



Municipality of Mississippi Mills

HERITAGE ADVISORY COMMITTEE AGENDA

Wednesday, January 15, 2025

4:00 p.m.

E-participation

	Pages
A. CALL TO ORDER The Chair to call the meeting to order at 4:XX pm.	
B. DISCLOSURE OF PECUNIARY INTEREST AND GENERAL NATURE THEREOF None.	
C. APPROVAL OF AGENDA Recommended Motion: THAT the agenda be approved as presented.	
D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES Recommended Motion: THAT the minutes dated December 18, 2024 be approved.	3 - 8
E. DELEGATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS	
E.1 Pakenham Stone Arch Bridge - Rehabilitation Project Recommended Motion: THAT the Heritage Advisory Committee recommend that Council approve the proposed rehabilitation project of the Pakenham Stone Arch Bridge as detailed in the report and recommend that Lanark County accept the proposed Statement of Cultural Heritage Value prepared by the Municipality's Heritage Consultant similar in effect to Attachment C.	9 - 26
F. STAFF REPORTS AND HERITAGE APPLICATIONS	
F.1 Heritage Applications Report Melanie Knight, Director of Development Services and Engineering, to provide an overview of heritage applications and inquiries received in 2024.	27 - 29
G. BUSINESS ARISING OUT OF MINUTES	
G.1 38 Main Street East - Dungarvon Building Update Melanie Knight, Director of Development Services and Engineering, to provide an update.	

H. INFORMATION AND NEW BUSINESS

H.1 Heritage Committee Orientation Refresher

30 - 45

Heritage Committee Orientation Refresher for new and returning members.

I. MEETING ANNOUNCEMENTS

The next Heritage Advisory Committee meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, February 5, 2025 at 4:00 pm.

J. ADJOURNMENT

Recommended Motion:

THAT the meeting be adjourned at X:XX pm.



The Corporation of the Municipality of Mississippi Mills

Heritage Advisory Committee Meeting

MINUTES

December 18, 2024

3:00 p.m.

E-participation

Committee Present: Michael Rikley-Lancaster
Janet Carlile
Stephen Brathwaite
Harold McKay
Sandra Franks
Gary Lamers

Committee Absent: Jane Torrance

Guests: Sally Coutts, Heritage Consultant
Sarah More, Researcher
Ryan Koolwine, project1studio
Joe Thottungal
Keith Blades

Staff Present: Melanie Knight, Director of Development Services & Engineering
Melissa Fudge, Planning Technician
Hayley McCartney, Policy Planner

A. CALL TO ORDER

The Chair, Michael Rikley-Lancaster, called the meeting to order at 3:05 pm.

B. DISCLOSURE OF PECUNIARY INTEREST AND GENERAL NATURE THEREOF

None.

C. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Moved by Stephen Brathwaite

Seconded by Sandra Franks

THAT the agenda be approved as presented.

CARRIED

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Moved by Janet Carlile

Seconded by Sandra Franks

THAT the minutes dated November 20, 2024 be approved.

CARRIED

E. NEW HERITAGE ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBER

The Chair, Michael Rikley-Lancaster, introduced Gary Lamers, the new Committee member, and provided a brief biography.

F. DELEGATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS

F.1 27 Bridge Street - Pre-consultation for Proposed Restaurant

Ryan Koolwine of project1studio presented an overview of the proposed 1-storey restaurant for 27 Bridge Street. The purpose of the presentation was for pre-consultation with the Committee prior to a formal heritage permit and site plan applications. The Chair welcomed comments from Committee members, and the following items were discussed:

- Gary Lamers inquired about the number of parking stalls in relation to seating capacity.
 - Ryan Koolwine confirmed the proposal includes 5 parking stalls and 71 seats, including the patio.
- Gary Lamers inquired about the adequacy of the 5 parking stalls and the design of the rear parking lot and lane.
 - Melanie Knight, Director of Development Services and Engineering, clarified that the parcel has legal non-conforming right of no parking, and the applicant is making improvements to the on-site parking.

- Janet Carlile asked whether the design would fit within the context of the community and if a second storey for accommodations was being considered.
 - Melanie Knight confirmed that the applicant could consider adding a second storey to the design.
 - Sally Coutts, Heritage Consultant for Mississippi Mills, provided historical context, noting that the site was previously occupied by a two-storey building before the pizza restaurant with a photo of the building on the cover of the Heritage Conservation District (HCD) document. While a second storey could be added, there were no heritage concerns with proceeding with a flat-roof design. The streetscape guidelines in the HCD encourage a continuous street wall, which is reflected in the design, except for the gap between the patio and the stone wall.
- Stephen Brathwaite thanked the applicant for presenting the project and acknowledged that change within the HCD is challenging. Stephen also noted that additional parking is available on Reserve Street by the Alameda.
- Stephen Brathwaite asked whether a rooftop patio had been considered.
 - Ryan Koolwine confirmed that a second storey and rooftop patio were initially considered, but the challenge of staff movement between levels made it less ideal for operations.
- Michael Rikley-Lancaster acknowledged that the proposal represents a vast improvement and is an exciting addition to the community.
- Sally Coutts noted some design elements, such as the cornice and the reflective windows, did not fully reflect the character of the HCD, but expressed approval of the overall design spirit. It was also noted that the design has a very different expression compared to typical buildings within the HCD. Sally questioned whether the stone was laid with mortar and how the stone was selected.
 - Ryan Koolwine confirmed that mortar would be used in the stonework and that the stone was intended to resemble ledge

stone, similar to the stonework of the Almonte Old Town Hall.
The rendering provided did not fully capture this detail.

