

St. Catharines Heritage Advisory Committee

Minutes

Thursday, November 12, 2020

Electronic Participation at 2:30 pm

Members:

Ms. Gail Benjafield
Ms. Lorraine Giroux
Mr. Mark Hoerd
Mr. Andrew Humeniuk
Mr. Robert Speck
Mr. Brian Narhi
Mr. Peter Wing

Regrets:

None

Absent:

Mr. Justin Nicholls
Mr. Marty Mako
Mr. Peter Wing

Staff Liaison:

Michael Seaman, Heritage Planner, Planning and Building Services
Elaine Munro, Committee Secretary & Planning Technician, Planning and Building Services

1. Call meeting to order (Chair)

Chair Brian Narhi called the meeting to order at 2:30 p.m.

2. Recognition of Traditional Territories

3. Additions/Deletions to the Agenda

Chair Narhi requested that 229 St. Paul Street be discussed under new business.

4. **Motion to approve the agenda**

Moved by: Andrew Humeniuk
Seconded by: Mark Hoerd

“That the SCHAC ratify and adopt the agenda for this SCHAC meeting held on Thursday, November 12, 2020, as amended, copies having been previously distributed.”

CARRIED

5. **Motion to adopt the minutes of the previous meeting**

Moved by: Gail Benjafield
Seconded by: Robert Speck

“That the SCHAC approve the minutes of the SCHAC meeting held on Thursday, October 8, 2020.”

CARRIED

6. **Presentations (invited guests)**

– Margaret Josipovic, Project Expeditor, Regarding Item 7.1

7. **Business arising from the minutes**

7.1 Mountain Locks Park

Margaret Josipovic, Project Expeditor

– Verbal update regarding the proposed expansion of the existing parking lot at Glendale Place Plaza into Mountain Locks Park.

The Heritage Planner noted that the committee had requested further information on this project which is a proposed expansion of the existing parking lot at Glendale Place Plaza into Mountain Locks Park. The item was considered by the Heritage Advisory Committee at its July 23, 2020 meeting and a recommendation in support of the proposal was carried at that time subject to archaeological monitoring taking place during construction and the design and installation of a commemorative plaque. The Heritage Planner provided a brief update at the October 8, 2020 meeting and Ms. Josipovic was on hand at the November 12, 2020 meeting to answer additional questions that members of the committee had about the project.

Member Giroux provided a list of questions to be answered in advance of the meeting. Chair Narhi suggested that Ms. Josipovic go through each of the questions posed by Member Giroux and then any additional questions that members of the committee had about the project.

Question 1: Did the proposal come from the plaza management and not the Keg? The Keg is saying they are not responsible for the request

Answer: It was the owner of the plaza that made the initial request for the parking expansion.

Question 2: The engineering report mentions a visual survey undertaken by the 'archaeology consultant'. Is this the same person who would be hired to be present during construction? If it indeed is the plaza that is requesting the change, does the plaza pay for this inspection?

Answer: Staff hasn't seen an engineering report. That wasn't part of the initial requirements or submission. There would be some engineering requirements such as grading and drainage, which would be reviewed by the City's Engineering staff. At present the City hasn't begun the full site and engineering review.

Question 3: What will happen to the water flow in that area when the construction takes place? Right now, there is a stream of moving water from the old weir across to the Merritt Trail. The stream is in the site of the remnants of an old scow. Will the change the movement of water or affect the old scow by exposing the wooden ribs?

Answer: Any of the runoff that is caused by more pavement is going to go into the existing catch basins on the commercial property. It should not affect anything in the actual park.

Question 4: What landscaping is proposed to fill the strip between the lock wall and the parking area? Will there be a support wall of some kind? Grassy slope?

Answer: There won't be a support wall. The City's parks department are looking at the design right now. They are leaning towards a natural style of landscaping not manicured lawns and planting beds.

Question 5: Could the plaza extend at the other end rather than in the park?

Answer: It's all private property on the other side of the subject lands, and so there was no opportunity to extend that way unless they purchased and cleared another property and the other property owner was willing to sell.

Question 6: In the presentation, I believe it was called a passive park. What does the terminology refer to for a 'passive park'?

Answer: An active park has playgrounds, sports fields, etc. A passive park has trails and open areas.

Question 7: Is the owner of the property responsible for the repairs that the SCHAC recommended be made to the landscaping and the payment of an archaeologist to monitor the site?

