

# AGENDA

#### HERITAGE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

#### THE CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF MISSISSAUGA

#### **TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 9, 2014 – 9:30 A.M.**

#### COUNCIL CHAMBER SECOND FLOOR, CIVIC CENTRE 300 CITY CENTRE DRIVE, MISSISSAUGA, ONTARIO, L5B 3C1 http://www.mississauga.ca/portal/cityhall/heritageadvisory

#### Members

Councillor George Carlson, Ward 11 (CHAIR) Councillor Jim Tovey, Ward 1 (VICE-CHAIR) Robert Cutmore, Citizen Member David Dodaro, Citizen Member Mohammad N. Haque, Citizen Member James Holmes, Citizen Member Rick Mateljan, Citizen Member Cameron McCuaig, Citizen Member Michael Spaziani, Citizen Member Michelle Walmsley, Citizen Member Matthew N. Wilkinson, Citizen Member

NOTE: Heritage Advisory Committee Members are encouraged to visit the properties listed on agendas prior to Committee meetings in order to gain information and context.

CONTACT PERSON: Mumtaz Alikhan, Legislative Coordinator, Office of the City Clerk Telephone Number: 905-615-3200, ext. 5425; Fax Number: 905-615-4181 Email Address: mumtaz.alikhan@mississauga.ca **NOTE:** Heritage Impact Assessments related to properties in this Agenda can be viewed in person by appointment in Heritage Office, Culture Division, 201 City Centre Drive, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor – 905-615-3200 ext. 4064.

#### CALL TO ORDER

#### APPROVAL OF AGENDA

#### DECLARATIONS OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST

#### DEPUTATIONS

A. Proposed New Dwelling at 1066 Old Derry Road – Alison Strickland, Partner, Strickland Mateljan Design Associates Ltd.

#### MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED

- 1. Approval of Minutes of Previous Meeting held on July 22, 2014
- 2. <u>Proposed Part IV Heritage Designation, Hammond Property, Cultural Heritage</u> Landscape, 2625 Hammond Road (Ward 8)

#### **RECOMMENDATION FOR APPROVAL**

That a by-law be enacted to designate the property located at 2625 Hammond Road, in its entirety under Section 29 (1) of the *Ontario Heritage Act* for its historical/associative, physical/design and contextual value and that the appropriate City officials be authorized and directed to take the necessary action to give effect thereto.

3. <u>Alteration of a Designated Part V Property, 7005 Pond Street, Meadowvale Village</u> <u>Heritage Conservation District (Ward 11)</u>

#### **RECOMMENDATION FOR APPROVAL**

That the Corporate Report dated August 27, 2014, from the Commissioner of Community Services regarding the owner's request to alter the property located at 7005 Pond Street, which is Designated under Part V of the Ontario Heritage Act as part of the Meadowvale Village Heritage Conservation District, be adopted in accordance with the following:

- 1. That the demolition of the existing detached garage and construction of a new garage be approved;
- 2. That the addition of a second chimney and cooking fire be approved;
- 3. That the relocation of a secondary door from the south front façade to the west side of the new addition be approved;

- 4. That the change in slope to the primary structure's roof be approved;
- 5. That the construction of an arcade roof joining the end of the dwelling to the end of the garage be denied;
- 6. That the appropriate City officials be authorized and directed to take the necessary action to give effect thereto.

#### 4. <u>Request to Demolish a Heritage Listed Property Within a Cultural Landscape, 1411</u> <u>Glenwood Drive (Ward 1)</u>

#### **RECOMMENDATION FOR APPROVAL**

That the property at 1411 Glenwood Drive (Ward 1), which is listed on the City's Heritage Register as part of the Mineola West Neighbourhood Cultural Landscape, is not worthy of heritage designation, and consequently, that the owner's request to demolish the structure be approved and that the appropriate City officials be authorized and directed to take the necessary action to give effect thereto, as described in the Corporate Report dated August 14, 2014 from the Commissioner of Community Services.

5. <u>Request to Demolish a Heritage Listed Property Within a Cultural Landscape, 26 Cotton</u> <u>Drive (Ward 1)</u>

#### **RECOMMENDATION FOR APPROVAL**

That the property at 26 Cotton Drive (Ward 1), which is listed on the City's Heritage Register as part of the Mineola West Neighbourhood Cultural Landscape, is not worthy of heritage designation, and consequently, that the owner's request to demolish the structure be approved and that the appropriate City officials be authorized and directed to take the necessary action to give effect thereto, as described in the Corporate Report dated August 14, 2014 from the Commissioner of Community Services.

6. <u>Request to Demolish a Heritage Listed Property Within a Cultural Landscape, 1470</u> <u>Mississauga Road (Ward 2)</u>

#### RECOMMENDATION FOR APPROVAL

That the property at 1470 Mississauga Road (Ward 2), which is listed on the City's Heritage Register as part of the Mineola West Neighbourhood Cultural Landscape, is not worthy of heritage designation, and consequently, that the owner's request to demolish the structure be approved and that the appropriate City officials be authorized and directed to take the necessary action to give effect thereto, as described in the Corporate Report dated August 14, 2014 from the Commissioner of Community Services.

7. <u>Request to Demolish a Heritage Listed Property Within a Cultural Landscape, 2098</u> <u>Mississauga Road (Ward 8)</u>

#### RECOMMENDATION FOR APPROVAL

That the property at 2098 Mississauga Road (Ward 8), which is listed on the City's Heritage Register as part of the Mineola West Neighbourhood Cultural Landscape, is not worthy of heritage designation, and consequently, that the owner's request to demolish the structure be approved and that the appropriate City officials be authorized and directed to take the necessary action to give effect thereto, as described in the Corporate Report dated August 14, 2014 from the Commissioner of Community Services.

8. <u>Request to Demolish a Heritage Listed Property Within a Cultural Landscape, 1617</u> <u>Blythe Road (Ward 8)</u>

#### RECOMMENDATION FOR APPROVAL

That the property at 1617 Blythe Road (Ward 8), which is listed on the City's Heritage Register as part of the Credit River Corridor Cultural Landscape, is not worthy of heritage designation, and consequently, that the owner's request to demolish the structure be approved and that the appropriate City officials be authorized and directed to take the necessary action to give effect thereto, as described in the Corporate Report dated August 14, 2014 from the Commissioner of Community Services.

9. <u>2014 Designated Heritage Property Grant Program Payment Revision Notification for</u> <u>7067 Pond Street</u>

Memorandum dated August 26, 2014 from Elaine Eigl, Heritage Coordinator.

10. <u>Monthly Update Memorandum from Heritage Planning</u> Memorandum dated August 25 2, 2014 from Laura Waldie, Heritage Coordinator, providing a monthly update from Heritage Coordinators for receipt.

#### 11. SUBCOMMITTEE UPDATES FROM CHAIRS

Heritage Designation Subcommittee Public Awareness Subcommittee

- 12. INFORMATION ITEMS
  - (a) <u>New Procedure for Accessing Heritage Impact Assessments</u> Memorandum dated August 29, 2014 from Mumtaz Alikhan, Legislative Coordinator.

DATE OF NEXT MEETING - Tuesday, December 9, 2014 at 9:30 a.m., Council Chamber

#### OTHER BUSINESS

ADJOURNMENT



# **DRAFT MINUTES**

# HERITAGE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

THE CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF MISSISSAUGA

## TUESDAY, JULY 22, 2014 - 9:30 A.M.

COUNCIL CHAMBER SECOND FLOOR, CIVIC CENTRE 300 CITY CENTRE DRIVE, MISSISSAUGA, ONTARIO, L5B 3C1 www.mississauga.ca

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Councillor George Carlson, Ward 11 (CHAIR) Robert Cutmore, Citizen Member James Holmes, Citizen Member Rick Mateljan, Citizen Member Cameron McCuaig, Citizen Member Michael Spaziani, Citizen Member Matthew N. Wilkinson, Citizen Member

MEMBER ABSENT:

Councillor Jim Tovey, Ward 1 (VICE-CHAIR) Mohammad N. Haque, Citizen Member David Dodaro, Citizen Member Michelle Walmsley, Citizen Member

STAFF PRESENT:

Laura Waldie, Heritage Coordinator, Culture Division Greg Magirescu, Acting Manager, Culture & Heritage Planning Mark Warrack, Cultural Planner, Culture Division Meaghan Fitzgibbon, Researcher, Culture Division Mumtaz Alikhan, Legislative Coordinator 1-2

#### July 22, 2014

NOTE: The Committee changed the order of the Agenda and the Minutes reflect the order of the meeting.

CALL TO ORDER - 9:35 a.m.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Approved (M. Wilkinson)

#### DECLARATIONS OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST

Mr. Mateljan declared a conflict with Item 3, noting that his firm has worked on the project, and left the Council Chamber during discussion of this item.

Mr. Spaziani declared a conflict with Item 4, noting that his firm has worked on the project, and left the Chamber during discussion of this item.

#### **DEPUTATIONS**

A. Item 2: Megan Hobson, Heritage Conservation Consultant and Steve Hamelin, Designer, Steve Hamelin Architecture Design and Build, with respect to Alterations to 271 Queen Street South.

Steve Hamlin advised that Megan Hobson could not attend the meeting. He introduced Joseph Maniccia who was present to answer construction related questions.

Mr. Hamlin reviewed the proposed alternations to 271 Queen Street South noting the idea is to convert the two storey building into a three storeys with a large penthouse on the top floor, 4 apartments on the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor with each one exiting through a fire escape, and two mercantile units on the main floor. In order to accommodate this, the main floor would be dropped by two feet. The building is rundown, and the proposal is to clad the bottom half of it in wood replicating the 1875 style. The front door façade will be bigger but the chimneys will be repaired rather than removed. He noted that the building is beautiful but run down and the proposal will ensure that it will retain the 1875 style.

