and Cultural Heritage Landscape Assessment, Bovaird Drive: Lake Louise Drive/Worthington Avenue to Old Pine Crescent, Brampton, Regional Municipality of Peel, Ontario, by Amec, pg. 40 and Appendix B.


"Nov. 2001 2838 Highway No.7," In *Summary of Historical Associations For Purposes of Inventory Evaluation, City of Brampton*.


9. Appendix

Map 1: 2838 Bovaird Drive West property outlined in red.

Map 2: Map showing the location of the property along Bovaird Drive.
Map 3: Bird's Eye View of 2838 Bovaird Drive West (Bing Maps).

Map 4: Location of Laird property, Concession 6 West Part Lot 11, South Chinguacousy on 1859 Tremaine map, 26 years before the fire.
Map 5: Laird House property highlighted on 1877 Peel County Atlas, Concession 6, West Part Lot 11, South Chinguacousy.
Image 1: View of the Laird House and property from the driveway.

Image 2: View of the south and east sides of the Laird House.
Image 3: Close up view of front portico and bay windows.

Image 5: Detail of cornice, bedmould, frieze, and paired wood brackets.

Image 6: East façade of house with view of addition.
Image 7: East façade of house with detail of porch.

Image 8: South façade with view of front door and foundation.
Image 9 & 10: Entry Door and handle detail.
Image 11: Fieldstone wall to the north of the house with red gambrel-roofed barn in the background.

Image 12: Detail of fieldstone wall to the north of the house.
Image 13: Detail of the corner stones of the fieldstone wall.

Image 14: Existing picnic area created by fieldstone wall.
Image 15: Gambrel-roofed barn to the north of the house.

Image 16: East side of gambrel-roofed barn.
Image 17: Gambrel-roofed barn cupola/vent.

Image 18: Gambrel-roofed barn haysling door.
Image 19: View of surrounding landscape from northwest side of the property.

Image 20: Pile of red bricks possibly from the original west chimney.
Image 21: Mature willow tree to the north of the house.
Image 22: Peter Laird and his family c.1855, courtesy of PAMA.

Image 23: Picture of Peter Laird from the 1877 Peel County Atlas.
Image 24: Original Laird house at Concession 6 West Part Lot 11, South Chinguacousy.


Murray Laird plowed his land the hard way

By ANI PEDERIAN
Herald Staff Writer

Today, Murray Laird has time to watch the chickadees and gold finches that come to peck away at the hanging seed containers in view of his dining room windows.

At one time, there wasn’t time to take in the panoramic southerly view from atop the hill that lies between Norval and Brampton off Highway 7.

Mr. Laird, who turns 80 this summer, was too busy farming the 100 acres belonging to the Laird family. His dad, Alfred Miller Laird was in poor health, and his only brother was disabled at a young age when he fell beside the threshing machine in the barn. It was up to Murray to work the land.

TWO YEARS

“I only put in two hours at two highs,” said the white haired gentleman. “You couldn’t buy help on the farm for love nor money, so I played an old saw and it was hard work from there on.”

REFLECTIONS:

A series of historical articles on Walton’s heritage

Back in the days when you could buy two pounds of round steak for a quarter, Mr. Laird plaited barley, oats, wheat, turnips and cow feed. There were poultry, sheep, dairy and beef cattle and pigs to raise, as well as grow grain.

“I learned to shear sheep with Jimmy, my grandfather Peter Laird in 1935. The son of United Empire Loyalists from Massachusetts, Vermont. Peter Laird paid £75 for the acreage, buying it from a Lewis Braith who’d been granted William the Fourth of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, for his services in the military.

NOT COSTLY

“Those were the good old days when it didn’t cost much. Now they try and raise a family of ten kids,” Murray Laird chuckled.

The farm was passed on to his youngest son and heir, Alfred Miller Laird, Murray’s dad. Alfred Laird lived from 1857 to 1904 and had two sons and two daughters. Murray is the only surviving one.

Across from Pine Valley Farms, at the crest of the Highway 7 hill leaving Norval, stands the house that Peter Laird and his five sons, Alfred, Jack, Peter, Lou and Nelson, built in 1896.

“Goddamn, this is looking better day by day,” Murray Laird says.

He points to the road two decades ago, on a single furrow walking plow.

In 1914, wheat was $5 to $6 a bushel, and the men who drove the teams of horses with the grain to the mill earned $1 a day for their ten hours or more labor.

“Everything was a good price in those days, when the war was on. It seemed as if, if you want prosperity, you’ve got to start a war,” Mr. Laird said, proclaiming himself an agnostic.

