

Staff Report

Report To: Community Services Committee

Report From: Amy Cann, Community Planner

Meeting Date: December 18, 2019

Report Code: CS-19-154

Subject: Application for Demolition or Removal of a Structure Designated under Part IV of the *Ontario Heritage Act*: rectory of St. Mary's Roman Catholic Church, 554 15th Street East

Recommendations:

That in consideration of Staff Report CS-19-154 and a presentation by GM Diemert Architect Inc. respecting the rectory of St. Mary's Roman Catholic Church, 554 15th Street East and their Application for Demolition or Removal of a Structure Designated under Part IV of the *Ontario Heritage Act*, Community Services Committee recommends:

- 1) That City Council receives the Staff Report and presentation by GM Diemert Architect Inc. for information; and
- 2) That City Council select one of the following options:
 - a. THAT Council directs staff to serve a notice of receipt of all required information to the applicant and undertake Peer Review of the Heritage Impact Assessment, Engineering Studies, and/or Urban Design Study by a qualified person(s) to assess the proposal on behalf of the City, and to facilitate a Council decision within 90 days.
 - b. THAT Council directs staff to serve a notice of receipt to the applicant to deem that the submission material required for Council's consideration is not complete, and the following shall be submitted to the City:
 - i. Any items that Council deems to be required for completeness.

c. THAT Council directs staff to serve a notice of receipt of all required information to the applicant and <u>consents</u> to the demolition with conditions as outlined in Schedule E; and

That City Council endorses, in principle, the design concept of the proposed rectory design by GM Diemert Architects Inc. subject to Site Plan Approval, Heritage Permits, Buildings Permits and any other approvals that may be required for redevelopment of the lands.

d. THAT Council directs staff to serve a notice of receipt of all required information to the applicant and <u>consents</u> to the demolition with conditions as outlined in Schedule E:

That City Council endorses, in principle, the design concept of the proposed rectory design by GM Diemert Architects Inc. subject to Site Plan Approval, Heritage Permits, Buildings Permits and any other approvals that may be required for redevelopment of the lands, as well as the following modification:

- i. That the proposed south wing be removed or altered to:
 - Maintain a setback from the dripline of all private and City trees along the 15th St. E. corridor, and
 - Be more in line or behind the south façade of the church (looking north) or not extend beyond the south extent of the existing rectory footprint.
- e. THAT Council directs staff to serve a notice of receipt of all required information to the applicant and <u>refuses</u> the demolition.
- 3) THAT City Council directs staff to issue Notice of Consent, Consent with Conditions, or Refusal as warranted by its chosen option in accordance with the Ontario Heritage Act.
- 4) That City Council makes note that it has not contemplated the future development of the easterly corner of the lands at the corner of 16th St E and 6th Ave E, and notes that a separate process under the Ontario Heritage Act for site alteration would be required; and
- 5) That City Council direct City Planning and Heritage Staff to undertake an update to Designation By-law 1979-15 for 554 15th St E to reflect the findings of the Heritage Impact Assessment by Robinson Heritage Consulting dated September 2018.

Strategic Initiative:

Objective 6: Promote and enhance Owen Sound's built heritage.

Background:

The subject lands are located in the north-east quadrant of the City and are sized approximately 1.6 ha. The lands have frontage on 15th and 16th Streets East and 4th and 6th Avenues East.

The property contains the historic St. Mary's Catholic Church and associated buildings/additions. The original 1871 church exterior was moved to be designated under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act (the Act) by the City's Local Architectural Conservation Advisory Committee (LACAC) in 1978 for architectural and historical [contextual] reasons. Designation By-law 1979-15 can be found attached hereto and broadens the designation to the church property as a whole and does not specify any buildings or structures as having specific merit for preservation.

In 2018 the applicant retained Robinson Heritage Consulting to complete a Heritage Impact Assessment of the site, with focus on the rectory. According to the HIA the structures on site were erected as follows (see Fig. 1):

- Church/Sanctuary with spire constructed in 1871 in the medieval style
- Rectory construction in 1872 in the Empire style
- Apse and sacristy additions in 1901
- 15th St E stone wall construction in 1932
- Rectory porch enclosed in mid-1960s
- Detached garage constructed in 1968
- Rectory renovation in 1977
- Parish Hall construction in 1996
- Parish Hall addition in 2019



Figure 1: Excerpt from Demolition and New Construction Strategy by GM Diemert with emphasis added

The Proposal

The applicant is proposing to demolish the designated rectory and reconstruct a new rectory within the same general footprint plus an extension to the south. The current and proposed rectory are attached to the sacristy and apse, and must be 'detached' from the existing building. The Act requires that specific consultation, notice and submission of supporting materials be executed prior to demolition or removal of designated structures. City Heritage Permits (x2) are required to allow for the removal and reconstruction of the rectory.

Current Parish Hall Addition Project

In June 2018, the owner of St. Mary's Church (The Roman Catholic Episcopal Corporation of the Diocese of Hamilton) submitted a pre-consultation to the City that proposed:

- 1) Demolition of the existing rectory building, which was also used as the church office;
- 2) Construction of a new rectory; and
- 3) Construction of an addition onto the existing Parish Hall to accommodate church offices previously within the rectory.

The City response to this proposal was sent in August 2018 and outlined the process required under the Ontario Heritage Act for consideration of this proposal, which included the rectory demolition (a designated building). The applicant decided at that time to proceed only with the addition to the Parish Hall and to come forward at a later date to request the approval required for the rectory proposal. The Parish Hall addition received Site Plan Approval from City Council on February 11, 2019 (ST2018-015) and is currently under construction.

One of the submission items submitted with ST2018-015 was a Heritage Impact Assessment that considered the impacts to the cultural heritage value of the comprehensive proposal, which considered demolition of the existing rectory and construction of a new rectory.

Submission Items

In response to the City's requirements and as outlined in the scoping letter dated October 29, 2019 (attached), the following items have been submitted and are attached for Committee and Council's consideration:

- Urban Design Study dated December 2019 by GM Diemert
- Existing Conditions Site Plan (SP1) by GM Blue Plan dated April 2018
- Demolition Plan (A1) by GM Diemert dated 4 Dec 2019
- Rebuild Plan (A2) by GM Diemert dated 4 Dec 2019
- Site Plan (A3) by GM Diemert dated 4 Dec 2019
- Ground Floor Plan (A4) by GM Diemert dated 4 Dec 2019
- Second Floor Plan (A5) by GM Diemert dated 4 Dec 2019
- Tree Retention Plan (A6) by GM Diemert dated 4 Dec 2019
- Existing and Proposed East and North Elevations (A7) by GM Diemert dated 4 Dec 2019
- View Corridor Study from 6th Ave E and 16th St E (A8) by GM Diemert dated 4 Dec 2019
- View Corridor Study from 15th St E and 6th Ave E (A9) by GM Diemert dated 4 Dec 2019

The City worked with the applicant to scope the initial submission items to allow the Community Services Committee and Council to consider the request in a timely manner. Because of the scoping of the initially requested submission items by Staff, Committee and Council may not be satisfied that the application was submitted with all plans and information they require. Through this presentation, Committee and Council are requested to comment on the completeness of the submission. If satisfactory, a notice of receipt will be forwarded to the applicant.

The Process so Far

In August of 2019, City Planning & Heritage Staff met with the applicant to discuss the proposed demolition of the St. Mary's rectory. Thereafter, the applicant formally engaged GM Diemert to undertake a rectory reconstruction design. On October 29, 2019 the City provided the applicant and Diemert a letter outlining the items that would be required to accompany a Demolition Permit Application for the rectory and Heritage Permit for alteration to the attached apse and sacristy, which are physically attached to the sanctuary itself. This letter is attached.

A flowchart from the Ontario Heritage Toolkit has been attached to provide Committee with a visual tool to understand the process that is required under Sec. 34 of the Act to demolish or remove designated structures.

| Date | Item |
|-------------------|--|
| June 2018 | Initial discussions with the City about rectory demolition |
| August 2018 | Letter from City outlining requirements for complete submission for rectory demolition |
| August 2019 | Meeting with applicant and City Staff to discuss demolition proposal |
| October 29, 2019 | Formal scoping letter to applicant defining those items required to form an initial submission to consider demolition and reconstruction of rectory |
| November 26, 2019 | Submission of items requested for Committee's/Council's consideration |
| December 9, 2019 | Submission of all initial items requested for Committee's/Council's consideration |
| December 18, 2019 | Staff report and presentation to Community Services Committee |

The following items merit note as process points that have occurred to date:

Analysis:

All development that takes place within the City and all decisions respecting land use planning matters are required to be consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement and conform to the City of Owen Sound Official Plan. In the context of cultural heritage matters, the requirements of the Ontario Heritage Act must be met.

A: Provincial Policy Statement

The Provincial Policy Statement calls for the conservation of significant built heritage resources and significant cultural heritage landscapes. By virtue of the Part IV Designation under the Act, the rectory meets the definition of a built heritage resource under the PPS. The PPS also supports long-term economic prosperity through encouraging a sense of place by conserving features that help define character, including built heritage resources. The direction provided by the PPS would indicate a requirement to conserve the rectory, or at the very least, to ensure careful removal and sympathetic site design that enhances the overall site in favour of the remaining designated buildings and the site's landmark character.

B: City of Owen Sound Official Plan (2006)

The subject lands are designated 'Residential' in the City's Official Plan (OP). A place of worship is among the uses permitted in this designation. The OP states that the City will promote an interesting and inspiring public environment through a high standard of building and landscape design and the preservation of heritage features (Sec. 7.8.4.5). It also states that development and public works should have regard for designated heritage resources. The City encourages, wherever possible, incorporation of the of these resources into any development plans that may be proposed (Sec. 7.2.2.7).