- Sally Coumts recommended that the Committee review the relevant sections of the HCD guidelines to ensure the design aligns with the district's character. Sally suggested that further fine-tuning could be done to address these concerns.
- Sandra Franks noted that the building appeared quite modern and questioned whether it fit within the HCD. Sandra expressed interest in seeing it connected to a more tangible historical reference.
- The applicant will consider Committee's comments and return with a Major Heritage Permit application for further review.

G. STAFF REPORTS AND HERITAGE APPLICATIONS

G.1 Heritage Applications Report

Melanie Knight, Director of Development Services and Engineering provided an update on the applications.

G.2 Stone Five Arches Bridge, Pakenham - Rehabilitation Project

Melanie Knight, Director of Development Services and Engineering, confirmed that a recommendation report will be provided for the following meeting.

H. BUSINESS ARISING OUT OF MINUTES

H.1 Cemeteries

Michael Rikley-Lancaster provided a summary of the report from Keith Blades regarding the proposed remediation of the Old Methodist Church Cemetery.

The Committee discussed the following items:

- Keith Blades, Conservator, confirmed that the report was created to maintain traction on the project and is a summary of items discussed with Deputy Mayor Minnille on site. Keith noted that marble markers are deteriorating and require immediate attention. Keith recommended that an action plan be developed, including research on the site, boundary identification, and cleanup.
- Keith also suggested that designation of the cemetery is important for raising awareness of its value.

- Sandra Franks emphasized that the cemetery is in a prominent location and expressed support for keeping the public aware of its significance. Sandra encouraged the Committee to highlight the importance of cemeteries like this one and expressed a desire to see the action plan progress.
- Michael Rikley-Lancaster asked if Sarah More could undertake research on the cemetery to support the project.
- Keith Blades noted that unmarked burials exist within the cemetery and recommended conserving the existing markers; suggesting redisplaying the markers in their original locations or potentially relocating them, but more research is required.
- Sally Coutts mentioned experience in conducting research on cemetery conservation and advised the cemetery is not eligible to be designated under Part V of the Ontario Heritage Act. It was suggested to focus on the project as a worthy conservation effort, even if the long-term designation may not be feasible.
- Michael Rikley-Lancaster recommended that research should be conducted to define the cemetery's boundaries, as it could assist with securing funding for the project.
- Keith Blades is willing to continue advising the Committee as needed throughout the project.
- Janet Carlile suggested that the Committee visit the cemetery to gain a better understanding of its condition and historical significance and noted that several notable figures from Almonte are buried there.
- Melanie Knight suggested scheduling a site visit in the Spring, following completion of research component.

H.2 38 Main Street East - Dungarvon Building Update

Melanie Knight, Director of Development Services and Engineering, provided an email update this week regarding the progress of the project and that it is progressing well. The stabilization work is on track for completion by the end of January.

I. INFORMATION / NEW BUSINESS

I.1 Committee Meeting Schedule for 2025

Michael Rikley-Lancaster confirmed that the schedule for 2025 has been sent out to the Committee. Meetings will typically be scheduled on the first Wednesday of each month at 4:00 pm.

J. MEETING ANNOUNCEMENTS

The next Heritage Advisory Committee is scheduled for Wednesday, January 8, 2025 at 4:00 pm.

K. ADJOURNMENT

Moved by Janet Carlile

Seconded by Sandra Franks

THAT the meeting be adjourned at 4:02 pm.

CARRIED

Melissa Fudge, Recording
Secretary

THE CORPORATION OF THE MUNICIPALITY OF MISSISSIPPI MILLS

HERITAGE REPORT

MEETING DATE: January 8, 2025
TO: Heritage Advisory Committee
FROM: Melanie Knight, Director of Development Services and Engineering
SUBJECT: **Rehabilitation of the Pakenham Stone Arch Bridge and Review of draft Statement of Cultural Heritage Value**

THAT the Heritage Advisory Committee recommend that Council approve the proposed rehabilitation project of the Pakenham Stone Arch Bridge as detailed in the report and recommend that Lanark County accept the proposed Statement of Cultural Heritage Value prepared by the Municipality's Heritage Consultant similar in effect to Attachment C.

BACKGROUND

For additional details, please refer to the attached documents:

- Attachment A: Heritage Report dated October 16, 2024
- Attachment B: Heritage Advisory Committee meeting minutes from November 20, 2024.

DISCUSSION

The Pakenham Stone Arch Bridge, constructed in 1901, spans the Mississippi River and connects County Road 29 and Kinburn Side Road in Pakenham. Built from local limestone, the 82-meter bridge features five 12-meter arches supported by stone piers and abutments.

Lanark County is preparing for a major rehabilitation project for the Pakenham Stone Arch Bridge, scheduled to start in the spring of 2025. At the Heritage Advisory Committee meeting on August 21, 2024, the Public Works Department with Lanark County presented the proposed rehabilitation plan for review.

The Heritage Advisory Committee reviewed the draft Statement of Cultural Heritage Value and provided feedback to Lanark County and their heritage consultants on the proposed rehabilitation project and the draft Statement of Cultural Heritage Value proposed by Lanark County. Comments from the Committee were submitted to Lanark County on October 16, 2024 in the attached Heritage Report (Attachment A).

Lanark County and Andy Huctwith, CAHP, WSP, returned to the Heritage Advisory Committee on November 20, 2024, to address concerns raised by the Municipality and Committee. The following clarifications were provided in response to those concerns:

1. Conservation Approach:

Concerns were raised regarding the clarity of the conservation strategy in the rehabilitation plan and questions whether a masonry conservator was involved in the assessment. Further evaluation of the project through a traditional conservation lens was recommended.

