Tuesday, May 28, 2019
7:00 p.m. – Regular Meeting

Council Chambers
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
           Palvinder Gill
           Doug McLeod
           Mary Pettingill
           Anthony Simone
           Lynda Voegtle
           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: Meeting information is also available in alternative formats, upon request.

Note: Any difficulty accessing meeting rooms, buildings, elevators, etc. please contact security at 905-874-2111
1. **Approval of Agenda**

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

3. **Previous Minutes**
   
   3.1. **Minutes – Brampton Heritage Board – April 16, 2019**

   Note: The minutes were considered at the Planning and Development Committee Meeting of April 29, 2019, and the recommendations were approved by Council on May 8, 2019. 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 – May 9, 2019**

   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. Report from Pascal Doucet, Heritage Planner, Planning and Development Services, dated May 22, 2019, re: *Heritage Permit Application – Alterations to a Designated Heritage Property – Notice of Intention to demolish a metal shed and Authority to Enter into a Heritage Easement Agreement – 6461 Mayfield Road (Thompson Farmhouse) – Ward 10 (File HE.x).*

   *Recommendation*

10.2. Information Update from Al Meneses, Commissioner of Community Services, and Amy Pyne, Real Estate Coordinator, Community Services, re: *Heritage Theatre Block – 82-86 Main Street North – Ward 1.*

   See Item 11.1

10.3. Discussion at the Request of Lynda Voegtle, Board Member, re: *Victoria Park Arena.*

10.4. Discussion Item at the Request of Cassandra Jasinski, Heritage Planner, Planning and Development Services, re: *Plaque and Awards of Merit Event.*


11. **Referred/Deferred Items**


See Item 10.2

Note: Deferred from the Brampton Heritage Board Meeting of April 16, 2019, pursuant to Recommendation HB0025-2019, approved by Council on May 8, 2019.

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**
Tuesday, April 16, 2019

Members Present: Peter Dymond (Co-Chair)
Paul Willoughby (Co-Chair)
Michael Avis
Christ Bejnar
Harry Blackburn
Steve Collie
Palvinder Gill
Doug McLeod
Lynda Voegtle
David Whyte
Ken Wilde

Members Absent: Jeff Chalmers (regrets)
Herman Custodio (regrets)
Kathryn Fowlston (regrets)
Mary Pettingill (regrets)
City Councillor Doug Whillans – Wards 2 and 6 (personal)

Staff/Others Present: Regional Councillor Vicente (Council representative for incoming Board)
Planning and Development Services:
  Bob Bjerke, Director, Policy Planning
  Pascal Doucet, Heritage Planner
  Cassandra Jasinski, Heritage Planner
  Erin Smith, Assistant Heritage Planner
City Clerk’s Office:
  Terri Brenton, Legislative Coordinator
The meeting was called to order at 7:06 p.m. and adjourned at 8:20 p.m.

1. **Approval of Agenda**

   A discussion item at the request of Michael Avis re: Robinson Barn was proposed for addition to the agenda.

   The following motion was considered.

   HB018-2019 That the agenda for the Brampton Heritage Board Meeting of April 16, 2019 be approved as amended, as follows:

   **To add:**

   10.4. Discussion Item at the Request of Michael Avis, Board Member, re: Robinson Barn.

   Carried

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

3. **Previous Minutes**

   3.1. **Minutes – Brampton Heritage Board – March 19, 2019**

   The minutes were provided for the Board's information.

4. **Consent**

   The following item listed with an asterisk (*) was considered to be routine and non-controversial by the Board and was acknowledged at this time.

   (12.1)

5. **Delegations/Presentations**

   5.1. Delegation from David Waverman, Senior Landscape Architect, Stantec Consulting Ltd. re: Heritage Permit Application – 525 Main Street North – Ward 5 (File HE.x).

   Item 10.1 was brought forward and dealt with at this time.
David Waverman, Senior Landscape Architect, Stantec Consulting Ltd., provided a presentation entitled “Region of Peel – Peel Manor Seniors Health & Wellness Village”, outlining the landscape plan for the property abutting the designated Eventide Cemetery.

Mr. Waverman responded to questions from the Board with respect to information outlined in his presentation.

The following motion was considered.

HB019-2019  
That the delegation from David Waverman, Senior Landscape Architect, Stantec Consulting Ltd., to the Brampton Heritage Board Meeting of April 16, 2019, re: Heritage Permit Application – 525 Main Street North – Ward 5 (File HE.x), be received.  
Carried

Erin Smith, Assistant Heritage Planner, Planning and Development Services, provided an overview of the staff report on this matter (Item 10.1).

The following motion was considered.

HB020-2019  
1. That the report from Erin Smith, Assistant Heritage Planner, Planning and Development Services, dated April 5, 2019, to the Brampton Heritage Board Meeting of April 16, 2019, re: Heritage Permit Application – 525 Main Street North – Ward 5 (File HE.x), be received;

2. That all relevant supporting documentation submitted with the Heritage Permit application, attached as Appendix B – Appendix G, be received;

3. That the Brampton Heritage Board endorse the recommended options in this report for the Commemorative Program;

4. That the Heritage Permit application for 525 Main Street North for the removal of five (5) to six (6) Norway spruce trees and the introduction of an east-west mulch pathway south of the Eventide Cemetery entrance be approved, subject to the following conditions:

   a. That the applicant undertake all recommendations and mitigation measures in accordance with the Heritage Impact Assessment, dated March 29, 2019 prepared by Stantec Consulting Ltd., to the satisfaction of the
b. That the applicant undertake all work in accordance with the Heritage Conservation Plan, dated April 5, 2019 prepared by Stantec Consulting Ltd., to the satisfaction of the Director of Policy Planning, Planning and Development Services at the City of Brampton;

c. That the Region of Peel's ISA certified arborist be present during construction activities of the east-west mulch pathway south of the Eventide Cemetery entrance;

d. Prior to Site Plan approval, the applicant submit a final Commemorative Program and updated Cost Estimate to the satisfaction of the Director of Policy Planning, Planning and Development Services;

e. That as a condition of Site Plan approval, the applicant shall provide financial securities as specified in the updated Cost Estimate plus an additional 30% contingency in a form and amount satisfactory to the Commissioner of Planning and Development Services to secure all work included in the Heritage Conservation Plan and final Commemorative Program prepared by Stantec Consulting Ltd.;

f. That prior to the release of financial securities, the applicant provide a letter, prepared and signed by a qualified heritage expert, certifying that all works as outlined in the Heritage Conservation Plan and final Commemorative Program have been completed, and that an appropriate standard of conservation has been maintained, all to the satisfaction of the Director of Policy Planning, Planning and Development Services;

g. That the approval for alterations given under Section 33 of the Ontario Heritage Act expire two years after the date where Council has given its consent to alter the property; and,

h. That Planning and Development Services (Heritage) be notified prior to the commencement of any work that is not identified in the scope of this Heritage Permit.
application to obtain approval under Section 33 of the Ontario Heritage Act for review and documentation.

Carried

6. **Sub-Committees**

6.1. **Minutes – Heritage Resources Sub-Committee – March 14, 2019**

Paul Willoughby, Co-Chair, provided an overview of discussions at the sub-committee meeting of March 14, 2019.

The following motion was considered.

HB021-2019 That the Minutes of the Heritage Resources Sub-Committee Meeting of March 14, 2019, to the Brampton Heritage Board Meeting of April 16, 2019, be received.

Carried

7. **Designation Program**

7.1. **Proposed Designations**

A list of properties proposed for heritage designation was provided with the agenda for this meeting. No updates were provided with respect to the properties on the list.

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

9. **Correspondence – nil**

10. **Other/New Business**


**Dealt with under Item 5.1 – Recommendation HB020-2019**

See also Recommendation HB019-2019
10.2. Report from Pascal Doucet, Heritage Planner, Planning and Development Services, dated April 10, 2019 re: **Notice of Intention to Demolish Barns and Outbuildings on a Heritage Property that has not been Designated – 11248 Mississauga Road – Ward 6 (File HE.x).**

Pascal Doucet, Heritage Planner, Planning and Development Services, provided an overview of the subject report, and responded to questions from the Board regarding potential re-use of salvageable materials from the barn, and future heritage designation of the farmhouse.

The following motion was considered.

HB022-2019 1. That the report from Pascal Doucet, Heritage Planner, Planning and Development Services, dated April 10, 2019, to the Brampton Heritage Board Meeting of April 16, 2019, re: **Notice of Intention to Demolish Barns and Outbuildings on a Heritage Property that has not been Designated – 11248 Mississauga Road – Ward 6 (File HE.x),** be received; and

2. That the municipality receives and accepts the notice in writing to permit the demolition of the barns and outbuildings as well as the removal of the outbuildings and the upper wooden portion of the barns as described in the notice in writing, plan and information provided in accordance with subsections 27 (3) and (4) of the **Ontario Heritage Act** (the “Act”).

Carried

10.3. **Briefing Note, re: Main Street South Heritage Conservation District (RM 40/2019).**

Cassandra Jasinski, Heritage Planner, Planning and Development Services, provided an overview of the subject briefing note.

The following motion was considered.

HB023-2019 That the briefing note, to the Brampton Heritage Board Meeting of April 16, 2019, re: **Main Street South Heritage Conservation District (RM 40/2019),** be received.

Carried
10.4. Discussion at the Request of Michael Avis, Board Member, re: Robinson Barn.

Michael Avis, Board Member, outlined information on the Robinson Barn, which is the subject of a staff report to be considered at the Committee of Council Meeting of April 17, 2019.

Mr. Avis expressed concern that sufficient notice was not given to interested parties so that they could attend the meeting and express their support for rebuilding of the barn on the Historic Bovaird House (HBH) property, and also posed questions about the cost estimates outlined in the staff report.

Board consideration of this matter included:
- cost estimates outlined in the staff report
- decrease in the number of barns throughout Ontario
- varying opinions about rebuilding of the barn on the HBH property
- potential for deferral of the report to a future Committee of Council meeting to provide the opportunity for interested parties to delegate
- request for itemized cost information from staff for resurrection of the barn
- potential less costly options for rebuilding of the barn

The following motion was considered.

HB024-2019 That the Brampton Heritage Board requests that the report on the Robinson Barn (Committee of Council Item 9.2.1 – April 17, 2019) be deferred to the Committee of Council Meeting of May 1, 2019 to provide time for the Board to develop a presentation to Committee; and, in the interim, the Board requests itemized costs for the City’s estimate for the resurrection of the barn on the Historic Bovaird House property.

Carried

11. Referred/Deferred Items


Terri Brenton, Legislative Coordinator, City Clerk’s Office, informed the Board that Al Meneses, Commissioner of Community Services, expects to have an update on the Heritage Theatre Block within the next two months.

Board consideration of this matter included varying opinions on the proposed designation of the subject property.
The following motion was considered.

HB025-2019 That the report from Peter Dymond and Paul Willoughby, Co-Chairs, to the Brampton Heritage Board Meeting of April 16, 2019, re: Heritage Report: Reasons for Heritage Designation – 82-86 Main Street North – Heritage Theatre – Ward 1, be deferred to the Board June 2019 meeting.

Carried

12. Information Items


This material was provided for the Board’s information.

13. Question Period

In response to a question from Lynda Voegtle, Board Member, regarding potential remnants of the original Peel House of Industry and Refuge in the basement of the existing Peel Manor building (525 Main Street North), staff indicated they would raise this matter with representatives at the Region of Peel.

14. Public Question Period – nil

15. Closed Session – nil

16. Adjournment

The following motion was considered.

HB026-2019 That the Brampton Heritage Board do now adjourn to meet again on Tuesday, May 21, 2019 at 7:00 p.m. or at the call of the Chair.

Carried
Brampton Heritage Board
Heritage Resources Sub-Committee Meeting
May 9, 2019

Present: Michael Avis, Ken Wilde, Paul Willoughby, Pascal Doucet
Regrets: Lynda Voegtle

Agenda:

1. Rosalea Park:
Ken Wilde is near completion of the text for the commemorative plaque for Rosalea Park.

2. Pendergast Log House Site:
Michael Avis and Paul Willoughby are working on the text for the heritage plaque which will go on the original site of the House.

3. 55, 59, 61 Beech Street and 136 Church Street:
There is a large piece of land connected to these properties. There is a pre-consultation meeting scheduled under the Planning Act to inform developers what is involved with the site. Heritage staff will also be involved in the meeting. The Board should move forward as soon as possible with evaluating the properties to determine if they meet the criteria for designation.

4. 172 Church Street East:
There is a large piece of land at the back of this house. This property should be considered for protection under the Ontario Heritage Act.

5. 37 Elizabeth Street South:
The owners have requested designation.
6. 380 Conservation Drive:
The owners have requested designation. Ken Wilde has material to support the designation and confirm that the property meets the criteria for designation.

7. 30 McLaughlin Road South:
Ken Wilde brought in an announcement from the Region of Peel headed “Private Well Abandonment Program.” It is a program to decommission old, unused private wells in Caledon, rural Brampton and Mississauga. Ken said there are two wells on the 30 McLaughlin South property that should be included. Pascal Doucet will make enquiries about the fact these wells are on a designated property or a property included on the municipal register of cultural heritage resources.
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
- 1985 Bovaird Drive West – McCandless Plank House – Ward 6
- 3448 Castlemore Road (Squire Thomas Burrell Grist Mill Site/Burrell’s Hollow) – Ward 10
- 10900 Coleraine Drive (Cole Farmhouse) – Ward 10
- 10100 The Gore Road – Ward 10
- 10192A Highway 50 – Ward 10
- 1 Peel Village Parkway (The Watson Roundhouse) – Ward 3
- 11651 Bramalea Road (Archdekin-Giffen Farmhouse) – Ward 9
- 10254 Hurontario Street (Learment/C. Armstrong Farmhouse) – Ward 2
- 860 North Park Drive – Ward 7
Date: 2019-05-22

Subject: Alterations to a Designated Heritage Property, Notice of Intention to demolish a metal shed and Authority to Enter into a Heritage Easement Agreement – 6461 Mayfield Road (Thompson Farmhouse) – Ward 10 (H.Ex. 6461 Mayfield Road)

Contact: Pascal Doucet, Heritage Planner, Planning and Development Services, (905) 847-2780, pascal.doucet@brampton.ca

Recommendations:

1. That the report from Pascal Doucet, Heritage Planner, Planning and Development Services, dated May 22, 2019, to the Brampton Heritage Board Meeting of May 28, 2019, re: Alterations to a Designated Heritage Property, Notice of Intention to demolish a metal shed and Authority to Enter into a Heritage Easement Agreement – 6461 Mayfield Road (Thompson Farmhouse) – Ward 10 (H.Ex. 6461 Mayfield Road), be received; and

2. That the Heritage Permit Application for the alterations of the Thompson Farmhouse and Application to demolish the existing metal shed on the heritage property at 6461 Mayfield Road be approved in accordance with sections 33 and 34 of the Ontario Heritage Act (the “Act”), to permit a new commercial development that includes the construction of new commercial buildings with a parking area and the conservation of the Thompson Farmhouse within the lands known municipally in 2019 as 6461 Mayfield Road, with such alterations in accordance with the plans, drawings Conservation Plan and Heritage Building Protection Plan dated July 18, 2018 and revised May 21, 2019, prepared by AREA Architects Rash Eckler Associates Ltd. and on file with the Policy Planning Division of the Planning and Development Services Department and the Notice of Intention to Demolish the metal shed dated May 21, 2019, signed by David Eckler from AREA Architects Ltd. and on file with the Policy Planning Division of the Planning and Development Services Department, all subject to the following additional conditions:

   a. That prior to the adoption of the related site specific Zoning By-law Amendment giving rise to the proposed alterations and construction of a new commercial development for the property at 6461 Mayfield Road, the owner shall:
i. Enter into a Heritage Easement Agreement with the City for the property at 6461 Mayfield Road in accordance with the plans, drawings Conservation Plan and Heritage Building Protection Plan dated July 18, 2018 and revised May 21, 2019, prepared by AREA Architects Rash Eckler Associates Ltd. and on file with the Policy Planning Division of the Planning and Development Services Department.

b. That prior to final Site Plan Approval for the proposed commercial development for the property at 6461 Mayfield Road, the owner shall:

i. Provide final site plan drawings including drawings related to the approved Conservation Plan and Heritage Building Protection Plan referenced herein in Recommendation 2;

ii. Provide a detailed Interpretation and Commemoration Plan for the subject property, to the satisfaction of the Director of Policy Planning; and

iii. Provide a detailed Landscape Plan for the subject property, to the satisfaction of the Director of Policy Planning.

c. That prior to the issuance of any permit for the alteration of the heritage property or for the construction of any building or structure for all or any part of the property at 6461 Mayfield Road, including a heritage permit or a building permit, the owner shall:

i. Provide full building permit drawings, including notes and specifications for the conservation and protective measures keyed to the approved Conservation Plan and Heritage Building Protection Plan referenced herein in Recommendation 2;

ii. Provide a Letter of Credit, including a 30% contingency, in a form and amount and from a bank satisfactory to the Director of Policy Planning; and

iii. Provide full documentation of the existing heritage property at 6461 Mayfield Road, including two (2) printed sets of archival 8” x 10” colour photographs with borders in a glossy or semi-glossy finish and one (1) digital set on a CD in tiff format and 600 dpi resolution keyed to a location map, elevations and measured drawings, and copies of all existing interior floor plans, to the satisfaction of the Director of Policy Planning.

d. That prior to the release of the Letter of Credit required in Recommendation 2.c.ii., the owner shall:
i. Provide a letter of substantial completion prepared and signed by a qualified heritage consultant confirming that the required conservation work, protection work, interpretation work, commemoration work and landscaping work have been completed in accordance with the approved Conservation Plan and Heritage Building Protection Plan referenced herein in Recommendation 2, the required Interpretation and Commemoration Plan referenced herein in recommendation 2.b.ii. and the Landscape Plan referenced herein in Recommendation 2.b.iii; and

ii. Provide full documentation of the existing heritage property at 6461 Mayfield Road, including two (2) printed sets of archival 8” x 10” colour photographs with borders in a glossy or semi-glossy finish and one (1) digital set on a CD in tiff format and 600 dpi resolution keyed to a location map, elevations and measured drawings, and copies of all existing interior floor plans, showing completion of the conservation work, protection work, interpretation work, commemoration work and landscaping work to the satisfaction of the Director of Policy Planning.

3. That a heritage easement agreement for the property at 6461 Mayfield Road be endorsed; and

4. That the Commissioner of Planning and Development Services be authorized to sign a heritage easement agreement for the property at 6461 Mayfield Road with content satisfactory to the Director of Policy Planning in a form approved by the City Solicitor.

Overview:

- This report recommends that the Brampton Heritage Board endorse the applications to alter the heritage property and demolish an existing metal shed subject to the terms and conditions recommended in this report.

