

April 21, 2021

Tom Dodds  
*Director of Community Development*  
*Municipality of Port Hope*  
5 Mill Street South  
Port Hope ON L1A 2S6

Dear Mr. Dodds,

RE: Addendum to the 2018 Heritage Impact Assessment for the Subject Lands located at 65 Ward Street, 36-38 Hope Street, 20 Hope Street, Municipality of Port Hope  
**OUR FILE: '17357 B'**

---

The purpose of this letter is to provide information which serves as an addendum to the Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) prepared by MHBC in March, 2018 for the subject lands located at 65 Ward Street, 36-38 Hope Street, 20 Hope Street, Municipality of Port Hope (herein after referred to as "the subject lands").

The proposed plans for the redevelopment of the subject lands have changed between 2018 and present. As a result, the Town of Port Hope has requested additional information as it relates to anticipated impacts to cultural heritage resources. This information is provided in the form of an addendum letter as the revised plans for redevelopment does not result in substantial changes to the recommendations to the HIA provided in 2018.

This addendum also includes a review of potential impacts to two properties located in the vicinity of the subject lands at the request of Town staff. These two properties do not have any cultural heritage status under the *Planning Act* or the *Ontario Heritage Act* and were therefore not included in the 2018 Heritage Impact Assessment.

We have reviewed the revised plans for the proposed development of the subject lands and conclude that removal of the existing buildings of cultural heritage value or interest will result in adverse impacts that requires mitigation. The proposed new building will not result in adverse impacts to the two properties located at 18 Princess Street and 64 Ward Street.

Relevant Background:

MHBC Planning Ltd. was retained by Southbridge Care Homes Inc. to undertake a Heritage Impact Assessment for the subject lands in 2018 (see *Appendix A*). Subsequent to the completion of the Heritage Impact Assessment in 2018, the property owner (Southbridge Care Homes Inc.) and the Municipality were party to a Conservation Review Board (CRB) hearing. The CRB hearing report dated March 19, 2019 (see *Appendix B*) indicates that the Municipality sought to designate the subject lands under Part IV of the *Ontario Heritage Act*. The property owner objected to the Notice of Intention to Designate (NOID) the property. The CRB ultimately recommended the following,

*Having considered the evidence and submissions at the hearing, and for the reasons set out above, the Review Board recommends that the property be designated under s. 29 of the OHA.*


Subsequent to the CRB hearing, an Agreement was made between the Municipality and the property owner, executed by By-law No. 69-2019, dated September 17 2019 (see *Appendix C*). The Agreement states that the Municipality agrees to withdraw the Notice of Intention to Designate to permit the demolition of all existing buildings for the construction of a new Long-Term Health Care Facility. The Agreement indicates that Site Plan Approval for the development project.

The Municipality of Port Hope states in their email to the property owner (dated January 11, 2021) that the municipality requires the following as part of the forthcoming Site Plan Application:

- 1. The municipality requires a Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment (CHIA) as part of this site plan application.*
- 2. We understand that Southbridge completed a CHIA prior to the CRB review and implementation of the revised Provincial Policy Statement. We also know that the new design for the proposed long-term care facility at 65 Ward St. is different than the one under consideration at the time that the original CHAI was prepared.*
- 3. Under these circumstances, Southbridge requested to consider one or a combination of the following options:*

- *Option A:*  
*Southbridge undertakes to have its own qualified heritage consultant review the original CHIA completed update and resubmit it, taking into the consideration the information referenced in the attached Background Doc. Staff will then review and likely conduct its own peer review.*
- *Options B*  
*If Southbridge is prepared to submit a copy of the original CHIA to the Municipality now, staff are prepared to forward it on to our external heritage consultants and request them to conduct a peer review. (Note: Staff will be checking to determine whether they have the capacity and time to undertake the peer review and any subsequent work in the timeframes that Southbridge and Municipality may require).*

At the time the HIA was drafted by MHBC in March 2018, the proposed development included the demolition of all buildings located on the subject lands, *with the exception of* the existing Southbridge Long Term Care Facility and the “powerhouse” building located north of the Hope Street Terrace Care Facility.



(above) Aerial photo of context and study area. Approximate location of subject lands noted in red. Approximate location of the “powerhouse” noted in yellow. (Source: Northumberland County Interactive Map, 2018)

The Heritage Impact Assessment identifies that the subject lands includes significant cultural heritage resources and that the proposed demolition would result in adverse impacts. The HIA provided the following recommendations should Council approve the demolition of the cultural heritage resources.

- *That prior to the demolition of the buildings, a Cultural Heritage Documentation and Salvage Report and Commemoration Plan be drafted and implemented which includes:*
  - *Detailed photographic documentation (interior and exterior);*
  - *Measured architectural drawings of all exterior elevations;*
  - *Measured floor plans;*
  - *Recommendations for items to be salvaged for commemoration purposes or donation as opposed to being deposited as landfill; and*
  - *Recommendations for appropriate commemoration of the buildings and the landscape, which may include commemorative plaques.*
- *That the 'powerhouse' located on-site, north of the Southbridge Hope Street Terrace Care Facility be appropriately repaired and conserved as per the recommendations provided in the Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada. Investigations of the building have determined that considerable damages to masonry have occurred due to exposure to the elements (spalling and corroded bricks); and*
- *That this report be filed with the Municipality of Port Hope to supplement the historic record.*

We are in receipt of the revised Site Plan for the subject lands, which includes the demolition of *all buildings and features* (including the existing Hope Street facility). The proposed development includes the construction of a new 7 storey Long Term Care Facility with a total GFA of 13,293 square metres. The proposed development will provide 192 beds as part of the facility with a total of 96 parking spaces. A copy of the Site Plan and Elevations is provided in *Appendix D* of this letter.

The revised Site Plan includes the demolition of the powerhouse structure. This revision to the proposed site plan is the primary difference between what was proposed in 2018 and present, in terms of cultural heritage resources. The 2018 HIA identified that the powerhouse building is a cultural heritage resource of the subject property. Additional information on the reasons for which the powerhouse is of CHVI are provided in the 2018 HIA. The removal of the powerhouse structure is considered an adverse impact. While it is of cultural heritage value, it is considered a *secondary* feature of the site. The Port Hope Hospital at 65 Ward Street is considered the *primary* feature of the site. The removal of the powerhouse structure requires mitigation recommendations. We are of the opinion that the mitigation measures and recommendations contained in the 2018 HIA should also be applied to the removal of the power house building.

### Adjacent Heritage Properties:

Notwithstanding that the subject lands are not located adjacent (contiguous) to any properties which are listed or designated under the *Ontario Heritage Act*, the Town of Port Hope has requested that the properties located at 64 Ward Street and 18 Princess Street be subject to an impact analysis. As noted previously, these two properties were not included in the 2018 Heritage Impact Assessment as they do not have any official heritage status under either the *Ontario Heritage Act* or the *Planning Act*.

PPS 2020 defines adjacent as follows,


*Adjacent lands: means*

*d) for the purposes of policy 2.6.3, those lands contiguous to a protected heritage property or as otherwise defined in the municipal official plan.*

The Town of Port Hope does not define adjacent as it relates to cultural heritage resources. Therefore, the properties located at 64 Ward Street and 18 Princess Street are not located contiguous to the subject lands. Further, they do not have any official heritage status under either the *Ontario Heritage Act* or the *Planning Act*. Notwithstanding that there is no requirement under Provincial Policy Statement or the Town of Port Hope Official Plan to assess these properties, we have included them as part of this review. These properties are as follows:

- 18 Princess Street: Future designation planned, no Notice of Intention to Designate has been published);
- 64 Ward Street: Proposed for listing under Section 27 of the *Ontario Heritage Act*);

A map noting the location of the properties at 18 Princess Street and 64 Ward Street in relation to the subject lands is provided in the Figure below.



(above) Map of 65 Ward Street and surrounding context, noting the locations of 18 Princess Street and 64 Ward Street. Approximate location of the subject lands outlined in black dashed line.

### 18 Princess Street

The property located at 18 Princess Street is identified as having cultural heritage value or interest by the Town of Port Hope. The designation process under Part IV of the *Ontario Heritage Act* is being initiated by the owner and will occur at an unknown date in the future. The property includes a single detached one-and-a-half storey red brick dwelling which is oriented east towards Princess Street. At this time this letter was drafted, the Town of Port Hope has not identified the heritage attributes of the property which are to be included in the designation By-law. The building at 18 Princess Street is situated across Princess Street from the proposed new building on the subject lands (See Figures below).



(left) Aerial photo noting the location of the subject property (outlined in black) and the property at 18 Princess Street (outlined in red) (right) View of 18 Princess Street (front elevation)

### 64 Ward Street

The property located at 64 Ward is identified as having cultural heritage value or interest by the Town of Port Hope. The Town of Port Hope intends to list this property on the Town of Port Hope Municipal Heritage Register under Section 27 of the *Ontario Heritage Act* at an undetermined date in the future. The Town of Port Hope has identified that the property is of cultural heritage value or interest as it includes the former Dr. Powers High School. The property includes a 2 storey brick building which is located at the north-west corner of Hope Street North and Ward Street. The building was designed by architects James Augustus Ellis and William Connery, who also designed the hospital located on the subject lands fronting Ward Street as well as the Central School building located at 39 Pine Street North. The Town of Port Hope has not identified the heritage attributes of the property at 64 Ward Street. The building at 64 Ward Street is situated across Ward Street from the proposed new building on the subject lands (See Figures below).



(left) Aerial photo noting the location of the subject property (outlined in black) and the property at 64 Ward Street (outlined in red) (right) View of 64 Ward Street (front elevation)

### Impact Analysis

The Ontario Heritage Toolkit (an explanatory guide to the *Ontario Heritage Act*) identifies potential sources of adverse impacts which may occur as a result of a proposed development. These are provided in the following table which summarizes whether or not the proposed development is likely to result in adverse impacts to the properties located at 64 Ward Street or 18 Princess Street.

Potential Source of Impact:	18 Princess Street	64 Ward Street
Destruction: of any, or part of any <i>significant heritage attributes</i> or features	<u>No.</u> The proposed development will not result in the destruction of any component, feature, or attribute of the building(s) at 18 Princess Street.	<u>No.</u> The proposed development will not result in the destruction of any component, feature, or attribute of the building(s) at 64 Ward Street.
Alteration: that is not sympathetic, or is incompatible, with the historic fabric and appearance	<u>No.</u> The proposed development will not result in the alteration of any component, feature, or attribute of the building(s) at 18 Princess Street.	<u>No.</u> The proposed development will not result in the alteration of any component, feature, or attribute of the building(s) at 64 Ward Street.
Shadows: created that alter the appearance of a <i>heritage attribute</i> or change the viability of a natural feature or plantings, such as a garden	<u>No.</u> The proposed new building is 7 storeys (approximately 25.4 metres in height) and shadows will	<u>No.</u> The proposed new building is 7 storeys (approximately 25.4 metres in height). The shadow study ( <i>see Appendix E</i> )



	<p>be cast primarily towards the north-west, north, and north-east. The shadow study (<i>see Appendix E</i>) demonstrates that no shadows as a result of the new building will be cast to the south-west on 18 Princess Street.</p>	<p>demonstrates that minimal shadows will be cast towards the north onto the property at 64 Ward Street. These shadows will primarily be cast during the winter season when the sun is at the lowest point in the sky. These shadows are minimal and are not anticipated to result in adverse impacts.</p>
<p>Isolation: of a <i>heritage attribute</i> from its surrounding environment, context or a significant relationship</p>	<p><u>No.</u> The Town of Port Hope has identified that the property at 18 Princess Street has a significant cultural heritage value related to the existing dwelling. The dwelling does not have an important relationship to any surrounding natural or built feature which makes an important contribution to the community. No adverse impacts related to isolation are anticipated.</p>	<p><u>No.</u> The Town of Port Hope has identified that the property at 64 Ward Street has a significant cultural heritage value related to the existing school building. The building does not have an important relationship to any surrounding natural or built feature which makes an important contribution to the community. No adverse impacts related to isolation are anticipated.</p>
<p>Direct or Indirect Obstruction: of significant views or vistas within, from, or of built and natural features</p>	<p><u>No.</u> All features of the property at 18 Princess Street which are visible in the public realm will not be impacted by the proposed new building and will continue to be visible from Princess Street.</p>	<p><u>No.</u> All features of the property at 64 Ward Street which are visible in the public realm will not be impacted by the proposed new building and will continue to be visible from Ward Street and Hope Street North.</p>
<p>A change in land use: such as rezoning a battlefield from open space to residential use, allowing new development or site alteration to fill in the formerly open spaces</p>	<p><u>No.</u> The proposed development on the subject lands will not result in a change of land use at 18 Princess Street.</p>	<p><u>No.</u> The proposed new development on the subject lands will not result in a change of land use at 64 Ward Street.</p>

Land disturbances: such as a change in grade that alters soils, and drainage patterns that adversely affect an archaeological resource	<u>No.</u> The proposed development is sited away from the building(s) at 18 Princess Street, separated by a municipal thoroughfare. Construction activities will be limited to the subject lands are not likely to result in any adverse impacts to cultural heritage resources 18 Princess Street.	<u>No.</u> The proposed development is sited away from the building(s) at 64 Ward Street, separated by a municipal thoroughfare. Construction activities will be limited to the subject lands are not likely to result in any adverse impacts to cultural heritage resources at 64 Ward Street.
--	--	---

Summary of Recommendations:

The removal of the heritage buildings located on the subject lands will result in permanent adverse impacts as it includes the removal of heritage fabric and requires mitigation recommendations. The proposed new building will not result in adverse impacts to the properties located at 18 Princess Street or 64 Ward Street.

We recommend the following in order to mitigate the demolition of all existing buildings and features located on the subject lands at 65 Ward Street, 36-38 Hope Street, and 20 Hope Street:

- That the 2018 Heritage Impact Assessment report as well as this addendum be filed with the Municipality of Port Hope to supplement the historic record;
- That a Cultural Heritage Documentation and Salvage Report be required as a condition of Site Plan Approval (and undertaken prior to the demolition of buildings located on-site) which includes:
  - Detailed photographic documentation (interior and exterior);
  - Measured architectural drawings of all exterior elevations;
  - Measured floor plans;
  - Recommendations for items to be salvaged as opposed to being deposited as landfill; and
- That a Commemoration Plan be required as a condition of Site Plan Approval in order to:
  - Provide recommendations for appropriate commemoration of the buildings and the landscape, which may include commemorative plaques, landscape features, or other.

- Provide recommendations for where salvaged elements could be incorporated into commemoration measures.

If you have any questions regarding the contents and recommendations of this letter, please do not hesitate to contact me.

*Yours truly,*

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Vanessa Hicks". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial "V".

Vanessa Hicks  
*Associate, MHBC*

*cc. Dan Currie, MHBC*

*cc. Oren Barfoot, Vice President, Southbridge Health Care LP*

# Appendix A – 2018 Heritage Impact Assessment (MHBC)

# Heritage Impact Assessment **REPORT**

65 Ward Street, 36-38 Hope Street, 20 Hope Street  
Municipality of Port Hope

Date:

**March, 2018**

Prepared for:

**CVH (No.6) LP**

Prepared by:

**MacNaughton Hermsen Britton Clarkson Planning Limited (MHBC)**

200-540 Bingemans Centre Drive

Kitchener, ON N2B 3X9

T: 519 576 3650

F: 519 576 0121

Our File: '17357 A'

## Table of Contents

Project Personnel.....	4
Glossary of Abbreviations.....	4
1.0 Executive Summary.....	5
2.0 Introduction.....	8
3.0 Policy Context.....	9
3.1 The Planning Act and PPS 2014.....	9
3.2 The Ontario Heritage Act.....	10
3.3 Municipality of Port Hope Official Plan.....	11
3.4 Terms of Reference.....	12
4.0 Description of Subject Lands.....	14
4.1 Location of Subject Lands.....	14
4.2 Heritage Status.....	16
5.0 Historical Overview.....	17
5.1 Durham County, Hope Township.....	17
5.2 Port Hope.....	18
5.3 Lot/Concession.....	20
5.4 36-38 Hope Street.....	22
5.5 65 Ward Street.....	26
5.6 Powerhouse (c. 1921).....	27
6.0 Description of Site and Surrounding Context.....	29
6.1 Introduction.....	29
6.2 Landscape and Surrounding Context.....	29
6.3 Description of Built Features.....	30
6.3.1 65 Ward Street.....	31
6.3.2 36-38 Hope Street.....	36
6.3.3 20 Hope Street 'Powerhouse'.....	40
7.0 Evaluation of Cultural Heritage Resources.....	44

7.1 Evaluation Criteria .....	44
7.2 65 Ward Street.....	45
7.2.1 Evaluation of Design/Physical Value.....	45
7.2.2 Evaluation of Historical or Associative Value.....	45
7.2.3 Evaluation of Contextual Value .....	45
7.2.4 Heritage Attributes.....	46
7.3 36-38 Hope Street.....	46
7.3.1 Evaluation of Design/Physical Value.....	46
7.3.2 Evaluation of Historical or Associative Value.....	47
7.3.3 Evaluation of Contextual Value .....	47
7.3.4 Heritage Attributes.....	47
7.4 20 Hope Street.....	48
7.4.1 Evaluation of Design/Physical Value.....	48
7.4.2 Evaluation of Historical or Associative Value.....	48
7.4.3 Evaluation of Contextual Value .....	48
7.4.4 Heritage Attributes.....	49
7.5 Cultural Heritage Landscape Evaluation.....	49
7.6 Summary of Evaluation.....	51
8.0 Description of Proposed Development.....	52
9.0 Impacts of Proposed Development.....	54
9.1 Introduction .....	54
9.2 Analysis of Impacts.....	54
9.2.1 Demolition of 65 Ward Street .....	54
9.2.2 Demolition of 36-38 Hope Street.....	55
9.2.3 Retention of the 'Powerhouse' at 20 Hope Street.....	55
9.2.4 Impacts on the Subject Lands as a Potential Cultural Heritage Landscape .....	55
10.0 Consideration of Development Alternatives, Mitigation Measures and Conservation Recommendations.....	56
10.1 Alternative Development Approaches.....	56
10.2 Mitigation Recommendations.....	57

10.3 Implementation and Monitoring.....	58
11.0 Recommendations and Conclusions.....	59
12.0 Sources.....	61
Appendix <b>A</b> – Site Plan and Elevations (next page).....	62
Appendix <b>B</b> – Chain of Title .....	63
Appendix <b>C</b> – Photo Map (next page).....	64
Appendix <b>D</b> - Curriculum Vitae (next page).....	65



## Project Personnel

Dan Currie, MA, MCIP, RPP, CAHP	<i>Managing Director of Cultural Heritage</i>	Senior Review
Vanessa Hicks, MA	<i>Heritage Planner</i>	Research, Author


## Glossary of Abbreviations

HIA	<i>Heritage Impact Assessment</i>
MHBC	<i>MacNaughton Hermsen Britton Clarkson Planning Limited</i>
MTCS	<i>Ministry of Tourism Culture and Sport</i>
OHA	<i>Ontario Heritage Act</i>
OHTK	<i>Ontario Heritage Toolkit</i>
O-REG 9/06	<i>Ontario Regulation 9/06 for determining cultural heritage significance</i>
PPS 2014	<i>Provincial Policy Statement (2014)</i>

# 1.0 Executive Summary

MHBC was retained by CVH (No. 6) LP in February, 2018 to prepare a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) for the subject lands, which includes the properties located at 65 Ward Street, 36-38 Hope Street, and 20 Hope Street, Municipality of Port Hope. This HIA was prepared by Vanessa Hicks and Dan Currie of the Cultural Heritage Division of MHBC.

The subject lands include three structures of potential cultural heritage value or interest. This includes the Port Hope Hospital located at 65 Ward Street, the 2 storey red brick building located at 36-38 Hope Street, and the red brick power facility (former a laundry facility for the Port Hope Hospital) located north of the Hope Street Terrace Care Facility at 20 Hope Street. The Hope Street Terrace Care Facility is not identified as being of cultural heritage value or interest as it was constructed in the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century and does not demonstrate a built form which is rare, unique, early, or representative of a particular architectural style. A review of the Municipality of Port Hope Heritage Register confirms that none of the properties which are part of the subject lands have been identified as being of cultural heritage value or interest and are not 'listed' or designated under the *Ontario Heritage Act*. Further, the subject lands are not located adjacent (contiguous) to any properties identified by the Municipality of Port Hope as being of cultural heritage value or interest.



**Figure 1:** Aerial photo of context and study area. Location of built structures on the subject lands noted in red. (Source: Northumberland County Interactive Map, 2018)

This Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) has identified that the subject lands have significant cultural heritage value as they include a) the Port Hope Hospital located at 65 Ward Street, b) the

2 storey brick structure located at 36-38 Hope Street, and c) the 'powerhouse' (formerly a laundry facility for the Port Hope Hospital) located at 20 Hope Street. All three of these structures meet the criteria for determining significant cultural heritage value as per *Ontario Regulation 9/06*. In addition to this, the subject lands have been evaluated based on the *PPS 2014* definition of a significant cultural heritage landscape. This report has determined that the subject lands include structures which are valued both independently, but together for their interrelationship, meaning, and association with institutional/medical operations in Port Hope.

The proposed development includes the demolition of the Port Hope Hospital at 65 Ward street and the 2 storey red brick building located at 36-38 Hope Street in order to construct a new long term Care Facility which will add to the existing Southbridge Hope Street Terrace Care Facility. The existing 'powerhouse' located north of the Hope Street Care Facility is proposed to be retained in-situ amongst landscaped open space (See Appendix A).

The proposed development will result in permanent adverse impacts related to the removal of the buildings located at 65 Ward Street and 36-38 Ward Street. As this would constitute adverse impacts to both these buildings individually as well as the subject lands as a potential Cultural Heritage Landscape, alternative development recommendations have been drafted for consideration. Should one of these alternative development options be implemented, specific mitigation recommendations would be required for any new plans.

Should the proposed development be approved, the following recommendations should be implemented in order to mitigate the adverse impacts related to the demolition of the buildings located at 65 Ward Street and 36-38 Hope Street, as well as the retention of the 'powerhouse' structure in-situ:

- That prior to the demolition of the buildings, a Cultural Heritage Documentation and Salvage Report and Commemoration Plan be drafted and implemented which includes:
  - Detailed photographic documentation (interior and exterior);
  - Measured architectural drawings of all exterior elevations;
  - Measured floor plans;
  - Recommendations for items to be salvaged for commemoration purposes or donation as opposed to being deposited as landfill; and
  - Recommendations for appropriate commemoration of the buildings and the landscape, which may include commemorative plaques.
  