Andy Huctwith, Engineer and member of the Canadian Association of Heritage Professionals (CAHP) gave a PowerPoint presentation on his involvement with the project as a heritage masonry expert since its inception. Mr. Huctwith's expertise and experience in heritage stone masonry allayed concerns regarding the involvement of heritage professionals in the project.

2. Stone Replacement Justification

There was a concern raised related to the necessity for stone replacement, beyond the issue of salt damage. It was unclear whether traditional masonry treatments were explored, such as dressing back the loose material. It was also unclear if the design team included a masonry conservator, or professionals experienced with historic stone repair and conservation treatments.

Andy Huctwith explained the 1984 project, emphasizing that it resulted in a new concrete parapet sheathed in veneer cut from the original stones to preserve the character of the original structure. A detailed explanation of the proposed stone replacement was also provided, outlining the causes of deterioration, including salt exposure, poor drainage, wide masonry joints allowing water penetration, and issues related to expansion joints. It was underscored the critical importance of repair and replacement to safeguard the arches' integrity, as any damage to them could compromise the entire bridge.

3. Proposed Stone Replacement

Concern was raised regarding the proposed replacement stone which appeared to be saw-cut with a highly regular, commercial appearance. The random, yet repetitive, pattern did not seem to reflect the cultural heritage value of the bridge. It was recommended, if the existing stone could not be reclaimed, that a traditional stone mason should be engaged to replicate the traditional stone shaping methods and coursing used in the original. This approach aligns with the "The Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada (Standards and Guidelines) which emphasize "...the limited replacement in kind, or replacement with an appropriate substitute material, of irreparable or missing components, based on physical or documentary evidence," when working with engineering works. The Guideline reflects Standard 10 of the document, "Repair rather than replace *character-defining elements*. 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.

Mr. Huctwith provided a detailed analysis of the proposed replacement stone and masonry coursing. It was explained that the stones would be guillotine-cut rather than saw-cut, producing rougher cuts more in line with the character of the original material. Additionally, the surfaces would be chisel-faced to replicate the texture of the original stones. The proposed masonry pattern would echo both the original and the 1984 design, incorporating a mix of large and smaller stones in a repeating 2/3 arrangement. The replacement stone was subsequently brought to the site to demonstrate its match with the existing masonry and was supported by Watson MacEwen Teramura Architects (WMTA) and committee members. This approach aligns with Standard 10 of the Standards and Guidelines referenced above.

4. Concrete Curb:

It was recommended that the proposed concrete curb be reconsidered, as it draws attention to the fact that the stone facing is a modern veneer and is unlikely to prevent salt damage caused by splashing. Given that the proposed stone, being a veneer, is essentially a sacrificial surface, it was advised that it may eventually require replacement in kind due to inevitable damage caused by salt and water exposure.

Further details were provided about the concrete curb to direct water away from the masonry and whether it was required. Images were presented showing water pooling and drainage issues along the roadbed that demonstrated the necessity for a curb. To blend in, the curb will be dyed to match the stone and designed with a low profile to ensure it blends seamlessly with the structure. The Committee expressed satisfaction with the curb after reviewing these additional details.

CONCLUSION

Based on the information presented by Lanark County and their consultants, the Municipality is supportive of the proposed Pakenham Stone Arch Bridge Rehabilitation project. The detailed presentation of the masonry work and additional information provided at the Heritage Advisory Committee meeting have effectively demonstrated that the project aligns with preservation goals for the bridge. Key aspects of the proposal have been thoughtfully planned to maintain the historical integrity of the bridge.

The Municipality and Heritage Advisory Committee remain available for further engagement on the next steps, particularly regarding the selection of finishes and input on heritage components. This rehabilitation project represents an essential step in preserving the bridge's historical significance, ensuring its continued protection for further generations and the broader community.

Prepared by,



Melissa Fudge
Planning Technician

Approved by:



Melanie Knight MCIP, RPP
Director of Development Services and
Engineering

ATTACHMENTS

- Attachment A: Heritage Advisory Committee Recommendation Report dated October 16, 2024
- Attachment B: Heritage Advisory Committee meeting minutes from November 20, 2024
- Attachment C: Statement of Cultural Heritage Value (Draft for Review) prepared by Sally Coutts

Attachment A

THE CORPORATION OF THE MUNICIPALITY OF MISSISSIPPI MILLS

HERITAGE REPORT

MEETING DATE: October 16, 2024
TO: Heritage Advisory Committee
FROM: Melanie Knight, Director of Development Services and Engineering
SUBJECT: **Review of draft Statement of Cultural Heritage Value
Pakenham Five Arches Bridge, Lot 11, Concession XI,
Township of Pakenham, municipally known as 4916
Kinburn Side Road, Pakenham**

THAT the Heritage Advisory Committee recommend that Council forward this report and the draft Statement of Cultural Heritage Value to Lanark County for consideration and request that Lanark County return to a future Heritage Advisory Committee meeting to further discussions regarding the proposed rehabilitation project and the impact to the Five Arches Bridge, prior to the completion of the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment.

BACKGROUND

Lanark County is preparing for a major rehabilitation project for the Five Arches Bridge in Pakenham, scheduled to start in the spring of 2025. At the Heritage Advisory Committee meeting on August 21, 2024, the Public Works Department with Lanark County presented the proposed plan for the bridge’s rehabilitation.

As part of the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (MCEA) Consultation Process, any reconstruction, alteration or grading adjacent to a structure over 40 years old with potential cultural heritage value must follow a thorough evaluation. This includes ensuring that the structure’s heritage attributes are conserved, guided by recommendations from a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA).

