

HERITAGEstudio

Alex Rowse-Thompson MCIP RPP CAHP
149 Ordnance St.
Kingston, ON, K7K 1G9
alex@heritagestudio.ca

April 24, 2024.

Paula Wubbenhorst, Heritage Planner
Planning & Development
City of Mississauga
300 City Centre Drive
Mississauga, ON, L5B 3C1
905-615-3200 ext 1

paula.wubbenhorst@mississauga.ca

R E : HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT - ADDENDUM
2625 HAMMOND ROAD, MISSISSAUGA
(HERITAGE STUDIO PROJECT 24-006)

Dear Ms. Wubbenhorst,

The purpose of this letter is to provide the City of Mississauga (City) with an update to the Heritage Impact Assessments (HIAs) that were previously completed in support of the proposed residential redevelopment of the property at 2625 Hammond Road, Mississauga. Following an Ontario Land Tribunal (OLT) Decision, dated January 3, 2023, which allowed the Owner's appeals, in part, relating to Official Plan Amendment (OPA), Zoning By-Law Amendment (ZBA) and Draft Plan of Subdivision applications, this HIA addendum letter is required to address the Conditions of Approval for draft Plan of Subdivision relating to cultural heritage considerations (Appendix 1). The following documents were reviewed in support of this addendum letter:

Application Materials

- Heritage Impact Study (ATA Architects Inc., undated)

- Heritage Impact Assessment Addendum (David Cuming, August 2016)
- Draft Plan of Subdivision (Tarasick McMillan Kubicki Limited)
- Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment (Archeoworks Inc., August 2012)

Project Background Materials

- City of Mississauga Terms of Reference for a Heritage Impact Assessment
- A Place to Grow: Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe
- Region of Peel Official Plan
- Mississauga Official Plan

Additional Reference Materials

- Ontario Heritage Act
- Ontario Regulation 9/06
- Ontario Heritage Tool Kit
- Provincial Policy Statement (2020)
- Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada

PROJECT BACKGROUND

The subject property, known municipally as 2625 Hammond Road, is located on the east side of Hammond Road, southeast of the Dundas Street West and Erin Mills Parkway intersection. The property is approximately 0.86 hectares (2.14 acres) in size and contains a two-storey red brick Italianate residence (i.e., historic farmhouse), constructed circa 1866, as well as a small brick outbuilding atop a root cellar at the edge of the ravine. The remainder of the property is characterized by open space with a ravine and creek running through the northern half. The area surrounding the farmhouse has established gardens, circular driveway, and associated landscaping, while the northern half adjacent to the ravine and creek is semi-naturalized. The property was first designated under Part IV of the *Ontario Heritage Act* in 1984 through By-Law Number 224-84 (Appendix 2), and subsequently amended in 2018 through By-Law Number 0175-2018 (Appendix 3). The 2018 designation bylaw describes the house, including its siting on an elevated location, historic driveway alignment, and visibility from the edge of the property, as well as the small outbuilding. It does not, however, note the later garage and guest house as heritage attributes.

The proposed plans for the residential redevelopment of this property were initiated in 2012 by the Owner, Latiq Qureshi, and supported by a concurrent Heritage Impact Study (ATA Architects Inc., undated). Following a substantial redesign of the proposed lot fabric, an HIA

addendum letter was completed (David Cuming, August 2016) that supplemented the original Heritage Impact Study. The failure of the City to make decisions regarding the Owner's applications for OPA, ZBA and Draft Plan of Subdivision applications, led to an appeal to the OLT and the resulting decision, dated January 3, 2023, which allowed the Owner's appeal, in part. The OLT Decision sets out the approved Official Plan Amendments, Zoning By-Law Amendments, and associated lot fabric, which includes:

- Three new residential lots; and
- An open space block.