- That the 'powerhouse' located on-site north of the Southbridge Hope Street Terrace Care Facility be appropriately repaired and conserved as per the recommendations provided in the Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada.


Investigations of the building have determined that considerable damages to masonry have occurred due to exposure to the elements (spalling and corroded bricks); and

- That this report be filed with the Municipality of Port Hope to supplement the historic record.

*Respectfully submitted,*



Vanessa Hicks  
MHBC



Dan Currie  
MHBC

*Note to the Reader: The purpose of this executive summary is to highlight key aspects of this report and therefore does not elaborate on other components. Please note that this report is intended to be read in its entirety in order to gain a full understanding of its contents.*

## 2.0 Introduction

MHBC was retained by CVH (No. 6) LP in February, 2018 to prepare a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) for the properties located at 65 Ward Street, 36-38 Hope Street, and 20 Hope Street, Municipality of Port Hope. This HIA was prepared by Vanessa Hicks and Dan Currie of the Cultural Heritage Division of MHBC.

A review of the Municipality of Port Hope Heritage Register confirms that the subject property has not been identified as being of cultural heritage value or interest. The subject property includes several different buildings. The building known as the 'Port Hope Hospital' at 65 Ward Street, the 2 storey brick single detached dwelling located at 36-38 Hope Street, as well as the 'powerhouse' located at 20 Hope Street. None of these properties or buildings are 'listed' or designated under the *Ontario Heritage Act*.

The subject lands are located east of downtown Port Hope and are situated south of Ward Street, west of Hope Street South, east of Princess Street. The surrounding land uses are primarily low density residential with institutional uses, including the Dr. L.B. Powers School located north of Ward Street.

The subject lands currently includes a former hospital/retirement home (now vacant) fronting Ward Street, a single-detached house fronting Hope Street which is currently used as storage space for the Hope Street Terrace long-term care home currently operating at 20 Hope Street South. The subject lands also include a small brick building constructed in 1921 as the laundry facility for the Port Hope Hospital, which appears to have been adaptively re-used as a powerhouse for the Hope Street Terrace facility.

A site visit of the property was conducted on February 27, 2018.

# 3.0 Policy Context

## 3.1 The Planning Act and PPS 2014

The *Planning Act* makes a number of provisions respecting cultural heritage either directly in Section 2 of the Act or Section 3 respecting policy statements and provincial plans. In Section 2 *The Planning Act* outlines 18 spheres of provincial interest that must be considered by appropriate authorities in the planning process. One of the intentions of *The Planning Act* is to “encourage the co-operation and co-ordination among the various interests. Regarding Cultural Heritage, Subsection 2(d) of the Act provides that:

*The Minister, the council of a municipality, a local board, a planning board and the Municipal Board, in carrying out their responsibilities under this Act, shall have regard to, among other matters, matters of provincial interest such as, ...*

(d) *the conservation of features of significant architectural, cultural, historical, archaeological or scientific interest;*

In support of the provincial interest identified in Subsection 2 (d) of the *Planning Act*, and as provided for in Section 3, the Province has refined policy guidance for land use planning and development matters in the *Provincial Policy Statement, 2014* (PPS). The PPS is “intended to be read in its entirety and the relevant policy areas are to be applied in each situation”. This provides a weighting and balancing of issues within the planning process. When addressing cultural heritage planning, the PPS provides for the following:

*2.6.1 Significant built heritage resources and significant cultural heritage landscapes shall be conserved.*

*2.6.3 Planning authorities shall not permit development and site alteration on adjacent lands to protected heritage property except where the proposed development and site alteration has been evaluated and it has been demonstrated that the heritage attributes of the protected heritage property will be conserved.*

Significant: *e) in regard to cultural heritage and archaeology, resources that have been determined to have cultural heritage value or interest*

*for the important contribution they make to our understanding of the history of a place, an event, or a people.*

*Built heritage resource: means a building, structure, monument, installation or any manufactured remnant that contributes to a property's cultural heritage value or interest as identified by a community, including an Aboriginal community. Built heritage resources are generally located on property that has been designated under Parts IV or V of the Ontario Heritage Act, or included on local, provincial and/or federal registers.*

*Cultural heritage landscape: means a defined geographical area that may have been modified by human activity and is identified as having cultural heritage value or interest by a community, including an Aboriginal community. The area may involve features such as structures, spaces, archaeological sites or natural elements that are valued together for their interrelationship, meaning or association. Examples may include, but are not limited to, heritage conservation districts designated under the Ontario Heritage Act; villages, parks, gardens, battlefields, mainstreets and neighbourhoods, cemeteries, trailways, viewsheds, natural areas and industrial complexes of heritage significance; and areas recognized by federal or international designation authorities (e.g. a National Historic Site or District designation, or a UNESCO World Heritage Site).*

*Conserved: means the identification, protection, management and use of built heritage resources, cultural heritage landscapes and archaeological resources in a manner that ensures their cultural heritage value or interest is retained under the Ontario Heritage Act. This may be achieved by the implementation of recommendations set out in a conservation plan, archaeological assessment, and/or heritage impact assessment. Mitigative measures and/or alternative development approaches can be included in these plans and assessments.*

The subject lands are not considered to be a *protected heritage property* under the consideration of the PPS as they are not 'listed' (non-designated) or designated under the *Ontario Heritage Act* by the Municipality of Port Hope.

## 3.2 The Ontario Heritage Act

The *Ontario Heritage Act*, R.S.O., 1990, c.0.18 remains the guiding legislation for the conservation of significant cultural heritage resources in Ontario. This Heritage Impact Assessment has been guided by the criteria provided with *Regulation 9/06* of the *Ontario Heritage Act* outlines the

mechanism for determining cultural heritage value or interest. The regulation sets forth categories of criteria and several sub-criteria.

### 3.3 Municipality of Port Hope Official Plan

Section C.11.2 of the Municipality of Port Hope Official Plan includes policies related to the conservation of cultural heritage resources. This includes the following as it relates to the scope of this Heritage Impact Assessment:

#### **C11.2.2 Principle**

*Council recognizes the importance of Cultural Heritage Resources within the Municipality. Therefore Council or its designate shall encourage the identification, conservation, protection, restoration, maintenance and enhancement of Cultural Heritage Resources in keeping with recognized conservation principles. All new development permitted by the land use policies and designations of this Plan shall have regard for Cultural Heritage Resources and shall, wherever possible, incorporate these resources into any new development plans. In addition, all new development shall be planned in a manner that preserves and enhances the context in which*

*Cultural Heritage Resources are situated. The Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada shall be used wherever possible to guide the implementation of the heritage policies of this Plan.*

#### **C11.2.3 Policy**

*Council shall ensure that Cultural Heritage Resources are identified, protected and managed in a manner that maintains their cultural heritage value and interest and benefit to the community. In order to achieve this goal, Council will:*

*a) Limit the demolition, destruction or inappropriate alteration of Cultural Heritage Resources*

*b) Encourage development adjacent to significant Cultural Heritage Resources to be of an appropriate scale and character;*

*c) Require the preparation, by a qualified heritage consultant, of a Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment to evaluate proposed development and site alteration and to demonstrate that the*



*cultural heritage value or interest of cultural heritage resources will be conserved;*

*d) Encourage and foster public awareness, participation and involvement in the conservation of Cultural Heritage Resources;*

*e) Support and maintain the existing Cultural Heritage Resource information base, resulting in comprehensive Heritage site inventories and master plans;*

*f) Facilitate research into the Cultural Heritage of the Municipality and identify methods of its conservation and enhancement;*

*g) Mitigative measures and/or alternative development approaches may be required in order to conserve the heritage attributes of the protected heritage property affected by the adjacent development or site alteration; and*

*h) The Municipality of Port Hope will encourage the use of archaeological zoning by-laws under Section 34 (1) 3.3 of the Planning Act, to prohibit and land use activities or the erection of buildings or structures on land which is a site of a significant archaeological resource and to maintain its integrity.*

### 3.4 Terms of Reference

This Heritage Impact Assessment has also been guided by the Terms of Reference for Heritage Impact Assessments provided by the Municipality of Port Hope via email on January 29, 2018 as follows:

*A Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report / Heritage Impact Assessment is an independent study to determine the impacts of proposed future development on cultural heritage resources. This report considers mitigation options and recommends a conservation strategy demonstrating how cultural heritage values and interests will be protected. Cultural heritage resources encompass buildings of architectural and/or historical merit designated under the Ontario Heritage Act either individually or within a Heritage Conservation District, a cultural heritage landscape, or other cultural heritage areas. The report can also recommend alternative development approaches, demonstrate how it is not physically feasible to maintain the cultural heritage resource where it is not designated under the Ontario Heritage Act, or request to de-designate a protected heritage property. The report must be*

*prepared by a qualified individual, such as a heritage, architectural or landscape consultant with knowledge of accepted standards of historical research, identification, evaluation, and methods of conservation and mitigation. The scope of the report is determined in consultation with the municipality.*

*A Heritage Impact Assessment / Cultural Heritage Evaluation shall include:*

- *Historical Research, Site Analysis and Evaluation of site's current conditions;*
- *Identification of the Significance of Cultural Heritage Value, Interest, and Attributes of the Existing Cultural Heritage Resource;*
- *Description of the Proposed Development;*
- *Measurement of Positive and Adverse Development Impacts;*
- *Consideration of Alternatives, Mitigation and Conservation Methods;*
- *Review of any relevant policy and regulatory documents (e.g. Heritage Conservation District Plan);*
- *Implementation and Monitoring; and*
- *Summary Statement and Conservation Recommendations.*

# 4.0 Description of Subject Lands

## 4.1 Location of Subject Lands

The subject lands are located east of downtown Port Hope and are situated south of Ward Street, west of Hope Street South, east of Princess Street. The surrounding land uses are primarily low density residential with institutional uses, including the Dr. L.B. Powers School located north of Ward Street.

The subject lands currently contain four buildings as follows:

- A former hospital/retirement home (now vacant) fronting Ward Street (See Figure 2);
- A single-detached house fronting Hope Street which is currently used as storage space for the Hope Street Terrace long-term Care Facility currently operating at 20 Hope Street South (See Figure 3);
- A small brick building constructed in 1921 as the laundry facility for the Port Hope Hospital, which appears to have been adaptively re-used as a powerhouse for the Hope Street Terrace facility, also located on the subject lands to the south (See Figure 4);
- The existing Hope Street Terrace Care Facility at 20 Hope Street (See Figure 5);



**Figures 2 & 3:** (left) View of Port Hope Hospital looking south from Ward Street (right) View of 2 storey brick dwelling looking west from Hope Street (Source: MHBC, 2018)



**Figures 4 & 5:** (left) View of 'powerhouse' / laundry facility looking south, (right) View of Hope Street Terrace looking south-west from Hope Street (Source: MHBC, 2018)



**Figure 6:** Natural Resources Canada Topographic Map, approximate location of subject lands noted in red. (Source: Natural Resources Canada Toporama, 2017)



**Figure 7:** Aerial photo of context and study area. Approximate location of subject lands noted in red. (Source: Northumberland County Interactive Map, 2018)

## 4.2 Heritage Status

The Municipality of Port Hope Heritage Register confirms that a) the property located at 65 Ward Street has not been identified as being of cultural heritage value or interest, b) the property located at 36-38 Hope Street has not been identified as being of cultural heritage value or interest, and c) the property located at 20 Hope Street has not been identified as being of cultural heritage value or interest. As such, the subject lands do not include property which is either 'listed' (non-designated) or designated under the *Ontario Heritage Act*.

Further, the subject lands are not located adjacent (contiguous) to any properties identified by the Municipality of Port Hope as being of cultural heritage value or interest.

# 5.0 Historical Overview

## 5.1 Durham County, Hope Township

Historic Durham County was once part of Nassau District. Nassau District was one of the first four districts in what is now Ontario, created in 1788. Nassau was renamed Home District in 1792 and subsequently included Durham County. The County included the townships of Cartwright, Manvers, Cavan, Darlington, Clarke, and Hope (Ontario Archives, 2015).

In 1793, United Empire Loyalists began to settle Hope Township after the American Revolutionary War. Some of the first settlers of the Township included Elias Smith, Captain Jonathan and Abraham Walton, who traveled west to the Ganaraska River. Shortly after their arrival in Hope Township, they were responsible for aiding forty additional families achieve settlement. These men were granted Crown Patents for lots five, six, and seven in Broken Front Concession and Concession One which became known as the town of Port Hope (Clayton, 2017) (See Figure 8). Durham County was dissolved in 1974 when the Regional Municipality of Durham was created.



**Figure 8:** Historical Atlas map of Durham County (including Hope Township). Approximate location of subject lands noted in red.

## 5.2 Port Hope

The early settlement was originally known as 'Smith's Creek'. The name Port Hope was officially adopted in 1819. By 1826, the village had grown with the construction of four general stores, two saw and grist mills, four distilleries, a shoemakers shop, a mill factory, a malt house, ashery, wool-carding factory, a cut nail works, a hotel, and many other. The railway arrived in Port Hope through the Peterborough and Lindsay Railway Company in 1852. By 1865 the population of the village was 4,500. The population of the village reached 5,000 residents after the First World War,

and the economy did not rise again until after the depression in the 1920s/1930s era (Clayton, 2017; National Archives Canada).

**PORT HOPE**—A flourishing incorporated town situated on the north shore of Lake Ontario, in the township of Hope, county of Durham. The location of the town is very pleasant, the site extending over a valley and the surrounding hills, and though owing to natural obstructions it is rather irregularly laid out, the appearance it presents, viewed either from the lake or any other avenue of approach, is very picturesque. Its churches, hotels, shops, and private residences are creditable to the enterprise and taste of the inhabitants. The principal streets are lit with gas. Smith's creek flowing through the centre of the town affords fair water power, advantage of which has been taken in the erection of several manufacturing establishments, embracing five flouring mills, a plaster mill, planing mill, woollen factory, button factory, cabinet factory, tannery, two breweries, and a distillery. Port Hope possesses one of the finest harbors on the lake, from which lumber, grain and flour are annually exported to a large amount. An extensive fleet of schooners is engaged in this trade, and being mostly owned in the town, form no mean addition to its wealth. The southern terminus, head office and works of the Midland Railway of Canada, (formerly known as the Port Hope, Lindsay and Beaverton road) are situated here, and the gauge of this road being the same as that of the Grand Trunk, with which it forms a junction, every facility is afforded for the shipment of its through freight. The Grand Trunk railway has a station at which all trains stop. The steamers of the Canadian Navigation Co. call here regularly; there is a daily steamer to Charlotte, N.Y., the port of Rochester, on the opposite shore of the lake. The Montreal Telegraph Co. and Dominion Telegraph Co. have offices here. Distant from Cobourg 7 miles, from Peterborough 31 miles, from Lindsay 43 miles, from Rochester 68 miles, from Toronto 63 miles, from Montreal 270 miles. Fare to Rochester \$2, to Toronto by rail \$2.10 first, and \$1.50 second class; to Montreal by rail \$7.85 and \$3.50; by boat, cabin \$7, deck \$2.50. Mail daily. Population nearly 6000.

**Figure 9:** Ontario 1871-1872 Directory of Port Hope (Source: National Archives Canada)






**Figure 10:** Historical Atlas map of Port Hope, 1881. Approximate location of subject lands noted in red (Source: Port Hope Archives)

### 5.3 Lot/Concession

The subject lands are historically part of Concession 1, Lot 5 of the Township of Port Hope, which became part of Smith's Plan. Jonathan Walton Smith was granted 200 acres of land from the Crown in 1797, and registered his plan for the subdivision of land in 1848. The entirety of the subject lands have been consolidated as one lot and are legally described as Lots 21-31 of the Smith Estate Plan of Port Hope, Hope Township (See Figures 11 and 12). The following sections of this report describe the chronological development of the subject lands.



**Figure 11:** Excerpt of 1848 Smith Plan. Approximate location of subject lands noted in red (Town Plot 13). (Source: Port Hope Archives).



**Figure 12:** Excerpt of 1878 map of Port Hope. Approximate location of subject lands noted in red (Source: Port Hope Archives).


### 5.4 36-38 Hope Street

According to the land registry records for the subject lands, the property was part of the 200 acres granted to Jonathan Smith by the Crown in 1797. The subject property was sub-divided as part of the Smith Plan dated 1848 and re-named part of Town Plot 13 (See Figure 12). The subject lands are described as being located on part of lots 21-31 of Town Plot 13. The lands were granted to John D. Smith in 1849. J. Smith granted to A. Smith in 1849. A. Smith granted to William Smith in 1851. W. Smith granted to R.C. Smith in 1863. R.C. Smith sold to Ada M. Smith in 1868 who subsequently sold to Griffin in 1870. In 1887, Griffin sold to Ford, who in turn sold to James in 1911. James sold 2.5 acres of land to the Port Hope Hospital Trust in 1912 which included the existing 2 storey brick house on Hope Street.

The land registry records do not provide many clues as to the date of construction of the 2 storey brick house. All land ownership was relatively short and the purchase values of the land are not provided up until the year 1870 when the land was valued at \$993.75. The house displays evidence of hand hewn beams in the basement, which indicates an early construction date

(usually prior to the 1850s). The house appears to have been constructed in the Regency architectural style with design cues of the Georgian architectural style. Buildings constructed in the Regency architectural style are typically dated between 1830 and 1860 (Blumenson, 1990).


According to Humble (n.d.), the 2 storey brick house located on the subject lands (fronting Hope Street South) was a dwelling formerly owned by Colonel William McLean. McLean was the owner of a piano and organ business which operated on the south side of Walton Street. The 1892-1893 *Might's Ontario Directory* lists Wm. McLean as a dealer of agricultural implements, pianos and organs. McLean is also listed in the 1895 directory (See Figure 13).



**Figure 13:** Excerpt of *Might's 1892 Ontario Directory* (Source: National Archives Canada).

William McLean is not included in any census records for Port Hope during the 19<sup>th</sup> or 20<sup>th</sup> centuries. Wm. McLean is also not listed in any of the land registry records for lots 21-31 of Lot 13 of Smith's Plan, indicating that he either resided on the property and was not an owner, or that he did not reside in the existing house on the subject lands.

The existing 2 storey brick building is noted on the 1904 Fire Insurance Plan for Port Hope (See Figure 14). Here, the brick building is described as being 2 storeys with a roughly rectangular-shaped plan. Two smaller brick additions are located to the west, with an attached wood addition oriented north-south, and a small wood frame single storey detached structure to the south (likely a barn).



**Figure 14:** Excerpt of 1904 Fire Insurance Plan, Port Hope. Approximate location of subject lands noted in red. (Source: Port Hope Archives).

According to Humble (n.d.), the house is noted as being part of the 'James' lot' at the corner of Hope and Ward Streets on a 2.5 acre lot, where members of the James family owned the property between 1876 and 1912. This lot was purchased as part of the lands for the proposed new hospital. Prior to the building of the new hospital, Mr. Burry (an architect for the project) suggested that the brick house be used as a temporary hospital until the new one was constructed. The brick house was renovated at a cost of \$1,375.00 by Thomas Garnett & Sons and the hospital was officially opened in January 1913, having a total of 9 hospital beds.

Humble further notes that between June 15 to August 16 in the year 1915, approximately 200 soldiers of the 136<sup>th</sup> Battalion was cared for on the subject lands in large hospital tents (16) (Humble, n.d.).



**Figure 15:** Photograph of the 2 storey brick house/hospital on Hope Street South, no date. (Source: Humble, n.d.)



**Figure 16:** Interior of army hospital tent on the subject lands, no date. (Source: Montagnes, 2007).

## 5.5 65 Ward Street

According to the records available at the Land Registry Office, the subject lands were sold by the James family to the Port Hope Hospital Trust in 1912 for \$8,000.00. The lands included the 2 storey brick house fronting Hope Street.

The construction of the new Port Hope Hospital was approved on June 20, 1912, and cost approximately \$25,000.00 to \$30,000.00. The hospital was constructed by Ellis and Ellis architects and officially opened on June 29, 1916. The new facility had 20 hospital beds. A sun porch was built as an addition to the building in 1917. In 1918, funds were raised for the construction of a west wing at the cost of \$15,000.00. The west wing was constructed by Ellis and Ellis, and was completed in 1929. The new wing had 25 additional beds. 1952, the hospital underwent several renovations, including a new roof, refurbishing of the kitchens, and new clinical labs.

By 1954, there were discussions for a new hospital in Cobourg. Options to expand the existing hospital in Port Hope were contemplated, but in 1959 the Hospital Board decided that an entirely new hospital facility was to be constructed. The new Port Hope and District Hospital opened in 1964 near Oxford Street and Wellington Street.

The subject lands (including the Port Hope Hospital, 2 storey brick dwelling, and 'powerhouse') were sold by the Port Hope Hospital Trust to Hope Haven Rest Home Limited in 1965 and converted to a retirement home facility (Humble, n.d).



**Figure 17:** Photograph of the Port Hope Hospital, n.d. (Source: Humble, n.d.).

## 5.6 Powerhouse (c. 1921)

The 'powerhouse' (addressed as 20 Hope Street) was originally constructed as a laundry facility for the Port Hope Hospital in 1921. The date stone for the building reads,

*ERECTED IN 1921 IN MEMORY OF ALEXANDER MCMANN WHOSE GENEROSITY PROVIDED THE FUNDS FOR THIS BUILDING*

The building was constructed in the Edwardian architectural style and is similar in its design to the hospital building constructed by Ellis and Ellis in 1915. For example, the building includes arched window openings at the front facade and a wood stringcourse below the roofline with dentils. The building was renovated in 1952 to include a new steam generator (Humble, n.d). The interior of the building has been renovated in recent years to include power generating equipment for the existing Southbridge Hope Street Terrace Care Facility.





**Figures 18 & 19:** (left) View of north elevation of powerhouse, looking south (right) Detail view of date stone at north elevation of powerhouse (Source: MHBC, 2018)

# 6.0 Description of Site and Surrounding Context

## 6.1 Introduction

The following provides a description of the site and surrounding context, followed by the built features of the subject lands.