Lanark County engaged a Heritage Consultant, Matrix Heritage, to assess the cultural significance of the Five Arches Bridge and provide a Statement of Cultural Heritage Value. Matrix Heritage presented an overview of the bridge’s cultural significance to the Heritage Advisory Committee as part of the consultation required under the MCEA process.

The Heritage Advisory Committee was tasked with reviewing the draft Statement of Cultural Heritage Value for providing feedback to both Lanark County and Matrix Heritage. While the original deadline for comments was set for the end of September, the Department has been granted an extension to allow for a more comprehensive review. To assist in this process, the Department has engaged the Municipality’s Heritage Consultant, Watson MacEwen Teramura Architects (WMTA), to provide their expertise and comments for the Heritage Advisory Committee’s consideration.

DISCUSSION

The Pakenham Five Arches Bridge spans the Mississippi River and rapids in Pakenham, connecting County Road 29 and Kinburn Side Road. Originally built in 1901 by Ottawa construction company O'Toole and Keating, the bridge is constructed of limestones sourced from a local quarry. The bridge spans 82 metres (268 feet), consisting of five-12 metre (40-foot) arches with stone piers and abutments.

In 1984, the bridge underwent a major rehabilitation, which included the removal, identification, and precise reinstallation of the original stones onto a reinforced concrete structure used to strengthen the bridge for modern day use. Further rehabilitation work in 2012 addressed issues such as repointing masonry joints, replacing parapet cap stones, and drainage improvements.

The Five Arches Bridge is a rare example of a five-arched stone bridge believed to be one of a kind and is a historical landmark in Pakenham and Mississippi Mills. It is also a vital crossing over the Mississippi River in Mississippi Mills.

The Five Arches Bridge was designated by the County of Lanark through By-law 84-36. As a designated property, all changes to it must be approved by municipal council after consultation with its heritage committee (Section 33 *Ontario Heritage Act*). The designated parcel includes the bridge and its approaches.

In 1985, the Ontario Heritage Trust (OHT) entered into an easement agreement with the County to ensure the ongoing conservation of the bridge. This agreement was partially secured through a \$25,000 contribution to preserve the bridge during the 1984 rehabilitation project. A key clause in the easement is that the County must obtain prior approval from the OHT before undertaking or allowing any demolition, construction, alteration, remodelling, or any other thing or act which materially affect the appearance of construction of the bridge.

The easement generally requires that the County notify the OHT for input on any proposed changes to the property. In 2010, the easement agreement was amended to a value-based approach to ensure proper techniques for repointing mortar joints were followed when the bridge was repointed. In addition, the revisions required that Parks Canada's "Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada," be followed when undertaking work on the bridge.

Following this amendment, a statement of cultural heritage value for the bridge was created to meet OHT's requirements.

The OHT requires that all alterations and interventions to buildings and structures with easements must be approved prior to the start of work. In addition to this requirement, an "Application to Alter" the bridge must be approved by committee and council before work can proceed. To obtain both permissions, it must be demonstrated that the proposed changes are consistent with the "Standards and Guidelines," and good heritage practice.

The bridge is currently listed in the Heritage Register maintained by the Municipality of Mississippi Mills and is undergoing review by the Municipality's Heritage Consultant,

WMTA. The bridge is also on the Province of Ontario Heritage Bridge List as a significant structure.

HERITAGE CONSULTANT COMMENTS RECEIVED

Staff circulated the draft statement to the Municipality's Heritage Consultant, WMTA for review. The key points are summarized below, and a revised Statement of Cultural Heritage Value is attached (Attachment A):

1. Conservation Approach:

WMTA noted that the conservation strategy in the rehabilitation plan was unclear and has also questioned whether a masonry conservator had been involved in the assessment. Further evaluation of the project through a traditional conservation lens is recommended.

2. Stone Replacement Justification

There is concern related to the necessity for stone replacement, other than it is exhibiting salt damage. It is unclear if traditional masonry treatments have been explored, such as dressing back the loose material. It is unclear if the design team included a masonry conservator, or professionals experienced with historic stone repair and conservation treatments. This information should be confirmed by the County and explored further.

3. Proposed Stone Replacement

The proposed replacement stone is saw cut and has a highly regular, commercial appearance. The proposed random, but repetitive, pattern does not reflect the cultural heritage value of the bridge. If existing stone cannot be reclaimed, a traditional stone mason should be engaged to replicate the traditional stone shaping methods and coursing used in the original. This approach is consistent with the "Standards and Guidelines" which recommend "...the limited replacement in kind, or replacement with an appropriate substitute material, of irreparable or missing components, based on physical or documentary evidence," when working with engineering works. This "Guideline" reflects Standard 10 of the document, "Repair rather than replace *character-defining elements*. 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.

4. Concrete Curb:

The proposed concrete curb draws attention to the fact that the stone facing is a modern veneer and is unlikely to prevent salt damage caused by splashing. The stone, being a veneer, is essentially a sacrificial surface that may eventually require replacement in kind because of unavoidable stone damage.

CONCLUSION

Staff are of the opinion that it is important to ensure that the rehabilitation of the Pakenham Five Arches Bridge adheres to best practices in heritage conservation while maintaining the bridge's historical integrity for future generations.

Staff concur with the Heritage Consultant's feedback and recommend that the Committee recommend to Council that this report and attachments are forwarded to the County for consideration and further discussion with the Committee prior to finalizing the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment process.

All of which is respectfully submitted,



Melanie Knight MCIP, RPP
Director of Development Services and Engineering

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A – Statement of Cultural Heritage Value prepared by Sally Coutts

Attachment B – Heritage Advisory Committee meeting minutes from August 21, 2024

Attachment B



The Corporation of the Municipality of Mississippi Mills

Heritage Advisory Committee Meeting

MINUTES

November 20, 2024

3:30 p.m.