- The property at 6461 Mayfield Road is designated under Part IV, section 29 of the Ontario Heritage Act for its cultural heritage value or interest.

- The only building of heritage value or interest on the property is the one-and-a-half storey fieldstone farmhouse (the “Thompson Farmhouse”).

- The City of Brampton received an application for a site specific Zoning By-law Amendment to permit a new commercial development that includes the construction of new commercial buildings and parking area as well as the conservation of the Thompson Farmhouse (City File number: C07E17.010).
Heritage City staff received a heritage permit application made in accordance with section 33 of the Ontario Heritage Act (the “Act”) to alter the heritage property. Staff also received a Notice of Intention to demolish the existing metal shed on the property in accordance with section 34 of the Act.

A conservation strategy and approach have been developed to mitigate the impact of the proposed commercial development on the cultural heritage resources. This strategy and approach are outlined in this report and include the authority to enter into a heritage easement agreement.

The Heritage Impact Assessment, Conservation Plan and Heritage Building Protection received for the applications made under sections 33 and 34 of the Act are conforming to the conservation strategy and approach recommended by the applicant and heritage consultant in the related application to amend the Zoning By-law.

Background:

Decision History
The property at 6461 Mayfield Road is designated under Part IV, section 29 of the Ontario Heritage Act, as amended (the “Act”) with the passage of By-law number 182-2015 on August 12, 2015. A copy of this designation By-law is attached hereto as Appendix A.

Application History
The City of Brampton received an application for a site specific Zoning By-law Amendment to permit a new commercial development (City File number: C07E17.010). This application includes the construction of new commercial buildings and parking area, the demolition and removal of a metal shed, and the conservation of the one-and-a-half storey fieldstone farmhouse (the “Thompson Farmhouse”). Heritage City staff is currently working with the applicant and heritage consultant to develop and implement a conservation strategy and approach within the process of reviewing this application to amend the Zoning By-law.

On May 21, 2019, heritage City staff received an application to alter the heritage property in accordance with section 33 of the Act as well as a Notice of Intention to demolish and remove the existing metal shed in accordance with section 34 of the Act. Both applications have been deemed complete the day they were received.

Legislative Framework
The property at 6461 Mayfield Road is subject to the Act. As such, no heritage attribute can be affected by any alteration and no building or structure can be demolished or
removed without prior approval as required under sections 33 and 34 of the Act. Heritage City staff determined that the alterations to the heritage property will affect the heritage attributes:

- The heritage attributes found on the Thompson Farmhouse;
- The rural residential character and agricultural setting of the Thompson Farmhouse; and
- The frontage of the Farmhouse screened by a planning of mature trees.

Applications made under section 33 and 34 of the Act must be accompanied by a detailed plan and to set out such information as Council may require. An application made under these sections may be approved, approved with terms and conditions or refused. The Act provides a period of 90 days for Council to make a decision upon receipt of a complete application.

Policy Framework
The proposed alterations to the heritage property at 6461 Mayfield Road and the Notice of Intention to demolish and remove an existing building are subject to the following policy framework:

The Planning Act
The Planning Act guides development in the Province of Ontario and states that municipalities must have regard for matters of provincial interest. The conservation of features of significant architectural, cultural, historical, archaeological or scientific interest is identified under paragraph 2(d) of the Planning Act as a matter of provincial interest.

City of Brampton Official Plan
The proposed alterations, demolition and removal are subject to the Cultural Heritage Policies of the Official Plan. More specifically, the policies that are relevant in the context of this report and applications made in accordance with sections 33 and 34 of the Act are:

4.10.1.8 Heritage resources will be protected and conserved in accordance with the Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada, the Appleton Charter for the Protection and Enhancement of the Built Environment and other recognized heritage protocols and standards. Protection, maintenance and stabilization of existing cultural heritage attributes and features over removal or replacement will be adopted as the core principles for all conservation projects.

4.10.1.9 Alteration, removal or demolition of heritage attributes on designated heritage properties will be avoided. Any proposal involving such works will require a heritage permit application to be submitted for the approval of the City.
4.10.9.2 The City shall use the power and tools provided by the enabling legislation, policies and programs, particularly the *Ontario Heritage Act*, the *Planning Act*, the *Environmental Assessment Act* and the *Municipal Act* in implementing and enforcing the policies of this section. These shall include but not be limited to the following:

(ii) Requiring the preparation of a Heritage Impact Assessment for development proposals and other land use planning proposals that may potentially affect a designated or significant heritage resource or Heritage Conservation District.

(iii) Using zoning by-law provisions to protect heritage resources by regulating such matters as use, bulk, form, location and setbacks.

(iv) Using the site plan control by-law to ensure that new development is compatible with heritage resources.

(ix) Requiring a Heritage Building Protection Plan to be submitted with a planning application if there are built heritage resources on the lands affected by the application that have been identified by the City of Brampton as having priority for preservation. The Heritage Building Protection Plan shall outline measures that the applicant is expected to implement to secure, protect and conserve the heritage resource. In addition to other measures, the City may require that a part of the financial securities for the planning application taken at the time of approval be reserved for the protection of heritage resources.

4.10.9.3 The City shall acquire heritage easements, and enter into development agreements, as appropriate, for the preservation of heritage resources and landscapes.

**Current Situation:**

The conservation strategy and approach proposed in the application for a site specific Zoning By-law Amendment to permit a new commercial development on the property consist of conserving the Thompson Farmhouse and integrate this heritage building within the proposed development. The conservation work of the Thompson Farmhouse includes:

- The retention in situ of the entire building;
- The restoration of all exterior elevations of the building;
- The implementation of protective measures to ensure that the heritage attributes found on the heritage building are and will be safeguarded;
The creation of a buffer of soft/permeable landscaping around the heritage building; and
The creation of a walkway connection to integrate the heritage building within the new commercial development.

The conservation strategy and approach are described within the Heritage Impact Assessment, Conservation Plan and Heritage Building Protection Plan included as part of the information submitted for the application received in accordance with sections 33 and 34 of the Act. The submission for these applications are attached hereto as Appendix B and consist of the following documents:

- Heritage Impact Assessment titled: “Thompson Farmhouse 6461 Mayfield Road, Brampton, Ontario Mayfield Arcadeium Center Centre Commerical Development HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT” dated January 31, 2018, revised on March 19, 2018 and further revised on May 6, 2019, prepared by AREA, Architects Rasch Eckler Associates Ltd.
- Heritage Permit Application Form signed by David Eckler and dated May 21, 2019.
- Notice of Intention to Demolish a Non-Heritage Shed signed by David Eckler and dated May 21, 2019.
- Plan of Survey of PART OF LOT 17 CONCESSION 7, NORTHERN DIVISION CITY OF BRAMPTON completed on the 21st day of September 2016 and signed by Ophir N. Dzaldov.
- Site Plan Drawing titled “Site Plan” from n Architecture Inc. dated May 16, 2016 and date-revised 15th May 2019.
- Landscape Plan Drawing titled “Landscape Master Plan” from n Architecture Inc. dated Jan. 2018 and date-revised 04/24/19.
- Conservation Plan and Heritage Building Protection Plan dated July 18, 2018 and revised May 21, 2019, prepared by AREA Architects Rash Eckler Associates Ltd.
- Owner’s Insurance Policy for the Thompson Farmhouse.
- Architect Series Window Product Specifications from Pella for the restoration of the wood windows.

The proposed alterations, demolition and removal are supportable with the terms and conditions recommended in this report. The terms and conditions are recommended to ensure effective protection and preservation of the heritage property. The demolition and removal of the metal shed are supportable on the basis that the building has not been identified within the designation By-law has a building containing heritage value or interest. The alterations to the heritage property are supportable on the basis that the proposed development of the property is mitigated with the conservation strategy and approach provided within the Heritage Impact Assessment, Conservation Plan and Heritage Building Protection Plan.

In order to further secure the conservation and maintenance of the heritage attributes, landscaping improvements and commemorative and interpretive work, Heritage City
staff is recommending as a condition prior to the adoption of the related site specific Zoning By-law Amendment that the owner of the property enters into a heritage easement agreement pursuant to section 37 of the Act. The landscaping improvements to implement the proposed conservation strategy and approach consist of the soft/permeable landscaping buffer and walkway connection. The recommended commemoration and interpretive work consist of a heritage plaque with content and specification provided within a detailed Interpretation and Commemoration Plan satisfactory to the Director of Policy Planning.

**Corporate Implications:**

**Financial Implications:** There are no financial implications resulting from the adoption of the recommendations in this report.

**Other Implications:** There are no other implications resulting from the adoption of the recommendations in this report.

**Strategic Plan:**

This report achieves the Strategic Plan priorities by:

- Preserving and protecting heritage environments with balanced and responsible planning.

**Living the Mosaic – 2040 Vision:**

This report aligns with the following visions:

- **Vision 1:** In 2040, Brampton will be a mosaic of sustainable urban places, sitting within an interconnected green park network, with its people and environmental stewards – targeting ‘one-planet’ living.

- **Vision 5:** In 2040, Brampton will be a rich mosaic of cultures and lifestyle, coexisting with social responsibility, respect, enjoyment, and justice.

**Conclusion:**

Heritage City staff has been working with the applicant and heritage consultant to develop and implement a conservation strategy and approach to mitigate the impact of the proposed commercial development on the heritage property. The heritage easement agreement, conservation work, landscaping improvements and commemorative and
interpretive work will enable the long-term conservation of the significant cultural heritage resources found within the property at 6461 Mayfield Road.

Approved by:       Approved by:

Pam Cooper, MCIP, RPP  Bob Bjerke, MCIP, RPP
Manager, Land Use Policy  Director, Policy Planning

Attachments:

Appendix A – City By-law number 182-2015 designating the property at 6461 Mayfield Road for its cultural heritage value or interest – 6461 Mayfield Road – Ward 10 (H.Ex. 6461 Mayfield Road)

Appendix B – Information submitted on May 21, 2019 for the applications received in accordance with sections 33 and 34 of the Act for the heritage property at 6461 Mayfield Road – 6461 Mayfield Road – Ward 10 (H.Ex. 6461 Mayfield Road)
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THE CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF BRAMPTON

BY-LAW

182-2015

To designate the property at 6461 Mayfield Road as being of cultural heritage value or interest.

WHEREAS Section 29 of the Ontario Heritage Act, R.S.O. 1990, Chapter O. 18 (as amended) authorizes the Council of a municipality to enact by-laws to designate real property, including all the buildings and structures thereon, to be of cultural heritage value or interest;

WHEREAS the Brampton Heritage Board supports the designation of the properties described herein;

WHEREAS a Notice of Intention to Designate has been published and served in accordance with the Act, and there has been no Notice of Objection served on the Clerk;

NOW THEREFORE the Council of the Corporation of the City of Brampton HEREBY ENACTS as follows:

1. The property at 6461 Mayfield Road, more particularly described in Schedule "A", is hereby designated as being of cultural heritage value or interest pursuant to Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act.

2. City Council shall cause a copy of this by-law to be registered against the property described in Schedule "A" to this by-law in the proper Land Registry Office.

3. The City Clerk shall cause a copy of this by-law to be served upon the owners of the property at 6461 Mayfield Road and upon the Ontario Heritage Trust, and cause notice of this by-law to be published on the City's website in accordance with Council's Procedure By-law.

4. The short statement of the reason for the designation of the property, including a description of the heritage attributes are set out in Schedule "B" to this by-law.

READ A FIRST, SECOND AND THIRD TIME AND PASSED IN OPEN COUNCIL THIS 12TH DAY OF August, 2015.

Approved as to form

July 30, 2015

LINDA JEFFREY – MAYOR

Approved as to content:

Heather MacDonald, Director, Planning Policy and Growth Management
SCHEDULE "A" TO BY-LAW 182-2015

LEGAL DESCRIPTION

FIRSTLY: PART OF LOT 17, CONCESSION 7, NORTHERN DIVISION, TORONTO GORE, DESIGNATED AS PART 1 ON REFERENCE PLAN 43R1109;
SECONDLY: PART OF LOT 17, CONCESSION 7, NORTHERN DIVISION, TORONTO GORE, DESIGNATED AS PARTS 1 AND 3 ON REFERENCE PLAN 43R16625;
BRAMPTON

14219-0145 (LT)
SHORT STATEMENT OF THE REASON FOR THE DESIGNATION OF 6461 MAYFIELD ROAD:

The property at 6461 Mayfield Road is worthy of designation under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act for its cultural heritage value. The property meets the criteria for designation prescribed by the Province of Ontario under the three categories of design or physical value, historical value and contextual value.

6461 Mayfield Road is located on the southwest corner of Mayfield Road and Goreway Drive, in the former Toronto Gore Township, now the City of Brampton. The 4.32 acre lot currently contains a one-and-a-half storey stone farmhouse and an ancillary structure. The house is flanked by vacant fields, set back from Mayfield Road and screened by a growth of mature trees. A portion of Salt Creek also runs through the property.

The property at 6461 Mayfield Road is the earliest example of a vernacular stone farmhouse built in the Toronto Gore Township. The earliest stone masons in Ontario were French Canadians sent to Kingston to assist in government construction in preparation for the arrival of the United Empire Loyalists in the 1780s. Their building materials consisted of the local rubble stone found in bits and chunks near limestone quarries. Fieldstone, however, is the general term for construction using stone that was collected from fields or streams, rather than being quarried from bedrock outcrops. In southern Ontario, its use was most common in the mid-nineteenth century in regions where the bedrock is covered by a thick layer of glacial debris, left behind by the retreating ice sheets, some 10,000 years ago.

When it came to stone construction, materials and labour were harder to come by than other types, which meant that stone buildings were no bigger than they had to be. They were equally modest in terms of detailing. Very few of these houses were built in the area and the structure is relatively unaltered. So few structures were built due to the time and efforts required to gather fieldstones, transport them to the construction site and organize them according to appropriate shapes and dimensions for placement. A great deal of technical innovation and foresight was required to build this house, further strengthening its uniqueness in Brampton.

Stone was used in two common styles: Scottish immigrants preferred to refashion the stone into regular, rectangular blocks; other immigrants, largely of German origin, split the stones, but otherwise did not refashion their shape. In this second case, a large
amount of mortar was generally required. 6461 Mayfield Road is representative of the second style as the house was constructed of irregularly shaped stones and mortar is heavily applied in locations where the stones are not flush. It appears that some of the fieldstones have not been split but have been integrated into the cladding as large support members at corners or over window and door openings.

The farmhouse is a well-designed one-and-a-half-storey fieldstone clad structure with an offset one-storey wing extending from the rear elevation. The house features a square plan with three bays and a side gable roof. The front door is centred on the façade with a simple transom. The fenestration is modest with 1/1 windows flanking the front door on the façade, and two 1/1 windows in each gable end of the side elevations. The windows feature stone lintels and larger stones are laid at the building’s corners. Each stone in the structure was strategically placed to serve a purpose.

The farmhouse also has historical or associative value. Francis Foster received the patent from the Crown for Lot 17 Concession 7 on November 30, 1832. On November 27, 1832, three days before he had the patent, Foster sold 50 of the 200 acres to Thomas Thompson. 6461 Mayfield Road has been associated with the Thompson family for over a century. Thomas Thompson, an early settler and farmer in the former Toronto Gore Township, purchased the property in 1844 after having immigrated to Upper Canada from England with his wife Frances. The area at the time was known as the Hamlet of Tullamore, an area named and settled by Irish immigrants. Thomas built the stone farmhouse sometime in the mid-to-late 1840s for his growing family. As most houses listed in the local enumeration district for 1852 were constructed of log, the Thompson house is considered to be an early example of stone construction in the Toronto Gore Township.

Following Thomas Thompson’s death in 1871, his son Thomas took over the family farmstead. The rear one-storey wing was likely added during Thomas’ ownership in the 1890s to house the kitchen. The property continued to be passed down through the Thompson family until the 1960s.

DESCRIPTION OF THE HERITAGE ATTRIBUTES OF THE PROPERTY:

The heritage attributes comprise all façades including all entranceways and windows, together with construction materials of brick, stone, wood, metal, and associated building techniques. The detailed heritage attributes include, but are not limited to:

- One-and-a-half storey construction
- Square plan
• Fieldstone cladding
• Three bays
• One-storey wing projecting from rear elevation
• Side gable roof
• Two one over one windows in each gable end
• One over one windows flanking front door
• Centred front door with transom
• Large fieldstones at corners
• Stone lintels
• Rural residential character and agricultural setting
• Frontage screened by a planting of mature trees
Thompson Farmhouse
6461 Mayfield Road, Brampton, Ontario
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1. BACKGROUND TO THE REPORT

AREA, Architects Rasch Eckler Associates Ltd. (AREA) was retained by Mayfield Arcadeium Holdings Ltd. to prepare this Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) report for the property at the current municipal address 6461 Mayfield Road, Brampton, Ontario (“Subject Property”), with legal description, Part Lot 17, Concession 7 Northern Division, Toronto Gore, designated as Part 2, Reference Plan 43R-25677, save & except Part 1, Reference Plan 43R-25725; Brampton. The property at 6461 Mayfield Road is located in a mixed residential/agricultural area on the southwest corner of Mayfield Road and Goreway Drive, in the former Toronto Gore Township, now the City of Brampton. The subject site has been used for residential purposes with a portion being farmed until recently. The neighbouring properties consist mainly of rural residential properties along Mayfield Road, Goreway Drive and Salt Creek ravine to the west, east, and south, respectively, a commercial property to the north, and a piece of vacant land beyond Mayfield Road to the northwest of the subject site. For the purposes of this report, Mayfield Road will be considered to have an east-west orientation (even though it deviates from the true geodetic directions) and the other streets and geographical locations will be described with having their relative orientation accordingly.

The buildings on the property are currently comprised of a one-and-a-half storey stone farmhouse, also referred to by this HIA report as the “Thompson Farmhouse” (or “Farmhouse”) and an ancillary structure. The property at 6461 Mayfield Road has been designated under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act (OHA).

