Tuesday, July 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 Custudio
- Kathryn Fowlston
- Doug McLeod
- Anthony Simone
- David Whyte
- Ken Wilde
- City Councillor Doug Whillans – Wards 2 and 6

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

Terri Brenton, Legislative Coordinator
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 – June 21, 2016**

   The recommendations in the minutes were approved by Council on July 6, 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.

     (nil)

5. **Delegations/Presentations**

6. **Sub-Committees**

   6.1. **Minutes – Heritage Resources Sub-Committee – June 9, 2016**

    *To be received*

7. **Designation Program**

   7.1. **Proposed Designations**

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

9. **Correspondence**

10. **Other/New Business**

10.1. Verbal Advisory from Heather Frost, Central Area Coordinator, Office of the Chief Operating Officer, re: *Infrastructure Improvements to Main and Queen Streets and Adjacent Side Streets in Downtown Brampton – Wards 1, 3 and 5*


*Recommendation*

10.3. Report from Antonietta Minichillo, Heritage Coordinator, Planning and Infrastructure Services, dated July 12, 2016, re: *Notice of Intention to Demolish the Residential Dwelling at 8292 Creditview Road – Ward 4* (File HE.x).

*Recommendation*

10.4. Verbal Advisory from Antonietta Minichillo, Heritage Coordinator, Planning and Infrastructure Services, re: *Churchville Heritage Conservation District Guidelines Update Public Open House*

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. **Closed Session**

16. **Adjournment**

Next Meeting:  Tuesday, September 20, 2016 – 7:00 p.m.
Tuesday, June 21, 2016

Members Present: 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  
Ken Wilde  
City Councillor Doug Whillans – Wards 2 and 6

Members Absent: David Whyte (regrets)

Staff Present: Planning and Infrastructure Services:  
Antonietta Minichillo, Heritage Coordinator  
Stavroula Kassaris, Heritage Coordinator  
Corporate Services:  
Nupur Kotecha, Legal Counsel, Litigation  
Peter Fay, City Clerk  
Terri Brenton, Legislative Coordinator
The meeting was called to order at 7:03 p.m. and recessed at 7:45 p.m. The Board moved into Closed Session at 7:47 p.m., recessed at 8:02 p.m., reconvened in Open Session at 8:03 p.m. and adjourned at 8:45 p.m.

1. **Approval of Agenda**

The following motion was considered.

HB054-2016 That the agenda for the Brampton Heritage Board Meeting of June 21, 2016 be approved as printed and circulated.

Carried

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

3. **Previous Minutes**

3.1. **Minutes – Brampton Heritage Board – May 17, 2016**

The minutes were considered by Planning and Infrastructure Services Committee on June 6, 2016 and the recommendations were approved by Council on June 8, 2016.

The minutes were provided for the Board's information.

4. **Consent** – nil

5. **Delegations/Presentations** – nil

6. **Sub-Committees** – nil

7. **Designation Program**

7.1. **Proposed Designations**

A list of properties proposed for heritage designation was included with the agenda for this meeting.
Stavroula Kassaris, Heritage Coordinator, Planning and Infrastructure Services, responded to questions from the Board with respect to the status of the Main Street South Heritage Conservation District.

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

9. **Correspondence** – nil

10. **Other/New Business**

10.1. Report from Stavroula Kassaris, Heritage Coordinator, Planning and Infrastructure Services, dated June 1, 2016, re: **Heritage Permit Application – 45 Railroad Street – Ward 1 (File HE.x)**.

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

In response to questions from the Board, Ms. Kassaris, Jordan Molnar, Project Manager, ERA Architects Inc., and Paul Aldunate, Central Area Planner, Planning and Infrastructure Services, provided information on the following:

- proposed construction timelines
- restoration plans for the south elevation of the heritage building
- salvaging of excess bricks
- proposed interpretative plan
- recognition of the former Copeland-Chatterson Loose-Leaf Ledger Factory, which was located on the property at one time

The following motion was considered.

**HB055-2016**

1. That the report from Stavroula Kassaris, Heritage Coordinator, Planning and Infrastructure Services, dated June 1, 2016, to the Brampton Heritage Board Meeting of June 21, 2016, re: **Heritage Permit Application – 45 Railroad Street – Ward 1 (HE.x)**, be received; and,

2. That the Heritage Permit application for 45 Railroad Street for a residential high-rise development that incorporates and rehabilitates the Copeland-Chatterson/Dominion Skate Building be approved, subject to the following conditions:
   a) That prior to the issuance of the Heritage Permit, the owner provide details regarding the masonry cleaning
approach to the satisfaction of the Heritage Coordinator, Planning and Infrastructure Services;

b) That prior to Site Plan approval, the owner provide financial securities in an amount and form satisfactory to the Executive Director of Planning, Planning and Infrastructure Services, to secure all work included in the Conservation Plan by ERA Architects dated May 27, 2016;

c) That prior to Site Plan approval, the owner submit a final Interpretation Plan to the satisfaction of the Heritage Coordinator, Planning and Infrastructure Services;

d) That the owner undertake all work in accordance with the approved Conservation Plan by ERA Architects dated May 27, 2016 and in compliance with all applicable laws having jurisdiction and by retaining all necessary permits prior to the release of the financial securities and to the satisfaction of the Executive Director of Planning, Planning and Infrastructure Services; and,

e) That prior to the release of the financial securities the owner shall provide a letter of substantial completion prepared and signed by a qualified heritage consultant confirming that the work has been completed in accordance with the Conservation Plan by ERA Architects dated May 27, 2016, that an appropriate standard of conservation has been maintained, and that the Interpretation Plan has been executed, to the satisfaction of the Heritage Coordinator, Planning and Infrastructure Services.

Carried

10.2. Report from Stavroula Kassaris, Heritage Coordinator, Planning and Infrastructure Services, dated June 7, 2016, re: Designated Heritage Property Incentive Grant Application – 280 Main Street North – Ward 1 (File HE.x).

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

In response to a question from the Board, Ms. Kassaris confirmed the property was converted to commercial use from its original residential use.
The following motion was considered.

HB056-2016 1. That the report from Stavroula Kassaris, Heritage Coordinator, Planning and Infrastructure Services, dated June 7, 2016, to the Brampton Heritage Board Meeting of June 21, 2016, re: Designated Heritage Property Incentive Grant Application – 280 Main Street North – Ward 1 (HE.x), be received; and,

2. That the Designated Heritage Property Incentive Grant for 280 Main Street North for the front porch restoration be awarded for half of the costs not covered under the Façade Improvement Program, to a maximum of $5000.

Carried


Item 10.4 was brought forward and dealt with at this time.

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

In response to a question from the Board, Ms. Kassaris confirmed applicants may apply for a grant every two years, and that the owners received a grant in 2012 for work on the shutters.

The following motions were considered.

HB057-2016 1. That the report from Stavroula Kassaris, Heritage Coordinator, Planning and Infrastructure Services, dated June 7, 2016, to the Brampton Heritage Board Meeting of June 21, 2016, re: Heritage Permit Application – 62 Union Street – Ward 1 (File HE.x), be received; and,

2. That the Heritage Permit Application for 62 Union Street to repair the stucco cladding be approved.

Carried
HB058-2016 1. That the report from Stavroula Kassaris, Heritage Coordinator, Planning and Infrastructure Services, dated June 7, 2016, to the Brampton Heritage Board Meeting of June 21, 2016, re: Designated Heritage Property Incentive Grant Application – 62 Union Street – Ward 1 (File HE.x), be received; and,

2. That the Designated Heritage Property Incentive Grant application for 62 Union Street for the stucco restoration be approved, to a maximum of $5000.

Carried


Dealt with under Item 10.3 – Recommendation HB058-2016

See also Recommendation HB057-2016.


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

The following motion was considered.

HB059-2016 1. That the report from Antonietta Minichillo, Heritage Coordinator, Planning and Infrastructure Services, dated June 7, 2016, to the Brampton Heritage Board Meeting of June 21, 2016, re: Heritage Permit Application – Part V of the Ontario Heritage Act – 7746 Churchville Road – Ward 6 (File H.Ex.), be received; and,

2. That the Heritage Permit application for the property owner at 7746 Churchville Road for the construction of an addition be approved subject to the following conditions:
a. That the two windows on the addition facing Churchville Road be sash wood windows and that the final window composition be approved by the Heritage Coordinator, Planning and Infrastructure Services;

b. That the segmentally arched windows on the proposed addition be replaced with flat, rectangular windows; and,

c. That the building cladding on the addition be wood siding. If possible, an examination of the original wood siding, currently covered with synthetic siding, should guide the selection for the width and profile of the new wood siding.