Although Murray Laird now lives on only 20 acres of his original 100, he still has the desire for the land bought by his father in 1867.

A native of Green Gables, Prince Edward Island, Peg Laird was used to the farming life. A visit to her cousin Lucy Maud Montgomery, who was the Canadian author of the popular Anne of Green Gables and wife of Norval and Union Presbyterian Churches pastor, introduced Peg Laird to her future husband, Norval farmer Murray Laird. Married in 1924, after an eight year courtship, the couple have lived at the crest of the Norval hill that borders on Brampton.

(Herald photo)

It was built on the same foundation as the original home that burnt down prior to that year. The date 1896 is scratched in the plaster of one of the windows.

The Laird brothers were known around the countryside for the homes and barns they built, and Murray Laird remembers his dad Alfred pointing out homes he’d built with his brothers and father Peter for a sum like $1,000.

The Laird family home has lots of windows and a carriage house below. In 1914, it and the 700 acres were sold. Because the farm on the west side of Chinguacousy Township had been surveyed incorrectly, the Lairds gained the extra land they now live on.
Passenger rail service across Canada is suffering. Rail lines are being abandoned and historic railway stations are disappearing. In the face of this, there is a positive story from St. Marys, a town of about 7,000 people, 20 kilometers southwest of Stratford. Its 1907 Grand Trunk Railway Station, a few blocks from the downtown core, still serves rail passengers and interior rooms have been converted into creative work space for several new tenants.

The station has significant historic associations with the growth and development of the town. In the mid 1850s, news of the building of a Toronto to Sarnia line of the Grand Trunk Railway was greeted with excitement in St. Marys. Residents were soon disappointed when the main depot was built in 1858 at the Junction of the lines to Sarnia and to London, about two miles from the core of St. Marys. The distance between was inadequately served by an access road.

To alleviate this inconvenience, in 1879 GTR constructed a small, frame station closer to the downtown. This modest building did not present the strong first impression of St. Marys that town officials felt was deserving. Many supported the construction of a rival rail line, entering the town from the southeast, that later became a branch of Canadian Pacific Railway. Faced with this competition, GTR built a handsome, passenger and freight depot on the railway right of way close to Queen Street, the town’s main thoroughfare.

The GTR station was constructed in the summer of 1907. The general contractor and possible designer was E. Chandler of Stratford. He used a glazed Logan brick, deep orange brown in colour with characteristic black flecks of granite. The new station, replacing the modest frame station and supplementing the remote Junction Station, was in a beautiful location, perched on the edge of the wide Trout Creek valley, close to the magnificent railway trestle bridge crossing to the north. It stood in the shadow of the town’s iconic stone water tower to the southwest.

This station has been the arrival and departure point for a century of local and area residents. Some were taking short
excursions to other communities along the line; some were striking out to university or some new profession or trade; leaving to serve their country in war time; or arriving as immigrants to make a new life in the St. Marys area.

In the 1970s, VIA trains still stopped in St. Marys but Canadian National Railway ceased staffing the building and left it almost empty. In the mid 1980s, the station was to be demolished. Thanks to intervention by the Town of St. Marys and some government grants, the station was saved. The project gave the community a great sense of accomplishment. In 1988, ownership transferred to the municipality and the sadly neglected building was revitalized.

The surviving 1907 floor plan of the long neglected interior revealed a central waiting room, a station agent's office overlooking the track, a ladies' retiring room, smoking room for men, a baggage room at the south end, and an express department at the north end. Divisions to mark these separate rooms were restored.

Other restored features include a high vaulted, central ceiling in the waiting room. This is supported by two, curved oak beams with a simple wooden crown mould bead separating the walls and ceiling. The inside walls are painted plaster over the double brick exterior and have a high panelled wainscoting topped with a ledge. The station agent's bay projects into the central waiting area at its northeast corner. The trim and framing of the wickets connecting the waiting room to this office are restored. A large fireplace with brick surround and an oak mantel is the main feature of the west wall, beside the main entrance door. The floor is tongue and groove hardwood with a varnished finish.

In 1988, a cedar roof was put in place and the wood trim, soffits and fascia were repaired. Other original exterior features include a layered hipped roof with bargeboard trim, typical of Ontario railway depots. On the east side, facing the railway track, the station agent's bay has windows on its three exterior walls on the east, north, and south, giving a clear view of the line in both directions.

Under the terms of the transfer of ownership from CNR, a VIA ticket counter is maintained and the building is open for passenger convenience during train times. Since 1988, some rooms have been leased to private businesses or used as offices for town departments, including Tourism. The Town maintains the building and grounds.

