## CITY OF VAUGHAN

## EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF DECEMBER 12, 2018

Item 10, Report No. 29, of the Committee of the Whole, which was adopted without amendment by the Council of the City of Vaughan on December 12, 2018.
10. NEW CONSTRUCTION - SINGLE DETACHED DWELLING, 77

CLARENCE STREET, WOODBRIDGE HERITAGE CONSERVATION DISTRICT

The Committee of the Whole recommends approval of the recommendation contained in the following report of the Deputy City Manager, Corporate Services, dated December 5, 2018:
The Deputy City Manager, Corporate Services, on behalf of Heritage Vaughan forwards the following recommendation from its meeting of November 21, 2018 (Item 1, Report No. 7), for Council's consideration:

1. That the recommendation contained in the following report of the Deputy City Manager, Planning and Growth Management, dated November 21, 2018, be approved.

## Committee of the Whole Report

DATE: Wednesday, December 05, 2018
WARD(S): 2

## TITLE: NEW CONSTRUCTION - SINGLE DETACHED DWELLING, 77 CLARENCE STREET, WOODBRIDGE HERITAGE CONSERVATION DISTRICT

## FROM:

Nick Spensieri, Deputy City Manager, Corporate Services

## ACTION: DECISION

## Purpose

To forward recommendations from the Heritage Vaughan meeting of November 21, 2018, regarding the proposed construction of a detached dwelling located at 77 Clarence Street, a property located in the Woodbridge Heritage Conservation District Plan and designated under Part V of the Ontario Heritage Act.

## Report Highlights

- The Owner is proposing a new detached dwelling to be located at 77 Clarence Street.
- The proposal is consistent with the relevant policies of the Woodbridge Heritage Conservation District Plan ("WHCD Plan").
- Heritage Vaughan review and Council approval is required under the Ontario Heritage Act ("OHA").
- Staff are recommending approval of the proposal as it conforms with the WHCD Plan.


## Recommendations

The Deputy City Manager, Corporate Services, on behalf of Heritage Vaughan forwards the following recommendation from its meeting of November 21, 2018 (Item
1, Report No. 7), for Council's consideration:

1) That the recommendation contained in the following report of the Deputy City Manager, Planning and Growth Management, dated November 21, 2018, be approved.

## Background

## Recommendation and Report of the Deputy City Manager, Planning and Growth

 Management, dated November 21, 2018:1. THAT Heritage Vaughan Committee recommend approval to Council for the proposed demolition of the detached dwelling at 77 Clarence Street.
2. THAT Heritage Vaughan Committee recommend approval to Council, subject to final approval of the Site Development File DA. 17.057 under the Planning Act, for the proposed new construction (detached dwelling) at 77 Clarence Street under Section 42 of Ontario Heritage Act, subject to following conditions:
a) Any significant changes to the proposal by the Owner, may require reconsideration by the Heritage Vaughan Committee, which shall be determined at the discretion of the Director of Development Planning and Manager of Urban Design and Cultural Heritage;
b) That Heritage Vaughan Committee recommendations to Council do not constitute specific support for any Development Application under the Ontario Planning Act or permits currently under review or to be submitted in the future by the Owner as it relates to the subject application; and
c) That the applicant submit Building Permit stage architectural drawings and building material specifications to the satisfaction of the Vaughan Development Planning Department, Urban Design and Cultural Heritage Division.

The subject property is municipally known as 77 Clarence Street and is located on the north-east corner of Clarence Street and Park Drive, as shown in Attachment \#1.

## The submitted Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment has determined the existing 1925 workman's cottage has lost its contributing status

The subject property currently contains a contributing 1925 workman's small cottage (Attachment \#3) that is proposed for demolition. The applicant has submitted a Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment ("CHIA") that determined that the building has been altered over time. The front porch was enclosed and amalgamated into the house, new larger windows were installed, and numerous rear additions were added. As an original workman's cottage, it once contributed to the context of the area. The CHIA concluded
that the effect of the extensive unsympathetic modifications means that it is no longer representative of the time and style it was built, and therefore no longer fulfills this contributing role in the Woodbridge Heritage Conservation District. The CHIA also concludes that reverting the heavily modified building back to its original form is not feasible since there is not enough of the original building left to restore.

## Previous Reports/Authority

Not applicable.

## Analysis and Options

The Owner is proposing to demolish the existing dwelling and build a new twostorey brick dwelling.

The applicant is proposing to demolish the existing detached house on the subject property and construct a new detached dwelling with the proposed dwelling will be twostoreys in height ( 9.15 m ) and include the main entry from Clarence Street with a secondary entry from Park Drive. The site plan also includes a three-car garage accessed from the driveway at the east end of the subject property from Park Drive. The proposed dwelling is inspired by the Georgian style through the inclusion of symmetrical elevations, hipped roof, brick material and stone trim details.

## A Minor Variance is required for the proposal to conform to the WHCD Plan

The applicant has submitted a Minor Variance application (A180/18) for the proposed garage. The Building Standards Department has confirmed that the following minor variance is required to Zoning By-law 1-88:

1. To permit a front yard setback of 0.95 m from Clarence Street, whereas the minimum front yard setback requirement is 4.5 m .
Cultural Heritage staff can support the above variance, as this requirement was requested by Cultural Heritage staff to conform to Section 64.1.6 of the WHCD Plan which requires a 0-2 m front yard setback for the east side of Clarence Street.

The proposed new construction is consistent with the following relevant sections of the WHCD Plan, with justification provided where the proposal does not meet certain polices in their entirety.

## Height, Massing \& Scale

## Section 6.1.5.4 - Clarence Street and Park Drive - Guidelines

"4. New buildings should be a minimum of 2 floors ( 8.5 m ) high and a maximum of 3 floors (11 m)".

The proposed building height as shown on the submitted elevations (Attachment \#4) is 9.15 m from the average finished grade to the top of the flat roof. The proposed building height is under the maximum of 11 m and will be two storeys. This height is supportive of the character of Clarence Street and Park Drive, which contains a range in building heights from 1.5-2 storeys. The proposed building height is satisfactory to Cultural Heritage staff. This method of measurement for the building height is consistent with Guideline \#3 of Section 6.4.2.1 of the WHCD Plan.

## Materials

## Section 6.2.8 - Appropriate Materials - Guidelines

Exterior Finish: Smooth red clay face brick, with smooth buff clay face brick as accent, or in some instances brick to match existing conditions.

Exterior Detail: Cut stone or reconstituted stone for trim in brick buildings.

Roofs: Hipped or gable roof as appropriate to the architectural style. Cedar, slate, simulated slate, or asphalt shingles of an appropriate colour. Standing seam metal roofing, if appropriate to the architectural style.

Doors: Wood doors and frames, panel construction, may be glazed; transom windows and paired sidelights with real glazing bars; wood french doors for porch entrances; single-bay, wood panelled garage doors.

Windows: Wood frames; single or double hung; lights as appropriate to the architectural style; real glazing bars, or high quality simulated glazing bars; vertical proportion, ranging from 3:5 to 3:7.

The proposed building materials (Attachment \#9) utilizing red brick, natural stone foundation, wood railings and asphalt shingles are appropriate and consistent with the above WHCD Plan policies. The windows and doors will be a vinyl material to replicate the look of wood.

## Architectural Style

## Section 6.3.3 Architectural Guidelines - Proportions of Parts

"For new buildings in this heritage district, the design should take into account the proportions of buildings in the immediate context and consider a design with proportional relationships that will make a good fit".

- $\quad$ Cultural Heritage staff are satisfied that the proportions of the proposed design fit within the immediate context of 1.5-2 storey dwellings. The
massing of the building is consistent with adjacent dwellings, as depicted in the submitted streetscape renderings (Attachment \#5).
"For new buildings in the Woodbridge Heritage Conservation District, the detailing of the work should again refer to the nature of the immediate context and the attributes of the Character Area in which it is to be placed."
- The proposed building is contemporary in style with traditional detailing that references traditional building attributes such as the arched window, window pane configuration and wood paneled doors with sidelights.


## Street wall Setbacks

## Section 6.4.1.1. - Woodbridge HCD Plan (General) - Guidelines

"4. Except where noted, new buildings must follow the City of Vaughan Zoning By-law in regard to side yards, back yards, interior yards and exterior yards".

The Building Standards Department has confirmed that the proposal follows the City of Vaughan Zoning By-law 1-88 in regard to side yards, back yards, interior yards and exterior yards.

## Street Wall Height and Scale

## Section 6.4.2.1 - Woodbridge HCD Plan (General) - Guidelines

"1. Except where noted, new buildings should be a minimum of 2 floors ( 8.5 m ) and a maximum of 3 floors ( 11 m )".