The Committee raised the following issues:

- Disparity in the Heritage Impact Assessment in which the Heritage Consultant indicates that the building does not meet the criteria of a Part IV Designation, yet her comments indicate that it is a landmark building, which in itself is a reason for Designation;
- Preference is for retaining the brick exterior instead of wood cladding and creating a false façade;
- Dropping of the main floor by 2 feet will change the internal and external character of the building and the streetscape;
- Four fire escapes will be a visible distraction and will change the character and appearance of the building;
- Concern with the condition and preservation of the brickwork under the cladding;

- 1 -

Heritage Advisory Committee

- Concern with structurally altering the façade by widening of the Arch and the Front Door;
- Animation of the streetscape and ensuring the building is in keeping with the character of the area;
- Lack of a site plan to show property lines as fire escapes may extend over the property line
- The accumulated living floor space on the second and third floors warrant the necessity of consulting a licenced architect and an Ontario Building Code expert ;
- Concern with conversion of the building from two to three storeys.

Mr. Hamlin responded that the Heritage Consultant was in support of the cladding of the main floor in wood. He noted that the brickwork is badly damaged and off colour, costly to restore and may still not match with the rest. With respect to the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor, the façade will remain as is and the chimneys will also be repaired. His client would be willing to keep the present arch intact. Mr. Hamlin noted that in order to accommodate the three floors, it was practical to drop the main floor since raising the upper floor is costly and would impact the windows by cutting into those.

Mark Warrack, Cultural Planner, Culture Division, said that it is important to note that any changes to the structure should be easily reversible in future.

Councillor Carlson suggested that it may be appropriate for Members of the Committee, Heritage Staff and the Owner to meet at the site and he will contact all concerned to arrange a suitable date through his Office. The Committee was in agreement.

The Committee dealt with Item 2 at this time.

#### MATTERS CONSIDERED

2. Alterations to 271 Queen Street South

Memorandum dated July 2, 2014 from Laura Waldie, Heritage Coordinator, entitled *Alterations to 271 Queen Street South*.

#### RECOMMENDATION

HAC-0042-2014

- (a) That the Memorandum dated July 2, 2014 from Laura Waldie, Heritage Coordinator, entitled "*Alterations to 271 Queen Street South*", be received.
- (b) That Committee Members and Heritage Staff meet with Mr. Steve Hamelin, Steve Hamelin Architecture Design and Build, at 271 Queen Street South, to review the proposed alterations.

(Ward 11)

Approved (R. Mateljan)

1-3

1-4

#### 1. Approval of Minutes of Previous Meeting

The Minutes of the Heritage Advisory Committee Meeting held on June 17, 2014 were approved as presented.

Approved (R. Mateljan)

#### 3. <u>Alteration to a Designated Part V Structure, 1092 Old Derry Road, Meadowvale Village</u> <u>Heritage Conservation District (Ward 11)</u>

R. Mateljan left the meeting for this item.

#### RECOMMENDATION

HAC-0043-2014

That the property owner's request to alter the property located at 1092 Old Derry Road (Ward 11), which is Designated under Part V of the Ontario Heritage Act as part of the Meadowvale Village Heritage Conservation District, be recommended for approval, as described in the Corporate Report dated June 23, 2014, from the Commissioner of Community Services.

#### Approved (J. Holmes)

4. <u>Alteration to a Designated Part V Structure</u>, 7015 Pond Street, Meadowvale Village <u>Heritage Conservation District (Ward 11</u>)

M. Spaziani left the meeting for this item.

#### RECOMMENDATION

HAC-0044-2014

That the property owner's request to alter the property located at 7015 Pond Street (Ward 11), which is Designated under Part V of the Ontario Heritage Act as part of the Meadowvale Village Heritage Conservation District, be recommended for approval, as described in the Corporate Report dated June 23, 2014, from the Commissioner of Community Services.

Approved (J. Holmes)

5. <u>Request to Demolish a Heritage Listed Property Within a Cultural Landscape, 75</u> <u>Inglewood Drive (Ward 1)</u>

#### RECOMMENDATION

HAC-0045-2014

That the property at 75 Inglewood Drive (Ward 1), which is listed on the City's Heritage Register as part of the Mineola West Neighbourhood Cultural Landscape, is not worthy

of heritage designation, and consequently, that the owner's request to demolish the structure be approved and that the appropriate City officials be authorized and directed to take the necessary action to give effect hereto, as described in the Corporate Report dated June 25, 2014 from the Commissioner of Community Services.

#### Approved (R. Cutmore)

# 6. <u>Request to Demolish a Heritage Listed Property</u>, 24, 26, 28 and 32 Dundas Street East (Ward 7)

The Committee raised the following issues:

- That the façade be preserved
- Treatment of the middle unit of the three unit building differently to animate the streetscape, or by incorporating landscaping or benches.

Ms. Waldie advised that the buildings were completely damaged by fire, however they will be replicated despite even though they are not Designated. She further noted that this proposal is not subject to site plan control, however she will contact the Architect with respect the Committee's recommendation for improvement to the streetscape.

#### RECOMMENDATION

HAC-0046-2014

- 1. That the properties at 24, 26, 28 and 32 Dundas Street East (Ward 7), which are individually listed on the City's Heritage Register, are not worthy of heritage designation, and consequently, that the owner's request to demolish the structure be approved and that the appropriate City officials be authorized and directed to take the necessary action to give effect hereto, as described in the Corporate Report dated June 26, 2014 from the Commissioner of Community Services;
- 2. That Heritage Staff be directed to convey the Committee's suggestions to the Owner with respect to the three (3) unit structure to consider treating the middle unit's façade differently or by incorporating landscaping or benches to animate the front streetscape.

#### Approved (M. Wilkinson)

7. Monthly Update Memorandum from Heritage Planning

Memorandum dated July 2, 2014 from Laura Waldie, Heritage Coordinator, providing a monthly update from Heritage Coordinators.

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

HAC-0047-2014

That the Memorandum dated July 2, 2014 from Laura Waldie, Heritage Coordinator, providing a monthly update from Heritage Coordinators, be received for information.

Received (J. Holmes)

1-6

#### 8. <u>SUBCOMMITTEE UPDATES FROM CHAIRS</u>

Heritage Designation Subcommittee - Nil.

Public Awareness Subcommittee - Nil.

#### 9. **INFORMATION ITEMS**

(a) <u>1050 Old Derry Road Notice of Appeal to the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB)</u> Letter dated June 27, 2014 to Neil O'Conner, Owner of 1050 Old Derry Road from the OMB acknowledging receipt of his Notice of Appeal.

Ms. Waldie advised that staff will be providing the requested documentation to the OMB. The Hearing Date has not yet been scheduled.

#### RECOMMENDATION

HAC-0048-2014

That the letter dated June 27, 2014 from the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB) acknowledging receipt of a Notice of Appeal from Neil O'Conner, Owner of a Designated Part V Structure, Meadowvale Village Heritage Conservation District (Ward 11) located at 1050 Old Derry Road, be received for information.

Received (J. Holmes)

DATE OF NEXT MEETING - Tuesday, September 9, 2014 at 9:30 a.m., Council Chamber

#### OTHER BUSINESS

- (a) M. Wilkinson advised that nominations for *The Credits* Heritage Awards are due by August 29, 2014, and that he will email a package to Committee Members shortly.
- (b) In response to C. McQuaig, Ms. Waldie noted that the Region of Peel Heritage Planning Session has not been scheduled and she will attempt to organize one for the Fall and prepare the content for the session.

#### ADJOURNMENT - 10:34 am



Clerk's Files

Originator's Files

· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
DATE:	August 20, 2014				
TO:	Chair and Members of the Heritage Advisory Committee Meeting Date: September 9, 2014				
FROM:	Paul A. Mitcham, P. Eng, MBA Commissioner of Community Services				
SUBJECT:	Proposed Part IV Heritage Designation Hammond Property, Cultural Heritage Landscape 2625 Hammond Road (Ward 8)				
<b>RECOMMENDATION:</b>	That a by-law be enacted to designate the property located at 2625 Hammond Road, in its entirety under Section 29 (1) of the <i>Ontario</i> <i>Heritage Act</i> for its historical/associative, physical/design and contextual value and that the appropriate City officials be authorized and directed to take the necessary action to give effect thereto.				
REPORT HIGHLIGHTS:	<ul> <li>The City designated the subject property under the <i>Ontario</i> <i>Heritage Act</i> in 1984</li> <li>Only the south half of the 2.15 acre property was designated at that time</li> </ul>				
	<ul> <li>Council directed City staff to designate the entire property under the <i>Ontario Heritage Act</i> on June 11, 2014</li> <li>This report recommends that the entire property be designated under the <i>Ontario Heritage Act</i> for its physical/design, historical/associative and contextual value</li> </ul>				

2-1

Heritage Advisory Committee

**BACKGROUND:** 

Oliver Hammond was one of the earliest farmers in Erindale Village. Born in 1812 to English parents, Oliver acquired 100 acres of farm land through his marriage to Sarah Carpenter. It is presumed that the Hammonds built the existing house on the subject property in the 1860s.

The entire property is 2.15 acres in size. The site includes the dwelling, other ancillary structures, Governor's Creek with associated valley lands and dozens of trees. The property is designated under by-law 224-84. However, the current designation only covers the southerly portion of the property where the house and outbuildings sit. This designation was accepted by the property owner at the time in 1984 and does not reflect the intrinsic contextual value of the heritage attributes of the property. Significant changes to the *Ontario Heritage Act* in 2005 encouraged municipalities to designate full properties to protect heritage attributes other than just built features. Accordingly, the full property at 2625 Hammond Road should be conserved, including the built structures, the treed valley and Governor's Creek. Therefore, the heritage designation should be expanded to include the entire property.