## 6.2 Landscape and Surrounding Context

The subject lands are located east of downtown Port Hope and are situated south of Ward Street, west of Hope Street South, east of Princess Street. The surrounding land uses are primarily low density residential with institutional uses, including the Dr. L.B. Powers School located north of Ward Street.

A Photo Map of the subject lands is provided in Appendix C which aids in the interpretation of the photographs in this section of the report.

The subject lands are characterized by a combination of buildings, each having its own different purpose, function, date of construction, and composition. However, all of which are related to the theme of medical services. The site includes open landscaped space, small gardens, plantings, and circulation (parking and pathways/laneways).



**Figures 20 & 21:** (left) looking west from east side of Hope Street South, (right) View of existing Southbridge Care Facility, looking south-west from east side of Hope Street South, (right) View of Ward Street looking west from Ward Street between Hope Street South and Princess Street (Source: MHBC, 2018)




**Figures 22 & 23:** (left) View of Ward Street, looking east towards Hope Street from Ward Street, (right) View of former hospital looking south from north side of Ward Street, (Source: MHBC, 2018)



**Figures 24 & 25:** (left) View of Ward Street, looking east towards Hope Street from Ward Street, (right) View of Princess Street, looking south from west side of Princess Street (Source: MHBC, 2018)

## 6.3 Description of Built Features

The subject property includes three structures of potential cultural heritage value or interest. This includes the Port Hope Hospital fronting Ward Street, the 2 storey red brick building fronting Hope Street, and the red brick power facility (former laundry building) located north of the Hope Street Terrace Care Facility. As the Hope Street Terrace Care Facility is not identified as being of cultural heritage value or interest as it was constructed in the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century and does not demonstrate a built form which is rare, unique, early, or representative of a particular architectural style.



**Figure 26:** Aerial photo of context and study area. Location of built structures on the subject lands noted in red. (Source: Northumberland County Interactive Map, 2018)

### 6.3.1 65 Ward Street

The Port Hope Hospital was constructed as a 2 storey red brick building c. 1915 in the Edwardian architectural style. The original portion of the building is roughly rectangular in shape with a flat roof, oriented east-west. The building has been subject to several additions and alterations. This includes an L-shaped wing at the west elevation, and two rectangular-shaped wood frame sun-rooms at the south elevation. A small vestibule has been added to the south elevation of the original portion of the building. The building has been vacant for approximately 10 years.



**Figure 27:** Aerial photo of 65 Ward Street noting original portion of the building and subsequent additions (Source: Northumberland County Interactive Map, 2018)

## North Elevation

The north elevation of the building displays a flat roof with wood stringcourse below running the entire north elevation of the building. Two brick projections are located at either end of the north elevation. The building includes 10 bays of rectangular-shaped windows at ground level (providing light to the basement), 10 bays of windows at the first/main storey, and 11 bays of windows at the second storey. All windows include large 6x6 double hung windows. Each window at the second and third storey includes a keystone and stone sill. The east and west ends of the building are decorated with brick quoins.

The main floor of the building is accessed by a set of wooden steps. The main entrance at the north elevation includes a tall classically detailed portico supported with three wood Doric-order columns at either side. The architrave of the portico has been damaged and may have originally included wood dentils.

The main entrance includes sidelights and a fan-pattern transom above. This wood frame entrance is surrounded by an arched brick voussoir.

A date stone is located at the east end of the north elevation and reads 'OCTOBER EIGHTH MCMXV' (roman numerals for 1915).



**Figures 28 & 29:** (left) View of north elevation looking south from north side of Ward Street, (right) Detail view of main entrance at north elevation, (Source: MHBC, 2018)



**Figures 30 & 31:** (left) Detail view of date stone at north elevation, (right) View of typical windows at north elevation, (Source: MHBC, 2018)

## **East Elevation**

The east elevation of the eastern portion of the building includes three bays of windows at ground level, as well as the first and second storeys. The windows of the main floor are enclosed in three arches, each window having a brick voussoir with keystone and stone sill. Brick quoins are located at either side of the east elevations.

The east elevation has been extended to include a wood frame sun room resting on a red brick base. The east elevation of the sun room includes a person door and large window at the second storey. The string course is continued below the roofline of the sun room.

The east elevation of the westerly wing is an addition added to the original portion of the building shortly after it was constructed c. 1915. This portion of the building includes an alcove with balconies. The ground level of this portion of the building includes access to the basement. Each balcony of the alcove above includes two rectangular-shaped windows.

South of the alcove, two rectangular windows are located at the ground floor, main floor, and second storey below the wood stringcourse. The east elevation is extended by a wood frame sunroom supported by a brick base having two large contemporary windows at the first and second storeys.



**Figures 32 & 33:** (left) View of east elevation, looking west (right) Detail view of stringcourse and windows at second storey of east elevation, (Source: MHBC, 2018)



**Figures 34 & 35:** (left) View of east elevation of west wing, looking west (right)View of east elevation of west wing, looking west towards balconys/alcove (Source: MHBC, 2018)

## **West Elevation**

Views of the west elevation include the original portion of the hospital, having 3 bays of windows, ending with a set of brick quoins. The building continues to the south as part of the west wing constructed in 1928. This portion of the building includes 4 regular bays of rectangular-shaped windows, with the first and second storeys including a smaller rectangular-shaped window. Four bays of windows are provided at grade.



**Figures 36 & 37:** (left) View of east west elevation, looking east, (right) View of west elevation windows at ground level, looking south-east (Source: MHBC, 2018)

## **South Elevation**

The south elevation of the hospital provides views of the original hospital, the wood frame sunrooms, and the west wing. A small vestibule is also located at the south elevation of the original portion of the building, likely constructed in the mid. 20<sup>th</sup> century (See Figure 39).

The south elevation of the original portion of the building includes a central rear entrance with a large rectangular-shaped window with fanlight providing light to the stairs at the interior of the building. Several bays or regular-shaped windows are located to the east and west. The south elevation of the sunrooms display modern windows, which have likely replaced original windows of these additions.





**Figures 38 & 39:** (left) View of south elevation looking north from parking lot (right) View 20<sup>th</sup> century vestibule addition to south elevation of original portion of the building, looking north-west (Source: MHBC, 2018)



**Figures 40 & 41:** (left) View of south elevation, looking north-west, (right) Detail view of sunroom at east end of south elevation, looking north-east (Source: MHBC, 2018)

### 6.3.2 36-38 Hope Street

The 2 storey brick building located at 36-38 Hope Street can be described as a dwelling constructed in the mid. 19<sup>th</sup> century in the Regency architectural style. The building includes a hipped roof. Two brick additions have been added to the west. This building was utilized as a single detached dwelling, and adaptively re-used in 1913 as a hospital while the newly approved hospital was being constructed to the north at Ward Street. The building is currently used as storage space for the adjacent Hope Street Terrace Care Facility.



**Figure 42:** Aerial photo of context and study area, detail view of 36-38 Hope Street. (Source: Northumberland County Interactive Map, 2018)

## North Elevation

The north elevation of the building provides views of the original dwelling as well as the two brick additions to the west. The original building displays two rectangular-shaped windows at the second storey and one rectangular-shaped window at the first storey to the east. The existing window at the first storey to the west appears to have been altered to include a contemporary window opening. The remaining windows at this elevation appear to respect original window openings and include 6x6 wood frame windows. A brick chimney is visible above the roofline. All windows include brick voussoirs and wood sills.

The two brick additions read as one structure but are clearly divided by details in the brickwork. The easterly addition directly abutting the original portion of the house displays two small wood-frame window openings below the roof gable and a large rectangular-shaped window opening at the first storey. A small contemporary window appears to have been added to the first storey of this addition. The second addition to the west includes one rectangular-window opening below the roofline and one larger window opening at the first storey, both having 6x6 lights.



**Figures 43 & 44:** (left) View of north elevation, looking south (right) Detail view of north elevation, looking south. Red box notes location of division line between first and second brick additions (Source: MHBC, 2018)

### East Elevation

The east (front) elevation displays a 2 storey three bay facade. At the second storey, three equally spaced rectangular-shaped window openings are provided, each having 6x6 wood framed windows. The first storey includes a door opening to the south having a wood framed side light and transom. Two rectangular-shaped window openings are provided to the north of the front entrance door. The entire front entrance is complemented by a simple wood frame portico supported by wooden posts.



**Figures 45 & 46:** (left) View of east elevation looking west from east side of Hope Street (right) Detail view of east elevation, looking west (Source: MHBC, 2018)

### South Elevation

The south elevation provides views of the original building and the two additions to the west. The original building displays two rectangular-shaped window openings at the second storey having

6x6 lights with brick voussoirs and wood sills. Two similarly shaped windows are located at the first storey, but are not symmetrical with the windows of the second storey and are located closer together to the west.

The first portion of the west addition directly abutting the original portion of the house includes a wood frame portico supported by wood columns. The first storey includes a door opening with voussoirs above, and a rectangular-shaped window opening to the west. A smaller wood-framed window is located at the second storey. The second brick addition to the west includes a rectangular-shaped window opening at the first storey and a smaller sized rectangular-shaped window opening below the roofline.



**Figures 47 & 48:** (left) View of south elevation, looking north-east (right) Detail view of wood frame portico at south elevation of first brick addition, looking north (Source: MHBC, 2018)

## **West Elevation**

The west elevation only provides views of the west elevation of the second brick addition. The foundation of the addition displays a rubble stone foundation and a single rectangular-shaped window opening off-centre below the roof gable, having 6x6 lights and a wood sill.




**Figures 49 & 50:** (left) View of west elevation, looking east towards second brick addition (right) View of south and west elevations, looking north-east (Source: MHBC, 2018)

### 6.3.3 20 Hope Street 'Powerhouse'

The property located at 20 Hope Street includes the existing Southbridge Hope Street Terrace Care Facility, as well as the 'powerhouse'. As the Hope Street Terrace Care Facility was constructed in the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, it is not of significant cultural heritage value or interest and is not included in the detailed description of the property.

The 'powerhouse' was constructed in 1921 and originally used as a laundry facility for the Port Hope Hospital on Ward Street. The building was constructed in the Edwardian architectural style and includes details similar to that of the Port Hope Hospital constructed by Ellis and Ellis in 1915. A single storey addition has been added to the south elevation, which likely includes the steam generator added to the structure in 1952. The building has been altered in recent years to include new power generating equipment.



**Figure 51:** Aerial photo of context and study area noting details of powerhouse at 20 Hope Street,(Source: Northumberland County Interactive Map, 2018)

## North Elevation

The north (front) elevation of the building displays features which are similar to that of the Port Hope Hospital on Ward Street. The building displays a 3 bay facade with central double-door having 8 lights each and fanlight above. Each three bays are complemented by brick arches and stone sills, the central door having a keystone. The easterly bay has been boarded-up. The westerly bay has been altered to include a large air vent. The entire building includes a wood stringcourse with dentills below the flat roofline. A date stone is located east of the main entrance door.



**Figures 52 & 53:** (left) View of north elevation looking south, (right) Detail view of date stone at north elevation, (Source: MHBC, 2018)

### East Elevation

The east elevation provides three bays similar to that of the north elevation. The two northerly bays do not include any window or door openings, which was likely part of the original design. The southerly bay includes a person door with 6 pane transom window above.



**Figures 54 & 55:** (left) View of east elevation, looking south (right) Detail view of door at south end of east elevation, (Source: MHBC, 2018)

### South Elevation

The south elevation provides views of the single storey brick addition to the rear and the roof of the original structure. The stringcourse of the original structure ends at the east and west sides of the south elevation above the roofline of the addition. The rear addition includes a central door, and two wood frame windows to the east and west. The south elevation bricks show evidence of efflorescence and extreme corrosion.



**Figures 56 & 57:** (left) View of south elevation, looking north (right) Detail view of bricks at south elevation noting damage to masonry (Source: MHBC, 2018)

### West Elevation

Views of the west elevation display three bays of arches, where all three include metal air vents, which have likely been added in recent years. A single rectangular-shaped wood frame window is located at the west elevation of the rear addition.



**Figures 58 & 59:** (left) View of west elevation, looking east (right) Detail view of south corner of west elevation noting damages to masonry (Source: MHBC, 2018)



# 7.0 Evaluation of Cultural Heritage Resources

The following sub-sections of this report provide an evaluation of the subject lands as per Regulation 9/06 of the *Ontario Heritage Act*. These criteria have been adopted as standard practice in determining significant cultural heritage value or interest.

## 7.1 Evaluation Criteria

*Ontario Regulation 9/06* prescribes that:

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

1. *The property has design value or physical value because it,*
  - i. *is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, expression, material or construction method,*
  - ii. *displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit, or*
  - iii. *demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement.*
2. *The property has historical value or associative value because it,*
  - i. *has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization or institution that is significant to a community,*
  - ii. *yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of a community or culture, or*
  - iii. *demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer or theorist who is significant to a community.*
3. *The property has contextual value because it*
  - i. *is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an area,*
  - ii. *is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings, or*
  - iii. *is a landmark.*

## 7.2 65 Ward Street

### 7.2.1 Evaluation of Design/Physical Value

The property located at 65 Ward Street has design/physical value as it includes the Port Hope Hospital constructed by Ellis and Ellis (architects) in 1915, completed in 1916. The building was constructed in the Edwardian architectural style and displays attributes indicative of this style of architecture. The building was constructed in two main phases, where the original portion of the building oriented east-west was completed in 1916, and the west wing was constructed by Ellis and Ellis architects, opened in 1929. The building also includes two wood frame sunrooms at the south elevation, the first being constructed in 1917. The building is considered a representative example of an Edwardian building constructed for institutional (medical) purposes and demonstrates a high degree of craftsmanship. The building does not demonstrate a high degree of technical or scientific achievement.

### 7.2.2 Evaluation of Historical or Associative Value

The property located at 65 Ward Street has historical/associative value for its long-standing use related to the theme of institutional/medical operations of Port Hope, which is significant to members of the local community for its contribution to overall well being and standard of living. The building, including the stories of its former employees and patients has the potential to yield further information that contributes to the understanding of the community. The building reflects the work of Ellis and Ellis architects.

### 7.2.3 Evaluation of Contextual Value

The property located at 65 Ward Street has contextual value as the Port Hope Hospital is important in maintaining the character of the area. The building does not appear to provide evidence of being functionally linked to its surroundings, but remains in its original location in-situ fronting Ward Street. The building, due to its size and prominent location on Ward Street could reasonably be considered a landmark to the local community. The building is also connected with the other buildings located on the subject lands, all of which are related to the theme of medical care.

## 7.2.4 Heritage Attributes

Heritage attributes of the building located at 65 Ward Street includes the following:

- Overall 2 storey red brick construction with flat roof;
- All original features indicative of the Edwardian architectural style at the north, east, south and west elevations;
- Wood stringcourse below the roofline;
- North elevation main entrance with wood portico supported by columns accessed by stairs;
- Main entrance door frame including sidelights and fanlight;
- All original window openings including brick voussoirs, keystones, arches, and sills;
- All original double-hung wood frame windows, being 6x6 wood frame window frames with internal pulley and weight system; and
- West wing addition (including all original features and attributes indicative of the Edwardian style of architecture);
- View of the north elevation and main entrance looking south from Ward Street.

*It is important to note that while the existing sunrooms were constructed in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century, they appear to have been altered to include modern window openings and have lost their heritage integrity. They are not considered, rare, unique, early forms of architecture and are not representative of the Edwardian architectural style. Therefore, these portions of the building are not considered significant heritage attributes.*

## 7.3 36-38 Hope Street

### 7.3.1 Evaluation of Design/Physical Value

The property located at 36-38 Hope Street has design/physical value as it includes a 2 storey red brick building constructed in the mid. 19<sup>th</sup> century in the Regency architectural style. While the exact date of construction of the building could not be conclusively determined as per a review of historic maps and records available at the Land Registry office, the building was constructed with construction methods and materials typically used in the early to mid. 19<sup>th</sup> century. Buildings constructed in the Regency architectural style are typically dated between 1830 and 1860 (Blumenson, 1990). The building displays original attributes indicative of the Regency architectural style, including hipped roof, symmetrical 3 bay facade and front entrance with sidelights and transom. It cannot be conclusively determined whether or not the existing front elevation portico

fronting Hope Street is original to the structure, however it is likely that the original design of the building included a porch or portico. The building has design/physical value as a representative example of the Regency architectural style, which appears to include the majority of its original design features. The building does not demonstrate a high degree of craftsmanship or scientific achievement.

### 7.3.2 Evaluation of Historical or Associative Value

The property located at 36-38 Ward Street has historical/associative value primarily for its associations with the theme of institutional/medical operations in the 20<sup>th</sup> century. The building was adaptively re-used as the first Port Hope Hospital in 1913 while the new Port Hope Hospital fronting Ward Street was constructed. The building is also said to be the former residence of Colonel William McLean. McLean was the owner of a piano and organ business which operated on the south side of Walton Street. While this is true, it should be noted that no primary evidence has been found to date which demonstrates that he was the resident of the dwelling.

### 7.3.3 Evaluation of Contextual Value

The property located at 36-38 Hope Street has contextual value as it remains in-situ in its original location fronting Hope Street. The subject property has changed considerably, where the landscape originally included wood frame additions and a detached wood frame structure (likely a barn). As the building was the first to be constructed on this part of Town Plot 13, it originally would have included open landscaped areas, gardens, and likely grazing areas for livestock to support a single household. The landscape has evolved to include additional structures related to the theme of medical care. The building is important in maintaining the history of its context (related to the surrounding medical facilities) and is historically linked to its surroundings as the first building on this lot. The building does not have a markedly prominent location and may not be considered a landmark by the local community.

### 7.3.4 Heritage Attributes

Heritage attributes of the building located at 36-38 Ward Street includes the following:

- Overall red brick construction and 2 storey massing with hipped roof;
- Chimney at the north elevation above the roofline;
- Overhang cornices;
- All original window openings with brick voussoirs and wood sills;
- All original wood frame windows (where existing);
- Original wood frame entrance panel with sidelights and transom;

- Rear red brick additions, including original window openings, brick voussoirs and sills.

## 7.4 20 Hope Street

### 7.4.1 Evaluation of Design/Physical Value

The property located at 20 Hope Street is significant primarily for its design/physical value as it includes the single storey red brick 'powerhouse' north of the existing Southbridge Hope Street Terrace Care Facility. The 'powerhouse' was constructed in 1921 and was originally used as a laundry building for the Port Hope Hospital fronting Ward Street. The building was constructed in the Edwardian architectural style and includes attributes similar to that of the Port Hope Hospital. The building includes an addition constructed in the 1950s to include new steam equipment. The building has been unsympathetically altered at the exterior to include new power generating equipment. This includes the installation of new metal air vents at the north and west elevations. The building is representative of the Edwardian style of architecture and mimics some of the attributes of the Port Hope Hospital. The building does not demonstrate evidence of having a high degree of craftsmanship or scientific achievement.

### 7.4.2 Evaluation of Historical or Associative Value

The property located at 20 Hope Street has some historical/associative value as the 'powerhouse' building contributes to the overall theme of institutional/medical operations of the property. The building is not particularly significant in its own right as it is a detached accessory structure to the Port Hope Hospital fronting Ward Street. The building is therefore not associated to any individual as a former resident or owner. The building does not have the potential to yield information which would contribute to the understanding of the community. It is likely that the building was constructed by Ellis and Ellis, the same architects who constructed the Port Hope Hospital at 65 Ward Street.

### 7.4.3 Evaluation of Contextual Value

The property located at 20 Hope Street has some contextual value as the 'powerhouse' building remains in its original location in-situ. The building is visually, historically, and functionally associated to the Port Hope Hospital fronting Ward Street as it was originally constructed as a detached laundry facility for the hospital, located a short distance away to the south. The building was designed to have a visual connection with the hospital, as both include similar architectural detailing. The building is important in maintaining the character of the subject property as they both share aspects of the same history and architectural style. The building may not be

considered a local landmark due to its existing location and limited visibility from Ward, Princess, and Hope Streets.

#### 7.4.4 Heritage Attributes

Heritage attributes of the 'powerhouse' building located at 20 Hope Street includes the following:

- Overall red brick construction and single storey massing with flat roof;
- Wood stringcourse with dentils under the roofline;
- All decorative brickwork at all elevations;
- All original window openings (including 'blind windows' which were originally bricked) with stone sills, brick voussoirs, brick arches, and keystones;

## 7.5 Cultural Heritage Landscape Evaluation

This section of the report provides an evaluation of the subject lands (including the properties located at 65 Ward Street, 36-38 Hope Street, and 20 Hope Street) as a potential Cultural Heritage Landscape.

A Cultural Heritage Landscape is defined by *Provincial Policy Statement 2014* as follows:

*Cultural Heritage Landscape: means a defined geographical area that may have been modified by human activity and is identified as having cultural heritage value or interest by a community, including an Aboriginal community. The area may involve features such as structures, spaces, archaeological sites or natural elements that are valued together for their interrelationship, meaning or association. Examples may include, but are not limited to, heritage conservation districts designated under the Ontario Heritage Act; villages, parks, gardens, battlefields, mainstreets and neighbourhoods, cemeteries, railways, viewsheds, natural areas and industrial complexes of heritage significance; and areas recognized by federal or international designation authorities (e.g. a National Historic Site or District designation, or a UNESCO World Heritage Site).*

The Ontario Heritage Toolkit identifies that a Cultural Heritage Landscape or Heritage Conservation District may be classified as either designed (purposely planned), evolved (grown over a period of time), static/relict (evolutionary process has ended), or dynamic (continuing to evolve).

Cultural Heritage Landscapes are identified and evaluated based on their associative/historical value, such as with themes or events, the identification of a grouping of heritage resources within a defined area, and its value as determined by a community based on local histories and public consultations, for example.

The subject lands have been a) modified by human activity and b) can be defined geographically as part of Lots 21-31 of the Smith Estate Plan registered in 1848. However, the subject lands have not been identified as being of cultural heritage value or interest by the community as they are not included on the Municipality of Port Hope Heritage Register as either 'listed' or 'designated' under the *Ontario Heritage Act*.

While this is true, this Heritage Impact Assessment has demonstrated that the subject lands include multiple built features, all of which are valued together for their interrelationship, meaning, and association with institutional/medical operations in Port Hope.