Carried


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

Art Lucs, Artist, and Greg Peddie, Coordinator, Public Arts and Partnerships, Public Services, provided a 3D model of the public art project entitled “The River Drew Me Here”. At the request of the Board, Mr. Lucs provided a description of his art piece.

In response to questions from the Board, Ms. Minichillo, Mr. Lucs and Mr. Peddie provided information on the following:

- proposed location for the artwork within Sid Manser Park
- materials and coating on the art piece to protect it from vandalism
- City’s maintenance program for public art
- review of the artwork by the City’s Risk Management Division
- interpretative signage for the art piece
- proposed timelines for installation of the artwork

The following motion was considered.

HB060-2016 1. That the report from Antonietta Minichillo, Heritage Coordinator, Planning and Infrastructure Services, dated June 7, 2016, to the Brampton Heritage Board Meeting of June 21, 2016, re: Heritage Permit Application – Part V of the Ontario Heritage Act – 7840 Creditview Road – Ward 6 (File HE.x), be received; and,
2. That the Recreation and Culture Division and Heritage Coordinator work collaboratively with the artist to finalize the location and detailed specifications for the art piece; and,

3. That the art be accompanied by interpretive signage; and,

4. That the Heritage Permit application submitted by the City of Brampton for the installation of public art in honour of Churchville's 200th Anniversary be approved.

Carried

10.7. Verbal Report from Paul Willoughby, Co-Chair, re: Brampton Heritage/Art Task Force – Peel Memorial Centre for Integrated Health and Wellness.

Paul Willoughby, Co-Chair, provided a verbal report on this matter, which included:

- the Brampton Heritage/Art Task Force was formed by the William Osler Health System (WOHS) to deal with commemorating the original Peel Memorial Hospital in the new Peel Memorial Centre for Integrated Health and Wellness
- he and Stavroula Kassaris, Heritage Coordinator, Planning and Infrastructure Services are members of the Task Force, along with a representative from the Peel Art Gallery, Museum and Archives (PAMA), and the balance of members are from WOHS
- the Task Force is chaired by Ann Ford, Vice President, Facilities and Redevelopment, WOHS
- there is an extensive collection of materials related to the original hospital, including photographs, memorabilia, medical implements
- several areas of the new Centre will house various heritage displays
- the new Centre is scheduled to open in 2017

The following motion was considered.

HB061-2016 That the verbal report from Paul Willoughby, Co-Chair, to the Brampton Heritage Board Meeting of June 21, 2016, re: Brampton Heritage/Art Task Force – Peel Memorial Centre for Integrated Health and Wellness, be received.

Carried
Verbal Advisory from Antonietta Minichillo, Heritage Coordinator, Planning and Infrastructure Services, re: **Churchville Heritage Conservation District Guidelines Update**.

Antonietta Minichillo, Heritage Coordinator, Planning and Infrastructure Services, provided the following verbal advisory on this matter:

- City staff has received a draft of the Guidelines
- the Guidelines will be provided to Board Members in the near future for input
- comments from the Board will be consolidated with staff comments and forwarded to the consultant; following this, the draft Guidelines will be made available for public feedback

The following motion was considered.

**HB062-2016** That the verbal advisory from Antonietta Minichillo, Heritage Coordinator, Planning and Infrastructure Services, to the Brampton Heritage Board Meeting of June 21, 2016, re: **Churchville Heritage Conservation District Guidelines Update**, be received.

Carried

11. **Referred/Deferred Items** – nil

12. **Information Items**

For the Board’s information, Steve Collie, Board Member, provided details on the interior tour of the new Carve restaurant that he and Paul Willoughby, Co-Chair, undertook recently.

13. **Question Period** – nil

14. **Public Question Period** – nil

15. **Closed Session**

The following motion was considered.

**HB063-2016** That the Brampton Heritage Board move into Closed Session to deal with a matter pertaining to:
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.

HB064-2016 That the Brampton Heritage Board do now adjourn to meet again on Tuesday, July 19, 2016 at 7:00 p.m. or at the call of the Chair.

Carried

____________________________ ____________________________
Co-Chair – Peter Dymond         Co-Chair – Paul Willoughby
Present: Stav Kassaris, Ken Wilde, Paul Willoughby

1. Ken Wilde reviewed the history of the early public schools in Brampton. The first school was located at the north-east corner of John Street and Chapel Street. It was later moved to the south-east corner of John Street and Mary Street. The building is still there and has been used for many purposes. The second school built was at 24 Alexander Street. The next one built was at the south-west corner of Queen Street West and Mill Street South.

2. The Sub-Committee proceeded to review several property files. The purpose was to decide which should be put forward for listing. The following were decided to pursue listing of:

- 56 John Street
- 97 John Street
- 199 Main Street North
- 244 Main Street North
- 268 Main Street North
- 281 Main Street North
- 358 Main Street North
- 2 Victoria Terrace
- 12 Rosegarden Drive
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
- 7 English Street – Ward 5
- 11285 Creditview Road – Drinkwater Farmhouse – Ward 6
- 22 William Street – Ward 1
- 73 Main Street South – Ward 4
- 3448 Castlemore Road (Squire Thomas Burrell Grist Mill Site/Burrell’s Hollow) – Ward 10
- Cole Farmhouse – Ward 10
- 11223 Torbram Road – Hewson Farm – Ward 10
- 2472 Bovaird Drive West – Ward 6
- 2838 Bovaird Drive West (Laird House) – Ward 6
Date: 2016-07-11

Subject: Notice of Intention to Demolish the Farmhouse and Two Associated Structures at 7575 Kennedy Road South – Ward 3

Contact: Robert Hornblow, Project Manager, Building Design and Construction, Public Services Department, 905.874.2384

Recommendations:

1. That the report from Robert Hornblow, Project Manager, Building Design and Construction, Public Services, dated July 11, 2016, to the Brampton Heritage Board Meeting of July 19, 2016, re Notice of Intention to Demolish the Farmhouse and Two Associated Structures at 7575 Kennedy Road South – Ward 3, be received; and

2. That the property at 7575 Kennedy Road South be removed from the Municipal Heritage Register;

3. That the Farmhouse and two associated structures be demolished;

4. That the single detached dwelling at 7575 Kennedy Road South be offered for a minimum of 30 days to any interested third party for relocation to and rehabilitation at a new location at no cost to the City;

5. That prior to its demolition or removal, the dwelling be fully documented through measured drawings and photographs, to the satisfaction of a City Heritage Coordinator;

6. That all reasonable efforts be made to salvage the handmade brick and other items of significance, as identified by the Heritage Impact Assessment prepared by Robinson Heritage Consulting and as directed by a City Heritage Coordinator, be retained by the Corporation for future heritage restoration projects;

7. That the salvaged materials be appropriately stored in a secure location until their reuse;

8. That construction materials not required by the City be made available to interested third parties on an “as is” basis;

9. That a commemorative plaque be installed in accordance with the City standard for heritage interpretive signage on the subject site;
10. That a budget of $100,000 be approved for the demolition and site clean-up costs, to be submitted as part of 2017 budget; and

11. That the appropriate City officials be authorized and directed to take all necessary actions to give effect thereto, if required.

Overview:

- The property at 7575 Kennedy Road is listed on the City’s “Municipal Register of Cultural Heritage Resources” due to the presence of a mid-19th century farmhouse and also contains two associated structures on the southeast portion of the site.
- The farmhouse is currently vacant, in a state of disrepair and despite efforts to secure the structure, subject to ongoing vandalism thus posing a liability concern for the City.
- Building Design and Construction is currently taking steps to bring the structures into conformance with the Vacant Building By-law 155-2012.
- Significant funds would be required to bring the structures back to a state of good repair.
- The former farmhouse is not needed for operations of the Powerade Centre and has not been identified by the City for future use or programming.
- A Notice of Intention to Demolish has been submitted in accordance with the Ontario Heritage Act, including a Heritage Impact Assessment.
- Staff is seeking approval to remove the property from the Heritage Register, and pursue the removal of the farmhouse and its associated structures, including mitigation measures as outlined in this report.