In 2012, the property owners filed a rezoning application (OZ 12/013) and a Plan of Subdivision (T-M12001) to permit seven building lots on the property. In June 2014, Council refused the application at a public meeting of the Planning and Development Committee and directed staff to proceed with the designation of the entire property.

#### **COMMENTS:**

Heritage Planning staff recommend that the entire property be designated under the *Ontario Heritage Act*. Ontario Regulation 9/06 prescribes the criteria for determining a property's cultural heritage value or interest. The Hammond property meets these criteria:

#### **Physical/Design Value**

The Hammond House has physical/design value as it is representative of the vernacular Italianate style of architecture. The house also displays a high degree of craftsmanship and artistic merit.

#### Historical/Associative Value

The Hammond Property has historical/associative value because it is associated with the Hammond family, a family that was significant to the local community and beyond. As an early Erindale farmer and merchant and in his many roles, including auditor and justice of the peace, Oliver Hammond contributed substantially to nineteenth century Toronto Township society. Son Thomas was also a successful businessman. Additionally, the family helped finance St. Peter's Anglican Church, a principal component of Erindale's history. Moreover, the property yields information that contributes to an understanding of 19<sup>th</sup> century settlement culture in Toronto Township.

#### **Contextual Value**

The Hammond House has contextual value as it is a cultural heritage landscape and local landmark that is physically, functionally and historically linked to its surroundings.

The Ontario Heritage Tool Kit states that "A building, or structure, together with its site, should retain a large part of its integrity – its relation to its earlier state(s) – in the maintenance of its original or early materials and craftsmanship." By retaining the relationship between the Hammond property structures, relative to the remnant green space, the context, or integrity, of the Hammond Property will be maintained.

Based on the merits above, the Hammond Property should be designated in its entirety under the *Ontario Heritage Act*.

The full report is attached as Appendix 1.

There is no financial impact

#### FINANCIAL IMPACT:

**CONCLUSION:** 

The Hammond Property at 2625 Hammond Road warrants full designation under the *Ontario Heritage Act* for its physical/design, historical/associative and contextual value. Therefore, Heritage Planning staff recommends the designation of the entire property.

**ATTACHMENTS:** 

Appendix 1: Cultural Heritage Assessment



Paul A. Mitcham, P. Eng, MBA Commissioner of Community Services

Prepared By: Elaine Eigl, Laura Waldie and Paula Wubbenhorst



*Corporate Report*  Clerk's Files

Originator's Files

DATE:	August 27, 2014
то:	Chair and Members of the Heritage Advisory Committee Meeting Date: September 9, 2014
FROM:	Paul A. Mitcham, P. Eng, MBA Commissioner of Community Services
SUBJECT:	Alteration of a Designated Part V Property 7005 Pond Street Meadowvale Village Heritage Conservation District (Ward 11)
<b>RECOMMENDATION:</b>	That the Corporate Report dated August 27, 2014, from the Commissioner of Community Services regarding the owner's request to alter the property located at 7005 Pond Street, which is Designated under Part V of the Ontario Heritage Act as part of the Meadowvale Village Heritage Conservation District, be adopted in accordance with the following:
	<ol> <li>That the demolition of the existing detached garage and construction of a new garage be approved;</li> <li>That the addition of a second chimney and cooking fire be approved.</li> <li>That the relocation of a secondary door from the south front façade to the west side of the new addition be approved;</li> <li>That the change in slope to the primary structure's roof be approved;</li> <li>That the construction of an arcade roof joining the end of the dwelling to the end of the garage be denied;</li> <li>That the appropriate City officials be authorized and directed to take the necessary action to give effect thereto.</li> </ol>

3-2

REPORT HIGHLIGHTS:	Heritage Planning received an application requesting alterations to     a designated property in Meadowvale Village
	• These alterations are the result of a revision to application SPI 13/086
	• These revisions were assessed using the 2003 Design Guidelines because the original application was filed before the current 2014 HCD Plan was adopted by Council
	• Heritage Planning recommends approval of all revisions with the exception of the arcade roof joining the detached garage to side of the house
BACKGROUND:	The subject property was designated in 1980 within the Meadowvale Village Heritage Conservation District under By-law 453-80. The subject property is one of the original mid-nineteenth century stacked plank structures located within the HCD. This structure is indicated on the 1856 Bristow Survey of the Village.
	A Site Plan application was filed with the City's Planning and Building department in 2013 (SPI 13/086) to construct an addition onto the original structure. This proposed addition was reviewed and recommended for approval by the Heritage Advisory Committee meeting at its July 23, 2013 meeting. Since that time, the property owner has made some revisions to the original Site Plan by requesting the following:
	<ol> <li>The demolition of the existing garage to construct a new detached garage</li> <li>A second chimney and outdoor cooking fire.</li> <li>relocating a secondary door from the front façade to the side of the new addition</li> <li>A change in the roof pitch of the primary structure and</li> <li>An arcade roof joining the garage to the end of the dwelling</li> </ol>
	These revisions were considered significant enough by Planning and Building to warrant a new Site Plan Revision application (SPR 14/105) and are subject to the approval of several variances from Planning and Building. These revisions also require a recommendation from the Heritage Advisory Committee. Because this is a revision of the original Site Plan filed in 2013, these recent revisions were evaluated under the Conservation Principles and Design Guidelines for the "Meadowvale Village Heritage Conservation District 2003"

Heritage Advisory Committee

3-3

(2003 Design Guidelines) as the 2014 Meadowvale Village Heritage Conservation District Plan had not been finalised or approved by Council.

The property owner is required to obtain a heritage permit as per Section 42. (1) of the Ontario Heritage Act which states: "No owner of property situated in a heritage conservation district that has been designated by a municipality under this Part shall do any of the following, unless the owner obtains a permit from the municipality to do so:

- 1. Alter, or permit the alteration of, any part of the property, other than the interior of any structure or building on the property.
- 2. Erect, demolish or remove any building or structure on the property or permit the erection, demolition or removal of such a building or structure."

In addition, Section 5.1.16 of the 2003 Design Guidelines states that "Garages must be detached structures and should be located to the side or rear of the house. As an outbuilding, the garage should be smaller than the house in all of its dimensions." The plans for the new garage have the structure located to the rear and set back from the original façade. Its massing is significantly smaller than the original house and is complimentary in style and building materials. However, there is a roof overhang which attaches the garage to the new addition by creating an arcade effect. Furthermore, Section 5.1.7 states that "arcades are inappropriate and will not be approved".

With regard to the relocation of the secondary entrance on the front façade of the addition to the side, Section 5.2.10 supports this change as doorways "should not be added to front facades." Relocating the secondary entrance to the side of the structure maintains the appearance of one main entrance off the streetscape.

The 2003 Design Guidelines are silent with regard to adding new chimneys and cooking fires. The only mention of chimneys in the 2003 document is in section 5.2.6 which states: "Retain original chimneys. If they are no longer in use, cap rather than remove." Therefore the addition of the second chimney and cooking fire is considered a permissive alteration.

As for the slope change to the existing structure's roofline, the roofline pitch was first approved under the original Site Plan application. Since that time, the property owner has lowered the pitch of the roof further to adhere to guideline 5.2.6 which states original roof shapes should be maintained.

- 4 -

In support of the application, the property owner has submitted revised architectural drawings (Appendix 1) and a Heritage Property Permit Application (Appendix 2).

Therefore, based on the stated policies above Heritage Planning staff recommends approval of:

- The demolition of the existing garage to construct a new detached two car garage
- The relocation of the secondary entrance from the south front façade to the west side of the structure
- The addition of a second chimney and cooking fire
- The change in roof pitch on the original structure

However, Heritage Planning recommends the arcade roof attaching the garage to the end of the dwelling be denied. The change in roof slope to the existing roof should be deferred until architectural plans are submitted for review.

#### FINANCIAL IMPACT:

**CONCLUSION:** 

The property owner of 7005 Pond Street has requested permission to alter a property that is Designated within the Meadowvale Village HCD. Heritage Planning staff recommend the property owner's application to alter be recommended for approval with the exception of the attached arcade as described in the report.

#### **ATTACHMENTS:**

Appendix 1: Revised Drawings Appendix 2: Heritage Property Permit Application

There is no financial impact.