- As previously stated above, the proposed building height is below the required maximum height and is therefore satisfactory to Cultural Heritage staff.


## Landscaping

## Section 6.6.3-Tree Canopy and Vegetation - Guidelines

"3. Trees on public and private property, having a tree diameter of twenty (20) centimeters or more or having a base diameter of twenty (20) centimetres or more, must be conserved, and the requirements of the City of Vaughan Tree Bylaw 185-2007 must be adhered to."

An Arborist Report and Tree Protection Plan (Attachments \#6 and \#7) were submitted in support of the proposal. The proposal will remove 4 trees for the development and will replant 5 trees.

## Timeline

This Application is subject to the 90 -day review under the Ontario Heritage Act. This Application was declared complete on November 5, 2018, and must be deliberated upon by February 3, 2019, to meet the 90 -day timeline.

## Financial Impact

There are no requirements for new funding associated with this report.

## Broader Regional Impacts/Considerations

There are no broader Regional impacts or considerations.

## Conclusion

The Urban Design and Cultural Heritage Division has reviewed the Application to permit a detached dwelling on the property municipally known as 77 Clarence Street and is satisfied that the proposed detached dwelling is consistent with the WHCD Plan. Accordingly, the Urban Design and Cultural Heritage Division of the Development Planning Department can support the approval of the proposed new construction under Section 42 of the Ontario Heritage Act, subject to the recommendations in this report.

For more information, please contact: Shelby Blundell, Cultural Heritage Coordinator, ext. 8813

## Attachments

1. Location Map
2. Subject Property
3. Site Photos
4. Architectural Drawings, Noor and Associates, September 8, 2018
5. Streetscape Rendering, Noor and Associates
6. Arborist Report, Tree Doctor's Inc., July 5, 2017
7. Tree Protection Plan, Noor and Associates, March 8, 2017
8. Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment, Joan Burt Architect, June 2018
9. Proposed Material Details, Noor and Associates

## Prepared by

Shelby Blundell, Cultural Heritage Coordinator, ext. 8813
Shahrzad Davoudi-Strike, Senior Urban Designer, ext. 8653
Rob Bayley, Manager of Urban Design \& Cultural Heritage, ext. 8254

## Attachment 1

## Location Map



## Subject Property
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Front view of 77 Clarence Street


Front Entrance of 77 Clarence Street


Side View (Park Drive) of 77 Clarence Street


Corner of Clarence Street and Park Drive


View of Park Drive
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## Introduction

Tree Doctors Inc. was retained by the general contractor, Nick Noorzad, to complete a Construction Arborist Report and Tree Protection Plan in support of a development application for the property located at 77 Clarence Avenue in Vaughan, Ontario.

An on-site inspection was undertaken by the arborist on June 28, 2017 in order to:

- Prepare an inventory of all bylaw-protected trees. The inventory includes all private trees measured 20 cm . in diameter (measured at base) or greater, as well as all trees located on the City road allowance, on or within 6 meters of the subject site;
- Document each tree's condition, location, and minimum protection requirements;
- Evaluate potential site plan modifications in the interest of tree preservation;
- Establish and illustrate the required hoarding layout to be maintained for the duration of construction activities.

The results of the inspection are contained within this document, the Construction Arborist Report, as well as the accompanying Tree Protection Plan.

## Methodology

A Visual Tree Assessment (VTA) was undertaken on all bylaw-protected trees. Bylaw-protected trees include all private trees measured with a base diameter of 20 cm . or greater, as well as all trees located on the City road allowance, on or within 6 meters of the subject site. The VTA method is used to evaluate the health and structural condition of each tree and the site in which it grows. This method is recognized as a Limited Visual Inspection by the International Society of Arboriculture. In cases where neighboring trees have a base diameter of <20 cm., but are within proximity of the site disturbance, they have been included in the inventory and Tree Protection Plan in the interest of preserving a private asset.

Tree resources were assessed based on the following parameters:
Tree \#: identification number assigned to the tree, corresponding to the location plotted of the Tree Protection Plan.
Species: common and botanical names provided in the inventory table.
Base Diameter: stem diameter measured at grade.
Condition: condition of tree considering trunk integrity, crown structure, and crown vigour.
Condition ratings are defined as follows:

1. Good - trees in good overall health and condition with desirable structure
2. Fair - trees in moderate health and condition with less desirable structure
3. Poor - trees displaying prominent health issues such as decay and disease and/or poor form and structure

Inventoried trees have been assigned one of the following ownership categories:

1. Trees with base diameters of 20 cm or more, situated on private property on the subject site.
2. Trees with base diameters of 20 cm or more, situated on private property, within 6 m . of the subject site.
3. Trees of all diameters situated on City-owned parkland within 6 m . of the subject site.
4. Trees on lands protected by the Toronto Region Conservation Authority (TRCA) of all diameters situated within 12 m . of construction activity.
5. Trees of all diameters situated within the City road allowance, on or within 6 m . of the subject site.

## Existing Site Conditions

The existing site is occupied by an aging 2-storey, single family dwelling with rear drive. Up to $35 \%$ of the property gets its canopy cover from a mature side yard Norway Maple. The remaining $10-15 \%$ coverage is provided by a combination of established woody ornamentals, semi-mature conifers, and invasive species.

## Proposed Development

The proposed development, as illustrated in the provided site plan, includes the demolition of the existing dwelling, followed by the construction of a new 2 -storey, single family dwelling with asphalt drive, 3 -car garage, basement walkout, and rear deck. The accompanying Tree Protection Plan provides an overview of the proposed construction relative to the constructionrelated impact on the existing bylaw-protected trees on site.

## Discussion

The following section of the report provides discussion and analysis of the construction-related impact on the existing trees on site, tree removal requirements, and tree preservation and pruning measures relative to the proposed development and existing conditions.

The proposed development conflicts with the protected root zone of four (4) bylaw-protected tree on site:

Tree 1: 87 cm . Norway Maple - Request Permit to Remove
Tree 1 is an $87-\mathrm{cm}$. mature Norway Maple located on private property, within the footprint of the proposed development at 77 Clarence Street. This tree cannot be preserved and therefore, we are requesting a permit for removal. For a tree removal of this size ( 50 cm . + base diameter), the City of Vaughan requires 4 replacement trees as compensation. Please see the section titled, "Replanting Plan" for more details.

## Tree 4: 22 cm . White Spruce - Request Permit to Remove

Tree 4 is a $22-\mathrm{cm}$. White Spruce in fair condition located within just West of the existing driveway at 77 Clarence Street. The proposed construction encroaches on the 1.8-meter Tree Protection Zone by up to 1.4 meters. The tree cannot be retained in safe and healthy condition at this level of encroachment. Therefore, we are requesting a permit for removal. For a tree removal of this size ( $20-30 \mathrm{~cm}$. base diameter), the City of Vaughan requires 1 replacement tree as compensation. Please see the section titled, "Replanting Plan" for more details.

TREE DOCTORS
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## Tree 5: 41 cm . Colorado Spruce - Request Permit to Remove

Tree 5 is a $41-\mathrm{cm}$. Colorado Spruce in poor condition located within just within the limit of excavation required for the proposed development at 77 Clarence Street. The tree cannot be retained in safe and healthy condition and therefore, we are requesting a permit for removal. For a tree removal of this size ( $41-50 \mathrm{~cm}$. base diameter), the City of Vaughan requires 3 replacement trees as compensation. Please see the section titled, "Replanting Plan" for more details.

## Tree 6: 46 cm . Colorado Spruce - Request Permit to Remove

Tree 6 is a $46-\mathrm{cm}$. Colorado Spruce in fair-poor condition located within just within the limit of excavation required for the proposed development at 77 Clarence Street. The tree cannot be retained in safe and healthy condition and therefore, we are requesting a permit for removal. For a tree removal of this size ( $41-50 \mathrm{~cm}$. base diameter), the City of Vaughan requires 3 replacement trees as compensation. Please see the section titled, "Replanting Plan" for more details.

All other trees on site can be protected to the full extent of the required tree protection zone. Please refer to the Tree Protection Plan for the required hoarding layout.

## Tree Protection

- Tree Protection Plans are to include a description of tree protective measures (e.g. hand digging, compaction reduction plans, hoarding installations, etc.)
- Trees being protected are to be shown on all plans.
- Tree protection hoarding locations must be shown along with Tree Protection Zones (TPZ).
- TPZ distances from trees are shown in Table 1
- Areas within the TPZ are considered "no touch areas". Grading, excavation, machinery access and material storage are prohibited within "no touch areas".
- Machinery access and storage sites must be shown on plans.
- If access is required through TPZ areas, a compaction reduction plan is required as part of the report. The compaction reduction plan is to include materials and installation techniques to be employed, along with post construction treatments.