Background:

The property at 7575 Kennedy Road South is located on the east side of Kennedy Road, north of Highway 407. The 112 acre property contains the Powerade Centre, sports fields, the Peel Children’s Safety Village, a farmhouse, a shed and a barn.

The property is listed on the City of Brampton’s “Municipal Register of Cultural Heritage Resources” due to the presence of the mid-19th century farmhouse and also houses two associated structures on the southeast portion of the site.

The property is owned by the City of Brampton, and was purchased from the province in March of 1997. The lands have partially been turned into a multi-use sports centre now known as Powerade. PA Sports Centre Incorporated is the sole tenant per the lease agreement with the City of Brampton.

In 2000, City staff consulted with the Brampton Heritage Board regarding the future of the dwelling, including the possible divestment of the dwelling by the City. The Board requested that staff review potential future use for the structures and recommended that it be boarded up until a plan is developed. There are no clear
options to adaptively re-use the structures as they do not sit in an area that is conducive to re-use. The property shoulders a cell tower that services Highway 410 to the south and is below a current overpass that shadows the property.

**Current Situation:**

The farmhouse and associated structures at 7575 Kennedy Road South has been the subject of concern for the City for many years. As a result of several sub-lease tenants activities in the structures, continued vacancy and unauthorized dumping of materials on site, the buildings have fallen into a state of disrepair and pose a liability risk to the City. A number of violation notices have been issued and despite efforts to secure the structures, vagrants have repeatedly broken into the house.

Under section 27(3) of the *Ontario Heritage Act*, the owner of a property that is listed on the Municipal Heritage Register shall not demolish a building or structure on the property unless the owner gives Council at least 60 days’ notice in writing of their intention to demolish. The notice was submitted on July 11, 2016, and a decision to remove the property from the Municipal Heritage Register or designate the property under Part IV of the *Ontario Heritage Act* must be made before September 8, 2016.

**Heritage Impact Assessment**

As part of the Notice of Intention to Demolish, a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) was completed by Robinson Heritage Consulting, and is attached hereto as Appendix A. A summary of the findings of the HIA are as follows:

- The farmhouse was built in the mid to late 19th century and is a representative example of mid-Victorian brick farmhouse;
- The property is associated with the Grahams, a pioneering family of rural settlement in the area and the establishment of Derry West of the former Toronto Township;
- The farmhouse is one of only a few remnant elements that help to define the original rural settlement patterns of the area;
- The property meets the criteria for designation under the *Ontario Heritage Act*;
- The physical features of the property that support the cultural heritage value of the property are limited to the original 1.5 storey brick dwelling exterior, excluding the north and east extensions;
- The gambrel roof barn does not have cultural heritage value;
- The gable roof shed was not accessible at the time site visits were undertaken, and have not been evaluated;

**Proposed Approach for the Farmhouse**

Building Design and Construction is seeking approval to remove the property from the “Municipal Register of Cultural Heritage Resources” and undertake removal / demolition of the farmhouse and associated structures.

The building is not an ideal contender for reuse. The dwelling is located adjacent to a highway overpass to the south, a multi-plex sport arena to the north, and vacant...
lands to the east and west, all of which constrain its potential for future use/programming.

Consideration has been given to bringing the structures to a state of good repair for possible future use. This is not a viable option due to its aggregate size and current state of repair. It would also divert money from other projects and properties to maintain the vacant structures and would reduce the ability to fund other more important heritage resources that are currently in the inventory.

The structures also remain a target for vagrants and vandalism, despite efforts to keep the structure secure.

Without a clear plan to adaptively reuse the structure, seeking the necessary funding to maintain the structures and associated lands is difficult to support. In general terms it is cost prohibitive to maintain this in light of the fact there are more examples in better condition of this style and type of architecture within the boundaries of the City of Brampton.

Due to the aforementioned circumstances, the Public Services Department, in consultation with other City Departments is seeking the approval to demolish the former farmhouse and associated structures.

It is recommended that the former farmhouse be offered for 30 days to interested third parties for relocation and rehabilitation at no cost to the City. If a bona fide expression of interest is not received within the 30 days, the City will then undertake the demolition of the farmhouse and the associated structures.

Should the structures at 7575 Kennedy Road be approved for demolition, it is recommended that reasonable effort be made to salvage the handmade brick and other items of significance by the City and securely stored for reuse on future restoration projects for any of the other eighteen heritage buildings maintained by the City. Current possible locations include the Carnegie Library (55 Queen Street East) and the historic Fire Hall (2 Chapel Street). The demolition of this heritage resource will help facilitate the long-term conservation of other significant cultural heritage resources. It is further recommended that the site be commemorated with a plaque.

**Corporate Implications:**

**Financial Implications:**

The estimated cost for the site clean-up, disposal of abandoned materials and demolition of the 3 buildings is estimated at $100,000, inclusive of project costs and hard costs for clean-up. The funds will be requested in the 2017 capital budget submission, pending Council approval.

**Other Implications:**

Staff is of the opinion that it is cost prohibitive to continue to maintain the structures at the subject lands without a clear plan to eventually reuse the structures in the foreseeable future. The cost to supervise, maintain minimal servicing and keep the
buildings in compliance with the vacant buildings bylaw is not economically viable to support for these particular structures.

**Strategic Plan:**

The recommendations in this report achieve the Strategic Plan priorities of:

- Good Government, specifically the goal to “Practice proactive, effective and responsible management of municipal assets and services”; and,

- Smart Growth, specifically the goal to “Preserve and protect natural and heritage environments with balanced, responsible planning”.

**Conclusion:**

Demolition reviews are made on a case-by-case basis. Decisions regarding one property do not set precedent, as the decisions are made based on the unique circumstances of the given property. The City remains committed to the conservation of its cultural heritage resources.

The farmhouse, drive shed and barn at 7575 Kennedy Road have been vacant since 2007 with no defined use by either the PA Sports Centre Incorporated or the City.

It is recommended that the property located at 7575 Kennedy Road South be removed from the “Municipal Register of Cultural Heritage Resources” and demolished as soon as funding is available.

Approved by: 
Randy Rason  
Director  
Building Design and Construction

Approved by: 
Al Meneses  
Executive Director  
Facility Services

**Attachments:**


Report authored by: Robert Hornblow, Project Manager, Building Design and Construction, Public Services Department
Heritage Impact Assessment

7575 Kennedy Road South
Brampton, Ontario

Prepared for the City of Brampton
by Robinson Heritage Consulting
21 June 2015
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1.1 Commissioning of Report

Robinson Heritage Consulting was retained on 11 December 2014 by Robert Hornblow on behalf of the City of Brampton, the current owner of the subject property, to carry out a Heritage Impact Assessment according to the City of Brampton’s Heritage Assessment Study Guidelines.

1.2 Limitations

The information contained in this report represents the professional opinion of Stephen Robinson, MA, CAHP, of Robinson Heritage Consulting.

This report is intended for the client named. The material in this report reflects the consultant's best judgment in light of the information available at the time of preparation.

Any use a third party makes of this report, or reliance on, or decisions made based on it are the responsibility of such third parties. The consultant accepts no responsibility for damages, if any suffered by any third party as a result of decisions made or actions based on this report.
1.3 Proponent Contact Information

(Owner/Proponent)

Corporation of the City of Brampton

(City Staff Contact)

Robert Hornblow, MAATO
Project Manager
Building Design and Construction
Public Services
City of Brampton
Tel: (905) 874-2384
robert.hornblow@brampton.ca

1.4 Project Personnel

Robinson Heritage Consulting

Stephen Robinson, Principal
Tracie Seedhouse, Principal
2. Introduction

The subject of this Heritage Impact Assessment is a brick farmhouse (Figures 1 and 1b) and its immediate surroundings (Figure 2) at 7575 Kennedy Road South in the City of Brampton. The subject site is part of a larger property owned by the City of Brampton, located north of Highway 407, west of Highway 410, east of the Brampton Golf Club and south of the Powerade Centre (Figures 3 and 4).

