



July 12, 2023

## SCOPED HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT

### 2230 MISSISSAUGA RD., MISSISSAUGA ON

#### Land Acknowledgement:

**We acknowledge the lands, which constitute the present-day City of Mississauga as being part of the Treaty Lands and Traditional Territory of the Mississaugas of the Credit First Nation, Haudenosaunee and the Huron-Wendat First Nation. We recognize the ancestors of these peoples as the inhabitants of these lands since time immemorial. The City of Mississauga is home to First Nations, Métis and Inuit peoples.**

#### 1.0 Introduction

This Heritage Impact Statement deals with an existing building at 2230 Mississauga Rd., Mississauga ON. It is required to support a Building Permit application to allow the demolition of the existing building and the construction of a new single family dwelling at this site.

**This building was previously studied and a Heritage Impact Study prepared by Heritage Resources Consulting (Robert Joseph Burns CAHP). That Study was prepared according to the terms of the previous City of Mississauga Terms of Reference for Cultural Impact Statements. The present Terms of Reference have different evaluation criteria. This Scoped Heritage Impact Statement relies on the research and conclusions of the Burns report and adds new relevant information from the current Terms of Reference.**

The site is located in the Mississauga Road Scenic Route Cultural Landscape recognized and regulated by the City of Mississauga.

The Cultural Landscape Inventory defines and describes the fundamental characteristics of this Landscape as follows:

*“Mississauga Road is one of Mississauga’s oldest north-south transportation corridors and has historically connected some of the City’s oldest communities, including Port Credit, Erindale, and Streetsville. While the roadway extends the entire north-south extent of Mississauga, the Mississauga Road C.H.L. runs from Lakeshore Road West in the south to Britannia Road in the north. In the southern half of the C.H.L., the road follows an Indigenous trail along the top of bank of the Credit River. This C.H.L. is known for its scenic quality with views to the Credit River and associated valley, varied topography and land use, significant residential neighbourhoods, and mature trees and natural vegetation..”*

*(Conserving Heritage Landscapes – Cultural Heritage Landscape Project – ASI Heritage Consultants )*

## 1.1 Terms of Reference

The City requires that at a minimum a Cultural Landscape Heritage Impact Statement must include the following:

### 1. General requirements:

- location map*
- a site plan of existing conditions, to include buildings, structures, roadways, driveways, drainage features, trees and tree canopy, fencing and topographical features*
- a written and visual inventory (photographs) of all elements of the property that contribute to its cultural heritage value, including overall site views. For buildings, internal photographs and floor plans are also required.*
- a site plan and elevations of the proposed development*
- for cultural landscapes or features that transcend a single property, a measured streetscape drawing is required, in additions to photographs of adjacent properties*
- qualifications of the author completing the report*

### 2. Property information:

- list of property owners from Land Registry Office*
- building construction date, builder, architect/designer, landscape architect and personal histories*
- current property owner information must be redacted*
- research must be sufficient to make recommendation #6*
- The City of Mississauga recognizes the historic and continued use of the land now known as Mississauga by the Mississaugas of the Credit First Nation, the Haudenosaunee Confederacy the Huron-Wendat and Wyandotte Nations. As such all HIAs must include recognition of Indigenous history and settlement and where appropriate, address Indigenous cultural heritage interests in the surrounding area. Specific attention should be paid to possible traditional use areas as well as sacred and other sites, which could exist on or near the property.*

### 3. Arborist Report

- When trees are a heritage attribute, and it is also required as part of the site plan process, an arborist report is required. Current property owner information must be redacted.*

### 4. Impact of Development or Site Alteration:

- destruction of any, or part of any, significant heritage attributes or features*
- removal of natural features, including trees*
- alteration that is not sympathetic, or is incompatible, with the historic fabric and appearance*
- shadows created that alter the appearance of a heritage attribute or change the viability of an associated natural feature, or plantings, such as a garden*
- isolation of a heritage attribute from its surrounding environment, context or a significant relationship*
- direct or indirect obstruction of significant views or vistas within, from, or of built and natural features*
- a change in land use where the change in use negates the property's cultural heritage value*
- land disturbances such as change in grade that alter soils and drainage patterns that adversely affect cultural heritage resources*