## Tree Protection Distances:

| City of Vaughan <br> Minimum Tree Protection Zones (TPZ) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Trunk Diameter DBH ${ }^{1}$ | City Owned and Private Trees ${ }^{2}$ | Trees in Naturalized Areas <br> Whichever is greater |
| < 10 cm | 1.2 m | Dripline ${ }^{3}$ or 1.2 m |
| $10-20^{4} \mathrm{~cm}$ | 1.2 m | Dripline or 1.2 m |
| $21-30 \mathrm{~cm}$ | 1.8 m | Dripline or 3.6 m |
| $31-40 \mathrm{~cm}$ | 2.4 m | Dripline or 4.8 m |
| $41-50 \mathrm{~cm}$ | 3.0 m | Dripline or 6.0 m |
| $51-60 \mathrm{~cm}$ | 3.6 m | Dripline or 7.2 m |
| $61-70 \mathrm{~cm}$ | 4.2 m | Dripline or 8.4 m |
| $71-80 \mathrm{~cm}$ | 4.8 m | Dripline or 9.6 m |
| $81-90 \mathrm{~cm}$ | 5.4 m | Dripline or 10.8 m |
| $91-100 \mathrm{~cm}$ | 6.0 m | Dripline or 12.0 m |
| > 100 cm | $\begin{gathered} 6 \mathrm{~cm} \text { per } 1 \\ \mathrm{~cm} \text { DBH } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 12 cm per 1 cm diameter or the dripline ${ }^{5}$ |

${ }^{1}$ Diameter at breast height (DBH) is the measurement of the tree trunk taken at 1.4 metres above ground level.
${ }^{2}$ Tree Protection Zone distances are to be measured from the outside edge of the tree base.
${ }^{3}$ The dripline is defined as the area beneath the outer most branch tips of a tree
${ }^{4}$ Base diameter ( 20 cm ) at which trees qualify for protection under the private tree by-law.
${ }^{5}$ Converted from the ISA Arborist Certification Study Guide, general guideline for tree protection barriers of 30.4 cm of diameter from the trunk for each 1 cm of trunk diameter

A tree protection zone (TPZ) must be established around each tree not slated for removal, extending in all directions from the base of the tree to a minimum distance of approximately six times the diameter. TPZs shall be 1.2 meters ( 4 feet) high and consist of plywood or plastic web hoarding or equivalent (as approved by the City). Orange plastic web snow fencing may be used on 2 " $\times 4$ " wooden frames in the case of trees situated on the City road allowance. Metal T-bars are not an acceptable alternative to a 2 " $x 4^{\prime \prime}$ wooden frame because these can injure critical tree roots or come into contact with energized underground conductors.

TPZs must remain in place for the duration of any construction or demolition occurring on the property. Inside the TPZ no construction, storage or disposal of material of any kind, adding of fill, or excavation may occur. For each TPZ that falls below the minimum size stipulated by City bylaws in order to accommodate construction, an Application to Injure or Destroy Trees will be made and the City appropriately compensated.

Establishing a TPZ is necessary to prevent physical harm to the stem and branches of the tree which may otherwise be incurred due to proximity of construction or demolition activities. The TPZ will encompass the tree's critical root area, protecting the roots from being damaged during excavation and from soil compaction which may occur due to the presence of heavy machinery.

Tree protection plan details: Light Duty
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| Pro | tected Trees |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \dot{\text { ¿ }} \\ & \text { む̀ } \\ & \stackrel{1}{2} \end{aligned}$ | Species | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{n}{c} \\ & \stackrel{y}{\#} \\ & \stackrel{y}{n} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \dot{y} \\ & \text { ́ㅗ } \\ & \text { I } \end{aligned}$ | Condition | Protection Requirements |  | Cond. <br> Rating |  |
| 1 | Norway Maple (Acer platanoides) | 1 | 87 | Deadwood up to 15 cm . in diameter through the live crown; $<10 \%$ small diameter deadwood; general health and vigour is fair; significant included bark seam on back side of tree | Remove | 1 | Fair-2 | 5.4 m. |
| 2 | Norway Maple (Acer platanoides) | 1 | 32 | 15-degree stem lean from upright; growing location on fence line is poor and fence may eventually girdle a portion of the root flare; crown condition and general vigour are good | Preserve with 2"x4" frame and plywood-clad hoarding | 1/2 | Fair-2 | 2.4 m. |
| 3 | Norway Spruce (Picea abies) | 1 | 72 | Crown density, colour and general vigour is fair; wellestablished root flare with pronounced surface rooting | Preserve with 2"x4" frame and plywood-clad hoarding | 2 | Fair-2 | 4.8 m . |
| 4 | White Spruce (Picea glauca) | 1 | 22 | Crown density, colour and general vigour is fair; clearance pruning to lower canopy; $<5 \%$ small diameter interior deadwood | Remove | 1 | Fair-2 | 1.8 m . |
| 5 | Colorado Spruce (Picea pungens) | 1 | 41 | Extensive dieback through the lower crown (up to 25\%); gummosis visible on main stem; crown health and vigour is considered poor | Remove | 1 | Poor-3 | 3.0 m. |
| 6 | Colorado Spruce <br> (Picea pungens) | 1 | 46 | Extensive dieback through the lower crown (up to 15\%); gummosis visible on main stem; crown health and vigour is considered fair to poor | Remove | 1 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Fair- } \\ & \text { Poor: } \\ & 2.5 \end{aligned}$ | 3.0 m. |

## Replanting Plan

Replacement Trees are required as a condition of all individual Tree Removals. This does not apply to Woodlots, Ravine Edge Restoration plans, and City owned lands (such as parks and open spaces lands). The number of replacement trees required will be determined by the diameter at the base of the removed tree, as outlined in the following chart:

| Base Diameter of Tree <br> to be Cut or Removed | Number of Replacement <br> Trees Required |
| :---: | :---: |
| 20 cm to 30 cm | 1 |
| 31 cm to 40 cm | 2 |
| 41 cm to 50 cm | 3 |
| 51 cm or greater | 4 |

Replacement trees must be: For evergreen (coniferous) trees, at least 200 cm ( 6.5 ft ) tall. For leafy (deciduous) trees, have a caliper of at least $50 \mathrm{~mm}(2 \mathrm{in})$. If fruit trees or small statured trees are desired, you must plant two trees for each regular replacement. Replacements are to be planted within one year of the issuance of the tree removal permit. Replacements cannot be a shrub, trees for the purpose of hedging, or of a low growing variety. Replacements cannot be an invasive species. Replacement trees shall meet the highest horticultural standards of the Canadian Nursery Trades Association with respect to grading and quality and shall be in strict accordance with the approved Plant List and Specifications and shall be nstalled as per City approved details and standards.

## The developer has chosen to plant the following 5 trees:

1. European Beech (Fagus sylvatica)
2. Japanese Katsura (Cercidiphyllum japonicum)
3. Eastern Hemlock (Tsuga canadensis)
4. Kentucky Coffeetree (Gymnocladus dioicus)
5. Paper Birch (Betula papyrifera)

In instances where more replacement trees are required than can reasonably be accommodated on the development site, a 'cash-in-lieu' payment may be made to the Forestry Tree Reserve Fund (Account \#6810001.3550.03) to fund tree planting on city owned properties in the same community. The developer has chosen to pay cash in lieu of replanting for the remaining 6 trees in the amount of $\$ 550$ per tree.

Figure 1. Tree planting methodology


## Summary of Requirements

- Removal or root-zone injuries proposed in this Construction Arborist Report require permitting from City of Vaughan Urban Forestry. The work outlined in this document shall not be performed without first obtaining the required permits.
- Tree protection barriers and fencing shall be installed according to the hoarding layout illustrated in the accompanying Tree Protection Plan. All tree protection hoarding shall remain in place for the duration of construction-related activities. No construction-related activity-including machine/foot traffic, excavation of any kind, storage of materials or vehicles, unless specifically outlined above-is permitted within the area identified in the Tree Protection Plan as the bylaw-protected root zone (TPZ).
- Branches and roots that extend past the required tree protections zones that require pruning must be performed by an I.S.A. Certified Arborist. All pruning of tree roots and branches must be in accordance with good arboricultural practices.
- Site visits prior to, during, and post-construction are recommended to ensure that the development is in compliance with all applicable forestry bylaws. Site visits should be performed by an I.S.A. Certified Arborist or similarly qualified forestry personelle.