Robinson Heritage Consulting conducted an inspection of the subject site and the interior of the brick farmhouse and the gambrel roof barn on March 21, 2015 accompanied by City of Brampton staff. The weather was clear and sunny. The interior of the third building (a gable roof shed) was not accessible during the March 2015 inspection. As well, any basement area of the farmhouse was also not accessible during the inspection.
3. **Context Description**

7575 Kennedy Road is in an area of the City of Brampton that was formerly part of the Town of Mississauga and within what historically was known as the New Survey in the north part of Toronto Township in Peel County. Kennedy Road (Regional of Peel Road 16) was named after former local MPP and Premier of Ontario, the Honorable Thomas Laird Kennedy.\(^1\) The original single-lane road allowance for Kennedy Road is seen in the orthographic photo (Figure 2) and in Figures 3 and 4. The modern four lanes of Kennedy Road have been curved to the southwest in front of the subject property when the 407 overpass was created.

The subject farmhouse is one of only a few surviving elements of an area with a land use that was completely agricultural until the later 20\(^{th}\) century. The obvious changes to this farmstead landscape include the construction of the 410 and 407 highways, the re-aligned and widened Kennedy Road which now passes over the 407 Highway to the south of the farmhouse (Figure 4) and the redesignation of land use through the development of farm land to industrial and recreational uses.

At high speed, passing motorists have a quick glimpse back in time when looking north from the 407 at Kennedy Road to what remains of the James Graham farmstead set against the Powerade Centre at 7575 Kennedy Road South (Figure

---

5), a 5,000-seat multi-purpose arena which opened in 1998 and was formerly known as the Brampton Centre for Sports & Entertainment.

The subject farmhouse has been listed (non-designated) as a Category B property on the City of Brampton’s Municipal Register of Cultural Heritage Properties (Figure 6a). According to City of Brampton policy, Category B indicates a significant heritage property that is worthy of preservation and for which a municipal designation under the Ontario Heritage Act will always be considered.

An earlier Graham family farmhouse was located to the north near Etobicoke Creek at 7715 Kennedy Road South (Figures 6a-6c). This single-storey, five-bay stone house was known later as the Rutledge family homestead. Unfortunately this listed stone dwelling was destroyed by fire in 2010. The Graham Pioneer Cemetery (Figure 6d), located on the north side of Etobicoke Creek is currently being researched for heritage designation.

Figure 6b – “Rutledge homestead, Broodytown” (Image: Perkins Bull Collection, PAMA)

Figure 6c – After fire at 7715 Kennedy Rd S. (Image: Brampton Guardian, Apr 2010)

Figure 6d – “Etobicoke Creek on the Rutledge Farm – showing swimming hole & on top bank, an abandoned cemetery”. (Image: Perkins Bull Collection, PAMA)
It is important to point out that a footprint representing the stone homestead (formerly at 7715 Kennedy Road South) is not indicated on Tremaine’s Map of 1856 nor does it appear on the 1877 Historical Atlas. What is shown on both of these historical maps is a house owned by George Rutledge in the middle of the northwest quarter of Lot 13 in Concession 2 (Figure 7). By 1877 a house is shown on the east side of Kennedy Road, in both the northwest and southwest quarters of Lot 13 (Figure 8). This corresponds to the buildings shown on Reference Plan 42R-2995 which shows brick dwellings in both locations (Figure 14). The only dwelling indicated on the registered plan within Lot 14 Con 2 EHS is a single-storey bungalow, clad in asbestos siding with a concrete block foundation. It appears that the stone dwelling that burned in 2010 has not been indicated on any of these maps.

What can be confirmed is that the dwelling indicated on the 1877 map within the southwest quarter of Lot 13 in Concession 2 EHS is the subject building of this heritage impact assessment and that the occupant of the dwelling at that time was James Graham (Figure 8).
4. **Selected Ownership History of the Subject Site**

George Graham, grandfather of James Graham, purchased the entire Lot 13 in Concession 2 East of Hurontario Street (EHS) from the Crown in April 1836. Later that year George and his wife Mary Graham sold the SW ¼ (south half of the west half) of Lot 13, Con 2 EHS (50 acres) to William Robinson for £45. This ownership is shown in 1856 on Tremaine’s *Map of the County of Peel* (Figure 7).

Thomas Graham, son of George Graham, is shown on the 1856 and 1877 maps as owner of the east half of Lot 12 Concession 1 EHS. Thomas purchased the SW ¼ of Lot 13 Con 2 EHS (50 acres) from William Robinson for £400 in 1864. At the same time, Thomas and Mary Ann Graham received a mortgage from William Robinson in the amount of $1,400 and this mortgage was discharged by 1872.

In 1877 a map of the north section of Toronto Township in the *Historical Atlas of the County of Peel* shows James Graham’s name on the SW ¼ of Lot 13, Con 2 EHS (Figure 8). The title abstracts indicate that in 1883 Thomas Graham sold the property to his son James for $1.

---

2 The selected ownership history is based on a title search conducted at the Peel Archives (PAMA). The full title search results are shown in table form in Appendix 2.

3 Thomas Graham’s house as indicated on the 1856 and 1877 maps may be in the same location as what is now 7324 Kennedy Road (Figure 9). To date, RHC has not been able to confirm any historical details of this property.
In 1907, the year following James Graham’s death, the SW ¼ of Lot 13 in Con 2 EHS is sold by Mary, Willard and Frederick Graham and James Graham’s estate to Elizabeth and John McCord for the sum of $3,250. Elizabeth McCord (widow) sells the SW ¼ to Wilson Henry for $4,000. In 1935 Albert E. Parr and Florence E. Parr purchase the property. By 1962 Albert E. Parr grants the property to Thomas I. Somers, Thadeus J. Maleki and Robert N. McLaughlin as Trustees and Parr takes out a mortgage from these trustees in the amount of $25,000. In 1968 the property is sold to Somergate Developments Limited who then take out a mortgage of $207,440 and grant the property to Moonbeam Holdings Limited. Moonbeam Holdings Limited received a mortgage of $161,500 and later sold what is indicated as Part 6 on Registered Plan 43R-2995 (Figure 14) to the Province of Ontario in 1976.

The Graham and Rutledge Families as Early Settlers

According to the Tweedsmuir History of Derry West and other secondary sources⁴, many Irish immigrants landed at New York and tried to settle before making their way to Toronto Township. Among them were John Rutledge (Figure 10), his wife Alice (Dixon). His brother Archibald Rutledge came to

---

America (New York) in 1817 with John and Alice’s daughter Catherine. They left daughter Jane behind but brought Joseph Graham, son of Thomas and Ann Graham (Alice’s nephew as Ann was Alice’s sister). The lack of work and the effect of the War of 1812 sent many out looking for alternative areas to settle. Members of the Graham, Ruthledge, Beatty and Brody families were some of the earliest settlers to come to Toronto Township travelling together in a caravan after having sent two of their young men to scout out Toronto Township ahead of them. When the young men (Reed Thomas and Joseph Graham) returned with favourable reports, the decision to move together was made. The trip to Upper Canada was arduous for the families with a number of mishaps including rescuing one of the toddlers from a fall off the ferry when crossing the Niagara River, a confrontation with American border patrol and the realization that the carriage James Graham had brought with him could not be used in Toronto Township as there were no cut roads. It was the first covered carriage in Upper Canada and ended up, in the enterprising way of settlers, being used as a hen house. Good fortune came in the form of the Morrison’s forethought to sling an anvil under their wagon proving itself indispensable along with the hospitality of innkeeper Caleb Hopkins who offered them an extra days lodging in his establishment to celebrate the Sabbath during their travels.

---

**Figure 10** – John Rutledge (Image: Tweedsmuir History of Derry West, PAMA)

**Figure 11** – George Rutledge and William Rutledge (Image: Tweedsmuir History of Derry West, PAMA)
The Rutledge family history tells the story of how by the mid-1860’s a brick house was built across (Kennedy Road) from the Rutledge farmhouse, that the limestone foundation stones were from the quarry shown on the 1877 map at the Etobicoke Creek (Figure 12b)\(^6\) and that the bricks were handmade on site. As the bricks of the subject property are also handmade red bricks it may be possible they were made at the same time. John Rutledge’s son George Rutledge and his son William are also associated with the ownership history of Lot 13 Con 2 (EHS) (Figure 11).

