

Citizen Summary

Mississauga Heritage Advisory Committee (HAC)
Meeting: Tuesday, July 27, 2010 @ 9:00 a.m.

Agenda Item #6

Hill Gatehouse / Dudgeon Cottage
305 Lakeshore Road West, Port Credit

All members of the Heritage Advisory Committee were in attendance:

Councillor Carolyn Parrish, Ward 6
Councillor George Carlson, Ward 11 (CHAIR)
Mohammad Haque (Citizen Member)
James Holmes (Citizen Member)
Bernie Hu (Citizen Member)
Craig Lawrence (Citizen Member)
Rick Mateljan (Citizen Member)
Gay Peppin (Citizen Member)
Michael Spaziani (Citizen Member)
James Tovey (Citizen Member) (VICE-CHAIR)
Matthew Wilkinson (Citizen Member)

HAC member **Michael Spaziani**, a Port Credit architect, recused himself from this Agenda Item due to a perceived conflict of interest, as he has assisted the local residents' associations in developing an alternative site plan which would enable the heritage building in question to be retained on-site at 305 Lakeshore Road West with the proposed new development of a 2-storey building and parking lot to accommodate the relocated Port Credit branch of the CIBC.

[http://www.topca.net/images/Site_Alternative_CIBC_with_character_building.pdf]

NOTE: For additional images of the site, including present condition, go to:
[http://www.topca.net/news/Briarwood_Phase_3_and_Hill_Gatehouse.pdf]

The developer, Pelican (Lakeshore) Commercial, a subsidiary of Senator Developments, was represented by **Glen Broll**, Partner with Glen Schnarr & Associates (urban planning and development consultants) and **David Eckler**, Principal with Architects Rasch Eckler Associates (AREA), who both tried to make the case that the Gatehouse was not worthy of designation, despite the 69-page Heritage Impact Statement (HIS) written by Mr. Eckler and submitted to the City, which outlines the rich history of the site, the building and its occupants.

[http://www.topca.net/Senator_Developments_Heritage_Impact_Statement_305_Lakeshore_Road_West.pdf]

Instead, the HIS proposes a "salvage mitigation strategy" by transferring a partial façade of the Gatehouse to the wall of the proposed 2-storey medical office

building at 325 Lakeshore Road West, and then designating *that*. This way, according to Mr. Eckler, there would be a “gateway feature into Port Credit” as part of the new medical building.

Glen Broll stated that there were different investors anxious to move this project forward, and that the prospective tenants of the medical building are “ready to go”. In addition, the CIBC is a prospective tenant for the new building on the site at 305 Lakeshore Road West.

HAC member **Rick Mateljan** commented that the design of the medical building incorporating the heritage façade seemed “very arbitrary” and questioned what would happen if the HAC agreed to some designation so that the community has more of a role in the future of the heritage building?

David Eckler replied that the Gatehouse has “listable value” but not “designatable value”. He then referred to the developer’s Transportation Report (*not seen by the citizens, though promised*) which indicates the CIBC needs access to the site from Lakeshore Road, requiring the Gatehouse to be removed. He stated the CIBC building needs to be 2-storeys for its mainstreet location.

HAC Vice-Chair **Jim Tovey** asked if Michael Spaziani’s alternative site plan for the property was at all considered for retention of the Gatehouse?

Glen Broll replied that they were considering the ultimate use by their client.

The citizen representatives from the residents’ associations in Port Credit were then invited by the Chair to make their deputations to the Committee.

Judy Smith, Executive Member, Cranberry Cove Port Credit Ratepayers’ Association, made the following introductory presentation:

“The redevelopment of the former Briarwood property represents an exciting opportunity for the City of Mississauga, Senator Homes and the residents of Port Credit to work together. By respecting the intent of the [Port Credit] *Directions Report*, recognizing the need of developers to earn a profit and understanding that the final product impacts on a daily basis on local citizens, we could create a framework for the future mainstreet commercial development that will inevitably occur along Lakeshore Road. We could refine the process so that all involved parties could come away feeling that their positions had been heard and respected. The outcome could be a model for integrating the old with the new, leaving a legacy for future Port Credit residents who could observe: ‘Boy, did they get it right!’

“Senator Homes has consistently promised that the residents’ groups would receive a copy of their Heritage Impact Statement when completed. Mayor Hazel McCallion herself arranged a meeting on May 17, 2010 to bring together representatives from the CIBC, Senator Homes and our various residents’ groups. At that meeting Senator Homes assured the Mayor that we would receive a copy of their study as well. What we have received instead is short notice of this meeting and a Corporate Report recommending that the property in question not be designated.