This report was carefully completed for submission by:


By Shane Goldman, ISA Certification: ON-1645AT
Consulting Arborist - Tree Doctors Inc.
sgoldman@treedoctors.ca
Tree Doctors Inc.
425 Kilpling Avenue, Toronto, ON, M8Z SC7
P: (416) 201-8000 F: (647) 435-3439
info@treedoctors.ca

Tree 1: 2.5-meter include bark seam on backside of tree



Tree 2: Visible lean, minor fence damage, source of basal girdling


Tree 3: Norway Spruce (Picea abies)


Tree 3: Well-established root flare with pronounced surface rooting



Tree 5: Colorado Spruce (Picea pungens)


Tree 5: Gummosis on main stem




Trees 5 \& 6: Colorado Spruce (Picea pungens), 5 at right, 6 at left


Tree 6: Gummosis on main stem


Tree 6: Significant dieback through lower crown
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## CULTURAL HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT
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### 1.0 INTRODUCTION TO THE SITE

### 1.1 Location Map



## Location Of 77 Clarence Street, City Of Vaughan

### 1.2 Legal Description

PART 1
PLAN OF PART OF LOT 7
CONCESSION 7
CITY OF VAUGHAN
REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF YORK
ALSO KNOWN AS PART OF LOT 6 ACCORDING TO
PLAN 546 OF THE FORMER VILLAGE OF WOODBRIDGE

### 1.3 Zoning

R3

### 1.4 Heritage Status

A Contributing Property to the Woodbridge Heritage Conservation District, and is therefore Designated Part V under the Ontario Heritage Act

### 1.5 Planning Approval Being Sought

Demolition Permit for the building at 77 Clarence Street, City of Vaughan and Design Approval for a new single - family residence on the same site
1.6 Property Index Map

| City of Vaughan, Ontario | Clarence Stret |
| ---: | ---: |
| Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment |  |

301 - SHEET 8 OF 8 -
PROPERTIES EXIT SHEET
scale $\rightarrow 2$ PROPERTY INDEX MAP
BLOCK O330I
CITY OF VAUGHAN
REG. MUNICIPALITY OF
YORK
(OFFICE 65) 1 ,


| $\begin{array}{r}\text { City Clarence Street } \\ \text { City Vaughan, Ontario }\end{array}$ | 3 |
| ---: | ---: |
| Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment |  |




### 1.8 Description of the Property

This property is located at the north - east corner of Clarence Street (formerly Race Street), and Park Drive (formerly Spiker Avenue).

The lot is close to a parallelogram with the west lot line on Clarence Street being $22.08 \mathrm{~m} .(72.44 \mathrm{ft}$.) and the parallel east lot line 21.75 m . ( 71.36 ft .). The north and south lot lines are 30.48 m . ( 100.00 ft .), (see Survey). The site is relatively flat.
Presently, on the lot is a two - storey frame single - family house with a rear one storey frame addition, all located close to the north - west corner of the lot. At the south - east corner of the lot off Park Drive are the remains of a driveway, which accessed a single - car garage, now removed.

There are three mature trees on the site, one coniferous at the south - west corner of the house, and two deciduous trees, one at the south - east corner of the addition, and one at the east end of the north property line. There is a mature bush at the north - west corner of the house. The remainder of the lot is grass.


Aerial View Showing Features of the Property
1-Clarence Street, 2-Park Drive 3-77 Clarence Street, (Tree Closest To Corner Died \& Removed)

### 1.9 Description of the Building on the Site

## The House

The original c. 1925 house is a modest two - storey frame building. The form of the house comes from an earlier three bay vernacular residential building type, but significantly modified. At this time it is difficult to determine the configuration of the original front elevation, as the front porch which was originally open, has been incorporated into the body of the house and the plan altered to reflect this change.
The front section of the house, (22' $-10^{\prime \prime}$ wide $\times 23^{\prime}-3^{\prime}$ deep approx.) has a gable roof, with a pitch of approximately 45 degrees, that has its peak running north and south. Off the second floor there is an enclosed deck over the rear addition. The kitchen behind this front section (22' - 10" wide $\times 12^{\prime}-8$ " deep approx.), has a gable roof with a pitch of less than 30 degrees, with its peak intersecting the front gable peak at a right angle.

A one - storey addition (22' - 10" wide x $24-8^{\prime \prime}$ deep approx.) was added to the house after 1974. This addition also has a gable roof with a pitch similar to the kitchen section.

The house has a basement. The ceiling height in the front section is lower than the ceiling height under the kitchen and the addition which is $8^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$. The building is very lightly constructed, as noted in various sections of the house, particularly in the basement where the first floor joists can be seen to be spaced much wider than 20" apart.


Original Two - Storey House Left, Kitchen Section Middle, And Newer Addition Right

### 2.0 Background Research and Analysis

### 2.1 Chain of Title

77 Clarence Street, City of Vaughan Owner: Nagin Rahman and Yama Lodin

Part W $1 / 2$ Lot 7, Con. 7, being part of Lot 6 , Village Plan 546
pt. 1, 64R-4174, Vaughan
Pin 03301-0391 LT

| Instrument \# | Instrument type and amount paid | Date of instrument | Registration date | Vendor | Purchaser | Amount of land |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Patent |  | 20 May 1801 | Crown | Hugh Cameron | $100 \mathrm{ac} . \mathrm{W} 1 / 2$ lot 7, con. 7 |
| 271 | $B$ \& S | 27 July 1802 <br> (these dates are correct as per abstract) | 25 Mar. 1802 | Hugh Cameron | John Cameron | 100 ac . |
| 311 | B \& S | 22 Jan. 1803 | 26 Jan. 1803 | John Cameron | Thomas B. Gough | 100 ac . |
| 735 | B \& S | 21 Dec. 1805 | 11 Apr. 1806 | Thomas B. Gough | William Cooper | 100 ac . |
| 6198 | B \& S | 6 Fel |  | William Cooper | Joseph Stump | 100 ac . |
| 14696 | B \& S | 11 Mar. 1837 | 24 Mar. 1837 | Joseph Stump | Rowland Burr | E pt. of W half 50 ac . |
| 65548 | B \& S | 13 Nov. 1850 | 3 Jan. 1857 | Rowland Burr | John W. Gamble | Village lots 6 \& 7 <br> Plan 546 |
| 1997 (Vaughan) | $B$ \& S | 1 Nov. 1875 | 8 Apr. 1876 | Elizabeth Greey- (Estate of John William Gamble ) | John Abell | Pt. W half |
| 362 | Grant \$4,000 | 2 Jan. 1894 | 5 Jan. 1894 | John Abell and Christina Abell | Henry Abell | Pt. (document missing) |
| $757$ <br> (woodbridge) | Grant Nil | 8 Feb. 1909 | 2 Mar. 1909 | Henry Abell | Christiana Abell | Pt. of land in 1997 Parcels C \& D (plan missing from document) |
| $831$ <br> (woodbridge) | Grant $\$ 4,000$ | 17 Jan. 1912 | 3 Feb. 1902 | Christiana Abell | Henry Abell | AS IN 757 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 1056 \\ & \text { (Woodbridge) } \end{aligned}$ | Grant | 28 June 1920 | 22 Oct. 1920 | Charles James Agar (Estate of Henry Abell) | TheToronto Suburban Railway | Pt. as in 1997 |
| $1220$ <br> (woodbridge) | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Grant } \\ & \$ 1,300 \end{aligned}$ | 26 May 1925 | 17 July 1925 | Charles James Agar | Arthur George Banks | Village lot 6, Plan 546 |
| $5947$ <br> (woodbridge) | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { Grant } \\ \$ 16,000 \end{array}$ | 15 July 1965 | 30 July 1965 | Arthur George Banks | James McEachern and Winnie McEachern | Village lot 6, Plan 546 |
| 64R-4174 |  |  | 23 Oct. 1974 |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 7169 \\ & \text { (woodbridge) } \end{aligned}$ | Grant (assume mortgage outstanding \$1,800 parents to grantee) | 7 May1970 | 24 June 1970 | James McEachern and Winnie McEachern | John Campbell and Terry Campbell | Pt . village lot 6, lands in 64R-4174 |
| 83018 (Vaughan) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Grant } \\ & \$ 88,000 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 29 \text { March } \\ & 1979 \end{aligned}$ | 26 April 1979 | John Campbell and Terry Campbell | Francis Donald McLean and Catherine McLean | Pt. 1, 64R-4174 |
| 477187 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Transfer } \\ & \$ 230,000 \end{aligned}$ | 28 July 1988 | 29 July 1988 | Francis Donald McLean and Catherine Mclean | George Issa Abdallah and Lourice Abdallah | Pt. 1, 64R-4174 |
| R692828 | Transfer \$204,000 | 28 Jan. 1997 | 28 Jan. 1997 | George Issa Abdallah and Lourice Abdallah | George Ayyad and Anna Ayyad | Pt. 1, 64R-4174 |