On August 3, 2017, a Zoning By-law Amendment (ZBA) Application (“Application”) was submitted to the City of Brampton’s Planning and Infrastructure Services Department to re-designate the site from Residential/Agricultural to a Commercial Site-Specific Zone for the reason of permitting the proposed new uses. Candevcon Limited (“Candevcon”) by the client-developer as the consulting planner to lead and coordinate the development approval Applications. The Application indicated minimum and maximum height requirement in the proposed zoning as 1-2 storey commercial units. The proposed new uses have been illustrated in Proposed Development Mayfield Arcadeium Center (“MAC”), 6401 Mayfield Road, Brampton - Site Plan and Building Elevations by nArchitecture Inc., last issued April 15, 2019 (Appendix A) and described in the Urban Design Brief by NAK Design Strategies, dated March 25, 2019. This proposed development anticipates the entire site to be comprised of commercial-office-retail uses, and to consist of five component buildings as follows:

- three new one-storey buildings –
  i. Building A - Montessori School 703.66 sm (7,574.02 s.f.),
  ii. Building C - Grocery Store 1092.4 sm (11,758.48 s.f.),
  iii. Building E – Retail 526.34 sm (5,665.47 s.f.);
- one new 2-storey buildings –
  iv. Building D – Retail 3450.47 sm (37,140.51 s.f.); and
- the existing 1½ -storey subject building –
  v. Building B – Heritage Farmhouse repurposed to office or medical functions 208.38 sm (2,242.98 s.f.).
The plaza design also incorporates the ancillary spaces for garbage enclosures, electrical/mechanical rooms, loading spaces, a parking lot with two entrances and connecting landscaping elements (Appendix A).

The City's Development Services issued a Notice of Incomplete Application on October 27, 2017 listing several heritage submissions which are still needed to complete for the Application: Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA); Heritage Conservation Plan (HCP); and Heritage Building Protection Plan (HBPP). To support the planning applications, these heritage submissions will comprise both a report (HIA) and drawings (HCP & HBPP) to address the City's heritage policies and guidelines for integrating the heritage Farmhouse within the new development. For the subject property, this HIA report is required to form part of the submissions for the ZBA and an Official Plan Amendment (OPA), the latter application also was required for the proposed development.

This HIA seeks to evaluate the heritage value of, and the development impacts on a cultural heritage resource. This HIA is being submitted in compliance with the requirements of the OHA. It also references technical drawings and documents associated with the subject property, other provincial and municipal heritage standards and guidelines, as well as archive documents from various sources. These references include but are not limited to the following:

a. Stage 1 & 2 Archaeological Assessment for 6461 Mayfield Road [...], The Archaeologist Inc., February 28, 2017
b. Mayfield Arcadeium Center [...], Urban Design Brief, by NAK Design Strategies, March 25, 2019
c. City of Brampton Designation By-Law (DBL) 182-2015 to designate the property at 6461 Mayfield Road as being of cultural heritage value or interest, August 12, 2015
d. Application for Zoning By-law Amendment, August 3, 2017
e. Heritage Report: Reasons for Heritage Designation 6461 Mayfield Road, Brampton Heritage Board (“BHB”), March 19, 2013
f. Site Plan & Building Elevations, nArchitecture Inc., issued April 15, 2019
g. Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, 6461 Mayfield Road [...], Soil Engineers Ltd., June 6, 2016
h. Structural Review, Thompson Farm House, 6461 Mayfield Rd., Brampton, Candevcon, July 5, 2018 (Appendix C)
i. Geotechnical Review, Thompson House, 6461 Mayfield Rd., Brampton, Soil Engineers Ltd., June 29, 2018 (Appendix D)
j. Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment, Terms of Reference, City of Brampton
k. Ontario Heritage Act, R.S.O. 1990, with amendments up to 2017
l. Ontario Heritage Tool Kit, Ontario Ministry of Culture, 2006

This HIA report also incorporates information derived from a site visit conducted by AREA staff on November 26, 2017. During the site visit, photo documentation and inspection of the Farmhouse were undertaken.

The conservation approach has been developed with reference to the Parks Canada Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada (reference ‘m’ above, Appendix B) and the Ontario Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport’s Ontario Heritage Tool Kit. This HIA will form part of the ZBA and OPA development applications, subject to the review of Brampton Heritage Board, and ultimately, Council.

AREA, Architects Rasch Eckler Associates Ltd.
2. INTRODUCTION TO THE SUBJECT PROPERTY

2.1. DESCRIPTION AND LOCATION

**Municipal Address:** 6461 Mayfield Road, Brampton, Ontario

**Legal Description:** Part Lot 17, Concession 7 Northern Division, Toronto Gore, designated as Part 2, Reference Plan 43R-25677, save & except Part 1, Reference Plan 43R-25725, Brampton

**Current owner:** Mayfield Arcadeium Holdings Ltd.

**Previous owner:** Anne C. Shaw

**Site Area and Street Frontage:** The property is approximately 1.76 ha. (4.32 acres) in area and has approximately 164 m of street frontage on Mayfield Road.

**Location:** 6461 Mayfield Road is located on the southwest corner of Mayfield Road and Goreway Drive, in the former Toronto Gore Township, now the City of Brampton (Figure 2).

**Boundaries:** The property is bounded by an existing residence to the west, Salt Creek floodplain area and ravine to the south, Mayfield Road and Goreway Drive on the north and east sides respectively (Figure 3).

**Official Plan Designation:** The subject land is designated as "Residential/Open Space" in Secondary Plan Area 49, the Vales of Castlemore North

**Zoning By-Law:** The subject property is split-zoned as “Agricultural” on the westerly portion and “Residential – Other” on the easterly portion along Mayfield Road (Figure 4).
Figure 1 – Approximate Location of the Subject Property (blue arrow) in the Vales of Castlemore North Secondary Plan Area

Figure 2 – Location of 6461 Mayfield Road [Google Maps, 2017]
Figure 3 – Planimetric Data Map of the Subject Property [Brampton Maps Online, 2017]

Figure 4 – Zoning Map of the Subject Property and the adjacent lands. [Base map obtained from Brampton Maps Online, 2017; annotated by AREA to show boundaries of the subject property]
2.2. CONTEXT OF SUBJECT PROPERTY

2.2.1. ADJACENT PROPERTIES AND LAND USES

The subject property is bounded by Mayfield Road on the north, Goreway Drive and existing estate residential to the east (11937 Goreway Dr., 2 Lucinda Cr.), an existing residential lot to the west (6443 Mayfield Rd.), and natural heritage features to the south, separating an existing “Upscale Executive” residential neighbourhood along Concorde Dr. from the subject property (Figure 5).

Figure 5 – Properties surrounding 6461 Mayfield Road.
2.2.2. HERITAGE STATUS OF PROPERTY & APPLICABLE POLICIES

The property at 6461 Mayfield Road was designated under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act through City of Brampton Designation By-law 182-2015 passed August 12, 2015. This designation gives City Council the legal authority to refuse an application that will adversely affect the property’s heritage attributes. “Designation not only publicly recognizes and promotes awareness of heritage properties, it also provides a process for ensuring that changes to a heritage property are appropriately managed and that these changes respect the property’s heritage value.”

The conservation of cultural heritage resources is governed at the provincial level by the Ontario Heritage Act, R.S.O. 1990, with amendments up to 2017 and Section 2.6 Cultural Heritage and Archaeology of the Provincial Policy Statement of the Planning Act, 2014. The PPS Policy 2.6.3 incorporates a requirement for a Heritage Impact Assessment through its definition of the term “conserved”, the identification, protection, management and use of built heritage resources, cultural heritage landscapes and archaeological resources in a manner that ensures their cultural heritage value or interest is retained under the Ontario Heritage Act.

The property meets the criteria for designation prescribed by the Province of Ontario Regulation 09/06 under the three categories: design or physical value, historical value and contextual value. A detailed evaluation of listed and designated properties is critical to determine their cultural heritage value or interest. The cultural heritage resource will be evaluated using the set of provincial heritage criteria, comprised of the above-listed three categories in Section 3.3. to follow (also see Table 2).

1Ontario Heritage Act
2.2.3. ADJACENT CULTURAL HERITAGE RESOURCES

Cultural Heritage Resources (CHRs) within the subject property’s 1.5-km radius are comprised of historic houses – extant or previously removed – that were identified for their cultural value and heritage significance. The CHRs surrounding the subject property demonstrate the subject property’s existing heritage context (Figure 6, Table 1).

Figure 6 – Adjacent cultural heritage resources map [Brampton Maps Online, 2017]. See Table 1.
Table 1 – Description of adjacent cultural heritage resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Name, Address</th>
<th>Photo</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>4 Lucinda Court - Odlum House.</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Odlum House" /></td>
<td>Odlum House is a rare example of a Georgian style home. &quot;The house is distinguished by an original Adam style door, spindles, dentils, dichromatic brickwork including quoins and a quatrefoil band, a side-gable roof with two chimneys, and a central door with a transom and sidelights. The house has been maintained in excellent condition.&quot;²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>6791 Mayfield Rd.</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="6791 Mayfield Rd." /></td>
<td>1 ½-storey brick house was an example of the Ontario Gothic Cottage style, is believed to have been built in the late 19th century. Destroyed by fire in February 2016.³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3864 Countryside Dr.</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="3864 Countryside Dr." /></td>
<td>The Pendergast Log House was built in the mid-1800s, and is one of last known surviving log houses in the city. In the 1920s, the log house was clad in brick for protection. The log house has been relocated to the Bovaird House property.⁴</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

² City of Brampton Municipal Register of Cultural Heritage Resources Designated Under the Ontario Heritage Act Designated Properties. July 2016
2.3.1. SITE CONDITIONS & PROPERTY FEATURES

AREA conducted a site visit on November 26, 2017. The property can be accessed from Mayfield Road through a private driveway. Trees screen significant parts of the back of the property including the Farmhouse and its presence is not clearly distinctive along the property’s street elevation (Figure 7). The property is approximately 1.67 hectares (4.32 acres), with a mostly flat topography and a ravine slope to the southeast Salt Creek natural resource. The open portions of the subject property have been used for agricultural fields. The site was generally found to be in good condition, and without any observed health and environmental risks.

Figure 7 – Property frontage. View of heritage house from Mayfield Rd. [Google Maps, 2017]
2.3.2. EXISTING BUILDINGS ON-SITE

There are two structures within the subject property: the Thompson Farmhouse and an ancillary structure (Figure 8). Only the Farmhouse is considered to be of cultural heritage value.

![Figure 8 – Site plan of the Subject property](image)

2.3.3. THOMPSON FARMHOUSE STRUCTURE

a. Building Style and Use

The Farmhouse is comprised of a one-and-a-half-storey fieldstone structure with side gable roof. The house features a square main building (MB) at the front (north) and an offset One-storey Wing (OW) addition at the rear (south) extending from the MB south elevation. Stone patios are located at each entrance (Figure 9). The building is used as a single-family dwelling house.

![Figure 9 – Thompson Farmhouse Schematic Plan](image)
b. Building elevations features

Main Building (MB): The front door with a transom and a stone lintel is centered on the MB north façade. Fenestration is modest with two 1/1 windows flanking the front door and two other windows on each floor of the west elevation. The east elevation contained two windows on the second floor, one of which is currently blocked and another door, at the ground floor. The openings feature stone lintels and sills and overall detailing is very modest. Larger stones are laid at the building's corners to provide sufficient structural stability and are similar to quoins but are irregularly vernacular and not formally designed. The fireplace with a stone chimney is located at the east wall of MB projecting above the roof but flush with the exterior wall. Almost all windows and doors are relatively recent vinyl replacements of the previous fenestration and some openings are boarded with rigid insulation. A possible original wooden window can only be found on the MB south elevation in deteriorated, rotten condition (Figures 10, 11, 14, 16).

One-storey Offset Wing (OW) addition: The offset addition wing functions as a combined kitchen/dining room and features doors on the east and west elevations flanked by one (west) or two (east) 1/1 windows. A large fireplace previously located at the south wall is currently fully blocked and does not project above the roof. The addition was erected, by conjecture, around 30 years later than the original MB structure. But due to a lesser quality of stonework, the invasive tree roots and the sloping grade from its immediate proximity to the ravine, its condition is considerably weaker and more unstable than the MB portion. The foundation and ground floor structure, are deteriorated and tilting due to settlement from the eroding ground slope (Figures 12, 13, 15).

c. Exterior cladding materials and methods

The masonry type of the Farmhouse can be classified as **uncoursed rubble**, made of split but otherwise undressed field stones. Such stones can be found in the area where the bedrock is covered by a thick layer of glacial debris, left behind by the retreating ice sheets, around 10,000 years ago. The main characteristics of this type of stone masonry are as follows:

- The stones are used as they are extracted from a quarry or (in this case) simply from the surrounding ground. The stones are not of the same height. They are leveled at every 250-500 mm (10-20") height.
- Stone chips and spalls are used to fill the empty spaces. The joints are thick about 12 mm or more, and a large amount of lime-based mortar was generally required.
- Stones are used that are at the full width of the wall if the width of the wall is less the 300 mm (24’’); for wall width more than 300 mm (24’’), 2 stones with lap joints are used.

The stone for the Farmhouse exterior appears to have been collected from the surrounding fields or streams, rather than being quarried from bedrock outcrops. Large stones, cleared from soil, provided a ready source of building material. The fieldstones were used for foundations as well as for the above-grade exterior walls.
Figure 10 – MB north elevation

Figure 11 – MB west elevation

Figure 12 – OW west elevation

Figure 13 – OW south elevation

Figure 14 – MB south elevation

Figure 15 – OW east elevation
This method of construction required a significant amount of time and effort to gather fieldstones, transport them to the construction site, cut and organize them according to shapes and dimensions for placement. Therefore, the stone buildings were no bigger than they had to be.

Roof cladding on the MB and OW comprises contemporary asphalt shingles. Gutters and flashings are all contemporary prefinished metal. Roof structure was not accessed at the time of this review.

d. Deterioration of stone cladding

The main evident deterioration of the stonework is the breaking down of the lime-based mortar due to water penetration leading to the appearance of large crack between the stones. The stones themselves are mostly intact. However, some cracks at joints between stones are over 25 mm (1”) thick. The larger cracks were previously patched with foam insulation or cement which makes the masonry even weaker over time. Significant mortar spalling can be also noticed all over the building exterior.
In summary, the Farmhouse Main Building is overall sound. However, its exterior envelope exhibits minor forms of deterioration, such as cracking and mortar spalling which should be repaired to stabilize this front portion. The rear OW addition is significantly deteriorated and visibly leaning as soil conditions are settling, eroding and weaker at this close proximity to the ravine. As well, the greenery and bushes at the ravine are growing too close to the south wall of the addition, deteriorating its foundation. This offset One-storey Wing also has evident traces of previous repairs, alterations and adjustments for current use as a dwelling house. This rear portion of the house contains previous settlement which has made its structure compromised.
3. EVALUATION OF CULTURAL HERITAGE VALUE OR INTEREST

3.1. HISTORY OF PROPERTY OWNERSHIP

The earliest available record indicates that the subject site of 200 acres was patented to Francis Foster by the Crown on November 30, 1832. The lot was subdivided and sold to John Bagwell (150 acres) and Thomas Thompson (50 acres) on November 27, 1832 (Figure 19). The subject property, 6461 Mayfield Road, was owned by the Thompson family until the 1960s.

Figure 19 – Original land transfer records for subject property

The historical setting of the subject property within the nineteenth century context are defined in Tremaine’s Map of the County of Peel, Canada West, 1859 (University of Toronto, Map and Data Library) and the Historical Peel County Atlas, 1877 (McGill University, Canadian County Atlas Digital Project). Both sources indicate the subject property is located in the northeast corner of Lot 17, Concession 7 ND, in the former Township of Toronto Gore (Figures 20, 21).

Figure 20 - Tremaine’s Map of the County of Peel, Canada West, 1859, portion showing the subject property
The 1859 map indicates that the owner of the eastern quarter of the original 200-acres Lot is "Thos. Thompson". A church (Ch) is depicted on his land close to the roadways. Salt Creek is also illustrated as running through the Thompson portion of the Lot.

![Figure 21 - Historical Peel County Atlas, 1877, portion showing the subject property](image)

The 1877 atlas map indicates a few structures/uses on the subject 50-acres Farm Lot at that time. The primary developed use appears to be as farmland and an orchard. It was common practice for a farmhouse in the nineteenth century to have an adjacent orchard and otherwise surrounded by its operating farmland in close proximity. The church is no longer illustrated in the same spot as it was on the 1859 Map. The 1877 atlas now depicts the church as being adjacent to the creek at the northwest corner of the Lot. Another structure, which is likely the subject Farmhouse, and an adjacent orchard are illustrated on the northeast corner of the Lot at the intersection of the Concession 7 Road (present-day Goreway Dr.) and the No. 17 Sideroad (present-day Mayfield Road). Like its current setting, the subject Farmhouse site shown on the 1855 map is near to the corner of the roadways and the Salt Creek watercourse. The estate of “EDW Odlum” (known as the historic Odlum House nowadays) is also shown on both maps adjacent to the east.

Based on the dating of these maps, the Thompson Farmhouse would have been built sometime between 1859 and 1877, under the ownership of the Thompson family. The City’s Heritage Report and DBL about this property indicates an approximate construction period of the mid-to-late 1840s for the house. However, if the church structure was at the Lot’s northeast corner until at least 1859 and perhaps beyond, it does not seem possible that the Thompson Farmhouse and its adjacent orchard and farm crops would have been in the same location. Therefore, from the evidence of these historic maps, this report’s research indicates that the Farmhouse’s construction date would be somewhat later, in the third quarter of the nineteenth century.
### 3.2. EVALUATION OF CULTURAL HERITAGE VALUE

The heritage evaluation methodology is based on Ontario Regulation 9/06 “Criteria for Determining Cultural Heritage Value or Interest” under the Ontario Heritage Act.

Table 2 – Ontario Heritage Act, Ontario Regulation 9/06 Criteria applicable to Subject Property

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESIGN OR PHYSICAL VALUE</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>Material or construction methods:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i. rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, expression, material or construction method</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>The Thompson Farmhouse, erected in the third quarter of the nineteenth century, is the earliest example of a vernacular fieldstone farmhouse built in the Toronto Gore Township as most houses at that time were constructed of log. Fieldstone material was collected from fields or streams, and due to lack of local sources for quarried stone, such stone buildings were of modest size. Field stone was split but otherwise undressed, therefore the stone masonry included a relatively large amount of mortar. Some of the sizable unsplit fieldstones have been integrated into the walls as large support members at corners, resembling quoins, or over the openings. Building type: The Farmhouse is a well-designed one-and-a-half-storey fieldstone structure with a later 1890s one-storey wing extending from the south elevation. The house features a square plan with three bays, a side gable roof and is modest in terms of detailing. The front door is centered on the façade with a simple transom. The fenestration is modest with 1/1 windows flanking the front door on the façade, and pairs of windows in each gable end of the side elevations (on one or both storeys). The windows feature stone lintels and larger stones are laid at the building’s corners, quoin-like, to provide stability to the structure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. displays high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. demonstrates high degree of scientific or technical achievement</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Historical or Associative Value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>i. direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization or institution that is significant to a community</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>The property at 6461 Mayfield Road has been associated with the Thompson family for over a century. Thomas Thompson, an early settler and farmer in the former Toronto Gore Township, purchased the property in 1844 after having immigrated to Upper Canada from England with his wife Frances. The area at the time was known as the Hamlet of Tullamore, an area named and settled by Irish immigrants. Following Thomas Thompson's death in 1871, his son Thomas took over the family farmstead. The property continued to be passed down through the Thompson family until the 1960s.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ii. yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of a community or culture</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>A frame Wesleyan church building was located on the north-west corner of the property in 1852, as Thompson had sold a small parcel of land to Nathaniel Reed and to the church trustees in 1851. Brampton's first formal congregation was a group of Wesleyan Methodists, who gathered in a private house on Main Street in 1822. As the church became more established, they constructed additional buildings for congregations in the townships, such as the one located on Thompson's property. The building was removed from the property sometime after 1859.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, builder, designer or theorist who is significant to a community</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Contextual Value

| i. important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an area | YES | The Farmhouse retains the rural residential character of the area and is contextually linked to the surrounding agricultural and natural setting. |
| ii. physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings | YES | The house site at 6461 Mayfield Road has retained its traditional connections with the intersection of the historical roads – now Mayfield Road and Goreway Drive – and a portion of Salt Creek running through the ravine at the rear which comprises a natural heritage system of the property. |
| iii. landmark | N/A | --- |
3.3. HERITAGE ATTRIBUTES

The following list of heritage attributes is based on the Corporation of the City of Brampton Designation By-Law 182-2015 (DBL) to designate the property at 6461 Mayfield Road as being of cultural heritage value or interest.