“This year we are celebrating the 175th anniversary of the founding of Port Credit yet we have been negligent in preserving buildings that could give us a visual sense of how this village evolved. Clarke Hall, built in 1922 and the Cenotaph on Stavebank Road, built in 1925, are both Ontario Heritage Properties. The Hill gatehouse under review today is of the same period, and you have received from the residents’ groups our assessment of the historical and architectural merits of the building and the current site.

“Our society is quick to applaud innovative redevelopment that daringly combines the **new** with the **old**, i.e. the glass pyramid at the entrance to the Louvre in Paris or the new wing at the Royal Ontario Museum. Why then is combining the **old** with the **new** any less exciting or meritorious? Over the course of the past century successive additions to our own Port Credit Post Office, for example, have sensitively matched brick and window styles.

“The former Briarwood site represents the western gateway to a new mainstreet commercial district for Port Credit. What better way to blend the old with the new than by retaining a precious icon from past days – the gatehouse – on its current site? We are asking that the Heritage Advisory Committee immediately begin the process to designate the Hill Gatehouse as a Heritage Property.”

Richard Collins, Executive Member of the Town of Port Credit Association (TOPCA) and President of the Mississauga South Historical Society, then spoke regarding the “Citizen Heritage Impact Study” which he had prepared on behalf of TOPCA and which was endorsed by the other two local residents’ associations and formally submitted to all members of the HAC:

[http://www.topca.net/Citizen_Heritage_Impact_Study_305_Lakeshore_Road_West.pdf]

He gave a PowerPoint presentation highlighting how the Gatehouse meets the criteria for designation as set out in the *Ontario Heritage Act*. He provided visual images and historical anecdotes to support the citizen recommendation to designate the building.

Rod Male, Director of the Port Credit Village Residents' Association (PCVRA), who has a development background, then addressed HAC by asking that the developer be consistent and conform to and respect the Official Plan and the Port Credit *Directions Report*. While the prototype design of the proposed CIBC building doesn't match the existing Gatehouse, there is flexibility.

Citing the developer's Heritage Impact Statement (p9, section 3.3 *first sentence* and p13), he stated the HIS makes a great argument for why the Gatehouse *should* be saved. The conclusion of the HIS is inconsistent with the body of the report.

As a final comment, he stated that the plan to take the facades off the heritage building is an insult – the building should stand alone as a Gatehouse. What the developer is proposing is “facadism” with the old walls “pasted on to the side of another building”. The heritage building should instead be designated.

Jim Danahy, Co-President of TOPCA and a retail consultant, next addressed the HAC, stating that he chose to live in Port Credit for its village character and heritage assets. The Gatehouse is the first house west of his house, and provides a connection and a landmark.

He referred to the developer's February 2010 Site Plan for the property, which shows a driveway where the Gatehouse presently stands – this was prior to the developer's HIS even being written.

[http://www.topca.net/images/Pelican_CIBC_site_plan_Feb_2010.PDF]

Furthermore, the developer's HIS had one day with City Staff, having been received by the Community Services Dept. on July 15, 2010. The City's 3p Corporate Report in support of demolition was issued from the same Dept. on July 16, 2010, so clearly there was no staff fact-checking of the 69p HIS.

[http://www.topca.net/news/305_Lakeshore_Rd_W_Facade_Relocation_Corporate_Report.pdf]

Meanwhile, the citizens did not receive copies of the developer's HIS as promised at the joint meeting on May 17, 2010, nor have they received the developer's Transportation Study, as referenced in Glen Broll's presentation.

The heritage building has fallen into disrepair, and the developer has taken no efforts to protect the building. The steel fencing is leaning against the building instead of protecting the building. There has been a show of bad faith, with no response to the citizens' sending of Michael Spaziani's alternative site plan along with 20 examples of various 2-storey designs of CIBC branches.

[http://www.topca.net/RAs_Letter_June_9_2010_re_305_Lakeshore_Road_West.pdf]

Eventually a REIT (Real Estate Investment Trust) will be brought in to operate the property, and surely it makes sense to maximize the development value on the site?

CIBC has said they didn't want to move their branch in the first place. A walkable mainstreet location is best for a bank, and the citizens can't be told (as presently, by the developer) that the "bank won't do it" when it comes to critical mainstreet commercial design issues.

The vacuum of a 3p Corporate Report from the City is disappointing and there is an issue of trust with the developer, but citizens still believe that sitting down and discussing these issues with all parties is the only way to generate the best outcome.