The OP also maintains that the image and structure of the City is most readily understood through long views made possible by the high surrounding hills. According to the OP, it is the City's intention to protect these long views from being blocked by inappropriately located tall buildings (Sec. 7.8.3.4). The new rectory is proposed to be 1-2 storey, which is lower in height than the existing three storey building. The proposed rectory design does not block, and in fact opens up views of the church looking from the east and southeast. Having said this, however, the designated rectory is worthy of being in view as a spectacle on the lands if it is elected to remain.

The OP requires the protection of mature trees throughout the City, particularly on the slopes of the escarpment and along the streets. There is a sizeable population of mature trees along the north side of 15th St E and the southwest lot line. Some of these are City trees and some are on the St.

Mary's private property. The trip up the 15th St E hill is defined most immediately by the stone wall constructed in 1932 and the tree canopy that lines the street. Staff have some concern that the proposed south wing of the rectory will detrimentally impact the mature trees. The south wing is the only extent of the building that is proposed outside of the existing rectory footprint.

Heritage Staff consulted with Parks and Open Space Staff and the proposed south wing appears to significantly encroach into the dripline of several trees impact greater than 20 percent of the trees root systems. City Staff are hesitant to support this encroachment, and recommend that if demolition and reconstruction are endorsed, the south wing be redesigned outside of the tree dripline. The south wing also encroaches into the slope of the 15th St E hill and the Grey Sauble Conservation Authority regulated area. While the trees may not have existed on site when the buildings were erected, they now contribute to the modern character and landmark appeal of the site and of the 15th St E corridor and should be protected.

C: Proposed New Rectory Design Details

GM Diemert Architect Inc. has prepared a detailed submission package and has created a 'vision' for the rectory redevelopment within the built heritage context. The existing rectory is a three-storey building with a mansard (flat) roof design. Diemert finds that the massing of this original rectory is 'unfortunate' (i.e., large, blunt) in the current ensemble of buildings.

The proposed rectory is to be constructed with sympathetic materials, including red clay brick, aluminum siding, and a brown asphalt shingle roof. The window frames are proposed to be bronze aluminum. All is generally proposed to 'maintain visual parity' or be complimentary to the church and other additions.

Diemert proposes that the new rectory will retain the memory of the historic rectory in location, footprint and volume in abstracted form. The HIA maintains that the location of the rectory is a character-defining element, which is generally proposed to be maintained in the proposed rectory reconstruction. The new rectory proposes to construct a glass passage from the rectory to the church. Bricks are proposed to be salvaged from the original rectory and used to reconstruct portions of the new façade and exterior design elements, which is positive.

City Staff have requested that the applicant provide preliminary confirmation that demolition of the rectory is not anticipated to structurally impact the

apse, sacristy or sanctuary. Diemert has provided comments that the rectory will be separated from the sacristy along existing construction joints. The portion of the rectory that is connected to the sacristy was constructed in 1977, and Diemert expects the joinery between the two buildings to be clear and predictable.

GM Diemert puts forward architectural control guidelines for reconstruction. If Committee and Council support the demolition and reconstruction, Site Plan Approval and would be required, with an Agreement being registered on title. Final architectural control guidelines reflecting the approved final design would form part of this agreement.

D: Engineering Assessment

The applicant has had a qualified structural Engineer, The Engineering Co., complete an assessment of the structural condition of the rectory. The Engineer found that the rectory does not meet current standards for Ontario Building Code or Accessibility for Ontarian's with Disabilities Act. This is not surprising given that the building construction predates modern building codes. A detailed structural analysis, being a more invasive building examination, has not yet been completed and would be required to confirm the structural condition of the building. The Engineer Co. opines that the existing building has significant concerns regarding continued use and that renovation cost would be at a premium due to the difficulty of the work.

The applicant has also commissioned a Building Condition Assessment from Lanhack Engineering Consultants to review and comment on the structural integrity of the building and comment on the cost/benefit to new construction vs. renovating the existing building. The site assessment finds that there are some structural concerns with the original rectory and its additions, and that more extensive review is needed to inform further conclusion. Like the Engineer Co. review, the Lanhack review did not include an in depth examination of the building for structural integrity. The study notes that the space does not flow efficiently and some brickwork and insulation requires attention. Lanhack opines that the present building is salvageable, but at a higher price tag than a new build.

E: Landscape and Views

According to a letter written by the City's Heritage Coordinator in 1995:

"In the reasons for designation, the landmark status of the church is prominently recognized. This characteristic was clearly the intention of Father Granottier and the church builders in 1871. Therefore, the church's prominence on the east hill is a heritage attribute that must be respected."

The HIA asserts that in addition to the church the rectory is a heritage attribute, particularly in the contextual sense, given its massing and prominence on the site tableau. The HIA reviews a proposed design that is different than Diemert's design, but the building footprints are very similar. As discussed, the south wing of the proposed rectory projects closer to the 15th St E corridor (a prominent sightline) and beyond the existing church and rectory facades. The HIA expresses concern that the placement of the new rectory and the south wing will detrimentally impact the site. It states that:

"In good heritage practice where alterations to heritage sites are made, and in particular to designated sites, additions and alterations are kept back beyond the most significant facades in order to reduce the impact to the cultural heritage resource. The proposed rectory projects beyond the two most historically significant facades (the south and west or front of the church) forever altering the intended design for the church and rectory which goes beyond the negative impact of the demolition itself."

As noted previously, the site is defined, in part by its topography and treecover. Staff have concern that the proposed south wing will alter the topography of the site and will cause loss to the nature trees on site. If demolition and replacement is the chosen option by Committee, Staff recommend that the south wing be revised to be located behind the south façade of the church building or me altered to be more in line with the south face of the sanctuary, sacristy and apse.

The Urban Design Study affirms that the church is the 'Primary architectural gesture' of the site. When the church and rectory was constructed in 1871-2, there were minimal large trees on site and the church and rectory dominated the hill and east-facing viewscape. Diemert recognizes the heritage landscape value of the site and specifies several approaches to honouring and/or preserving the landscape, including: preservation of the footpath to the front entrance of the church; recognition of the prospect (visibility) of the church; acknowledging the primacy of the church; honouring the central axis of the building delineation on site. The Architect proposes to protect the primacy of the church for the benefit of the public by minimizing the height of the rectory and maintaining its placement behind the south façade of the church (looking south from 16th St E).

While the proposed rectory is more diminutive in height, the footprint is larger. Accounting for contemporary tree cover, views of the site can be captured from the west, but can most readily be enjoyed from the 15th St E corridor and generally the corner of 15th St E and 6th Ave E. The proposed south wing of the new rectory impedes the view of the apse and sacristy to a greater degree than the current rectory. It merits note once again that the historic rectory is a point of interest within the viewscape and is a heritage attribute of the landmark site. Refer to Drawing A9 by GM Diemert attached for a visual representation.

F: Heritage Impact Assessment

In 2018 the applicant retained the services of Robinson Heritage Consulting to undertake a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) for the St. Mary's property. The HIA uses Ontario Regulation 9/06 to determine if the rectory can be deemed to have cultural heritage value or interest. The HIA finds that the rectory meets all three criteria for determining value or interest outlined in the regulation:

1. Design or Physical Value

The HIA states that the "the extant [existing] form of the original rectory... is a fine and representative example of Second Empire style popular in the mid-late Victorian era of Canadian architectural design. The original exterior displays a high degree of craftsmanship in its bi-chromatic brick construction method."

2. Historical or Associative Value

The HIA states that the "rectory has historical value and direct association with an institution that is significant to the Owen Sound community and the surrounding counties in that it played (and continues to play) an important role in the accommodation of the ministry of Catholic faith in Owen Sound and throughout the parish in Grey and Bruce Counties. The rectory was built to house priests that travelled to serve parishioners across the two counties for over 145 years. The rectory has direct association with two significant people in Owen Sound's community history as it was built under the direction of Rev. Francois Xavier Granottier and was designed by Owen Sound builder and architect Robert Sadler."

3. Contextual Value

The HIA states that the "rectory at St. Mary of the Assumption is a heritage attribute within the church grounds as a cultural heritage landscape. The rectory is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of the church grounds setting and is functionally, visually and historically linked to its surroundings. Since its construction c. 1872, the rectory has been a part of the view that has long established St. Mary of the Assumption as a landmark in the City of Owen Sound."

It merits note that the proposed new rectory assessed in the HIA is different in design than the current proposal. The HIA generally does not view the demolition favourably and recommends conservation of the current rectory with alterations executed to increase the usability and accessibility of the building. The HIA references the partial demolition and creative rehabilitation of the <u>Guelph Parish Rectory</u> as a comparable project also within an identified cultural heritage landscape.

Conclusion:

The City has never before consented to the demolition of a structure designated under the Ontario Heritage Act.

Staff concur with GM Diemert's finding that given the different massing and architectural designs, the church and rectory may not 'match' or 'make sense together' from a contemporary standpoint. However, this modern outlook cannot be used to negate the irrefutable evidence that the rectory is a heritage attribute of the site and has cultural heritage value.

The new rectory design by GM Diemert is thoughtfully designed in the context of the site. The proposed design appears to pay homage to the church as its primary objective. The importance of the 1871 gothic church as the site's primary heritage attribute is supported by staff. City Staff recognize the appeal of new construction in terms of custom functionality (e.g., accessibility) and straightforward construction methodology.