The three residential lots are zoned R3-72 (Residential with Exceptions), with the open space zoned G1 (Greenlands) through Zoning By-Law Number 0225-2007. The objective of this addendum letter is to address the Conditions of Approval for Draft Plan of Subdivision, primarily Condition 5, which requires the completion of an updated HIA to address the new proposal and current Terms of Reference for an HIA. This letter additionally addresses Condition 17.2, which relates to the appearance and design of future houses on the new residential lots. The City's current Terms of Reference for an HIA provide the framework for this letter. Conversations with Paula Wubbenhorst confirmed that Sections 2.4, 2.5 and 2.7 of the Terms of Reference need to be addressed as well as clarification regarding two comments made by David Cuming in his addendum letter regarding the design of the new houses, including:

- "New should be distinguishable from old."
- "No rationale was given in the original Heritage Impact Assessment to employ traditional elements of the Georgian style."

Alex Rowse-Thompson of Heritage Studio completed a site visit on March 27, 2024. The site review included walking around the property, and surrounding neighbourhood. Site visit photographs are included in Appendix 4 of this letter.

CITY OF MISSISSAUGA TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR AN HIA

Subsection 2.4 of the Terms of Reference for an HIA

The following section assesses the approved residential redevelopment as set out by the OLT Decision against the potential negative impact(s) as described in the Ontario Heritage Tool Kit. Of the three new residential lots, only Lots 2 and 3 are considered “adjacent”¹ to the Hammond House. Lot 4 is not contiguous to the Hammond House property and is separated by the ravine (Block 5). Given the distance between Lot 4 and the Hammond House, and the approved zoning provisions in place (R3-72), a preliminary assessment of the potential negative impacts found that the future development of this lot has a very limited ability to impact the cultural heritage value and attributes of the Hammond House as set out in By-Law Number 0175-2018. Consequently, the following assessment pertains to Lots 2 and 3.

Potential Negative Impact	Assessment
Destruction of any, or any part of, significant heritage attributes or features	There is no demolition or destruction of heritage attributes of the Hammond House. However, the alignment of the driveway, which “follows the traditional path of the laneway as depicted in the 1877 Peel Atlas” will be modestly impacted by the proposed redevelopment. The easternmost portion of the driveway (approximately 7 metres from Hammond Road) will be relocated 5 metres south of the existing access point, reconnecting with the existing alignment approximately 7 metres into the property.
Alteration that is not sympathetic, or is incompatible, with the historic fabric and appearance	Without careful consideration, the future design and appearance of new houses on Lots 2 and 3 has the potential to negatively impact the cultural heritage value of the Hammond House. The Zoning By-Law provisions are quantitative, and without additional qualitative considerations, are there not sufficient in ensuring the compatibility with, and subservience to, the architectural style and heritage attributes of the Hammond House. Additionally, the R3-72 zoning provisions allow for a maximum height of 10.7 metres,

¹ The Provincial Policy Statement, 2024, for the purpose of cultural heritage policies, defines adjacent as “those lands contiguous to a protected heritage property or as otherwise defined in the municipal official plan.”

	<p>which is taller than the Hammond House, which is approximately 8 metres at the roof ridge. There is potential for new houses to visually overwhelm, or detract from, the appreciation of Hammond House as a significant historic resource.</p> <p>Lot 4 is relatively far removed from the context of the Hammond House, fronting King Forest Drive, and therefore, the design of a house in compliance with the zoning provisions, is anticipated to have a neutral impact on the cultural heritage value and attributes of the Hammond House.</p>
Shadows created that alter the appearance of a heritage attribute, or change the viability of a natural feature or plantings, such as a garden	None. The maximum permitted height as allowed by the R3-72 zone is 10.7 metres, and consequently, shadows that alter the appearance of the Hammond House's heritage attributes are not anticipated.
Isolation of a heritage attribute from its surrounding environment, context or a significant relationship	None. The OLT Decision establishes the approved lot configuration. The proximity of the two new adjacent residential lots and their future buildout will inevitably alter the existing setting and landscape character surrounding the Hammond House. However, the surrounding landscape, beyond the driveway alignment, is not listed as a heritage attribute in By-Law Number 0175-2018.
Direct or indirect obstruction of significant views or vistas within, from, or of built and natural features	<p>None. By-Law Number 0175-2018 identifies "the visibility of the house from the property edge" as a heritage attribute. In my professional opinion, important views of the house include looking northeast from Hammond Road towards the house, looking east towards the façade from Hammond Road, and looking southeast towards the house from the entrance to the driveway. The proposed houses will not obstruct these views.</p> <p>The Conditions of Approval for Draft Plan of Subdivision include a Condition requiring that the Subdivision Agreement prohibit fencing along the shared driveway and along the front yard of the</p>