Chain of Title (continued)

| YR1349468 | By-law <br> \# 102-2009 | 26 May 2009 | 28 July 2009 | To designate an area as a Heritage Conservation District |  | Affects pt. 1, 64R-4174 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| YR2448652 | Order | 18 Mar. 2016 | 24 Mar. 2016 | To remedy violation of standards of maintenance |  | Pt. 1, 64R-4174 <br> PIN 03301-0391 LT |
| YR2533283 | Jdgmt. <br> Foreclosure | 29 Aug. 2016 | 29 Aug. 2016 |  | 1557901 Ontario Ltd. | Pt. 1, 64R-4174 PIN 03301-0391 LT |
| YR2536185 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Transfer } \\ & \$ 760,000 \end{aligned}$ |  | 31 Aug. 2016 | 1557901 Ontario Ltd. | Nagin Rahmani and Yama Lodin | Pt. 1, 64R-4174 <br> PIN 03301-0391 LT |
| YR2536186 | Charge \$494,000 |  | 31 Aug. 2016 | Nagin Rahmani and Yama Lodin | Home Trust Company |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Last instrument 28 Sept. 2016 | YR2540563 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



Aerial Image Depicting The Area Of Woodbridge In 1942-77 Clarence Street Shows Arthur George Banks House, On The Large Lot Before It Was Subdivided Into Three Lots. The Photograph Also Shows The Distribution And Location Of The Buildings At That Time.
Image From City Of Vaughan Archives And Records Management Services.


[^0]
### 2.4 Property Owners

| Property Owner | Occupation | Relationship to Property |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Hugh Cameron | An early settler | This group of owners were either farmers, loggers, or land speculators |
| John Cameron | An early settler |  |
| Thomas B. Gough | Unknown at this time |  |
| William Cooper | Unknown at this time |  |
| Joseph Stump | Unknown at this time |  |
| Rowland Burr | Flour mill, saw mill \& textile mill owner, credited with being the founder of Woodbridge | These owners used the land for business purposes. and likely did not build this modest house as they were fairly well off. |
| John Gamble | Unknown at this time |  |
| John Abell | Entrepreneur, \& Manufacturer Owner of Abell Agricultural Works |  |
| Christiana Abell | Widow |  |
| Henry Abell | Unmarried Man |  |
| The Toronto Suburban Railway | Bought a portion of the land to the south |  |
| Charles James Agar | Accountant - Trustee |  |
| Arthur George Banks | Leather worker | Title search shows it is probable the house was built by Banks |
| James McEachern Winnie McEachern | Maintenance Mechanic Married Woman | Owner lived in the house, 1974 survey shows no addition |
| John Campbell Terry Campbell | Truck Driver Married Woman | Either of these two owners could have built the addition, as indicated by the selling price |
| Francis Donald McLean | Unknown |  |
| Catharine McLean | Unknown |  |
| George Issa Abdullah | Unknown | Owners lived in the house |
| Lourice Abdullah | Unknown |  |
| George Ayyad | Unknown |  |
| Anna Ayyad | Unknown |  |
| 1557901 Ontario Ltd | Foreclosure |  |
| Nagin Rahmani Yama Lodin | Present owners |  |

## Conclusion

From the research to date none of the owners of the house were found to have made a significant contribution to the Woodbridge community.
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### 2.5 Site History

On May 20, 1801 Hugh Cameron was granted 100 ac . (w $1 / 2$ lot 7 con 7 ) of Crown Land. He sold it to John Cameron in 1802, who sold the same land to Thomas B. Gough in Jan. 1803. This same 100 ac. was sold by Gough in Dec. 1805 to William Cooper. Up to this time each owner held the land for a very short period of time, too short a time for farming, but possibly logging could have been taking place.
William Cooper held the land for 22 years, and could have used the land for farming or logging before selling the land to Joseph Stump in Feb. 1828. Joseph Stump held the land for 9 years and in March 1837 sold half of the 100 acres to Rowland Burr. Up to this time, it may be assumed that the owners of the property were probably farmers, loggers or land speculators.
Rowland Burr held the land for 20 years, built a flour mill, a saw mill and a textile mill on the land, and in 1857 he sold village lots 6 \& 7 Plan 546 (see Section 2.3 map) to John W. Gamble. In 1875 Gamble's estate sold Pt. of the west half to John Abell.
John Abell, who established the Abell Agricultural Works, and later his estate and members of his family held the land until Jul. 1925, when they sold Arthur George Banks Village lot 6 Plan 546 (see Section 2.2 map). From the time Rowland Burr bought the land and the time that the Abells sold it, it is doubtful that this house was on the land, as this group of people were well off business men who used the land for manufacturing because of its proximity to the Humber River and transportation.
Therefore, we believe that Arthur George Banks built the original house, which he located very close to Clarence Street, and centred on the lot between the north and south property lines, as can be seen in Section 2.3 Plan of Survey.
In 1965 Arthur Banks sold the property to James and Winnie McEachern, who in 1970 sold Part of Lot 6, land in 64R - 4174 (see 1974 Survey Section 2.3) to John Campbell and Terry Campbell. At this time the present lot has been established.
The Campbells had the property until 1979, when they sold it to the Francis Donald Mclean and Catherine McLean for $\$ 88,000$. The McLeans sold the property in 1988 to George Issa Abdallah and Lourice Abdallah for $\$ 230,000$. From the increase in the selling price, either the Campbells or the McLeans could have built the addition, after 1974 and before 1988. The Abdallahs sold the property to George Ayyad and Anna Ayyad for \$204,000 in Jan 1997.
In August of 2009 the area was Designated a Heritage District.
In 2016 there was a foreclosure and the property came under the ownership of 1557901 Ontario Ltd., who immediately sold the property to the present owners.

### 2.6 Architect, Designer, or Builder of the House

No architect, designer, or Builder has been found in connection with the building of the house at 77 Clarence Street.

### 3.0 Architectural Description

### 3.1 Exterior Views 77 Clarence Street



Elevations


West Elevation


## South Elevation

Elevations continued


## East Elevation

## Three Quarter Views



## South West View

Three Quarter Views continued


## South East View



## North West View

### 3.2 Measured Drawings of Existing Building



## SECOND FLOOR PLAN



## BASEMENT FLOOR PLAN

First Floor
1 Entry Hall
2 Living Rm.
3 Kitchen / Dining
4 Family Rm.
5 Powder Rm.
6 Side Entry

## Basement

11 Hall
12 Furnace Rm.
13 Powder Rm.

### 4.0 Assessment of Existing Conditions

### 4.1 Exterior

## General

This modest two storey wood frame house is composed of the small original house with a front porch, which at some time was enclosed and incorporated into the first floor plan. It is unclear if the kitchen / dining area (see Section 3.2 Measured Drawings of Existing Building), was really part of the original house or was added at a later date, as the floors are at differing heights and the structure could indicate this. After 1974 a one - storey addition was added to the rear of the house (see Section 1.7 Survey Of Property).

The original porch was approximately $17^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime} N / S$ by $7^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime} E / W$, and the house including the kitchen / dining is $24^{\prime}-3^{\prime \prime}$ N/S by $28^{\prime}-3^{\prime \prime}$ E/W. The later rear addition is $24^{\prime}-3^{\prime \prime}$ E/W by $24^{\prime}-3^{\prime \prime}$ N/S. The building is on a concrete block foundation.


Roof
The porch has a shed roof pitched from the house towards the street. The front part of the house has a gable roof with the ridge running N/S, and a pitch of about 45 degrees. The kitchen/dining section has a gable roof with the ridge intersecting the front gable ridge, and has a pitch of about 30 degrees. The roof over the later one storey addition is a gable with the ridge running E/W, and ending at the east end of the house; it also has a pitch of about 30 degrees. The second floor master bedroom has an enclosed deck set into the roof of the one storey addition. All of the roofs have an overhang of approximately $12^{\prime \prime}$ with no return eaves, and all presently have asphalt shingles. The condition of the roof is very poor.

## Fascia and Soffit

The original design and material of the fascia and the soffits cannot be viewed, as for the most part they are presently covered in metal. From the general profile that can be seen, it appears that the original fascia and soffits were simple, austere and utilitarian.