In the end, the PPS and the City's OP policy call for the protection of heritage resources. This policy guidance does not include caveats that allows project cost or technical difficulty to justify the demolition of built heritage.

Staff have undertaken to provide Committee with the policy framework, design details, site and context information, and history to make an informed decision about the St. Mary's rectory. The Act allows Council 90 days to

consent, consent with conditions, or refuse the proposed demolition. Staff recommend selection of one of the following options:

- a. THAT Council directs staff to serve a notice of receipt of all required information to the applicant and undertake Peer Review of the Heritage Impact Assessment, Engineering Studies, and/or Urban Design Study by a qualified person(s) to assess the proposal on behalf of the City, and to facilitate a Council decision within 90 days.
- b. THAT Council directs staff to serve a notice of receipt to the applicant to deem that the submission material required for Council's consideration is not complete, and the following shall be submitted to the City:
 - i. Any items that Council deems to be required for completeness.
- c. THAT Council directs staff to serve a notice of receipt of all required information to the applicant and <u>consents</u> to the demolition with conditions as outlined in Schedule E; and

That City Council endorses, in principle, the design concept of the proposed rectory design by GM Diemert Architects Inc. subject to Site Plan Approval, Heritage Permits, Buildings Permits and any other approvals that may be required for redevelopment of the lands.

d. THAT Council directs staff to serve a notice of receipt of all required information to the applicant and <u>consents</u> to the demolition with conditions as outlined in Schedule E:

That City Council endorses, in principle, the design concept of the proposed rectory design by GM Diemert Architects Inc. subject to Site Plan Approval, Heritage Permits, Buildings Permits and any other approvals that may be required for redevelopment of the lands, as well as the following modification:

- i. That the proposed south wing be removed or altered to:
 - Maintain a setback from the dripline of all private and City trees along the 15th St. E. corridor, and

- Be more in line or behind the south façade of the church (looking north) or not extend beyond the south extent of the existing rectory footprint.
- e. THAT Council directs staff to serve a notice of receipt of all required information to the applicant and <u>refuses</u> the demolition.

| Date | Item |
|---|--|
| January 13, 2020 | Community Services Committee Meeting Minutes from Dec. 18/19 to Council |
| | Council serves a notice of receipt of all required information the applicant, if no further information is deemed to be required |
| | Council decides to consent or refuse application within 90 days of notice of receipt |
| On or before 90 days after Notice of Receipt is issued | Notice of Decision to Refuse/Consent given |
| | Property Owner Appeal Period |

The Process From Here

If Council consents to demolition and reconstruction, the development of the site will require Site Plan Approval, Heritage and Building Permits, and any other approvals required for development of the lands.

Financial/Budget Implications:

None.

Communication Strategy:

Notice of Receipt and Notice of Decision shall be provided to the prescribed persons in accordance with the Ontario Heritage Act.

Consultation:

A. Parks, Manager of Parks and Open Space

Attachments:

| Schedule A: | Designation By-law 1979-15 | | |
|---------------|--|--------------------------------|--|
| Schedule B: | Scoping Letter to applicant dated October 29, 2019 | | |
| Schedule C: | OH Toolkit Flowchart: Demoli | tion or Removal of | |
| | [Designated] Structure | | |
| Schedule D: | Urban Design Study with App | endices, including Plans dated | |
| | December 2019 by GM Dieme | ert | |
| Schedule E: | Recommended Conditions of Consent for St. Mary's rectory | | |
| | Demolition | | |
| | | | |
| Prepared by: | Amy Cann, M. PL. MCIP, RPP | Signature on File | |
| | | | |
| Reviewed by: | Pam Coulter, BA, RPP | Signature on File | |
| | | | |
| Submitted by: | Wayne Ritchie | Signature on File | |

BY-LAW NO. 1979 - 15

THE CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF OWEN SOUND

A BY-LAW TO DESIGNATE THE PROPERTY KNOWN MUNICIPALLY AS 554 - 15TH STREET EAST IN THE CITY OF OWEN SOUND AS BEING OF ARCHITECTURAL AND HISTORICAL VALUE OF INTEREST

WHEREAS section 29 of The Ontario Heritage Act, 1974 authorizes the Council of a municipality to enact by-laws to designate real property, including all buildings and structures thereon, to be of Architectural or Historic value or interest; and

WHEREAS the Council of the Corporation of the City of Owen Sound has caused to be served on the owners of the lands and premises known as St. Mary's Catholic Church at 554 - 15th Street East in the City of Owen Sound and upon The Ontario Heritage Foundation, notice of intention to so designate the aforesaid real property and has caused such notice of intention to be published in the same newspaper having general circulation in the Municipality once for each of three consecutive weeks; and

WHEREAS no notice of objection to the proposed designation has been served on the Clerk of the Municipality.

NOW THEREFORE THE COUNCIL OF THE CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF OWEN SOUND ENACTS AS FOLLOWS:

1. There is designated as being of Architectural and Historical value or interest the real property known as St. Mary's Catholic Church at 554 - 15th Street East in the City of Owen Sound, more particularly described in Schedule "A" hereto.

2. The Municipal Solicitor is hereby authorized to cause a copy of this by-law to be registered against the property described in Schedule "A" hereto in the proper land registry office.

3. The Clerk is hereby authorized to cause a copy of this by-law to be served on the owner of the aforesaid property and on the Ontario Heritage Foundation and to cause notice of the passing of this by-law to be published in the same newspaper having general circulation in the Municipality once for each of three consecutive weeks.

4. This by-law shall come into full force and effect upon the final passing thereof.

PASSED this 13th day of August, 1979.

lst reading August 13, 1979
2nd reading August 13, 1979.
3rd reading August 13, 1979.

Mayor

SCHEDULE "A" TO BY-LAW NO. 19/9-15

SCHEDULE "A"

ALL AND SINGULAR that certain parcel or tract of land and premises situate, lying and being in the City of Owen Sound, in the County of Grey and being composed of Lots 2, 3, 4 and 5 on the Northeast side of Garafraxa Street; Lot 1 on the East side of High Street South of St. Vincent Street; and Lots 1 and 2 on the West side of Princess Street South of St. Vincent Street; and Lot A on the Northeast side of Garafraxa Street in the said City of Owen Sound.

1.10.2

Community Services Department Planning & Heritage Division City of Owen Sound 808 2nd Ave East Owen Sound, Ontario N4K 2H4



Telephone: 519 376-4440 Facsimile: 519 371-0511 email: jteakle@owensound.ca Website: www.owensound.ca

October 29, 2019

Via Email

St. Mary's Roman Catholic Church 554 15th Street East Owen Sound, ON N4K 1X3

Dear Fr. Kuzma,

RE: PROPOSED DEMOLITION AND ALTERATION FOR ST. MARY'S RECTORY

This letter is to follow up from the matters discussed at our meeting on August 8, 2019 between City Planning staff and Neil Devlin & Mike Donovan of the St. Mary's Building Committee. City staff stated at the meeting that submission requirements for the proposed demolition of the rectory would be refined and provided to St. Mary's Building Committee.

The following would be required at the time of submitting the Demolition Permit (request to demolish) and the first Heritage Permit. These items should be:

- A) The following items are required to form a complete submission for Council to consider **demolition** of the rectory building:
 - 1. Demolition Permit Application and Fee for proposed removal of the rectory.
 - 2. Heritage Permit Application (1st) to consider consequential alterations to the remaining buildings, including the apse and sanctuary.
 - 3. Demolition Plan showing all structures proposed to be removed in metric units showing the entire property with complete dimensions and site statistics.
 - 4. Heritage Impact Assessment and Conservation Plan in support of the proposal.
 - 5. Urban Design Study contemplating the impact of the proposed removal of the rectory and the construction of a new building incorporating:
 - i) Architectural Control Guidelines; and
 - ii) Significant View Corridor Study.
 - 6. Conceptual elevations of all existing and proposed buildings including existing and proposed exterior cladding materials and colours prepared by a qualified professionals.
 - 7. A structural assessment by a professional engineer detailing the approach for separating the rectory from the apse/sanctuary.



Telephone: 519 376-4440 Facsimile: 519 371-0511 email: jteakle@owensound.ca Website: www.owensound.ca

- B) The following items may be **deferred** until such time as Council has made a decision on the proposed application to demolish the rectory building.
 - 1. Any and all items identified by Council in the review of the Demolition Permit Application and first Heritage Permit and as reflected in any terms and conditions of Council's resolution on the matter.
 - 2. Any items required by the Chief Building Official under the Ontario Building Code, including a Designated Substances Report together with a Notice of Project filed with the Ministry of Labour.
 - 3. Site Plan Approval submission, including:
 - i) Application form and fee
 - ii) Site Plan showing the entire property showing all structures proposed to built and all structure proposed to be removed in metric with complete dimensions and site statistics
 - iii) Engineering Services Review Form and Fee
 - iv) Grey Sauble Conservation Authority Planning Services Form
 - v) Site Plan Application Cover Letter including statement of conformity with the Provincial Policy Statement
 - vi) Servicing Plan
 - vii) Stormwater Management Plan
 - viii) Grading and Drainage Plan
 - ix) Detailed elevations and 3D rendering of all existing and proposed buildings including existing and proposed exterior cladding materials and colours.
 - x) Geotechnical Study (slope stability)
 - xi) Tree Preservation and Planting/Landscape Plan
 - xii) Floor Plans of all existing and proposed buildings to understand the uses
 - 4. Heritage Permit Application (2nd) and Building Permit Application and fee for construction of a new or altered rectory.

Please don't hesitate to contact me if you have any questions.