Answer: Yes, it would be the owner of the plaza that would enter into any type of agreement required by the City. For example, if the project was approved by Council there would be a lease agreement with the City and/or a development agreement or this would be tied into the lease agreement. It would be the owner that would sign that, and they would be responsible for those requirements and costs

Question 8: If there was an engineering report would there be consultation with an archaeologist as part of that work/

Answer: Typically, most of the engineering reports do not deal with archaeology. A specific archaeology study, for the project would be what would look at that. The heritage advisory committee had not asked for that, it had asked that an archaeologist be present during construction. A Phase I Study would tell you if there is a potential for archaeological finds on the site.

The Region would be responsible for requesting an archaeology study of the site as part of a Planning Act application on behalf of the Province (Part VI) of the Ontario Heritage Act. The mandate of SCHAC extends only to Part IV and Part V of the Ontario Heritage Act. (Individual property designation and heritage conservation district) and other matters that council may specify by by-law. The Region retains the necessary professional expertise to consider and evaluate archaeology reports.

SCHAC and staff could request a Cultural Heritage Resource Assessment as part of a planning act application or a heritage act application.

Question 9: There are often public open houses for different proposals in the community. Would there be an open house in this situation and an opportunity for public input?

Answer: The Council meeting when this was discussed is a public meeting. Council approved staff to enter into lease negotiations. This would be going back to Council to describe the lease negotiations. This would be another opportunity for the public to speak. This is not a planning act application so

there would be no official public meeting. The Council meeting would be the main forum for the public and contacting their members of Council.

Question 10: Would there be an Environmental Assessment Requirement?

Answer No, there would not because of the scale.

Question 11: When would this be going back to Council?

Answer: Probably Q1 of 2021. The Realty Department which manages City owned leases is working with the City's Planning Department and Parks Department to determine what the requirements would be regarding its status as City property including access to the site and requirements related to plans and submissions that are necessary to review the proposal. A staff report would be prepared referencing all these matters for consideration by Council.

There was discussion within the committee about whether it was appropriate to request an archaeology study. It was concluded that the measures already recommended related to monitoring would be sufficient.

Moved by: Lorraine Giroux

Seconded by: Peter Wing

"That the verbal update from Margaret Josipovic, Project Expeditor regarding Mountain Locks Park has been received."

CARRIED

7.2 Municipal Heritage Register Update – Council decision October 19, 2010
Michael Seaman, Heritage Planner and Staff Liaison
– Verbal update from the Heritage Planner

The Heritage Planner advised that the heritage register update report was considered by Council at its October 19, 2020 meeting and read the motion that was approved by Council. He noted that 58 properties were added to the municipal heritage register (non-designated). There were three that were removed – 66 St. Paul Street, 348 St. Paul Street and 23 Duke Street.

It was noted that the owner of 23 Duke Street made a deputation to Council indicating that while he originally had no objection to being included on the municipal heritage register (non-designated) that he is in the process of making renovations to the property and was told by his financial broker that he would either be denied financing or receive unfavorable rates. Council removed the property from the properties being recommended for the register, but there was a stated understanding that once the renovation work was completed on the property that the recommendation that this property be

included on the municipal heritage register could be brought back to Council for reconsideration.

The Heritage Planner indicated that in his 30 years working in heritage planning he had not heard of this situation and so did some research, contacting banks and credit unions and it was found that none of them discriminated against heritage properties. Two local brokers were contacted. One indicated that there would not be a problem financing heritage property and one indicated that their market was largely newer housing product and that they would not work with the owners of heritage properties.

The Heritage Planner contacted the Ontario Municipal Heritage Planners network and only one response was received from the City of Cambridge where there was a similar occurrence, however, the property in Cambridge had other extenuating issues that needed to be considered.

There were three properties that Council deferred consideration for inclusion on the municipal heritage register. These were 101 Oakdale Avenue, 25 Duke Street and 174 to 176 St. Paul Street. The intent would be that staff and the municipal heritage advisory committee would meet with these property owners and a report would be brought back to Council at a later date, reporting on the additional consultation and the outcome of the discussions.

The Heritage Planner indicated that the addition of 58 properties to the municipal heritage register was a positive step in providing the City with the tools available to protect heritage resources in the City.

It was noted by Chair Narhi that 174-176 St. Paul Street was the former location of the Hippodrome theatre which is a very significant cultural heritage property in the City.

Member Humeniuk suggested that the matter of the public perception that designation and heritage recognition is a liability is something that the outreach and education sub-committee could look at and undertake public education to challenge that.

It was noted that Member Humeniuk had undertaken research on 23 and 25 Duke Street as part of the heritage register update and believed that both were sufficiently significant to merit designation under Section 29 of the Act. And would provide the background research already prepared on these properties to assist in further discussions with the owners of these properties.