E-participation

Committee Present: Michael Rikley-Lancaster
Janet Carlile
Stephen Brathwaite
Harold McKay
Jane Torrance

Committee Absent: Sandra Franks

Staff Present: Melanie Knight, Director of Development Services & Engineering
Melissa Fudge, Planning Technician
Hayley McCartney, Policy Planner

A. CALL TO ORDER

The Chair, Michael Rikley-Lancaster, called the meeting to order at 3:33 pm.

B. DISCLOSURE OF PECUNIARY INTEREST AND GENERAL NATURE THEREOF

None.

C. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Moved by Jane Torrance
Seconded by Janet Carlile

THAT the agenda be approved as presented.

CARRIED

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Moved by Jane Torrance

Seconded by Janet Carlile

THAT the minutes dated October 16, 2024 be approved.

CARRIED

E. DELEGATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS

E.1 Stone Arch Bridge, Pakenham - Rehabilitation Project

Andy Huctwith, Lanark County's consultant from WSP, presented on the Stone Arch Bridge Rehabilitation Project in Pakenham to address the concerns raised in the staff report submitted to the Committee on October 16, 2024.

The Committee provided the following comments:

- Councillor Torrance was pleased with the information provided and expressed concerns about the proposed concrete curb, requesting a visual representation of the curb design.
 - Andy Huctwith confirmed that the curb is designed to blend in with the stone of the bridge, intended to "disappear" visually.
- Harold asked whether the mortar will be lime-based.
 - Andy Huctwith explained that the mortar will either be 116 or Natural Hydrated Lime (NHL), depending on the conditions.
- Sally Coutts, Heritage Consultant working with Mississippi Mills, acknowledged that many concerns raised in the report had been clarified by the presentation. Sally requested that the tint for the concrete curb be reviewed by the Committee to ensure it complements the bridge's stone.
 - Andy Huctwith confirmed that a range of samples will be provided for the Committee's review. The concrete tint for the curb will be similar to the bridge's stone, in a slightly darker shade. Guillotine stone will be used for a slightly rougher texture, similar to the example shown for the Fort Frontenac in Kingston ON.
- Councillor Torrance inquired about the color match of the stone.

- Andy Huctwith confirmed that color match is similar to existing bridge stone. A color sample will be provided for the Committee's review.
- Janet Carlile asked for details on the drainage material and proposed lighting upgrades.
 - Andy Huctwith presented a detail of the proposed galvanized steel pipe drain, which will be cast into the curb. There will be one drain at the top of each arch.
 - Sean Derouin confirmed that there is a proposal to upgrade lighting, including color-changing lights that will be positioned in the same locations to illuminate the arches. The County is currently working with the Municipality to assume responsibility for the under-arch lighting, while the County would be responsible for upgrades to the street lighting.
 - Councillor Torrance suggested that a grant could be applied to cover the cost of the under-arch lighting.
- Sean Derouin noted that the County recently met with the Ontario Heritage Trust to review the proposed rehabilitation project. Approval from the Ontario Heritage Trust is necessary to comply with easement requirements.

Moved by Jane Torrance

Seconded by Janet Carlile

THAT the Heritage Advisory Committee accept the information as presented and direct Staff to prepare a report for the following meeting.

CARRIED

F. STAFF REPORTS AND HERITAGE APPLICATIONS

F.1 Heritage Applications Report

No updates for this meeting.

F.2 Blakeney Bridge - Reconstruction Project

Melanie Knight, Director of Development Services and Engineering, presented conceptual ideas for historical improvements for the Blakeney Bridge reconstruction project. Staff will gather feedback from the

Committee, conduct further research on preferred options, and carry out a feasibility study for consideration.

The Committee provided the following comments:

- Natalie Anderson-Rathwell noted that the cultural assessment was based on the 1912 bridge, not the original 1830s bridge.
- Stephen Brathwaite expressed interest in the arch detail of the 1830s bridge and suggested incorporating it into a contemporary version of the railing design or integrating it into a separate structure elsewhere.
- Councillor Torrance inquired about the possibility of incorporating the V-shape design into the pedestrian access funded by the Municipality.
 - Sean Derouin confirmed that the pedestrian access will be separated using flexible bollards, which will be removed during the winter. Sean also noted that incorporating the V-shape into the railing would be challenging as the railing is currently being manufactured.
- Janet Carlile asked where the Committee could provide influence or support for the project.
 - Sean Derouin explained that panels are already being proposed in collaboration with the Algonquins to reflect their settlement history. Sean also noted that Blakeney Park will be leveled to create a new area, providing opportunities for park improvements. The park is managed by the Fish and Game Club and the land is owned by the Ministry which may complicate the process. Sean suggested that adding embossments to the retaining wall on the island could be done without issue, however, any physical changes to the bridge itself would be challenging since the project is well underway.
- Janet Carlile emphasized that the focus should be on commemorating the bridge and its approach for heritage purposes, rather than the surrounding areas. Janet also raised concerns about traffic speed on the new bridge and the potential impact on local wildlife.
- Michael Rikley-Lancaster inquired about the possibility of additional color-changing lighting feature for the future.

- Sean Derouin confirmed that underground conduits may be installed for future connection.
- Councillor Torrance flagged the importance of the night sky lighting requirements.
 - Sean Derouin will provide contact information for lighting consultant used for the Pakenham Bridge lighting, which could assist in meeting these requirements.
- Staff will conduct a feasibility study on the proposed options and engage in further discussions with Lanark County.