The property includes the Port Hope Hospital fronting Ward Street, as well as the 2 storey brick dwelling located at Hope Street which was the original dwelling on the subject lands and was adaptively re-used in 1913 as the first hospital while the new hospital was being constructed to the north. The property includes the single storey red brick laundry facility (now used as a 'powerhouse') which is associated with the Port Hope Hospital. The landscape also includes the Hope Street Terrace facility (which is not of cultural heritage value or interest); however, all the existing structures on the subject lands culminate in a dynamic and evolved landscape which is associated with medical care. The grounds are also associated with medical care, such as the installation of tents to care for wounded soldiers during the First World War. This interrelationship and historical/associative and contextual value shared by these buildings demonstrates that the subject lands meet the criteria of a Cultural Heritage Landscape.

## 7.6 Summary of Evaluation


Ontario Regulation 9/06	65 Ward St.	36-38 Hope St.	20 Hope St. 'powerhouse'
<b>1. Design/Physical Value</b>			
<b>i. <u>Rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, expression, material or construction method</u></b>	✓	✓	✓
<b>ii. Displays high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit</b>	✓	✗	✗
<b>iii. Demonstrates high degree of technical or scientific achievement</b>	✗	✗	✗
<b>2. Historical/associative value</b>			
<b>i. <u>Direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization, institution that is significant</u></b>	✓	✓	✓
<b>ii. Yields, or has potential to yield information that contributes to an understanding of a community or culture</b>	✓	✓	✗
<b>iii. Demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer, or theorist who is significant to the community.</b>	✗	N/A	✗
<b>3. Contextual value</b>			
<b>i. Important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an area</b>	✓	✓	✓
<b>ii. Physically, functionally, visually, or <u>historically linked to its surroundings</u></b>	✓	✓	✓
<b>iii. Is a landmark</b>	✓	✗	✗




# 8.0 Description of Proposed Development

The proposed development of the subject lands includes the demolition of the Port Hope Hospital at 65 Ward street and the 2 storey red brick building located at 36-38 Hope Street in order to construct a new long term Care Facility which will add to the existing Southbridge Hope Street Terrace Care Facility. The new building is proposed to connect to the north elevation of the existing facility. The existing 'powerhouse' located north of the Hope Street Care Facility is proposed to be retained in-situ amongst landscaped open space (60). The design of the proposed new building includes a main entrance at Hope Street, with parking located parallel to the street, at Hope Street and Princess Street. The design of the building includes a focus on the east elevation fronting Hope Street and includes design elements which are reminiscent of that of the existing Port Hope Hospital fronting Ward Street (See Figures 61 – 62).

Copies of the proposed site plan and elevations are provided in Appendix A of this report.



**Figure 60:** Proposed Site Plan noting location of powerhouse to remain in-situ in red (Source: Vijay Vasantgdkar Architect Inc., 2018)



**Figure 61:** Proposed East and North Elevations (Source: Vijay Vasantgdkar Architect Inc., 2018)



**Figure 62:** East elevation concept views (Source: Vijay Vasantgdkar Architect Inc., 2018)

# 9.0 Impacts of Proposed Development

## 9.1 Introduction

There are three classifications of impacts a proposed development may have on an identified cultural heritage resource: beneficial, neutral or adverse. Beneficial effects may include such actions as retaining a property of cultural heritage value, protecting it from loss or removal, maintaining restoring or repairing heritage attributes, or making sympathetic additions or alterations that allow for a continued long-term use and retain heritage building fabric. Neutral effects have neither a markedly positive or negative impact on a cultural heritage resource. Adverse effects may include the loss or removal of a cultural heritage resource, unsympathetic alterations or additions that remove or obstruct heritage attributes, the isolation of a cultural heritage resource from its setting or context, or the addition of other elements that are unsympathetic to the character or heritage attributes of a cultural heritage resource. Adverse effects may require strategies to mitigate their impact on cultural heritage resources.

The impacts of a proposed development or change to a cultural heritage resource may be direct or indirect. They may occur over a short term or long term duration, and may occur during a pre-construction phase, construction phase or post-construction phase. Impacts to a cultural heritage resource may also be site specific or widespread, and may have low, moderate or high levels of physical impact.

## 9.2 Analysis of Impacts

As the proposed development includes the demolition of the Port Hope Hospital at 65 Ward street and the 2 storey red brick building located at 36-38 Hope Street in order to construct a new long term Care Facility, the following analysis analyzes the impact of the demolition of these buildings as well as the impact on the subject lands as a potential cultural heritage landscape.

### 9.2.1 Demolition of 65 Ward Street

The proposed demolition of the Port Hope Hospital at 65 Ward Street is considered adverse impact as it would result in the permanent removal of heritage fabric. The building has been demonstrated in this Heritage Impact Assessment to have design/physical value as a representative example of the Edwardian architectural style constructed in 1915/1916. The

building is associated with the theme of medical services in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century of Port Hope and has historically benefited many local residents of the community as it relates to healthcare and standard of living. The existing building is also prominent along Ward Street and likely considered a landmark to the local community.

### 9.2.2 Demolition of 36-38 Hope Street

This report has demonstrated that the building located at 36-38 Hope Street has design/physical value for its construction in the mid. 19<sup>th</sup> century in the Regency architectural Style. The building is considered a representative example of this style of architecture. The building also has historical/associative value, primarily for its adaptive re-use in 1913 as a hospital facility. The building's contextual value is therefore related to the overall theme of the subject lands, related to medical care.

### 9.2.3 Retention of the 'Powerhouse' at 20 Hope Street

The proposed development includes the retention of the existing 'powerhouse' at 20 Hope Street. The proposed development includes retaining the building in-situ in setting similar to what is existing with small garden areas and landscaped open space. While the retention of the building in-situ is considered a beneficial impact as its results in the long-term care and conservation of the building, the construction of the new facility along Hope Street will eliminate any views or access to the structure from Hope Street, which is considered a neutral impact as the existing buildings on-site do not offer substantial views of the powerhouse from Hope Street. The west elevation of the building will remain visible from Princess Street, looking west.

### 9.2.4 Impacts on the Subject Lands as a Potential Cultural Heritage Landscape

The removal of the existing Port Hope Hospital fronting Ward Street and the 2 storey red brick building fronting Hope Street would result in the removal of two structures which make a significant contribution to the value of the subject lands as a potential Cultural Heritage Landscape. The removal of these structures would be considered a permanent adverse impact as the site would no longer retain the physical features which supported the historic use of the property for medical purposes.

# 10.0 Consideration of Development

## Alternatives, Mitigation Measures and Conservation Recommendations

### 10.1 Alternative Development Approaches

As the proposed development has been identified as resulting in permanent adverse impacts, the following provides alternative development approaches for consideration.

#### 10.1.1. Do nothing

The 'do nothing' alternative would prohibit the redevelopment of the subject property and would prevent the demolition/removal of buildings and features as described in this report. A 'do nothing' approach would result in the inability to redevelop the site and may result in the further deterioration of cultural heritage resources located on-site if they are left vacant or underutilized in-situ and further exposed to the elements. This option is not recommended.

#### 10.1.2. Retain Buildings in-situ and Integrate with the Proposed Development

This option would result in retaining the buildings (or a portion of the buildings) and integrate them with the proposed development in-situ. While the retention of the entirety of all buildings of cultural heritage value located on the subject lands is preferable (related to the 'powerhouse', 2 storey brick dwelling fronting Hope Street and the Port Hope Hospital fronting Ward Street), there is opportunity for demolishing later additions to the hospital and 2 storey brick building to make additional area available for the construction of a new facility. The original Port Hope Hospital was subject to the addition of sunrooms and a west wing. These additions could be removed while retaining the original portion of the hospital. The removal of these additions would constitute a minor adverse impact and require mitigation recommendations to ensure that the original portion of the hospital was retained and conserved appropriately. The 2 storey brick dwelling fronting Hope Street also displays two brick additions towards the west. These brick additions are not part of the original structure and do not include attributes which are indicative of the Regency architectural style. The removal of these later additions would constitute a minor adverse impact. Mitigation recommendations would be required in order to ensure that the original portion of the building was retained and conserved appropriately. The retention of the buildings

and integration is considered a beneficial impact as the original portions of the buildings on-site would be preserved over the long-term. However, detailed designs for the proposed integration of the three heritage buildings of cultural heritage value or interest would be integrated with the new facility would be required in order to provide an analysis of anticipated impacts and provide appropriate mitigation recommendations.

### 10.1.3. Retain Building and Re-locate within the Proposed Development

Retaining the building (or a portion of the existing building) and relocating them within the proposed development would prevent demolition. However, the buildings have not been assessed by way of a structural assessment which would determine whether or not they are able to be re-located. The Port Hope Hospital, for example, is exceedingly large and may not be a good candidate for re-location, even short distances. While the retention of the buildings is considered a beneficial impact, their re-location on site would constitute a minor adverse impact provided that they retain their relationships to each-other and the public realm. It should be noted that the re-location of buildings is often costly and dependant on other factors, such as grading, engineering, and the condition of the building, for example. Therefore, the retention of the buildings at an alternative location on the subject lands may not be feasible. In addition to this, due to the specifics of the site, the cost of re-locating the buildings to another location on the subject lands may not constitute a benefit which would make this alteration feasible.

### 10.1.4 Retain Building and Re-locate to an Alternative Site

Retaining the buildings and re-locating them to an alternative site within the Town of Port Hope would constitute an acceptable level of change provided that the buildings were able to be re-located safely. As noted above, it may not be feasible to re-locate the Port Hope Hospital due to its size. The 2 storey brick dwelling fronting Hope Street could potentially be re-located to an alternative location off-site, which would constitute an adverse impact as it would result in the removal of a built feature which is important in maintaining the theme of the landscape related to medical care. This impact would require mitigation recommendations, including the appropriate conservation of the building in an alternative location and commemoration for the building in its original location on the subject lands.

## 10.2 Mitigation Recommendations

Should the demolition of the 2 storey brick dwelling at 36-28 Ward Street and the Port Hope Hospital located at 65 Ward Street be approved, the following provides recommendations as mitigation of the identified adverse impacts:

- That prior to the demolition of the buildings, a Cultural Heritage Documentation and Salvage Report and Commemoration Plan be drafted and implemented which includes:
  - Detailed photographic documentation (interior and exterior);
  - Measured architectural drawings of all exterior elevations;
  - Measured floor plans;
  - Recommendations for items to be salvaged for commemoration purposes or donation as opposed to being deposited as landfill; and
  - Recommendations for appropriate commemoration of the buildings and the landscape, which may include commemorative plaques.
  
- That the 'powerhouse' located on-site north of the Southbridge Hope Street Terrace Care Facility be appropriately repaired and conserved as per the recommendations provided in the Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada. Investigations of the building have determined that considerable damages to masonry have occurred due to exposure to the elements (spalling and corroded bricks); and
  
- That this report be filed with the Municipality of Port Hope to supplement the historic record.

### 10.3 Implementation and Monitoring

Should the proposed development be approved, the existing 'powerhouse' structure at 20 Hope Street should be repaired during the medium term. Here, deficiencies in masonry have been noted at all elevations including the corrosion, spalling, and deterioration of bricks and mortar. No recommendations are necessary in the short term as all buildings have been efficiently boarded-up and there is no evidence of damage as a result of vandalism.

# 11.0 Recommendations and Conclusions

This Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) has identified that the subject lands have significant cultural heritage value as includes a) the Port Hope Hospital located at 65 Ward Street, b) the 2 storey brick structure located at 36-38 Hope Street, and c) the 'powerhouse' (formerly a laundry facility for the Port Hope Hospital) located at 20 Hope Street. All three of these structures meet the criteria for determining significant cultural heritage value as per *Ontario Regulation 9/06*. In addition to this, the subject lands have been evaluated based on the *PPS 2014* definition of a significant cultural heritage landscape. This report has determined that the subject lands include structures which are valued both independently, but together for their interrelationship, meaning, and association with institutional/medical operations in Port Hope.

The proposed development includes the demolition of the Port Hope Hospital at 65 Ward street and the 2 storey red brick building located at 36-38 Hope Street in order to construct a new long term Care Facility which will add to the existing Southbridge Hope Street Terrace Care Facility. The existing 'powerhouse' located north of the Hope Street Care Facility is proposed to be retained in-situ amongst landscaped open space (See Appendix A).

The proposed development will result in permanent adverse impacts related to the removal of the buildings located at 65 Ward Street and 36-38 Ward Street. As this would constitute adverse impacts to both these buildings individually as well as the subject lands as a potential Cultural Heritage Landscape, alternative development recommendations have been drafted for consideration. Should one of these alternative development options be implemented, specific mitigation recommendations would be required for any new plans.

Should the proposed development be approved, the following recommendations should be implemented in order to mitigate the adverse impacts related to the demolition of the buildings located at 65 Ward Street and 36-38 Hope Street, as well as the retention of the 'powerhouse' structure in-situ:

- That prior to the demolition of the buildings, a Cultural Heritage Documentation and Salvage Report and Commemoration Plan be drafted and implemented which includes:
  - Detailed photographic documentation (interior and exterior);
  - Measured architectural drawings of all exterior elevations;
  - Measured floor plans;




- Recommendations for items to be salvaged for commemoration purposes or donation as opposed to being deposited as landfill; and
- Recommendations for appropriate commemoration of the buildings and the landscape, which may include commemorative plaques.
  
- That the 'powerhouse' located on-site north of the Southbridge Hope Street Terrace Care Facility be appropriately repaired and conserved as per the recommendations provided in the Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada. Investigations of the building have determined that considerable damages to masonry have occurred due to exposure to the elements (spalling and corroded bricks); and
  
- That this report be filed with the Municipality of Port Hope to supplement the historic record.

*Respectfully submitted,*



Vanessa Hicks, MA, CAHP  
MHBC



Dan Currie, MA, MCIP, RPP, CAHP  
MHBC

# 12.0 Sources

Blumenson, John. *Ontario Architecture: A Guide to Styles and Building Terms 1874 to the Present*. Fitzhenry and Whiteside, 1990.

Clayton, Garnet Holloway. Port Hope History, a Subjective View, 2017. Website accessed online at <http://www.porthopehistory.com/>

Craick, W. Arnot. *Little Tales of Old Port Hope*. Port Hope: The Guide Publishing Company, 1966.

Craick, W. Arnot. *Port Hope Historical Sketches (Illustrated)*. Port Hope, 1901.

Cruikshank. *Port Hope: A Treasury of Early Homes*. Port Hope: Bluestone House Inc, 1987.

Heritage Resources Centre. *Architectural Style Guide*. University of Waterloo, 2009.

Humble, Isabel. *A History of the Port Hope Hospital: 1911-1980*. n.d.


Government of Canada. Parks Canada. *Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada*. 2010.

Montagnes, Ian. *Port Hope: A History*. 2007.

Ontario Ministry of Culture. *Ontario Heritage Tool Kit: Heritage Resources in the Land Use Planning Process, InfoSheet #2, Cultural Heritage Landscapes*. Queens Printer for Ontario, 2006.

Senior Historical Researchers of the EDHS. *Port Hope and its Port: Two Centuries of Change*. East Durham Historical Society, 1992.

## Appendix **A** – Site Plan and Elevations (next page)



**BUILDING AREA**

- 1) FIRST FLOOR  
EXISTING BUILDING/NEW CORRIDOR = 13,702sq.ft
- 2) SECOND FLOOR  
EXISTING BUILDING  
+ ADDITION FOR RHA#1 = 14,207sq.ft
- 3) THIRD FLOOR  
EXISTING BUILDING  
+ ADDITION FOR RHA#2 = 14,207sq.ft
- 4) NEW HUB AREA = 4,660sq.ft
- 5) NEW FIRST FLOOR (RHA#3)  
INCLUDING STAIRCASE/CORRIDOR = 15,368sq.ft
- 6) NEW SECOND FLOOR (RHA#4) = 15,368sq.ft
- 7) NEW THIRD FLOOR (RHA#5) = 15,368sq.ft

**TOTAL GROSS FLOOR AREA = 92,880sq.ft**

PARKING REQUIRED AT THE RATE OF 0.5 SPACES PER BED  
 160 BEDS @ 0.5 BEDS = 80 SPACES REQUIRED  
 PARKING PROVIDE AS FOLLOWS  
 NEW 54+20= 74 SPACES  
 EXISTING 2+10+5= 17 SPACES  
**TOTAL PARKING 91 SPACES**

**PROPOSED SITE PLAN**

SCALE: 1" = 20'-0"

**VIJAY VASANTGADKAR ARCHITECT INC.**

1614 LESPERANCE ROAD, SUITE #8A  
 TECUMSEH, ONT. N9N 1Y3  
 Tel. (519) 988-1855


JAN, 01 2018	REVISED CONCEPT
DEC, 20 2017	OWNERS APPROVAL
DATE	ISSUED FOR

PROJECT:  
**PROPOSED RENOVATION AND ADDITION TO HOPE STREET TERRACE NURSING HOME**

20 PORT HOPE STREET SOUTH, PORT HOPE, ONTARIO

DWG. TITLE:  
**PROPOSED SITE PLAN**


DWG. NO.  
**A-1**  
 PROJECT #1759



**PROPOSED KEY EAST ELEVATION**  
SCALE: 1/16" = 1'-0"



**PROPOSED EAST ELEVATION**  
SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"



**PROPOSED NORTH ELEVATION**  
SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"

**PROPOSED CONCEPT ELEVATIONS**

**VIJAY VASANTGADKAR ARCHITECT INC.**  
1614 LESPERANCE ROAD, SUITE #8A  
TECUMSEH, ONT. N8N 1Y3  
Tel. (519) 988-1855

JAN, 01 2018	REVISED CONCEPT
DEC, 20 2017	OWNERS APPROVAL
DATE	ISSUED FOR

PROJECT:  
PROPOSED RENOVATION AND ADDITION  
TO HOPE STREET TERRACE NURSING HOME  
  
20 PORT HOPE STREET SOUTH, PORT HOPE, ONTARIO

DWG. TITLE:  
PROPOSED CONCEPT  
ELEVATIONS

DWG. NO.  
**A-2**  
PROJECT #1759

## Appendix **B** – Chain of Title

## Chain of Title

Lot 21-31 Smiths Plan 'Town Plot 13' (1797-1965)


Inst. No.	Inst. Type	Reg. Date	Grantor	Grantee	Quantity	Remarks
-	Grant	1797	The Crown	Jonathan Walton (?) Smith	200 acres	-
LOT 21-31 SMITHS PLAN						
A-193	Will	1849	John D. Smith	Augusta S – Elias P. John Shulin (?) Smith	-	-
A-329	Deed	1851	A.S. Smith et al Justine (?)	William M. Smith	-	-
4-1889	Will	1863	Wm. M. Smith	R. C. Smith and Hon. (?) Smith	-	-
6-2738	D of (?)	1868	R.C. Smith and Sidney (?) Smith	Ada M. Smith	-	-
7-3148	B&S	1870	Ada M. Smith	Martin (Marlin?) Griffin	-	\$993.75
20-7360	Mtge.	1887	MarlinGriffin and wife	James (St.?) Ford	-	\$5000.00
28(?) 1552	Probate	1911	James (?) Ford (Fond ?)	James (?) James	-	'see will'
29-(?)1863	B&S	1912	James (?) James etux	Port Hope Hospital Trust	-	\$5,000.00
N15189	Deed	1965	The Port Hope Hospital Trust	Hope Haven Rest Home Limited	-	\$5,000.00

## Appendix C – Photo Map (next page)





# Photo Map



**Photo Map 1:** View of subject lands noting photo locations (Source: Northumberland County Interactive Maps, 2018)



**Photos 1 & 2:** (left) View of former hospital looking south from north side of Ward Street, (right) View of Ward Street looking west from Ward Street between Hope Street South and Princess Street, (Source: MHBC, 2017)



**Photos 3 & 4:** (left) View of Ward Street, looking east towards Hope Street from Ward Street, (right) View of former hospital looking east towards west elevation, (Source: MHBC, 2017)



**Photos 5 & 6:** (left) View of north elevation of former hospital looking south from south side of Ward Street (right) View of north elevation, looking south-west (Source: MHBC, 2017)



**Photos 7 & 8:** (left) View of McLean House (east elevation) and former hospital (east elevation) looking west from east side of Hope Street South, (right) View of existing Southbridge Care Facility, looking south-west from east side of Hope Street South (Source: MHBC, 2017)



**Photos 9 & 10:** (left) View of former hospital looking north-west towards south and east elevations (right) View of McLean House, looking south towards north elevation (Source: MHBC, 2017)



**Photos 11 & 12:** (left) View of former hospital, looking north-west towards east elevation (west wing), (right) View of McLean House, looking east towards west elevation (Source: MHBC, 2017)



**Photos 13 & 14:** (left) View of Powerhouse, looking south towards north elevation, (right) View of McLean House, looking north-east towards south elevation (Source: MHBC, 2017)



**Photos 15 & 16:** (left) View of Powerhouse, looking south-west towards east elevation, (right) View of Powerhouse, looking north towards south elevation (Source: MHBC, 2017)



**Photos 17 & 18:** (left) View of existing Southbridge Care facility, looking east towards west elevation of Powerhouse (background) (right) View Powerhouse, looking east towards west elevation (Source: MHBC, 2017)



**Photos 19 & 20:** (left) View of former hospital and McLean House, looking east from west side of Princess Street (right) View of Princess Street, looking south from west side of Princess Street (Source: MHBC, 2017)



**Photos 21 & 22:** (left) View of intersection of Princess Street and Ward Street, looking north-east (towards public school) (right) View of former hospital, looking south-east towards north and west elevations from north side of Ward Street (Source: MHBC, 2017)



**Photos 23 & 24:** (left) View of subject lands looking south from rooftop of former hospital, (right) View of public school, looking north of subject lands from rooftop of former hospital (Source: MHBC, 2017)

## Appendix **D** - Curriculum Vitae (next page)





# CURRICULUMVITAE

## Dan Currie, MA, MCIP, RPP, CAHP

Dan Currie, a Partner and Managing Director of MHBC's Cultural Heritage Division, joined MHBC Planning in 2009, after having worked in various positions in the public sector since 1997 including the Director of Policy Planning for the City of Cambridge and Senior Policy Planner for the City of Waterloo.

Dan provides a variety of planning services for public and private sector clients including a wide range of cultural heritage policy and planning work including strategic planning, heritage policy, heritage conservation district studies and plans, heritage master plans, heritage impact assessments and cultural heritage landscape studies.