This satisfactory arrangement was threatened when VIA recently reduced passenger service, leaving only two trains each way on the north line to and from Toronto. Revenue from ticket sales was affected. A further challenge came with the relocation of municipal staff from the station to the Town Hall. Realizing that an empty building is not a healthy situation, Town Council and administration decided to call for proposals for the lease of vacant space in the station.

The leasing condition was set as preserving features, exterior and interior, that are considered to be of cultural heritage significance. In 1987, the property was designated under the Ontario Heritage Act, but the statement of cultural heritage value and description of heritage attributes were brief and lacking in sufficient detail. The St. Marys Heritage Committee updated the bylaw, listing clearly and completely all significant architectural exterior and interior features.

Although several prospective tenants were unable to meet the conditions, leases were signed for four rooms in the station, leaving the central area available for rail passengers. Charles Sharan and Cameron Porteous are visual artists; Reed Needle restores antique spinning wheels and antique clocks. A fourth tenant recently signed a lease for the remaining room: Don Corby's Bizbiz is an online sports enterprise.

A trip to St. Marys should include a stop at the Grand Trunk/VIA Station. This is an opportunity to enjoy all the original features of this beautiful building, a treasure for photographers and railway history enthusiasts. If some of the occupants of the studio spaces are on hand, they would happily describe their creative work and initiatives for the benefit and enrichment of the community.

Mary Smith is a member of the St. Marys Heritage Committee and the retired Director of the St. Marys Museum.
The Duck Bay Road Bridge spans Matchedash Bay at Waubaushene. It was opened in 1927 to connect the lands on the eastern and southern shores of Georgian Bay.

In the mid 19th century, several forces combined to create a burgeoning lumber industry along southern Georgian Bay. White pine was plentiful and there was a huge demand for sawn lumber from the towns and cities of the United States. In a few short years, Georgian Bay was lined with sawmills from Collingwood to Britt, including a mill at Waubaushene (1861). Mill towns developed as the lumber companies built housing and amenities for the mill workers and managers. Many of the mills were incorporated in three companies. The largest mill was at Waubaushene, where the Georgian Bay Lumber Company had its headquarters and senior management.

Prior to the opening of Duck Bay Road Bridge in 1927, settlers, lumbermen, and others wanting to proceed north from Waubaushene by land, had to travel through Coldwater and around Matchedash Bay, adding an extra twenty miles to the journey. Correspondingly, travellers from the northern part of Tay Township and other townships to the north had to travel around Matchedash Bay to reach Waubaushene. To go to school in Waubaushene, the children came by boat in the summer or across the ice in the winter, but only when conditions were favourable.

The Georgian Bay Lumber Company, which owned much of the land at Waubaushene, would not allow a bridge to be built across the Bay. The company argued it would obstruct the movement of tugs and barges in front of the mills and piling yards. Simcoe County petitioned the federal government in 1882, 1885, and 1905 to build the bridge.

Finally, in 1927, after the mill had closed, a grant was secured for the construction of the bridge. The Waubaushene community donated land and contributed labour, horsepower, and materials. The bridge at Waubaushene was actually moved from Atherley. It was built in 1887 as a swing bridge over the narrows between Orillia and Atherley. It was among the first iron bridges built in Ontario.

The ribbon was cut by the Honourable William Finlayson, Provincial Minister of Lands and Forests and MPP from Midland, to officially open the Waubaushene bridge on June 11, 1927. Bands played, children marched, and the residents held a dance in the evening.

In the days after the close of the lumber industry and before the development of highways in the area, the bridge played a key role in the regrowth of Tay's commerce. It opened markets to the settlers to the north, and allowed tourists access through Waubaushene from the south.

The 1927 bridge was a very unique structure. It consisted of three pony truss spans, a rare feature when most multi span bridges were the through truss type. The two northern spans consisted of five panels each, while the southern span had only four panels. In 1927 when the trusses were relocated from Atherley, they were placed on new concrete support pillars anchored in the water at Duck Bay Road. Since the spans were traditional fixed truss spans, it is assumed they were the approach spans for the Atherley swing bridge.

The bridge had a distinct appearance due to the notable road grade on the end spans. This was to ensure that the center span had enough clearance for boats. It was not possible to see one end of the bridge from the other end. To ensure safety on the narrow bridge, given the poor view of oncoming traffic, it was treated in later years as one lane with traffic controlled by a stoplight signal at each end.

The bridge was one of the few metal truss type remaining in Simcoe County. It was listed on the Tay Township Heritage...
Inventory and was repaired as needed for continued personal use. In 1987, new weight restrictions for bridges forced the Township to divert all large vehicles including buses, municipal emergency, and maintenance vehicles, to nearby Highway 400 to service the northern parts of the Township.