Community Services Department Planning & Heritage Division City of Owen Sound 808 2nd Ave East Owen Sound, Ontario N4K 2H4



Telephone: 519 376-4440 Facsimile: 519 371-0511 email: jteakle@owensound.ca Website: www.owensound.ca

Sincerely,

Justin Jeakle

Justin Teakle, _{BES} Junior Planner/Heritage Coordinator

CC:

Wayne Ritchie, City Manager Pam Coulter, Director of Community Services Amy Cann, Community Planner Kevin Linthorne, Chief Building Official Neil Devlin, St. Mary's Building Committee G.M. Diemert Architect Inc.

7. Demolition or Removal of Structure

(Section 34, 34.1 & 34.3 of the Ontario Heritage Act)





An Urban Design Study:

The Rectory for St. Mary of the Assumption Roman Catholic Church, Owen Sound The Roman Catholic Episcopal Corporation of the Diocese of Hamilton in Ontario



December 2019

G. M. DIEMERT ARCHITECT INC.

Suite 201 - 957 Fourth Avenue East Owen Sound, Ontario N4K 2N9 Telephone 519 - 376 - 1975 gdiemert@gmda.ca

Table of Contents

Preface and Statement of Qualifications, pages 3 - 4.

- A. BACKGROUND: The City of Owen Sound Planning and Development Process, pages 5 7.
- B. Review and Commentary on Robinson Heritage Consulting's Heritage Impact Assessment, pages 7 14.
- C. Urban Design Study the New Rectory, pages 15 24.
 - C.6 Significant View Corridor Study, page 22 and Appendix A, Architectural Drawings.
 - C.7 Proposed Architectural Control Guidelines, page 22.
- D. Detailed Historical Analysis and Architectural Design Implementation
- E. Demolition and New Construction Strategy

Information Sources:

- .1 <u>Heritage Impact Assessment Rectory Building at St. Mary's and the Missions</u>, Roman Catholic Parish, Owen Sound. Author: Robinson Heritage Consulting – September, 2018.
- .2 <u>St. Mary's Church Owen Sound: Church of St. Mary of the Assumption, Owen Sound, Ontario, Golden Jubilee</u> <u>History</u> 1871-1921. Author is not identified.
- .3 Fr. Stephen LaCroix, CSB, History of St. Mary of the Assumption Parish Church and Rectory.
- .4 Mr. Neil Devlin, long standing member of the parish and chairman of the current Building Committee and the Building Committee convened to construct the Parish Centre during 1995.
- .5 Allen-Hastings Limited, general contractor for the current expansion of the Parish Centre and the 1996 Parish Centre construction project.
- Appendix A: Architectural Drawings, ANSI "D" size, dated "2019, Dec. 04" and prepared by G.M Diemert Architect Inc. and numbered as follows:
 - A1 Demolition Plan
 - A2 Rebuild Plan
 - A3 Site Plan
 - A4 Ground Floor Plan
 - A5 2nd Floor Plan
 - A6 Tree Retention Plan
 - A7 East & North Elevation Comparative Existing and Proposed
 - A8 View Corridor Study from 6th Ave. East & 16th Street East
 - A9 View Corridor Study from C/O 15^{th} St. & 6^{th} Ave. E.

GM BluePlan Engineering, drawing SP1, ANSI "D" size, Parish Hall Addition, St. Mary's and the Missions, 554 15th Street East, Owen Sound Overall Site Plan Existing Conditions.

| Appendix B: | <u>Heritage Impact Assessment - Rectory Building at St. Mary's and the Missions</u> , Roman Catholic Parish, Owen Sound. Author: Robinson Heritage Consulting – September, 2018. |
|-------------|--|
| Appendix C: | Structural Condition Assessment, Rectory at St. Mary's and the Missions by the Engineering Company, dated September 25, 2018. |
| Appendix D: | Building Condition Assessment, Rectory at St. Mary's and the Missions, by Lanhack Consultants Inc., February 27, 2017. |
| Appendix E: | Designated Substance Survey, St. Mary's and the Missions Parish, by Roop Chanderdat and Associates Inc., February 25, 2017. |
| Appendix F: | St Mary's and the Missions, Report of Parishioner Engagement for the Rectory Renewal Project, prepared by Robert Foster, Member, St Mary's Building Committee, November 25, 2019. |

Preface and Statement of Qualifications:

I have used the third person within this study as a nod to propriety and the terms "writer" and "architect" mean the same person. I am an architect with training in architecture and professional standing in the Ontario Association of Architects and I have practiced architecture in Owen Sound for 28 years. I have experience gained through design and involvement in the construction of the modification of designated structures throughout the Grey/Bruce region and I provide consulting and reporting associated with designated structures on behalf of the Architectural Conservancy of Ontario. For St. Thomas Church in Owen Sound, I had received recognition for design work by the City of Owen Sound LACAC. I have an interest in the preservation of buildings with particular merit and significance and these buildings generally deserve their designations. The critical lesson derived from my experience is that it is important to preserve significant, older buildings unless doing so would result in a serious burden to those who must care for the buildings. The burden can be financial or a due to the loss of important space or due to the need to support more space than is otherwise required for the functions intended. Whatever the case, the buildings need the care of owners who are devoted to their continued presence and who have the means to support them. Therefore, the buildings that should and can be saved must have value and significance that transcends the financial inconvenience to the organization that will own and care for them.

The care and devotion of the parish to St. Mary of the Assumption church is clearly evident, and I believe this has been true from the day of its conception in the planning stages. I cannot reliably assert the objective of those who designated the entire site during 1978; however, I suspect that it was the church that would have provided the motivation. The rectory was already compromised given the narrative associated with the 1976 through 1977 renovations and its continued repair and maintenance was likely a matter of financial necessity in view of the failing brick masonry on the church and the immanent need for serious intervention which culminated in the circa 1980 replacement of the brick – a truly enormous task, fraught with risk. Today, for the parish, the existing rectory must once again, be placed in lower priority. At this time, the continued viability of the parish requires safe, accessible, efficient and comfortable housing for the community's spiritual leaders at a cost that is sustainable.

It is my view that the existing rectory has, unfortunately, lost any modest architectural merit that it may have had. Its large, somewhat imposing and the box-like nature is a bit awkward and incongruous in its formal relationship with the church. Perhaps if the rectory were designed in the gothic style, the two buildings it would appear as an architectural ensemble of related parts. But, it does not: it is a completely different style that is nearly antithetical to the church in its form. Perhaps it is not an accident that the roof line also resembles Sadler's Owen Sound Town Hall of 1868 – 1870 (Robinson HIA, page 27). The Town Hall was an architectural example available for Fr. Granottier to examine and I believe that he had been attracted to the useable attic space. I also believe that the construction of the rectory was accomplished in great haste and possibly without a detailed understanding of the interior floor plan, as evidenced by the lack of alignment in the load-bearing partitions. Certainly, many features of the Second Empire architectural style were not present. This is usually a much more elaborate style. As such, this rectory building may be the product of Fr. Granottier's attitude toward the building as a practical necessity and a response to an urgent need. I do not find within the Robinson HIA a compelling case to preserve the architecture of the existing rectory, but rather, an urge to preserve it due to its age.

However, I agree that there is no doubt that this site is an important cultural heritage landscape and that any new work on the site must consider the landscape with great care. Personally, I find the position of the existing rectory both interesting and unusual and worthy of consideration and acknowledgement.

I believe that in the case of the removal of the existing rectory, Fr. Granottier would approve of a new rectory, provided that restoration and renovation options were not cheaper. Further, it is my belief that the location of the rectory behind the church had been a deliberate maneuver by Fr. Granottier: it is practical for

the priests and the church hides the rectory from the parishioner climbing the western hillside pathway. The parishioner would have lingered more or less at the western end of the church before and after mass, at least for the first 30 or 40 years of the church's history and the rectory would have been private space for priests as it is to this day. What has changed is that public territory now surrounds two sides of the rectory and the other two are open toward 6th Avenue East and 15th Street East.

In addition, I believe that Fr. Granottier might have been distressed by the focus on the rectory that is established when access to the site was shifted to the rear of the church due to the use of automobiles during the 1920's and 1030's. The design of the new rectory presents it as clearly subservient to the church and I think he would have viewed this as appropriate in the circumstance. Further, the new design embeds and enhances the essential nature of the relationship between the existing rectory and the church and the maintenance of this relationship within the context of contemporary construction, adds considerable interest to the new rectory design. The new rectory's form is therefore, enabled and reinforced by this original maneuver once again and the new project has an additional layer of cultural significance.

One important aspect of this heritage landscape is that the current and persistent function of the buildings taken together with the nature of the site delivers architectural and cultural richness and meaning. Within the design process for the new rectory, there is continuous regard for the cultural heritage of the site, the topography, the local and distant views and the ways in which the new building will both shape the landscape and bring it into focus during the prosecution of the daily routine of the rectory's future inhabitants. The institution is integral to the site and its cultural expression and the rectory requires the church for relevance.

In the case of St. Mary of the Assumption, the institution is alive and well. It is active and contributing to the community at large and the rectory is first and foremost, a home for the priests rather than an architectural embellishment. It is also important to note that the Parish has a vested interest in its history, the maintenance of the church and the long-term health of the institution and that the decision to demolish a building is not taken lightly. It is also important to note that the landscape and the buildings together provide significance to the site. Indeed, the presence of a new rectory on the site ensures the continued viability of the heritage landscape in the twenty-first century.