The following members of the Graham family (four brothers and two sisters) came with other Irish immigrants to settle in Toronto Township in 1819: Joseph, James, Thomas, George, Sarah and Margaret.

George Graham became known as the founder of Derry West (called at different times “Grahamville” or “Graham’s Corners” before settling on Derry West. “Derry” was chosen for Londonderry, Ireland and “west” as added by the post office. George Graham was born in 1784 in County Tyrone, Ireland and died in Peel County on June 11, 1863. George married Mary Henderson (b. 1786 in County Tyrone, Ireland, d. 1 May 1865). George and Mary settled in 1819 in Toronto Township, Peel County (Lot 12, Con 1, EHS), sold their lot in 1823 and repurchased it in 1836.

\(^6\) The Tweedsmuir History states that limestone from this same Etobicoke Creek quarry was used to build the walls of the County Jail in downtown Brampton (see Figure 12a).
George and Mary had five children: Thomas, Anne, James, Joseph and Sarah. The family attended the Church of England and were buried in the Anglican cemetery at Derry West - the monument to their son Joseph ("Jose") bears the inscription of their deaths.

Thomas Graham (born 1810 in County Tyrone, Ireland) married Mary Ann Morrison (b. 1819 in Canada) on 5 March 1838. Thomas was the founder of the Loyal Orangeman’s Lodge No.5 (Orangedale Lodge) and was later Master for forty years. Thomas and Mary Ann are shown at right celebrating their 60th wedding anniversary in March 1898 (Figure 13). Thomas Graham died shortly after, on 5 April 1898, and Mary Ann died on 2 Aug 1903.

Thomas and Mary Ann Graham had eleven children: Sarah (b.1839); George (b.1841); Martin; Joseph (d. 4 yrs); James (b. 21 Sept 1847); Joseph (b. 1852); Mary Jane (b.1854); Thomas Jr. (b.1854); Hugh (b. 1856); John (b.1858); Ellen Ann.

The Personal Census of Canada from 1861 indicates Thomas Graham as a farmer of the Anglican faith, born in the United States, with his wife Mary Ann (born in Canada West) and nine children: Sarah, George, Martin, James, Mary

---

7 Tweedsmuir History
8 Personal Census of Canada. Enumeration District No.7, Township of Toronto, County of Peel. (Page 765 of 841). Source: Ancestry.com
Jane, Joseph, Thomas Jr., Hugh and John. All were living in a 1.5-storey brick house.\(^9\)

At 27 years of age, James Graham married Mary Emmett (22 yrs) daughter of William K. and Isabella Emmett of Chinguacousy Township on 11 March 1874 in Chinguacousy Township.\(^{10}\)

The 1891 Census\(^{11}\) indicates James Graham (43 years of age) a farmer and his wife Mary (39) with sons Willard (12) and Frederick (10). James Graham died only 15 years later on 4 January 1906, in Portland, Oregon while his children were with their mother, Mary, in Rossland, B.C.

The 1891 Census also indicates Thomas Graham (an 80 year old grandfather) and his wife Mary Ann (72) living with their daughter Mary Jane (37), their son John Graham (33), John’s wife Elizabeth J. (24) and their children Charles (2 ?), Harry (12) and Gertie (15) with a 19 year old domestic named Edgar Curtis.

\(^9\) It is possible that this is what is now 7324 Kennedy Road.
\(^{10}\) Record #006105-74 (Peel Co) found in Rootsweb by Ancestry.com (http://homepages.rootsweb.ancestry.com/~maryc/peel74.htm)
\(^{11}\) Personal Census of Canada. Enumeration District No.7, Township of Toronto, County of Peel. (Page 112 of 118).
Reference Plan 42R-2995

Reference Plan 42R-2995 (Figure 14), dated 1975, shows Part 6 in the west half of Lot 13 in Concession 2 East of Hurontario Street. The reference plan schedule refers to the lands being within the “Township of Toronto, then in the City of Mississauga, now in the City of Brampton”. Moonbeam Holdings Limited are listed as the property owner of Part 6 with a lot area is 50.450 acres.

Part 6 of the west half of Lot 13 does not include the half-acre parcel in the northwest corner. The dashed line just north of the line between Lots 12 and 13 indicates the right-of-way for what is now Highway 407.

The detail inset (Figure 15) shows the subject buildings within the farm building complex in 1975, including:

- 2-storey brick house, stone foundation and uncovered wooden porch
- wooden barn with a concrete block foundation
- corrugated steel garage and concrete block
- wooden barn
- corrugated steel garage with concrete block foundation
- insulbrick siding shed

The farmhouse, wooden barn and “garage” that remain today are highlighted in yellow. No other structures are indicated on the reference plan within the subject site area.
5. **Sketch Plans of the James Graham Farmhouse**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Floor</th>
<th>Upper Floor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A – Kitchen</td>
<td>F – Upper Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B – Front Room</td>
<td>G – Bedroom G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C – Bedroom C</td>
<td>H – Bedroom H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D – Back Room D</td>
<td>I - Bedroom I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E – Back Room E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J – Summer Kitchen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K – Back Room</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L - Bathroom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 16 – Sketch Roof Plan (not to scale) (Image: RHC 2015)

Figure 17 – Sketch Main Floor Plan (not to scale) (Image: RHC 2015)

Figure 18 – Sketch Upper Floor Plan (not to scale) (Image: RHC 2015)
6. **Physical Description - Exterior**

RHC has prepared sketch roof and floor plans of the areas inspected during the March 2015 site visit (Figures 16, 17 and 18).

The James Graham farmhouse, has an asymmetrical floor plan and is a variation on a typical L-plan house of the mid to late-19th century. The north-south roof ridge meets roughly at the centre of the higher east-west ridge (Figure 16). The south eave wall and the west eave wall have wall dormers with pointed arch windows.

All roof slopes appear to have been clad with dark grey asphalt shingles applied over wood shingles. Many areas are missing shingles so that the wood plank roof decking is exposed which has allowed the elements to enter through the roof. The soffit and fascia of the north extension is missing.
The front door is on the west eave wall (Figures 19 and 21) of Room A (Figure 17). The front door and two window kitchen windows were originally under a wrap-around verandah. The lighter area of brick (or ghosting) and nailers (pieces of wood laid in place of stretcher bricks) indicates the verandah location and roof line. RHC found what are likely broken elements of scrollwork verandah trim on the ground in front of the house (Figure 22).

The exterior door to the frame wing (Rooms J and K) leads to the interior side door of the brick portion of the dwelling. The verandah roof would have sheltered this entrance as well.

Masonry

The wall field is hand-pressed red brick, laid in a stretcher bond pattern with a light coloured lime mortar (Figure 23). The walls have been constructed in what is likely a brick veneer secured to a wood frame substructure with nails laid in the mortar between brick courses.

The principle corners of the house have “white” brick quoins in bands of three courses that are two stretchers deep.

---

12 Brickmakers in the mid to late 19th century referred to the bricks made from lighter “yellow” clays as “white” e.g. Brantford white brick.
The front door and north side door and all but two of the original window heads have segmental arches constructed in yellow (white) brick. The drip mold is seven corbelled (protruding) stretcher bricks - each have four bevel cuts into the bottom arris of the brick that create a sawtooth appearance (Figure 23). The segmental arch is constructed with 15 white soldier brick voussoirs with 6 ½ white stretcher bricks at the haunch of the arch.

The bay window on the front gable wall is flat on top with a slightly belcast slope constructed with what appears to be copper. Paired, scrollwork brackets support the soffit at each of the four corners of the bay. The window sills are a plain wood lug sill. Below each of the three sills is a raised rectangle of white brick. The foundation exterior above grade is roughly coursed, bedded limestone.

The two gothic or pointed arch windows, the first in the wall dormer over the south elevation (Figure 28) and the second in the wall dormer over the front door (Figure 27), have a similar treatment but built with a drip mold of 20 white header bricks (plus two white half-headers at the peak) each with their end bevel cut on the bottom arris of the brick. The inside arch the window was made with 30 white rowlock bricks.
North Extension

All four side walls of the single-storey, gable roof, wood frame extension on the north elevation of the house (Rooms J and K) are clad in sheets of pressed metal siding applied over vertical wall boards. The siding has been stamped with an impression that gives the appearance of rock-faced brick in a stretcher bond and it has been painted red. As the roof rafter ends, soffit and back fascia board seen in Figure 29 appear to have been applied over top of the metal siding, it is the consultant’s opinion that the metal cladding is the original cladding of the north extension.