In 2012, an engineering inspection recommended either major repairs or demolition. Outright demolition would be a devastating loss of transportation heritage, especially considering how few heritage truss bridges survive in Simcoe County. After public consultation and due deliberation, the municipal Council authorized a $2 million bridge reconstruction project.

This work involved stabilizing and encapsulating in concrete the existing piers, removing the original bridge, rehabilitating the abutments, and installing a new truss bridge. Duck Bay Road was closed at the bridge for just under four months. The old bridge was moved to the north ramp and cut apart for scrap. All the materials for the reconstruction were staged on the north side, where the new bridge sections were unloaded and welded together. It was then pushed across to the piers.

On December 4, 2015, Tay Township Mayor Scott Wannock, Council members, and invited guests officially cut the ribbon on the newly reconstructed Duck Bay Road Bridge. A Fire and Emergency Services tanker truck made the first official crossing, marking the end of twenty-eight years of weight restrictions. Emergency vehicles, school buses, and municipal road maintenance equipment can once more cross the bridge rather than be rerouted to Highway 400. The new bridge maintains an essential community link for local residents and a possible alternative for Highway 400 traffic in case of emergency.

Terry Fegarty is a member of the Tay Township Municipal Heritage Committee.
Doors Open is typically about opening doors to buildings that the public does not normally get to see. Sometimes, there may not be a physical door or even a trace of a historic site, but the story is still worth "seeing." Doors Open being a door to the past.

In 2015, Doors Open Grimsby interpreted the Grimsby Arena, which burned in 1949. It told a unique story of the time when a big league hockey team came to stay in this small Niagara town. The story seems made for Hollywood, like the Russell Crowe movie "Mystery Alaska" where the New York Rangers come to play hockey in a small Alaska town.

In the early 1920s, there were few indoor artificial ice rinks in Canada. The first was in the 1912 arena built by the Patrick Brothers in Victoria; another followed in Vancouver. The only indoor artificial rink in eastern Canada by 1920 was the Mutual Street Arena in Toronto, home of the Toronto Arenas, forerunner of the Maple Leafs. When the Grimsby Arena opened on January 4, 1922, as the second artificial ice rink east of Winnipeg.

Grimsby’s indoor arena was a direct result of the local tender fruit industry. In 1914, the federal government built a precooling plant on the present day site of the Livingston Activity Centre. Its purpose was to cool fruit before it was shipped to market, thereby extending its shelf life long enough to reach more distant markets. Making good use of the ice making equipment from the precooling plant, in 1921 Grimsby approved the construction of an arena with an artificial ice surface.

When completed, Grimsby Arena immediately attracted interest from professional teams who had no access to an artificial ice rink. The Ottawa Senators made inquiries first, but the Montreal Canadiens snapped up the opportunity to hold its pre-season training camp on artificial ice prior to the 1922-23 season. The Canadiens also needed access to a first class hotel. Grimsby had one, the Village Inn (on the site of the Village Inn plaza), but it had been closed for more than a year. Evidently the civic leaders were able to make things happen. In the same week of December 1922 when the Canadiens arrived in town, the Village Inn reopened. The players were evidently impressed by the welcome they received, and the climate. When speaking to the Montreal Gazette, Team Captain Sprague Cleghorn referred to Grimsby as the "Florida of Canada."

Among the players who arrived in Grimsby that December were Hall of Famers Sprague Cleghorn and goaltending legend Georges Vézina. The 1922 visit saw the debut of future Hall of Famer Aurel Joliat, who took his first skate with the Canadiens on Grimsby ice.

When the team returned for the next pre-season, December 1923, they brought a young forward named Howe Morenz. Like Joliat, he took his first skate with his new team on Grimsby ice. Morenz would become one of the greatest stars of the Canadiens and National Hockey League.

He was the Wayne Gretzky of his era in the 1920s and 30s.

Evidently the pre-season training served the Canadiens well as in March 1924 they were victorious over the Calgary Tigers in the Stanley Cup final, taking the title of World Champions of Hockey. Such was the pride in their temporary pro team that when the Canadians returned in November...
1924, they were referred to as the “Grimsby Canadiens. World Champions at Professional Hockey.”

If ever Grimsby were to lay claim to a Stanley Cup winning team, 1924 was the year. The team was sporting a globe on its sweaters, signifying the team’s world championship status. Grimsby was the first place that the famous globe logo was unveiled. This globe made a return to the Canadiens sweater, along with the White CH (for Canadiens Hockey) that appeared in the 1923/24 season, as part of the team’s retro uniform in the 2016 NHL Winter Classic held in Foxborough, Massachusetts. In a small way, the Grimsby Canadiens were taking to the ice again.