The following material contains the opinion of the architect unless explicitly noted otherwise. The historical sources consulted for this study are the sources said to be utilized by Robinson in the production of the HIA. In addition to this information, the writer has knowledge of the site which is imparted herein. I am not a trained historian just as Robinson is not a trained architect and I acknowledge that I have taken liberties in my interpretation of the facts as presented. If the reader finds that opinions that I have expressed give rise to questions that warrant further explanation, the writer will attempt to collect supporting documentation as necessary or to issue explanations or amendments.

Grant M. Diemert, OAA

A. BACKGROUND - City of Owen Sound Planning and Development Process:

A.1 Ownership:

The Owner of the property and all buildings on the site of the Parish is <u>The Roman Catholic Episcopal</u> <u>Corporation of the Diocese of Hamilton in Ontario</u>. Through issuance of written authorization sealed by the Bishop of Hamilton, Fr. Kuzma, Pastor of St. Mary of the Assumption Parish in Owen Sound is granted signing authority and the authority to act as the "Owner" in all matters pertaining to permits and approvals required for site plan applications, and demolition and construction permits.

A.2 City of Owen Sound Process:

The City of Owen Sound requirements for submission of a Demolition Permit are provided within a letter written by Justin Teakle of the City of Owen Sound Planning and Heritage Division, dated of October 29, 2019 and addressed to Fr. Kuzma. The letter provides a list of documents required for the processing of a Demolition and Heritage Permit associated with the removal of the existing St. Mary's Rectory. Statements below marked in quotations are excerpted from this letter. The headings below are also excerpted from the letter.

1.2.1 The Demolition Permit Application and Payment of the Associated Fee

The Demolition Permit Application associated with the existing rectory building had been submitted to the City previously by the Owner. The form utilized is the Provincial standard form for such applications. The City has acknowledged receipt of the application verbally. The fee associated with the release of the permit has not been established by the City and it has not been paid by the Church.

1.2.2 Heritage Permit Application (1st):

The City requires the Heritage Permit application in order to "consider consequential alterations to the remaining buildings, including the apse and sanctuary". The form was completed by G. M. Diemert Architect Inc. and sent to The Planning and Heritage Division at the City of Owen Sound via electronic transmission on November 29, 2019, addressed to Ms. Amy Cann, Community Planner and Ms. Sabine Robart, Community Planner. Accompanying this application was the architect's <u>Demolition and New</u> <u>Construction Strategy</u> report which provides the method that will be utilized during demolition and construction.

1.2.3 A Demolition Plan

The plan prepared must be in metric units and illustrate all structures proposed to be removed. It must illustrate the entire property, complete with dimensions and site statistics.

• The architect provides a demolition plan within Appendix A, "Drawing A1 – Demolition Plan".

1.2.4 Heritage Impact Assessment and Conservation Plan in support of the proposal.

A <u>Heritage Impact Assessment</u> (HIA) had been prepared by Robinson Heritage Consulting during September of 2018 and submitted to the City of Owen Sound, Planning and Heritage Division. The Robinson HIA is included the appendices of this document for convenience.

• NOTE: The Architectural Design illustrated within the drawings attached within Appendix A and this supporting <u>Urban Design Study</u> constitute the Conservation Plan.

1.2.5 Urban Design Study:

The study is to illustrate and describe the impact of the proposed removal of the rectory and the construction of a new building incorporating:

- i) Architectural Control Guidelines
 - Refer to Appendix B: Proposed Architectural Control Guidelines
- ii) Significant View Corridor Study.
 - Refer to Appendix A: Drawings A8 & A10.
- The Urban Design Study text is provided within Section C of this report.

1.2.6 Conceptual elevation drawings:

Illustrate all existing and proposed buildings, including existing and proposed exterior cladding materials and their colour. The drawings are to be prepared by a qualified professional.

• G. M. Diemert Architect Inc. has prepared the elevation drawings of existing and proposed construction. Refer to Appendix A, Drawing A7.

1.2.7 A structural assessment completed by a professional engineer:

The assessment shall consider a strategy for separating the existing rectory from the apse and sanctuary during the demolition of the existing rectory.

- The following is a summary of the architect's commentary regarding this requirement:
 - The sanctuary had withstood significant construction circa 1900 when the existing sacristy and its full basement (extending below the depth of the existing sanctuary foundation) had been added to the sanctuary. This work included construction of the apse and the rear doorway, the connection to the former rectory and a staircase leading to a Winter Chapel included within the basement of this addition.
 - The apse, sacristy and the sanctuary have experienced significant construction in 1976-1977 during the demolition of the circa 1900 connecting link between the sacristy and the rectory and the demolition of the former rectory kitchen and servants' quarters.
 - The entire perimeter of the church experienced significant construction during the replacement of brick on the entire church together with the reinforcement or buttressing of existing sanctuary and sacristy foundations.
 - During 1996, the Parish Centre construction abutted the church's steeple foundation on the northern side and this construction was effected without serious damaged to the heaviest, most precarious components in the location nearest the portion of the landform that is most likely to be unstable.
 - The G. M. Diemert Architect Inc. design limits joining to the sacristy stairwell and corridor extension created during c. 1901. Refer to drawings within Appendix A.
 - A qualified structural engineer will be appointed to the project design team following approval of the proposed demolition project by the City. A qualified geotechnical engineer will monitor the excavation and assess founding soil conditions uncovered during demolition and

construction. A qualified materials testing firm will test concrete strength and measure the attained compaction fill.

- The services described above are routine when competent professionals are engaged in the design of any construction project.
- The architect has provided a <u>Demolition and New Construction Strategy</u> report which outlines the sequence of activities and the roles assigned to project team experts during design and construction. The measures described are intended to minimize the risk of damage to any part of the remaining church.

B. Review and Commentary on Robinson Heritage Consulting's Heritage Impact Assessment

This urban design study must include consideration for the history of the site in view of the designation of the site as a whole and because the opinions expressed within the Robinson HIA that are contrary to the intent of the parish. As such, this first section of the Urban Design Study considers the Robinson HIA.

Please refer to detailed <u>Architectural History and Design Implementation</u> prepared by G. M. Diemert Architect Inc. which is a component of this study for additional explanatory material.

B.1 The Development Alternative Selected from the Heritage Impact Assessment's List of Alternatives:

The Robinson HIA, Section 7.3, page 50 "Recommended Alternative Options with Mitigation Measures" lists three scenarios which are paraphrased below and highlighted with italic text. The bullet points represent the Parish's response to the options.

- .1 Retain and restore the existing rectory's central 1872, 3-storey brick and Mansard roofed volume with the frontispiece; remove or modify selected components; and renovate the interior. An elevator is also recommended.
 - This option is addressed in detail throughout the <u>Architectural Design Implementation</u> portion of this study; however, the structural challenges associated with the existing interior combined with the elevator and the restoration work will result in a very expensive project – beyond the means of the Parish. Note that the structural masonry walls rely on the floor system (which is ill-supported) to remain effective and true. There have been interventions that attempt to correct the interior structural challenges during 1976 and later in the early 1980's. Steel columns and steel tie rods in addition to numerous jack posts have been inserted. These interventions were made using methods that would reduce the impact on the use of the interior as it was originally designed and these interventions hamper any complete removal of interior partitioning.
 - In addition, it is the architect's opinion that the size of additional ground floor space will result in "negative impacts" to the heritage landscape that will likely exceed the impact of the new design as proposed.
 - The Parish established an important goal: maintain the church as the primary architectural feature on the site. The expansion and preservation of the existing rectory is not consistent with this goal and the historical record suggests that it is not consistent with the founding of the site (refer to the <u>Architectural Design Implementation</u> portion of this study for details). The rectory is and was intended to be a secondary structure. The 3-storey bulk of the rectory complicates this goal and the architectural view corridor study reveals the extent to which the existing rectory dominates the eastern portion of the site.

- .2 Seek a "community partner" to assume care and control of the rectory and locate the rectory off site.
 - The Parish has rejected this idea.
 - It is the architect's opinion that authenticity in the use of this heritage landscape should be regarded as the primary reason for the existence of the heritage landscape. The authentic uses include the current uses: church, rectory and community building although the uses could also include housing for the Catholic community or additional community building initiatives properly placed on the eastern and northern parts of the site. It is the architect's opinion that, should the Parish fail as a whole, this option offered by Robinson becomes a tragic last resort.
- .3 Create a new rectory and with the design, reduce the "negative impacts" outlined in this report.
 - The Parish has selected Option 3 the development of a new design for a replacement rectory. The new design will be created to reduce the "negative impacts" outlined within the HIA report.
 - The architect identifies important and essential characteristics of the heritage landscape within the <u>Architectural Design Implementation</u> portion of this study. This work is completed in order to provide a means to judge the effect of the design during its development. The features selected generally agree with the HIA.
 - The HIA Section 6.2 page 36, third paragraph is as follows:

"The church of St. Mary of the Assumption is the most significant building on the property as it is the most prominent architecturally and houses the sanctuary for the congregation to worship. The immediate surroundings, topographic context and relationship of the church to the rectory is key to understanding the property's full cultural heritage value or interest. The property location at the edge of the hill at 15th Street East looking over the city and its pairing with the rectory building create a unique and valuable cultural heritage landscape."

- The Parish asserts that the use of the church as a place of ritual, contemplation and community celebration provides significance to the Parish, rather that it's architectural character. The use of the church imparts significance to the heritage landscape. The architecture and the position of the church heighten and enhance the importance of the site for the Parish and these provide drama that enhances the city as a whole.
- The Architectural Design Implementation portion of this study provides a detailed discussion of the heritage landscape and an interpretation of historical facts presented in the HIA.
- The Parish agrees on the following points:
 - .1 When considered as part of the urban fabric of the City, the position of the church and its nature as the most elaborate building make this building the most significant part of the landscape.
 - .2 The relationship between the church and the rectory established by Fr. Granottier is also an important element in the landscape. The rectory is considered a secondary feature relative to the church and its meaning is derived and contingent on the presence of the church.
 - .3 The positions of these two buildings do act as the catalyst for the creation of a unique and valuable cultural heritage landscape in time.
- The new proposed rectory respects and continues these relationships in a sophisticated way. Further, the new proposal reinforces the primacy of the church building in the current age: parishioners now experience the site from the rear yard of the church. Finally, the rectory as designed, ensures that the story of the original rectory remains imprinted on the site.