Large areas of the roof cladding are missing and wood shingles are present under what is left of deteriorated asphalt shingles. The roof ridge of the north extension is capped with formed sheet metal. There are holes in the roof decking where the verandah had once covered that area. Knob and tube wiring is attached to a rafter in the exposed roof area. Much of the front soffit and fascia boards are missing.

The exterior door to the north extension is not visible beneath the plywood boarding. This door does not have a transom as in the doors of the brick house. To the left of the door is a wood sash window with a segmental arch head visible above the plywood boarding. The north gable wall window is completely covered. The east and south walls of the extension (Figures 29 and 30) have rough openings for a door and two unglazed windows.
Brick East Extension

The brick extension (Rooms E and D) extend the floor plan east and appear to be part of the original house design. The extension’s roof continues the same pitch as the main roof above it. There are areas of the roof that are open to the elements.

Similar to the main block of the house, this extension was constructed with an exterior wall field in hand-pressed red brick, laid in a stretcher bond pattern with a light coloured lime mortar (Figures 32-34). The corners of the extension have white brick quoins in single courses that are one stretcher deep – the southeast corner of the main house block has the same quoin detail on the gable wall elevation.

The two windows of the brick addition have segmental arch heads in red soldier bricks. Both windows have wooden lug sills and wood sashes with a segmental arched top and a 2-over-2 glass pane arrangement.

Insulbrick East Extension

The bathroom extension in the southeast corner (Room L) is wood frame construction with the exterior clad in insulbrick that mimics red brick. There is no decking or cladding on the roof of this extension. The roofline extends from under the upper window sill and is a much lower pitch than the brick extension.
7. Physical Description – Interior

During the consultant’s inspection, the house could only be entered through the back door of the north extension. The partition wall between Rooms J and K (Figure 36) contains a wooden shelf for a stove pipe. There are burn marks on the roof rafters from a past fire.

The front and side windows of Room J have wooden roundel cornerblocks and casings. The front door of in Room J was completely covered with plywood boarding.

The front, side and rear interior walls have been finished with doubled, horizontal tongue-and-groove wood boards. The interior brick wall is exposed but painted the same grey as the wall boards. The ceiling is covered with pressed metal panels with 16 sections and a “rope” profile crown moulding also in pressed metal.

Room J appeared to have a basement area below it but this area was not accessible during the inspection.
Room A - Kitchen

The kitchen (Room A) is entered through a transomed door in the north (brick) wall (Figure 40). The wood trim is the only feature of interest in this room as it is thought to be part of the original house: door transoms, wainscot, chair rail, door/window casings and baseboards. All wood trim has been painted a dark brown. The ceiling has been covered with white acoustic tile that extends down from the top of the wall for one square. The front and side door are not original or of significant age.

Figure 40 (Photo: RHC 2015)

Figure 41 (Photo: RHC 2015)

Figure 42 (Photo: RHC 2015)
Rooms E and D

The rooms on the east side of the kitchen are in a very dilapidated state of repair – open roof and exposed lath from fallen interior wall plaster. Although these two rooms may well be part of the house’s original footprint, it is the consultant’s opinion that due to their low physical integrity, if the brick exterior wall is not sound enough to retain in situ, this north extension (Rooms E and D) should both considered for a careful dismantling and salvage of useful brick for repair work elsewhere on the building.

Room E (Figure 43) still contains the remains of a 2-over-2 wood sash window.

Room D (Figures 44 and 45) has a stovepipe thimble over the door casing trim. To the right of the door to Room D is a doorway to the stairway which leads up to the entrance to the bathroom (Room L) before winding up to the upper floor.
Rooms B and C

To the right of the stairway door in Room A is a doorway to Room B (Dining Room). The features of significance in Room B are the plaster medallion in the ceiling (Figure 49), the three sashes of the bay window (Figure 50) and the wood trim work, 4-panel wood doors and original hinges/hardware.
Stairway and Upper Rooms F and G

The winding staircase has a handrail with a distinctive profile supported by pencil post newel posts and alternative single (square) and double (round) balusters (Figures 54 and 55). There are some balusters missing.

Room F (Upper Hallway) has a 2-over-2 wood sash window on the east wall and a pointed or Gothic arch window facing south. The west partition has a stove pipe shelf and thimble that extend through to Room G.

Water damage from leaking in the roof valley where the tail roof connects to the south section is shown in Figure 60.
Upper Rooms H and I

Two back bedrooms on the upper floor (Rooms H & I) contain 4-panel wood doors. Room H has a stove pipe thimble and the west-facing pointed or Gothic window (Figure 63).

Room I has a ceiling hatch that allowed RHC to see the roof ridge construction for the tail section of the house. There is no ridge board, the rafters simply connect to the corresponding member at the top of the opposite slope (Figure 66).
Behind the James Graham farmhouse (to the east) are two outbuildings.

**Gambrel Roof Barn**

With a slightly belcast roof design and shed roof dormers, vertical corrugated metal siding and steel roof ridge ventilators, the gambrel barn (Figure 67) is clearly a product of the mid-20th century. As the structure is not at all part of the Graham family occupation, the author is not of the opinion that the gambrel roof barn has cultural heritage value.

**Gable Roof Shed**

As stated previously, during the March 2015 site visit the interior of the gable roof shed (Figure 70) was not accessible for inspection as a large storage box had been placed in front of the access doors. RHC had been told by City of Brampton staff that this building was of timber construction but were unable to confirm any physical details or conduct any photodocumentation for this HIA report.

![Figure 67 (Photo: RHC 2015)](image1)
![Figure 68a (Photo: RHC 2015)](image2)
![Figure 68b (Photo: RHC 2015)](image3)
![Figure 68c (Photo: RHC 2015)](image4)
![Figure 70 (Photo: RHC 2015)](image5)
![Figure 69 (Photo: RHC 2015)](image6)
8. Cultural Heritage Value or Interest

According to Regulation 9/06 under the Ontario Heritage Act, a property may be designated under section 29 of the Act if it meets one or more of the three criteria for determining whether it is of cultural heritage value or interest. The criteria provided by Regulation 9/06 are presented in Appendix 1.

It is the consultant’s opinion that the farmhouse at 7575 Kennedy Road in the City of Brampton has cultural heritage value or interest as it satisfies the three criteria used to determine cultural heritage value or interest according to Regulation 9/06 under the Ontario Heritage Act. 13

8.1 Design or Physical Value

The James Graham farmhouse has design value or physical value as it is a representative example of mid-Victorian brick farmhouse construction methods using hand-pressed red brick with white brick trim. The subject farmhouse has physical value as it is in its original location.

8.2 Historical of Associative Value

The James Graham farmhouse is associated with members of the Graham family, a pioneering family in the development of rural settlement in the area and the establishment of the Derry West area of the former Toronto Township.

8.3  Contextual Value

The James Graham farmhouse has contextual value as it is one of only a few remnant elements that help to define the original rural settlement patterns of this area of the former Toronto Township. Its location near the original Kennedy Road and the original road allowance itself assist the viewer in understanding the original rural setting.

9.  Heritage Attributes

It is RHC’s recommendation that the physical features of the property that support the cultural heritage value or interest of 7575 Kennedy Road South in the City of Brampton are limited to the original 1.5-storey brick dwelling exterior (being the footprint of rooms A – I in sketch floor plan), and exclude the north and east extensions (identified as Rooms J, K and L).