The heritage attributes comprise all facades of the Main Building including all entranceways and windows, together with construction materials of stone, wood and associated building techniques. The detailed heritage attributes include the following:

- One-and-a-half storey construction
- Square plan
- Fieldstone walls
- Three bays
- One-storey wing projecting from rear elevation
- Side gable roof
- Pairs of windows or their openings in each gable end
- One over one windows flanking front door
- Centered front door with transom
- Large fieldstones at corners
- Stone lintels
- Rural residential character and agricultural setting
- Frontage screened by a planting of mature trees

This latter heritage attribute contains an inherent conflict in terms of the conservation and adaptive reuse of this heritage building within the new development. The mature trees must necessarily be removed for the adaptive reuse of the heritage structure. Because the end objective is the long-term stewardship of the building, its visibility should preferably not be obscured in order to support its new commercial use. It is beneficial to both the buildings tenants and the public as a whole, for the heritage building to be visible from the street.

Regarding the heritage attribute of the rear OW structure, it is a later addition and in more deteriorated condition than the original Farmhouse MB. However, two engineering reports about the heritage structure have been undertaken comprising a Structural Review and a Geotechnical Review (Appendices C & D). Both reports support the retention of the rear One-storey Wing (OW) from the structural and geotechnical engineering perspectives. These engineering assessments provide direction recommendations that the OW construction can be retained and how it can be structurally reinforced.
4. DESCRIPTION OF DEVELOPMENT OR SITE ALTERATIONS

4.1. DESCRIPTION OF DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL

This section describes the proposed plan of the Mayfield Arcadeium Center (MAC) development, its conceptual design vision and principles. This description is based on the Urban Design Brief by NAK Design Strategies and architectural drawings by nArchitecture Inc. from which drawing A-1.0 Site Plan is attached in Appendix A (also see Figure 23).

The MAC site is proposed to be an attractive setting for retail, office (medical) and institutional uses. The design of the site is focused at the intersection of two arterial roads, Mayfield Road and Goreway Drive. As a community gateway, the development will provide appropriate architectural and landscape features to achieve an identifiable entry. Three principles were identified to guide the site composition and building design:

- Creating attractive edges by using built form and landscape features to frame the edges of the site, creating an appropriate interface between the proposed site and adjacent uses, including existing residential to the west and existing natural heritage features to the south;
- Establishing a community gateway by integrating massing at the corner as a vertical element to create a landmark; and
- Providing both physical and visual connections to its context using architectural details and massing as well as hardscape materials, site furniture and lighting fixtures to be consistent with the character of the surroundings.

The MAC concept plan specifies that “it is intended that the heritage farmhouse be retained and repurposed for retail or medical office use.” Site layout of the plaza will provide an appropriate interface with the adjacent arterial roads, a sensitive and attractive transition to nearby existing residential land uses and natural features. A total of 5 buildings are incorporated, including the preserved heritage Farmhouse (See Appendix A).

The primary intent of the architectural design for MAC is to achieve a unique, upscale commercial development. Architectural style should be inspired by the ‘traditional storefront’, with walls articulated to show a substantial base and heavy capital top, as appropriate to the architectural style. Similar to a ‘traditional storefront’, the commercial building will be designed with a base panel, a shop window for each unit and a top fascia for signage and fascia bands. Architectural detailing will create a consistent, cohesive and attractive appearance by arrangement of columns, base treatment, fenestration, facade materials and articulated roof line. A combination of masonry, precast concrete and/or stone, as well as glass, will define the exterior wall treatment. Masonry and/or precast will serve as the field treatment, with stone potentially used for accents and emphasizing features such as columns and base elements (Figure 22).
The majority of the ground level facade will comprise storefront window treatment. Colours and textures may reflect traditional or contemporary influences and treatments. Only quality materials shall be specified throughout to reflect the "Upscale Executive" neighbourhood character.

The proposed conceptual design for the MAC shall fully address the development requirements and achieve the stated principles through a coordinated, well-functioning architectural and landscape design response. The proposed site plan, built form and streetscape design reflect the primary objective of balancing functional requirements and create an attractive public realm, which will integrate the existing heritage-designated stone farmhouse, in situ, that will be repurposed for retail or medical office use.

The Site Plan by nArchitecture clearly shows that new buildings will not interfere with the Thompson Farmhouse (Figure 23) about which further discussion will follow below (see Sections 5 & 6).
There had been a previous version of this Site Plan which incorporated a shed for shopping carts in the space between heritage building and Building ‘C’ on the east. During the application process and through the preparation of this HIA, the shopping cart shed was removed due to it being incompatible with the conservation of the heritage building. Instead, an 1839 mm (6’-0”) setback of open space will be maintained between the Building ‘C’ Grocery Store and the heritage farmhouse which is an appropriate conservation approach.

5. IMPACT ASSESSMENT

The impact assessment methodology is based on the *Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada*.

The following table represents the potential impact of the new development on the heritage attributes and the proposed mitigation strategies to counter those impacts:

Table 3 – Impact & Mitigation Strategies for the Character-Defining Elements of the Thompson Farmhouse

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of Character-Defining Element</th>
<th>Potential Impact due to Proposed Development</th>
<th>Mitigation Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One-and-a-half storey construction</td>
<td>No impact. Height of nearby new buildings will not exceed one storey.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Square plan</td>
<td>Low impact due to the Farmhouse’s siting with all sides being detached and visible.</td>
<td>Visual gap of minimum 1839 mm (6’-0”) shall be maintained between the Building ‘C’ Grocery Store and the Farmhouse (see Section 6.1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fieldstone walls</td>
<td>Potential impact due to vibration during construction work.</td>
<td>Issue vibration monitoring program including: 1) Plan showing the construction site, adjacent lands, buildings, and zone of influence (prepared by a Professional Engineer); and 2) General review commitment certificate by a P.Eng. responsible for vibration control and letter of undertaking by owner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three bays</td>
<td>No impact. The Farmhouse building is retained, in situ.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description of Character-Defining Element</td>
<td>Potential Impact due to Proposed Development</td>
<td>Mitigation Strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-storey wing projecting from rear elevation</td>
<td>Potential impact from structural deterioration due to soil erosion and settlement.</td>
<td>The rear OW portion of the house contains previous settlement, deteriorated masonry and cracked joints. The Structural Review Report (Appendix C) provides direction for reinforcement of the foundations which are also part of the Conservation Plan Notes 2.4.2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side gable roof</td>
<td>No impact. The Farmhouse building roof is retained.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pairs of windows or their openings in each gable end</td>
<td>Impacted positively to improve the heritage authenticity. The Farmhouse window openings will be retained but the present non-historic vinyl windows will be replaced.</td>
<td>The present contemporary vinyl windows have no heritage significance and will be replaced (where existing) or reinstated (where they are blocked) with reproduction wood windows to restore their original character.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One over one windows flanking front door</td>
<td>Impacted positively to improve the heritage authenticity. The Farmhouse’s present non-historic vinyl windows will be replaced.</td>
<td>The present contemporary vinyl windows have no heritage significance and will be replaced with reproduction wood windows to restore their original character.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centered front door with transom</td>
<td>Low impact. The centre front door opening to the building will be retained but the present non-historic vinyl door will be replaced.</td>
<td>The present contemporary vinyl door and transom (the latter currently blocked) have no heritage significance and will be replaced with a reproduction wood door and transom to restore their original character.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large fieldstones at corners</td>
<td>No impact. The farmhouse building structure is retained.</td>
<td>Stone masonry rehabilitation will be undertaken to be detailed in a subsequent Heritage Conservation Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone lintels</td>
<td>No impact. The farmhouse building structure is retained.</td>
<td>Stone masonry rehabilitation will be undertaken to be detailed in a subsequent Heritage Conservation Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description of Character-Defining Element</td>
<td>Potential Impact due to Proposed Development</td>
<td>Mitigation Strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural residential character and agricultural setting</td>
<td>Impact by changing setting from agricultural to commercial/institutional and development of plaza on the site.</td>
<td>The site layout and landscaping of the plaza shall provide a sensitive and attractive transition to nearby existing residential land uses and natural features. The commercial development design shall utilize natural streetscape elements such as trees and shrubs to link the built form architecture and landscape design.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frontage screened by a planting of mature trees</td>
<td>Impact due to the frontage of mature trees being removed to accommodate the commercial use in which the heritage house will be integrated.</td>
<td>The removal of the screening trees is actually an appropriate mitigation strategy in order to allow for a view of the heritage house at its distance location from Mayfield Rd. However, soft landscaping has been provided completely surrounding the house except for the front centre entrance walkway which emulates its original rural residential setting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. SUMMARY AND CONCLUDING RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1. DESIGN REVISIONS

This May 2019 revision of the HIA incorporates several updates to the project layout and site design related to the heritage house. In particular, the City Heritage Planner, Pascal Doucet, provided a September 20, 2018 memorandum of Heritage Comments on the OPA/ZBA application and the submission of its supporting documents. Since the previous March 19, 2018 issuance of the HIA and as part of the planning approval process, several discussions and meetings have occurred between City staff, including from Planning & Development Services, and the owner accompanied by their consulting engineer and planner, Candevcon. This revised HIA report incorporates the design revisions and other responses to the City comments in the table below:

Table 4 – Summary of City Heritage Issues & Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Heritage Issue</th>
<th>Heritage Planner Comments</th>
<th>Design Revision &amp;/or Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Planting at frontage instead of patio</td>
<td>P. 3 top, 2nd bullet: “The Heritage Impact Assessment does not assess the impact of the proposed development on the frontage screened by a planting of mature trees, which is a heritage attribute.” P. 4 bottom, last paragraph: “In addition, Heritage staff recommends a greater amount of soft and permeable landscaping surrounding the Thompson Farmhouse.” P. 5, 5th bullet: “Remove or relocate the patio proposed in front of the Thompson Farmhouse, as this construction will affect the front elevation of the heritage building and its appearance from Mayfield Road. A patio is only appropriate next to the west side elevation if it is necessary for the future use of the heritage building.”</td>
<td>Architectural and Landscape Architectural drawings A-1.1 &amp;L1-01 have been revised to provide soft landscaping at the front of the heritage house instead of a patio.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Building Use</td>
<td>P. 3, 3rd paragraph: “Use of Heritage Building. The use proposed for the Thompson Farmhouse is not provided. The use of the heritage building must be identified and confirmed through this application to amend the Zoning By-law and Official Plan.”</td>
<td>The proposed use of the Heritage Building will be for a professional office (i.e. medical, legal or accounting offices). Candevcon has prepared and submitted the draft OPA and ZBA which include the permitted uses being requested under the zone Commercial One (C1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Ancillary Structure</td>
<td>P. 3 bottom, last bullet: “There is no measure provided for the metal shed located near the Thompson Farmhouse.”</td>
<td>The existing metal shed is not original to the nineteenth century farmstead and has no heritage value. It will be removed because it is located within the Valley Buffer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Signage &amp; Plaque</strong></td>
<td><strong>Visual Relationship</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>P. 4 bottom, last paragraph: “Signage and Landscaping. Signage for the future use of the heritage building should have no negative impact on the appearance and fabric of the Thompson Farmhouse. Heritage staff considers that a freestanding sign incorporated into the landscape surrounding the Thompson Farmhouse is the most appropriate form of signage for this building if it does not overwhelm or obscure any of its heritage attributes and architectural features.”</td>
<td>Signage and interpretive plaque will be implemented in accordance with City Heritage staff recommendation as part of the Site Plan Approval (SPA) submissions in the Architectural and Landscape Architectural drawings. A pedestal plaque facing Mayfield Road will be located next to the street right-of-way, or otherwise installed at an agreed upon location closer to the Thompson Farmhouse. An Interpretation Plan will be provided as part of the SPA process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P. 5 top, 1st paragraph: “Heritage staff will require that a detailed Landscape Plan and a Signage Plan, both satisfactory to the Director of Policy Planning, be provided prior to the final Site Plan approval for the proposed development.”</td>
<td>Comments in Pascal Doucet’s email (via Kevin Freeman) of January 29, 2019 pertaining to items outside of the HIA, Building Protection and Conservation Plan are being addressed through the SPA process: “Heritage City staff is agreeing to remove the comment recommending a 2 meters wide walkway with abutting strips of linear landscape between Mayfield Road and the heritage stone house (Thompson Farmhouse) provided that the application and proposed development be amended to include the following conservation measures:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P. 5 top, 2nd paragraph: “Interpretation of the site. The property’s cultural heritage value should be interpreted with the installation of a pedestal plaque facing Mayfield Road that is located next to the Right-of-Way, at the entrance of the recommended walkway leading to the Thompson Farmhouse.”</td>
<td>- Provide an unobstructed view corridor looking perpendicularly (at a 90-degree angle) at the Thompson Farmhouse from Mayfield Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>P. 5, 1st bullet: “Enhance the prominence and visual relationship of the Thomson Farmhouse from Mayfield Road by providing a linear and continuous walkway of at least 2 meters wide plus an abutting and continuous landscape median that are both connecting the front entrance of the Thomson Farmhouse to the regional sidewalk along Mayfield Road. The proposed walkway and abutting continuous landscape median should form a straight line at a right angle (90 degrees) from Mayfield Road.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Surrounding Landscape &amp; Central Walkway</strong></td>
<td>P. 5, 2nd bullet: “Enhance the rural residential character and agricultural setting of the property by providing soft landscaping all around the Thomson Farmhouse (except for the walkway leading to the front entrance door), and by retaining the trees and vegetation in the buffer area along the southerly property line.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7.</strong></td>
<td><strong>East Side Yard Transition</strong></td>
<td>P. 5, 3rd bullet: “The form, scale and massing of the proposed grocery store building identified as building ‘C’ on the Site Plan Drawing is dwarfing and overwhelming visually the Thomson Farmhouse. A greater separation between the Thomson Farmhouse and the proposed grocery store is recommended to provide a better transition and an appropriate amount of soft landscaping around the heritage building.” P. 5, 4th bullet: “Remove the shed for shopping carts proposed between the grocery store (building ‘C’) and the Thomson Farmhouse, as construction of the shed will result in physical impacts to the fabric of the heritage building that can be avoided with an alternate design.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These recommended design revisions have been implemented during the City’s review process of the planning applications as this stage, ZBA and OPA, and will be further developed in the subsequent phases of Site Plan Approval (SPA) and Building Permit Application (BPA).

6.2. HERITAGE ASSESSMENT CONCLUSION

The proposed plan of the Mayfield Arcadeium Center development demonstrates a sensitive approach to integrate the heritage Thompson Farmhouse building into a contemporary plaza design. Such integration will support the community value of the proposed development by linking nearby neighbourhoods to their past. Retention of most heritage attributes is achievable and every effort was demonstrated to preserve the heritage Farmhouse in-situ and repurpose it for commercial or medical office use.

It is important that the new construction promotes architectural interest, human scale, and sympathetic design to the character-defining attributes of the heritage structure. New, contemporary buildings may be sympathetically designed to incorporate concepts and elements from the heritage structure. For example, the surrounding building elevations that face Mayfield Rd., may take inspiration from the Farmhouse’s frontage width or fenestration shape. The heritage building’s frontage width can be used as a guide for the three-dimensional forms of “relief” on large expanses of storefront elevations. This can be achieved, for example, by “jogging” the depths of the façade, by strategically locating exterior finishes (e.g. vertical glazing between solid walls, or combination of different finishes) and fixtures (e.g. lighting or signage).
6.3. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR SUBSEQUENT SUBMISSIONS

The following recommendations and actions are proposed to achieve and develop a comprehensive conservation approach for the heritage aspects of this project:

(a) Implement the recommended design revisions described above (Sub-section 6.1).

(b) One-storey Wing rear addition should be structurally stabilized in order to be retained, rehabilitated and restored together with the front (north) MB construction.

(c) Provide an engineering assessment and reinforcement of the MB and OW construction in order to achieve its structural integrity. Such structural measures would have the objective of assuring long-term stability to counteract soil deterioration and construction-related vibrations.

(d) Provide appropriate conservation measures and repairs on the Thompson Farmhouse (i.e. remove foam and cement patches, clean and repoint stone masonry, replace non-historic windows, etc.). This includes preparation of a Heritage Conservation Plan (HCP) and Heritage Building Protection Plan (HBPP).

(e) Establish an interpretive plaque near the Farmhouse or along the Mayfield Road street allowance, describing the property’s history and significance.
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Appendix B. Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada

THE STANDARDS

The Standards are not presented in a hierarchical order. All standards for any given type of treatment must be considered, and applied where appropriate, to any conservation project.

General Standards for Preservation, Rehabilitation and Restoration

1. 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.

2. Conserve changes to an historic place that, over time, have become character-defining elements in their own right.

3. Conserve heritage value by adopting an approach calling for minimal intervention.

4. Recognize each historic place as a physical record of its time 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.

5. Find a use for an historic place that requires minimal or no change to its character-defining elements.

6. 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.

7. 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.

8. 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.

Appendix B. Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada (cont’d)

**Additional Standards Relating to Rehabilitation**

10. Repair rather than replace *character-defining elements*. Where character-defining elements are too severely deteriorated to repair, and where sufficient physical evidence exists, replace them with new elements that match the forms, materials and detailing of sound versions of the same elements. Where there is insufficient physical evidence, make the form, material and detailing of the new elements compatible with the character of the *historic place*.

11. Conserve the *heritage value* and *character-defining elements* when creating any new additions to an *historic place* or any related new construction. Make the new work physically and visually compatible with, subordinate to and distinguishable from the historic place.