G. BUSINESS ARISING OUT OF MINUTES

G.1 Cemeteries

No updates for this meeting.

G.2 38 Main Street East - Dungarvon Building Update

Melanie Knight, Director of Development Services and Engineering provided an email update two weeks ago. According to the Chief Building Official, the work is progressing well and is expected to be completed for the end of December.

G.3 Taylor Park, Clayton - Water Turbine

Melanie Knight, Director of Development Services and Engineering, provided an update on the progress of repairing the water turbine. Staff are working with Mike Dupuis from Canadian Hydro Components to transport the water turbine to their shop for further assessment and repairs. Mike has kindly volunteered time to work on the water turbine throughout the winter, with plans to reinstate it in Spring/Summer of 2025. Staff will report back to the Committee with more information as the project progresses.

G.4 Training for Committee

Melanie Knight, Director of Development Services and Engineering, confirmed that we are working with educators on training options for the Committee. Additional information will be provided to the Committee at a later date.

G.5 Downtown Core - Replacement Crosswalks

Melanie Knight, Director of Development Services and Engineering confirmed that the pedestrian crossovers (PXOs) have been removed and will be replaced with PXOs approved by the Committee.

H. INFORMATION / NEW BUSINESS

H.1 Almonte Old Town Hall - Curtainwall Replacement Project

Melanie Knight, Director of Development Services and Engineering presented the proposed curtainwall replacement project for the Almonte Old Town Hall (AOTH). The Municipality's Facility Manager is seeking the Committee's feedback on the color of the framing and is suggesting black finish.

The Committee provided the following comments:

- Councillor Torrance emphasized the importance of ensuring that the glass mural will remain in place and be reinstated after the installation of the new curtainwall.
 - Stephen Brathwaite confirmed that the mural will likely need to be reworked as part of the project.
 - Councillor Torrance asked if rods are included in the project and if there is an opportunity to add more with the help of the Youth Center.
- Harold suggested using bronze for the trim rather than black, to respect the 1970s addition to the building.
 - Councillor Torrance noted that the original building windows are black and maroon.
 - Stephen Braithwaite noted that black would match the exterior stairwells in black, but bronze would also blend well with building's existing feature.
- No strong opinions were expressed regarding the color choice, with most agreeing that the most cost-effective option should be prioritized.

H.2 Committee Meeting Schedule for 2025

Melanie Knight, Director of Development Services and Engineering, confirmed that a poll will be sent out to the Committee to determine the most suitable day and time for meetings. Staff are open to any suggestions if a better day or time works for Committee members.

H.3 38 Mill Street - Canada Post

Stephen Brathwaite raised the topic of Canada Post moving mailboxes into 38 Mill Street and suggested that staff reach out to Canada Post to explore the possibility of facade improvements and state support for the restoration of the heritage facade with potential for incentive.

The Committee provided the following comments:

- Councillor Torrance was not aware that Canada Post was moving to a new location, and inquired about why the building owner would not be responsible to carry out the improvements themselves.
 - Stephen Brathwaite clarified that Canada Post is handling the tenant improvements as part of their move to 38 Mill Street.
- Harold inquired about parking arrangements for the new location.
 - Stephen Braithwaite confirmed parking would remain in the same parking lot across the street.
- Councillor Torrance acknowledged that it would be a good idea to give the facade more heritage aesthetic, but noted that it appears to be the responsibility of the building owner rather than Canada Post.
 - Stephen Brathwaite explained that tenants often carry out exterior building improvements as part of their lease agreement.
- Melanie Knight confirmed that the Municipality offers a Heritage Grant Program, which provided up to \$5,000 for heritage designated properties, subject to budget approval and funds remaining. Melanie also emphasized that a Heritage Permit would be required for any new exterior door installation. Staff have been in discussions with Canada Post regarding their relocation and clarified that a distribution-only center is not permitted in the Downtown Commercial zone. Staff will follow up with Canada Post's representative by the end of the week to provide them with an image of the original storefront and information about the

Heritage Grant Program. Melanie mentioned that there may not be any remaining funds for this year.

I. MEETING ANNOUNCEMENTS

I.1 Next Meeting

The next Heritage Advisory Committee meeting is scheduled for December 18, 2024 at 3:00 pm. Staff will send an email to confirm attendance.

J. ADJOURNMENT

Moved by Jane Torrance

Seconded by Stephen Brathwaite

THAT the meeting be adjourned at 5:11 pm.

CARRIED

Melissa Fudge, Recording
Secretary

Attachment C

Statement of Cultural Heritage Value (Draft for Review)

Description

The Pakenham Five Arch Bridge is located on the Mississippi River in Pakenham between County Road 29 and Kinburn Side Road. The designated parcel includes the bridge and its approaches.

Statement of Cultural Heritage Value

The Pakenham Five Arch Bridge, constructed 1901, replaced an earlier wooden structure. A rare example of a load-bearing stone bridge the bridge's five arched design is unusual in Canada. When the bridge was completed, Pakenham was a busy town, with lumber, flour and wool mills, at least two general stores and amenities for local farmers. An up-to-date bridge in this location was critical for the success of these commercial enterprises and mills. Stone was chosen as its construction material because of its durability and easy availability. The bridge's function as the gateway to Pakenham and its shops and services contributes to its cultural heritage value.

The Bridge's cultural heritage value also lies in its association with Robert Surtees, a prominent Ottawa architect and civil engineer, responsible for the design of the Fleet Street Pumping Station and Major's Hill Park in Ottawa. The firm of O'Toole and Keating, also of Ottawa, constructed the bridge.