Glen Broll responded to the technical points and indicated he would "repeat this in front of Council" at the next meeting [August 4, 2010]. He indicated the citizens had received the site plans, but he had waited as to the technical reports, as he first wanted them to be "flushed through the City" before distributing to the citizens. He wants the Transportation and Works Dept. to review the consultant's Transportation Study first. He stated that the developer and consultants had been unfairly painted as "the bad guys".

David Eckler then reiterated that the conclusion in the HIS was the right decision in light of the "transportation needs of the site" [i.e. the need for the driveway].

Jim Tovey asked David Eckler if he had considered the enhanced cultural context once the former Texaco refinery frontage [just east of the heritage building] on Lakeshore Road is developed?

No real answer was given, but Mr. Eckler further stated that "the applicants are willing to have a plaque" erected on the medical building, and that "the [Gatehouse] building [i.e. façade] will be more permanent in the new location".

Jim Danahy rejoined: "It is clearly about the driveway".

HAC member **Gay Peppin** commented that the building has gotten her attention as she enters Port Credit from the west, and she would like to see the building kept.

HAC member **Matthew Wilkinson** stated that the developer's HIS was "a good report" and an in-depth review by the consultant (AREA). There are only two (2) other examples in Mississauga of a gatehouse being kept even with the estate

house gone. The impassioned community voice is speaking to the landmark status of this building to *them*. The strong community voice here can't be ignored.

HAC member **Bernie Hu** expressed concern about the protection of the building right now; the developer should take measures to protect it. [See *link to images at the beginning of this document, which shows present condition of the property*]

HAC member **Craig Lawrence** noted that the HAC comes in at the last stage and is usually told "this is the best you will get". HAC should have impact *before* the developer has spent thousands of dollars on consultants. There is frustration that HAC has to "take it, or leave it". There is pressure from the developer, and citizens are only able to come in at the 11th hour with their concerns. In this case, Ward 1 Councillor Carmen Corbasson sent a strong letter of support that morning, which is rare, and coupled with the community voice, it appears that designation is an option in this case.

HAC member **Jim Holmes** stated that in his thirty (30) years on the HAC, he has never seen a better example of a building that should be designated and preserved.

HAC member **Rick Mateljan** commented that HAC has seen two equally thorough presentations [developer and citizens], noting the residents did theirs so quickly – he has never seen anything so thorough or rapid come from the community. The community is so strong.

Often developers get an on-site building that is difficult to work with. In this case, the Gatehouse is a small building at the corner of a very large site. He recognizes CIBC's point of view but in this case of infill development, as is increasingly common now, the new building has to be crafted to suit its surroundings. Heritage buildings shouldn't be compromised to suit the template of a branch design.

HAC Vice-Chair **Jim Tovey** remarked that it is amazing to see citizens out in support of their community at the HAC. He would support a Motion that the building be designated.

HAC Chair and Councillor **George Carlson** stated that the Gatehouse building is eminently designatable. The conclusion in the developer's HIS does not match the report. CIBC built a new branch next to the Forster House on Britannia Road, which is a beautiful example of adaptive reuse as opposed to "cookie cutter" CIBC branches.

In Port Credit, every building should be subject to rigorous site plan review. The CIBC can be flexible and may already be on their way to a new design (citing the Spaziani alternative site plan submission).

There is no excuse for not retaining a 700 square foot building positioned as this one is. If this building does not count for heritage, then nothing else will. Yes, it is modest, and not “Casa Loma” but it should be preserved. Once designated, then site plans can change. The developer can always appeal to “the correct body”.

HAC member and Councillor **Carolyn Parrish** stated she is in full support of designation.

HAC Chair **George Carlson** then made the following Motion, which was passed unanimously by all HAC members in attendance:

HAC-0045-2010

Notwithstanding the Corporate Report dated July 16, 2010 from the Commissioner of Community Services titled “Request to Remove Heritage Listed Building Hill Gatehouse/ Dudgeon Cottage; 305 Lakeshore Road West (Ward 1)”, the Heritage Advisory Committee recommends that Hill Gatehouse / Dudgeon Cottage, located at 305 Lakeshore Road West be designated under the Ontario Heritage Act for the property's physical/design, historical/associative and contextual value, and that the appropriate City officials be authorized and directed to take the necessary action to give effect thereto.

CS.08. LAK W1

This recommendation will come before Council for approval, at its meeting on Wednesday, August 4, 2010. The developer will be making a deputation in appeal according to the Agenda for the Council meeting, and the citizens will have a rejoinder in support of the HAC recommendation.