## 5. Mitigation Measures:

- alternative development approaches
- isolating development and site alteration from the significant built and natural heritage features and vistas
- design guidelines that harmonize mass, setback, setting and materials
- limiting density and height
- allowing only compatible infill and additions
- reversible alterations
- buffer zones, site plan control, and other planning mechanisms

## 6. Recommendation:

- the consultant should provide a recommendation as to whether the subject property is worthy of heritage designation in accordance with the heritage designation criteria per Regulation 9/06, Ontario Heritage Act
- The following questions must be answered in the final recommendation of the report:
- Does the property meet the criteria for heritage designation under Ontario Regulation 9/06, Ontario Heritage Act?
- If the subject property does not meet the criteria for heritage designation then it must be clearly stated as to why it does not
- Regardless of the failure to meet criteria for heritage designation, does the property warrant conservation as per the definition in the Provincial Policy Statement.

## 7. Qualifications:

- The qualifications and background of the person completing the HIA will be included in the report. The author must be a qualified heritage consultant by having Professional standing with the Canadian Association of Heritage Professionals (CAHP) and/or clearly demonstrate, through a Curriculum Vitae, his/her experience in writing such Assessments or experience in the conservation of heritage places. The Assessment will also include a reference list for any literature cited, and a list of people contacted during the study and referenced in the report.

## 1.2 Addressing the Cultural Landscape or Feature Criteria:

(criteria specific to Mississauga Road Scenic Route Cultural Landscape)

### Cultural Heritage Value:

- Design/Physical Value: Is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a landscape
- Design/Physical Value: Aesthetic/Scenic reasons
- Historical/Associative Value: Direct association with a theme, event, person, etc.
- Historical/Associative Value: Contributes to an understanding of a community/culture
- Contextual Value: Important in defining character of an area
- Contextual Value: Historically, physically, functionally or visually linked to surroundings

### Community Value:

- Pride and Stewardship
- Public Space

- Local History
- Genius Loci
- Tourism
- Planning

Historical Integrity:

- Land Use
- Built Elements
- Vegetation
- Cultural Relationship
- Natural Features
- Natural Relationships
- Views

## 2.0. General Requirements

### **Property owners:**

Refer to Heritage Resources Consulting report for this information.

### **Context:**

Refer to Heritage Resources Consulting report for this information.

### **Existing conditions on site:**

Refer to Heritage Resources Consulting report for this information.

### **Existing home:**

Refer to Heritage Resources Consulting report for this information.

## 2.1 Site History

Refer to Heritage Resources Consulting report for this information.

## 3.0 The proposal

Refer to Heritage Resources Consulting report for this information.

## 3.1 Cultural Heritage Analysis

Refer to Heritage Resources Consulting report for this information.

## 3.2 Views

Refer to Heritage Resources Consulting report for this information.

### 3.3. Landscape Analysis

Refer to Heritage Resources Consulting report for this information.

### 3.4 Mitigation Measures

Refer to Heritage Resources Consulting report for this information.

## 4.0 Addressing the Mississauga Road Scenic Route Cultural Landscape Feature or Criteria

### Cultural Heritage Value or Interest: (Ontario Heritage Act 9/06 criteria)

1. The landscape has design value or physical value because it:

- i. is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a landscape (style, trend, movement, school of theory, type, expression, material use or construction method, settlement pattern, time period or lifeway)
- ii. displays a high degree of design or aesthetic appeal/scenic quality, or
- iii. demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement.

**Analysis:** *Minimal impact. The building to be demolished is typical of many thousands of such dwellings that were popular during the mid 20<sup>th</sup> century and were built extensively across sub-urban and semi-rural Ontario. As such it is part of an identifiable trend and group, but it is neither rare, unique or representative in a significant way. Buildings of this type rarely displayed high levels of craftsmanship or technical achievement and none is apparent here.*

*The proposed building is an architectural expression that reflects the time and place of its construction and its purpose. It joins other buildings on the street that are similarly architecturally expressive.*

*The removal of the existing building represents a loss of original building fabric on the street but there is nothing to indicate that this house is of any greater interest than the many surviving examples of this style elsewhere in the City*

2. The landscape has historical value or associative value because it:

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

**Analysis:** *Minimal impact. The house proposed to be removed is a remnant of the original development of the site and part of the mid-20th century formative period of development of Mississauga and its removal represents a loss of this history but there is nothing to indicate that this house is of any greater interest than the many surviving examples of this style elsewhere in the City.*

*The property has associative value because of its association with the infilling and sub-urbanization of Mississauga in general and Mississauga Rd., in particular during the mid-20th century. This value is very limited, however, because it is shared by so many buildings on the street and in the greater community. There is no known association with any builder, designer or theorist important to the community.*

3. The landscape has contextual value because it:

- i. is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an area,
- ii. is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings, or
- iii. is a landmark.