12. Create any new additions or related new construction so that the essential form and integrity of an *historic place* will not be impaired if the new work is removed in the future.

**Additional Standards Relating to Restoration**

13. Repair rather than replace *character-defining elements* from the *restoration* period. Where character-defining elements are too severely deteriorated to repair and where sufficient physical evidence exists, replace them with new elements that match the forms, materials and detailing of sound versions of the same elements.

14. Replace missing features from the *restoration* period with new features whose forms, materials and detailing are based on sufficient physical, documentary and/or oral evidence.
July 5, 2018

AREA, Architects Rasch Eckler Associates Ltd.
15 Lola Road
Toronto, Ontario
M5P 1E5

Attn: Mr. David Eckler

Re: Structural Review,
Thompson Farm House
6461 Mayfield Road
City of Brampton
Our File No. W18103

Dear David:

In your e-mail of June 19th 2018 to Mayfield Arcadeium Holdings Ltd. you advised that Pascal Doucet, City of Brampton Heritage Planner, had requested that a Structural/Geotechnical Study be prepared to assess the structural condition of the rear one-storey addition and its impact on the integrity of the main building. Mayfield Arcadeium Holdings subsequently engaged Candevcon to complete the structural assessment and also engaged Soil Engineers Ltd. to complete a geotechnical assessment.

I advise that we are familiar with the property for several years and currently are the Planning and Engineering Consultant for the Mayfield Arcadeium Holdings application. We have coordinated the preparation of the Geotechnical Slope Stability Study (Soil Engineers Ltd, 2017) as well as the site walk with the City and TRCA representatives to determine the “top of bank”. We have also reviewed the Heritage Impact Assessment Study prepared by AREA Architects.

As requested by Mayfield Arcadeium Holdings Ltd we carried out a structural inspection of the house on June 25th 2018 and our findings and recommendations are outlined below. I also enclose a copy of Soil Engineers Ltd. Letter report dated June 29th 2018 which responds on a number of geotechnical issues.

1. Structural Inspection - Description and Findings

1.1 Description

The inspection included both the main building (MB) with a focus on the one-story wing addition at the rear (OW)

The main building comprises a one-and-a-half story structure with a full height basement and concrete floor. The wing addition is a single story building with a partial height basement and an earth floor. The main building is generally in good structural condition. The condition of the wing addition is summarized in Section 1.2 below.
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Appendix C. Structural Review, Thompson Farmhouse, 6461 Mayfield Rd., Candevcon, July 5/18 (cont.)

1. Structural Inspection - Description and Findings (Cont’d)

1.2 Findings (Wing Addition)

(i) Roof:

The roof shows evidence of significant sagging; since the roof framing is not visible (due to the ceiling) the condition of the roof framing members is not known.

(ii) Ground Floor:

The ground floor is wood flooring supported on half dressed timber beams; the timber beams are supported in the centre as well as at the east and west walls with a wood beam and post system. The posts are supported on the ground without proper footings, and, for the purposes of this report, appear to be original, albeit with various reinforcements completed at a later date. The original floor framing slopes down from north to south; the existing kitchen floor is built up on top of the original sloping structure to provide a level surface. The condition of the wood is generally poor.

(iii) Walls

The condition of the stone walls is poor with significant mortar spalling and cracks between the stones (some previously sealed with foam insulation). The joints (east and west) between the walls of the wing addition (OW) and the main building (MD) are “butt jointed” with evidence of minor separation.

The south foundation wall of the wing addition that is visible due to the sloping ground in this area shows evidence of instability (bulging) and some settlement at the south east corner.

In summary, the wing addition is in poor condition both structurally and from a weather-proofing perspective.

2. Recommendations

In consideration of the current condition of the wing addition there are two (2) options:

(i) Removal, or

(ii) Repair/replacement of the roof and ground floor and restoration/strengthening of the foundations. If this option is selected, specifications/drawings will be provided. It is noted that the partial basement should be filled in and a concrete ground floor slab provided.
Appendix C. Structural Review, Thompson Farmhouse, 6461 Mayfield Rd., Candevcon, July 5/18 (cont.)

3. Responses to Potential Questions

In your e-mail of June 19th, you identified several questions relating to the rear addition and our responses are provided as follows:

(i) Is the rear portion structurally stable or not in its current condition?

On a long term basis the rear portion (wing addition) is not structurally stable in its current condition.

(ii) Does the rear portion undermine the structure of the front main house block? In other words is the rear portion pulling on the front main block?

No

(iii) Would the front main house block be more stable or can it be structurally reinforced to be made more stable by removing the rear portion?

The front main house (MW) is independently stable

(iv) Can the rear portion be structurally stabilized and reinforced and, if so, how?

Yes, the rear portion can be structurally stabilized and made safe and useable, however, the cost will be significant.

As noted in 2(ii) above, the work generally comprises:

(a) Replacement of the roof;

(b) Removal of the ground floor; filling in of the partial basement (under controlled engineering conditions); construction of concrete floor.

(b) Strengthening of the foundation wall along the south side including verification of the foundation depth and potential grading/insulation to provide frost cover.

(d) Clean and repoint stone masonry (including removal of foam); replacement of windows and doors

In summary, the repair work will result in only the walls being retained (and repaired).
3. Responses to Potential Questions (Cont’d)

(v) *Can its existing deterioration - its sloping ground floor joists/floor and its cracked foundation walls be rectified and, if so, how?*

Yes, refer to (iv) above.

(vi) *Are the soils geotechnical characteristics sufficiently stable to allow for the structurally support and reinforcement of the rear portion over the long term?*

As confirmed by Soil Engineers Ltd. in their letter report of June 29th 2018, yes, the existing ground in this area is globally stable and will accommodate reinforcement of the rear portion as required.

(vii) *Is the soil at this top of bank eroding? Does the soil at the rear of the house portion need to be stabilized and, if so, how?*

The slope at the top of bank is not eroding. Soil stabilization is not required, however, the grading needs to be adjusted if the wing addition is being retained (refer also to the Soil Engineers report).

We trust that the foregoing report identifies the existing structural condition of the main house (MB) and wing addition (OW), provides options for removal or repair, and responds to the City’s questions.

If you have any questions, however, please advise.

Respectfully submitted

Diamuid K. Horgan, P. Eng


cc David Eckler
    Shawn Ahuja
June 29, 2018

The City of Brampton
Planning and Development Services
2 Wellington Street West
Brampton, Ontario
L6Y 4R2

Attention: Mr. Pascal Doucet, Heritage Planner

Re: Geotechnical Review - Heritage Impact Assessment
Thompson Farm House
6461 Mayfield Road
City of Brampton

Dear Sir:

Soil Engineers Ltd. has completed a geotechnical investigation at the captioned site. This letter is to address our comments regarding the demolition of the single storey structure beside the heritage house at the mid-south portion of the site.

House Condition

The exterior of the heritage house consists of stone walls with sloped roof of shingles. The interior is wood framed, finished with wood ceilings, stone cladding, wooden wall panels and drywalls, tiles, carpet and hardwood flooring. The basement is unfinished, with stone walls and concrete floor.
Reference No. 1804-S001
June 29, 2018

Subsoil and Groundwater Condition

According to the borehole findings (Our reference No. 1804-S001 dated June 2018), the subsoil in the vicinity of the heritage house consists of silty clay till of firm to hard in consistency, overlying the shale bedrock at a depth of 2.4 to 4.2 m from grade.

Although slight seepage of groundwater was recorded in the borehole, the clay till is competent and non-erodible that the wall of excavation will remain stable with a safe backing slope of 45°.

Geotechnical Assessment of One-Storey Wing

The structure to be demolished is a single storey structure attached to the south of the heritage house.

In Response to the City Comments, in the geotechnical perspective, our comments are summerized below:

1. Is the rear portion structurally stable or not in its current condition?
   See Structural Comments.

2. Does the rear portion undermine the structure of the front main house block? In other words, is the rear portion “pulling” on the front main block?
   The rear structure is self-standing that the foundation can be removed separately from the front block.

3. Would the front main house block be more stable or can it be structurally reinforced to be made more stable by removing the rear portion?
   See Structural Comments.
4. Can the rear portion be structurally stabilized and reinforced and, if so, how?
See Structural Comments.

5. Can its existing deterioration – its sloping ground floor joists/floor and its cracked stone foundation walls – be rectified and, if so, how?
See Structural Comments.

6. Are the soil’s geotechnical characteristics sufficiently stable to allow for the structurally support and reinforcement of the rear portion over the long term?
The subsoil is competent and stable for temporary or permanent support of structures in this nature. There is no adverse effect to the adjacent soils.

7. Is the soil at this top-of-bank area eroding? Does the soil at the rear house portion need to be stabilized and, if so, how?
The subsoil is competent with no signs of erosion at the bank. In addition, there is no significant groundwater flow in the foundation depths. Soil stabilization is not necessary.

We trust that this letter report satisfies your requirements. Should any query arises, please do not hesitate to contact our office.

Yours very truly,

SOIL ENGINEERS LTD.

Adrian Lo, B.Sc.

Bennett Sun, P.Eng.
AL/BS
Appendix E. Qualifications of AREA and David Eckler

FIRM PROFILE | HERITAGE & MUSEUM WORK

AREA is a full service firm, based in Toronto and operating across Canada, which specializes in the restoration and adaptive re-use of historic buildings, urban design for heritage streetscapes and approvals under the Ontario Heritage Act. The firm has a history extending over 30 years of practice, and is managed by 2 principals and 8 technical staff – including intern architects, interior designers and architectural technologists – with experience in the documentation and restoration of historic buildings and sites. Although we are qualified for heritage and museum projects, the members of our firm have also undertaken a wide range of institutional and commercial projects often involving the integration of historic components into new developments.

AREA and its staff are members of various heritage associations and advisory boards across Canada. David Eckler, O.E.S., B.Arch., OAA, RAIC is an active member in many heritage associations including the Architectural Conservancy of Ontario Advisory Board. He is a former Vice-Chair of Heritage Toronto, which advised Toronto City Council on heritage matters as a LACAC under the Heritage Act. Bernard Rasch, B.Arch., OAA, FCAOA, FRAIC, ARIBA has served on a number of heritage committees and boards including the Markham District Historical Society and City of York Historical Committee and the Metro Board of Management for The Guild from 1984 to 1998 where he served in many positions including Chair & Vice-Chair of the Board.

Historical Façade Improvement Guidelines & Heritage Districts
- Stouffville Main Street Revitalization, 1998, DEA was presenter at workshop
- Yonge Street Commercial Façade Improvement Program, 1998, received City approval of grant
- Woodstock Façade Improvement Program, 1995, DEA initiated program for City
- Halton-York Area Heritage Conservation District Study, City-sponsored study
- Fergus Downtown Community Masterplan & Design Guidelines

Historic Museums, Institutional & Cultural Buildings
- Officers' Quarters [1830], Military & Naval Establishment, Discovery Harbour, Penetanguishene
- Spence Half-Way House Restoration [c. 1850], Muskoka Pioneer Village, Huntsville
- Sharon Temple Compound [1821], Sharon, York Region
- Heliconian Hall [first Olivet Sunday Schoolhouse, circa 1876], [Yorkville]
- Cedar Ridge Studio Gallery [1918], 225 Confederation Drive, [Scarborough]
- Aurora Historical Society Museum [1886 school], 22 Church Street, Aurora
- The Niagara Institute [early 20th c.], 9 Weatherstone Dr., Niagara on the Lake
- St. Lawrence Hall [1840] - renovations of town hall to accommodate National Ballet School

Historic House Restorations
- Jacob Rose House Restoration [1852], 100 Stoney Ave.
- William Wench House Restoration [1840], 2777 Woodbine Ave., Markham
- Robert Milroy House Restoration [c. 1833], 7111 Reesor Rd., Markham
- McDougall Farmhouse [1893] Heritage Assessment, James Snow Parkway, Milton, ON
- Devonian House Restoration & Addition [circa 1923], 144 John St. E., Niagara on the Lake
- Savage House & Blacksmith Shop [c. 1890], 1480 Derry Rd. E., Mississauga

Converted Historic Residences
- Old Post Inn [c. 1830], 367 Kingston Road East, Ajax
- Valley Halls Villa [Jackson Residence, 1922], Toronto Zoo, Rouge Valley, Scarborough
- Armour Heights Officer’s Mess [1913, Strathroy, ON], Canadian Forces College, 215 Yonge Blvd.
- Bellevue Daycare Centre [1887], 95 Bellevue Ave.
- Gerrard & Bay Historic Houses [1860-1890], 68-84 Gerrard St. W.
- Toronto French School Restoration [Sifton Estate, 1923], 294 - 318 Lawrence Ave. E.
Thompson Farmhouse
6461 Mayfield Road, Brampton, Ontario

David Eckler is the firm's principal and is responsible for the design, construction drawings, specifications and construction administration of all heritage projects in the office. Mr. Eckler has over 25 years experience in the conservation, restoration and adaptive reuse of heritage structures for government, non-profit agencies and private sector owners and developers. Mr. Eckler directs the Concept Design, Design Development and Contract Documents phases of heritage projects and authors many of the firm's heritage assessment reports.

Mr. Eckler established a specialization in heritage conservation beginning in 1992 with his previous firm David Eckler Architect (DEA) and continuing in his current practice, AREA Architects. His architectural heritage services include feasibility studies, preservation planning, infill projects within historic districts, adaptive re-use and building restoration. David is an active member in many architectural and heritage associations including the Architectural Conservancy of Ontario Advisory Board. He is a past member of the Canadian Association of Professional Heritage Consultants and is a former Vice-Chair of Heritage Toronto, which advised Toronto City Council on heritage matters under the Heritage Act and as an advisory board for the city's museums.

Mr. Eckler has particular experience in the restoration of heritage properties within public parks and cultural landscapes. An example of a heritage attraction in a park setting is the restoration of the Officers' Quarters within the Discovery Harbour museum in Penetanguishene. He has most recently worked on the restoration of the historic site of the 1710 Allan Gardens Conservatory.

RELEVANT EXPERIENCE: Toronto location unless indicated

Heritage Adaptive Re-use

- Goldring Student Centre [Wymilwood, 1954] - 150 Charles St. W., Toronto
- Warwick Office Building [1905] - 601-609 King St. W.
- Church of Christ, Scientist [1928], Condominium Redevelopment, 70 High Park
- Eglington Hunt Club [1929] - Condominiums, 1355 Kingston Rd.
- Hutton House [1850] - Community Centre, Ardmore Park, St. Marys
- Bellevue Daycare Centre [1887] - 95 Bellevue Avenue

Restoration of Institutional Historic Buildings

- Allan Gardens Conservatory Complex [1910] - 160 Gerrard St. E.
- Aurora Historical Society Museum [Church Street School, 1886]
- Toronto French School [Sifton Estate, 1924] - 304 Lawrence Ave E
- Armour Heights Officers' Mess [Strathallan] [1913] - 215 Yonge Blvd.
- Medical Arts Building Restoration [circa 1929]
- Officers' Barracks [1830] - Discovery Harbour, Penetanguishene
- Heliconian Hall [first Olivet Church, 1876] - 35 Hazelton Ave.

Heritage Planning, Parks & Streetscape Design

- Cookstown Heritage Conservation District - Innisfil, ON.
- Old Pickering Village Planning & Heritage Study, Ajax
- Yorkville-Hazelton Avenue Heritage Conservation District
- Limehouse Kilns Heritage Masterplan, Halton Hills
- Confederation Commemorative Park, Charlottetown, PEI
- Gerrard & Bay Historic Houses [1860-1890]
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): Surinder/Shawn Ahuja, Mayfield Arcadeium Holdings Ltd.

TELEPHONE NO. HOME ( ) BUSINESS: (416) 821-7180 FAX: ( )

E-MAIL ADDRESS: ahuja@arcadeium.com

MAILING ADDRESS: 1087 Meyerside Drive, Unit #7

Mississauga, Ontario L5T 1M5

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

NAME OF AGENT(S): David Eckler, AREA, Architects Rasch Eckler Associates Ltd.

TELEPHONE NO. HOME ( ) BUSINESS: (416) 696-1969 FAX: (416) 696.1966 x225

E-MAIL ADDRESS: deckler@areaarchitects.ca

MAILING ADDRESS: 15 Lola Road

Toronto, Ontario M5P 1E5

COPY ALL COMMUNICATIONS TO AREA ARCHITECTS

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

LOTS(S) / BLOCK(S)  Part Lot 17

CONCESSION NO.  7 Northern Div'n, Toronto Gore

REGISTERED PLAN NO.  Pt.2 Ref. Pl.43R-25677 save & except REFERENCE PLAN NO. Pt.1 Ref. Pl.43R-25725

PART(S) NO.(S)  10-12-0-003-12315-00000

PIN (PROPERTY IDENTIFICATION NO.)

Address: 6461 Mayfield Road  Name: Thompson Farmhouse

D. OVERALL PROJECT DESCRIPTION / SUMMARY OF PROPOSAL

Architectural Heritage Conservation Plan Drawings of the Thompson Farmhouse

providing description of conservation work are attached as follows:

AH1.1 Site Plan, Conservation Notes & Heritage Building Protection Plan

AH1.2 Conservation Notes (cont'd) & Key Floor Plans

AH1.3 Conservation Notes (cont'd), Site Plan & Key Floor Plans

AH2.1a As-Existing Conditions, North & West Elevations, Existing Windows & Doors

AH2.1b As-Existing Conditions, South & East Elevations, Existing Windows & Doors

AH2.2a Proposed Restoration, North & West Elevations, Windows & Doors Schedule

AH2.2b Proposed Restoration, South & East Elevations, Windows & Doors Schedule

The proposed conservation work is intended to comply with generally-accepted heritage standards of best practices:

- Parks Canada’s Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places
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):

Wood Refinishing - eaves trim incl. bargeboard, fascia, soffit, etc.;
- repair, patch & fill
- selective replacement & dutchman repair with in-kind materials;
- strip, clean, sand, repaint re-finishing.

Masonry - clean stone throughout;

Restoration - repoint & replace stone at deteriorated areas;
- provide stone dutchman repair with in-kind materials.

