



Municipality of Port Hope

56 Queen Street
Port Hope, ON
L1A 3Z9

REPORT TO: Community Development Committee

FROM: Tom Dodds, Director, Community Development

SUBJECT: Heritage Impact Assessments for the Penryn Mason Homes
- Phase 5 Subdivision

DATE: March 3, 2020

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Receive for information.

BACKGROUND:

At the February 24th, 2020, meeting of the Heritage Port Hope Advisory Committee (HPH), the Committee received representations from community stakeholders requesting a series of heritage impact assessments be undertaken by Penryn Mason Homes Inc. for the proposed Penryn Mason Homes Phase 5 subdivision development. These community stakeholders identified the proposed development's impact on the following properties designated under Part IV the *Ontario Heritage Act* (OHA):

- 88 Victoria Street South (formerly 82 Victoria Street South)
- 82 Victoria Street South (also known as Penryn Park)

The Provincial Policy Statement 2014 (PPS) provides provides policy direction on matters of provincial interest related to land use planning and development. More specifically regarding Cultural Heritage, the Section 2.6.4 says:

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

Last year staff undertook a review of designated heritage buildings and properties that could be impacted by the subdivision development. Staff determined that only the designated Penryn Park buildings located at 82 Victoria Street South, which include three historical buildings (Penryn Big House, Billiard House, and Winwood Lodge) and small portions of land around each identified

structure, did not meet the PPS policy criterion of being “adjacent”, and therefore did not merit having the developer undertake a heritage impact assessment. (see **Figure 1**)

Earlier this month staff undertook a review of 88 Victoria Street South and determined that a small part of that property, which serves as a right of way on its northern boundary, is contiguous to the proposed subdivision development (see **Figure 2**). Consequently, a heritage impact assessment will be considered in staff’s recommendations to Council.

In attendance at the HPH meeting were the owners of 88 Victoria Street South who discussed the impact of tree removal and construction noise and vibrations on the designated heritage property adjacent to the proposed subdivision. The owners have requested to be a delegation at Council for the March 3rd, 2020, meeting.

Also in attendance was the chair of the Port Hope Chapter of the Architectural Conservancy of Ontario (ACO). He requested the Committee consider the broader cultural and natural heritage context of the area, inclusive of all designated and non-designated structures of Penryn Park (see **Figure 1** shown in yellow and including subdivision). His consideration is in reference to Section 2.6 of the PPS which states: “Significant built heritage resources and significant cultural heritage landscapes shall be conserved.” Staff is currently determining its recommendations on this PPS heritage matter.

As a result of the delegations and discussions at the February 24th, 2020, meeting, the Committee passed the following motion moved by M. Jones and D. Gardner:

“Be it resolved that the Heritage Port Hope Advisory Committee recommends to council to have a heritage impact assessment completed on the Penryn Homestead (88 Victoria St S).

Further, be it resolved that the Heritage Port Hope Advisory Committee recommends to Council to have a heritage impact assessment completed on Penryn Park (82 Victoria Street S).

And further, be it resolved that the Heritage Port Hope Advisory Committee recommends to Council that the aforementioned heritage impact assessments be combined.”

CARRIED

RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS:

There will be a cost for the heritage impact assessments and these are normally conducted by the developer. There will be additional staff time spent reviewing these assessments.

CONCLUSION:

The Committee's recommendation should be part of the public consultation record. Staff will consider them in the context of all ongoing discussions with the developer and its ultimate recommendations to Council.

Respectfully submitted,

Tom Dodds
Director, Community Development



