A. Introduction:

Robertson Martin Architects (The Consultant) was retained in July, 2012 by Doyle Homes (the Client) to provide a Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment (CHIS) for a proposed development at 61 Queen Victoria Street in Ottawa, Ontario.

Section 4.6.1 of the City of Ottawa Official Plan has polices that outline when a Cultural Heritage Impact Statement (CHIS) is required, which will evaluate the impact of a proposed development on cultural heritage resources when development is proposed that has the potential to:

- Adversely impact the cultural heritage value of properties designated under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act (OHA).
- Adversely impact the cultural heritage value of districts designated under Part V of the OHA.

In addition:

- A CHIS may also be required for development applications adjacent to or within 35 meters of designated buildings and areas.
- A CHIS is required when demolition is proposed.

The Consultant has been provided with copies of the development proposal plans and planning rationale submitted to the City of Ottawa.

B. General Information

Address of current property: 61 Queen Victoria Street, Ottawa, Ontario

C. Current Conditions/ Introduction to Development Site

The subject property consists of an existing single-family home (c. 1871) situated on an L-shaped lot on Queen Victoria Street. The lot extends east from Queen Victoria Street then turns at a right angle south to River Lane.

The proposed development consists of severing the existing lot into two smaller lots, one fronting 61 Queen Victoria, the second fronting River Lane. For the existing building, the developer proposes retaining the original building facing Queen Victoria Street, demolishing the rear additions and replacing them with a two-storey structure. For the severed lot facing River Lane, the developer proposes erecting a new 3 storey residence.
The subject property is situated in the New Edinburgh Heritage Conservation District designated under Part V of the Ontario Heritage Act in 2001. The existing residence is also recognized by the City of Ottawa as a Category 2 building. In the immediate vicinity, there are eight Category 3 buildings (47, 49, 51, 55, 57, 56, 58 Queen Victoria) and one additional Category 2 building (64 Queen Victoria). There are no Category 1 buildings or properties individually designated under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act in the subject property’s close vicinity.

The City of Ottawa Comprehensive Zoning By-law (2008-250) designates the study area around the subject property as Residential Fourth Density (low rise apartments) subzone S, with two areas zoned as Minor Institutional for St. Bartholomew’s Church (MacKay and Queen Victoria) and the Governor’s Walk Retirement Residences (150 Stanley Avenue extending back onto the South side of River Lane).

D. Background Research and Analysis

Research and Methodology.

The methodology used in the preparation of this assessment includes review and reference to the following:

- Development proposal options prepared by Doyle Homes;
- On-site visits to the property and surrounding area;
- New Edinburgh Heritage Conservation District Study, prepared by the Department of Urban Planning and Public Works, dated September 2000;
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- Map of the New Edinburgh Heritage Conservation District;
- Heritage Survey and Evaluation Form – 61 Victoria, prepared by M. Benson, dated 1997;
- New Edinburgh Community Association (NECA) Response to Proposed Development at 61 Queen Victoria;
- Standards & Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada, Parks Canada;

Site Analysis and Evaluation

The original building at 61 Victoria Street (now Queen Victoria Street) was built around 1873-1874. The fire insurance plans from 1888 show a frame construction 1 ½ storey high, with a verandah fronting Victoria Street and two additions extending towards the back-yard of 1 ½ and 1 storey respectively. The lot is rectangular and faces only Victoria Street. By 1912, a one-storey high addition in the back-yard has been demolished and the neighboring lot at 55-57 Victoria Street has been severed creating a small empty lot facing River lane. This small lot is presently part of the 61 Queen Victoria L-shaped lot.

According to the Heritage Evaluation Form and Survey, the porch was rebuilt in 1976 and the main façade cladding, originally of board and batten, was changed to clapboard c.1900. The side elevations are clad in board and batten.

The original 19th century building has been preserved to this day and appears to be in reasonably good condition. The rear additions have been replaced with other additions of 2 stories and 1 storey respectively. These also appear to be in good condition but are proposed for demolition and replacement with a sympathetic 2-storey addition. On the side of the lot facing River Lane, there is now a shed that is to be demolished.
E. Statement of Significance

Historic value:

The original building at 61 Victoria Street was built during the 1870s building boom in New Edinburgh. It is one of the first houses to be constructed on Victoria Street. The original owner was Alexander Maginnes – one of the earliest settlers of New Edinburgh and a well-known figure in the neighbourhood.