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

**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):

Roof Replacement - 2-layer roof shingles with shadow line to replicate cedar shakes
Windows Replacement - Replace existing non-original windows with "in-kind" wood windows.
- Existing windows are non-original vinyl replacements, non-heritage.
- Other deterioration of frames from rot, breakage, etc.
- New reproduction wood windows by Pella Windows or approved equal.
- To replicate original proportions double- or single-hung sashes.
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 164 M approx. DEPTH__________
LOT AREA approx.17,600 m²
EXISTING BUILDING COVERAGE N.A._________%
BUILDING HEIGHT EXISTING N.A._________m
PROPOSED N.A._________m
BUILDING WIDTH EXISTING 9.13_________m
PROPOSED same_________m
ZONING DESIGNATION ___________ from Residential to Commercial

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.
Notice of Intention to Demolish Non-Heritage Shed
NOTICE IN WRITING
PURSUANT TO S. 27 (3) OF THE ONTARIO HERITAGE ACT

May 21, 2019

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

Attn: Mr. Peter Fay, City Clerk
Re: Notification of Intent to Demolish pursuant to Section 27 (3) of Ontario Heritage Act
6461 Mayfield Rd., Brampton: Non-Heritage Shed adjacent to Thompson Farmhouse

In accordance with the provisions of Section 27 (3) of the Ontario Heritage Act, this correspondence provides notification to Council of the intent to demolish only the non-heritage shed adjacent to but not original to the Thompson Farmhouse at 6461 Mayfield Rd.

The following clarifications about this notification are provided:

- The notice is submitted to facilitate the adaptive re-use of the historic Thompson Farmhouse as part of and integrated into the redevelopment of the property as the Mayfield Arcadeium Center commercial development.
- The subject shed to be demolished is not historic and its materials and construction date to a later period than the circa 1860s construction of the Thompson Farmhouse.
- The previously submitted Heritage Impact Assessment, dated May 6, 2019, addresses several design changes in the site plan layout of the Mayfield Arcadeium Center in response to your previous comments.
- A Heritage Building Protection Plan (HBPP) & Heritage Conservation Plan (HCP) outline the proposed retention, rehabilitation and restoration of the Thompson Farmhouse.

Photographs and the survey portion of the shed which is proposed to be demolished have been incorporated in the HBPP and HCP drawing AH1.1 and have been attached to this letter as well. As discussed with Pascal Doucet, the City Heritage Planner, this notice letter and attachments together with the other heritage submission materials will be presented to the upcoming BHB meeting together with your Heritage Planning Staff report.

Yours truly,

David Eckler, BES, B.Arch., OAA, MRAIC
AREA Architects Ltd., Heritage Consultants

Copies to:
Surinder (Shawn) Ahuja, Mayfield Arcadeium Holdings Ltd.
Pascal Doucet, Heritage Planner, Planning & Development Services, City of Brampton
Erik Mirtsou, Diarmuid Horgan, Candevcon Limited

Attachments
Re: 6461 Mayfield Road, Brampton, Thompson Farmhouse:
Notification of Intent to Demolish Non-Heritage Shed

May 21, 2019
STABILIZATION

1. PREPARATION

1.1. Submit detailed sequence of structural stabilization and removal work with starting and ending dates for each activity. Inspect structure before reinforcement work.

1.2. Inspection form: To be completed of Owner, Structural Engineer, and Storm Protection Heritage.

1.3. Structural Engineer to outline all measures to be undertaken to stabilize the one-story wing (OWM) the house. Engineering report to be submitted to client/appraiser.

1.4. Photograph details, and existing conditions.

2. APPLICATION

2.1. APPLY BUILDING PROTECTION PLAN (See Appendix D, Staking Protection Plan) (V) by Fos, Inc. During the period prior to restoration, the subject OWM will be subject to damage. Protect building during periods of construction.

2.2. PROJECT SURROUNDING AREAS including; parking, patios, and equipment from damage. Direct temporary protection for parking, patios, and equipment, and the surrounding areas from damage caused by the stabilization work. Allow a minimum of 12 ft. of space around any equipment surrounding the site for stabilization. No automobile, equipment, or personnel are permitted within the clearances.

2.3. STABILIZE STRUCTURE

2.3.1. Provide interior and exterior shoring, bracing, or supports for weight removal, and prevention of further collapse.

2.3.2. Bracing existing wall spacers, and new wall spacers resulting from stabilization. Apply compression-type protection for walls and floor framing (e.g., floor joists).

2.4. CARPETILY STABILIZE (S) south additions.

2.4.1. Disruption utilities on site (South) (S) (of 12 ft). The total area of the building:

2.4.2. Implement reinforcement procedure recommended by Structural Engineers on site. (S)

(a) Replacement of the roof
(b) Removal of the ground floor, fitting in of the portal boundary (under controlled environmental conditions), construction of anode floor.
(c) Strengthening of the foundation wall along the south side including verification of the foundation depth and the results of any soil testing. Grouting/repair to provide final cover.
(d) Clean and repair stone masonry (including removal of fans).

2.5.4. Minimize damage to materials and components as required.

2.5. IMMEDIATELY REMOVE DEBRIS AND MATERIALS to prevent excessive loads on supporting walls, floors, and framing.

2.6. CEASE OPERATIONS IF STRUCTURE IS DISASSEMBLED: notify inspection team (01-11).

2.7. CLEAN ORIGINAL, BRICK

2.7.1. Confirm involvement of architect in removing historic artifacts from original building.

2.7.2. Remove from original site all debris, dirt, and other obstructions resulting from demolition operations.

2.7.3. Property dispose hazardous materials, if need.

RESTITUTION

10.1-78

MASONRY RESTORATION NOTES

M1. ALL EXISTING MASONRY SURFACE IS TO BE CLEARED PRIOR TO OTHER MASONRY RESTORATION WORK IN ORDER TO LOSEN CRACKED MORTAR JOINTS, TO ELIMINATE EROSION/SCOUR & TO REMOVE DIRT & DETRITUS.

USE THE GENTLEST CLEANING METHOD USING A SOLUTION OF WATER AND BONUS DETERGENT, APPLIED WITH LOW-PRESSURE MASH AND NATURAL BRUSH BRUSHES. IF THE WALL IS NATURAL TREATED AND MORTAR AND CAULKING JOINTS ARE SOUND, ALLOW TWO TO FIVE WEEKS OF DRY WEATHER BEFORE FROST. ANY CHEMICAL SOLUTION IS NOT TO BE USED WHEN PRECIPITATION IS POSSIBLE.

CONTROL THRIVING PLANTS ON STONE MASONRY SURFACE BY CUTTING PLANTS AT THE ROOTS. ALLOW TO WITHDRAW PRIOR TO GENTLE REMOVAL. APPLY MINIMUM SULPHATE ON ROOTS. IF NECESSARY, ADD FURTHER DAMAGE TO MORTAR.

M2. REMOVE PAINT, PAINTING & OTHER HEAVY STAINING TO NEXT SOUND LAYER. THE GENTLEST METHOD POSSIBLE. DETERMINE IF PAINT IS OIL-BASED OR WATER-BASED. IF OIL-BASED, SUBSEQUENTLY APPLY COMPATIBLE PAINT REMOVAL METHOD ON A TEST AREA. LOCATED ON AN INCONSPICUOUS AREA. MINIMUM V/A. DETERMINE EFFECTIVENESS OF PAINT REMOVAL METHOD BY ASSESSING THE EXTENT OF DAMAGE POSSIBLY CAUSED BY CLEANERS AND PAINT REMOVERS. FOR STAINED SURFACES THAT CANNOT BE REMOVED BY CLEANING, STAIN INCOMPATIBLE – COLOURED BRICK TO MATCH SURROUNDING ORIENAL MASONRY. ALL SELECTIVE CLEANING SHOULD BE CLEANED SHOULD THEN BE REPAIRED AS PER M3.

M3. RE-POINT OPEN & CRACKED CONCRETE, STONE, BRICKS, AND JOINTS FOR 25% OF EACH OF THE WALL AREAS, AS APPLICABLE. BONE POINT SPECIFIC AREAS, SHOWED LIGHT TONES, BUT OTHER AREAS WILL BE IDENTIFIED ON SITE DURING THE 25% OF EACH OF THE WALL AREAS. CUT OUT & FILL POINT USING MORTAR MIX TO MATCH WIDTH, PROFILE & COLOUR OF EXISTING JOINTS.

M4. REPLACE MASONRY SURFACES FOR 25% OF EACH OF THE WALL AREAS WHERE DAMAGE OR DEGRADATION IS VISIBLE (e.g., SIGNIFICANT CRACKS, HOLES, ETC.). AND WHERE SIGNIFICANT MASONRY FEATURES (sec.2c) ARE MISSING OR SEVERELY ALTERED. REPLACE SPECIFIC AREAS AS DARK TONES, BUT OTHER AREAS WILL BE IDENTIFIED ON SITE TO MAKE UP THE 25% EACH OF THE WALL AREAS. USE SALVAGED STONE RETAINED ON SITE OR NEW MATERIAL FROM SPECIALIZED SUPPLIERS DEALING WITH HISTORIC MASONRY.

M5. REPLACE HEAVILY DEGRADATION & CEMENT OR STONE SURFACES, APPROXIMATELY 10% OF EXISTING WINDOW SILLS. FOR NEW OR RECONFIGURED WINDOW OPENINGS, REMOVE ANY EXISTING WINDOW SILL, SALVAGE, AND RELOCATE AS SHOWN.

EXISTING CONDITIONS

DETERIORATED FOUNDATION & FLOOR STRUCTURE

Due to settling from the surrounding area, the basement foundations are heavily deteriorated and sinking. The stonework is heavily cracked, and is subject to falling tree roots.

WOOD ORIGINAL WOOD TRIM

Wood trim along the gabled roof is deteriorated in multiple areas. Chipping, discoloration, peeling, and missing components can be seen throughout.

BRICK ORIGINAL BRICK CHIMNEY

The brick chimney connects to the fireplace located on the roof wall of section MB and is a flush with the exterior wall.

GABLED ROOF

Original gabled roof clad with contemporary asphalt shingles. Gutters and flashings are all contemporary prefinished material. Replace with new decorative shingles, low-slope asphalt shingles to reflect congoctural cedar shingles.

DETERIORATED/MISSING STONES

Stone steps and spalls are used to trim corners in the masonry walls. They are approximately 12mm thick and consist of limestone-based mortar.

ORIENAL FIELDSTONE MASONRY WALL

Masonry consists of uncrurled ribbon combination of split and undressed fieldstones. Stones are mismatched heights and are levels at every 250-500mm height.
Your **business insurance policy renewal**

**Important information**

**Your Certificate of Insurance**

Welcome to our new look! Our policy documents are now personalized and easier to understand. Please review your renewal package. If you have any questions, please contact us.

**Go Paperless.** Visit [www.cooperators.ca/aclickaway](http://www.cooperators.ca/aclickaway) to sign up for an online services account.
Privacy Breach Coverage for Business Owners

Privacy breach is a growing concern for Canadian business owners and changes to tighten privacy laws are imminent. Our new Privacy Breach Coverage protects your business from the legal liability and expenses you could incur if personal information is lost, stolen or mistakenly shared. It also includes exclusive access to CyberScout’s professional loss prevention and remediation services. Contact us today to add Privacy Breach coverage to your policy.

With an Online Services account, you can:
- Update your profile and preferences
- View policy details
- Find, view and download documents related to your policies
- GO PAPERLESS!
- Make payments
- Start a claim and monitor its status

Visit cooperators.ca/aclickaway and sign-up today!

Already have an account? Your online experience just got better with new features, a new look and more self-serve options - check them out!
Enhancements to your policy

The following changes apply to your coverage under the Insuring Agreements and Common Definitions, Exclusions and Conditions Form - Applicable to all provinces except the provinces of British Columbia, Alberta and Quebec:

We've updated your policy to provide coverage for Innocent Persons. As a result, in the event of loss or damage, any insured who is a natural person, and who did not help or consent to the damaging act that results in a claim, may be eligible for compensation if the claim qualifies.

Previously this coverage was only provided in British Columbia, Alberta and Quebec.
This Certificate of Insurance summarizes your coverages, and shows your policy's effective and expiry dates.

Any premium reimbursement issued by Co-operators General Insurance Company, during the term of your policy, will be made payable to the payor on file, as per the information provided by the insured.

For more information on your property and liability coverages, refer to the Your Coverages section of this policy. For information on your policy coverages and discounts, refer to cooperators.ca.

Insurance is provided for only those locations, operations, coverages and limits specifically indicated herein.

Declaration of Emergency - Extension of Termination or Expiry Date
Insuring Agreements and Common Definitions, Exclusions and Conditions Forms (as per Province)

Operations: Vacant land; Building (Owner's risk only) Rented Dwellings, 1 or 2 units/suites
Location: 6461 MAYFIELD ROAD, BRAMPTON, ON L6P 0H9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>CO-INSURANCE</th>
<th>DEDUCTIBLE</th>
<th>LIMIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building - Commercial Broad Form - Actual Cash Value</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$438,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building # 1: Dwelling - RESIDENTIAL HOME - 1845 - 1500 Square feet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Mortgagee - ANNE CATHERINE SHAW, 6430 MAYFIELD RD, CALEDON EAST ON, L7C 0Z7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Mortgagee - Westmount Guarantee Services Inc, as administrative agent for the surety, 205-600 COCHRANE DR, MARKHAM ON, L3R 5K3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tenants Damage Exclusion Endorsement Broad Form

Water Damage Deductible Endorsement | $10,000 |
Earthquake Shock Endorsement | 3% |
Flood Endorsement | $10,000 |
Sewer Back-up Endorsement | $10,000 |

(continued)

The policy contains a clause that may limit the amount payable.
Location: 6461 MAYFIELD ROAD, BRAMPTON, ON L6P 0H9 (continued)

### Commercial Advantage Endorsement

(Please refer to the terms of the endorsement)

**Part I - Aggregate Limit**

The Aggregate Limit of Insurance stated is the most the Insurer will pay for any one occurrence for loss involving any one or more of the extensions of coverage in PART I.

- Accounts Receivable
- Brands and Labels
- Exterior Signs including Street Clocks, Communication Towers, Antennae and Satellite Receivers
- Extra Expense
- Fine Arts
- Fire Department Service Charges
- Fire Equipment Recharge
- Glass - $500 Deductible
- Master Key - $500 Deductible
- Newly Constructed Buildings at the Insured's Premises - Automatic coverage for 60 days
- Professional Fees
- Stock Spoilage (Consequential Loss)
- Valuable Papers and Records

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CO-INSURANCE</th>
<th>DEDUCTIBLE</th>
<th>LIMIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Part II - Coverage Extensions**

The Limit of Insurance for any loss involving any extension in PART II is the limit stated in each extension of coverage.

- Arson Award
- Building By-Laws - included in Building, Dwelling or Structure limit
- Building Damage by Theft
- Debris Removal
- Exhibitions
- Growing Plants, Trees, Shrubs or Flowers Outside the Building
- Identity Theft
- Installation
- Land and Water Pollution Clean Up
- Money and Securities
- Moulds, Patterns and Dyes
- Newly Acquired Locations
- Peak Season Increase

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25% of Stock</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
Location: 6461 MAYFIELD ROAD, BRAMPTON, ON L6P 0H9 (continued)

**CO-INSURANCE DEDUCTIBLE LIMIT**

- Personal Property of Officers and Employees  
  - Property in Transit  
  - Roadways, Walkways and Parking Lots  
  - Sales Representative (contents)  
  - Sidewalk Sales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CO-INSURANCE LIMIT</th>
<th>DEDUCTIBLE LIMIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25% of Stock or maximum $25,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Temporary or Unnamed Locations

---

**Escape of Fuel Oil - Rental Dwelling Endorsement (Broad Form)**

---

**Illegal Drug Operations Exclusion Endorsement**

---

**CO-INSURANCE DEDUCTIBLE LIMIT**

**Liability**

Commercial General Liability Policy - Occurrence Basis

**Bodily Injury and Property Damage Liability**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CO-INSURANCE LIMIT</th>
<th>DEDUCTIBLE LIMIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each Occurrence Limit</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Products-Completed Operations Aggregate Limit</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each Occurrence Deductible - Property Damage</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Personal and Advertising Injury Liability**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CO-INSURANCE LIMIT</th>
<th>DEDUCTIBLE LIMIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Medical Expense Limit - Any One Person**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CO-INSURANCE LIMIT</th>
<th>DEDUCTIBLE LIMIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tenants' Legal Liability Limit - Any One Premises**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CO-INSURANCE LIMIT</th>
<th>DEDUCTIBLE LIMIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Non-owned Automobile Liability**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CO-INSURANCE LIMIT</th>
<th>DEDUCTIBLE LIMIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Contractual Liability Endorsement**

**Legal Liability for Damage to Hired Vehicle Endorsement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CO-INSURANCE LIMIT</th>
<th>DEDUCTIBLE LIMIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Excluding Long Term Leased Vehicle Endorsement**

**Reduction of Coverage for Lessees or Drivers of Leased Vehicles Endorsement**

---

Non-Taxable Premium: $0.00

Taxable Premium: $3,107.00

Tax: $248.56

Total Policy Cost: $3,355.56
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discounts</th>
<th>Your policy includes discounts for:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Claims Free</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Co-operators Advantage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Robert Wesseling  
President and Chief Executive Officer  
Authorized Signature of Insurer
INSURING AGREEMENTS AND COMMON DEFINITIONS, EXCLUSIONS AND CONDITIONS FORM - APPLICABLE TO ALL PROVINCES EXCEPT THE PROVINCES OF BRITISH COLUMBIA, ALBERTA AND QUEBEC

Applicable to all Property and Business Interruption and Inland Marine coverages of this Policy.

Words and phrases in quotation marks have special meaning as defined in the Common Definitions.

I. Insuring Agreements

The Insurer, in consideration of payment of the premium, in reliance upon and subject to the statements in the application made a part of this Policy and subject to all the terms and conditions of this Policy, the “Certificate of Insurance” and the Forms, Schedules and Endorsements attached, agrees with the Named Insured as follows:

A. Indemnity Agreement

In the event that insured property is lost or damaged during the policy period by an insured peril, the Insurer will indemnify the Insured against the direct loss or damage so caused to an amount not exceeding whichever is the least of:

1. the value of the lost or damaged property as determined in the applicable Form or Endorsement;
2. the interest of the Insured in the property;
3. the Limit of Insurance specified in the “Certificate of Insurance” for the lost or damaged property.

The inclusion of more than one person or interest shall not increase the Insurer’s liability.

B. Extensions of Coverage

The following extensions of coverage shall not increase the Limits of Insurance stated in the “Certificate of Insurance” and are subject to all the conditions of this Form.

1. Removal:
   - If any of the insured property is necessarily removed from the “Premises” or “Project Site” to prevent loss of or damage to or further loss of or damage to such property, that part of the insurance under this Policy that exceeds the amount of the Insurer’s liability for any loss already incurred shall, for 30 days only, or for the unexpired term of the Policy if less than 30 days, insure the property removed and any property remaining at the “Premises” or “Project Site” in the proportions which the value of the property in each of the locations bears to the value of the property in them all.