## Structure and Exterior Cladding

The house is wood frame construction, and no doubt was clad in wood siding which likely was narrower than the wider metal siding that is presently installed, possibly over the original siding. Although the metal siding is well installed, it shows no respect for the original corner details, cornice board or water table. The trim on the windows and doors are wood of a later detail. On the north elevation, there is a newer brick chimney that was built to accommodate a furnace.

## Windows and Doors

All the original windows have been replaced with casement windows, some with simulated divided lights and some with none. In 1925, the original windows could have been either casement windows with divided lights or double hung windows with or without divided lights. No evidence of the original windows was found, nor was any photographic evidence or reference material located. Some of the windows in some of the rooms are out of scale (too large) with the size of the room. The window openings may have been enlarged when the windows were replaced.


North Elevation Showing Metal Siding, Soffits \& Fascia, Enlarged Window On The Second Floor, \& Brick Chimney

## Front Porch and Enclosed Rear Deck

Originally the front porch was an open platform with a roof and railing. The front door to the house came off this porch \& was located in the west wall of the house, to the south of the interior stairs. The present front entry door and concrete platform is relatively new and was positioned in its new location on the south elevation of the porch to accommodate the incorporation of the porch into the living room. The original door was not found in the house. Enclosing the porch and adding two windows changed the whole character of the house. The original open porch with its railing provided interesting detail for the entry, and gave the house a welcoming aspect. The very poorly considered design with respect to the placement and size of the windows and the resultant wall space is totally unsympathetic to the house.
The porch was built on posts, and has no foundation. Traditionally, the space under the porch would have been open and vented by a wood trellis enclosure from the platform to the ground. As this space is now under the living room, flimsy panels have been installed to close off this space from the weather, which gives a temporary appearance.
The recent side entry on the south elevation is located at the west end of the one story addition, and is a poorly constructed door with sidelights. Directly above this is the deck off the master bedroom on the roof of the one - storey addition. It appears to have been built at the same time that the one - storey addition was added, and then enclosed with aluminum windows in a make shift manner at a later date. Its design is a very uncomfortable fit with the house.


West Elevation Of The Enclosed Front Porch, And A Portion Of The New Front Entry


South Elevation Of The Kitchen Section Of The Two - Floor House, And The Rear Addition: Showing The Side Entry Door With Side Lights, And The Enclosed Deck Off The Second Floor Master Bedroom

## Garage

The 1974 Survey shows a wood frame one - car garage, located at the east end of the property with access off Park Drive. There was a shed attached to the north side of the garage, possibly used as a workshop or for garden storage. At some time the garage and attached shed were removed.

## Conclusion

There is very little of the original house remaining and what is remaining is of minimal cottage construction, with poor quality craftsmanship.
The original porch has been enclosed, with two new windows added, and the space incorporated into the house plan by removing the first floor front elevation of the house (see 4.2 Interior). It is likely that the kitchen/dining section, because of its poor connection to the front part of the house was a later addition, and might have replaced a kitchen tail. All windows have been replaced and many of the openings enlarged. All doors, trim, siding, soffit and fascia have been removed or covered over. The unsympathetic 1974 addition on the east elevation has altered the east elevation of the earlier addition to the house. The result of all these changes is that there is not enough of the original building left to restore.

### 4.2 Interior

## General

The original first floor plan has been altered by the incorporation of the front porch into the living room and front entry. There are two bedrooms over the original section of the house. The two storey kitchen/dining section with master bedroom above was likely an early addition before the 1974 one storey family room addition to the rear was added. There is no original trim, doors, or baseboard remaining. All of the interior is in very poor condition.


Entry Hall Looking North - West: Showing The Incorporated Enclosed Front Porch Indicated By The Drop In The Ceiling, The Newer Stairs In The Original Location, And No Original Trim


Kitchen Looking South - West: Step Up To The Front Entry Can Be Seen On The Right


Living Room Looking North - East: Showing Replaced Window, Original Stained Wood T \& G Ceiling with Drywall Over, Step Down Entry Doorway To Dining Area, And No Original Trim


Family Room In The New Addition Looking South East with a View to Park Drive


South West Bedroom, Looking South West, Showing New Enlarged Window On The South Elevation, No Window Trim Or Baseboard


Master Bedroom Looking South East Showing New Sliding Doors To Enclosed Deck On The East Elevation

Conclusion
The interior is shoddily built, and there is nothing of heritage value within the house.

### 5.0 Contextual and Contributing Property Assessment

### 5.1 General Background

### 5.1.1 Woodbridge Heritage Conservation District



The Woodbridge Heritage Conservation District Boundary
77 Clarence Street is located in The Woodbridge Heritage Conservation District where the intent is to preserve the "village character and quality of the district" that emanates from the relationship between the "cultural heritage landscape, properties and structures."

### 5.1.2 Woodbridge Heritage Conservation District - Character Areas

The Woodbridge HCD is divided into seven "character areas", each of which has "distinct and intertwined identities". 77 Clarence Street is located in character area no. 6 - Clarence Street and Park Drive.


### 5.1.3 Clarence Street and Park Drive Character Area

## Outline of Heritage Attributes from Woodbridge HCD Plan

1. Residential street character, pedestrian oriented, includes a broad variety of housing types and styles fronting on to Clarence Street
2. Provides access to Woodbridge Avenue from the North
3. Provide access and views to the Humber River corridor
4. In addition to parkland, front yards provide significant greenery and tree canopy
5. Houses are predominantly 2 to 3 floors high
6. Side yards provide views towards the landscaped backyards and the river valley to the east

## 77 Clarence Street With Respect To The Above Heritage Attributes

1. Residential building with no particular style
2. Not relevant to 77 Clarence Street's contribution
3. See No. 6
4. Front yard is too short to provide meaningful green space, or tree canopy
5. Although there are two floors the house is a storey and a half
6. North side yard is too narrow to provide a view, the south side yard has a view to part of the house behind, and the houses at the end of Park Drive where the street ends in a T .


South West View of 77 Clarence Street Illustrates Some Of The Above Points

### 5.2 Contextual and Contributing Property Assessment

### 5.2.1 Historical Evolution

Clarence Street is a slow curving street that provides access from Islington at the north to Woodbridge Avenue and the village centre of Woodbridge at the south. In the area of Clarence Street, where number 77 is located, there are a very few early significant and important heritage houses, such as 117 Clarence Street, the 1859 John Abell House (designated), and 15 Clarence Street 1825-1850. As there are so few of these architecturally significant houses, they no longer set the character of the street. In the1920's there was an influx of workers who built modest houses of various types and styles, typified by 89 Clarence Street, a vernacular style cottage, and 20 Park Drive, a larger Arts and Crafts cottage. For sometime, these houses set the character of the area as a workers' neighbourhood. In more recent times, the expectations of the new homeowners changed, and these houses were too small to accommodate their desired life style, and newer larger houses or additions to existing houses were introduced into the Clarence Street and Park Drive character area. At the present time, the area reflects the change of history in the changing designs and scale of the buildings. (All above dates are from the Woodbridge HCD)


1859 John Abell House - 117 Clarence Street Early Architecturally Significant House Georgian Style, Classical Details (Designated)


1920 Arts and Crafts Cottage - 20 Park Drive A More Elaborate Cottage Of The Same Period As The Vernacular Cottage Style (above right)


1920-1925 Vernacular Cottage Style 89 Clarence Street Typical Workman's Cottage (Listed)


New Residence Built After April 2009 69 Clarence Street - Replaced A Large Ontario Cottage 1925-1950 (demolished)
5.2.2 Present Streetscape

The panoramic view of both the east and west sides of Clarence Street, shows the relationship of the houses on the street, in terms of their style, building period and contribution to the Heritage Attributes of the Clarence Street and Park Drive Character Area.