Paul A. Mitcham, P. Eng, MBA Commissioner of Community Services

Prepared By: Laura Waldie, Heritage Coordinator

3-4



REFER TO ARCHITECTS DRAWINGS FOR INFORMATION ON HOUSE ADDITION





# Heritage Property Permit Application

Form 2248 (Rev. 2013 06)



**APPENDIX 2.** The Corporation of the City of Mississauga Community Services Culture Division 201 City Centre Drive, Suite 202 Mississauga, ON L5B 2T4 FAX: 905-615-3828

www.mississauga.ca/heritageplanning

LOCATION DETAILS		For Office Use Only:	it Number:
(Please Print Clearly)		Will the Heritage Advisc	ry Committee review be required?  Yes No
Municipal Address: 7005 Pond Street L5W	/1A1		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Legal Address:	·	-	
Property Owner:	YKENS Contac	t Address:	
905-564-3499 Fax:_		Email address:	martinboeykens@hotmail.com
HERITAGE DESIGNATION BY-LAW NUMBER	(if applicable):		
What type of Permit is Required?	. ( <b></b>	· · ·	
Alteration or addition	X Yes	No	
Demolition	x Yes	No	
New Construction	⊠ Yes	No	
Repeal of Designation By-law	Yes	No	
Is there a corresponding application , such as			
a) Building permit number	=	b) Site Plan application	on number
c) Rezoning application number		d) Other	
Description of Work to be Completed : Please attach drawings, site plans, and photographs -Demolition of the existing shed/gar	to better illustrate the age and constr	project. These may be requered to the requered to the requered to the	uired depending on the scale of the project. le car garage. Proposed garage is
offset from existing garage's footpr	int to protect	an adjacent old s	pruce tree.
Relocation of new side entrance doo	r from facade	to side of home an	d addition of a covered stoop to
protect side access from the element	s. Proposed re	located door preve	nts visual confusion caused by
two main doors on facade which also	suggested a tw	o units residence.	
Addition of a cooking fire on the b	ack of the pro	operty behind the h	ome, not visible from the street.
-Increase height of existing upstair	<u>s bathroom, cr</u> the family usi	nanging the root si	ope to help mitigate low head room
which requires constant bending for	che ramity usi		
which requires constant bending for			
which requires constant bending for 	ens	Date:	2014/08/07



*Corporate Report*  Clerk's Files

Originator's Files

	August 14, 2014
DAIE:	August 14, 2014
то:	Chair and Members of the Heritage Advisory Committee
	Meeting Date: September 9, 2014
FROM:	Paul A. Mitcham, P. Eng, MBA
• •	Commissioner of Community Services
SUBJECT:	Request to Demolish a Heritage Listed Property Within a Cultural
	Landscape
	1411 Glenwood Drive
•	(Ward 1)
and the second	

**RECOMMENDATION:** 

BACKGROUND:

That the property at 1411 Glenwood Drive (Ward 1), which is listed on the City's Heritage Register as part of the Mineola West Neighbourhood Cultural Landscape, is not worthy of heritage designation, and consequently, that the owner's request to demolish the structure be approved and that the appropriate City officials be authorized and directed to take the necessary action to give effect thereto, as described in the Corporate Report dated August 14, 2014 from the Commissioner of Community Services.

The subject property was Listed on the City's Heritage Register in 2005 as part of the Mineola West Neighbourhood Cultural Landscape, which is noted for its large lots and mature landscaping. The property was part of the original land holdings of the Cotton family, who were one of the early settlers in the Port Credit area, having emigrated from County Roscommon in Ireland in 1837. The present dwelling was likely constructed in the early 1950s.

The current property owner has submitted Site Plan application SPI 14/005, in support of an application to remove the existing single detached dwelling and replace it with a new single detached dwelling.

#### Heritage Advisory Committee

4-2

Attached as Appendix 1 is the Heritage Impact Assessment prepared by Robert Bailey. An Arborist's Report prepared by ArborFront Consulting is attached as Appendix 2. Landscaping and urban design matters will be reviewed as part of the Site Plan review process to ensure the project respects the character of the surrounding Cultural Landscape.

#### **COMMENTS:**

Section 27. (3) of the *Ontario Heritage Act* states that structures or buildings on property listed on the City's Heritage Register cannot be demolished without 60 days' notice to Council. This allows Council time to review the property's cultural heritage value and to determine if the property merits designation, as set out under Regulation 9/06 of the *Ontario Heritage Act*. In order to merit designation, one of the following three criteria must be satisfied:

- 1. The property has design value or physical value;
- 2. The property has historical value or associative value;
- 3. The property has contextual value.

-2-

Furthermore, Section 27. (5) of the *Ontario Heritage Act*, states Council may require the applicant to submit plans in support of a demolition application for a property included on the city's Heritage Register.

The Heritage Impact Assessment concludes the house at 1411 Glenwood Drive is not worthy of heritage designation under Regulation 9/06 of the *Ontario Heritage Act*. The existing structure does not illustrate a style, trend or pattern; have any direct association with an important person or event; illustrate an important phase in the city's social or physical development; nor does it illustrate the work of an important designer.

As per Section L-RES-6 of the Cultural Landscape Inventory's characteristics for the Mineola West Neighbourhood, the proposed new construction preserves the existing building setbacks; meets height restrictions; is designed to respect the existing vegetation; and preserves the existing grades and drainage patterns of the lot. Furthermore to those guidelines, the proposed new development strives to protect the property's horticultural attributes and complements the existing building stock very well.

Heritage Advisory Committee

- 3 -

FINANCIAL IMPACT: There is no financial impact.

**CONCLUSION:** 

The property owner of 1411 Glenwood Drive has requested permission to demolish a structure on a property that is listed within a Cultural Landscape on the City's Heritage Register. The subject property is not worthy of designation and the request for demolition should, therefore, be recommended for approval.

#### **ATTACHMENTS:**

Appendix 1:Heritage Impact Assessment by Robert BaileyAppendix 2:Arborist Report by ArborFront Consulting

Paul A. Mitcham, P. Eng, MBA Commissioner of Community Services

Prepared by: Laura Waldie, Heritage Coordinator

ArborFront Consulting

# **ARBORIST REPORT**

## PROPOSED RESIDENTIAL DWELLING FOR 1411 GLENWOOD DRIVE, MISSISSAUGA

**Prepared For:** 

Mr. Steve Greer Harvis Barklay Investments Inc. 261 Oakhill Road Mississauga, ON L5G 2P8

**Prepared By:** 

Goran Olbina ISA Certified Arborist #ON-1249A ArborFront Consulting 7212 Danton Promenade Mississauga, ON L5N 5C4 (905) 756-4611

> Project No: 1479

May 16, 2014

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0	Introduction1	
2.0	Field Observations1	
3.0	Methodology2	
4.0	Tree Inventory and Assessment2	
5.0	Recommendations4	
6.0	Tree Preservation and Protection Measures6	
7.0	Conclusion9	
Figure 1.	Key Plan11	
Figure 2.	Photographs12	
Appendix A. Tree Inventory Chart 16		
Appendix B. Tree Protection Barriers 17		

### 1.0 INTRODUCTION

ArborFront Consulting has been retained by Mr. Steve Greer of Harvis Barklay Investments Inc. to prepare an Arborist Report and Tree Protection Plan for the site located at 1411 Glenwood Drive.

We have been advised by Mr. Greer that the subject site is to be developed into a new single family dwelling. The existing house, paved walkways, stone retaining walls and paved patio area in the backyard will be removed. A small portion of the existing driveway area will be utilized for a new driveway alignment. The trees involved with this project are regulated under the City of Mississauga's Private Tree Protection By-law No. 0254-2012.

The purpose of this report is to inventory and assess the condition of trees involved with the proposed project, and determine if they will be suitable for preservation. The report outlines the tree preservation requirements and mitigation measures for trees to be retained. Trees recommended for removal will also be identified. Recommendations will be given based on tree condition, analysis of the existing site, and review of the proposed site plan.

### 2.0 FIELD OBSERVATIONS

The subject property is a corner lot located north east of the intersection of Kenollie Avenue and Glenwood Drive. It is bounded by existing residential lots to the north and east. See Figure 1, Key Plan.

The site and field observations were made on March 21<sup>st</sup>, 2014 by I.S.A. Certified Arborist, Goran Olbina of ArborFront Consulting. There was no construction activity on the site. The site has an existing single family dwelling and gravel driveway. There is a stone retaining wall in the front along the driveway and a series of stairs leading to the front door and another set of stairs to the east side yard leading towards the backyard. In the backyard there is an existing hard surface paved area, and metal shed. There is perimeter wood board fencing in the backyard bounding the south, west and east sides with part of the westerly wood board fence on City boulevard property. There is also a chain link fence bordering the north property line. The majority of the trees encountered were located in the front yard, backyard and west side yard. There is also ten (10) City owned trees and some groupings of shrubs in the boulevard adjacent to the subject site.

A total of twenty-six (26) trees were inventoried for this report. This inventory includes all trees greater than or equal to 15 cm DBH on the site, within approximately five meters of neighbouring properties and any sized trees on the adjacent City owned boulevard. Private trees less than 15 cm DBH on the subject site, and shrubs were not inventoried or shown on the accompanying Tree Protection Plan.

There were no tree species encountered on site that were listed under the Canadian Species At Risk Act, 2002 or the Ontario Endangered Species Act, S.O. 2007.

The majority of species inventoried were native Ontario tree species. The native species consisted of Red Oak (*Quercus rubra*), White Spruce (*Picea glauca*), Red Maple (*Acer* rubrum), Black Cherry (*Prunus serotina*), White Oak (*Quercus* alba), White Cedar (*Thuja occidentalis*), and Canadian Hemlock (*Tsuga canadensis*). The non-native species consisted of White Mulberry (*Morus alba*), Norway Spruce (*Picea abies*), Siberian Elm (*Ulmus pumila*), Juniper (*Juniperus spp.*) and Cedar (*Thuja spp.*).

The general condition of most of the trees is fair with a few trees having some structural defects. None of the trees inventoried can be classified as dead, dying or hazardous at this point in time.

### 3.0 METHODOLOGY

The topographical survey information was prepared by Young & Young (Etobicoke 2006) Inc., and the Site / Grading / Servicing Plan was prepared by Roamy Design Consulting. This information was used as a base for the preparation of a Tree Protection Plan accompanying this report. Trees #285 to 296 were physically tagged in the field and trees #N1 to N14 were not physically tagged in the field. We have added the approximate locations of trees #291, N1, N2, N3, N8, N9, N10 and N13 on the Tree Protection Plan based on field observations.

The trees that were inventoried for this report have been fully assessed documenting tree number, species, ownership, condition (structure & health), and size using standard arboriculture procedures approved by the International Society of Arboriculture (I.S.A.). The caliper (diameter) of each tree was measured at 1.4 metres above existing grade using a caliper tape and recorded in centimetres (cm) as Diameter at Breast Height (DBH).