***Analysis:*** *No impact. The streetscape along this part of Mississauga Rd. reflects a layering of architectural styles as the original mid-20<sup>th</sup> century homes have been replaced by newer and larger homes. This proposal continues that trend and is very much in keeping with the character of the street. The proposed new house maintains the general aesthetic/visual quality of the street. The existing buildings are respected and will not be intentionally dominated by the proposed building.*

*By virtue of its history and method of development, Mississauga Rd. exhibits a wide variety of architectural styles and building forms. This has been exacerbated in recent years because of a steady attrition of early and mid-20<sup>th</sup> century dwellings and the area must be considered to be transitional in nature.*

*The existing building cannot be considered to be singularly important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of the area. It is not physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings. It is not a landmark.*

#### **Community Value:**

**Pride and Stewardship:** The community demonstrates a high degree of pride and stewardship in the area (heritage designations, plaques, voluntary upkeep)

***Analysis:*** *This community does demonstrate a high degree of pride and stewardship and this is expected to continue with the new dwelling. There are no plaques or Part IV heritage designations in the area.*

**Public Space:** The area is a site of frequent or longstanding public gatherings or events

***Analysis:*** *Not applicable. There is no history of public use.*

**Local History:** the place is written about in local histories or spoken about through local stories or lore

***Analysis:*** *The majority of the development in this area is mid-20th century. There is no significant written local history or lore.*

**Genius Loci:** People refer to the area as having a distinctive atmosphere or pervading 'sense of place'

**Analysis:** *There is a distinctive atmosphere about this place and it is generally regarded as being a premium residential area comprised of wealthy homes on generous lots. This atmosphere is continued by the proposed development.*

Tourism: The area is promoted as a tourist destination

**Analysis:** *Not applicable. There is no tourist element here.*

Planning: The area has been identified through another planning process as being unique

**Analysis:** *This area was previously under Site Plan protection, however this is no longer in place due to recent Provincial policy changes. There is no other Planning process.*

### **Historical Integrity:**

Land Use: The landscape has had continuity in use and/or a compatible use (agricultural, commercial, residential, or institutional)

**Analysis:** *There is a continuity of use since the mid-20th century. This use is maintained by the proposed development.*

Built Elements: The buildings and other built elements (fences, walls, paths, bridges, corrals, pens, garden features, lighting, sidewalks, fountains, piers, etc.) have survived in their historic form in relatively sound condition.

**Analysis:** *There are minimal built elements with the exception of single family homes in this area. These have survived although under gradual pressure through on-going replacement and improvement. The majority of buildings in this part of the Landscape are not original.*

Vegetative Elements: plantings (hedgerows, windows, gardens, shade trees, etc.) are still evident and their traditional relationship to buildings, lanes, roadways, walks and fields are still discernable.

**Analysis:** *Not applicable. The extant vegetative elements are associated with individual single family homes. There are no vegetative elements that transcend individual lots.*

Cultural Relationships: The relationships between historic buildings and other built and designed elements (yards, fields, paths, parks, gardens, etc.) are intact

**Analysis:** *Not applicable. The extant designed elements are associated with individual single family homes. There are no designed elements that transcend individual lots.*

Natural Features: Prominent natural features (cliff, stream, vegetation, landform, physiography, soils, etc.) remain intact

**Analysis:** *Not applicable. There are no extant natural features in this part of the Landscape.*

Natural Relationships: The historical relationships to prominent natural features still exist both for the site as a whole and within the site

**Analysis:** *Not applicable. There are no extant natural relationships in this part of the Landscape.*

Views: the existing views of and within the site can be closely compared to the same view in the past (certain views may have been captured in historic photos)

**Analysis:** *Not applicable. There are no extant significant views in this part of the Landscape.*

**Conclusion:**

The existing building at 2230 Mississauga Rd. is of some minimal associative and contextual value. It is not of significant architectural or historical value. The contextual and associative value does not rise to the level that it meets the requirements for designation under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act.