In 1924, the Canadiens brought the Saskatoon Sheiks of the Western Canada Hockey League to train with them. The Sheiks were a pro team at the same level as the Canadiens. On November 19, the two teams played an exhibition game. Some say it was the greatest collection of hockey talent ever assembled on Grimsby ice. Nine Hall of Famers lined up before a capacity crowd, with the Sheik’s prevailing 4-2. The game was refereed by Lou Marsh, after whom the Lou Marsh Trophy for best Canadian athletes of the year is named.

Grimsby continued to impress. George Vézina, a French Canadian from Chicoutimi who had little command of English, wrote how touched he was that the people of Grimsby had adopted him as their own.

(The there is an interesting story of Vézina, Cleghorn, and Berlingueau hiling up to Beaver Point with the innkeeper’s gun to hunt.)

The Canadiens brought great exposure to Grimsby. There were daily articles in all the Montreal newspapers about the training camp. Almost all the classic photographs we see today of the Canadiens during the 1922-24 period were taken in front of the old Grimsby Arena.

There was a lot of talk in 1924 about the Canadiens returning again, but it never happened. When the team returned to Montreal, the Forum was nearing completion. It was built for their cross town rivals, the Montreal Maroons. The Canadiens abandoned the Mount Royal Arena for the artificial ice of the Forum so the annual preseason trek to Grimsby was no longer necessary.
The Grimsby Arena continued to serve the dual purpose of fruit packing station in the summer and hockey universe in winter. Local players learned their trade there, including Gerald "Stub" Carson, Marvin "Cyclone" Wentworth, and Bill Carson, all Stanley Cup winners.

When the arena burned in 1949, it was replaced in the 1950s. The second arena lasted until 2005. The Grimsby Peach King Centre is now the home of Grimsby hockey. It hosted the Hamilton Bulldogs (then the Canadien's farm team) for a training camp, but the players may not have known of the legendary skaters that went before them on Grimsby ice.

The Grimsby Canadien exhibit was a well-received component of Doors Open Grimsby. The Municipal Heritage Committee, in cooperation with Grimsby Square Plaza, will be installing a plaque on the site of the old Grimsby Arena. It will tell the story of the original hockey palace, the Peach Kings, and the brief shining moment when the Montreal Canadien... called Grimsby home. The exhibit is online at drive.google.com/file/d/0B6suSZfsCOZ1DYXUIdmZKR1e5cHe/view?ts=562fa352

Michael Seaman is the Director of Planning for the Town of Grimsby and a member of the Board of the National Trust for Canada.

Ontario Archaeological Society 2015 Symposium

The annual symposium of the Ontario Archaeological Society (OAS) was held in Midland, October 16 to 18, 2015. Hosted by the Huronia Chapter (Midland) of the OAS, some 300 attendees included about 50 Quebec Wendat and a similar number of delegates from the Eastern States Archaeological Federation in the United States. Well represented were municipal planners, heritage professionals, and members of Municipal Heritage Committees.

Sponsorship funds were provided by, among others, the Municipality of the Township of Tay and the Township of Tay Heritage Committee. The symposium was attended by Councillor Cate Root and Terry Fegarty of the Tay Heritage Committee.

Titled "Circles of Interaction: The Wendat and their neighbours in the time of Champlain," the symposium focused on the 17th century and earlier time periods from the First Nation's side. There are over 1000 known aboriginal sites in Simcoe County. Only 200 have been tested, and only 20 have been fully excavated. On average, 2-3 new pre-contact sites are found each year in Southern Ontario.

The program included fifty (concurrent) presentations and four guided tours over the three days. Some topics of particular interest were as follows:

- Effect of the Mini Ice Age (<10,000 BC) on aboriginal food and trade
- Wendat towns and nations 1450 - 1650
- Landuse trends of the Wendat and Iroquoians
- Aboriginal use of the Georgian Bay Islands before 1600
- Archeological verification of location of 17th century sites
- Warminster site, 1610 - 1624
- Tay Point site (Ahatsistikari)
- Changing Wendat food ways at the Ellery site
- Wendat presence in Southern Ontario after 1649
- Wampum belts to document treaties
- Ground Penetrating Radar as a tool to locate historical graves
- Computer graphics to visualize historic sites
- Assessment of Champlain
- Damage and destruction of aboriginal sites
In 1876, Harold Child Bickford was born in Toronto. He joined the Canadian military in 1895 and had a distinguished career before retiring in 1920. As the First World War began in 1914, Bickford bought a large tract of undeveloped land in Scarborough, overlooking Lake Ontario. He named the property Ranelagh Park and built a large summer home.