B.2 Notes and Commentary regarding the HIA Section 6.3, Evaluation of the Rectory using Regulation 9/06:

2.2.1 "Design or Physical Value" - HIA, Page 37:

The HIA suggests that the rectory is a "...fine and representative example of Second Empire style popular in the mid-late Victorian era of Canadian architectural design."

- The architect contends that the rectory was modelled after the Second Empire style as a matter of practicality: the Mansard roof and the square, centre hall plan deliver an acceptable volume of useable space. It is also likely that Sadler recommended the Mansard roof as a solution to the spatial requirements of the rectory as a dormitory structure.
- The Second Empire style was likely derived from existing pattern books of the time. The architect believes that ornamentation was omitted from the construction project except for the eave brackets, some brick detailing and the shape of the Mansard roof. However, the building was not particularly elaborate and did not have features common to better examples in the region including, most notably, the Bothwell Manor east of Owen Sound. The architect suggests that the Bothwell Manor is a "fine and representative example of the style".
- The Second Empire features of the rectory, such as they were, have been removed over time. The brick details remaining and the round-top windows identified within the HIA are not features exclusive to Second Empire stylistic embellishments. Nevertheless, these are the features remaining and noted in the HIA.
- It is the architect's opinion that regarding elements that display architectural style, the key feature, and perhaps the sole feature of the existing rectory's Second Empire design inspiration is the Mansard roof and this is seriously compromised.
- It is the architect's opinion that the position of the rectory building is important and that the architectural style is incidental.

2.2.2 "Historical value or associative value", HIA, Page 37-38:

"The rectory has historical value and direct association with an institution that is significant to the Owen Sound community and the surrounding counties in that it played (and continues to play) an important role in the accommodation of the ministry of Catholic faith in Owen Sound and throughout the parish in Grey and Bruce Counties. The rectory was built to house priests that travelled to serve parishioners across the two counties for over 145 years. The rectory has direct association with two significant people in Owen Sound's community history as it was built under the direction of Rev. Francois Xavier Granottier and was designed by Owen Sound builder and architect Robert Sadler."

- The Parish agrees with these statements. However, the Parish and the architect believe that the existing rectory and the vestiges of its unembellished architectural style are secondary to the presence of the church and the rectory on the site when considering the importance of the Catholic faith to the Owen Sound and Grey/Bruce region. The viability of the heritage landscape is ensured for the immediate future by the development of a new rectory. The Parish wishes to develop a building that will survive 100 years into the future.
- The contributions of Fr. Granottier are discussed within the <u>Architectural Design</u> <u>Implementation</u> portion of this study in detail. It is the architect's opinion that the new

design honours Fr. Granottier's work through a design that is sensitive to the nuances of the existing circumstances and respectful of the intent of the design of the original rectory.

- Robert Sadler's church design is indeed worthy of continued preservation at this time and the rectory project as proposed, does not imperil the church or the perception of the church as an element of the urban fabric of the City.
- 2.2.3 "Contextual Value", HIA, Page 38:

"The rectory at St. Mary of the Assumption is a heritage attribute within the church grounds as a cultural heritage landscape. The rectory is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of the church grounds setting and is functionally, visually and historically linked to its surroundings. Since its construction c.1872, the rectory has been a part of the view that has long established St. Mary of the Assumption as a landmark in the City of Owen Sound."

- The Parish and the architect agree that the rectory as a feature of the cultural heritage landscape is important; however, architectural style of the existing building is not necessary to establishing the significance of the rectory's role in that landscape. The rectory's interesting spatial relationship to the church is significant to the architecture of the church.
- The Parish agrees that the rectory plays a part in the visual appearance of the site, but the Parish finds the height and the volume of the existing rectory problematic in the contemporary circumstance.
- The Parish and the architect contend that it is the church itself which establishes St. Mary of the Assumption as a landmark and the site as a cultural heritage landscape in the City of Owen Sound.
- 2.2.4 "Character-Defining Elements of the Rectory as a Heritage Attribute", HIA page 39:
 - The HIA lists those aspects of the existing rectory building that Robinson considers to be significant. In the context of option 3, the development of a new rectory, this list is not material to the discussion.
 - In the context of a new rectory and a new design, the architect and the Parish select the last point within the Robinson list as the key element to preserve: "view of the original pairing of the church and rectory as seen from 15th Street East". However, the architect and the Parish find the massing of the original rectory unfortunate in the current ensemble of buildings and as a result, the new design is a rectory that is rather more understated in comparison to the existing rectory.
 - The Parish is not convinced that the list provided by Robinson, taken together with other aspects of the HIA, presents a sufficiently strong case for the retention of the existing rectory. In the face of the numerous risks and the anticipated cost, the new development option was selected.

B.3 Notes and Commentary regarding the HIA Section 7.0, Proposed Development, Impacts and Mitigation:

- 2.3.1 "Negative impacts on a cultural heritage resource in MCTS InfoSheet #5 include, but are not limited to:", (HIA page 41):
 - Destruction of any, or part of any, significant heritage attributes or features;
 - Alteration that is not sympathetic, or is incompatible, with the historic fabric and appearance;
 - Shadows created that alter the appearance of a heritage attribute or change the viability of a natural feature or plantings, such as a garden;
 - Isolation of a heritage attribute from its surrounding environment, context or a significant relationship;
 - A change in land use such as rezoning a battlefield from open space to residential use, allowing new development or site alteration to fill in the formerly open spaces;
 - Land disturbances such as a change in grade that alters soils, and drainage patterns that adversely affect an archaeological resource.
 - The first "negative impact" listed above will apply to the proposal to construct a new rectory in place of the existing rectory. The balance of negative impacts will not apply to the new rectory design as proposed.
- 2.3.2 "MCTS InfoSheet #5 recommends methods of minimizing or avoiding a negative impact on a cultural heritage resource. These include, but are not limited to:", (HIA page 41):
 - Alternative development approaches.
 - Isolating development and site alteration from significant built and natural features and vistas Design guidelines that harmonize mass, setback, setting, and materials.
 - Limiting height and density.
 - Allowing only compatible infill and additions.
 - Reversible alterations.
 - Buffer zones, site plan control, and other planning mechanisms.
 - It is the architect's opinion that the design for the new rectory demonstrates the use of the listed methods and further, that these methods correspond with the goals established by the Parish for the project.
 - The minimization of the connection point between the proposed new rectory and the existing church is an example of the implementation of several of these methods.
 - The reduced height of the proposed rectory ensures that the new project has the minimum impact on the views of the remaining historic structure.

2.3.3 "Notes and Commentary related to "Potential Negative Impacts of the Proposed Development": (HIA page 46):

"The heritage character-defining elements recommended for retention and incorporation into the proposed development are limited to the original, 3-storey building (identified in the Lanhak report as "Area A"). There is no reason to object to a partial demolition of the balance of the current rectory building elements." HIA page 46.

- It is the architect's opinion that the current state of the original 3-storey building prohibits a rehabilitation project that is within the financial capacity of the Parish.
- The proposed design honours the key elements of the 3-storey building within a contemporary architectural design that ensures that the imprint of the original rectory plays a significant part in the future of the Parish.

"As the proposed rectory design builds closer to 15th Street East, it would be more visible on the south slope than the existing rectory and would impact the principle view of the cultural heritage landscape. The new rectory could be perceived in the foreground as opposed to in line with and therefore secondary to the church as with the location and design of the historic rectory." HIA, page 47.

- The proposed design does not remove trees from the landscape and the new rectory is much less prominent relative to the church when compared with the prominence of the current rectory. The trees currently occlude much of the view of the rectory and this will continue to be the case.
- The height of the existing church ensures that it will remain the primary and most evident feature of the site when viewed from the south.
- It is the architect's opinion that the alignment of the structures along the southern flank of the church is inconsequential to the primacy of the church: any view of the eastern or south-easterly directions will feature the rectory and this is especially true in the case of the current rectory. The lower design of the proposed rectory permits a view of the historic church beyond and above the rectory. In this way, the new design achieves the Parish's goal to maintain the church as the most prominent element in the landscape of the site.

"The extent and type of excavation and compaction activity even before the construction begins adds risks that should be addressed by an engineer with proven experience with heritage conservation and a member in good standing with the Canadian Association of Heritage Professionals so that the parish is making fully informed decisions."

- The Parish has retained competent professionals for all design work undertaken on the site to date and has been diligent in the preservation of the church on the site. The Parish has a vested and financial interest in the careful prosecution of work near the existing church. Therefore, it displays diligence in this regard through retention of qualified professionals.
- It is the architect's opinion that membership in an association does not guarantee competent design. Rather, special knowledge of previous construction projects in the area and on the church site is a greater asset. Professionals engaged to provide services to this site have current experience with the soil composition revealed during the 2019 construction and prior to that, during the 1996 construction of the Parish Centre.