### EDUCATION

2006

Masters of Arts (Planning)  
University of Waterloo

1998

Bachelor of Environmental Studies  
University of Waterloo

1998

Bachelor of Arts (Art History)  
University of Saskatchewan

### PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS

Full Member, Canadian Institute of Planners

Full Member, Ontario Professional Planners Institute

Professional Member, Canadian Association of Heritage Professionals

### SELECTED PROJECT EXPERIENCE

#### MASTER PLANS, GROWTH MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES AND POLICY STUDIES

Niagara-on-the-Lake, Corridor Design Guidelines

Cambridge West Master Environmental Servicing Plan

Township of West Lincoln Settlement Area Expansion Analysis

Ministry of Infrastructure Review of Performance Indicators for the Growth Plan

Township of Tiny Residential Land Use Study

Port Severn Settlement Area Boundary Review

City of Cambridge Green Building Policy

Township of West Lincoln Intensification Study & Employment Land Strategy

Ministry of the Environment Review of the D-Series Land Use Guidelines

Meadowlands Conservation Area Management Plan

City of Cambridge Trails Master Plan

City of Kawartha Lakes Growth Management Strategy

City of Cambridge Growth Management Strategy

City of Waterloo Height and Density Policy

City of Waterloo Student Accommodation Study

City of Waterloo Land Supply Study

City of Kitchener Inner City Housing Study

### CONTACT

540 Bingham Centre Drive,  
Suite 200  
Kitchener, ON N2B 3X9  
T 519 576 3650 x 744  
F 519 576 0121  
dcurrie@mhbcplan.com  
www.mhbcplan.com

# CURRICULUMVITAE

Dan Currie, MA, MCIP, RPP, CAHP

## HERITAGE PLANNING

Town of Cobourg, Heritage Master Plan  
Municipality of Chatham Kent, Rondeau Heritage Conservation District Plan  
City of Kingston, Barriefield Heritage Conservation District Plan Update  
Burlington Heights Heritage Lands Management Plan  
City of Markham, Victoria Square Heritage Conservation District Study  
City of Kitchener, Heritage Inventory Property Update  
Township of Muskoka Lakes, Bala Heritage Conservation District Plan  
Municipality of Meaford, Downtown Meaford Heritage Conservation District Plan  
City of Guelph, Brooklyn and College Hill Heritage Conservation District Plan  
City of Toronto, Garden District Heritage Conservation District Plan  
City of London, Western Counties Cultural Heritage Plan  
City of Cambridge, Heritage Master Plan  
City of Waterloo, Mary-Allen Neighbourhood Heritage District Plan Study  
City of Waterloo Rummelhardt School Heritage Designation

Other heritage consulting services including:

- Preparation of Heritage Impact Assessments for both private and public sector clients
- Requests for Designations
- Alterations or new developments within Heritage Conservation Districts
- Cultural Heritage Evaluations for Environmental Assessments

## DEVELOPMENT PLANNING

Provide consulting services and prepare planning applications for private sector clients for:

- Draft plans of subdivision
- Consent
- Official Plan Amendment
- Zoning By-law Amendment
- Minor Variance
- Site Plan

## CONTACT

540 Bingham Centre Drive,  
Suite 200  
Kitchener, ON N2B 3X9  
T 519 576 3650 x 744  
F 519 576 0121  
dcurrie@mhbcplan.com  
www.mhbcplan.com



## CURRICULUM VITAE

### Vanessa Hicks, M.A., C.A.H.P.

#### EDUCATION

2016  
Master of Arts in Planning,  
specializing in Heritage  
Planning  
*University of Waterloo,  
School of Planning*

2010  
Bachelor of Arts (Honours) in  
Historical/Industrial  
Archaeology  
*Wilfrid Laurier University*

Vanessa Hicks is a Heritage Planner with MHBC and joined the firm after graduating from the University of Waterloo with a Masters Degree in Planning, specializing in heritage planning and conservation. Prior to joining MHBC, Vanessa gained practical experience working as the Program Manager, Heritage Planning for the Town of Aurora, where she was responsible for working with Heritage Advisory Committees in managing heritage resources, Heritage Conservation Districts, designations, special events (such as the annual Doors Open Ontario event), and heritage projects (such as the Architectural Salvage Program). Vanessa provides a variety of research and report writing services for public and private sector clients. She has experience in historical research, inventory work, evaluation and analysis on a variety of projects, including heritage conservation districts (HCDs), heritage impact assessments (HIAs), cultural heritage evaluation reports (CHERs), conservation plans, as well as Stages 1-4 archaeological assessments.

#### PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

June 2016 - Present      Cultural Heritage Specialist/ Heritage Planner  
MacNaughton Hermsen Britton Clarkson Planning Ltd.

2012 - 2016      Program Manager, Heritage Planning  
Town of Aurora

May 2012 - October 2012      Heritage Planning Assistant  
Town of Grimsby

2007 - 2010      Archaeologist  
Archaeological Research Associates Ltd.

#### CONTACT

540 Bingham Centre Drive,  
Suite 200  
Kitchener, ON N2B 3X9  
T 519 576 3650 x 728  
F 519 576 0121  
vhicks@mhbcplan.com  
www.mhbcplan.com

## CURRICULUM VITAE

**Vanessa Hicks, M.A., C.A.H.P.**

### SELECT PROJECT EXPERIENCE

#### **HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENTS (HIAs)**

Heritage Impact Assessment - 'Southworks', 64 Grand Avenue South, City of Cambridge

Heritage Impact Assessment - 47 Spring Street Waterloo, Albert/MacGregor Neighbourhood HCD

Heritage Impact Assessment - 107 Concession Street, City of Cambridge

Heritage Impact Assessment - 33 Laird Drive, City of Toronto

Heritage Impact Assessment - Badley Bridge, part of a Municipal EA Class Assessment, Township of Centre Wellington

Heritage Impact Assessment - 362 Dodge Drive, City of Kitchener

Heritage Impact Assessment - 255 Ruhl Drive, Town of Milton

Heritage Impact Assessment - 34 Erb Street East, City of Waterloo

#### **CULTURAL HERITAGE EVALUATION REPORTS (CHERs)**

Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report - Dunlop Street West and Bradford Street, Barrie - Prince of Wales School and Barrie Central Collegiate Institute

Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report - Lakeshore Drive, Town of Oakville

Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report - 317 Mill Street, 28/30 Elizabeth Street South, 16 Elizabeth Street South, Town of Richmond Hill

Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report - Queen Victoria Park Cultural Heritage Landscape

#### **HERITAGE CONSERVATION DISTRICTS (HCDs)**

Heritage Conservation District Study - Southeast Old Aurora (Town of Aurora)

#### **CONSERVATION PLANS**

Strategic Conservation Plan - Queen Victoria Park Cultural Heritage Landscape

#### **SPECIAL PROJECTS**

Artifact Display Case - Three Brewers Restaurant(275 Yonge St., Toronto)

#### **CONTACT**

540 Bingham Centre Drive,  
Suite 200

Kitchener, ON N2B 3X9

T 519 576 3650 x 728

F 519 576 0121

vhicks@mhbcplan.com

www.mhbcplan.com



**MHBC**  
PLANNING  
URBAN DESIGN  
& LANDSCAPE  
ARCHITECTURE

# Appendix B – CRB Hearing Report

**Conservation Review Board**  
Commission des biens culturels



**ISSUE DATE:** March 13, 2019

**CASE NO(S):** CRB1813

**PROCEEDING COMMENCED UNDER** subsection 29(5) of the *Ontario Heritage Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c.O.18, as amended

Owner: Southbridge Health Care GP Inc.  
Objectors: See Appendix 1 – Objector List  
Subject: Notice of Intention to Designate (Port Hope Hospital)  
Property Address: 65 Ward Street  
Legal Description: Lots 21-31 Smith Estate Plan Port Hope, save and except Lots 21-25  
Municipality: Municipality of Port Hope  
CRB Case No.: CRB1813  
CRB Case Name: Baker v. Port Hope (Municipality)

**Heard:** February 11, 2019 in Port Hope, Ontario

**APPEARANCES:**

**Parties**

**Counsel\*/Representative**

Municipality of Port Hope

Jennifer Savini\*

Dan Baker

Self-represented

Melinda Brown

Self-represented

Colleen Haley

Self-represented

Kathy Hensgens

Self-represented

**Participants**

Anthony T. Jenkins

Self-represented

Bruce Bowden	Self-represented
Brian McLaughlin	Self-represented
Phillip Goldsmith	Self-represented
Bill McGill	Self-represented

## **REPORT OF THE BOARD DELIVERED BY DANIEL NELSON AND LAURIE SMITH**

### **OVERVIEW**

[1] The Municipality of Port Hope (“Municipality”) seeks to designate the property located at 65 Ward Street South, Port Hope (“Property”) for its cultural heritage value or interest under s. 29 of the *Ontario Heritage Act* (“OHA”).

[2] The Property is owned by Southbridge Health Care GP Inc. (“Owner”). Three older buildings on the Property were built in 1865 and 1915-1916 and were formerly known as the Port Hope Hospital. A fourth building was built in 1974 and is operated by the Owner as Hope Street Terrace, a long-term care facility.

[3] The Municipality issued a Notice of Intention to Designate (“NOID”) for the Property and 95 people objected, including the Owner. The matter was referred to the Conservation Review Board (“Review Board”), which convened a hearing under s. 29(8) of the OHA (“Hearing”) for the purpose of recommending to the Municipality whether, in the opinion of the Review Board, the Property should be designated under s. 29 of the OHA.

[4] For the reasons set out below, the Review Board recommends that the Municipality designate the Property under s. 29 of the OHA.



## BACKGROUND

[5] The Property includes four buildings on a large lot at the intersection of Ward and Hope streets in a residential neighbourhood of Port Hope:

- the original Port Hope Hospital building, a two-storey brick house built c. 1865 (“Cottage Hospital”);
- the former Port Hope Hospital building, a three-storey brick institutional building built in 1915-1916 with additions in the 1920s (“Hospital”);
- the Power House and Boiler Room, a one-storey brick building built in 1915-1916 (“Power House”); (together, the “Buildings”) and,
- Hope Street Terrace, a long-term-care facility built in 1974 (“Hope Street Terrace”).

[6] The Property is located on Lots 21-31 of the Smith Estate Plan, Port Hope. The Cottage Hospital, the Hospital, and the Power House are located on Lots 26 – 31 of the Plan. Hope Terrace is located on Lots 21-25 of the Plan.

[7] The Property has been on the Municipal Register of Heritage Properties since 2003. On October 27, 2017, the Owner submitted an application to the Municipality to demolish structures on the Property. Around the same time, the Heritage Port Hope Advisory Committee (formerly the Port Hope Local Architectural Conservation Advisory Committee) (“Heritage Port Hope”), the municipal heritage advisory committee under the OHA, toured the Property and began to consider designation. However, Heritage Port Hope agreed to hold their recommendation “in abeyance” if the Owner withdrew its application to demolish, which it did.

[8] Between November 2017 and March 2018, Heritage Port Hope proceeded to consider the heritage value of the Property at a series of its meetings, culminating in a formal recommendation to Municipal Council on March 19, 2018, that it designate the

property under Part IV of the OHA. On April 11, 2018, Council unanimously passed a resolution in favour of designation; a NOID was published on April 19, 2018. The Owner and 94 others (“Objectors”) filed Notices of Objection and the matter was referred to the Review Board.

[9] The Review Board held a pre-hearing conference (“PHC”) in person at Port Hope on October 3, 2018. The Municipality and nine of the Objectors (Dan Baker, Melinda Brown, Ed Dhagwe, Julie Dickerson, Debra Gilmour, Colleen Haley, Kathy Hensgens, Joyce Prince and Loraine Wamboldt) attended. Three of the participants also attended: Anthony Jenkins, Bruce Bowden and Brian McLaughlin.

[10] The Review Board held a second PHC by telephone conference call on November 20, 2018. The Municipality, the Owner and two participants (Anthony Jenkins and Philip Goldsmith) attended.

[11] The Review Board issued a procedural order on December 20, 2018 setting the dates for the hearing as February 11-13, 2019 and setting dates for disclosure. The Review Board later issued directions extending the dates for disclosure and shortening the expected length of the hearing.

[12] The hearing was convened on February 11, 2019 in the Council Chambers at 56 Queen Street, Port Hope and concluded after one day. On the morning of the hearing, staff working for the Owner, the objector Dan Baker, legal counsel and witnesses for the Municipality, the participant Anthony Jenkins and the Review Board Panel Members conducted a brief site visit of the Property.

[13] At the hearing, the Municipality was represented by counsel Jennifer Savini, who called three witnesses: Sonia Tam, Heritage Planner for the Municipality; Theodhora Merepeza, Planning Manager for the Municipality; and Phillip Carter, Heritage Architect. Mr. Carter was qualified by the Review Board as an expert witness on heritage

architecture. Three of the Objectors represented themselves and provided evidence and arguments at the hearing: Colleen Haley, Melinda Brown and Dan Baker. Four participants provided statements and were cross-examined: Anthony Jenkins, Bruce Bowden, Philip Goldsmith and Brian McLaughlin. Objector Kathy Hensgens participated by confirming the statement of Brian McLaughlin. Participant Bill McGill also confirmed the statement of Brian McLaughlin.

[14] The Owner, through its legal counsel Eric Davis, indicated at the outset that it would “not actively participate” in the hearing and indeed, it did not present any evidence or make any arguments at the hearing. However, an employee of the Owner attended the first PHC and the hearing as an “observer”, and Mr. Davis attended the second PHC. Although the other Objectors Ms. Haley, Mrs. Brown and Mr. Baker are also employees of the Owner, they did not purport to act on behalf of the Owner.

[15] The remaining 85 Objectors did not participate in the proceedings before the Review Board.

[16] The list of exhibits entered as evidence at the Hearing is attached as Appendix 2 to this Report.

## **ISSUE**

[17] Three issues are before the Review Board:

- a. Whether the Property has cultural heritage value or interest as prescribed by Ontario Regulation (“O. Reg.”) 9/06 and should therefore be designated under s. 29 of the OHA;
- b. What are the boundaries of the property for the purposes of the designation; and

- c. Which built assets on the Property should be included as heritage attributes in the designation.

## RELEVANT LEGISLATION AND REGULATION

### [18] *Ontario Heritage Act*

#### Definitions

1. In this Act, “heritage attributes” means, in relation to real property, and to the buildings and structures on the real property, the attributes of the property, buildings and structures that contribute to their cultural heritage value or interest;

...

#### PART IV - CONSERVATION OF PROPERTY OF CULTURAL HERITAGE VALUE OR INTEREST

##### Definition

26. (1) In this Part, “property” means real property and includes all buildings and structures thereon.

##### Same

(2) In sections 27 to 34.4, “designated property” means property designated by a municipality under section 29.

##### Designation by municipal by-law

29. (1) The council of a municipality may, by by-law, designate a property within the municipality to be of cultural heritage value or interest if,

- (a) where criteria for determining whether property is of cultural heritage value or interest have been prescribed by regulation, the property meets the prescribed criteria; and
- (b) the designation is made in accordance with the process set out in this section.

...

##### Objection

(5) A person who objects to a proposed designation shall, within thirty days after the date of publication of the notice of intention, serve on the clerk of the municipality a notice of objection setting out the reason for the objection and all relevant facts.

...

### **Referral to Review Board**

(7) Where a notice of objection has been served under subsection (5), the council shall, upon expiration of the thirty-day period under subsection (4), refer the matter to the Review Board for a hearing and report.

### **Report**

(12) Within thirty days after the conclusion of a hearing under subsection (8), the Review Board shall make a report to the council setting out its findings of fact, its recommendations as to whether or not the property should be designated under this Part and any information or knowledge used by it in reaching its recommendations, and the Review Board shall send a copy of its report to the other parties to the hearing.

...

### **Decision of council**

(14) After considering the report under subsection (12), the council, without a further hearing,

- (a) shall,
  - (i) pass a by-law designating the property,
  - (ii) cause a copy of the by-law, together with a statement explaining the cultural heritage value or interest of the property and a description of the heritage attributes of the property,
    - (A) to be served on the owner of the property and on the Trust, and
    - (B) to be registered against the property affected in the proper land registry office, and
  - (iii) publish notice of the by-law in a newspaper having general circulation in the municipality; or
- (b) shall withdraw the notice of intention to designate the property by causing a notice of withdrawal,
  - (i) to be served on the owner of the property and on the Trust, and
  - (ii) to be published in a newspaper having general circulation in the municipality.

### **Decision final**

(14.1) The decision of the council under subsection (14) is final.

[19] O. Reg. 9/06: Criteria for Determining Cultural Heritage Value or Interest

**Criteria**

1.(1) The criteria set out in subsection (2) are prescribed for the purposes of clause 29 (1) (a) of the Act. O. Reg. 9/06, s. 1 (1).

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

1. The property has design value or physical value because it,
  - i. is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, expression, material or construction method,
  - ii. displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit, or
  - iii. demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement.
  
2. The property has historical value or associative value because it,
  - i. has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization or institution that is significant to a community,
  - ii. yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of a community or culture, or
  - iii. demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer or theorist who is significant to a community.
  
3. The property has contextual value because it,
  - i. is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an area,
  - ii. is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings, or
  - iii. is a landmark.

**CASE FOR THE MUNICIPALITY**

[20] The Municipality submits that the Property should be designated under s. 29 of the OHA because it meets more than one of the criteria under O. Reg. 9/06. The Municipality argues that the Property has design or physical value under s. 1(2)1i and ii, historical or associative value under s. 1(2)2i, ii and iii, and contextual value under s. 1(2)3i and ii. Ms. Savini noted that “we are not here to comment on the importance of

long-term care – those are issues for Council to consider – but only to decide whether the criteria have been met. Council’s job is to consider the impact of the designation if the Review Board recommends that it proceed with designation.”

[21] With respect to boundaries, the Municipality submits that a designation by-law should be registered on title to the entire property (Lots 21 – 31, Smith Estate Plan, Port Hope) and the Cottage Hospital, the Hospital and the Power House would be described in the heritage attributes as having heritage value. The Municipality believes that Hope Street Terrace should not be included as a heritage attribute. The Municipality understands that a proposal to build any new facility anywhere on the Property should consider the potential impact on the heritage attributes of the Property.

[22] The Municipality submits that the heritage attributes of the designation should be those listed in the report prepared by its expert witness, Philip Carter, and appended here as Appendix 3.

[23] The Municipality’s first witness, Ms. Tam, has been the heritage planner for the Municipality since July 2017. She outlined the chronology of meetings and reports from July 2017 forwards. She is the author of the March 26, 2018 report on behalf of committee members recommending the Council resolution that would direct the clerk to publish the NOID.

[24] Regarding the boundaries for the designation, Ms. Tam testified that it is not uncommon for buildings without heritage value to be located on properties that are designated under Part IV of the OHA. If alterations were proposed to the long-term care facility building, which the Municipality does not consider having heritage value, the Municipality would require a Heritage Impact Statement so that it could consider the effect on the heritage value of the other buildings on the Property. The Municipality would also require a Heritage Impact Statement if the long-term care facility was on a separate and adjacent parcel to the other buildings.

[25] The Municipality's second witness, Ms. Merepeza, is the Planning Manager for the Municipality. Ms. Merepeza was present at the April 3, 2018 meeting of Municipal Council in place of Ms. Tam, and authored the report dated April 10, 2018. Her report recommended that Council either designate the property, or direct staff to work with the owner and Heritage Port Hope during the site plan review process to ensure that any new facility on the Property "recognizes the cultural heritage significance of the original 1916 hospital building". Council voted for the first option, to designate the property.

[26] The Municipality called a third witness, Mr. Carter, and sought to have him qualified as an expert. The Review Board confirmed Mr. Carter as an expert on heritage architecture. Mr. Carter is a registered architect in practice since 1972 and a member of the Ontario Association of Architects, the Royal Architectural Institute of Canada and the Canadian Association of Heritage Professionals. He holds a B. Arch. (University of Manitoba, 1964), and an M. Arch. and Master of City Planning (University of Pennsylvania, 1966). Mr. Carter has worked on the restoration or adaptive reuse of many heritage buildings of similar vintage to those on the Property, including the Port Hope Library and has authored 13 Heritage Conservation District studies. He was a member of Heritage Port Hope from 1986 to 2001, serving as Chair for six years, and again from 2013 onwards. In that role, he was involved with the creation of the Downtown Heritage Conservation District and wrote a number of Part IV designations. He has been a member of the Architectural Conservancy of Ontario ("ACO"), Port Hope Branch, since 1985, and has sat on the executive. As a member of ACO's Preservation Works program, he wrote a number of evaluations resulting in adaptive reuse projects. He has received a number of heritage awards. He has been qualified as an expert witness before the Review Board in other proceedings and has extensive knowledge of the OHA and O. Reg. 9/06.

[27] Mr. Carter testified that he, together with Deirdre Gardner, another member of Heritage Port Hope, wrote the Designation Report for the property that is attached to



Ms. Tam's report of March 26, 2018. In preparing the report, he visited the property, its neighbourhood, and other buildings in Port Hope that he considers similar in age and style (Central School; Dr. Hawkins School; and Dr. Powers School) and conducted archival research (Goad's Insurance Plan 1901 (rev. 1904)); photographs from the Port Hope Archives; W. Arnot Craik, *Port Hope Historical Sketches* (Port Hope: Williamson Press, 1901) and Isabel M. Humble, *A History of the Port Hope Hospital, 1911-1980* (n.d., n.p.).

[28] In Mr. Carter's opinion, three of the four buildings on the Property are worthy of designation: the Cottage Hospital, the Hospital and the Power House.

[29] Mr. Carter believes that the Property has design or physical value under s. 1 (2)1i of O. Reg. 9/06 because both the Hospital and the Power House are representative of the Classical Revival style of architecture as applied to institutional buildings. He testified that the Hospital was built in two or possibly three phases. He is not sure if it was built as a symmetrical building but believes it "was always intended to be symmetrical". He noted that the portico retains its original columns but the pediment had been changed to a peaked roof at an unknown date. He noted the large frieze encircling the building and referred to the round-arched window on the rear elevation as a "Palladian-style window" and "Palladian window with tracery" above the front entrance door. With respect to the Power House, he noted that the symmetry of its front façade had been "disturbed by the red vent", but that it retained a "Palladian-style double door", a "decorative frieze and dentil mouldings" as well as brick quoins.