**5.0 Provincial Policy Statement:**

Under the Provincial Policy Statement,

“Conserved: means the identification, protection, use and/or management of cultural heritage and archaeological resources in such a way that their heritage values, attributes and integrity are retained.”

**Analysis:**

*Under this definition, 2230 Mississauga Rd. does not warrant conservation.*

**Appendix 1: CV for Rick Mateljan**



**RICK MATELJAN B. A. CAHP**

3566 Eglinton Ave. W., Mississauga, ON  
 (t) 416 315 4567 (e) rick.mateljan@smda.ca

**curriculum vitae****Education:****Trinity College, University of Toronto**

- B. A. (4 year) (Specialist English, Specialist History)

**Ryerson Polytechnic University**

- detailing of residential and institutional buildings, OBC, technical and presentation drawing

**Royal Architectural Institute of Canada Syllabus Program**

- program of architectural education through practical and design studio experience

**Employment:**


---

2010 - Present

**SMDA Design Ltd. (Owner)**

- (formerly Strickland Mateljan Design Associates Ltd.)
- architectural design practice specializing in custom residential and small commercial /institutional projects, land development consultation, residential infill, adaptive re-use, heritage conservation
- contract administration, tendering, site review for private and institutional clients
- heritage and urban design consulting for complex infill projects
- responsible for management, business development, marketing and project delivery
- extensive experience with building technical issues, integration of building systems, barrier-free issues, change of use issues, Ontario Building Code
- extensive experience in multi-disciplinary team environments
- extensive experience in municipal approvals, heritage approvals
- Ontario Association of Architects licence with terms, conditions and limitations
- qualified to give expert testimony on matters of Urban Design and Heritage Conservation to Ontario Local Planning Appeal Tribunal (LPAT) (2019)

2001 - 2010

**Gren Weis Architect and Associates, Designer and Project Manager**

- design, design development, conceptual, working and presentation drawings, project co-ordination, site review, liaison with authorities having jurisdiction
- extensive client, consultant and building site involvement
- specialist at Municipal Approvals, Site Plan and Re-zoning approvals
- specialist at renovation and conservation of Heritage buildings, infill developments in Heritage communities

1993-2001

**Diversified Design Corporation, Owner**

- conceptual design, design development, working drawings, approvals for custom residential, institutional and commercial projects
- construction management and hands-on construction

---

**Recent professional development:**

2022	Canadian Association of Heritage Professionals (Building Specialist)
2019	OAA Conference, Quebec City PQ
2018	Ontario Heritage Association Conference, Sault St. Marie ON
2017	RAIC/OAA Conference, Ottawa ON
2017	Ontario Heritage Association Conference, Ottawa ON
2012	OAA – Admission Course
2011	Ontario Heritage Association Conference, Cobourg ON
2010	Georgian College – “Small Buildings”
2010	Successfully completed Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing “Small Buildings” and “Designer Legal” examinations
2010	Successfully completed OACETT professional practice exam
2008	First appearance before the Ontario Municipal Board
2007	OAA – Heritage Conservation in Practice
2006	RAIC – Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada

---

**Activities:**

2022-2023	Member, OAA – OAAAS Integration Committee
2016-2019	Member, OAA Practice Committee
2015-present	Guest critic, Centennial College Architectural Technology Program
2014-2015	Guest critic, University of Waterloo Architectural Practice Program
2012-2022	Member, Board of Directors, OAAAS (President from 2018)
2011-2016	Member and contributing writer, Editorial Committee, OAA Perspectives magazine
2008-2015	Member, Board of Directors of Oakville Galleries (President 2011-2013)
2007-2020	Member, Mississauga Heritage Advisory Committee (vice-chair 2015-2019), member of the Heritage Award jury and Heritage Property Grant Panel
1995-2001	Member, Oakville Local Architectural Conservation Advisory Committee and Oakville Heritage Review Committee (Chair from 1998)
2001-2004	Alternate Member, Oakville Committee of Adjustment (appointed but never called to serve)

---

**Memberships:**

(former) Ontario Association of Architects (OAA)  
 Canadian Association of Heritage Professionals (CAHP)  
 (former) Ontario Association of Applied Architectural Sciences (OAAAS)