2. a. Debris Removal:
   - The Insurer will indemnify the Insured for expenses incurred in the removal from the “Premises” or “Project Site” of debris of the insured property, occasioned by loss of or damage to such property, for which loss or damage insurance is afforded under this Policy.
   - The amount payable under this extension shall not exceed 25% of the sum of:
     i. the total amount payable for the direct loss of or damage to insured property; and
     ii. the amount of the applicable deductible.

   b. Removal of Windstorm Debris:
   - The Insurer will indemnify the Insured for expenses incurred in the removal of debris or other property which is not insured by this Policy but which has been blown by windstorm upon the “Premises” or “Project Site”.

   Extensions of coverage 2. a. and 2. b. do not apply to costs or expenses:

1. to “Clean Up” “Pollutants” from land or water; or
2. for testing, monitoring, evaluating or assessing of an actual, alleged, potential or threatened spill, discharge, emission, dispersal, seepage, leakage, migration, release or escape of “Pollutants”.

Debris removal expense shall not be considered in the calculation of the value as determined in the applicable Form or Endorsement for the purpose of applying Co-insurance.
II. Common Exclusions

A. War Exclusion
This Policy does not insure against loss or damage caused by, related to, directly or indirectly, in whole or in part, by war, invasion, act of foreign enemy, hostilities (whether war is declared or not), civil war, rebellion, revolution, insurrection or military power. This exclusion applies whether or not there are one or more other causes or events (whether covered or not) that contribute concurrently or in any sequence to the occasioning of the loss or damage.

B. Nuclear Exclusion
This Policy does not insure against loss or damage caused by, related to, directly or indirectly, in whole or in part:
1. By any nuclear incident (as defined in the Nuclear Liability Act or any other nuclear liability act, law or statute, or any amending law) or nuclear explosion, except for ensuing loss or damage which results directly from fire, lightning or explosion of natural, coal or manufactured gas;
2. By contamination by radioactive material.
This exclusion applies whether or not there are one or more other causes or events (whether covered or not) that contribute concurrently or in any sequence to the occasioning of the loss or damage.

C. Bylaw Exclusion
This Policy does not insure against loss or damage caused by, related to, directly or indirectly, in whole or in part, arising in consequence of or contributed to by the enforcement of any bylaw, regulation, ordinance or law regulating zoning or the demolition, repair or construction of buildings or structures, which bylaw, regulation, ordinance or law makes it impossible to repair or reinstate the property as it was immediately prior to the loss.

D. Data Exclusion
Section 1. - Applicable to all coverages provided by this Policy other than those stated for Section 2. herein.

a. This Policy does not insure “Data”.

b. This Policy does not insure against loss or damage caused by, related to, directly or indirectly, in whole or in part, by “Data Problem”, regardless of any other cause or event that contributes concurrently or in any sequence to such loss or damage, nor any business interruption or extra expense loss resulting from such loss or damage, except as follows:

i. If loss or damage caused by “Data Problem” results in the occurrence of further loss of or damage to property insured that is directly caused by:
   1. “Specified Perils” as defined in the Common Definitions; or
   2. the following perils, only if otherwise insured and not otherwise excluded:
      a. escape of water from any tank, apparatus or pipe;
      b. flood;
      c. freezing;

   this part b. shall not apply to such resulting loss or damage.

ii. If “Data Problem” is the direct result of:
   1. “Specified Perils” as defined in the Common Definitions; or
   2. the following perils, only if otherwise insured and not otherwise excluded:
      a. escape of water from any tank, apparatus or pipe;
      b. earthquake;
      c. flood;
d. sewer back-up;

at the “Premises” or “Project Site” of the Insured, part b. of this exclusion shall not apply to resulting business interruption or extra expense loss, if insured under this Policy.

Section 2. - Applicable to the following coverages if provided by this Policy:
Contents coverage, but only if electronic data is insured thereby; Accounts Receivable coverage and Valuable Papers and Records coverage.

This Policy does not insure loss or damage caused by, related to, directly or indirectly, in whole or in part, by “Data Problem” regardless of any other cause or event that contributes concurrently or in any sequence to such loss or damage, nor any business interruption or extra expense loss resulting from such loss or damage, except as follows:

a. If loss or damage caused by “Data Problem” results in the occurrence of further loss or damage to property insured that is directly caused by:
   i. “Specified Perils” as defined in the Common Definitions; or
   ii. the following perils only if otherwise insured and not otherwise excluded:
      1. escape of water from any tank, apparatus or pipe;
      2. flood;
      3. freezing;

at the “Premises” or “Project Site” of the Insured, Section 2. of this exclusion shall not apply to such resulting loss or damage.

b. If “Data Problem” is the direct result of:
   i. “Specified Perils” as defined in the Common Definitions;
   ii. the following perils only if otherwise insured and not otherwise excluded:
      1. escape of water from any tank, apparatus or pipe;
      2. earthquake;
      3. flood;
      4. sewer back-up;

at the “Premises” or “Project Site” of the Insured, Section 2. of this exclusion shall not apply.

E. Pollution Exclusion
This Policy does not insure against:

1. loss or damage caused by, related to, directly or indirectly in whole or in part, by any actual or alleged spill, discharge, emission, dispersal, seepage, leakage, migration, release or escape of “Pollutants”, nor the cost or expense of any resulting “Clean Up”. This exclusion does not apply:
   a. if the spill, discharge, emission, dispersal, seepage, leakage, migration, release or escape of “Pollutants” is directly caused by a peril not otherwise excluded in this Policy; or
   b. to loss or damage caused directly by a resultant peril not otherwise excluded in this Policy;

2. cost or expense for any testing, monitoring, evaluating or assessing of an actual, alleged, potential or threatened spill, discharge, emission, dispersal, seepage, leakage, migration, release or escape of “Pollutants”.

F. Fungi and Spores Exclusion
This Policy does not insure against:

1. loss or damage caused by, related to, directly or indirectly, in whole or in part, by any “Fungi” or “Spores”. This exclusion does not apply:
a. if the “Fungi” or “Spores” are directly caused by a peril not otherwise excluded in this Policy; or
b. to loss or damage caused directly by a resultant peril not otherwise excluded in this Policy;

2. the cost or expense for any testing, monitoring, evaluating or assessing of “Fungi” or “Spores”.

G. Terrorism Exclusion
This Policy does not insure loss or damage caused by, related to, directly or indirectly, in whole or in part, by “Terrorism” or by any activity or decision of a government agency or other entity to prevent, respond to or terminate “Terrorism”. This exclusion applies whether or not there are one or more other causes or events (whether covered or not) that contribute concurrently or in any sequence to the occasioning of the loss or damage. If any portion of this exclusion is found to be invalid, unenforceable or contrary to law or statute, the remainder shall remain in full force and effect.

III. Common Definitions
Wherever used in this Policy:

A. “Certificate of Insurance” means the page(s) of your Policy which provide the specifics of your insured coverages and limits including any supplementary pages or schedule of coverages attached thereto applicable to this Policy subject to the terms and conditions of this Policy.

B. “Clean Up” means the removal, containment, treatment, decontamination, detoxification, stabilization, neutralization or remediation of “Pollutants”, including testing which is integral to any of these processes.

C. “Data” means representations of information or concepts, in any form.

D. “Data Problem” means:
   1. erasure, destruction, corruption, misappropriation, misinterpretation of “Data”;
   2. error in creating, amending, entering, deleting or using “Data”; or
   3. inability to receive, transmit or use “Data”.

E. “Fire Protective Equipment” includes tanks, watermains, hydrants, valves and any other apparatus whether used solely for fire protection or jointly for fire protection and for other purposes, but does not include:
   1. branch piping from a joint system where such branches are used entirely for purposes other than fire protection;
   2. any watermains or appurtenances located outside of the “Premises” or “Project Site” and forming a part of the public water distribution system;
   3. any pond or reservoir in which the water is impounded by a dam.

F. “Fungi” includes, but is not limited to, any form or type of mould, yeast, mushroom, mildew, wet or dry rot or bacteria, whether or not allergenic, pathogenic or toxigenic, and any substance, vapour or gas produced by, emitted from or arising out of any “Fungi” or “Spores” or resultant mycotoxins, allergens or pathogens.

G. “Pollutants” means any solid, liquid, gaseous or thermal irritant or contaminant, including, but not limited to, odour, vapour, fumes, acids, alkalis, chemicals and waste. Waste includes, but is not limited to, materials to be recycled, reconditioned or reclaimed.

H. “Premises” means the entire area within the property lines and areas under adjoining sidewalks and driveways at:
   1. each location described in the “Certificate of Insurance”;
   2. Temporary Locations and any Newly Acquired Location, if covered by this Policy; and in or on vehicles within 100 metres (328 feet) of such locations.

I. “Project Site” means the site of the project described in the “Certificate of Insurance”.

J. “Specified Perils” means:
1. **Fire or Lightning**

2. **Explosion:** Except with respect to the explosion of natural, coal or manufactured gas, there shall in no event be any liability for loss or damage caused by explosion, rupture or bursting in or of the following property owned, operated or controlled by the Insured:

   a. i. the portions containing steam or water under steam pressure of all boilers generating steam, and piping or other equipment connected to said boilers and containing steam or water under steam pressure;
      
   ii. piping and apparatus or their parts normally containing steam or water under steam pressure from an external source and while under such pressure;

   iii. the combustion chambers or fire boxes of steam generating boilers of the chemical recovery type and the flues or passages which conduct the gases of combustion from them;

   iv. smelt dissolving tanks;

   b. other vessels and apparatus, and connected pipes, while under pressure, or while in use or in operation, provided their maximum normal internal working pressure exceeds 103 kilopascals (15 pounds per square inch) above atmospheric pressure except that liability is specifically assumed for loss or damage resulting from the explosion of manually portable gas cylinders;

   c. moving or rotating machinery or parts of same when such loss or damage is caused by centrifugal force or mechanical breakdown;

   d. any vessels and apparatus and connected pipes while undergoing pressure tests, but this exclusion shall not apply to other insured property that has been damaged by such explosion;

   e. gas turbines.

   The following are not explosions within the intent of this section:

   1. electric arcing or any coincident rupture of electrical equipment due to such arcing;

   2. bursting or rupture caused by hydrostatic pressure or freezing;

   3. bursting or rupture of any safety disc, rupture diaphragm or fusible plug.

3. **Impact by Aircraft, Spacecraft or Land Vehicle:** The terms Aircraft and Spacecraft include articles dropped from them.

   There shall in no event be any liability for cumulative damage or for loss or damage:

   a. caused by land vehicles belonging to or under the control of the Insured or any of the Insured’s employees;

   b. to aircraft, spacecraft or land vehicles causing the loss;

   c. caused by any aircraft or spacecraft when being taxied or moved inside or outside of a “Building”.

4. **Smoke:** means smoke due to a sudden, unusual and faulty operation of any stationary furnace. There shall in no event be any liability for any cumulative damage.

5. **Leakage from “Fire Protective Equipment”:** means:

   a. the leakage or discharge of water or other substance from;

   b. the collapse of; or

   c. the rupture due to freezing of;

   “Fire Protective Equipment” for the “Premises”, “Project Site” or for adjoining structures.

6. **Windstorm or Hail:** There shall in no event be any liability for loss or damage:

   a. to the interior of the “Building” or to “Contents” unless damage occurs concurrently with and results from an aperture caused by windstorm or hail;
b. directly or indirectly caused by any of the following whether driven by wind or due to windstorm or not: snow-load, ice-load, tidal wave, tsunamis, high water, overflow, flood, waterborne objects, waves, ice, land subsidence, landslip.

K. “Spores” includes but is not limited to, one or more reproductive particles or microscopic fragments produced by, emitted from or arising out of any “Fungi”.

L. “Terrorism” means an ideologically motivated unlawful act or acts, including but not limited to the use of violence or force or threat of violence or force, committed by or on behalf of any group(s), organization(s) or government(s) for the purpose of influencing any government and/or instilling fear in the public or a section of the public.

IV. Policy Conditions

Where the terms and conditions of this Policy, the “Certificate of Insurance” and the Forms, Schedules and Endorsements attached thereto are in conflict with the applicable Provincial statutes, the interpretation most favourable to the Insured shall prevail.

A. Subrogation

The Insurer, upon making any payment or assuming liability for payment under this Policy, shall be subrogated to all rights of recovery of the Insured against others and may bring action to enforce such rights.

All rights of subrogation are waived against any corporation, firm, individual or other interest with respect to which insurance is provided by this Policy.

Where the net amount recovered, after deducting the costs of recovery, is not sufficient to provide a complete indemnity for the loss or damage suffered, that amount shall be divided between the Insurer and the Insured in the proportion in which the loss or damage has been borne by them respectively.

Any release from liability entered into by the Insured prior to loss shall not affect the right of the Insured to recover.

B. Enhancement Clause

If the Insurer in its sole discretion elects to broaden coverage under this Policy without any additional premium during the policy period, the broadened coverage will immediately apply to this Policy.

C. Recovery by Innocent Persons

If a contract contains a term or condition excluding coverage for loss or damage to property caused by a criminal or intentional act or omission of an Insured or any other person, the exclusion applies only to the claim of a person

1. whose act or omission caused the loss or damage,
2. who abetted or colluded in the act or omission,
3. who
   a. consented to the act or omission, and
   b. knew or ought to have known that the act or omission would cause the loss or damage, or
   c. who is not a natural person

provided that coverage shall only apply if the insured

i. co-operates with the insurer in respect of the investigation of the loss, including, without limitation, by submitting to an examination under oath, if requested by the insurer, and
ii. produces for examination, at such reasonable place and time as is designated by the insurer, all documents that relate to the loss in addition to those required by the contract.
Nothing in the above paragraph allows an insured to recover more than that insured's proportionate interest in the lost or damaged property.

V. Statutory Conditions
The Statutory Conditions below apply to the peril of fire and, as modified or supplemented by Forms or Endorsements attached, apply as Policy Conditions to all other perils insured by property coverage on this Policy.

A. Misrepresentation
If a person applying for insurance falsely describes the property to the prejudice of the Insurer, or misrepresents or fraudulently omits to communicate any circumstance that is material to be made known to the Insurer in order to enable it to judge the risk to be undertaken, the contract is void as to any property in relation to which the misrepresentation or omission is material.

B. Property of Others
Unless otherwise specifically stated in the contract, the Insurer is not liable for loss or damage to property owned by any person other than the Insured, unless the interest of the Insured in such property is stated in the contract.

C. Change of Interest
The Insurer shall be liable for loss or damage occurring after an authorized assignment under the Bankruptcy Act (Canada) or change of title by succession, by operation of law, or by death.

D. Material Change
Any change material to the risk and within the control and knowledge of the Insured voids the contract as to the part affected by the change, unless the change is promptly notified in writing to the Insurer or its local agent. The Insurer, when so notified, may return the unearned portion, if any, of the premium paid and cancel the contract. Alternatively, the Insurer may notify the Insured in writing that, if the Insured desires the contract to continue in force, the Insured must, within 15 days of the receipt of the notice, pay to the Insurer an additional premium. In a default of such payment the contract is no longer in force and the Insurer shall return the unearned portion, if any, of the premium paid.

E. Termination
1. This contract may be terminated:
   a. by the Insurer giving to the Insured written notice of termination at least:
      i. five days before the effective date of termination if personally delivered;
      ii. 15 days before the effective date of termination if the contract is terminated by registered mail for non-payment of premium; or
      iii. 30 days before the effective date of termination if the contract is terminated by registered mail for any other reason.
   b. by the Insured at any time on request.
2. When this contract is terminated by the Insurer:
   a. the Insurer shall refund the excess of premium actually paid by the Insured(s) over the pro rata premium for the expired time, subject to any minimum retained premium specified; and
   b. the refund shall accompany the notice, unless the premium is subject to adjustment or determination as to amount, in which case the refund shall be made as soon as practicable.
3. When this contract is terminated by the Insured, the Insurer shall refund as soon as practicable the excess of premium actually paid by the Insured over the short rate premium for the expired time, but in no event shall the short rate premium for the expired time be deemed to be less than any minimum retained premium specified.
4. The refund may be made by money, postal or express company money order or cheque payable at par.
5. The 15 and 30 days mentioned in clauses 1. a. ii. and iii. of this condition commence to run on the day following the receipt of the registered letter at the post office to which it is addressed.

F. Requirements After Loss
1. Upon the occurrence of any loss of or damage to the insured property, the Insured shall, if loss or damage is covered by the contract, in addition to observing the requirements of Conditions I., J., and K.: 
   a. immediately give notice of the loss or damage in writing to the Insurer;
   b. deliver as soon as practicable to the Insurer a proof of loss verified by a statutory declaration:
      i. giving a complete inventory of the lost, destroyed or damaged property and showing in detail quantities, costs, actual cash value and particulars of amount of loss claimed;
      ii. stating when and how the loss occurred, and if caused by fire or explosion due to ignition, how the fire or explosion originated, so far as the Insured knows or believes;
      iii. stating that the loss did not occur through any wilful act or neglect or procurement, means or connivance of the Insured;
      iv. showing the amount of other insurances and the names of other Insurers;
      v. showing the interest of the Insured and of all others in the property with particulars of all mortgages, liens, encumbrances and other charges upon the property;
      vi. showing any changes in title, use, occupation, location, possession or exposures of the property since the issue of the contract;
      vii. showing the place where the property insured was at the time of loss;
   c. if required, give a complete inventory of undamaged property, showing in detail quantities, cost, actual cash value;
   d. if required, and if practicable, produce accounts, warehouse receipts, stock lists, invoices and other pertinent records, verified by statutory declaration, as well as any relevant contracts or agreements with others.
2. The evidence furnished under clauses 1. c. and d. of this condition shall not be considered proofs of loss within the meaning of Conditions L. and M.

G. Fraud
Any fraud or wilfully false statement in a statutory declaration in relation to any of the above particulars vitiates the claim of the person making the declaration.

H. Who May Give Notice and Proof
In case of absence or inability of the Insured to give notice of loss or make proof of loss, notice of loss may be given and proof of loss may be made by the agent of the Insured. If the Insured fails to give notice immediately, the notice of loss may be given and the proof of loss may be made by a person to whom any part of the insurance money is payable.

I. Salvage
1. The Insured, in the event of any loss or damage to any insured property, shall take all reasonable steps to prevent further damage to such property and to prevent damage to other insured property, including, if necessary, removal to a secure location;
2. The Insurer shall contribute proportionately, according to the respective interests of the parties, towards any reasonable and proper expenses in connection with steps taken by the Insured and required under sub-section 1. of this condition.
J. **Entry, Control, Abandonment**

After loss or damage to insured property, the Insurer has an immediate right of access and entry by accredited agents sufficient to enable them to survey and examine the property, and to make an estimate of the loss or damage. After the Insured has secured the property, the Insurer has a further right of access and entry sufficient to enable its agents to make appraisement or particular estimate of the loss or damage. The Insurer is not entitled to the control or possession of the insured property. There can be no abandonment of insured property to the Insurer without the Insurer’s consent.