The other information gathered from field observations to aid in assessing the tree protection and/or preservation measures may have included any of the following, but not restricted to: tree height, crown spread, age, predicted longevity, health, form, proximity to construction activity, elevation of tree base, lowest elevation of crown branches, crown structure if trees are closely spaced, and overall landscape value.

### 4.0 TREE INVENTORY AND ASSESSMENT

The tree inventory and assessment is provided in chart form (Refer to Appendix A). We understand the City of Mississauga uses the tree's drip line (or canopy diameter) to establish the limits of the tree protection zone. While this standard is followed where possible, the minimum tree protection zone (TPZ) radius based on trunk diameter is also provided for all trees as the drip line distance cannot be achieved in all cases. Trees recommended for removal are based on tree condition, analysis of the existing site conditions, and the proposed construction works. Site photographs are illustrated in Figure 2. Refer to the Tree Protection Plan for specific tree locations and approximate canopy distribution.

A brief explanation of the assessment categories follows:

**Tree Number:** This number refers to the identification number assigned to the tree and corresponding number on the Tree Protection Plan indicating location of the tree.

**Owner:** The inventoried trees were placed into one the following categories:

- P Private client owned tree
- N Neighbour (private) owned tree
- SN Shared ownership with neighbour (private)
- M Municipal tree on boulevard
- M1 Municipal / Public tree in park, open space, or naturalized area
- SM Shared ownership with Municipality / Public Agency

**Common Name:** The common name is provided for each tree. "Snag" is indicated if the tree is unidentifiable due to its dead condition.

**Botanical Name:** The Latin name or botanical name is provided for each tree. "Snag" is indicated if the tree is unidentifiable due to its dead condition.

**DBH:** This refers to the Diameter at Breast Height of the tree (in centimetres) and is measured at 1.4 meters above the ground for each tree.

**Canopy Diameter:** This is an estimated diameter of the tree canopy measured in metres.

**TPZ:** Tree Protection Zone – These are the minimum distances required to protect a tree to be preserved. TPZ distances (in metres) are to be measured from the outer edge of the tree base towards the drip line and may be limited by an existing paved surface, provided that surface remains intact throughout the site alteration.

Condition: This is an assessment of both the structure and heath of the tree.

**Structure:** This component of condition is an assessment of the roots (visual above ground), trunk, scaffold branches, and canopy of the tree for any defects or weaknesses. The presence of any fruiting bodies is also considered in this category. This is measured on a scale of poor (P), fair (F), good (G).

**Health:** This component of condition is an assessment of the canopy vigour, and assesses the amount of deadwood and live growth in the crown as compared to a 100% healthy tree. Other considerations in this category are the size, colour, amount of foliage, insects, disease and any pathological concerns. This is measured on a scale of poor (P), fair (F), good (G).

**Comments:** These are specific and relevant comments related to the structure or health of the tree and related field observations.

**Recommendation:** This is the recommendation whether to protect or remove the tree based on all assessment categories and proposed development information provided.

#### 5.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

The recommendations in this section were determined after review of the condition of the trees, analysis of the existing site conditions, and proposed construction works.

#### 5.1 Trees to be Preserved

The tree preservation and protection measures section of this report provides guidelines and specifications for the protection of trees and the activities that will be unacceptable in tree preservation areas.

All protected trees are to be crown cleaned. Remove any hangers. Prune any dead, broken, or diseased branches, and any interfering branches to the satisfaction of the City of Mississauga and Applicant's Arborist. Also any branches of protected trees that will be interfering with construction access are to be pruned to allow for construction clearance of approximately 2.4m from the ground.

Out of the total of twenty-six (26) trees inventoried in this report, nineteen (19) trees are suitable for protection considering the condition, species tolerance to construction impact and the proposed construction works of the subject site. These trees have the following numbers: 288 to 290, 292 to 296, and N4 to N14. Install 1.2m high solid board tree protection hoarding on private property and to maintain sightlines it is recommended that the tree protection fencing within the City road allowance is 1.2m high plastic orange snow web fencing as shown on the Tree Protection Plan.

From the list of trees to be protected above, there are five (5) trees that will be injured due to the proposed construction works. The injuries should be minor to moderate in nature and mostly related to grading activities and excavations required. The injuries to the trees will be to a portion of the root systems within the minimum tree protection zones (TPZ's). These trees have the following numbers: 289, 290, N4, N7 & N14. An exploratory dig, either by hand, Airspade technology, or low water pressure hydrovac method, must be completed prior to commencing with open face cuts outside of the established TPZ hoarding limits. Note that any excavations by hand, Airspade, or using low water pressure hydrovac outside the TPZ distance are to be conducted only under the direct supervision of a Certified Arborist (Applicant's on-site Arborist) and City Forestry staff must notified in advance of any such procedures and on the day of the procedures as well so they may attend the site to view roots prior to pruning. After the exploratory digs exposing the intact roots outside the TPZ has occurred. and prior to root pruning, the qualified arborist on site must assess the abundance of larger sized roots (5 cm and larger diameter) and the abundance of smaller roots that need to be pruned to facilitate the construction works. If it is determined by the qualified arborist on site that too many of these larger sized roots (5 cm and larger diameter) or an abundance of smaller roots need to

pruned that will either compromise the structural integrity of the tree or lead to the decline in health of the tree then further discussion between the applicant's arborist and City Forestry staff is required prior to root pruning to determine if the entire tree should be removed or if root pruning can be performed. All necessary root pruning is to occur outside of the established hoarding limits. These trees are to be root pruned using acceptable arboricultural standards by a qualified arborist or approved tree care professional prior to commencement of excavation or grading works. Do not leave any roots exposed for longer than 4 hours. Refer to the Tree Protection Plan accompanying this report which shows the limits of hoarding which is within a portion of the minimum TPZ's for these trees to allow for the proposed construction works.

The placement of the tree protection fencing is limited **for trees #289 and N4** to allow for a gas service connection in the right-of-way. The new gas service will be installed by underground directional boring a minimum of 1.6m deep within the established tree protection fencing limits. Connections at the new house for the gas service will be done outside of the tree protection fencing areas. Tree N4 is to be pruned to allow for construction clearance (2.4m from ground) so lower branches do not get damaged or interfere with gas service connection work. Tree #289 is also to be pruned to reduce the overall canopy and restore structure to the upper canopy as the upper canopy has a pronounced lean and excessive end weight.

The placement of the tree protection hoarding is limited for **trees #290 and N7** to allow sufficient space for the demolition of the existing house and construction of the new house. A distance of 1.8m is shown on the Tree Protection Plan from the edge of the new house to the tree protection hoarding.

The placement of the tree protection hoarding is limited and is to be placed along the property line and edge of existing driveway for neighbour owned **tree #N14**. The existing gravel driveway is to remain intact and serve as construction access for the duration of construction activities until the very last part of construction for the site. The existing granular surface may be removed carefully by hand or hand held machinery for the areas outside the established hoarding limits that are still within the minimum TPZ of the tree. This will minimize damage to the root system of the tree. The City of Mississauga takes no responsibility for the protection of trees on adjacent properties. The owner of the subject site is to take all reasonable steps to minimize the disturbance to all adjacent tree root zone(s) that are within the subject site.

#### 5.2 Trees to be Removed

There are a total of seven (7) trees recommended for removal because they will be in conflict with the proposed development and associated grading/servicing works. These trees are as follows: private trees #285, 286, 287 and 291; City trees #N1, N2, and N3.

The reasons for removal of these four trees are further discussed below:

- Trees #285, 286, and 291 will be in direct conflict with the new house structure and associated grading and construction of steps and retaining wall.
- Tree #287 will have approximately 86% of its dripline with added fill in excess of 150mm (6") due to the proposed new house construction and proposed grades. The proposed new sanitary service is also going to be trenched through one side of its dripline destroying approximately 50% of its root system. This tree will not survive this change in grade and associated excavation for the new sanitary service.
- Trees N1 and N2 are small upright Junipers that will be in direct conflict with the new driveway alignment.
- Tree #N3, is a remnant Red Oak stump which has 3 sucker stems growing from it. This tree will be in direct conflict with the new hydro service connection which will be made in the boulevard. After the conventional excavation is made in the boulevard for the connection, the new hydro service will be installed by underground directional boring to the new house.

### 6.0 TREE PRESERVATION AND PROTECTION MEASURES

 The following tree preservation and protection measures will be undertaken to help eliminate and/or significantly reduce construction injury to all trees recommended for protection. All temporary tree protection measures cited for retained trees must comply with the City of Mississauga Development and Design Construction Hoarding Detail (See Appendix B – Tree Protection Details).

#### 6.1 **Pre-Construction Phase**

- Obtain all necessary authorization from adjacent landowners in writing where applicable prior to commencement of any tree removals, or tree work on any parts of trees that may be shared including, but not limited to roots, canopy, trunk, etc., any removals of existing fencing, or any other construction related activities necessary for the project
- Prior to construction, the trees to be preserved shall be protected with a tree protection barrier. The barrier shall consist of a 1/2" thick, 8'x4' plywood hoarding secured firmly to wood posts.
- Within a City road allowance when visibility is a consideration, 1.2m (4 ft.) high orange plastic snow fence on 2" x 4" frame should be used.