	heritage designated property to retain open views of the Hammond House. The prohibition of fencing in these locations will prevent the potential for obstruction of important views towards the Hammond House.
A change in land use such as a battlefield from open space to residential use, allowing new development or site alteration in the formerly open space.	None. The proximity of the two new adjacent residential lots and their future buildout will inevitably alter the existing setting and landscape character surrounding the Hammond House, however, the surrounding neighbourhood has a residential character and Block 5 (the ravine and creek) will help to preserve some of the open space associated with the former 19 th century farmstead.
Land disturbance such as a change in grade that alters soils, and drainage patterns that adversely impact archaeological resources.	None known.

Subsection 2.5 of the Terms of Reference for an HIA

The OLT Decision sets out the Official Plan Amendments, Zoning By-Law Amendments, and Draft Plan of Subdivision. No formal plans or drawings have been developed for the future buildout of the new residential lots, and accordingly, this subsection of the Terms of Reference cannot be addressed in this addendum letter. However, the appearance and design of the new houses has been identified as a potential negative impact in the section above and therefore, is addressed as part of the mitigation strategy below.

Subsection 2.7 of the Terms of Reference for an HIA

The OLT Decision has finalized the number and arrangement of new lots and as such, leaves no opportunity for the consideration of alternative development options or approaches. Consequently, the objective of this section is to provide mitigation measures that serve to limit or avoid the potential adverse impacts to the adjacent Hammond House as identified in the impact assessment above. These potential adverse impacts primarily relate to the future design and appearance of the new houses on Lots 2 and 3.

The principal recommended mitigation measure is the implementation of design guidelines for the two adjacent residential lots (2 and 3). The original Heritage Impact Study by ATA

Architects Inc. provided design considerations for the original proposal, a small subdivision, which are referenced in Subsection 17.2 of the Draft Conditions of Subdivision Approval. David Cuming's HIA addendum letter refers to these design considerations, noting that there is no clear rationale for the report's recommendation to employ traditional elements of the Georgian Style for the new subdivision houses. Rather, David Cuming recommends that "new should clearly be discernable from old" and that the City of Mississauga's standards and guidelines for replacement housing and additions provides a basis for the design of new houses on the property. He further adds that in his opinion, no specific guidance on architectural design is needed based on the lack of identified impacts to the Hammond House. While I agree with Mr. Cuming that the recommendation to employ traditional elements of the Georgian Style is not explained nor justified in the original HIA report by ATA Architects Inc., I believe that there is the potential for negative impacts to the cultural heritage value and attributes of the Hammond House resulting from the inappropriate design of new houses on Lots 2 and 3. The most recent designation bylaw is silent on the landscape north of the Hammond House, and therefore it is not considered to contribute to the cultural heritage value of the Hammond House. However, the new lots and associated future development will be viewed within the setting² of the Hammond House.

Without speaking to the author of the original Heritage Impact Study report by ATA Architects Inc., I would speculate that the recommendation regarding the use of the Georgian Style on new houses arose from both an antipathy to the surrounding 1990s style of housing, and a belief that designing the new houses in a similar style to the Hammond House would produce a compatible built form. While I do not recommend the construction of housing that reflects the surrounding styles on Hammond Road, King Forrest Drive, etc., I believe that to maintain the visual prominence of Hammond House's architectural style and related heritage attributes, a different design approach is required for the new houses. Parks Canada's Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada primarily address the management of change to historic places (i.e. Hammond House), Standard 11 provides clear direction on the design of new construction within the context of historic places and informs the recommended design guidelines below.