- The HIA's extraction of a particular quotation regarding the excavation that occurred during 1996 is based on recollection of events 40 years and more in the past by a well-intentioned member of the clergy. It is the architect's opinion that this evidence should have been consider to be unreliable with respect to a technical matter in view of the recent history of construction surrounding the church and this should have raised questions for any trained historian.
- Geotechnical reports, site photographs and the contractor's records are available to properly investigate a technical concern that seems to be beyond the scope of an HIA. As these events are relatively recent (1995-1996) many of the parties involved remain active in the construction sector.
- The contractor responsible for the 1996 Parish Centre is constructing the expansion to the Parish Centre and had been providing estimates that had been given to Robinson as part of their research.
- The geotechnical report utilized during the initial design of the Parish Centre was prepared by Gamsby and Mannerow Limited of Owen Sound during 1994 and the report is available for review. The findings of the report differ from the casual recollections of Fr. Stephen LaCroix.
- Gamsby and Mannerow Limited are now GM BluePlan Limited and they have provided geotechnical engineering and civil engineering to the Parish since 2017 which is prior to Robinson's involvement. The geotechnical engineer could have been consulted.
- Further, GM BluePlan has provided materials testing on the site for the Parish Centre expansion.
- Construction during 1977 exposed the foundation of the sacristy. The c. 1900 kitchen expansion added to the rectory was removed including the connecting walkway between rectory and church. It can be assumed that this demolition and construction did not jeopardise the sacristy and apse or evidence should be sought to the contrary.
- During the 1980's, the new brick cladding work had exposed foundation conditions around the entire church envelope and the foundation work involved reinforcement and buttressing of the existing church's foundations.
- During 1995/1996 the construction of the Parish Centre exposed the northern side of the steeple foundation and connected new construction to the church.
- Construction of the new Parish Centre during 2019 encountered bedrock at the depth of the basement level (approximately 2.8m below current grade elevation). Breaking of the bedrock had been required to install the elevator shaft and most of the eastern extent of the new foundations.

B.4 Summary and Conclusion:

St. Mary of the Assumption Parish has displayed admirable care and concern for the heritage asset present in the church and invested significant funds in its maintenance. The Parish has further invested in its presence at the site in the form of a Parish Centre. In these ways, the Parish plays a continuing role in the maintenance and care for the cultural heritage landscape of the site.

The Parish's considerable investment in engineering studies associated with the existing rectory and the architect's field measurements and other documentation of the existing rectory signify that the Parish has a deep understanding of the seriousness of the endeavour. The Parish does not take the decision to demolish the existing rectory lightly or due base that decision on financial implications alone.

Within the mandate provided by the Parish, the architect has invested many hours in the study of the site, the review of historical documentation, the analysis of the existing rectory building and in the consideration for the role of the existing rectory on the site. This effort commenced during May of 2017. Therefore, the design, as proposed is reasonably comprehensive with respect to the key attributes of the site and the relationships established with the existing landscape and the adjacent church; however, it is not yet complete. The final iteration of the design is in development and it is hoped that it will warrant the care and maintenance of future parishioners many years hence.

The Building Committee of St. Mary of the Assumption Parish provides this comment regarding the decision to replace the rectory:

"This is the option most acceptable to our Committee and the Catholic Community not only in Owen Sound but throughout Grey/Bruce that was surveyed. This community was surveyed and a town hall meeting was held and support was overwhelming with no objections. The Parish is agreeable and supportive of design aspects for a new rectory that is sympathetic to the history and architecture of the current rectory building."

- R Foster, for the Building Committee, Sept 5 2019.

C. Urban Design Study – the New Rectory

C.1 Historic landscape and contemporary landscape:

Figure 1 depicts the original church sanctuary on the site with the landscape west of the entrance to the church and path leading to the base of the escarpment approximately as they were during 1871. When the church was originally built, it seems reasonable to assume that the majority of the parishioners had resided to the west of the church within the valley of the growing urban community, while to the east were open fields and farms. The church's original 1871 main entrance, the steeple and spire of the church and the existing path that leads to the church's front entrance demonstrate that the position of the existing rectory was considered to be behind the church. The rectory would not have been visible to parishioners climbing the path.

Figures 2 and 3 illustrate the contemporary arrangement of buildings on the site. The path leading to the front doors of the church from the base of the escarpment remains. Figure 3 is the key view: the path provides the main historic view corridor on the site and it clearly displays the romantic roots of the decision to site the church in this spot. However, with the introduction of cars, the development of the City's road network and the neighbourhood surrounding the church, the current main access to the site has moved to 16th Street East or 6th Avenue East. The current parking lot was considered to be the rear of the site in 1871.



Figure 1: 1871 Sanctuary with private area to the east of the church.



Figure 2: Contemporary situation surrounds private space with public facilities.



Figure 3: The heritage view corridor.
C.2 The Church as the Significant Building – Massing and Site Arrangement:

The contemporary access to the site and the organisation of the buildings on the property has the effect of placing the existing rectory in a position of prominence from Sixth Avenue East and 16th Street East and the scale of the rectory competes with the church.

Figure 4 depicts the site as viewed from the 16th Street East entrance and it clearly demonstrates that the rectory competes for the visual primacy that is ideally reserved for the church. Figure 5 shows the site as viewed from 6th Avenue East. The rectory not only competes for visual hierarchy, but it generally obscures the church.



Figure 4: A view from 16th Street East.



Figure 5: A view from Sixth Avenue East.

C.3 St. Mary of the Assumption - a Diagrammatic Construction History:

The sequence of construction of buildings and additions to buildings is illustrated in the diagrams below (Figure 6). It is the opinion of the architect that the 1901 addition of the sacristy and apse to the church completes the vision commenced with the 1871 sanctuary. It is possible that the need for the rectory had proved more pressing and therefore, it precluded finishing the church immediately for financial reasons. The 3-storey brick rectory volume with its frontispiece is completed in 1872. The footprint shape of the rectory and its relationship with the church is, in the architect's opinion, the most interesting and compelling aspect of the existing rectory building. This conclusion is supported within the HIA and it is discussed within the <u>Architectural Design Implementation</u> portion of this study. The HIA seems to favour the preservation of this original volume and the frontispiece because of the relatively insensitive nature of the design of additions that occurred after 1872 including the seriously altered verandahs of 1917. The HIA makes special reference to the 1872 time period, it seems, primarily due to the age of this portion of the rectory since its architectural merit is also significantly degraded through the removal of the few architectural details originally present. Another cause to retain this part of the building is the influence of Fr. Granottier. There is little other rationale offered within the HIA to the implied and stipulated agreement to demolish the porches and the other additions occurring between 1872 and the 1978 designation date.







Circa 1900 kitchen

1871 Church



1901 Sacristy and apse



1977 Kitchen added to rectory

1872 Church and rectory



1917 Porches for the rectory



Garage is added for the rectory at an unknown date



1996 Parish Centre added to the church

Figure 6, Construction Sequence.

C.4 Architectural and Urban Design Goals for a New Rectory:

Figure 7 provides a diagram of the organization of the buildings and the approximate location of public and private spaces on the site in the current configuration of buildings. The St. Mary's Building Committee believes that the current site organisation will not change within the foreseeable future and that it is prudent to provide a design that achieves the following goals:

- a) Two key features of the Heritage Landscape ought to be maintained:
 - .1 the path joining the base of the escarpment to the front doors of the church. Refer to Figure 3. This path is an essential part of the west to east axis established on the site by the church. Refer to the images on the cover of this study.
 - .2 The hillside on the southern flank of the church should remain vacant of buildings and the view of the church from 15th Street East should be preserved. Refer to Figure 7a. An exception could be made for a pergola or similar landscape structure that facilitates a view from the church to the south and west. A pergola existed on the site near the western church entrance prior to the 1921 Golden Jubilee.
- b) Respect the importance of the church: acknowledge the change to the approach to the site and attempt to redress the accidental dominance of the rectory when the church is viewed from the eastern side of the property.
- c) Site organisation: ensure that the design of the rectory provides the desired separation of public and private space for the priests.
- d) Historic Buildings: honour the 1872 rectory within the new proposed architectural design.
- e) The relationship between the rectory and the church: place the proposed rectory in the position of the former rectory and connect the new rectory to the church in such a way as to minimize its architectural influence on the church.
- f) Existing Trees: protect and preserve all existing trees with a trunk diameter of more than 100mm as an important part of the effort to retain the visual appearance of the site.



Figure 7: Approximate public and private domains on the existing site.



Figure 7a: The existing southern flank of the church viewed from 15th Street East.

C.5 Architectural Design and Conservation Plan:

Readers are invited to review the drawings provided within Appendix A. As is usually the case, the architectural expression and the ideas embodied in the planning are numerous and difficult to describe using text. The writer invites dialogue in person, as necessary, to complete the reader's understanding of the design proposal.

C.5.1 Site organisation:

The 1871 sanctuary has a central aisle that connects the western front doors to the altar located in the eastern end of the church thus forming an axis. The pathway leading up the escarpment joins the western end of this axis at the front doors of the church. The axis is likewise continued out of the rear of the sacristy via the central door to connect with the existing rectory's former vestibule (the frontispiece) which contained the front door and vestibule within the 1872 rectory. The 1872 rectory has a centre-hall floor plan which, therefore, continues the axis through the rectory and out onto the formerly open, 1917 verandah. The relationship between rectory's frontispiece and the rear door of the church and the space initially between rectory and church is obscured by the 1977 kitchen addition and prior to that, the circa 1900 kitchen addition. The axis is skewed slightly since the rectory is not perfectly aligned to the church's axis. This axis and the skew in it are preserved in the new design. The frontispiece is also marked by a rectangular brick form that recalls the form of the frontispiece.



Figure 8: the west to east axis developed by the church is continued into the existing rectory's former front door and through the centre-hall plan.