- If applicable, attach a filter cloth 600mm high to the construction side of the hoarding to act as sediment control. Sediment control fencing per OPSD-219.110, and installed to the satisfaction of the City of Mississauga.
- All supports and bracing used to safely secure the barrier should be located outside the Tree Protection Zone (TPZ). All supports and bracing should minimize damage to roots.
- The fence is to be installed along the edge of the tree protection zones. This hoarding is to remain in place and remain in good condition throughout the entire duration of the project. Dismantling the tree protection barrier prior to approval by the City of Mississauga staff may constitute a contravention to the City of Mississauga By-law or permit issue.
- The applicant shall notify the City of Mississauga to confirm that the tree protection barriers are in place.
- Where some fill or excavated material must be temporarily located near a TPZ, a wooden barrier must be used to ensure no material enters the TPZ.
- Remove any garbage and foreign debris from the tree protection zones.
- For the trees that were recommended for removal and/or crown pruning that are within the TPZ limits, these activities are to be performed by a qualified Arborist prior to the installation of the tree protection zone barriers and prior to the commencement of any construction activities. Install the tree protection zone barrier as per municipal standards at the limits indicated in this report after the tree removal and crown pruning activities are completed.
- Only if required by the City of Mississauga a TREE PROTECTION ZONE sign must be mounted on all sides of a tree protection barrier for the duration of site construction. The sign should be a minimum of 40cm x 60cm and made of white gator board or equivalent material. The sign must contain the same notes and be similar to the illustration shown below or as directed by the City of Mississauga.

# TREE PROTECTION ZONE

#### No work is permitted in this Tree Protection Zone (TPZ).

This includes construction works, grading, storage of trash or materials.

The tree protection barrier must not be removed without written authorization of the City of Mississauga.

• All contractors should be informed of the tree preservation and protection measures at a pre-construction meeting.

#### 6.2 During Construction Phase

- All areas within the protective hoarding shall remain undisturbed for the duration of construction. There will be no grade changes, dumping, and storage of any materials, structures or equipment within these areas. The tree protection barrier must not be removed without written authorization of the City of Mississauga.
- Minor grading works will be permitted at the edge of the preservation zone as required to correct localized depressions adjacent to the new development. This work to be undertaken under the direct supervision of a Certified Arborist.
- A qualified Arborist will undertake proper root pruning in accordance with acceptable arboriculture practices when and if roots of retained trees are to be exposed, damaged, or severed by construction work. The exposed roots will be backfilled with appropriate material as soon as possible to prevent desiccation. Root pruning prior to excavation will help prevent unnecessary damage to tree roots. The use of Hydrovac or Airspade technology to expose roots is recommended.
- No cables, wire or ropes of any kind shall be wrapped around or installed in trees to be preserved.
- No contaminants will be dumped or flushed in the TPZ areas or where feeder roots of trees exist (generally beyond the TPZ areas).
- Irrigate tree protection zones during drought conditions, June to September to reduce drought stress.
- Inspect the site daily to ensure hoarding is in place and in good condition. Inspect trees to monitor condition.

#### 6.3 Post Construction Phase

- Following the completion of all site works, and after review and approval by the City of Mississauga staff, the protective hoarding may be removed.
- After removal of the protective hoarding, the tree preservation areas shall be inspected by the City of Mississauga staff. Any remaining dead, diseased, or hazardous limbs or trees are to be removed by a qualified Arborist as directed by City of Mississauga staff.

 Inspect trees two times per year, May and September to monitor condition for a minimum of two years.

#### 6.4 Planting / Landscaping

- Any planting or landscaping completed within the tree protection zones, after construction is completed and hoarding has been removed, must not cause damage to any of the trees or their roots. The trees must be protected for the same reasons listed above but without the use of hoarding.
- No grade changes are permitted which include adding and/or removing soil.
- No excavation is permitted within the Tree Protection Zone (TPZ). Only individual holes carefully hand dug for new planting of trees and shrubs will be permitted.
- No heavy equipment can be used within the TPZ so as to prevent soil compaction.

### 7.0 CONCLUSION

There are twenty-six (26) trees inventoried in this report for the proposed project. They are as follows:

Eleven (11) City of Mississauga owned trees are located on the boulevard. Only ten (10) of these are adjacent to the subject site. Judging by the type of these trees and their location it is predicted that the City of Mississauga did not plant some of these trees and that some were planted by the owner(s) of 1411 Glenwood Drive. Three (3) City owned trees #N1, N2, N3 in the boulevard will have to be removed to facilitate the proposed construction works and associated service connections. Two (2) City owned trees #N4 and N7 will receive minor injuries due to the proposed construction works but are recommended for protection. Six (6) City owned trees #N5, N6, N8, N9, N10, and N11 will retain 100% of the minimum TPZ and are recommended for protection.

Thirteen (13) private trees are on the subject property. Four (4) private trees #285, 286, 287 & 291 will need to be removed to accommodate the proposed construction of the site and associated service connections. Two (2) private trees #289 & 290 will be injured (root pruning) to facilitate the proposed construction works but are recommended for protection. Seven (7) private trees #288, 292, 293, 294, 295, 296 and N13 will retain 100% of the minimum TPZ and are recommended for protection.

Two (2) trees #N12 and N14 are privately owned by the neighbouring properties. Both trees will be protected; however, tree #N14 may receive minor injury (root pruning) to a portion of its roots which are on the subject property to accommodate the proposed construction.

With the above in mind, it is my opinion, that if the above recommendations for tree protection measures are implemented, the affected trees should recover from their injuries and the proposed construction should not adversely affect the long-term health, safety and condition of all trees scheduled for protection.

The inspection of the trees was made using accepted arboriculture practices and is limited to visual examination. There was no climbing, probing, coring, dissection and detailed root examination involving excavation. While reasonable efforts have been made to assess trees in this report, there is no guarantee offered, or implied that these trees or any of their parts may have problems or deficiencies that may arise in the future. Trees are living organisms and their health and vigour change over time and are subject to changes in site and weather conditions. As such trees should be re-assessed periodically.

The determination of ownership of any subject tree(s) is the responsibility of the landowner(s). Any civil or common-law issues, which may exist between property owners with respect to trees, must be resolved by the owner(s). Any recommendations to remove or protect tree(s) does not grant permission to encroach in any manner onto adjacent private properties.

The assessments made in this report are valid at the time of inspection.

Prepared by:

#### **ARBORFRONT CONSULTING**

Goran Olbina, OALA, ISA ISA Certified Arborist #ON-1249A

## Figure 1: Key Plan



North direction is towards the upper right corner, and the key plan is not to scale.

The location of the site is highlighted in yellow. (Source Mississauga EMaps)

# Figure 2: Photographs



Trees #285-286 (Left to Right)

Tree #287

Tree #288



Tree #289

Tree #290

Tree #291



Tree #292

Tree #293

Tree #294



Trees #295-296 (L-R)

Trees #N1-N2 (R-L)

Tree #N3



Trees #N4-N5 (L-R)

Tree #N6

Tree #N7



Trees #N8-N10 (L-R)

Tree #N11

Tree #N12



Tree #N13

Tree #N14

Appendix A: Tree Inventory Chart Site: 1411 Glenwood Drive, Mississauga											
							Cond	dition			
Tree No.	Owner	Common Name	Botanical Name	DBH (cm)	Canopy Diameter (m	Min.TPZ Radius (m)	Structure	Health	Comments	Recommendation	
285	Р	White Oak	Quercus alba	62,61	14	5.4	F-P	F	codominant included bark union @ 1.0m with associated crack	R	
286	Р	Red Oak	Quercus rubra	58	11	3.6	F-P	F	codominant included bark union @ 1.8m, 20% deadwood	R	
287	Р	Norway Spruce	Picea abies	37	8	2.4	F	F		R	
288	Р	Red Maple	Acer rubrum	33	9	2.4	F	G	unbalanced canopy	Р	
289	Ρ	Red Oak	Quercus rubra	79	13	4.8	F-P	F	codominant stem union @ 1.7m, 15-40° lean in upper canopy	PI	
290	Р	Red Oak	Quercus rubra	85	13	5.4	F	F	15% deadwood, interfering branches with tree #289	PI	
291	Р	Cedar	Thuja spp.	16	4	1.8	F	F	bottom half of canopy pruned	R	
292	Р	White Oak	Quercus alba	65	12	4.2	F	F		Р	
293	P	White Oak	Quercus alba	75	15	4.8	F	F	codominant stem union @ 1.8m	Р	
294	<u>P</u>	Black Cherry	Prunus serotina	39	8	2.4	F	F	20% deadwood	P	
295	Р	Red Oak	Quercus rubra	84	13	5.4	F	F	20° lean over house	Р	
296	P	Siberian Elm	Ulmus pumila	18,10	6.5	1.8	F	F	stem union @ 1.3m	Р	
N1	M	Juniper	Juniperus spp.	9	2	1.2	F-P	F-P	1-sided canopy	R	
N2	M	Juniper	Juniperus spp.	9	2	1.2	F-P	F-P	1-sided canopy	R	
N3		Red Oak	Quercus rubra	24,15,11	0	2.4			interference with overhead utility lines	R	
N5	M	White Spruce	Picea glauca	24	45	1.0		F	interference with overhead utility lines		
N6	M	Red Maple	Acer rubrum	21,20	8	1.8	F	F	2-stems @ grade, interference with overhead utility lines	Р	
N7	м	Red Oak	Quercus rubra	77	13	4.8	F	F	broken stubs in canopy	PI	
N8	М	Canadian Hemlock	Tsuga canadensis	8,4	3.5	1.2	F	F	2-stems @ grade	Р	
N9	М	White Cedar	Thuja occidentalis	9	2	1.2	F	F		Р	
N10	Μ	Canadian Hemlock	Tsuga canadensis	5,4,3	2.5	1.2	F	F	multi-stem clump	Р	
N11	M	White Oak	Quercus alba	61	9	4.2	F	F		Р	
N12	N	Spruce	Picea spp.	~25	6.5	1.8	F	F		P	
N13	P	White Mulberry	Morus alba	8,8	5	1.8			large vertical grack in main stem		
IN 14		Red Oak	Quercus rubra	nt proporty	20	0	Г	F			
Key to	les lie Owner	r Codes		int property							
P	Priva	te client owned tree		М	Munia	cinal t	ree on	boule	ward		
N	Neiał	nbour (private) owned tree		M1	Muni	cipal t	ree in	park.	open space or naturalized area		
SN Shared ownership with neighbour (private) SM Shared ownership with Municipality											
Key to Condition Ratings											
Structure and Health ratings are measured on a scale of Good (G), Fair (F), Poor (P)											
Key to I	Recon	nmendation Codes									
Р	Prote	ect tree - retaining 100% o	f min. TPZ			R	Remo	ove tre	e l		
PI	Prote	ect tree - minor Injury	L			RX	Remo	ove D	ead, Dying or Hazard Tree		





i:\planning\mapping\Special Projects\ 2008 \ConstructionHoarding\_JH\ D&D\_ContructHd.dgn