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

² The International Council on Monuments & Sites (ICOMOS) defines the setting of a heritage structure, site or area as "the immediate and extended environment that is part of, contributes to its significance and distinctive character" (2005).

In this case, the second part of Standard 11 speaks to the need to establish an appropriate balance between mere imitation of the Hammond House and pointed contrast, thereby complementing the house in a manner that respects its heritage value. Moreover, the new houses should be subordinate to the Hammond House, or rather not detract from its heritage value and attributes. This is not only a matter of size, as a small poorly designed house could also adversely affect Hammond House. The recommended design guidelines below have been developed to ensure, as far as possible, that the design of the two new residential dwellings is compatible with, and preserves, the Hammond House's prominence as a distinct historic resource. Additional recommended mitigation measures follow the design guidelines.

1. Design Guidelines

In addition to complying with the R3-72 zone provisions, additional design guidelines are needed to ensure that the adjacent future residential dwellings are compatible with, and do not adversely impact, the cultural heritage values, and attributes of the Hammond House. The following design guidelines should be included in the Subdivision Agreement.

- a. ***Architectural Style*** – The design of the new houses should not seek to replicate or mirror the architectural style of the Hammond House, but rather provide a gentle distinction. An established and often successful approach when designing new houses within the context of historic ones, is to employ traditional massing (i.e., rectilinear forms with simple roof forms) and either utilize modern detailing or simplified traditional detailing. In other words, avoid replicating earlier eras of architectural design and ornate or intricate detailing like on the Hammond House. Importantly, do not design the new houses in such a way that draws undue attention towards them.
- b. ***Height*** – The new houses should be between one and two storeys in height or approximately the same height or lower than Hammond House. The Hammond House's height is estimated at approximately 8.0 metres to the ridge of the roof, based on brick coursing. If overall heights of the new houses are proposed to be slightly taller than the Hammond House, they should be designed in such a way to minimize their perceived scale. Additionally, Heritage Planning staff should review and confirm that the proposed height will conserve the visual prominence of the Hammond House.

The first-floor heights of the new houses should be approximately 0.6 metres (1.9 feet) to ensure that their overall heights, datum points, and character, are consistent with the Hammond House, which sits just above grade with the rear above grade as the land slopes away to the east.

- c. **Massing** – Massing is an architectural term to describe the perception of the shape, form, and size of a building. The massing of a building provides the most immediate and significant visual impact of a building, and often corresponds to architectural styles. Hammond House’s massing is symmetrical with a vertical emphasis (i.e., proportions of windows, tall chimneys, central projecting gabled pavilion, quoining, etc.), characteristic of its Italianate Style with Gothic detailing. The new houses should include this sense of verticality in their massing but avoid elaborate or ornate architectural detailing.

- i. **Roof form** – New roof forms should be simple and could include side or end gable roofs. Hipped roofs should be avoided to retain the prominence and distinction of Hammond House’s hipped roof.

Steep pitches, cross-gables, multiple gables, and polygonal towers should be avoided as they can add significant height and massing to a building and on the new houses, could overpower the Hammond House.

- ii. **Windows** – The appearance of Hammond House is more wall surface (solids) than windows (voids). Original window openings have a vertical emphasis/proportion and are symmetrically placed on the elevations. The design and placement of windows on the new houses should generally reflect this character and pattern; however, the design and placement of windows does not need to replicate the Hammond House. For example, openings could be horizontal in shape, but include a vertical emphasis through their arrangement or division of lights or placed to create a sense of balance, but not perfect symmetry.

Modern windows can be plain without any divisions. If traditional windows (vertically sliding sash or casement) are employed, they should have a vertical emphasis (i.e., vertically oriented rectangular panes, not square), and use externally applied simulated divided lights (i.e., not internal divisions).