Architectural value:

The one and a half storey residence has a rectangular plan with a medium-sloped, front-gabled roof with returned eaves and double hung windows. The full-width one-storey porch features scroll brackets ending in small bell design, paneled and squared support posts and transom light for the front. The house is a good surviving example of front-gabled vernacular with Gothic Revival trim.

Heritage Conservation District:

From as early as the 1970s, the City of Ottawa zoned most of the New Edinburgh area as heritage residential to encourage “the retention of existing buildings by limiting the size, location and massing of buildings to replace them”. Furthermore, the City of Ottawa Zoning Bylaw (1998) identifies New Edinburgh as an area to which the Heritage Overlay applies. In 2001, the City of Ottawa recognized the historic core of the village of New Edinburgh (the area between Dufferin Road, Sussex Drive, Stanley Avenue and MacKay Street) as a Heritage Conservation District.

The existing building at 61 Queen Victoria is very compatible with the heritage environment and reinforces the heritage residential character of New Edinburgh.

The New Edinburgh Heritage Conservation District Study states that:

“Today, New Edinburgh displays a variety of architectural styles and building types that form streetscapes of diversity and visual appeal. Examples from each period of New Edinburgh’s development remain, helping to provide a clear understanding of the neighbourhood’s evolution and significance … A high degree of continuity with its early build form is still strongly evident because so much of its original building stock remains” (New Edinburgh Heritage Conservation District Study. Part 1 – Heritage Character and Significance, p. 1)
F. Description of the Proposed Development

The Client proposes to sever the lot at 61 Queen Victoria in two smaller lots. For the two resulting lots, they are proposing to maintain the exterior of the home fronting on Queen Victoria, demolish the kitchen and out-buildings at the rear and replace them with a smaller two-storey structure. The proposed addition is set back from the original building with 36 cm on the North side and 133 cm on the South side. Towards the back yard, the addition is set back 8.96 m from the proposed property line. The addition is also subordinated to the original building in terms of roof height.

For the resulting lot that faces to River Lane, Doyle Homes proposes to erect a new three-storey residence. The proposed infill is of contemporary design, with strong horizontal profiles, large glazed surfaces and a stepped third storey, set back from the River Lane façade. The proposed colour scheme consists mostly of brick and stucco in earth tones with some timber accents. Two proposals were presented for vehicle access to the proposed residence:

1. A rectangular lot with access off River Lane.
2. A L-shaped lot with a service easement on the 61 Queen Victoria lot.

G. Impact of Proposed Development

Our assessment attempts to identify any positive and negative impacts the proposed development may have on the heritage value of cultural heritage resource(s). Assessment is made by measuring the impact of the proposed works on the significance and heritage attributes defined in the New Edinburgh Heritage Conservation District Study.

Positive impacts of a development on cultural heritage resources districts typically include, but are not limited to:

- restoration of a building or structure, including replacement of missing attributes,
- restoration of an historic streetscape or enhancement of the quality of the place,
- adaptive re-use of a cultural heritage resource to ensure its ongoing viability,
- access to new sources of funds to allow for the ongoing protection and restoration of the cultural heritage resource.

Negative impacts include, but are not limited to:

- Demolition of any, or part of any, heritage attributes or features,
- Alteration that is not sympathetic, or is incompatible, with the historic fabric and appearance of a building or structure,
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- Shadows created that obscure heritage attributes or change the viability of the associated cultural heritage landscape,
- Isolation of a heritage resource or part thereof from its surrounding environment, context or a significant relationship,
- Obstruction of significant identified views or vistas within, from heritage conservation districts,
- Obstruction of significant identified views or vistas within or from individual cultural heritage resources,
- A change in land use where the change affects the property’s cultural heritage value,
- Land disturbances such as a change in grade that alters soils, and drainage patterns that adversely affect a cultural heritage resource,

In instances where demolition is proposed, the CHIS will demonstrate that the rehabilitation and reuse of the property or structure is not physically viable.