K. **Appraisal**

In the event of disagreement as to the value of the insured property or the value of the property saved or the amount of the loss, those questions shall be determined by appraisal as provided under the Insurance Act before there can be any recovery under this contract, whether the right to recover on the contract is disputed or not, and independently of all other questions. There shall be no right to an appraisal until a specific demand for one is made in writing and until proof of loss has been delivered.

L. **When Loss Payable**

The loss is payable within 60 days after completion of the proof of loss, unless the contract provides for a shorter period.

M. **Replacement**

1. The Insurer, instead of making payment, may repair, rebuild, or replace the property damaged or lost, giving written notice of its intention to do so within 30 days after receipt of the proof of loss;

2. In that event, the Insurer shall commence to repair, rebuild, or replace the property within 45 days after receipt of the proof of loss, and shall proceed with all due diligence to completion of the work.

N. **Action**

Every action or proceeding against the Insurer for the recovery of any claim shall be absolutely barred unless commenced within one year after the loss or damage occurs, unless legislation provides otherwise.

O. **Notice**

Any written notice to the Insurer may be sent by registered mail or delivered to the chief agency or any office of the Insurer in Canada. Written notice may be given to the Insured by letter personally delivered to the Insured or by registered mail addressed to the Insured at the Insured’s latest post office address as notified to the Insurer. In this condition, the expression “Registered” means registered in or outside Canada.
Pella Architect Series® Hung
Rectangular and Arch Head Units, LX Double-, Single- and Simulated-Hung
Wood Exterior
Detailed Product Descriptions

Frame
- Select softwood, water-repellent, preservative-treated with EnduraGuard® triple wood protection in accordance with WDMA I.S.-4. EnduraGuard triple protection formula includes water-repellency, three active fungicides and an insecticide applied to the frame.
- Interior exposed surfaces are [pine] [mahogany] (standard rectangular windows only). Any curved member may have visible finger-jointed surfaces.
- Exterior surfaces are [pine] [mahogany].
- Overall frame depth is 4-3/8" (111 mm) for a wall depth of 4-3/16" (106 mm).
- Jamb liner is wood insert.
- Optional factory applied jamb extensions available for 4-9/16" (116 mm) and 7-3/16" (183 mm) wall depths, with Pella's standard wood exterior trim.

Sash
- Select softwood, water-repellent, preservative-treated with EnduraGuard triple wood protection in accordance with WDMA I.S.-4. EnduraGuard triple protection formula includes water-repellency, three active fungicides and an insecticide applied to the sash.
- Interior exposed surfaces are [pine] [mahogany] (standard rectangular windows only). Any curved member may have visible finger-jointed surfaces.
- Exterior surfaces are [pine] [mahogany].
- Corners [mortised and tenoned on rectangular units] [mitered on arch head units], glued and secured with metal fasteners.
- Sash thickness is 1-7/8" (47 mm).
- [Double-Hung: Upper sash has surface-mounted wash locks] [Single-Hung: Fixed upper sash has surface-mounted wash locks] [Arch Head units have no wash locks].
- Lower sash has concealed wash locks in lower check rail.
- Simulated-Hung units have non-operable upper and lower sashes.

Weatherstripping
- Water-stop santoprene-wrapped foam at head and sill.
- Thermoplastic elastomer bulb with slip coating set into lower sash for tight contact at check rail.
- Vinyl-wrapped foam inserted into jamb liner components to seal against sides of sash.

Glazing System
- Quality float glass complying with ASTM C 1036.
- Silicone-glazed 11/16" dual-seal insulating glass [clear] [Advanced Low-E coated with argon] [NaturalSun Low-E coated with argon] [SunDefense™ [dual] Low-E with argon] [[bronze] [gray] [green] Advanced Low-E coated with argon].
- Custom and high altitude glazing available.

Exterior
- [Pine: factory primed with one coat acrylic latex] [Mahogany: factory primed with one coat acrylic latex] [Unfinished, ready for site finishing]]

Interior
- [Unfinished, ready for site finishing] [factory primed with one coat acrylic latex] [factory prefinished [White] [Linen White] [Bright White] [stain.]].

Hardware
- Galvanized block-and-tackle balances are connected to self-locking balance shoes which are connected to the sashes using zinc die cast terminals and concealed within the frame.
- Sash lock is [standard] [spoon-shaped]. Two sash locks on units with frame width 37" and greater.
  - Finish is [baked enamel [Champagne] [White] [Brown]] [Bright Brass] [Satin Nickel] [Oil-Rubbed Bronze].
- Optional sash lift furnished for field installation. Two lifts on units with frame width 37" and greater.
  - Finish is [baked enamel [Champagne] [White] [Brown]] [Bright Brass] [Satin Nickel] [Oil-Rubbed Bronze].
- [Simulated-Hung: Single-piece lock ties upper and lower sash together. When removed lower sash becomes operable.]
- Optional factory applied limited opening device available for rectangular and arch head vent units in stainless steel; nominal 3-3/4" opening. Limiting device concealed from view.

Optional Products

Grilles
Integral Light Technology® grilles

- Grilles are solid [7/8"] [1-1/4"] [2"] regular profile [pine] [mahogany].
- Patterns are [Traditional] [Prairie] [Top Row] [New England] [Victorian].
- Exterior surfaces are pine, water repellent, preservative-treated in accordance with WDMA I.S.-4, and are factory primed.
- Interior surfaces are [unfinished, ready for site finishing] [factory primed] [pine: factory prefinished] [White] [Linen White] [Bright White] [stain 1].
- Insulating glass contains foam grid between two panes of glass. Foam grid is adhered to the glass.
- Grilles are adhered to both sides of the insulating glass with VHB acrylic adhesive tape and aligned with the foam grid.

- or -

Grilles-Between-the-Glass

- Insulating glass contains 3/4" contoured aluminum grilles permanently installed between two panes of glass.
- Patterns are [Traditional] [Prairie] [Cross] [Top Row]
- Interior color is [White] [Tan] [Brown] [Ivory] [Brickstone] [Harvest] [Cordovan].
- Exterior color is [White] [Tan] [Brown] [feature 3].

- or -

Removable grilles

- Interior [unfinished, ready for site finishing] [factory primed] [pine: factory prefinished] [White] [Linen White] [Bright White] [stain 1].
- Exterior [unfinished, ready for site finishing] [factory primed] [factory prefinished, finish color matched to exterior cladding 3].

Screens (for Double- and Single-Hung)

- InView™ Screens
  - [Half-Size] [Full-Size] black vinyl-coated 18/18 mesh fiberglass screen cloth complying with SMA 1201, set in aluminum frame fitted to outside of window, supplied complete with all necessary hardware.
  - Full screen spreader bar placed on units > 37" width or > 65" height.
  - Screen frame finish is [baked enamel, White] [feature 3].

- or -

- Vivid View® Screens
  - [Half-Size] [Full-Size] PVDF 21/17 mesh, minimum 78 percent light transmissive screen, set in aluminum frame fitted to outside of window, supplied complete with all necessary hardware.
  - Full screen spreader bar placed on units > 37" width or > 65" height.
  - Screen frame finish is [baked enamel, White] [feature 3].
  - Arch head units have half-size screen only.

(1) Contact your local Pella sales representative for current color options.
(2) Available in clear or Low-E insulating glass only. White exterior grille color is the only option for clear insulating glass.
(3) Tan and Brown Interior GBG colors are available in single-tone (Brown/Brown or Tan/Tan). Other interior colors are also available with Tan or Brown exterior.
(4) Full screens are available on units ≤ 96" height.
(5) Appearance of exterior grille color will vary depending on Low-E coating on glass.
UNIT SECTIONS
Wood Exterior
LX Single- and Double-Hung

Scale 3" = 1' 0"
All dimensions are approximate.

* Dimension required for ordering units with unequal sash.
UNIT SECTIONS
Wood Exterior
LX Fixed and Transoms

FIXED

TRANSOMS

TYPICAL JOINING MULLIONS

Scale 3" = 1' 0"
All dimensions are approximate.
See Installation and Performance at www.PellaADM.com for mullion limitations and reinforcing requirements.
Hi Erin,

As per our site visit on May 2, 2019, to the basement of the existing Peel Manor Long-Term Care Facility, our visual inspection led us, in our professional opinion, that the brick wall has no significant or unique cultural heritage interest or value. The usage of brick, type of brick and the orderliness of the mortar joints suggest its installation is part of the existing Peel Manor facility. The brick material does not appear to date to the previous 1898 Peel House of Industry and Refuge structure. Instead the brick appears to be infill of a previous access way from the exterior into the basement, installed during the Peel Manor occupation of the site (Plate 1 and 2). Where the brick wall meets the concrete block foundation is a steel braided cable that would also date to the Peel Manor facility (Plate 3).
Plate 1: Brick basement wall looking southwest

Plate 2: Courtyard area with wood piece covering a potential previous access to basement

Plate 3: Corner of brick basement wall and concrete block wall with exposed steel braided cable

David Waverman CSLA, OALA, AALA, CAHP
Senior Landscape Architect, Community Development
Heritage Report:
Reasons for Heritage Designation

82 - 86 Main Street North
Heritage Theatre

MARCH 2016
### Profile of Subject Property

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Municipal Address</strong></th>
<th>82 - 86 Main Street North</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PIN Number</strong></td>
<td>141240089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Roll Number</strong></td>
<td>10-01-0-002-13900-0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Legal Description</strong></td>
<td>PL BR 2 PT LOTS 47, 48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ward Number</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Property Name</strong></td>
<td>Heritage Theatre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Owner</strong></td>
<td>City of Brampton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Owner Concurrence</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Zoning</strong></td>
<td>Commercial (DC1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Use(s)</strong></td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Construction Date</strong></td>
<td>1922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Notable Owners or Occupants</strong></td>
<td>Thomas H. Moorehead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Heritage Resources on Subject Property</strong></td>
<td>Building</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 82 - 86 Main Street North (Heritage Theatre) 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 its design/physical value, historical/associative value, and contextual value.

2. Description of Property

The property at 82 - 86 Main Street North, known as the Heritage Theatre, is located on the southeast corner of Main Street North and Theatre Lane and contains a three storey building. The Heritage Theatre along with three other properties forms a continuous stretch of commercial buildings known as the “Heritage Theatre Block”. Market Square Boulevard runs along the north edge of the Heritage Theatre property. Theatre Lane, formerly Hanna Street, which primarily serves the Rose Theatre and Garden Square, is located along the eastern edge of the property.

3. Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest

Design/Physical Value:

The cultural heritage value of the Heritage Theatre at 82 - 86 Main Street North is related to its design or physical value as a representative example of an early 20th century theatre. The three storey building, constructed in 1922, was designed by renowned Toronto architects Herbert George Duerr and B. Kingston Hall. Herbert George Duerr was known for building theatres and was contracted by companies such as Famous Players and Columbia Pictures.

In 1919, Duerr and Hall formed a partnership and specialized in the construction of theatres at a time when the motion picture was coming into its heyday. Unlike many of the surviving theatres designed by Duerr and Hall, which were built after the end of the silent film era, the Heritage Theatre was adapted to conform with the changing arts and culture fabric of North America during the crucial transition to 'talkies'.

The theatre is built of solid brick construction covered with stucco on the front and rear elevations. The main roof over the auditorium is flat. In some areas, the building drops to a height of two storeys. The overall massing harmonizes the large auditorium at the rear with the rest of the two storey commercial buildings along Main Street.
The front façade features a pitched roof with decorative wooden brackets under the eaves which give the building an Italianate appearance. Its original design created a semi-public space. The main entrance was flanked by two retail spaces which facilitated the continued flow of commercial space along the east side of Main Street. The marquee, which has now been removed, changed over the years with the theatre's owners.

The interior features an auditorium which was designed to have perfect acoustics. An orchestra pit was originally located near the stage but was removed after the end of the silent film era to make room for more seating. There is a second floor balcony to the back of the auditorium, accessed by two sets of stairs from the foyer. The ceiling retains its original decorative pressed tin frieze in the Liberty Torch pattern and the walls of the theatre are elegantly decorated in a corresponding pattern.

There were previously two outdoor terraces on the second level which were accessed from the interior balcony level and contributed to the original character of the building as a semi-public social space, integrating the exterior space with the interior. During the 1940s these terraces were enclosed and transformed into washrooms.

The Heritage Theatre has a 714 seat capacity, a size which was not usually encountered outside of major cities in the 1920s. Brampton had the population not only to support the Capitol Theatre, as it was then known, but the Giffen Theatre on Queen Street as well.

The theatre's appearance and layout has changed over time in accordance with its uses and, especially in the first half of its existence, those changes reflected the evolution of the motion picture industry. The Heritage Theatre is the last theatre of its kind in Brampton and is a good example of the early work of Duerr and Hall.

**Historical/Associative Value:**

The property at 82 - 86 Main Street North has associative value as a result of its connection with its owner and operator, Thomas H. Moorehead, and is an integral part of Brampton's cultural history. Moorehead, who was a Peel Magistrate, started a theatre chain with the Capitol Theatre which later expanded to Ottawa, Orillia, Midland, Welland, St. Thomas, London, and Belleville.

It officially opened on February 28, 1923 as the Capitol Theatre. The Capitol Theatre was originally built to put on Vaudeville shows. It was then converted to a silent movie
house with a live orchestra. It was the scene of many large and heated political rallies and a frequent venue for Brampton High School commencements and plays.

The Capitol Orchestra, conducted by Jim Algie, who also played coronet, often entertained on Sunday evenings. The famed Dumbells, a troupe of World War One veteran entertainers, played at the Capitol in 1926. On stage were Ross Hamilton, Capitol Plunkett, Pat Rafferty and Red Newman.

The Capitol Theatre was upgraded in 1928 when it began to show movies with sound and the orchestra pit was filled in to provide space for more seats. Thomas Moorehead sold the theatre to Les Gregory, who also operated theatres in Georgetown and Hamilton. Les Gregory was killed in a private airplane crash and the ownership of theatre changed once more. The theatre, which is located on a former flood plain, even survived the historic flood of 1948.

In 1949, the new Canadian Odeon Theatre chain took over ownership and operation of the Capitol Theatre and operated it as the Odeon Theatre. The equipment used inside was updated to provide the best movie-going experience possible. It operated as the Odeon Theatre until its sale to the City of Brampton in 1981.

A steering committee was formed to decide the fate of the Capitol/Odeon Theatre. It was ultimately refurbished as a live theatre venue and officially opened in November 1983. In 1989, the City of Brampton, with a matching grant from the Ontario Government, restored the theatre and renamed it The Heritage Theatre for the Performing Arts. Now owned by the City, it has been unoccupied since 2006 when the City's new venue, the Rose Theatre, opened.

The Heritage Theatre has been host to many big name artists such as Henry Youngman, Alan Thicke, Natalie MacMaster, Remy Shand, David Usher, Liona Boyd, Burton Cummings, Randy Bachman, Rita MacNeil, Amy Sky, the Royal Canadian Air Farce, Canadian Brass, and Holly Cole. It was also the site of the world premiere of Sarah Churchill's (Winston Churchill's daughter) movie "All Over the Town" in 1949.

**Contextual Value:**

The property at 82 - 86 Main Street North has contextual value as an iconic landmark for many of Brampton's citizens. It is associated with a vibrant time in Brampton's past and was once a main attraction in the downtown core. The Heritage Theatre is also integral to the existing character of the commercial streetscape along Main Street and to the Four Corners area of downtown Brampton.
The Heritage Theatre is a lasting testament to Brampton's early arts and culture scene and to the rich cultural heritage that has been an important component in the growth and development of Brampton over the years. It was a cultural hub for Brampton's citizens during most of the 20th century and a well-known venue in the area.

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:

- Unique street edge condition
- Oval medallion centered on second storey of façade
- Brick construction
- Stucco cladding
- Centered ground floor entrance
- Large flanking display windows by entrance
- Scale, form and setbacks of the principal elevation on Main Street
- 2 1/2 storey peaked gable roof with ornamental wooden brackets
- Original horse hair theatre seats
- Decorative pressed tin frieze and ceiling in the Liberty Torch pattern
- Auditorium design and massing
- Second floor balcony to the rear of the auditorium

5. Alteration History and Heritage Integrity

The following are the known alterations to the subject property:

- A two-storey rear addition constructed of brick piers and clay tile units shortly following its original construction in 1922.
- Original exterior terraces enclosed in 1947 to provide additional washroom space on the second level.
- Slope towards street in lobby removed to create a distinct foyer and entrance landing in 1947.
- Changes were made to the appearance and façade during 1980s restoration work.
- A new wood screen and guard rail were added to the rear of the building in 2005 as part of an exterior improvement scheme.
The marquee (canopy) was removed as part of an adaptive reuse plan in 2012 for health and safety reasons.

6. Archaeological Potential

The property has no known archaeological potential.

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

History of the Heritage Theatre, City of Brampton

ERA Architects. *70-86 Main Street North Heritage Background Assessment.* May 2009. Prepared for City of Brampton

A link to this report can be found at:

9. Appendix

Figure 1: Map showing 82-86 Main St N (Source: Google Maps)

Figure 1: Aerial view of Heritage Theatre (Source: Brampton Maps)
Figure 3: Original 1922 front elevation of the theatre (Source: ERA Architects)
Section showing original 1922 lobby, balcony seating and exterior terrace
(Source: Archives of Ontario, RG 56-10, Container 59)

Figure 4: Original 1922 section drawing of the theatre (Source: ERA Architects)
Figure 5: Archival image showing front façade of the theatre in 1930 (Source: PAMA)

Figure 6: Archival image showing front façade of the theatre, date unknown (Source: PAMA)
Figure 7: Archival image showing theatre and surrounding streetscape, circa 1950
(Source: PAMA)

Figure 8: Archival image showing theatre and surrounding streetscape, date unknown
(Source: PAMA)
Figure 9: Archival image showing front façade of the theatre, date unknown (Source: PAMA)

Figure 10: Front façade of the theatre circa 1950, and 1953 show ad (Source: ERA Architects)
Figure 11: Existing Heritage Theater Block (Source: Google Maps)

Figure 12: Pressed tin ceiling (Source: City of Brampton)
Figure 13: Original theatre seats (Source: City of Brampton)

Figure 14: HERITAGE THEATRE BRAMPTON  (Photo Courtesy of Jeff Chalmers)
Figure 15: BALCONY  (Photo Courtesy of Jeff Chalmers)

Figure 16: DETAIL  (Photo Courtesy of Jeff Chalmers)
Figure 17: DETAIL
(Photo Courtesy of Jeff Chalmers)

Figure 18: BALCONY TO STAGE
(Photo Courtesy of Jeff Chalmers)
Figure 19: CORNICE WITH GOLD LEAF DETAIL  (Photo Courtesy of Jeff Chalmers)