- d. **Exterior Cladding Materials** – To retain the visual prominence of Hammond House, brick should be avoided. Instead, utilize other traditional materials such as wood or stucco. Equally, new materials should reflect these traditional materials, but may include modern iterations, for example, painted wood composite siding or painted fibre cement board siding or shingles.

Furthermore, select colours for the exterior cladding that contrast, and do not match, the red brick on the Hammond House, to retain the historic house’s visual prominence.

- e. **Garages** – Integral garages should be set back, a minimum of 6", from the façade. Hardscaping should be limited to the area (i.e., driveway) in front of the garage with the remaining front yard landscaped with soft materials and plants to maintain and enhance the setting of the Hammond House.
- f. **Fencing** – To conserve views of Hammond House, fencing should not be permitted along the shared driveway.

2. Protection of Hammond House

In line with Mr. Cuming's recommendation, Hammond House should be protected during the construction phases of adjacent new houses. For example, temporary fencing should be erected to protect the Hammond House by ensuring construction machinery is restricted to Lots 2 and 3 and portions of the existing driveway. Additionally, excess accumulation of water should be disposed of during excavation of Lots 2 and 3 to avoid unnecessary runoff towards the Hammond House.

3. Archival Documentation

Copies of the two previous Heritage Impact Assessments as well as this addendum letter should be filed with the City of Mississauga Public Library and/or the Peel Art Gallery and Museum Archives as a record of the Hammond House's history and evolution.

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS

In my professional opinion, the primary identified potential negative impact resulting from the approved lot fabric is the inappropriate design of future houses on Lots 2 and 3, which can be mitigated through the implementation of the recommended design guidelines in this letter. The inclusion of these design guidelines in the Subdivision Agreement as well as the implementation of the remaining cultural heritage Conditions of Approval for the Plan of Subdivision in the OLT Decision, will ensure that the cultural heritage value and attributes of the Hammond House will be conserved. From a heritage conservation perspective, no additional studies are recommended.

Recommendations:

1. That the Subdivision Agreement include the recommended "Design Guidelines" contained within this letter in lieu of the design considerations outlined in pages 17-27 of the document entitled "2625 Hammond Road: Heritage Impact Study & Urban Design Guideline" by ATA Architects Inc.

2. That the City of Mississauga consider the installation of an interpretation plaque within the City's right-of-way, to improve the public's understanding of the history and evolution of the Hammond House farmstead. The plaque could be installed adjacent to the original driveway alignment, along Hammond Road. Significantly, the plaque could include the c.1870 photograph and 1877 Illustration Historical County Atlas of Peel map to demonstrate the small change in the alignment of the historic driveway.

I trust that the comments provided are to your satisfaction. Please contact me should you require any further details or wish to discuss the contents of this letter.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read 'A. Thompson' or 'Alex Thompson', written in a cursive style.

Alex Rowse-Thompson MCIP RPP CAHP
Principal, Heritage Studio

Appendix 1: OLT Decision

5.0 The applicant/owner shall provide all outstanding reports, plans or studies required by agency and departmental comments. The following satisfactory material will be required to be submitted:

- Revised Heritage Impact Assessment to address new proposal and current terms of reference

17.0 Prior to final approval, Culture Planning requires the following:

- 17.1 That the Subdivision Agreement contains provisions requiring that the shared driveway be a drivable grass or ground cover driveway;
- 17.2 That the Subdivision Agreement contain provisions requiring that infill development adhere to the design considerations outlined in pages 17 to 27 in the document entitled "2625 Hammond Road: Heritage Impact Study and Urban Design Guideline" by ATA Architects Inc., which was received by Planning & Building on December 5, 2012, and be subject to approval by Council in consultation with the Heritage Advisory Committee;
- 17.3 That the Subdivision Agreement contains provisions prohibiting fencing along the shared driveway and along the front yard of the heritage designated property in order to retain open views of the Hammond House.