For the proposed development at 61 Queen Victoria, the New Edinburgh Heritage Conservation District Guidelines emphasize respect for the original materials and decorative elements, maintaining existing verandahs and protecting the heritage residential feel of the neighbourhood, the streetscapes and the verdant green character of the laneways. As in any heritage conservation district, a respect for the general aspect of near-by buildings is required when undertaking new construction work. The Guidelines also mention that additions should complement, not copy, the original building so that there is a clear distinction between the new part of the building and the old.

**For the addition:**

The proposed addition conforms with the Heritage Overlay in that it is located entirely in the rear yard, the height of the walls and the slope of the roof do not exceed those of the building and the side yard setback is at least 30cm greater than that of the building. The addition is more subordinated to the original 19th century building than the existing rear additions, which seem to dominate the building, because of their larger height and massing; this represents an improvement in the current condition. Furthermore, the color scheme for the addition will be slightly different from the original building, thus making it distinguishable from the original building. As the general massing follows the Heritage Overlay guidelines and considering the foliage on both Queen Victoria and River Lane, the addition will not be very visible and thus have a limited visual impact on the neighbourhood.
There is some concern however about the overall style of the addition, namely that it is not entirely a product of its own time and copies decorative elements from the original building. Also, from the drawings provided by the developer it appears that the front door, the windows on the South side and decorative woodwork elements to the porch are to be replaced with new ones. We are of the opinion that the original decoration, window and door profiles and sizes should be maintained, or replicated in kind where the condition of the materials doesn’t allow repair. Furthermore, the drawings seem to indicate that the proposed size for the back-yard addition is larger than the Heritage Overlay maximum allowance of 30% of the existing building size. On the other hand, the proposed addition will in fact be smaller than the existing annexes to be demolished, so by comparison the proposal is still considered acceptable.

**For the new infill building:**

The infill building is of contemporary design, and may have the potential to draw some attention to itself; for example, through the strong horizontal profiles and the stepped structure. The horizontal bands of flat roof flashings are somewhat heavy and could be lightened up with some stepping and more subtle flashing details. The overall massing and height of the proposed infill, while within zoning limits, also appear to be slightly larger than the properties immediately adjacent. As a whole, the new residence does not seem to take into account the character of the existing buildings or enhance them. Notwithstanding the above, considering the discreet building location, the narrow width of the laneway as well as the existing foliage, the building will not be an extremely visible intervention, either from Queen Victoria or from River Lane.

It is also worth noting that the Governor’s Walk Retirement Residences has its back façade facing River Lane in the same area as the proposed new construction. As the retirement living facility is a significantly larger building than the single-family dwellings nearby, this has already altered the aspect of the section of River Lane in question. Additionally, the immediate neighbourhood has a fairly eclectic mix of housing styles, so the proposal is not incompatible.

There is some concern that the new infill coupled with cutting down there trees to make room for the new construction will alter the lane aspect and “feel” and lead to loss of neighbourhood landscaped open space. The New Edinburgh Community Association has also expressed concern about the increased traffic on River Lane, should access to the infill building will be from the laneway. However, the L-shaped lot with a service easement that is proposed as an alternative to the traffic increase has the additional disadvantages of cutting down one additional tree, more
paving and increased impact on the existing heritage building. The Consultant is of the opinion that the design as proposed is better for traffic and limiting impact to the identified heritage character.

Using the definitions of the Standards & Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada, and given the new addition being planned, the proposed conservation approach assessed is that of Rehabilitation in that the historic place is sensitively adapted for a continuing or compatible contemporary use, while protecting its heritage value.

The proposal conforms to the following Standards from the above Document, with commentary inserted where needed or applicable:

Standard 1: Conserve the Heritage Value of a Historic Place.

Standard 4: Recognize each historic place as a physical record of its time, place and use.

Standard 5: Find a use for an historic place that requires minimal or no change to its character-defining elements.

Standard 6: (a) Protect and, if necessary, stabilize an historic place until any subsequent intervention is undertaken. (b) Protect and preserve archaeological resources in place.