The location of the bridge at a narrow point in the Mississippi River, close to the mills (now demolished) constructed by Andrew Dickson, and the former limestone quarry that was the source of its stone and the town's main street contribute to its cultural heritage value.

Heritage Attributes

Key attributes that express the value of the Pakenham Five Arch bridge as an early 20th century engineering work include:

- Its construction of rough cut, irregularly shaped limestone blocks, laid predominantly in even courses,
- Its design, consisting of five stone arches each with voussoirs and a keystone,
- The low parapet walls with capstones and a stringcourse at the roadbed that follow the road,
- Its spandrels and load-bearing arches, massive stone piers, including cutwaters on its upstream side, stone footings, and
- The use of local stone from a quarry (now closed) on Kinburn Side Road, located just a few hundred metres southeast of the bridge.

Key attributes that express the value of the Bridge as a landmark that continues to define the character of Pakenham include:

- Its position on a narrow point in the Mississippi River at the junction of County Roads 29 and 20 (Kinburn Side Road),

- Its close physical relationship to the town centre and its amenities,
- The view of the bridge from local roadways, adjacent park and the Mississippi River, and
- Its role as a well-known local landmark.

Heritage Applications and Inquiries Summary

Reporting Date: January 8, 2025

HERITAGE PERMITS - 2024						
<i>File No.</i>	<i>Address</i>	<i>Description of Work</i>	<i>Associated Planning Applications</i>	<i>Associated Building Permits</i>	<i>Delegated Authority</i>	<i>Heritage Permit Issued</i>
R01-MUN-24	Cedar Hill School House – 270 Cedar Hill Side Road	Exterior parking repair on the foundation surrounding the schoolhouse.	n/a	n/a	Staff	2024-04-15
R01-LAW-24	4 Union Street North	Removing the existing non-contributing garage located in the HCD to construct a new garage with a larger footprint.	Minor Variance: D13-LAW-23	A24-1049	Staff	2024-04-23
R01-HIG-24	109 Princess Street	Replacing and extending the existing rear deck.	n/a	A23-1094	Staff	2024-04-19
R01-JEN-24	48 Main Street East	Removing the existing non-contributing garage located in the HCD to construct a new garage with a smaller footprint but taller in height.	Minor Variance: D13-JEN-24	A24-1077	Staff	2024-04-23
R01-PUG-24	83 Little Bridge Street, Unit #114	Attaching a retractable awning to the exterior wall to extend over balcony area.	n/a	n/a	Staff	2024-04-19
R01-LAV-24	83 Little Bridge Street, Unit #112	Attaching a retractable awning to the exterior wall to extend over balcony area.	n/a	n/a	Staff	2024-06-04
R01-MIL-24	98-102 Mill Street	Removing and replacing stucco façade.	n/a	n/a	Staff	2024-08-23
R01-NOR-24	65 Mill Street	New exterior signage for new retail store “Dot & Bliss”	n/a	n/a	Staff	2024-09-30
R01-HIL-24	85 Mill Street	New exterior signage to replace existing “EdwardJones – Investment” sign	n/a	n/a	Staff	

Summary of table:

The table summarizes heritage permits issued for properties in 2024, showing that a total of 9 minor heritage permits were delegated to staff. These permits involved various types of work, including exterior repairs, deck extensions, garage replacements, and signage updates. The approvals for these requests occurred between April and September 2024. The table highlights the ongoing interest in maintaining and updating heritage properties while adhering to regulatory requirements.

HERITAGE INQUIRIES - 2024						
Date of Inquiry	Address	Description of Work	Funding	Building Permit Required ? (Yes/No)	Delegated Authority	Date of Response
March 18, 2024	83 Little Bridge Street, Unit 114	Owner would like to add retractable awning over deck	n/a	No	Staff	March 22, 2024
April 4, 2024	104 Old Mill Lane	Owner would like to apply to have house added as a heritage property of significance	n/a	No	Staff	June 19, 2024
April 19, 2024	159 Country Street	Realtor inquired if property is designated	n/a	No	Staff	April 19, 2024
April 19, 2024	83 Little Bridge Street, Unit 204	Removing current deck boards and resurfacing with composite deck boards while keeping guards unchanged	n/a	No	Staff	April 29, 2024
May 7, 2024	Mississippi Valley Textile Museum	New kitchen venting options: 1. Through windows 2. Through roof	n/a	Yes	Staff	May 15, 2024
June 10, 2024	268 Country Street	Potential to remove drive-thru driveway from Country Street to St. George Street	n/a	No	Staff	November 4, 2024
July 16, 2024	73 Mill Street	Inquiry from tenant regarding tenant improvement projects in building	n/a	No	Staff	July 16, 2024
July 16, 2024	73 Mill Street, 61-63 Mill Street, 98-102 Mill Street	Inquiry about heritage grant and tax refund programs	n/a	Yes	Staff	July 16, 2024
August 14, 2024	904 Quarry Road	Owners would like to have a heritage sign installed at the road for this heritage property. https://www.mississippimills.ca/en/build-and-invest/heritage.aspx#James-McLachlan-House-904-Quarry-Road-Carleton-Place	n/a	No	Staff	November 8, 2024
September 20, 2024	125 Brougham Street	Would like to remove bars on windows at back of heritage building. Would like to understand heritage permit requirements.	n/a	No	Staff	Meeting scheduled for January 7, 2025

Summary of table:

The table summarizes heritage property inquiries in 2024, with a total of 10 inquiries reported. These inquiries included a range of requests, from minor alterations such as deck resurfacing and awning installations, to questions about heritage designation and available funding programs. The inquiries were addressed by staff, with responses provided between March and November 2024, reflecting ongoing interest and engagement with heritage properties throughout the year.