Unfortunately, Bickford had to sell the property in 1921 and it became the China Mission Seminary boarding school for missionaries training to work in China. It quickly became overcrowded and was sold to Robert Look in 1923. He was an American businessman who became president of the Canadian Creosoting Co. He used the building as his summer home, naming it Cliff Acres. When Look’s company moved to Montreal in 1927, the house remained vacant for the next five years but was maintained by a caretaker.

After eighteen years and three different owners, Rosa Breithaupt Hewetson purchased the property. Her first husband, Russell Hewetson, the owner of a major shoe company, died of pneumonia in 1928. Four years later, Rosa purchased Cliff Acres and on August 7, 1932, she married Herbert Spencer Clark at her newly acquired Scarborough home. Together, Rosa and Spencer developed a colony, named the Guild of All Arts, where craftsmen could live, work, and sell their products. It was well advertised in local newspapers.

As visitors to the property grew in number, the Clarks began to serve dinner. After the Second World War, they enlarged the building to accommodate overnight guests. As taxes rose, the Clarks developed part of the property into a unique planned residential community know as Guildwood Village. They kept the land overlooking the lake and developed what became known as the Guild Inn, adding a six storey hotel in 1965.

Spencer was involved in preserving Toronto’s built heritage. He was part of the group that successfully fought to preserve Toronto’s Old City Hall. If a building could not be saved, Spencer acquired its major architectural pieces and erected them in the gardens surrounding the Inn.

As the Clarks grew older, managing the site became, not only exhausting, but also very expensive. The property was sold to Metropolitan Toronto in 1979. Two years later, at the age of 93, Rosa passed away. Spencer remained as the volunteer manager of the Guild Inn for a few years. He died in 1986 at the age of 83.

The management of the Guild Inn property by the City of Toronto was less than perfect. Several attempts to find a permanent solution for this vast property and buildings met with little success. By 2000, the craftsmen, artists, and sculptors were long gone. While the beauty of the gardens remained and meals were still being served in the dining room, hotel accommodation and conferences began to decline. In 2001, the Inn was closed.

Although designated under the Ontario Heritage Act, there was little money available for the massive restoration and maintenance required. Within a few years, “demolition by neglect” was attracting vandals. In 2009, the studio building, which hosted hundreds of wedding receptions over the years, was gutted by fire. Demolition of the six storey hotel followed a few years later and the old Bickford house with its many additions, although boarded up, was vandalized and ready for demolition.

Finally, people began to realize what was happening to this wonderful historic property and action began to save the gardens and whatever part of the house was salvageable. A proposal for renewal was debated by staff and Council for what seemed like an eternity. The plan was to remove the various additions to the original 1914 structure and “to allow for its adaptive reuse” (of the property) as a restaurant, banquet hall, and conference and event centre. In November 2015, a demolition crew removed the various additions to Bickford’s original summer home. Work will soon begin on the new additions, which, hopefully, will return the Guild property to the attraction it was in the past. The City of Toronto has already relocated some of the architectural pieces to make way for construction of the expanded building. The City maintains the gardens that were severely damaged during the winter ice storm.

The future looks a little better now that work has begun in an effort to revitalize this important property.

Rick Schofield is the Corporate Secretary/Treasurer of CHO/PCO.

We Want to Hear From You

CHOnews is YOUR quarterly publication. We want to know about the initiatives, achievements, challenges, and concerns of your Municipal Heritage Committee. Information networking through CHOnews is important. Submissions are welcome at any time.
While it may not seem possible as you focus on heritage conservation issues in your community, you are part of a worldwide movement. This is evident in Australia, where I am writing this message; the Australian experience has relevance to your efforts.

Heritage conservation should encompass a community’s cultural heritage values in its totality, not just the places of the well-to-do but also those places of the less fortunate that are important in explaining a community’s full development. Australia, with its convict origin of European settlement, values prisons and associated warehouses, farms, workplaces, and facilities built by or for those prisoners of the Imperial Convict Establishment. It even includes some 1837 Canadian rebels who were transported to Australian prisons. Many of those prison facilities are designated by Australian states and recognized through a World Heritage designation stretching from coast to coast. The Fremantle prison, which held inmates into the mid 1970s, is now an important tourist destination and part of that World Heritage designation.