[30] Mr. Carter also believes that the Property also has design or physical value under s. 1(2)1i of O. Reg. 9/06 because the Cottage Hospital is representative of a mid-19<sup>th</sup> century Victorian Italianate-style house. He noted the very large overhang.

[31] In Mr. Carter's opinion, the Property also has design or physical value under s. 1(2)1ii of O. Reg. 9/06 because both the Hospital and the Power House display a high degree of craftsmanship. He pointed out the brick masonry work of the Hospital, the corbelled brick at the base of the blind arches, the original columns and their current rotted condition, and the somewhat deteriorated but still intact frieze. On the Power House, he noted the brick arches and quoins, the "Palladian-style transom light" and the frieze with moldings and dentils, also noting that the presence of the vents takes away from the style. On cross-examination by Mrs. Brown as to the deviations in brick arches and the lack of uniformity in the size of quoin bricks, Mr. Carter replied that this might be true but did not affect his estimate of the high level of craftsmanship.

[32] It is Mr. Carter's opinion that the Property has historical or associative value under s. 1(2)2i and ii of O. Reg.9/06 because the Cottage Hospital is significant to the community as the first hospital in Port Hope. It was purchased with the intent of building a new hospital building. The Hospital is important because it was built to serve Northumberland County generally and specifically to serve soldiers returning from the First World War and was built with local funds. The porches at the rear of the building provided access to fresh air, which was believed to be important for recuperation. The hospital was unusual in hosting a nursing program in which the training was related to veterans' injuries.

[33] Mr. Carter also believes that the property has historical or associative value under s. 1(2)2iii of O. Reg. 9/06 because the Hospital and Power House are major works of James Augustus Ellis and his son Howard Ellis, who were responsible for other major buildings in Port Hope including the Port Hope High School (later Dr. Hawkins School) and the Central School on Pine Street (1912).

[34] In Mr. Carter's opinion, the Property has contextual value under s. 1(2)3i and ii of O. Reg. 9/06 because it is important in defining a prominent part of the east section of Port Hope, "is an integral part of this east-Port-Hope area" and is the nexus of the

community. He emphasized the proximity to Dr. Powers School, the large open space around the hospital, and the generous front yards. He also believes that the Property has contextual value under s. 1(2)3iii because both the Hospital and the complex of buildings as a whole are a landmark due to their size, formal Classical Revival style and residential location as well as their proximity to Dr. Powers School.

### **CASE FOR THE OBJECTORS: COLLEEN HALEY AND MELINDA BROWN**

[35] Ms. Haley and Mrs. Brown are employees of the Owner and work at the Property. They made a joint presentation: Mrs. Brown provided evidence in the form of a printed PowerPoint presentation and both Mrs. Brown and Ms. Haley provided opening and closing arguments and participated in cross-examination.

[36] Mrs. Brown described the origins of the Port Hope Hospital and the group of women who worked to establish the first hospital in Port Hope. She referred to the Cottage Hospital which opened in the former house at 65 Ward Street in 1913, the Hospital which followed it, and future plans for the development of Hope Street Terrace.

[37] Counsel for the Municipality objected to the remainder of Mrs. Brown's presentation as not relevant to the issues in this proceeding. The Review Board sustained the objection, on the basis that the Review Board does not have the jurisdiction to consider the potential future uses of the Property, the potential social or economic effects of designation on the community, or the condition of other designated properties in the community. While these may be valid concerns for the community, the Legislature has not given the Review Board the mandate under the OHA to consider them.

[38] In closing, Ms. Haley stated "we understand that there is historical value in the bricks and mortar, but there is historical value in the people that are there today that need their home. If the Property is designated, it will lead to huge changes in the lives of

the residents who live at 20 Hope Street. I am concerned that this is the end of long-term care in Port Hope. That is all going to change if the designation goes through.”

### **CASE FOR THE OBJECTOR: DAN BAKER**

[39] Mr. Baker is employed by the Owner and works at the Property as “the maintenance man”. He has lived nearby on McCaul Street for 35 years and has been familiar with the Property his whole life.

[40] Mr. Baker testified that when he was young, the Property included a farm, orchard and garden and there were pigs, chickens and a cow on the site. His understanding from reading Isabel Humble’s account of the hospital history is that the Property was purchased in 1913 for \$12,000. In 1915, the 156<sup>th</sup> Battalion was training in the Town Park and the military expressed the need for a hospital to treat illnesses among the soldiers. The Cottage Hospital in the former house was inadequate to the task, and when funds became available, a new hospital was commissioned. Mr. Baker stated that according to Ms. Humble’s book, construction of the Hospital began in October 1915 and the building was ready to occupy nine months later, in the summer of 1916. An elevator was donated in 1917. Mr. Baker questioned the level of workmanship of the masonry, on the basis that “a good mason doesn’t lay bricks in winter”.

[41] Mr. Baker testified that within 10 years, the Hospital was found to be inadequate in size. A small addition was built at the back to house the boilers, with space for a laundry at the front. Mr. Baker further stated that Pep Pemberton, the town milkman, told him that a second extension at the rear was added in 1928-29.

[42] Mr. Baker stated that by the 1950s, the Municipality had decided to build a new hospital elsewhere. The Property was put up for sale in 1964 and sold in 1967-1968 for \$64,000 to serve as a long-term care facility. Hope Street Terrace was built as a long-

term care facility on the property in 1974 and the former hospital became a retirement residence.

[43] Mr. Baker testified that in his opinion as the maintenance man for the Property, “the buildings are worn out”. He believes that the workmanship of the brick masonry is not high quality, because “the joints are uneven and the mortar sticks out”.

## **PRESENTATIONS BY PARTICIPANTS**

### **Anthony Jenkins**

[44] Mr. Jenkins lives across the street from the Property. He spoke on behalf of himself and 10 others who live in the neighbourhood: David Connelly, Jenny Munro, Bernice Keating, Marielle Lambert, Will Lambert, David Broughton, Mary Jane Broughton, Colleen Bulger, Ken Burgin and Karen Rankin. All of these individuals support the designation of the Property. Mr. Jenkins stated on behalf of the group that the buildings on the Property “are a source of neighbourhood pride. They are of architectural merit and consistent with the character of our neighbourhoods. They are prominently located and important landmarks in the neighbourhood and larger community.”

[45] Mr. Jenkins testified that “the 1915 hospital was conceived, financed, and built by the citizens of Port Hope” and that this is and continues to be a source of civic pride. He characterized the construction of the Hospital as “a manifestation of this new Canadian Identity” because it was constructed for wartime use and provided care and comfort for veterans.

[46] Mr. Jenkins and those he represents “see and appreciate the architectural merit of the historical hospital buildings” and believe they contribute in an important way “to the substance and character” of their adjoining and surrounding neighbourhoods. They are “essential to the neighbourhoods’ strong “sense of place” and unquestionable authenticity”.

[47] Mr. Jenkins testified that the Cottage Hospital is an “excellent and well-preserved” example of “the modest, mid-nineteenth-century Ontario cottage” and is consistent with the scale and character of the residential neighbourhood. He characterized the Hope Street Terrace as an anomaly because of its size and mid-20<sup>th</sup> century institutional design and size.

[48] Mr. Jenkins stated that the Hospital is “an impressive and largely intact example of the Classical Revival architectural style”; it has “strong, clean lines, superior masonry work, and pleasing detail”. He noted that the Hospital is directly across the street from the Dr. Powers School building, built in 1927. Both buildings are similar in scale, style, high quality construction, and siting and function as “gateway buildings”.

[49] As part of his presentation, Mr. Jenkins referred to a letter from the Royal Canadian Legion (“Legion”) to the Municipality of Port Hope, dated July 25, 2018 and signed by the Legion’s Provincial President and the Chairman, Long Term Care. A copy of the letter was included with Mr. Jenkins’ witness statement and served on all parties in advance of the hearing. In the letter, the Legion refers to the Hospital treating “more than 200 WWI soldiers” and serving “as a significant recuperative centre for soldiers and veterans during and after the war.” It also refers to the Cottage Hospital “becoming a nursing school which provided the skills crucial to the war effort and to practice in the medical field”. The Legion expresses its support for “the ACO working with Southbridge Care Homes to keep the heritage of the Ward 65 Hospital buildings intact”.

**Bruce Bowden**

[50] Mr. Bowden is Vice-Chair of the Port Hope chapter of the ACO. He is a retired university administrator and a historian who taught public history.

[51] Mr. Bowden testified that planning for a Port Hope hospital began in 1912 when a local group purchased Colonel McLean's house on Hope Street and established a "cottage hospital". In 1916, a purpose-built hospital was built on the property with an additional wing built six or 12 years later. He referred to it as a "cultural reminder" of the transformation in health care taking place in Ontario at this time. In Mr. Bowden's opinion, there are very few extant properties in Ontario that can show us the changes in health care during this period in the way that the Property can. Mr. Bowden referred to 1916 as "the year that Canada began" as a nation. The Prime Minister's response to the Battle of the Somme was to "double down" on conscription, seek government funding through bonds, create the first income tax and ask for nursing volunteers. Significantly, the Hospital was completed that year, just in time for the war and the victims of gassing, and for the influenza epidemic that followed the war. Mr. Bowden believes that the building of a hospital is a unique occurrence and deserves to be in the public memory; the OHA invites us to create a public memory by preserving the physical building.

[52] Mr. Bowden also spoke about the importance of having a local hospital at a time when roads were still largely impassable to cars – Ward and Hope streets became an important destination in Port Hope.

[53] Mr. Bowden testified that the war developed a local nursing profession for Port Hope's students. The Cottage Hospital was used as a nursing residence and several nurses went on to further training at Women's College Hospital in Toronto.

[54] Mr. Bowden stated that Heritage Port Hope believes that this site deserves to be a National Historic Site, because it is “one of the few hospital sites that remain intact”. Its physical limitations are instructive rather than restrictive. The continuum of service and nursing care on the site are important.

[55] Mr. Bowden advised the Review Board: “Designation doesn’t pickle the building. Designation is all about the future. History is a conversation – we are always going back to it to ask questions of the past. If you take away our visible evidence, then you damage that conversation.”

### **Philip Goldsmith**

[56] Mr. Goldsmith has practised as an architect since 1985 and has extensive experience and qualifications in heritage conservation. He is a member of the ACO, the Ontario Association of Architects, the Royal Architectural Institute of Canada, the Canadian Association of Heritage Professionals, Association for Preservation Technology International and ICOMOS Canada. He has degrees in architecture and environmental studies and was involved in heritage conservation projects in Toronto at the National Ballet School, Fort York, Black Creek, Toronto Brickworks and at Thistle Ha’ Farm, Pickering. He is a resident of Port Hope and owns two houses on Hope Street.

[57] Mr. Goldsmith has been a member of Heritage Port Hope since the 1990s and was involved in preparing the designation for the Property.

[58] He testified that the property has design or physical value because there is currently no hospital in Port Hope and “these buildings therefore are all that remains of our significant Hospital legacy”. He believes that the Hospital and Power House are “good examples” of the Classical Revival style because “they are well built simple structures with notable classical revival features.” These features include “an elegant



classical doorway with a central door, glazed sidelights and an elliptical arched glazed transom.” Although some features such as the wood cornice and porch are “deteriorated” or “altered”, the bulk of the building’s brick exterior is “complete and unaltered”. He noted that “this is one of only a handful of Classical Revival buildings in Port Hope and the only one which is a hospital.” He believes that “for the period of construction and the challenges of the day, the construction of the hospital was a major achievement for a small community”, rivalling similar buildings in much larger Ontario communities.

[59] He believes that there is nothing wrong with the style of the Hospital: it is almost unique in Ontario because so many of the early hospitals have been altered or demolished. It could be restored.

[60] Mr. Goldsmith believes that the property has historical or associative value because “it changed our social investment in our town”, by providing hospital services to local residents and war veterans. “Port Hope’s ongoing support of its hospital became a defining attribute of this community”. He characterized the establishment of the Cottage Hospital as a “mistake” on the part of town leaders, who soon realized that a larger, more modern hospital was required and engaged in a fund-raising campaign to build the Hospital in 1916 and convert the Cottage Hospital to a nurses’ residence.

[61] Mr. Goldsmith stated that the Hospital was designed by the architectural firm of Ellis & Ellis: James Augustus Ellis and his son Howard Ellis. He believes that James Augustus Ellis “was an important and prolific Ontario practitioner and that it is a “good example” of his work in the Classical Revival style”. Ellis also designed the Port Hope High School on Pine Street, in partnership with William Connery. He noted that Ellis & Ellis were the architects for the Manhattan Apartments, Toronto, on which there is a heritage easement.

[62] He testified that the Property is located at an important nexus in Port Hope, the intersection of Ward and Hope streets: Ward Street links Trinity College School to the historic downtown; Hope Street connects areas of Port Hope to Highway 2 and the waterfront. Together with the Dr. Powers School on the opposite side of Ward Street, it functions as a landmark at this important corner.

[63] With respect to the heritage attributes of the Property, Mr. Goldsmith recommended that these include the location of the buildings and lawns on the site. For the Cottage Hospital, he recommended that heritage attributes include its two-storey height, pitched roof, house form, regular grid of window openings on Hope Street, single doorway with side lights and transom, punched windows on other elevations, and single storey porch with pitched roof.

[64] For the Hospital, Mr. Goldsmith recommended that heritage attributes include the scale and form of the Hospital, 2.5-storeys in height with a flat roof, and its exterior design, including: “the classical front entrance, stair, portico, classic wood and columns”; the “wide front door with sidelights and elliptical transom with elaborate window mullions and muntins”; the exterior brickwork with quoins, arches, corbelling, voussoirs and the entrance arch; and the wood, six-over-six, double-hung windows. He also recommended identifying heritage attributes on the interior, including the main lobby and surviving original light fixtures.

### **Brian McLaughlin**

[65] Mr. McLaughlin lives in Hope Street Terrace. He agreed that “everything people have said is true, the Property is special”. For him, the value of the property lies in its continuous delivery of health care and the importance of continuing that history. He noted that none of the parties or participants had found associative value in Hope Street Terrace: “my building has been washed over because it looks institutional”.

[66] On cross-examination by the Municipality, Mr. McLaughlin agreed that he is not disputing the history of the Property, but he is disputing whether the criteria of O. Reg. 9/06 have been met. His concern is about a building's usefulness in life – its value is insignificant. He believes that the value of the Property is in health care, because “tons of wonderful things went on there”. On cross-examination by one of the Objectors, Mrs. Brown, who asked “Why are you here?”, Mr. McLaughlin stated “I’m here to voice my opinion.”

[67] Mr. McLaughlin spoke on behalf of two other residents of Hope Street Terrace. He did not have a signed Form 1, but each resident subsequently confirmed, *viva voce*, that he spoke for them. These residents are:

- Kathy Hensgens, who stated further: “I really disagree with the heritage designation because it would take away from us what we deserve.”
- Bill McGill, who is also president of the residents’ association.

## **ANALYSIS**

[68] The background history of the Cottage Hospital, the Hospital, and the Power Building does not appear to be in dispute; certainly, the Objectors raised no arguments or supplied any evidence to disprove such background. The original Cottage Hospital was built c. 1865 and acquired in 1911 to serve as the first hospital in the town. The Hospital was built in 1915-1916 with subsequent additions during the 1920s. The Power House was built to provide power and heat for the main hospital and was built in a similar style. The Cottage Hospital was a temporary acquisition during the design, fundraising, and building of the Hospital and later served, *inter alia*, as administrative space and nursing accommodations. The Property was sold in the 1950s and used for a variety of functions thereafter.

[69] The Municipality's position regarding designation is sweeping: it claims that the property meets all three criteria set out in O. Reg. 9/06. The Objectors' position is less clear. They did not specifically refute the historic and associative value and contextual value of the property; indeed, in many cases their evidence helped establish such criteria. Nor did they entirely refute the design or physical value of the Buildings on the property. Mr. Baker argued, however, that the Hospital lacked craftsmanship owing to the speed of construction and the way the bricks and mortar were prepared and set. Unfortunately, Mr. Baker was not qualified as an expert on such matters and little weight may be given to such evidence. Furthermore, such evidence was refuted by other witnesses, which went unchallenged.

### **Criterion 1: Design or Physical Value**

***Does the property have design or physical value because it is a rare, unique, representative, or early example of a style, type or expression, material, or construction method? (s. 1(2)1i)***

[70] The Municipality's position, as demonstrated by the testimony of Mr. Carter, is that the Hospital and Power House are representative of "the Classical Revival style applied to institutional buildings", and that the Cottage Hospital is "representative of a mid-19<sup>th</sup> Century Victorian Italianate style". To be representative of a style or type, the Review Board considers that the proponent should first describe the benchmark characteristics of a recognized style or type within the context of architectural history, and then provide evidence as to how the present example meets or is typical of that benchmark. Several classically inspired revival styles were prevalent in the first few decades of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, including the Beaux-Arts style, the Edwardian Classical style, the Modern Classical style and the Georgian Revival style. Each had their own characteristics and approach to using classical elements, varying in form, scale, decorative program, surface treatment and materials. Classical styles were also employed during the early 19<sup>th</sup> century in Canada: Palladian, Neoclassical, and Italianate. When Mr. Carter refers to "the Classical Revival style of architecture applied

to institutional buildings”, to which style does he refer? What are the characteristics that distinguish that style from others? In what ways are the building in their current condition, typical of the style? All of these components are necessary in order to determine the extent to which each building conforms to the expected elements of the style.

[71] The Review Board finds that Mr. Carter has not provided appropriate evidence for the Review Board to determine the parameters of the “Classical Revival style of architecture applied to institutional buildings” and whether the Hospital and Power House are representative of that style. Mr. Carter’s listing of elements found on each building, without an architectural context, is not sufficient to reach a conclusion with respect to this criterion.

[72] In addition, the Review Board is concerned that subsequent alterations have rendered both the Hospital and the Power House no longer representative of any style. Both Mr. Carter and Mr. Goldsmith stated that the Hospital and Power House have been altered from their as-built condition. It is unclear whether the Hospital was built symmetrically, and the extent to which it was altered by later additions. Important features of the Hospital such as the portico and the frieze have been altered or deteriorated. The formal façade and round-arched openings of the Power House have been altered by the insertion of vents. A more fulsome explanation of the style characteristics might have made it possible to assess the extent to which these alterations have compromised the style.

[73] With respect to the Cottage Hospital, the Review Board has not been presented with sufficient evidence to find that the building is representative of the Italianate style. Some basic elements of the domestic form of the Italianate style are evident here, particularly the low-pitched roof, elongated windows, and a porch. However, there is little evidence of the style’s controlled ornateness, or decorative brackets (an undated,

historic photograph shows only simple brackets). In its current form, the house can hardly be described as representative.

[74] With respect to all three buildings, there is insufficient evidence to make a recommendation for designation under this criterion.

***Does the property have design or physical value because it displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit? (s. 1(2)1i)***

[75] The Municipality's position is that the Hospital and Power House display a high degree of craftsmanship.

[76] The question of what constitutes craftsmanship under this criterion is not defined in the OHA. The Oxford English Dictionary defines it as "skill in a particular craft." In the context of O. Reg. 9/06, the proponent must show that a building demonstrates a high degree of skill in a particular craft in relationship to the construction of the building. In other words, design and architectural decisions are not relevant to this criterion. Rather, did the craftspeople (masons, carpenters, glaziers, etc.) execute the design with a high degree of skill?

[77] Mr. Carter notes the arched brickwork, voussoirs, corbelled brick, brick corner quoins, flat-roofed portico, and classically inspired mouldings including dentils, but does not provide details of the craft or skill involved in their creation. The Review Board considers that the existence of such features demonstrates architectural style and taste, but not necessarily the skill of the craftspeople who executed on that design.

[78] As referenced above, Mr. Baker suggests that the brickwork was poorly done but such evidence necessarily carries little weight.

[79] In any event, the Review Board has little evidence before it on the degree of skill executed by craftspeople working on the Hospital and Power House and can make no recommendation in relation to this criterion.

## **Criterion 2: Historical or Associative Value**

***Does the property have historical or associative value because it has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organisation or institution that is significant to the community? (s. 1(2)2i)***

[80] On the evidence before it, the Review Board finds that the Property has historical or associative value because it has direct associations with a theme or activity that is significant to the community. The Review Board finds that the Property is directly associated with several themes from the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century: the history and development of Port Hope; the history of health care in Port Hope; the evolution of health care in Ontario; and the history of nursing and nursing training in Ontario. It is also associated with the activity of health care provision during the First World War, including the treatment of injured soldiers and veterans and the Spanish Flu epidemic.

[81] The Municipality, the Objectors, and some of the participants spoke movingly of the importance of this Property and the buildings on it as they relate to the history and development of Port Hope.

[82] All of the parties and participants also spoke to the role of this site in the evolution of health care in Port Hope and in Ontario generally, a point made several times by objectors Mrs. Brown and Ms. Haley and participant Mr. McLaughlin. Indeed, the existence of both the Cottage Hospital and the Hospital, on the same site, clearly demonstrates this evolution. That both survive, and are found together, is significant.

[83] The Review Board notes that the Legion also supports the designation since this hospital played a key recuperative role in the health of soldiers and veterans of the First World War. Other than Mr. McLaughlin, who touched on it indirectly, no one spoke of the connection of Hope Street Terrace to this ongoing story of the evolution of health care, locally, provincially, and nationally. The Objectors spoke of the importance of the Hope Street building as a community as well. Regrettably, no evidence was specifically provided to show whether Hope Street Terrace also contributed to heritage value.

[84] As the Review Board in *Faghani v. Toronto (City)*, 2018 CanLII 37799 (ON CONRB), noted: “the definition of ‘community’ is fluid and can be expanded, contracted, or specialized depending on the circumstances.” In this case, the Property is directly associated with themes that are significant to the Municipality but also at a provincial or even national level. It is also important to the community of veterans as demonstrated by the Legion’s support for designation.

[85] The Review Board is satisfied that the property does have important historical or associative value because of its direct associations with these themes and activities and therefore recommends designation under this criterion.

***Does the property have historical or associative value because it yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of a community or culture? (s. 1(2)2ii)***

[86] The Municipality raised this criterion but did not make any submissions with respect to it. However, the Review Board finds that the Property does have historical or associative value because it yields information that contributes to an understanding of a community or culture. The presence of both the Cottage Hospital and the Hospital on the same site provides evidence that contributes to an understanding of the community of Port Hope and the provision of health care services in early to mid-20<sup>th</sup> century, first in a small, cottage-sized hospital, and then in a larger, modern institution. Mr. Bowden



referred to the “continuum of service and nursing care on the site” and the importance of the site as visible, scientific evidence of past practices.