Standard 7: Evaluate the existing condition of character-defining elements to determine the appropriate intervention needed.

Standard 9: (a) Make any intervention needed to preserve character-defining elements physically and visually compatible with the historic place and identifiable on close inspection. (b) Document any intervention for future reference. Proposed interventions are assessed as being physically and visually compatible.

Standard 11: (a) Conserve the heritage value and character-defining elements when creating any new additions to an historic place or any related new construction. (b) Make the new work physically and visually compatible with, subordinate to, and distinguishable from the historic place. The proposed interventions are assessed as being physically compatible, visually compatible and subordinate to the historic place.

Standard 12: Create any new additions or related new construction so that the essential form and integrity of an historic place will not be impaired if the new work is removed in the future. The proposed interventions are assessed as not detracting from the integrity of the historic place.

The proposal does not conform to the following Rehabilitation Standards from the above Document:

Standard 3: Conserve heritage value by adopting an approach calling for minimal intervention. The property at 61 Queen Victoria is designated under Part V of the Ontario Heritage Act in its entirety – that is including the rear additions. The proposed development calls for the demolition of these additions and, although the new proposed addition will be better subordinated to the original 19th building, the approach does not qualify as minimum intervention.
Standard 8: (a) Maintain character-defining elements on an ongoing basis. (b) Repair character-defining elements by reinforcing their materials using recognized conservation methods. (c) Replace in kind any extensively deteriorated or missing parts of character-defining elements, where there are surviving prototypes. The proposal for the rehabilitation of the existing heritage homes seems to call for changes to the original windows, doors and decoration rather than repair.

Standard 10: (a) Repair rather than replace character-defining elements. (b) Where character-defining elements are too severely deteriorated to repair, and where sufficient physical evidence exists, replace them with new elements that match the forms, materials and detailing of sound versions of the same elements.

G. Alternatives and Mitigation Strategies

The CHIS must assess alternative development options and mitigation measures in order to avoid or limit the negative impact on the heritage value of cultural heritage resources.

Methods of minimizing or avoiding a negative impact on a cultural heritage resource(s) include but are not limited to:

- Alternative development approaches that result in compatible development and limit negative impacts,
- Separating development from significant cultural heritage resources to protect their heritage attributes including, but not limited to, their settings and identified views and vistas,
- Limiting height and density or locating higher/denser portion of a development in a manner that respects the existing individual cultural heritage resources or the heritage conservation district,
- Including reversible interventions to cultural heritage resources.

For the existing building, the consultant encourages retention of sound heritage material and its restoration. Should existing windows and trim be non functional and or beyond economic repair, any replacements should be carefully selected for compatibility with the heritage character. This would typically require thinner window sections and mullion details and reproduction wood millwork.

For the new building, although the design is contemporary and does not reflect the predominantly pitched roof neighbourhood character, the Consultant assesses that the design can fit comfortably in the laneway context and immediate surroundings. Further refinement of the horizontal elements to lighten up the detailing is recommended in the final design refinements.
H. Conclusion

The proposed options for the development at 61 Queen Victoria are in general conformity with the guidelines of the New Edinburgh Heritage Conservation District and are equally in general conformity with the requirements of the Standards & Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada. The new infill building, while different in character from other buildings in the neighbourhood, can fit comfortably within its context.

The design proposal offers positive impacts within the New Edinburgh Heritage Conservation District and the immediate environs of the subject property by restoring a century home and maintaining the heritage residential character of the neighbourhood.

Please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned should you have any questions or wish to discuss any aspect of this assessment.

Robert Martin  OAA, MRAIC, CAHP, LEED AP
I. Glossary

Adversely impact
A project has the potential to “adversely impact” the cultural heritage value of a project if it: requires the removal of heritage attributes, requires the destruction of a cultural heritage resource, obscures heritage attributes, is constructed in such a way that it does not respect the defined cultural heritage value of a resource.

Built Heritage
Includes buildings, structures and sites that contribute to an understanding of our heritage and are valued for their representation of that heritage. They may reveal architectural, cultural, or socio-political patterns of our history or may be associated with specific events or people who have shaped that history. Examples include buildings, groups of buildings, dams and bridges.