From this streetscape, it can be seen that 77 Clarence Street has no particular building style, has been heavily modified with the incorporation of the front porch into the body of the building, many of the window openings enlarged, and unsympathetic additions added to the building. As well, the building is in very poor condition. The result of these interventions and long term neglect, is that 77 Clarence Street does not make a contribution to the context of the street, and to the
Heritage Attributes of the Character Area.
 No. 69
Ontario Cottage
1925. 1950
Heavil Modified
Contributiting
Demolished
New House
Buill Atter
Bu09
2009


Now House
 No. 7
Nost
1900
1

| No. 89 |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Vernacular Cottage Style | No. 83 |
| Listed | No Style |
| 1900. 1925 | After 1974 |
| Contributing | Not contributing |



## No. 117 John Abell House 1859 <br> No. In John Abell Designated Conributing


$\begin{array}{lll}\text { No. } 109 & \text { No.s. } 97 \& 101 & \text { No. } 93 \\ \text { Cape Cod Cottage Style } & \begin{array}{l}\text { Listed } \\ \text { Ledwardian } \\ \text { 195. } 1950 \\ \text { Contributing }\end{array} & \text { Contributing }\end{array}$
CLARENCE STREET


No. 70
1930
1925-19tage
Contributing


1925. 1959
Contributing
10ө!
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### 5.3 Conclusion

When built in 1925, No. 77 Clarence Street was a workman's small cottage, of no particular style, with an open front porch on a very large lot. Two lots were sold off, one to the east and one to the north, and a house built on each lot after 1974. Overtime, the desire of the various owners to have a larger house resulted in the building being greatly altered. The front porch was enclosed and amalgamated into the house, and new larger windows installed, as well as addition(s) added to the rear. The consequence is that the heavily modified building is no longer the 1925 workman's cottage that it once was, and it no longer represents that layer of history.
As an original workman's cottage, it once contributed to the context of the area. The effect of the extensive unsympathetic modifications, and extremely poor condition of the building, means that it no longer is representative of the time that it was built, and therefore no longer fulfills this contributing role in the district. Hence, it does not contribute to the context of the Clarence Street and Park Drive character area, which is a Designated Heritage Conservation Area under Part V of the Ontario Heritage Act.
Some of the additions and alterations can be seen in the photograph below. Taking this heavily modified building back to its original form would not leave enough building left to restore.


### 6.0 Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest

The following is an evaluation of 77 Clarence Street, Woodbridge, Ontario, based on the previous information carried within this report, and with reference to the standard designation criteria prescribed in the Ontario Heritage Act (Ontario Regulation 9/06).

## - Design or Physical Value

- is a rare, unique, representation or early example of a style, type, expression, material or construction method
This $11 / 2$ storey 1925 frame house is not an early unique example of a style, type or expression.
It is built using standard building materials with standard construction methods; poorly executed.

Therefore it does not meet this criterion.

- displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit

The overall craftsmanship of the building, and its later addition both on the exterior and the interior is of below average quality, and the building has no artistic merit.
Therefore it does not meet this criterion.

- demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement Not applicable to this building as conventional construction methods and materials are employed.
Therefore it does not meet this criterion.
- Historical or Associative Value
- has direct associations with theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization, or institution that is significant to a community Research shows no association with theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization, or institution that is significant to the community and has no direct association with any of the above categories.
Therefore it does not meet this criteria.
- yields, or has potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of a community or culture
All buildings have the potential to yield the above to a lesser or greater degree. No specific contribution to the understanding of either the community or culture was found to be made by this building
Therefore it does meet this criterion.
- demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, building designer or theorist who is significant to a community
Not applicable, as no architect, artist, building designer, or theorist were found in association with the building.
Therefore it does not meet this criterion.


## - Contextual Value

## - is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an area

It is questionable that in 1925 this building defined, maintained, or supported the character of the area. This Building was of no particular style and over time the heavy modifications have significantly altered the appearance of the building. The building is in very poor condition. The house in its present form and condition does not define, maintain or support the character of the area.

Therefore it does not meet this criterion.

- is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings
The house in its original 1925 form was linked to it surroundings. However, the major unsympathetic additions, and alterations have resulted in a house of a entirely different appearance. It is no longer physically, visually or historically linked to its surroundings.
Therefore it does not meet this criterion.
- is a Landmark

Not applicable - It is not a landmark.
Therefore it does not meet this criterion.

## CONCLUSION

77 Clarence Street, Woodbridge, Ontario does not meet the criteria in any of the categories in "The Criteria for Determining Cultural or Heritage Value or Interest as set forth in the Ontario Heritage Act Ontario Regulation 9/06 ", and therefore does not merit Designation under this criteria.
It was also concluded that 77 Clarence Street does not support the Clarence Street Park Drive Character Area.

### 7.0 Conservation / Mitigation Options for 77 Clarence Street

## Conclusion

Based upon the Conclusion in 6.0 Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest, it was determined that there was nothing of heritage value found in the building at 77 Clarence Street, nor was it found that the building supports the Clarence Street and Park Drive Character Area (see Section 5.1.3).

Therefore, no conservation / mitigation options are being recommended.
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### 8.2 Background Information

The previous information in this report concluded that the present building on the site does not meet the criteria for Designation if this building was not in a Heritage District, and that it no longer contributes to the Heritage Character Area because its present condition is very poor. As well, over the years, the building has been heavily modified, greatly altering the original building; the result being that there is not enough of the original building left to restore. Therefore, it is proposed that the present building be demolished and a new single family house be built on the lot. The following is a description of the proposed building and an assessment of the house using the relevant information in 6.0 Heritage Attributes and District Guidelines.

### 8.3 Description of the Proposed New House

## Site

The proposed new house has the front entry on Clarence Street and an equally significant side entry on Park Drive. The minimum setback from Clarence Street is 1.929 m . and from Park Drive 5.029 m . The house is parallel to Park Drive and askew to Clarence Street. The minimum north set back is 1.219 m ., and the average east set back is 11.168 m .
The three - car garage is located on the east elevation of the house, and is accessed from the driveway at the east end of the lot off Park Drive. The driveway slopes towards Park Drive with a curb at the east side of the driveway. There is a basement walkup on the east elevation to the north side of the garage.

## Architectural Design

The exterior design of this two - storey house is of no particular historical style. However, the design is inspired by the Georgian style, which was the influence of many early Ontario houses in brick, stucco, and wood siding. The characteristics in brick Georgian houses are symmetrical elevations on the street(s), limestone lintels, sills, trim and optional stone below the first floor windows. These characteristics are to be found in the proposed design

The south and west elevations are symmetrical unto themselves. The west elevation has a generous front entry canopy and porch, and the south elevation has a recessed entry with a balcony enclosed on three sides above on the second floor. The east elevation is asymmetrical, and is more of a functional design, with the three car garage and a back yard entry with a modest deck. The north elevation is close to the property line and is mostly brick with the line of the natural stone going three quarters of the way to the east. There are 4 windows of varying sizes on the first and second floors.

## Roof

The hip roof has a 12-6 pitch and terminates approximately $7^{\prime}-6$ " above the eaves, creating a mansard type roof, with a short overhang of about $1^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$. The roofing is brown asphalt shingles.

## Windows

All windows with the exception of the basement are double hung one over one. The front entry has French doors with panels below and glass above. Metal railings on the two bay windows on the south elevation allude to two balconies.

## Materials / Detailing

The elevations have natural stone veneer with pre-cast concrete banding to the underside of the first floor windows, with some design variations.

### 8.4 Assessment of the Proposed New House

The Objectives in 5.1 of the HERITAGE CONSERVATION DISTRICT PLAN that are relevant to the proposed new house are:

- Ensure that new designs contribute to the Woodbridge heritage character (3)
- New Development is sensitively integrated, as part of a comprehensive district (5)
These will be addressed in the Clarence Street and Park Drive Character Area that follows, as well as the relevant sections in the Heritage Attributes and District Guidelines (6.0)


## Clarence Street and Park Drive (6.1.5)

## The Heritage Attributes

The new house maintains the residential character of the area and provides a house design of the present time, therefore enhancing the broad variety of houses on Clarence Street. The house faces onto Clarence Street with the south elevation facing Park Drive, which has a large number of more contemporary houses than on Clarence Street. (1)
The new house does not interfere with the access to Woodbridge Avenue nor the access or view to the Humber River Corridor. ( 2 \& 3)
The landscape plan (AOO) indicates that the front yard on Clarence Street has 1 tree at the north west corner of the lot, and small bushes at the building foundation with the remainder in grass. On Park Drive there are 4 trees, and the continuation of the small bushes at the foundation, the rest is in grass. At the property line there is a small retaining wall and at the east end of the lot is the driveway to the garages. (4)
The new house is 2 storeys, which is in keeping with the 2 \& 3 storey requirements of the district. (5)
77 Clarence Street is a corner lot, which is located at the north east corner of the intersection of Clarence Street and Park Drive. It is situated in a position that the view from Clarence Street, on the north side of the house looking east to the river valley, is blocked by all the houses on Park Drive, however, the view is of landscaped back yards. The side yard to the east of the new house on Park Drive has a driveway and a landscaped yard. The view is to a landscaped yard. (6)

## Guidelines

The new building is a single family detached building type, which retains the existing residential character of the area, and is designed to maintain the pedestrian streetscape. (1)
This new house is on a corner lot with a pedestrian sidewalk on Clarence Street and no sidewalk on Park Drive. Both these streets are used to access Woodbridge Avenue, and possibly the Parkland. There are no views from these areas to the Parkland.(2)
The house on Clarence Street has a setback of 1.929 m. , which is in accordance with the required setback. This will provide landscaping in the front yard as noted above. (3)
The new house is two floors and is 7.706 m . in height, which is below the maximum requirement. (4)

The new house provides side yards, that according to the design architect, comply with the zoning. The east-west view on the south side of the building is through the side yard on Park Drive from Clarence Street, and includes the width of Park Drive and this is a very generous east-west view. On the north side of the house the setback is 1.219. The adjacent neighbour's garage is setback from the lot line 1.134 m . making a total viewing space of 2.353 m ., which is a comfortable open viewing space. (5)

## Architectural Guidelines for New Buildings, Additions \& Renovations (6.3)

This proposed new building is of a contemporary design (6.3.)