The Australian prison facilities also speak to a community’s changing heritage values. Once European Australians downplayed their convict origins, now they revel in that phase of the country’s development, with many seeking to verify that they have a convict in their ancestry. So in your community, be conscious that heritage values are not constant. What we dismissed several decades ago may be valued by the community today or in the future.

The upcoming Ontario Heritage Conference in Stratford/St. Marys will deal with “Preservation in a Changing World.” There are many changes confronting us when it comes to conserving heritage resources. At the conference, we will be dealing with a number of different changes, but one persistent challenge is finding new uses for heritage resources when their original or recent use cannot be sustained. Several interesting examples I have found in Australia include downtown Fremantle where a number of 19th century commercial and residential structures have been converted to form the campus of Notre Dame University Australia, a private university. In Exmouth at a joint American - Australian military base, a surplus naval barracks has been converted to a motel.

I look forward to meeting many of you at the Conference. Please join us for an inspirational, educational, and good networking opportunity.

---

Même si ceci peut sembler invraisemblable, lorsque vous vous concentrez sur des problèmes de préservation du patrimoine dans votre communauté, vous faites partie d’un mouvement global. Ceci est évident en Australie, d’où je vous écris ce message ; l’expérience Australienne est pertinente à vos efforts.

La préservation du patrimoine devrait englober les valeurs culturelles de la communauté - non seulement les sites des bien nantis, mais aussi les endroits des moins fortunés, qui sont importants pour expliquer le plein développement d’une communauté.

L’Australie, avec ses origines de colonisation par des forçats Européens, valorise ses prisons et entrepôts, fermes, lieu de travail et installations bâtis par ou pour ces prisonniers de l’Imperial Convict Establishment. Ceci inclut même des rebelles canadiens de 1837 qui furent transportés aux prisons australiennes. Plusieurs de ces installations pénitentiaires sont dédiées par les États australiens et reconnus par une désignation patrimoniale mondiale qui s’étend d’une côte à l’autre. La prison de Fremantle, qui a abrité des détenus jusqu’au milieu des années 70, est maintenant une destination touristique importante et fait partit de la désignation patrimonial mondial.

Les établissements pénitentiaires d’Australie adressent également des valeurs patrimoniales changeantes dans communauté. Anciennement les australiens de descendances européennes...
minimisait leurs origines de prisonniers, maintenant ils se délectent dans cette phase du développement du pays, plusieurs cherchant même à vérifier s'ils ont des forçats dans leur ancêtres. Ainsi dans votre communauté soyez conscients que les valeurs patrimoniales ne sont pas constantes ; ce qui nous avons minimiser il y a plusieurs décennies peuvent être valoriser par cette même communauté aujourd'hui ou dans le futur.

La prochaine conférence sur le patrimoine de l'Ontario à Stratford/St.Marys traitera de "La Préservation dans un monde changeant". Nous devons faire face à plusieurs défis dans la conservation de nos ressources patrimoniales. À la conférence, nous traiterons d'un certain nombre de changement, mais un défi persistant continue d'être le besoin de trouver de nouveaux usages pour nos ressources patrimoniales lorsque leurs raisons d'être originales ou récentes ne peuvent être soutenues. J'ai trouvé des exemples intéressants en Australie, incluant le centre-ville de Fremantle ou une structure commerciale résidentielle du 19e siècle a été converti pour former le campus de l'Université Australienne de Notre Dame, une université privée, et à Exmouth à la base Américo-Australienne où les baraques du surplus naval ont été convertis en un motel.

J'ai hâte de rencontrer plusieurs d'entre vous à la conférence. Joignez-vous à nous – ce sera une source d'inspiration, éducatif et une bonne opportunité de réseau.

**CHO/PCO Mission Statement**

To encourage the development of municipally appointed heritage advisory committees and to further the identification, preservation, interpretation, and wise use of community heritage locally, provincially, and nationally.

---

**Champlain Park Plaque, Bridgenorth**

Sheryl Smith

Champlain Park in Bridgenorth received a newly restored heritage plaque on September 21, 2015, thanks to the Selwyn Township Municipal Heritage Committee. The plaque was rededicated to recognize the 400th anniversary of Samuel de Champlain's portage through Peterborough County. In 1615, a wounded Champlain was on his way back to Huronia from New York State and rested in the Bridgenorth area for thirty eight days.

The commemoration of this historically significant journey was attended by over fifty community members. The event commenced with a performance by the Chemong Public School Band and welcomed a variety of speakers including Dr. Elwood Jones, co-author of *Finding Champlain's Dream*. Dr. Jones was joined at the event by co-author Dr. Peter Adams (former MP for the area) and other representatives of the Trent Valley Archives, which published the book as a tribute to the anniversary.