Clerk's Files

5-1

Originator's Files

DATE:	August 14, 2014
то:	Chair and Members of the Heritage Advisory Committee Meeting Date: September 9, 2014
FROM:	Paul A. Mitcham, P. Eng, MBA Commissioner of Community Services
SUBJECT:	Request to Demolish a Heritage Listed Property Within a Cultural Landscape 26 Cotton Drive (Ward 1)
RECOMMENDATION:	That the property at 26 Cotton Drive (Ward 1), which is listed on the City's Heritage Register as part of the Mineola West Neighbourhood Cultural Landscape, is not worthy of heritage designation, and consequently, that the owner's request to demolish the structure be approved and that the appropriate City officials be authorized and directed to take the necessary action to give effect thereto, as described in the Corporate Report dated August 14, 2014 from the

Commissioner of Community Services.

**BACKGROUND:** The subject property was Listed on the City's Heritage Register in 2005 as part of the Mineola West Neighbourhood Cultural Landscape, which is noted for its large lots and mature landscaping. The property was part of the original land holdings of the Cotton family, who were one of the early settlers in the Port Credit area, having emigrated from County Roscommon in Ireland in 1837. Beginning in the 1870s, the lands were subdivided into individual building lots to create much of what is now Mineola West. The present dwelling was constructed in 1954.

The current property owner has submitted Site Plan application SPI 14/162, in support of an application to remove the existing single detached dwelling and replace it with a new single detached dwelling. Attached as Appendix 1 is the Heritage Impact Statement prepared by Su Murdoch Historical Consulting. The Arborist's Report from Bruce Tree Ltd. is attached as Appendix 2. Landscaping and urban design matters will be reviewed as part of the Site Plan review process to ensure the project respects the character of the surrounding Cultural Landscape.

**COMMENTS:** 

Section 27. (3) of the *Ontario Heritage Act* states that structures or buildings on property listed on the City's Heritage Register cannot be demolished without 60 days' notice to Council. This allows Council time to review the property's cultural heritage value and to determine if the property merits designation, as set out under Regulation 9/06 of the *Ontario Heritage Act*. In order to merit designation, one of the following three criteria must be satisfied:

- 1. The property has design value or physical value;
- 2. The property has historical value or associative value;
- 3. The property has contextual value.

Furthermore, Section 27. (5) of the *Ontario Heritage Act*, states Council may require the applicant to submit plans in support of a demolition application for a property included on the city's Heritage Register.

Heritage Planning staff concurs with the Heritage Impact Statement's findings that the house at 26 Cotton Drive is not worthy of heritage designation under Regulation 9/06 of the *Ontario Heritage Act*. The existing structure does not illustrate a style, trend or pattern; have any direct association with an important person or event; illustrate an important phase in the city's social or physical development; nor does it illustrate the work of an important designer.

Additionally, in consideration of L-RES-6 of the Cultural Landscape Inventory's design characteristics of the Mineola West Neighbourhood, the proposed new construction preserves the existing building setbacks; meets height restrictions; is designed to respect the existing vegetation; and preserves the existing grades and drainage patterns of the lot. The proposed new development also strives to

5-2

Heritage Advisory Committee

- 3 -

protect the property's horticultural attributes. The new build design also complements the existing building stock.

FINANCIAL IMPACT: There is no financial impact.

**CONCLUSION:** 

The property owner of 26 Cotton Drive has requested permission to demolish a structure on a property that is listed within a Cultural Landscape on the City's Heritage Register. The subject property is not worthy of designation and the request for demolition should, therefore, be recommended for approval.

#### **ATTACHMENTS:**

Appendix 1: Heritage Impact Assessment by Su Murdoch Historical ConsultingAppendix 2: Arborist Report by Bruce Tree Ltd.



Paul A. Mitcham, P. Eng, MBA Commissioner of Community Services

Prepared by: Laura Waldie, Heritage Coordinator



Clerk's Files

Originator's Files

DATE:August 14, 2014TO:Chair and Members of the Heritage Advisory Committee<br/>Meeting Date: September 9, 2014FROM:Paul A. Mitcham, P. Eng, MBA<br/>Commissioner of Community ServicesSUBJECT:Request to Demolish a Heritage Listed Property Within a Cultural<br/>Landscape<br/>1470 Mississauga Road (Ward 2)

**RECOMMENDATION:** 

That the property at 1470 Mississauga Road (Ward 2), which is listed on the City's Heritage Register as part of the Mineola West Neighbourhood Cultural Landscape, is not worthy of heritage designation, and consequently, that the owner's request to demolish the structure be approved and that the appropriate City officials be authorized and directed to take the necessary action to give effect thereto, as described in the Corporate Report dated August 14, 2014 from the Commissioner of Community Services.

#### **BACKGROUND:**

The subject property was Listed on the City's Heritage Register in 2008 as part of the Mississauga Road Scenic Route Cultural Landscape, which is noted for being one of the City's oldest and most picturesque thoroughfares. The road's alignment and scenic quality is notable because it traverses a variety of topography and varying land use, from old established residential neighbourhoods to new industrial and commercial areas. The road also includes some of the city's most interesting architecture and landscape features. The road's pioneer history and its function as a link between Mississauga's early communities, makes it an important part of the City's heritage. There are two structures on the property. One is a red brick house built c. 1955, which will be demolished. The second is a small 1940s 6-2

-2-

The current property owner has submitted Site Plan application SPI 14/204, in support of an application to remove the existing single detached dwelling and replace it with a new single detached dwelling. Attached as Appendix 1 is the Heritage Impact Assessment prepared by The Hicks Partnership Architects Inc. Landscaping and urban design matters will be reviewed as part of the Site Plan review process to ensure the project respects the character of the surrounding Cultural Landscape. The property owners have completed their minor variance application through the Committee of Adjustment for this development.

#### COMMENTS:

Section 27. (3) of the *Ontario Heritage Act* states that structures or buildings on property listed on the City's Heritage Register cannot be demolished without 60 days' notice to Council. This allows Council time to review the property's cultural heritage value and to determine if the property merits designation, as set out under Regulation 9/06 of the *Ontario Heritage Act*. In order to merit designation, one of the following three criteria must be satisfied:

- 1. The property has design value or physical value;
- 2. The property has historical value or associative value;

3. The property has contextual value.

Furthermore, Section 27. (5) of the *Ontario Heritage Act*, states Council may require the applicant to submit plans in support of a demolition application for a property included on the City's Heritage Register.

Heritage Planning staff concur with the findings of the Heritage Impact Assessment which concludes the house at 1470 Mississauga Road is not worthy of heritage designation under Regulation 9/06 of the *Ontario Heritage Act*. The existing structure does not illustrate a style, trend or pattern; have any direct association with an important person or event; illustrate an important phase in the City's social or physical development; nor does it illustrate the work of an important designer. Heritage Advisory Committee

6-3

The proposed new development has required minor variances through the Committee of Adjustment for set-back and detached garage requirements. The property owners have received approval for their minor variance application.

FINANCIAL IMPACT: There is no financial impact.

#### **CONCLUSION:**

The property owner of 1470 Mississauga Road has requested permission to demolish a structure on a property that is listed within a Cultural Landscape on the City's Heritage Register. The subject property is not worthy of designation and the request for demolition should, therefore, be recommended for approval.

#### ATTACHMENTS:

Appendix 1: Heritage Impact Assessment by The Hicks Partnership Architects Inc.

Paul A. Mitcham, P. Eng, MBA Commissioner of Community Services

Prepared by: Laura Waldie, Heritage Coordinator



Clerk's Files

Originator's Files

DATE:August 14, 2014TO:Chair and Members of the Heritage Advisory Committee<br/>Meeting Date: September 9, 2014FROM:Paul A. Mitcham, P. Eng, MBA<br/>Commissioner of Community ServicesSUBJECT:Request to Demolish a Heritage Listed Property Within a Cultural<br/>Landscape<br/>2098 Mississauga Road (Ward 8)

**RECOMMENDATION:** That the property at 2098 Mississauga Road (Ward 8), which is listed on the City's Heritage Register as part of the Mineola West Neighbourhood Cultural Landscape, is not worthy of heritage designation, and consequently, that the owner's request to demolish the structure be approved and that the appropriate City officials be authorized and directed to take the necessary action to give effect thereto, as described in the Corporate Report dated August 14, 2014 from the Commissioner of Community Services.

#### **BACKGROUND:**

The subject property was Listed on the City's Heritage Register in 2008 as part of the Mississauga Road Scenic Route Cultural Landscape, which is noted for being one of the City's oldest and most picturesque thoroughfares. The road's alignment and scenic quality is notable because it traverses a variety of topography and varying land use, from old established residential neighbourhoods to new industrial and commercial areas. The road also includes some of the city's most interesting architecture and landscape features. The road's pioneer history and its function as a link between Mississauga's early communities, makes it an important part of the City's heritage. The present dwelling was constructed in 1977.