Appendix 2: By-Law Number 224-84

SCHEDULE 'A' TO BY-LAW NO. 224-84

SHORT STATEMENT OF THE REASONS FOR

THE PROPOSED DESIGNATION

The Hammond House is listed on the Heritage Inventory and is recommended for designation for its architectural and contextual importance. Built by Thomas Hammond, c 1866, the house is a fine example of the type of farmhouse recommended by the Canadian Journal, The Canada Farmer in the mid-1860's. The building achieves distinction through the use of a variety of stylistic details. Architectural features of importance include the central projecting bay terminating at roof level in a gable, Italianate brackets, stone quoining and paired round headed windows in the gable ends of the rear addition. Contexturally, the house is a recognizable reminder of 19th settlement in Erindale and Mississauga.

Appendix 3: By-Law Number 0175-2018

SCHEDULE 'A' TO BY-LAW NO. 0175-2018

Description of Property – Hammond Farmhouse, approximately the south half of 2625 Hammond Road

The Hammond Farmhouse is a two storey brick residence located on the east side of Hammond Road, south of Dundas Street West. The property includes an outbuilding atop a root cellar at the ravine edge.

Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest

The Hammond Farmhouse has design value as it is representative of the vernacular Italianate style of architecture with the use of Gothic detailing organized around a symmetrical arrangement of façades and building forms.

The Hammond Farmhouse has historical and associative value because it is associated with the Hammond family, a family that was significant to the local community of Erindale and Toronto Township. As a Toronto Township farmer, merchant, auditor and justice of the peace, Oliver Hammond contributed to the development of the local nineteenth century community. Son Thomas Hammond was also a successful farmer and fruit grower. The Hammond family contributed financially to the 1886 reconstruction of the second St. Peter's Anglican Church.

The property also has historical and associative value as it yields information that contributes to an understanding of Toronto Township's evolving farm culture. Major Harry Gilmore Pepall owned the property from 1934 to 1967. He was a "gentleman farmer" who generally hired others to run his farm. He built a small cottage, which he dubbed "roothouse," on the ravine edge atop an existing root cellar. It served as extra sleeping quarters for the family and their guests, as well as farmhands.

The Hammond Farmhouse has contextual value because it is a landmark within its community and it is visually linked to its surroundings.

The former Hammond Farmhouse: Description of Heritage Attributes

- The shape, form and materials of the Hammond Farmhouse, its vernacular Italianate style, symmetrical proportions and Gothic detailing
- The shape and form of the original Hammond Farmhouse roof
- The symmetrical projecting frontispiece
- The tall symmetrical brick chimneys and their shape, form and materials
- The stone quoining at the corners of the original Hammond Farmhouse
- The symmetrical and rectangular window openings of the original Hammond Farmhouse
- The stone window lintels and sills and their placement, shape, form and materials
- The paired round headed windows with round louvers, their placement, form and material
- The bracketed eaves, their material, shape form and location
- The molded brackets, their shape, form and materials and location
- The exterior panelled frieze and its shape form, materials and location
- The Credit Valley stone foundation
- The small outbuilding on the ravine edge at the rear of the property, its shape and form and original materials and stone foundation; i.e. the former root cellar
- The house's siting on an elevated location on the property
- The driveway alignment, which follows the traditional path of the laneway as depicted in the 1877 Peel atlas
- The visibility of the house from the property edge

Appendix 4: Site Visit Photographs of the Hammond House and Property (March 27, 2024)



Looking east towards the façade of Hammond House.



Looking northeast towards Hammond House.



Looking southeast towards Hammond House.



Looking east along the driveway towards the Hammond House.



Hammond House façade with addition to the south.



North and west elevations of the Hammond House.



Looking southeast towards rear wing of Hammond House, small outbuilding, and modern detached garage.



Looking southwest towards Hammond House from King Forrest Drive.



Looking northwest towards location of future houses on Lots 2 and 3.



Looking north towards location of future houses on Lots 2 and 3.



Looking north towards location of future houses on Lots 2 and 3.