Chair of the Selwyn Township Municipal Heritage Committee, Sheryl Smith, noted that "the plaque was first installed and dedicated in 1988 and it is wonderful to see it restored. We are honoured to mark Champlain's visit to our region, and we remember those First Nations people who helped him along the way."

Mayor Mary Smith thanked the MHC, Bridgenorth Beautification Committee, Bridgenorth Business Association, the Joint Accessibility Advisory Committee, local historians, and various Township departments for their efforts in restoring the plaque and organizing the event. Mayor Smith stated "it is wonderful to have so many different committees, school children, and local historians come together to celebrate our Township's rich history and culture."

*Sheryl Smith is Chair of the Selwyn Township Municipal Heritage Committee.*
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Joint MHC Meetings
Paul R. King

Holding joint meetings, perhaps once or twice a year, with neighbouring Municipal Heritage Committees can be a worthwhile opportunity to:

☐ meet others in the local area with similar interests and issues
☐ talk about MHC mandates and basic purpose
☐ compare experiences
☐ compare accomplishments and challenges, including local projects of note
☐ provide suggestions and obtain pointers (such as methods of developing the list of properties for the municipal register, heritage conservation district guidelines and procedures, heritage grant programs, heritage tax relief choices, attracting new members)
☐ discuss establishing other MHCs in the area
☐ coordinate and compare notes on local events, such as Doors Open
☐ share information about plaquing programs, heritage fairs, public education
☐ share information about the experience of advising council
☐ learn about the history and heritage of neighbouring municipalities

In Perth County, members of the MHCs in Stratford and St. Marys, plus a potential member of the Township of West Perth, met in February 2016 at the St. Marys Town Hall. The Township of West Perth does not have a MHC but is attempting to attract members interested in serving so that they can re-establish a Committee. Under the Ontario Heritage Act, there must be at least five members on each MHC. At this joint February meeting, it was pointed out that, in today's fast paced world, many people are reluctant to commit to serving on a committee for four years. A suggestion was made to encourage people to initially serve on a task force, typically with a shorter mandate and, hence, less of a commitment. Once people are comfortable with this level of engagement, being on a MHC may not be as daunting.

The 2016 Ontario Heritage Conference will be held in Stratford and St. Marys from Thursday, May 12 to Saturday May 14, with annual general meetings of Community Heritage Ontario and the Architectural Conservancy of Ontario on Sunday morning, May 15. The joint meeting of the local MHCs was not held specifically to talk about the Conference, but the venue was useful to reiterate the importance of Committee members participating as Conference volunteers. This way, delegates from throughout the province will feel welcomed and have a wonderful experience in Perth County.

Paul R. King is a member of the CHO/PCO Board of Directors.
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Judy Maddren, Paul Berton Added to OCHC Media Panel

As host of CBC Radio’s World Report from 1993 to 2009, Judy Maddren helped millions of Canadians begin their day with the news of the world and Canada. On May 14, she will share her considerable media expertise with delegates at the Ontario Heritage Conference in Stratford and St. Marys.

Specifically, she will be on a panel discussing how heritage advocates can more effectively use conventional media to help save historical buildings and sites.

When she joined CBC in 1972 as a consumer affairs reporter, CBC was not hiring women as announcers. When that policy changed, in 1975, Maddren was the third woman to be hired. In 1990, she founded and expanded the CBC’s “A Christmas Carol” readings, which are held in dozens of communities across Canada each year, raising money for local charities of all kinds.

Since retiring from the CBC, she has created Soundportraits, a business in which she interviews people young and old, and records autobiographies.

Also joining the media panel at the OHC will be Paul Berton, editor-in-chief of the Hamilton Spectator. From 2001-2010, he was editor-in-chief of the London Free Press. He also worked as a reporter, editorial writer, columnist, copy editor, business editor and city editor at the Free Press and as a reporter and writer at the Toronto Star and Kitchener-Waterloo Record.

Ronayne Smith Fullerton, a journalism professor at Western University, will moderate the discussion. The third panelist, announced earlier, will be Christopher Hume, architecture critic and urban issues columnist for the Toronto Star.

More than 300 delegates are expected to attend the conference, May 12-14. It is sponsored by the Architectural Conservancy of Ontario and Community Heritage Ontario. The local planning committee includes members of the Stratford-Perth branch of the ACO, the St. Marys Heritage Committee, the Town of St. Marys, the Stratford Tourism Alliance, Heritage Stratford and Community Heritage Ontario’s board of directors.

For more information, contact Paul King, at wellingtonheights@rogers.com or visit the conference Web site at ontarioheritageconference.ca
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