## Contemporary Design (6.3.2)

Contemporary design is defined as "of its time", and is not "aggressively idiosyncratic" but is "neighbourly, and fits the village context while at the same time representing current design philosophy" (6.3.2)
" "Contemporary" as a design statement does not simply mean "current". Current designs with borrowed detailing inappropriately, inconsistently, or incorrectly used, such as pseudo Victorian detailing should be avoided." (6.3.2)

This new building makes a reference to a Georgian style, but is not a pseudo Georgian designed building. The example shown in the Woodbridge Heritage Conservation District Study and Plan is the Residence at Calf Creek designed by Robert A. M. Stern, where he makes reference to "domestic resort architecture of eastern Long Island in terms of picturesque massing of gambrel roof, dormer windows, and projecting bays". (quoted from: Robert A. M. Stern Selected Works) In a similar manner this new building makes reference to a Georgian design. (6.3.2)

## Architectural Guidelines (6.3.3)

## Materials Palette

The proposed building materials are primarily brick and stone, with glass \& vinyl windows and metal railings. With the exception of the vinyl windows, these materials are compatible with the ones used in the Woodbridge Heritage District.
The building is mostly brick with the natural stone carried up to the bottom of the first floor windows, and a dressed stone band marks the top of the natural stone, and a decorative exterior cornice at the top of the brick wall where it meets the sofitt. In a general way, this follows the general idea of the use of materials in some Georgian buildings. This gives a clarity to the structure, and reduces the visual scale of the building by providing interesting detailing for the viewer.

## Proportion of Parts

The houses adjacent to 77 Clarence are of differing designs and building periods. The house to the north is a red brick bungalow built after 1974, to the east is a splitlevel 1960's white horizontal sided loyalist inspired house with shutters, to the south is a new house in the current design idiom, clad in stone or faux stone, and on the west across the street is a 1930-1950 one storey cottage.
There is very little in common with these houses except their wide variations in style, materials and proportions. However, they are all of a modest residential scale and the lack of uniformity contributes to the neighbourly village character.

## Solidity versus Transparency

The new house follows the characteristics of historic buildings of the 19th century, wherein they have solid walls with punched windows. Although this is a contemporary building and large areas of glass might be expected in this design, it was believed that this would be inappropriate in this character area. The wall to window relationship in the new house appears to be well suited to the Clarence Street and the Park Drive Character Area.

## Detailing

The detailing in the house is relatively simple, and the horizontal natural stone and stone banding and the horizontal articulation of the window sills and heads, the cornices, the railings, and the paneled doors are of a more traditional nature. These more traditional features provide visual interest and make a good fit for the Character Area.

## Built Form Framework (6.4)

Street Wall Setbacks (6.4.1)
Clarence Street and Park Drive (6.4.1.6)

## Attributes

On the east side of Clarence Street there is a wide variety of set backs of the contributing buildings.(2)

## Guidelines

New buildings may be built with a zero setback and a maximum setback of 2 metres. (2)

The new proposed house at the north east corner of Clarence Street and Park Drive is fronting on Clarence Street. The front setback on Clarence Street is 1.929 m . which fits into the guidelines.

## Sources

- Woodbridge Heritage Conservation District Study Area
- The Ontario Heritage Act
- The Ontario Provincial Policy Statement
- Ontario Heritage Tool Kit

Ministry of Culture

- Canada Historic Places
- Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada
- Land Registry Office

Abstract Research Material
Linda Clark - Title Searcher

- City of Vaughan

Office of the City Clerk
Archive and Record Management Services

- The Ancestral Roof

Domestic Architecture in Upper Canada by Marion MacRae and Anthony Adamson

- Old Ontario Houses

Kim Ondaatij \& Lois MacKenzie

- Edifice Magazine (for general reference only)

Christopher Cooper Ph.D.
Editor-in-Chief

- Well - Preserved

The Ontario Heritage Foundation Manual Of Principles and Practices
for Architectural Conservation by Mark Fram

- Richard Zaplitney

Photographer \& Production

- Cultural Heritage Impact Assessments

Previously Prepared by Joan Burt Architect

## Joan Burt Architect

## Qualifications

Joan Burt is an architect and a member of the Ontario Association of Architects License \# 1466,and The Canadian Association of Heritage Professionals

## Firm's History

The firm of Joan Burt Architect was established in 1958
The firm specializes in a combination of residential, commercial, and heritage work. This includes restoration, renovations and additions, new construction, architectural interiors, as well as planning \& development.

Joan Burt Architect has received the following awards and recognition:

- Beautify Toronto Award for work to buildings on Berkeley Street between King and Adelaide including the Klaus Neinkamper Building which was featured in a Canadian Interiors publication (City of Toronto Designated List)
- Niagara-on-the-Lake Historical Society recognition for dismantling, relocating and reconstructing an 1840 Port Hope house to 115 Ricardo Street, Niagara-on-the-Lake.
- Plaques for Heritage Buildings, Toronto Historical Board, City of Toronto Sesquicentennial, including Belmont Street, No.'s 4, 14, 16, 18, 20; Alpha Avenue No.'s 4, 9, 11, 13; Beaconsfield Avenue, No. 57
- Credited with having started the revitalization of Cabbagetown at a time when the City of Toronto was planning major demolition in the area.


## Project Experience

Joan Burt, principal of the firm, graduated from the University of Toronto School of Architecture, in 1956. At that time the curriculum had a strong basis in a traditional architectural approach. As well as contemporary design there was a strong emphasis on architectural history, and structural design.

From the beginning, the focus of her practice has been the restoration of downtown Toronto districts and buildings. Experience was acquired by locating architecturally significant buildings to restore and renovate, matching a client to the building, performing architectural services that included both exterior facade and the interior spaces and assisting with the marketing of the project.

The firm of Joan Burt Architect has revitalized architecturally significant building areas in Toronto that include: Belmont Street, Cabbagetown, King and Berkeley, King and Jarvis, King and Wilkins, the Beaches and outside of Toronto in Niagara-on-the-Lake, St. Anns and Collingwood, as well as The Dundalk Community Improvement Plan

Joan Burt has 20 years experience as Chair of the Department of Design at the Ontario College of Art. She was the founder of a multi-disciplinary Department of Design that included Environmental Design (Interior Design), Ceramics, Textiles (woven and printed), and Glass. The curriculum that she developed had a strong basis in History of Design and the Decorative Arts.

Because of our interest in interior design and the decorative arts, the firm has also focuses on interior architecture (interior design) for our own architectural client projects, independent client projects, as well as consultant to other architects.

## Architectural Specialization

Joan Burt Architect heritage projects provide for contemporary life while retaining the historical architecture of the building. The projects range from small restorations to large Toronto developments. The scope of these projects include all aspects of heritage work including restoration, dismantling heritage buildings and reconstruction, to the restoration of the exterior and interior, as well as making alterations and/or additions to accommodate new living patterns within heritage buildings.

The nature of projects undertaken by our firm requires a major design component and a highly specialized hands-on approach. Consultants are retained as required, such as: architectural historians, structural engineers, landscape architects, and mechanical and electrical engineers, all who have experience with heritage work.

The skills available include: Heritage Impact Statements, historical research and detailing, technical detailing, specification writing, photography, model making, and architectural rendering. The firm has a strong liaison with traditional craftsmen in both architecture and the decorative arts.

## Contact Information

Joan Burt, B. Arch, OAA, CAHP<br>Joan Burt Architect<br>310 Delaware Avenue<br>Toronto, Ontario, M6H 2T8<br>T 4165330072<br>E joanburtarchitect@rogers.com
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