1 8 2 3 - 2 0 2 3

Mississippi
Mills

Heritage Committee Orientation Session

Thank you to our new and returning members for stepping forward to volunteer as members of the Heritage Committee!



Agenda


1. What is Heritage Planning?
2. Heritage Planning – Bills 109 and 23
3. What are Heritage Designations?
4. What are Heritage Permits?
 - a) Major Heritage Permits
 - b) Minor Heritage Permits
5. What is the Heritage Committee?
6. Committee Composition and Division of Responsibilities
7. Meeting Dates/Times and Venue
8. Resources Online

What is Heritage Planning?

- Ontario Heritage Act and O. Reg 9/06
- Provincial Policy Statement 2020
- Section 2.6 of the Provincial Policy Statement addresses Cultural Heritage and Archaeology:

“Significant cultural heritage resources shall be conserved”

- Anticipate changes in 2023 which will affect the Heritage Planning Framework in Ontario
- Official Plan policies reflect the policies of the Provincial Policy Statement



What is Heritage Planning?


- Processes under the Ontario Heritage Act (Heritage Act)
 - Listing properties
 - Designating properties
 - Heritage Permits
- Planning Act applications that involve or are adjacent to heritage resources
- Policy development (Official Plan, Zoning By-law)
- Building permit review and approval (listed and designated properties)
- Financial incentives (Heritage Grant Program, Heritage Tax Relief Program)
- Public Education
- Plaques and awards



What is Heritage Planning?


Heritage Planning is not:

- An attempt to freeze a property to make it undevelopable
- A requirement to open private property to the public
- A tool to prevent development or infill in established neighbourhoods
- A way to regulate the use of a building



Heritage Planning – Bill 109

- Legislative changes to the Heritage Act
- If decision is not made within 90 days, the heritage permit application is considered automatically approved



Heritage Planning – Bill 23

- Legislative changes to the Heritage Act
- A two-year time limit on listed properties (Heritage Register)
 - If not designated within two years, must be removed from the Register and cannot re-list for five years
- Properties **must be listed prior** to the receipt of a Planning Application in order to be **designated**
- New criteria for designations

Kitchener-Waterloo

Thousands of heritage properties risk losing protection under Bill 23, including more than 300 in Cambridge

JANUARY 17, 2023 ABBEY BILOTTA

Niagara heritage properties face risk following Bill 23

THE LINDSAY
Advocate

HOME NEWS ▾ OPINION ▾ PODCAST MAGAZINE ▾ ABOUT CONTACT SUPPORT US

Municipal

Turner addresses concerns about heritage-designated houses

By Kirk Winter February 13, 2023

ECONOMY | ENVIRONMENT

Heritage properties need not be sacrificed for housing growth

Ontario's push for density just stripped away heritage protections. Yet, attractive options exist to stimulate housing without loss of heritage.

by Ken Grafton, Marc Denhez

February 7, 2023


Heritage Planning – Bills 109 and 23

Bill 109 and 23

- In light of these changes, Planning staff will bring forward a subsequent report to Heritage Committee outlining:
 - next steps for staff to formalize/modify the current heritage review processes;
 - suggested workplan items for the Committee to consider taking on (review of Heritage Register, recommendations on properties to move forward to designate etc.)

What are Heritage Designations?

- Heritage Register – “listed” properties
- Part IV designations – Individual Property Designations
- Part V designations – Heritage Conservation Districts
- Can be designated under both Parts of the Heritage Act




What are Heritage Permits?

Major Heritage Permit (Committee/Council approval)

- New or replacement of historic cladding materials for both walls and roofs, historic windows or doors
- Alterations/Removal of heritage attributes including architectural decoration and other character defining elements (porches, balconies, parapets, etc....)
- Relocation or demolition of a building or structure
- New construction or replacement of porches, chimneys, roofs, walls, character elements
- Replacement or major alteration of storefront
- New commercial signage or awning installation
- Additions that will be visible from the street or the river
- New building construction in a heritage conservation district or on a designated property
- Projects that do not conform with Guidelines

Process for Major Heritage Permit




What are Heritage Permits?

Minor Heritage Permit (Delegated to Staff)

- Minor repair
- Replacement of existing commercial signage
- Masonry cleaning, repointing, foundation repairs, chimney repairs
- Alterations to non-contributing resources
- New or extended fences
- New or extended parking areas
- Permanent Exterior lighting installations
- Installations of TV or mechanical equipment that's visible from street or river
- Planting or removal of trees in public right of way or adjacent to river
- New alterations to existing hard landscaping

Process for Minor Heritage Permit



Note: if decision cannot be made by Municipal Staff, the Permit will need to follow “Major” process.



What is the Heritage Committee?

- Independent decision-making committee appointed by Council to make recommendations to Council on Heritage Permits and recommend actions related to heritage conservation within the Municipality
- The Heritage Committee derives its jurisdiction from the Ontario Heritage Act
- The Heritage Committee does not make decisions regarding...
 - *Private disputes between neighbours*
 - *Forestry and urban tree issues, including tree cutting and removal (unless included within a property designation)*
 - *Rights to a view*



Committee Composition and Division of Responsibilities



Committee Chair (1)

Committee Member selected by their peers to Chair meetings



Committee Members (6)

Reviews the recommendation reports and votes to approve or refuse major permit applications; grant funding exceptions, promotion of heritage and cultural conservation within the Municipality; undertake heritage projects.



Heritage Researcher (1)

Provides heritage research support

Planning Department



Provides administrative support to Committee.

Receives and processes the applications, prepares recommendation reports for each of the files that the Committee considers; the Municipality's planners and building staff are available to answer the Members' questions on any of the files.