The suggested heritage attributes of the original 1.5-storey brick dwelling exterior and its surroundings are as follows:

- original shape and massing of roofline, including two gable roof wall dormers
- brick exterior walls with red brick field and white brick trim (quoins, drip mouldings and labels over window and door openings)
- brick bay window at front with paired wooden brackets
- limestone foundation exterior visible from grade level
- pointed and segmental arch window and door openings and all original wood and glass elements that can be conserved

- original single-lane road allowance for Kennedy Road as seen in the front of the farmhouse

Features recommended for salvage and re-use (rooms J, K and L):

- wood window elements, including sashes, casings and other salvageable elements

- pressed metal exterior cladding of north extension

- pressed metal ceiling and crown moulding from Room J

- interior wooden 4-panel doors and associated hinges/hardware

10. Integrity of the Cultural Property

A cultural property does not need to be in original condition. Few survive without alterations on the long journey between their date of origin and today. Integrity is a question of whether the surviving physical features (heritage attributes) continue to represent or support the cultural heritage value or interest of the property.

from “Evaluating Heritage Resources” -
- Ontario Heritage Toolkit
**General Condition of the Farmhouse**

Because the farmhouse building has been allowed to stand vacant and neglected with no basic repairs or regular maintenance for years, it is difficult to know what damage (visible or concealed) has been done to the heritage attributes of the property by such prolonged exposure to the elements and the freeze/thaw cycle of the southern Ontario climate. RHC recommends that the subject building be assessed by a structural engineer for adequate physical and structural integrity.¹⁴

As the heritage attributes are essentially limited to the exterior of the building, if the degree of superficial deterioration on the interior is relatively high but the main structural elements (i.e. foundation walls, sill plates, roof members) are in reasonable condition it is RHC’s opinion that it may still be entirely possible to rehabilitate the building intact with its heritage attributes either *in situ* or in an appropriate new location.

In general, the consultant saw very little evidence of uneven settlement in the masonry walls. The only major cracking that was observed during the March 2015 site visit was the stepped cracking under the middle window sill toward the front right corner of the bay window (Figure 71).

---

¹⁴ Any observations, comments or opinions expressed by the author (Robinson Heritage Consulting) are strictly empirical and not to be construed as a structural assessment.
Most of the stone foundation exterior appears to be intact with only some areas of mortar loss (Figure 72).

There has been material loss in the brickwork (e.g. spalled brick faces and missing mortar in the joints of the main house block – mostly on the rear (east wall) (Figure 73). It should be noted that in this case the softer lime mortar has been washed out leaving the soft, hand-pressed brick exposed. Being the sacrificial element of a brick wall, the mortar was functioning as it should in breaking down before the brick units. Unfortunately the necessary repointing was not carried out at the proper time and the integrity of the wall below the window jamb has been put at risk.

11. Recommendations

It is the consultant’s opinion that the cultural heritage of the existing farmhouse at 7575 Kennedy Road in the City of Brampton is well worth documentation and should be included in the historical record of the City of Brampton and Peel Region.

RHC recommends that that City of Brampton prepare a Conservation Plan for this significant cultural heritage resource. The City should take measures to identify new uses for the portion of the building to be retained, in situ or at an appropriate new site, with a conservation strategy put in place and followed for its rehabilitation.
In general terms, the following interventions should be considered under the guidance of an approved Conservation Plan:

1. Careful removal of the north extension (Rooms J and K) and the east extension (Room L) should be carried out by a professional contractor specializes in dismantling and re-constructing of historic structures) using proper architectural preservation practice in such a way that allows for the salvage of identified elements and minimizes damage to the brick exterior.

2. The roof and structural systems of the remaining cultural heritage resource should be examined by a structural engineer that has experience with traditional building techniques and accepted heritage conservation practice for an assessment as to its structural integrity and for recommendations on how the roof and walls structure may be stabilized.

3. The existing asphalt cement shingle cladding should be removed and disposed of using proper methods with respect for the potential health hazards associated with these materials.

4. The existing roof decking boards, soffits and fascia should be assessed for retention or salvage and a new roof deck and trim should be applied that would carry a new roof cladding exterior.

5. A replacement shingle (mimicking weather wood shingles) should be chosen with an appropriate pattern, profile and color that is based on the remaining wood shingles and applied over the repaired decking. An appropriate
eavestrough and downspout system should be installed to divert rainwater away from the masonry of walls and foundation.

6. Once the removal of additions and the replacement of the roof has been completed, a mason with experience in traditional brickwork materials, techniques and accepted heritage conservation practice should be brought in to remove/replace bricks where necessary and to repoint the exterior brickwork were required.

7. After the roof and exterior masonry has been properly repaired, the property owner should consider the restoration of the wood and glass elements of the windows within the heritage building. A contractor with experience in traditional wood window materials, techniques and accepted heritage conservation practice should be retained to refurbish the existing windows to proper working order and with appropriate finishes.

Robinson Heritage Consulting recommends the following:

   a) That consideration be given by the current or subsequent owner of 7575 Kennedy Road to incorporate the heritage attributes of the heritage resource as elements of any proposed redevelopment or new construction on the property.

   b) Any new development or construction on the subject property should also be sympathetic to and be compatible with the remaining original heritage character of the James Graham farmhouse area.
c) That the existing residential building at 7575 Kennedy Road be assessed by a structural engineer for adequate physical and structural integrity to allow the building to be lifted and re-located to a proper, new foundation *in-situ*, to the satisfaction of the Brampton Heritage Board;
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Appendix 1

Ontario Regulation 9/06 made under the *Ontario Heritage Act*

A property may be designated under section 29 of the Act if it meets one or more of the following criteria for determining whether it is of cultural heritage value or interest:

1. The property has design value or physical value because it,
   i. is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, expression, material or construction method,
   ii. displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit, or
   iii. demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement.

2. The property has historical value or associative value because it,
   i. has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization or institution that is significant to a community,
   ii. yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of a community or culture, or
   iii. demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer or theorist who is significant to a community.

3. The property has contextual value because it,
   i. is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an area,
   ii. is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings, or
   iii. is a landmark.