Heritage Advisory Committee

7-2

- 2 -

The current property owner has submitted Site Plan application SPI 14/032, in support of an application to remove the existing single detached dwelling and replace it with a new single detached dwelling. Attached as Appendix 1 is the Heritage Impact Assessment prepared by ATA Architects Inc. Landscaping and urban design matters will be reviewed as part of the Site Plan review process to ensure the project respects the character of the surrounding Cultural Landscape.

#### **COMMENTS:**

Section 27. (3) of the *Ontario Heritage Act* states that structures or buildings on property listed on the City's Heritage Register cannot be demolished without 60 days' notice to Council. This allows Council time to review the property's cultural heritage value and to determine if the property merits designation, as set out under Regulation 9/06 of the *Ontario Heritage Act*. In order to merit designation, one of the following three criteria must be satisfied:

- 1. The property has design value or physical value;
- 2. The property has historical value or associative value;
- 3. The property has contextual value.

Furthermore, Section 27. (5) of the *Ontario Heritage Act*, states Council may require the applicant to submit plans in support of a demolition application for a property included on the City's Heritage Register.

The Heritage Impact Assessment concludes the house at 2098 Mississauga Road is not worthy of heritage designation under Regulation 9/06 of the *Ontario Heritage Act*. The existing structure does not illustrate a style, trend or pattern; have any direct association with an important person or event; illustrate an important phase in the City's social or physical development; nor does it illustrate the work of an important designer.

The proposed new development strives to protect the property's landscape attributes and complements the existing building stock very well.

FINANCIAL IMPACT:

There is no financial impact.

#### **CONCLUSION:**

The property owner of 2098 Mississauga Road has requested permission to demolish a structure on a property that is listed within a Cultural Landscape on the City's Heritage Register. The subject property is not worthy of designation and the request for demolition should, therefore, be recommended for approval.

#### **ATTACHMENTS:**

Appendix 1: Heritage Impact Assessment by ATA Architects Inc.



Paul A. Mitcham, P. Eng, MBA Commissioner of Community Services

Prepared by: Laura Waldie, Heritage Coordinator



Clerk's Files

Originator's Files

DATE:	August 14, 2014
то:	Chair and Members of the Heritage Advisory Committee Meeting Date: September 9, 2014
FROM:	Paul A. Mitcham, P. Eng, MBA Commissioner of Community Services
SUBJECT:	Request to Demolish a Heritage Listed Property Within a Cultural Landscape 1617 Blythe Road (Ward 8)
<b>RECOMMENDATION:</b>	That the property at 1617 Blythe Road (Ward 8), which is listed on the City's Heritage Register as part of the Credit River Corridor Cultural Landscape, is not worthy of heritage designation, and consequently, that the owner's request to demolish the structure be approved and that the appropriate City officials be authorized and directed to take the necessary action to give effect thereto, as described in the Corporate Report dated August 14, 2014 from the Commissioner of Community

**BACKGROUND:** The subject property was Listed on the City's Heritage Register in 2005 as part of the Credit River Corridor Cultural Landscape, which is noted for its natural heritage. The Credit River Valley is the most significant natural feature remaining in the City of Mississauga The subject property is part of the land holdings of the Oblate Fathers of the Assumption, who have occupied this property since the nineteenth century. The original Classical Revival structure on the property dated to about 1910 and was destroyed by fire in 2009 as is outlined in the Heritage Impact Assessment from IBI Group. The current dwelling structure on the property dates to the 1950s.

Services.

The current property owner has submitted Site Plan application SPI 14/038, in support of an application to remove the existing single detached dwelling and replace it with a new single detached dwelling. Attached as Appendix 1 is the Heritage Impact Statement prepared by IBI Group. Landscaping and urban design matters will be reviewed as part of the Site Plan review process to ensure the project respects the natural character of the surrounding Cultural Landscape.

#### **COMMENTS:**

Section 27. (3) of the *Ontario Heritage Act* states that structures or buildings on property listed on the City's Heritage Register cannot be demolished without 60 days' notice to Council. This allows Council time to review the property's cultural heritage value and to determine if the property merits designation, as set out under Regulation 9/06 of the *Ontario Heritage Act*. In order to merit designation, one of the following three criteria must be satisfied:

- 1. The property has design value or physical value;
- 2. The property has historical value or associative value;
- 3. The property has contextual value.

Furthermore, Section 27. (5) of the *Ontario Heritage Act*, states Council may require the applicant to submit plans in support of a demolition application for a property included on the city's Heritage Register.

Heritage Planning staff concurs with the Heritage Impact Statement's findings that the house at 1617 Blythe Road is not worthy of heritage designation under Regulation 9/06 of the *Ontario Heritage Act*. The existing structure does not illustrate a style, trend or pattern; have any direct association with an important person or event; illustrate an important phase in the city's social or physical development; nor does it illustrate the work of an important designer.

Additionally, in consideration of L-NA-2 of the Cultural Landscape Inventory's design characteristics of the Credit River Corridor Cultural Landscape, the proposed new construction preserves the existing building setbacks; meets height restrictions; is designed to respect the existing vegetation; and preserves the existing grades and drainage patterns of the lot. The proposed new development also strives to protect the property's horticultural and natural attributes. Heritage Advisory Committee

- 3 -

FINANCIAL IMPACT: There is no financial impact.

**CONCLUSION:** 

The property owner of 1617 Blythe Road has requested permission to demolish a structure on a property that is listed within a Cultural Landscape on the City's Heritage Register. The subject property is not worthy of designation and the request for demolition should, therefore, be recommended for approval.

**ATTACHMENTS:** 

Appendix 1: Heritage Impact Assessment by IBI Group



Paul A. Mitcham, P. Eng, MBA Commissioner of Community Services

Prepared by: Laura Waldie, Heritage Coordinator

Memorandum	
Community Services Department	
Culture Division	



SUBJECT:	2014 Designated Heritage Property Grant program Payment Revision notification re 7067 Pond Street
DATE:	August 26, 2014
FROM:	Elaine Eigl, Heritage Coordinator
TO:	Chair and Members of the Heritage Advisory Committee

As a result of a miscalculation of the eligible grant monies the above noted project qualified for under this year's Designated Heritage Property Grant program, a revised payment has been made to the owners of 7067 Pond Street.

At the May 20, 2014 Heritage Advisory Committee meeting, approval was given to the property owners to undertake the replacement of their cedar shake roof. Per the Designated Heritage Property Grant program guidelines, this work qualifies for a matching grant of up to \$10,000, rather than \$5,000. In error the owners were advised that they were eligible for \$3,964.63 when, in fact the project is actually eligible for \$7,929.25. These two figures represent the prorated amounts of \$5,000 and \$10,000 respectively, as the program was oversubscribed this year, and as such a full payment of \$10,000 was not possible.

K. Elaine Eigl

Elaine Eigl Heritage Coordinator Culture Division 905-615-3200, Ext. 5070 Elaine.Eigl@Mississauga.ca Memorandum Community Services Department Culture Division



TO:Chair and Members of the Heritage Advisory CommitteeFROM:Laura Waldie, Heritage CoordinatorDATE:August 25, 2014SUBJECT:Monthly Update Memorandum from Heritage Coordinators

The following non-substantive alterations came forward to Heritage Planning and did not require a Heritage Property Permit. These items are for information only.

Ward 1:

a. 1500 Stavebank Road: Cabana construction in rear yard of a Listed property.

b. 1560 Stavebank Road: Small rear addition to a Listed property.

c. 89 Inglewood Drive: Interior renovations and rear façade window replacement to a Listed property.

d. 124 Mineola Road West: Interior renovations to a Listed property.

Ward 2:

a. 1620 Orr Road: The Anchorage at Bradley Museum installed a security camera on the building. This is a reversible and non-substantial alteration to a Designated building.

Ward 10:

a. 6684 Mockingbird Lane: Interior renovations to a Listed property.

Ward 11:

a. 324 Queen Street South: Roof repair to a Listed property

LaleralValdie

Laura Waldie Heritage Coordinator Culture Division 905-615-3200, ext. 5366 laura.waldie@mississauga.ca 10

# Memorandum



TO:Chair and Members of the Heritage Advisory CommitteeFROM:Mumtaz Alikhan, Legislative CoordinatorDATE:August 29, 2015SUBJECT:New Procedure for Accessing Heritage Impact Assessments (HIAs)

Recently a request was received from a resident to have an HIA removed from the City's web servers for privacy reasons. City Clerk staff met with Heritage staff and consulted Legal with respect to the entire process dealing with HIAs. The conclusion was to remove these from the Heritage Advisory Committee (HAC) website and implement a new process for access to HIAs by Committee Members as follows:

- HIAs will no longer be identified on Corporate Reports as Appendices;
- The HIA Terms of Reference and templates for Consultants preparing these will be revised by Heritage Staff, including personal information and internal photographs;
- Access for Committee Members to HIAs will be provided by a link and password (both of which will remain unchanged and the password only renewed in the event of a change in the Committee's membership or Term of Office). These will be available for viewing only, and with the proviso that the link and password remain within the Committee.
- Public access to HIAs will be made available for viewing by appointment with the Heritage Office, Culture Division, located on the 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor, 201 City Centre Drive.

The link and password has been forwarded to Members of the Committee and will be included when agenda notifications are sent out.

This process will ensure that sensitive information is kept out of the public domain.

Mikhan

Mumtaz Alikhan Legislative Coordinator Legislative Services Division

/ma