***Does the property have historical or associative value because it demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer, or theorist who is significant to a community? (s. 1(2)2iii)***

[87] The Municipality’s position is that the Hospital and Power House are major works of the architects Ellis & Ellis, who were significant because of their connections with Port Hope and because the elder Ellis had designed other institutional buildings in Port Hope. Both Mr. Carter and Mr. Goldsmith testified to this effect but neither provided a source for the attribution to Ellis & Ellis. The Review Board does not dispute that James Augustus Ellis, senior partner of Ellis & Ellis, had strong ties to Port Hope and designed other local buildings. However, the Review Board is not convinced that the Hospital was designed by Ellis & Ellis.

[88] The *Biographical Dictionary of Architects in Canada* (“BDAC”) (Robert Hill, online), is one of the most important scholarly references for information on Canadian architects. The BDAC notes that the Toronto firm of Ellis & Ellis designed an addition to the Hospital in 1921, but does not record a designer for the Hospital itself. The BDAC notes more than 100 works designed by James Augustus Ellis, including Pine Street High School, Port Hope (1896); almost 50 works by Ellis in partnership with William Connery, including Central Public School, Pine Street, Port Hope (1911-12) and the hockey rink for Trinity College School, Port Hope (1911); and at least 18 other works by Ellis & Ellis in Ontario.

[89] However, a 1911 article in local Port Hope newspaper refers to the Hospital architects as “Prach[sic] & Perrine, architects and engineers, of Hamilton” (“Public Hospital Meeting”, *The Evening Guide*, 29 April 1911). The BDAC notes that American industrial architects and engineers Bernard Herman Prack and Ren B. Perrine opened an office in Hamilton in 1911 and completed more than 20 commissions for industrial

buildings, until Perrine left the firm in 1917. The BDAC does not list the Hospital Building. Further research would be needed to confirm whether Prack & Perrine are indeed the architects of the Hospital and to ascertain their significance in Port Hope.

[90] The Review Board finds that the Municipality has not provided sufficient evidence to support this criterion. The Review Board strongly recommends that the Municipality conduct further research to confirm the architects of the Property and their significance in relation to Port Hope.

### **Criterion 3: Contextual Value**

***The property has contextual value because it is important in defining, keeping, and supporting the character of an area (s. 1(2)3i)***

[91] The Municipality argues that the property is linked to a broader precinct in Port Hope. Indeed, Mr. Carter describes the area as a “campus-like complex” that links the historic downtown, on a major east-west arterial street, to Trinity College School and the town’s fairgrounds in the east, giving it a processional significance. There are links to Central Public School and Pine Street School, with Central Public School facing the Hospital and reflecting similar design elements.

[92] On the other hand, the immediate vicinity, excluding the school, appears to be an area of mixed housing of various ages and styles. Thus, it is difficult to discern how the property defines, keeps or supports the character of the area.

[93] The Review Board finds that this criterion has not been met.

***The Property has contextual value because it is physically, functionally, visually, or historically linked to its surroundings. (s. 1(2)3ii)***

[94] While the Property has some physical and visual links to its surroundings and stylistic and architectural links to the school across the road, these seem tenuous at best. The Review Board finds that this criterion has not been met.

***The Property has contextual value because it is a landmark (s.1(2)3iii)***

[95] The Municipality argues that the property functions as a landmark. In *Qureshi v. Mississauga (City)*, 2015 CanLII 99223 (ON CONRB), the Review Board considered what a landmark means in the context of O. Reg. 9/06 and determined that it means a “landmark in the context of its community.”

[96] In this case, the Review Board heard much testimony to support the idea that the Property functions as both a symbolic and geographic landmark in the Port Hope community. The Hospital is a large and commanding presence on an important arterial road, it has generous setbacks and its large, institutional design is surrounded by much smaller residential buildings. It would even seem to be a symbolic landmark for veterans as demonstrated by the support for designation of the Royal Canadian Legion.

[97] The Review Board is satisfied that the criterion for landmark has been met.

## **BOUNDARIES**

[98] There was some discussion, both at the PHCs and at the hearing itself, about the boundaries of the designation *vis-à-vis* the Property. The wording of the NOID suggests that the Municipality is only seeking to designate a property parcel comprising Lots 26-31, on which the Hospital, Cottage Hospital and Power House sit, and to exclude Lots 21-25 on which Hope Street Terrace sits. While this option is available to the

Municipality, it would necessitate severing the existing property parcel. However, at the hearing, the Municipality clarified that it is seeking to designate the entire existing parcel, including Lots 21-31.

[99] It is important to note that a designating by-law under s. 29 of the OHA attaches to the entire real property parcel and includes all of the buildings and structures on the property. However, it is the heritage attributes listed in the designating by-law that will determine what must be protected in order to conserve the heritage value of the property. The OHA defines heritage attributes “in relation to real property, and to the buildings and structures on the real property, the attributes of the property, buildings and structures that contribute to their cultural heritage value or interest.”

[100] The Review Board strongly recommends that the designating by-law be reworded to confirm that the designation includes the entire existing parcel, but that the heritage attributes concern only the buildings and spaces on Lots 26-31.

## **HERITAGE ATTRIBUTES**

[101] The Review Board strongly recommends that the Heritage Attributes be reworded to reflect the Review Board recommendations above, as follows.

1. As a result of the Review Board’s findings on the historical and associative value and on contextual value, the Review Board recommends that the following attributes be added:
  - a. The physical relationship between the three Buildings and their orientation on the site;
  - b. The important viewscales of the three buildings from the exterior of the property, including the setback and expansive lawns.

2. Regarding the Hospital, the Review Board recommends that its heritage attributes be modified as follows:
  - a. Remove the references to features which are no longer there such as the balcony. An extinct feature cannot be a heritage attribute.
  - b. Remove the references to Classical Revival style;
  - c. Remove the references to Palladian windows, as there are none on this building. A Palladian window is a tripartite window with a taller, round-arched panel flanked by shorter, flat-arched panels on either side. Single, round-arched windows and elliptical windows are not Palladian windows.
  - d. Remove the references to finely crafted brickwork.
  - e. References to fenestration should be revised to clarify that it refers only to surviving fenestration.
  - f. Add a more fulsome description of the building's exterior, including its scale and form, the placement of window and door openings, surviving remnants of the rear porches and the ornamental frieze.
  
3. Regarding the Power House, the Review Board recommends that its heritage attributes be modified as follows:
  - a. Remove the references to Palladian windows, as noted above.
  - b. Remove the references to finely crafted brickwork.
  
4. Regarding the Cottage Hospital, the Review Board recommends that its heritage attributes be modified as follows:
  - a. Remove the reference to late-19<sup>th</sup> century and replace it with a description in keeping with its c. 1865 construction date.

## SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

[102] Having considered the evidence and submissions at the hearing, and for the reasons set out above, the Review Board recommends that the Property be designated under s. 29 of the OHA.

*“Daniel Nelson”*

DANIEL NELSON  
MEMBER

*“Laurie Smith”*

LAURIE SMITH  
VICE-CHAIR

If there is an attachment referred to in this document,  
please visit [www.elto.gov.on.ca](http://www.elto.gov.on.ca) to view the attachment in PDF format.

### **Conservation Review Board**

A constituent tribunal of Tribunals Ontario - Environment and Land Division  
Website: [www.elto.gov.on.ca](http://www.elto.gov.on.ca) Telephone: 416-212-6349 Toll Free: 1-866-448-2248

# Appendix C – Agreement By-law



**TOWN HALL**  
56 Queen Street  
Port Hope, ON L1A 3Z9  
t: 905.885.4544  
f: 905.885.7698  
admin@porthope.ca  
www.porthope.ca

September 18, 2019

Mr. Keith McIntosh,  
Director and Executive Vice President  
Southbridge Care Homes  
766 Hespeler Rd.  
Suite 301  
CAMBRIDGE ON N3H 5L8

Dear Mr. McIntosh:

Further, to the Council meeting held on September 17, 2019, please find enclosed a copy of the Agreement between CVH (No. 6) LP and Southbridge Health Care GP Inc. which has been executed by the Mayor and Clerk along with a certified true copy of By-law 69/2019 being a By-law to authorize execution if an Agreement with Southbridge Health Care for the redevelopment of 65 Ward Street.

I provide this for your information and files.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact our offices at 905.885.4544

Sincerely,

*for*   
Daphne Livingstone,  
Legislative Services Manager/  
Deputy Clerk

tw

cc: T. Dodds, Director of Community Development  
file copy

encl. – Executed copy of the Agreement  
- Certified copy of By-law 69/2019



THIS AGREEMENT is made this 6<sup>th</sup> day of September, 2019

BETWEEN:

THE CORPORATION OF THE  
MUNICIPALITY OF PORT HOPE

(hereinafter the "**Municipality**")

Party of the FIRST PART

- and -

CVH (NO. 6) LP and SOUTHBRIDGE  
HEALTH CARE GP INC.

(collectively, hereinafter "**Southbridge**")

Party of the SECOND PART

WHEREAS CVH (No. 6) LP ("**CVH 6**") is the beneficial owner of the lands described in Schedule "A" (herein called the "**Subject Lands**") and Southbridge Health Care GP Inc., in its capacity as the managing general partner of CVH 6, holds registered title to the Subject Lands to and for the exclusive benefit of CVH 6 pursuant to the terms of a Nominee Agreement dated the 26<sup>th</sup> day of June, 2018;

AND WHEREAS Southbridge operates a 97 bed long-term care facility known as Hope Street Terrace on a portion of the Subject Lands and, subject to the terms and conditions set out herein, wishes to expand such facility to a three storey 160 bed "long term care facility" (which for purposes of this Agreement "long-term care facility" shall have the same meaning as that term is defined in the Municipal Zoning Bylaw 20/2010) on the Subject Lands (the "**Project**");

AND WHEREAS a portion of the Subject Lands contains three buildings formerly known as the Port Hope Hospital, the Power House and the Cottage Hospital (collectively the "**Hospital Buildings**");

AND WHEREAS completion of the Project will require the demolition of certain buildings on the Subject lands including, but not limited to, the Hospital Buildings;

AND WHEREAS on April 19, 2018, the Municipality gave a Notice of Intention to Designate the Subject Lands (the "**NOID**") in respect of heritage attributes relating to the Hospital Buildings pursuant to Section 29 the *Ontario Heritage Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. O.18;

AND WHEREAS the issue of designation was referred to the Conservation Review Board (the "**CRB**") under CRB Case No. 1813 and following a hearing the CRB recommended designation of the Subject Lands in respect of certain heritage attributes relating to the Hospital Buildings;

AND WHEREAS designation of the Subject Lands will prevent Southbridge from

proceeding with the Project;

AND WHEREAS the Municipality and Southbridge are desirous of entering into this agreement to document and evidence the commitment of Southbridge to complete the Project subject to the terms and conditions set out herein and the commitment of the Municipality to withdraw the NOID and permit completion of the Project only upon satisfactory completion by Southbridge of all of the terms of this Agreement;;

AND WHEREAS the Subject Lands are within a site plan control area as designated by the Municipality and subject to the requirements of the Municipality for development;

AND WHEREAS the operation of a long-term care facility on the Subject Lands is a permitted use pursuant to the Municipality's Zoning Bylaw 20/2010 and official plan relating to the Subject Lands;

NOW THEREFORE in consideration of the mutual agreements, covenants and promises herein contained, and other good and valuable consideration, the receipt and sufficiency of which is acknowledged by the parties hereto, the parties hereto agree as follows:

### **Withdrawal of NOID**

1. The parties acknowledge and agree that the purpose and intent of this Agreement is to:
  - a. have Southbridge obtain, at its sole cost, all approvals and satisfy all conditions precedent set out in this Agreement and obtain from the Municipality all permits and approvals required to demolish any buildings to be demolished on the Subject Lands, for the construction of the Project and for the development of the Subject Lands prior to withdrawal of the NOID by the Municipality; and
  - b. have the Municipality commit to the withdrawal of the NOID only upon satisfactory completion by Southbridge of all of the terms of this Agreement.
2. The parties agree that as conditions precedent to the withdrawal of the NOID Southbridge will (i) prepare and submit to the Municipality all of the applications (in accordance with applicable legislation and bylaws) including all supporting documents required in connection therewith that the Municipality requires in order to issue all of the required municipal approvals for the Project including, but not limited to, site plan approval pursuant to section 41 of the Planning Act RSO 1990 c.P13 as amended, building permits and demolition permits; (ii) participate in the usual planning application processes with the Municipality; (iii) execute and register on title to the Subject Lands a site plan agreement in a form acceptable to the Municipality; (iv) have all mortgagees and encumbrancers having an interest in the Subject Lands sign the required site plan agreement for the purpose of postponing their respective interests in the Subject Lands; (v) pay to the Municipality all of the required fees and charges associated with such applications and permits when they become due and payable; and (vi) provide written confirmation addressed to the Municipality from the architect and construction manager for the Project confirming that fully executed agreements are in place with them for the construction of the Project.
3. The Municipality hereby covenants and agrees that once Southbridge has fully complied with all of the conditions precedent set out in Section 2 above and, without limiting the

generality of the foregoing, Southbridge has: obtained final site plan approval for the development of the Project on the Subject Lands; executed and registered on title a site plan agreement for the development of the Project on the Subject Lands with the signatures of all mortgagees and encumbrancers having an interest in the Subject Lands thereon for purposes of postponing their respective interests in the Subject Lands; obtained and paid for all required building permits and demolition permits; paid to the Municipality all of the required fees and charges associated with the development of the Project on the Subject Lands; and provided to the Municipality the written confirmation from the architect and construction manager for the Project described above in Paragraph 2 of this Agreement then the Municipality shall, provided that this Agreement has not been terminated pursuant to Section 6 below, within fourteen (14) days withdraw the NOID by causing a notice of withdrawal,

- a. to be served on Southbridge and on the Ontario Heritage Trust; and
- b. to be published in a newspaper having general circulation in the Municipality.

The Municipality acknowledges that its decision to withdraw the NOID will be final and binding.

4. The Municipality covenants and agrees not to designate the Subject Lands pursuant to Parts IV or V of the *Ontario Heritage Act* or to take any steps in relation thereto, prior to the completion of the Project, unless this Agreement has been terminated.
5. Southbridge acknowledges and agrees that it shall not be entitled to terminate this Agreement after the Municipality has issued to Southbridge the notice set out in Section 3 (a) above and complied with its publication obligation under Section 3 (b) above.

#### Termination

6. Subject to Section 5, in the event that Southbridge is not satisfied for any reason whatsoever at any time prior to or during the application process or at any other time prior to the Municipality issuing both of the notices in Section 3(a) and (b) hereof, Southbridge may terminate this Agreement by giving the Municipality written notice of its wish to terminate this Agreement and withdraw all of the applications that it has submitted.
7. Southbridge acknowledges that in the event that this Agreement is terminated, the Municipality may proceed to designate the Subject Lands pursuant to the *Ontario Heritage Act R. S. O. 1990, Chapter O. 18*.
8. The parties agree that if this Agreement is terminated prior to the date that the NOID is withdrawn by the Municipality, the Municipality shall, within five business days of notice of such termination, deliver to Southbridge:
  - a. 50% of the public works user fees paid by Southbridge to the Municipality;
  - b. the full amount of the performance guarantee amount and development charges paid by Southbridge to the Municipality without any deduction, abatement or set off of any kind;
  - c. 45% of all building permit fees paid by Southbridge to the Municipality; and
  - d. a copy of any discharges required to discharge any site plan agreement, postponement or other document registered by the Municipality against the

Subject Lands.

Southbridge acknowledges and agrees that all major site plan application fees, GRCA review fees and demolition permit fees shall be fully non-refundable in the event that this Agreement is terminated.

9. The parties agree that if this Agreement is terminated prior to the date that the NOID is withdrawn by the Municipality, any site plan agreement, postponement, confirmation or any other documents provided by or on behalf of Southbridge shall be automatically terminated as of the date of the termination of this Agreement.
10. This Agreement shall terminate on:
  - a. the date that Southbridge issues a notice of termination pursuant to Section 6 above;
  - b. December 31, 2020 if Southbridge has not submitted all of the required applications for the Project and the demolition of buildings on the Subject Lands to the Municipality; and
  - c. the date that the parties mutually agree to terminate this Agreement.

**Notices**

11. Any notice required or permitted to be given by either party under this Agreement shall be in writing and shall be sufficiently given if delivered personally, sent by prepaid first-class mail, courier or transmitted by facsimile or electronic mail during the transmission of which no indication of failure of receipt is communicated to the sender:

- a. In the case of the Municipality at:

The Corporation of the Municipality of Port Hope  
56 Queen Street  
Port Hope, Ontario L1A 3Z9  
Attention: Brian Gilmer, Director of Corporate Services \ Clerk  
Fax No. (905) 885.7698  
Email: [bgilmer@porthope.ca](mailto:bgilmer@porthope.ca)

- b. In the case of Southbridge at:

766 Hespeler Road, Suite 301  
Cambridge, Ontario N3H 5L8  
Attention: Keith McIntosh, Director and Executive Vice President  
Fax No. (519) 621.8144  
Email: [kmcintosh@southbridgecare.com](mailto:kmcintosh@southbridgecare.com)

Any notice delivered personally or by courier shall be deemed to have been given and received on the date on which it was received at such address, or, if sent by mail, shall be deemed to have been given and received on the date which is five (5) days after which it was mailed, provided that if either such day is not a business day, then the notice shall be deemed to have been given and received on the business day next following such day.

Any notice transmitted by facsimile or electronic mail shall be deemed to have been given and received on the date of its transmission provided that if such day is not a business day or if it is received after 5pm on the date of its transmission at the place of receipt, then it shall be deemed to have been given and received at 9am on the first business day next following the transmission thereof. If normal mail service, courier service, facsimile or electronic mail is interrupted by strike, slowdown, force majeure or other cause, a notice, direction or other instrument sent by the impaired means of communication will not be deemed to be received until actually received, and the party sending the notice shall utilize any other such service which has not been so interrupted to deliver such notice.


## **General**


12. The parties hereto agree that the recitals to this Agreement are true.
13. Southbridge shall not assign this Agreement or any of its obligations hereunder without the prior written consent of the Municipality.
14. The headings in this Agreement are for the use of reference only and shall not be read or construed so as to abridge or modify the meaning of any provision in the main text of this Agreement.
15. This Agreement and the schedule attached hereto constitute the entire agreement between the parties pertaining to the subject matter of this Agreement and supersede all prior agreements, understandings, negotiations and discussions, whether oral or written, of the parties. No supplement, modification or amendment to this Agreement and no waiver of any provision of this Agreement shall be binding on any party unless executed by such party in writing.
16. The failure of either party to insist on strict performance of any of the terms, provisions, covenants or obligations contained in this Agreement shall not be deemed to be a waiver of any rights or remedies that party may have, and shall not be deemed to be a waiver of any subsequent breach or default of the terms, provisions, covenants and obligations contained in this Agreement.
17. If any term or provision of this Agreement or the application thereof to any person or circumstance shall be held by competent authority to be invalid or unenforceable to any extent, the remainder of this Agreement or the application of such term or provision to persons or circumstances other than those as to whom or to which it is held invalid or unenforceable, shall not be affected thereby and each term and provision of this Agreement shall be valid and enforceable to the full extent permitted by law.
18. All costs and expenses (including, without limitation, the fees and disbursements of legal counsel) incurred in connection with the negotiation, preparation, execution and registration of this Agreement, the transactions contemplated under this Agreement and the business between the parties leading up to this Agreement shall be paid by the party incurring such expenses.
19. Time shall be of the essence of this Agreement.
20. This Agreement may be executed by the parties in separate counterparts each of which when so executed and delivered shall be an original, and all such counterparts shall

together constitute one and the same instrument. This Agreement may be delivered by facsimile or electronic transmission and such delivery shall be deemed to be an original.


21. The parties hereto agree that all publicity concerning the transactions contemplated by this Agreement shall be jointly planned and coordinated and no party shall act unilaterally in this regard without the prior approval of the other party (such approval not to be unreasonably withheld).
22. This Agreement shall enure to the benefit of and be binding upon each of the parties hereto and its respective successors, successors in title and permitted assigns.


**THE CORPORATION OF THE  
MUNICIPALITY OF PORT HOPE**

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Per: Bob Sanderson, Mayor

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Per: Brian Gilmer, Clerk  
We have authority to bind the Municipality

**CVH (NO. 6) LP, by its managing general partner  
Southbridge Health Care GP Inc.**

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Per: Keith McIntosh, Director & Executive Vice  
President

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Per: Ryan Bell, Chief Executive Officer  
We have the authority to bind the partnership & the  
corporation

THIS AGREEMENT has been authorized and approved by By-Law No 69 / 2019 of the Corporation of the Municipality of Port Hope and passed the 17 day of September, 2019.

**SCHEDULE "A"**  
**LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF SUBJECT LANDS**

Lots 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30 and 31, Smith Estate Plan Port Hope, Municipality of Port Hope [PIN 51075-0087] municipally known as 20 & 36 to 38 Hope Street and 65 Ward Street, Port Hope, Ontario.