The Heritage Planner noted that a report on these three properties was most likely timed for late 1st quarter of 2021.

Member Benjafield asked for further information about the significance of the properties on Duke Street. It was noted that the three adjacent properties on Duke Street (21, 23 and 25) were associated with the Dougan family and had significance architecturally and as a grouping.

Member Giroux supported the idea brought forth by Member Humeniuk concerning future work of the outreach and education sub-committee in providing public education to clarify public perceptions related to such matters as financing and insurance. It was indicated that the sub-committee had discussed the preparation of articles on these subjects in the recent past and had asked about potential collaboration with the museum. Member Giroux requested that the Heritage Planner provide an update on this potential collaboration at the next meeting of the SCHAC.

Moved by: Andrew Humeniuk
Seconded by: Lorraine Giroux

“That the verbal update regarding the Municipal Heritage Register Update has been received.”

CARRIED

7.3 St. Catharines General Hospital – Decorative Arch Update

Michael Seaman, Heritage Planner and Staff Liaison

- Update to be provided regarding the decorative arch from the St. Catharines General Hospital site.

The Heritage Planner provided background information about the arch and indicated that despite reaching out to numerous sources associated with the project he has been unable to locate any new information about the status of the decorative arch. It was noted that Mr. Seaman would continue to explore this matter and would bring an update to the municipal heritage advisory committee when further information was available.

Moved by: Gail Benjafield
Seconded by: Robert Speck

“That the verbal update regarding the St.Catharines General Hospital - Decorative Arch has been received.”

CARRIED

8. Business

8.1 Henley Bridge (MTO) Strategic Conservation Plan (SCP)

Jacqueline McDermid, Heritage Team – Technical Writer and Researcher, Archaeological Research Associates Ltd.

– Consultation regarding the completion of a Strategic Conservation Plan (SCP) for the Ministry of Transportation (MTO) for the Henley Bridge, City of

St. Catharines. The Henley Bridge is a provincial heritage property of provincial significance.

The Heritage Planner described the project and the strategic conservation plan report.

Chair Narhi indicated that the report was well done and felt that one item that could be added that the report would benefit from is the former Welland Canal Crossing.

Member Benjafield concurred with the opinion of Chair Narhi as did Member Giroux and referenced the significance of the sculptures on the bridge.

Moved by: Peter Wing
Seconded by: Brian Narhi

“That the verbal update regarding the Henley Bridge (MTO) Strategic Conservation Plan (SCP) has been received.”

CARRIED

9. Updates from Sub-Committees

9.1 Designations, Plaquing and Ceremonies

None

9.2 Public Outreach and Education (POE)

None

9.3 Research and Inventory (R & I)

None

10. New Business

10.1 229 St. Paul Street “Walter’s Jewelry Store”

Chair Narhi indicated that he wished to bring this property forward as there had been information discussed in the community about the potential redevelopment of the site. It was indicated that the building on the site was built in the 1870s/80s and was distinguished by a boomtown front with architectural embellishments.

Member Benjafield indicated that she had circulated information about the proposal for the site and would share with other members who were interested. It was noted

that the existing building on site has an historical storefront behind the modern siding.

The Heritage Planner indicated that the subject property was included on the municipal heritage register (non-designated) by council as part of the recent update. It was noted that as a building on the municipal heritage register, if the property was proposed for redevelopment requiring an application under the Planning Act, that a Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment would typically be requested as part of a complete application. It was noted that both the preservation and future restoration of the building and façade could be considered as part of heritage requirements for a future development application.

Member Benjafield asked about circulation of an article that she had received concerning the potential redevelopment of the subject lands.

10.2 10 Seymour Avenue “Merritton High School”

Chair Narhi indicated that he is currently undertaking research on the property.

10.3 Neil Peart Task Force

Member Hoerdts gave an update on the status of the Neil Peart Task Force. It was noted that the artist is working on the project currently. It was noted that the location of the monument would now be northeast of the pavilion.

10.4 Welland House Hotel

Member Speck requested an update on the Welland House Hotel designation.

The Heritage Planner noted that the City is currently in pre-hearing discussions with the property owner.

11. Information/Correspondence

- Henley Bridge, Statement of Cultural Heritage Value, Archaeological Research Associates (2020)
- Extract from the minutes of the October 19, 2020 meeting of Council regarding the Municipal Heritage Register Update.

12. Date of next meeting

Thursday, December 10, 2020

13. Motion to Adjourn

Moved by: Robert Speck

“That the SCHAC meeting be adjourned at 3:33 pm.”

CARRIED