### Appendix 2 – Land Title Records for West Half of Lot 13, Concession 2, EHS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instr #</th>
<th>Instr</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reg</th>
<th>Grantor</th>
<th>Grantee</th>
<th>Consid</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13171</td>
<td>B&amp;S</td>
<td>9 May 1836</td>
<td>27 Aug 1836</td>
<td>George Graham et ux</td>
<td>William Robinson</td>
<td>£ 45</td>
<td>50 acres; SW ½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13172</td>
<td>B&amp;S</td>
<td>2 Aug 1836</td>
<td>27 Aug 1836</td>
<td>George Graham et ux</td>
<td>David Neelands</td>
<td>£ 87.10</td>
<td>50 acres; NW ½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33188</td>
<td>B&amp;S</td>
<td>25 July 1848</td>
<td>26 Dec 1848</td>
<td>David Neelands et ux</td>
<td>George Rutledge</td>
<td>£ 400</td>
<td>50 acres; NW ½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12539</td>
<td>B&amp;S</td>
<td>19 July 1864</td>
<td>19 July 1864</td>
<td>William Robinson</td>
<td>Thomas Graham</td>
<td>£ 400</td>
<td>50 acres; SW ½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12540</td>
<td>Mortgage</td>
<td>19 July 1864</td>
<td>19 July 1864</td>
<td>William Graham et ux</td>
<td>William Robinson</td>
<td>$1,400</td>
<td>50 acres; SW ½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1088</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>27 Nov 1872</td>
<td>28 Nov 1872</td>
<td>Wm. Robinson</td>
<td>Thomas Graham</td>
<td></td>
<td>Discharging No. 12544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3913</td>
<td>B&amp;S</td>
<td>6 Feb 1883</td>
<td>16 May 1883</td>
<td>Thomas Graham</td>
<td>James Graham</td>
<td>$1</td>
<td>S ½ of W ½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8296</td>
<td>Will</td>
<td>15 May 1890</td>
<td>18 May 1893</td>
<td>George Rutledge</td>
<td>Catherine Rutledge</td>
<td></td>
<td>NW ½ and O. L.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8298</td>
<td>B&amp;S</td>
<td>15 Nov 1893</td>
<td>18 Nov 1893</td>
<td>Catherine Rutledge et al</td>
<td>William Rutledge</td>
<td>$1</td>
<td>NW ½ Subject to legacies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9549</td>
<td>Release</td>
<td>25 Oct 1897</td>
<td>27 Oct 1897</td>
<td>Mary A. Graham, wife of Thomas Graham</td>
<td>James Graham</td>
<td>$1</td>
<td>SW ½ Releasing dower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12741</td>
<td>B.S.</td>
<td>22 July 1907</td>
<td>1 Aug 1907</td>
<td>Robert Crawford, Admr. of James Graham Est. &amp; Frederick Graham, Willard Graham &amp; Mary Graham (widow)</td>
<td>Elizabeth McCord, wife of John McCord</td>
<td>$3,250.00</td>
<td>SW ½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12742</td>
<td>Mortgage</td>
<td>30 July 1907</td>
<td>1 Aug 1907</td>
<td>Elizabeth McCord, wife of John McCord and the said John McCord</td>
<td>Eli Crawford</td>
<td>$1,250</td>
<td>S ½ of W ½ 50 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12743</td>
<td>Mortgage</td>
<td>1 Aug 1907</td>
<td>1 Aug 1907</td>
<td>Elizabeth McCord, wife of John McCord and the said John McCord</td>
<td>Mary Graham, widow and Frederick Graham and Willard Graham</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>S ½ of W ½ 50 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13338</td>
<td>B &amp; S</td>
<td>13 Nov 1912</td>
<td>24 Dec 1912</td>
<td>Elizabeth McCord, widow</td>
<td>Wilson Henry</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>S ½ of W ½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28097</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>6 Oct 1926</td>
<td>6 Oct 1926</td>
<td>Wilson Henry</td>
<td>Florence M. Henry &amp; Wilson Henry</td>
<td>$1 etc.</td>
<td>S ½ of W ½ 50 acres as joint tenants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36463</td>
<td>Mortgage</td>
<td>1 Mar 1935</td>
<td>28 Feb 1935</td>
<td>Albert E. Parr and Florence E. Parr</td>
<td>Florence M. Hillis</td>
<td>$4,500</td>
<td>S ½ of W ½ 50 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36464</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>1 Mar 1935</td>
<td>28 Feb 1935</td>
<td>Florence M. Hillis formerly Florence M. Henry</td>
<td>Albert E. Parr and Florence E. Parr</td>
<td>$1 &amp; c</td>
<td>S ½ of W ½ 50 acres as joint tenants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39789</td>
<td>Mortgage</td>
<td>13 Mar 1940</td>
<td>16 Mar 1940</td>
<td>Albert E. Parr et ux</td>
<td>J. Henry Robinson</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td>S ½ of W ½ 50 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93864</td>
<td>Mortgage</td>
<td>9 Feb 1956</td>
<td>13 Feb 1956</td>
<td>Florence E. Parr and Albert E. Parr</td>
<td>Christina Little</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>S ½ of W ½ 50 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103287</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>12 Feb 1957</td>
<td>9 May 1957</td>
<td>Florence E. Parr and Albert E. Parr</td>
<td>Elma I. Thompson and Leslie E. Thompson</td>
<td>$1 &amp; c</td>
<td>½ acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GR 14096</td>
<td>Cert.</td>
<td>21 Nov 1962</td>
<td>26 Nov 1962</td>
<td>Treasurer’s Consent</td>
<td>Florence E. Parr</td>
<td></td>
<td>SW ½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160423</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>7 Nov 1963</td>
<td>26 Nov 1962</td>
<td>Albert E. Parr</td>
<td>Thomas I. Somers, Thadeus J. Malski &amp; Robert N. McLaughlin as Trustees</td>
<td>$2 &amp; c</td>
<td>Part W 1/2 ; 50.44 acres Commencing at s L thence E 2220.76‘ x NW 1008.61‘ x W 2031.17‘ x SE 110‘ x W</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
50.44 acres | 197.29’ x SE 890.17’ to point of commencement. Dom Consent for Florence E. Parr attached. |
| 10614[... | Cert. | 13 Apr 1966 | 30 May 1966 | Treasurer’s Consent | Matthew A. Maher | Re: 160423 |
50.44 acres |
50.44 acres |
50.44 acres |
50.44 acres |
| 386732VS | Grant | 19 Mar 1976 | 29 Mar 1976 | Moonbeam Holdings Limited | Her Majesty the Queen represented by the Minister of Government Services | $2 & c | Part designated as Part 6 on 43R-2995 |
Date: 2016-07-12

Subject: Notice of Intention to Demolish the Residential Dwelling at 8292 Creditview Road – Ward 4 (HE.x 8292 Creditview Road – Eldorado Mill Pond, Dam and Sluice)

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 July 11, 2016, to the Brampton Heritage Board Meeting of July 19, 2016, re: Notice of Intention to Demolish the Residential Dwelling at 8292 Creditview Road – Ward 4 be received;

2. That the property at 8292 Creditview Road remain on the Municipal Heritage Register; and

3. That the demolition of the single detached dwelling at 8292 Creditview Road be permitted.

Overview:

- The property at 8292 Creditview Road is listed on the City’s “Municipal Register of Cultural Heritage Resources” because it contains the remains of the mill pond, dam and sluice of the former Eldorado Mill.
- The property also contains a single detached dwelling that does not contribute to the cultural heritage value of the property.
- A Notice of Intention to Demolish has been submitted in accordance with the Ontario Heritage Act for the demolition of the single detached dwelling.
- This report recommends 8292 Creditview Road continue to remain on the Municipal Heritage Register, and that the demolition of the dwelling be permitted to facilitate the development of a new single detached dwelling on the property.
- This report achieves the Strategic Plan priorities by preserving and protecting heritage environments with balanced, responsible planning.
Background:

The property at 8292 Creditview Road is located on the west side of Creditview Road north of Steeles Avenue West. The 4.24 acre property is listed on the “City of Brampton’s Municipal Register of Cultural Heritage Resources”, and contains the remains of the mill pond, dam and sluice of the former Eldorado Mill and a single-detached residential dwelling. The landowner is proposing the demolition of the existing single detached dwelling to facilitate the construction of new single detached dwelling on the property.

Current Situation:

Under section 27(3) of the *Ontario Heritage Act*, the owner of a property that is listed on the Municipal Heritage Register shall not demolish a building or structure on the property unless the owner gives Council at least 60 days’ notice in writing of their intention to demolish. A Notice of Intention to Demolish the residential dwelling at 8292 Creditview Road was submitted on July 12, 2016, and a decision regarding the demolition request must be made before September 9, 2016 – See Appendix A.

The cultural heritage value of 8292 Creditview Road is related to the remains of the former Eldorado Mill, including this mill pond, dam and sluice, which are located on the southwest of the property. The removal of the residence will not impact the cultural heritage value of the property, and the proposed replacement dwelling does not impact the remains of the former mill. In addition, a Stage 1 & 2 Archaeological Assessment was completed for the lands being impacted by the proposed new construction. The Assessment did not identify any archaeological resources and recommended that no further archaeological due diligence be required.

Corporate Implications:

Financial Implications:

None.

Other Implications:

Given that there are no scheduled Council meetings until September 14, 2016, the 60 day timeline prescribed by the *Ontario Heritage Act* for Council to respond to the Notice of Intention to Demolish will be exceeded. A special meeting of Council to address the Notice is not recommended because the dwelling proposed for demolition does not contribute to the cultural heritage value of the property. Alternatively, City staff will be issuing a briefing note to Council regarding this matter.

Strategic Plan:

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

The proposed demolition of the single detached dwelling at 8292 Credtiview Road does not impact the remains of the former Eldorado Mill. The proposal to develop a new residence on the property retains the mill pond, dam and sluice. As such, it is recommended the property remain on the Municipal Heritage Register, and that the demolition of the dwelling be permitted.

Approved by:

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

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

Attachments:

Appendix A – Notice of Intention to Demolish the Residential Dwelling at 8292 Credtiview Road

Report authored by: Antonietta Minichillo, Heritage Coordinator
NOTICE IN WRITING
PURSUANT TO S. 27 (3) OF THE ONTARIO HERITAGE ACT

July 12, 2016

Mayor and Members of Council
Corporation of the City of Brampton
2 Wellington Street West
Brampton ON L6Y 4R2

Attention: Mr. Peter Fay, City Clerk

Dear Sir;

Re: Notification of Intent to Demolish pursuant to Section 27 (3) of the Ontario Heritage Act - Residential dwelling at 8292 Creditview Road

In accordance with the provisions of Section 27 (3) of the Ontario Heritage Act, I am writing on behalf of the owners of 8292 Creditview Road to provide notification to the Brampton City Council of the intention to demolish the existing residential dwelling located at 8292 Creditview Road.

Regards,

Csaba Horvath
Architectural Designer