THE CORPORATION OF THE MUNICIPALITY OF PORT HOPE

BY-LAW NO. 69/2019

*Being a By-law to Authorize Execution of an Agreement between CVH (No. 6) LP and Southbridge Health Care GP Inc. and the Municipality of Port Hope for the Redevelopment of 65 Ward Street.*

WHEREAS Council of the Municipality of Port Hope at the Council meeting held on April 2, 2019 considered a Staff Report regarding the Conservation Review Board Report on the Ontario Heritage Act (OHA) Designation of 65 Ward Street;

AND WHEREAS Council at the Council meeting held on April 2, 2019 passed a motion directing Staff to develop an agreement between the Municipality of Port Hope and Southbridge Health Care GP Inc. to ensure that certain development approvals, permits and related matters have been obtained and completed prior to the withdrawal of the Notice of Intention to Designate 65 Ward Street;

AND WHEREAS CVH (NO.6) LP by its managing general partner Southbridge Health Care GP Inc. agrees to obtain, at its sole cost, all approvals and satisfy all conditions as set out in the attached Agreement and obtain from the Municipality all permits and approvals required to demolish any buildings to be demolished on the Subject Lands, for the construction of the Project and for the development of the Subject Lands prior to withdrawal of the Notice of Intention to Designate by the Municipality;

AND WHEREAS the Municipality of Port Hope commits to the withdrawal of the Notice of Intention to Designate only upon satisfactory completion by CVH (NO.6) LP by its managing general partner Southbridge Health Care GP Inc. of all the terms of the attached Agreement;


NOW THEREFORE THE MUNICIPAL COUNCIL OF THE CORPORATION OF THE MUNICIPALITY OF PORT HOPE ENACTS AS FOLLOWS:


1. THAT the Mayor and Municipal Clerk are hereby authorized to execute on behalf of the Corporation of the Municipality of Port Hope the Agreement with CVH (No. 6) LP by its managing general partner Southbridge Health Care GP Inc., which Agreement is attached hereto as Appendix "A" and forms an integral part of this Bylaw.
2. THAT the Mayor and Clerk are hereby authorized and directed to execute the attached Agreement including any minor extensions of time or other minor amendments to the attached Agreement and all other necessary or ancillary documentation that may be required to carry out the purpose of the attached Agreement.
3. THAT this By-law shall come into force the day it is finally passed.

READ a FIRST, SECOND and THIRD time and finally passed in Open Council this 17<sup>th</sup> day of September, 2019.

I, Daphne Livingstone of the Municipality of Port Hope, certify this to be a true copy of a By-law / Resolution.

Passed the 17 of Sept. 2019

  
Daphne Livingstone, Deputy Clerk

  
R.J. Sanderson, Mayor

  
B. Gilmer, Clerk



Appendix "A" to By-law 69/2019

THIS AGREEMENT is made this 6<sup>th</sup> day of September, 2019

BETWEEN:

THE CORPORATION OF THE  
MUNICIPALITY OF PORT HOPE

(hereinafter the "Municipality")

Party of the FIRST PART

- and -

CVH (NO. 6) LP and SOUTHBRIDGE  
HEALTH CARE GP INC.

(collectively, hereinafter "Southbridge")

Party of the SECOND PART

WHEREAS CVH (No. 6) LP ("CVH 6") is the beneficial owner of the lands described in Schedule "A" (herein called the "Subject Lands") and Southbridge Health Care GP Inc., in its capacity as the managing general partner of CVH 6, holds registered title to the Subject Lands to and for the exclusive benefit of CVH 6 pursuant to the terms of a Nominee Agreement dated the 26<sup>th</sup> day of June, 2018;

AND WHEREAS Southbridge operates a 97 bed long-term care facility known as Hope Street Terrace on a portion of the Subject Lands and, subject to the terms and conditions set out herein, wishes to expand such facility to a three storey 160 bed "long term care facility" (which for purposes of this Agreement "long-term care facility" shall have the same meaning as that term is defined in the Municipal Zoning Bylaw 20/2010) on the Subject Lands (the "Project");

AND WHEREAS a portion of the Subject Lands contains three buildings formerly known as the Port Hope Hospital, the Power House and the Cottage Hospital (collectively the "Hospital Buildings");

AND WHEREAS completion of the Project will require the demolition of certain buildings on the Subject lands including, but not limited to, the Hospital Buildings;

AND WHEREAS on April 19, 2018, the Municipality gave a Notice of Intention to Designate the Subject Lands (the "NOID") in respect of heritage attributes relating to the Hospital Buildings pursuant to Section 29 the *Ontario Heritage Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. O.18;

AND WHEREAS the issue of designation was referred to the Conservation Review Board (the "CRB") under CRB Case No. 1813 and following a hearing the CRB recommended designation of the Subject Lands in respect of certain heritage attributes relating to the Hospital Buildings;

AND WHEREAS designation of the Subject Lands will prevent Southbridge from

1

proceeding with the Project;

AND WHEREAS the Municipality and Southbridge are desirous of entering into this agreement to document and evidence the commitment of Southbridge to complete the Project subject to the terms and conditions set out herein and the commitment of the Municipality to withdraw the NOID and permit completion of the Project only upon satisfactory completion by Southbridge of all of the terms of this Agreement;

AND WHEREAS the Subject Lands are within a site plan control area as designated by the Municipality and subject to the requirements of the Municipality for development;

AND WHEREAS the operation of a long-term care facility on the Subject Lands is a permitted use pursuant to the Municipality's Zoning Bylaw 20/2010 and official plan relating to the Subject Lands;

NOW THEREFORE in consideration of the mutual agreements, covenants and promises herein contained, and other good and valuable consideration, the receipt and sufficiency of which is acknowledged by the parties hereto, the parties hereto agree as follows:

#### Withdrawal of NOID

1. The parties acknowledge and agree that the purpose and intent of this Agreement is to:
  - a. have Southbridge obtain, at its sole cost, all approvals and satisfy all conditions precedent set out in this Agreement and obtain from the Municipality all permits and approvals required to demolish any buildings to be demolished on the Subject Lands, for the construction of the Project and for the development of the Subject Lands prior to withdrawal of the NOID by the Municipality; and
  - b. have the Municipality commit to the withdrawal of the NOID only upon satisfactory completion by Southbridge of all of the terms of this Agreement.
2. The parties agree that as conditions precedent to the withdrawal of the NOID Southbridge will (i) prepare and submit to the Municipality all of the applications (in accordance with applicable legislation and bylaws) including all supporting documents required in connection therewith that the Municipality requires in order to issue all of the required municipal approvals for the Project including, but not limited to, site plan approval pursuant to section 41 of the Planning Act RSO 1990 c.P13 as amended, building permits and demolition permits; (ii) participate in the usual planning application processes with the Municipality; (iii) execute and register on title to the Subject Lands a site plan agreement in a form acceptable to the Municipality; (iv) have all mortgagees and encumbrancers having an interest in the Subject Lands sign the required site plan agreement for the purpose of postponing their respective interests in the Subject Lands; (v) pay to the Municipality all of the required fees and charges associated with such applications and permits when they become due and payable; and (vi) provide written confirmation addressed to the Municipality from the architect and construction manager for the Project confirming that fully executed agreements are in place with them for the construction of the Project.
3. The Municipality hereby covenants and agrees that once Southbridge has fully complied with all of the conditions precedent set out in Section 2 above and, without limiting the

2

generality of the foregoing, Southbridge has: obtained final site plan approval for the development of the Project on the Subject Lands; executed and registered on title a site plan agreement for the development of the Project on the Subject Lands with the signatures of all mortgagees and encumbrancers having an interest in the Subject Lands thereon for purposes of postponing their respective interests in the Subject Lands; obtained and paid for all required building permits and demolition permits; paid to the Municipality all of the required fees and charges associated with the development of the Project on the Subject Lands; and provided to the Municipality the written confirmation from the architect and construction manager for the Project described above in Paragraph 2 of this Agreement then the Municipality shall, provided that this Agreement has not been terminated pursuant to Section 6 below, within fourteen (14) days withdraw the NOID by causing a notice of withdrawal,

- a. to be served on Southbridge and on the Ontario Heritage Trust; and
- b. to be published in a newspaper having general circulation in the Municipality.

The Municipality acknowledges that its decision to withdraw the NOID will be final and binding.

4. The Municipality covenants and agrees not to designate the Subject Lands pursuant to Parts IV or V of the *Ontario Heritage Act* or to take any steps in relation thereto, prior to the completion of the Project, unless this Agreement has been terminated.
5. Southbridge acknowledges and agrees that it shall not be entitled to terminate this Agreement after the Municipality has issued to Southbridge the notice set out in Section 3 (a) above and complied with its publication obligation under Section 3 (b) above.

#### Termination

6. Subject to Section 5, in the event that Southbridge is not satisfied for any reason whatsoever at any time prior to or during the application process or at any other time prior to the Municipality issuing both of the notices in Section 3(a) and (b) hereof, Southbridge may terminate this Agreement by giving the Municipality written notice of its wish to terminate this Agreement and withdraw all of the applications that it has submitted.
7. Southbridge acknowledges that in the event that this Agreement is terminated, the Municipality may proceed to designate the Subject Lands pursuant to the *Ontario Heritage Act R. S. O. 1990, Chapter O. 18*.
8. The parties agree that if this Agreement is terminated prior to the date that the NOID is withdrawn by the Municipality, the Municipality shall, within five business days of notice of such termination, deliver to Southbridge:
  - a. 50% of the public works user fees paid by Southbridge to the Municipality;
  - b. the full amount of the performance guarantee amount and development charges paid by Southbridge to the Municipality without any deduction, abatement or set off of any kind;
  - c. 45% of all building permit fees paid by Southbridge to the Municipality; and
  - d. a copy of any discharges required to discharge any site plan agreement, postponement or other document registered by the Municipality against the

Subject Lands.

Southbridge acknowledges and agrees that all major site plan application fees, GRCA review fees and demolition permit fees shall be fully non-refundable in the event that this Agreement is terminated.

9. The parties agree that if this Agreement is terminated prior to the date that the NOID is withdrawn by the Municipality, any site plan agreement, postponement, confirmation or any other documents provided by or on behalf of Southbridge shall be automatically terminated as of the date of the termination of this Agreement.
10. This Agreement shall terminate on:
  - a. the date that Southbridge issues a notice of termination pursuant to Section 6 above;
  - b. December 31, 2020 if Southbridge has not submitted all of the required applications for the Project and the demolition of buildings on the Subject Lands to the Municipality; and
  - c. the date that the parties mutually agree to terminate this Agreement.

Notices

11. Any notice required or permitted to be given by either party under this Agreement shall be in writing and shall be sufficiently given if delivered personally, sent by prepaid first-class mail, courier or transmitted by facsimile or electronic mail during the transmission of which no indication of failure of receipt is communicated to the sender:

- a. In the case of the Municipality at:

The Corporation of the Municipality of Port Hope  
56 Queen Street  
Port Hope, Ontario L1A 3Z9  
Attention: Brian Gilmer, Director of Corporate Services \ Clerk  
Fax No. (905) 885.7698  
Email: [bgilmer@porthope.ca](mailto:bgilmer@porthope.ca)

- b. In the case of Southbridge at:

766 Hespeler Road, Suite 301  
Cambridge, Ontario N3H 5L8  
Attention: Keith McIntosh, Director and Executive Vice President  
Fax No. (519) 621.8144  
Email: [kmcintosh@southbridgecare.com](mailto:kmcintosh@southbridgecare.com)

Any notice delivered personally or by courier shall be deemed to have been given and received on the date on which it was received at such address, or, if sent by mail, shall be deemed to have been given and received on the date which is five (5) days after which it was mailed, provided that if either such day is not a business day, then the notice shall be deemed to have been given and received on the business day next following such day.

4

Any notice transmitted by facsimile or electronic mail shall be deemed to have been given and received on the date of its transmission provided that if such day is not a business day or if it is received after 5pm on the date of its transmission at the place of receipt, then it shall be deemed to have been given and received at 9am on the first business day next following the transmission thereof. If normal mail service, courier service, facsimile or electronic mail is interrupted by strike, slowdown, force majeure or other cause, a notice, direction or other instrument sent by the impaired means of communication will not be deemed to be received until actually received, and the party sending the notice shall utilize any other such service which has not been so interrupted to deliver such notice.

#### General

12. The parties hereto agree that the recitals to this Agreement are true.
13. Southbridge shall not assign this Agreement or any of its obligations hereunder without the prior written consent of the Municipality.
14. The headings in this Agreement are for the use of reference only and shall not be read or construed so as to abridge or modify the meaning of any provision in the main text of this Agreement.
15. This Agreement and the schedule attached hereto constitute the entire agreement between the parties pertaining to the subject matter of this Agreement and supersede all prior agreements, understandings, negotiations and discussions, whether oral or written, of the parties. No supplement, modification or amendment to this Agreement and no waiver of any provision of this Agreement shall be binding on any party unless executed by such party in writing.
16. The failure of either party to insist on strict performance of any of the terms, provisions, covenants or obligations contained in this Agreement shall not be deemed to be a waiver of any rights or remedies that party may have, and shall not be deemed to be a waiver of any subsequent breach or default of the terms, provisions, covenants and obligations contained in this Agreement.
17. If any term or provision of this Agreement or the application thereof to any person or circumstance shall be held by competent authority to be invalid or unenforceable to any extent, the remainder of this Agreement or the application of such term or provision to persons or circumstances other than those as to whom or to which it is held invalid or unenforceable, shall not be affected thereby and each term and provision of this Agreement shall be valid and enforceable to the full extent permitted by law.
18. All costs and expenses (including, without limitation, the fees and disbursements of legal counsel) incurred in connection with the negotiation, preparation, execution and registration of this Agreement, the transactions contemplated under this Agreement and the business between the parties leading up to this Agreement shall be paid by the party incurring such expenses.
19. Time shall be of the essence of this Agreement.
20. This Agreement may be executed by the parties in separate counterparts each of which when so executed and delivered shall be an original, and all such counterparts shall


5

together constitute one and the same instrument. This Agreement may be delivered by facsimile or electronic transmission and such delivery shall be deemed to be an original.

21. The parties hereto agree that all publicity concerning the transactions contemplated by this Agreement shall be jointly planned and coordinated and no party shall act unilaterally in this regard without the prior approval of the other party (such approval not to be unreasonably withheld).

22. This Agreement shall enure to the benefit of and be binding upon each of the parties hereto and its respective successors, successors in title and permitted assigns.


THE CORPORATION OF THE  
MUNICIPALITY OF PORT HOPE


  
Per: Bob Sanderson, Mayor

Per: Brian Gilmer, Clerk

We have authority to bind the Municipality

CVH (NO. 6) LP, by its managing general partner  
Southbridge Health Care GP Inc.

  
Per: Keith McIntosh, Director & Executive Vice  
President

  
Per: Ryan Bell, Chief Executive Officer

We have the authority to bind the partnership & the  
corporation


THIS AGREEMENT has been authorized and approved by By-Law No \_\_\_\_\_ of the Corporation of the Municipality of Port Hope and passed the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2019.

SCHEDULE "A"  
LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF SUBJECT LANDS

Lots 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30 and 31, Smith Estate Plan Port Hope, Municipality of Port Hope [PIN 51075-0087] municipally known as 20 & 36 to 38 Hope Street and 65 Ward Street, Port Hope, Ontario.

# Appendix D – Proposed Site Plan (2021)





REQUIRED PARKING	
NURSING HOME (1 SPACE PER 2 BEDS)	192 BEDS / 2 = 96 PARKING SPACES
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>48 PARKING SPACES</b>

PROVIDED PARKING			
		UNDERGROUND	ABOVE GROUND
REGULAR SPACES	MIN. 2.7m x 5.5m	-	47
ACCESSIBLE SPACES	TYPE A & B	-	1
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>= 48 PROVIDED PARKING SPACES</b>

BUILDING AREAS		
	CONSTRUCTION AREA [SQ.M]	CONSTRUCTION AREA [SQ.FT]
GROUND FLOOR AREA	1,899sq.m	20,450sq.ft
SECOND FLOOR AREA	1,899sq.m	20,450sq.ft
THIRD FLOOR AREA	1,899sq.m	20,450sq.ft
FOURTH FLOOR AREA	1,899sq.m	20,450sq.ft
FIFTH FLOOR AREA	1,899sq.m	20,450sq.ft
SIXTH FLOOR AREA	1,899sq.m	20,450sq.ft
SEVENTH FLOOR AREA	1,899sq.m	20,450sq.ft
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>13,293sq.m</b>	<b>143,150sq.ft</b>

CITY OF PORT HOPE ZONING BY-LAW		
ZONING PROVISIONS	REQUIRED	PROPOSED
URBAN INSTITUTIONAL		
MIN. LOT AREA	N/A	10,799.7sq.m
MIN. LOT FRONTAGE	N/A	159.5m
MIN. FRONT YARD SETBACK	6m	12m
MIN. REAR YARD SETBACK	7.5m	62.3m
MIN. INTERIOR SIDE YARD SETBACK	6m	14.2m
MIN. EXTERIOR SIDE YARD SETBACK	6m	NORTH 6m
MAX. BUILDING HEIGHT	19m	25.4m

NOTES:  
 1) ALL WORK TO BE IN COMPLIANCE WITH LOCAL BUILDING CODES, REGULATIONS AND BY-LAWS.  
 2) ADDITIONAL DRAWINGS MAY BE ISSUED FOR CLARIFICATION TO ASSIST PROPER EXECUTION OF WORK. SUCH DRAWINGS WILL HAVE THE SAME MEANING AND INTENT AS IF THEY WERE INCLUDED WITH PLANS IN CONTRACT DOCUMENTS.  
 3) DO NOT SCALE DRAWINGS.  
 4) ALL SUB-CONTRACTORS TO TAKE THEIR OWN ON-SITE MEASUREMENTS AND BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THEIR ACCURACY.  
 5) NOTIFY SHAWN J. LAWRENCE ARCHITECT FOR ANY ERRORS AND/OR OMISSIONS PRIOR TO START OF WORK.

SEAL: \_\_\_\_\_ NORTH ARROW:

No.	DATE	REVISION
03.	2021.01.31	ISSUED FOR REVIEW
02.	2021.01.26	ISSUED FOR REVIEW
01.	2020.12.10	ISSUED FOR REVIEW


S.J. LAWRENCE ARCHITECT INCORPORATED  
 18 DEAKIN STREET SUITE 205 OTTAWA, ONTARIO K2E 8B7  
 T: (613) 739-7770 F: (613) 739-7703 sjl@sjlarchitect.com

THIS DRAWING IS THE SOLE PROPERTY OF S.J. LAWRENCE ARCHITECT INCORPORATED. REPRODUCTION IS NOT PERMITTED.

PROJECT: **PORT HOPE NURSING HOME**  
 PROJECT ADDRESS: \_\_\_\_\_  
 SHEET TITLE: **CONCEPT SITE PLAN**

DRAWN BY: **A.L.** CHECKED BY: **CHECKED BY**  
 PLOT DATE: **2021.01.31** PROJECT DATE: **2020.10.31**  
 JOB NUMBER: **SL-1029-20** SCALE: **AS SHOWN**  
 SHEET NUMBER: \_\_\_\_\_

# Appendix E – Shadow Study



8:00am



9:00am




10:00am



11:00am



12:00pm



1:00pm



**S.J.LAWRENCE  
ARCHITECT  
INCORPORATED**

18 DEAKIN STREET  
SUITE 205  
OTTAWA, ONTARIO  
K2E 8B7

T: (613) 739.7770  
F: (613) 739.7703  
sjl@sjlarchitect.com

**DRAWING TITLE:**  
**SHADOW ANALYSIS - SOLSTICE (JUNE 21st) PART 1**

**PROJECT INFORMATION:**  
**PORT HOPE NURSING HOME**  
20 Hope Street South, Port Hope, ON

**DRAWN BY:**  
R.R.


**SCALE:**  
1 : 2000

**PLOT DATE:**  
2021-04-14 2:16:27 PM


**PROJECT NUMBER:**  
SL-1029-20




**SHEET NUMBER:**  
**ASK-1**




2:00p  
m




3:00pm




4:00pm



5:00pm



6:00pm



7:00pm



**S.J.LAWRENCE  
ARCHITECT  
INCORPORATED**

18 DEAKIN STREET  
SUITE 205  
OTTAWA, ONTARIO  
K2E 8B7

T: (613) 739.7770  
F: (613) 739.7703  
sjl@sjlarchitect.com

DRAWING TITLE:  
**SHADOW ANALYSIS - SOLSTICE (JUNE 21st) PART 2**

PROJECT INFORMATION:  
**PORT HOPE NURSING HOME**  
20 Hope Street South, Port Hope, ON

DRAWN BY:  
R.R.


PLOT DATE:  
2021-04-14 2:16:34 PM

SCALE:  
1 : 2000


PROJECT NUMBER:  
SL-1029-20



SHEET NUMBER:  
**ASK-2**




9:00am




10:00am




11:00am



12:00pm



1:00pm



2:00pm



**S.J.LAWRENCE  
ARCHITECT  
INCORPORATED**

18 DEAKIN STREET  
SUITE 205  
OTTAWA, ONTARIO  
K2E 8B7

T: (613) 739.7770  
F: (613) 739.7703  
sjl@sjlarchitect.com

**DRAWING TITLE:**  
**SHADOW ANALYSIS - SOLSTICE (DECEMBER 21st)**

**PROJECT INFORMATION:**  
**PORT HOPE NURSING HOME**  
20 Hope Street South, Port Hope, ON

**DRAWN BY:**  
R.R.


**SCALE:**  
1 : 2000

**PLOT DATE:**  
2021-04-14 2:16:41 PM


**PROJECT NUMBER:**  
SL-1029-20




**SHEET NUMBER:**  
**ASK-3**



8:00am



9:00am




10:00am



11:00am



12:00pm



1:00pm



**S.J.LAWRENCE  
ARCHITECT  
INCORPORATED**

18 DEAKIN STREET  
SUITE 205  
OTTAWA, ONTARIO  
K2E 8B7

T: (613) 739.7770  
F: (613) 739.7703  
sjl@sjlarchitect.com

DRAWING TITLE:

**SHADOW ANALYSIS - EQUINOX (SEPTEMBER 21st) PART 1**

PROJECT INFORMATION:

**PORT HOPE NURSING HOME**

20 Hope Street South, Port Hope, ON

DRAWN BY:  
R.R.

SCALE:  
1 : 2000


PLOT DATE:  
2021-04-14 2:16:47 PM

PROJECT NUMBER:  
SL-1029-20


SEAL:



SHEET NUMBER:  
**ASK-4**



2:00pm




3:00pm



4:00pm



5:00pm



6:00pm



**S.J.LAWRENCE  
ARCHITECT  
INCORPORATED**

18 DEAKIN STREET  
SUITE 205  
OTTAWA, ONTARIO  
K2E 8B7

T: (613) 739.7770  
F: (613) 739.7703  
sjl@sjlarchitect.com

DRAWING TITLE:  
**SHADOW ANALYSIS - EQUINOX (SEPTEMBER 21st) PART 2**

PROJECT INFORMATION:  
**PORT HOPE NURSING HOME**  
20 Hope Street South, Port Hope, ON

DRAWN BY:  
R.R.

SCALE:  
1 : 2000

PLOT DATE:  
2021-04-14 2:16:53 PM

PROJECT NUMBER:  
SL-1029-20



SHEET NUMBER:  
**ASK-5**