Cultural Heritage Resources
Includes four components: Built Heritage, Cultural Heritage Landscapes, Archaeological Resources, and documentary heritage left by people.

Cultural Heritage Landscape
Any geographic area that has been modified, influenced, or given special cultural meaning by people and that provides the contextual and spatial information necessary to preserve and interpret the understanding of important historical settings and changes to past patterns of land use. Examples include a burial ground, historical garden or a larger landscape reflecting human intervention.

Preservation
Preservation involves protecting, maintaining and stabilizing the existing form, material and integrity of an historic place or individual component, while protecting its heritage value.

Rehabilitation
Rehabilitation involves the sensitive adaptation of an historic place or individual component for a continuing or compatible contemporary use, while protecting its heritage value.

Restoration
Restoration involves accurately revealing, recovering or representing the state of an historic place or individual component as it appeared at a particular period in its history, while protecting its heritage value.
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Photographic Documentation
Image 1: City Plan of the ‘New Edinburgh Heritage Conservation District’. Yellow shading indicates location of 61 Queen Victoria Street in relation to the Heritage District.

Image 2: Blow up of City Plan of the ‘New Edinburgh Heritage Conservation District’. Yellow shading indicates location of 61 Queen Victoria Street.

Image 3: Aerial site photo of area with lot lines. Purple shading indicates location of 61 Queen Victoria Street.
Photo 1: Aerial view of the subject property and the surrounding buildings, with street names. Proposed building site at 61 Queen Victoria Street indicated within the red shading.

Photo 2: 61 Queen Victoria Street, subject property. Building is evaluated as Category 2 within the District.
Photo 3: Driveways between 61 and 57/55 Queen Victoria Street looking toward rear section of the property to be severed. Property line between houses located at center of paving stones between driveways.

Photo 4: 57/55 Queen Victoria Street, adjacent to subject property, with view down River Lane toward section of property to be severed. 51 Queen Victoria Street to the right of the laneway.
Photo 5: Rear portion of 61 Queen Victoria Street, on River Lane, to be severed for new development. 95 Crichton Street (Category 3) behind.

Photo 6: View from River Lane toward the rear of 55/57 Queen Victoria Street to the left and 61 Queen Victoria Street to the right.
Photo 7: River Lane east toward subject property.

Photo 8: Rear of 103 A and 103 B Crichton Street from River Lane. Previous infill adjacent to subject property.
Photo 9: Rear of 103 A and 103 B Crichton Street from River Lane. Previous infill adjacent to subject property.

Photo 10: River Lane west toward subject property.
Photo 11: Rear garage of 51 Queen Victoria Street on River Lane, directly across from subject property.

Photo 12: Rear of 51 Queen Victoria Street from subject property.
Photo 13: 57/55 Queen Victoria Street, adjacent to subject property. Category 3.

Photo 14: River Lane towards east.

Photos 15: 51 Queen Victoria Street. Category 3.

Photos 16: 49/47 Queen Victoria Street. Category 3.

Photo 17: 136 Stanley Street, Queen Victoria elevation. NB existing incompatible neighbourhood property.

Photos 18: 63 Queen Victoria Street, adjacent to subject property.
**Photo 19:** 89 Crichton Street, Queen Victoria elevation.

**Photo 20:** View of intersection between Crichton and Queen Victoria toward 61 Queen Victoria Street.

**Photo 21:** 132 Stanley Street, Queen Victoria elevation. NB existing incompatible neighbourhood property.

**Photo 22:** River Lane towards west.

**Photo 23:** 54 Queen Victoria Street. *Category 3.*

**Photo 24:** 56/58 Queen Victoria Street. *Category 3.*
Photo 25: 64 Queen Victoria Street. Category 2.

Photo 26: 89 Crichton Street, corner of Queen Victoria Street.

Photo 27: 95/93 Crichton Street. Category 3.

Photo 28: 101 Crichton Street. Category 2.

Photo 29: Laneway between 101 and 95/93 Crichton Street, looking toward subject property.