Refer to figure 9. The rectory is a private residence for priests on the grounds of an otherwise public space. The public areas are comprised of a treed landscape west of the church with the pathway leading from the bottom of the escarpment to the church; the church and Parish Centre; open space along the eastern and northern edges of the site and a parking lot immediately east of the church and north of the rectory. Although the trees on the southern hillside act as a buffer to the 15th Street right-of-way, the sole private area is the interior of the existing rectory.

The new rectory addresses the public spaces with its northern and eastern facades. It provides a private courtyard for the priests which has a more relaxed geometry that is derived from the shape of the apse of the church. The courtyard is focused on the apse and sacristy and toward the landscape along the southern flank of the church. Refer to Figure 10 which depicts the approximate view of the three suites designed as individual private quarters for three priests.



Figure 9: Public and private territories.

Figure 10: the view from the proposed suites designed for the priests.

Refer to Figure 11. The original 1872 rectory's position and outline is preserved within the design of the new building. The frontispiece becomes a new brick form, the northern wall is replaced by a new wall in the same location and the northern side of the former central corridor of the 1872 brick core of the former rectory forms the main collective living room and kitchen. The main interior passage takes the place of the central hall of 1872 and the rooms formerly south of the centre hall are replaced by an exterior terrace which has its southern boundary marked by the position of the original southern wall of the 1872 building.



Figure 11: The imprint of the 1872 brick shell and frontispiece in the new floor plan.

C.5.2 Architectural Form and Massing:

Refer to Figures 12 and 13. Figure 12 illustrates the current situation. The rectory is similar in height to the church and the 1977 kitchen joins to the rear door of the sacristy with a flat-roofed extension. The existing church has brick with a slightly different red hue because they had been replaced circa 1980. The rectory's brick work is original to 1872.

The new rectory is designed to be a lower building than the existing rectory. The northern limit of the new design is a single-storey to emphasize the dominance of the church. The small, second storey portion of the new rectory is set back toward the south to minimize its influence on the church. Appendix A, drawing A7 provides the elevation views of the existing and the proposed rectory and the relationship to the church.



Figure 12: the original rectory and the church viewed from the north.

Figure 13 illustrates the approximate effect of the reduced height of a new rectory. The Figure 13 image is made by altering the photograph to remove the upper levels of the existing rectory. The new design is not inserted into the image. Refer to Appendix A, view corridor studies for the relationship between new rectory and existing church.



Figure 13: An approximation of the effect of a one-storey rectory.

C.5.3 Retained Trees and Landscape:

The trees illustrated within Figures 8, 9 and 11 are the surveyed positions of all trees with trunk diameters greater than 100 mm. These are also illustrated within Appendix A, drawings A1 through A6, inclusive. Refer to the Tree Retention Diagram in Appendix A. It is anticipated that it will not be necessary to remove any trees from the site and therefore, the existing screening effect of the trees will persist. Further, these trees are taller than the proposed rectory and the new rectory will be screened by the trees when viewed from the east and the south more effectively than the trees currently screen the existing rectory. This measure will permit the site to retain its current landscaped appearance and the new rectory will be more subservient to the church.

C.6 Significant View Corridor Study:

Appendix A, drawings A8 and A9 illustrate the views of the proposed and existing church from when viewed from the north, the east, the intersection of Sixth Avenue East and 15th Street East and from the south and the base of the 15th Street East right-of-way.

The new rectory is lower that the current rectory and therefore, the church regains its visual primacy when viewed from the north and the east.

The new rectory is inserted among the trees and its lower height allows the church to dominate the site when viewed from the south-east and the south or from the lower region of 15th Street East.

The historic view corridor created by the path which climbs the escarpment to the west front of the church is a view corridor that should be carefully treated, acknowledged and maintained. The path should ideally retain its woodland character and therefore, its roots in the Romantic period of art history. As a piece of urban design, this path (Figure 3) and the view provided of the church within Figure 7a should be preserved.

C.7 Proposed Architectural Control Guidelines:

C.7.1 Intention and Summary:

- .1 Within the financial capacity of the property owner, maintain the church and its steeple as important heritage landmarks.
- .2 Preserve and protect important views of the church.
- .3 Permit controlled intensification of the site if required by the Parish or future owners of the site.
- .4 Minimize the connection between the rectory and the apse of the church.
- .5 Maintain and support tree plantings by replacement of aging trees with new trees on the southern slope of the site.

C.7.2 the Church and the Steeple:

.1 The church is positioned in an interesting and compelling way that takes full advantage of the escarpment landform through its position on the verge of the slope. The church is placed on a high point and the steeple enhances the visibility of the church and therefore, of the heritage

landscape created by the church. The steeple should be preserved, within the capacity of the church's ownership as a landmark visible from great distances.

- .2 The neo-Gothic architectural style of the church further emphasizes the vertical nature of the steeple and spire. The middle region of the bell tower is visually massive and this aspect should dominate the views of the church over the Parish Centre when the site is viewed from the Fifth Avenue East right-of-way. Similarly, when persons are present in the parking area or landscaped on the site immediately east and north of the church, it should be possible to see the steeple and the massive middle region of the bell tower. It is not critical to maintain an open view of the church from Sixth Avenue East or from 16th Street East.
- .3 Views of the bell tower when seen from the north and the east can be heightened by the establishment of a perimeter of buildings that creates a large, urban courtyard (or parking area) which will have the effect of accentuating the height and authority of the steeple by proximity to other buildings. These perimeter buildings are ideally not taller than 4 storeys or roughly, the peak of the roof of the church's sanctuary.

C.7.3 Preserve and Protect Important views from the City toward the Site:

- .1 Maintain both the path linking the base of the escarpment to the front doors of the church and the view along the path. Maintain the path in its woodland form to preserve the character of the path true to its roots in the Romantic period of art history. Permit the development of ways and means to celebrate this heritage using sensitive means including, but not limited to low, unobtrusive walls, small structures such as pergola and trellis and lighting as required. A pergola would more or less recreate the pergola from the circa 1910-1921 period.
- .2 Maintain the view of the flank of the church when it is seen from the south and the south-west by prohibiting construction of buildings on the southern slope in the region aligned with the southern wall of the church's sanctuary. Small landscaping walls, trellis structures, a vineyard, pergola structures and pathways should be permitted with careful consideration. These can provide a sense of the scale of the church.
- .3 Maintain the view of the church's bell tower, steeple and spire from the Fifth Avenue East rightof-way over the top of the Parish Centre or any other similar building.
- .4 Maintain the path and the shape of the natural drainage landform that extends the 16th Street East right-of-way in the western direction, down the escarpment slope.

C.7.4 Controlled intensification:

- .1 The architectural style of future buildings is not important to the integrity of the heritage landscape. What will be important is the evolution of the site as a viable development that can support and maintain the church building.
- .2 Additional buildings can be situated along the Sixth Avenue East and 16th Street East property lines. These would enclose an urban courtyard which can include landscaping and parking. The buildings should be no more than 4 storeys in height including any covered parking and approximately, but not exactly, the height of the peak of the sanctuary roof.
- .3 The use of the buildings is not critical to the preservation of the site. Controls associated with views noted above should suffice to control the nature of the development.

- .4 The buildings may occlude the view of the church when the site is seen from the north and the east.
- .5 The perimeter buildings may extend to the practical limits of the 15th Street right-of-way at the south-eastern corner of the site. The buildings should not encroach closer to the church than the proposed rectory does.

C.7.5 Minimize the Connection between Buildings and the Church:

- .1 Future buildings located east of the church or modifications to the proposed rectory should maintain a glass connection with the church and the space between the proposed rectory and the stair and rear entrance to the sacristy should be maintained more or less as illustrated within the proposed design. The connection between any other structure placed east of the church and the church itself is intended to have a visually "light" character.
- .2 The height of any connecting construction should fit within the height established by the stair, corridor and entrance to the rear of the sacristy established during 1901.
- .2 Future buildings should connect with the church as minimally as feasible and no connection should be larger than the connection between the church and the 1996 Parish Centre.
- .3 No connection with the church should extend new structure such that it will be west of a line established by the existing front doors of the church. These doors are recessed from the face of the masonry supporting the tower and buildings and connections to building situated east should be situated behind the face of the masonry tower construction.

C.7.6 Maintain Trees and Landscape Features:

- .1 Existing trees situated west and south of the church's sanctuary should be maintained and replaced over time unless a new plan proposes a vineyard on the southern slope of the site below the church or the proposal is the construction of a terraced landscape of a similar nature and height to the vineyard.
- .2 The slope of the southern and western hillsides must be stabilized by any new planting or landscape construction.
- .3 The path leading from the base of the escarpment to the front doors of the church should be retained as woodland setting west of the church.
- .4 The landforms created by drainage paths located north of the church bell tower and the current Parish Centre, including the pathway existing on the 16th Street East right-of-way should be preserved.

End of Architectural Control Guidelines.

The Rectory for St. Mary of the Assumption Roman Catholic Parish, Owen Sound The Roman Catholic Episcopal Corporation of the Diocese of Hamilton in Ontario



December 2019

G. M. DIEMERT ARCHITECT INC.

Suite 201 - 957 Fourth Avenue East Owen Sound, Ontario N4K 2N9 Telephone 519 - 376 - 1975 gdiemert@gmda.ca

Introduction:

Robinson Heritage Consulting's "<u>Heritage Impact Assessment</u>" for the rectory at St. Mary of the Assumption Parish in Owen Sound strongly supports the restoration, rehabilitation and expansion of the existing rectory building which had been first occupied during 1872. This report provides the rationale associated with the design of an entirely new rectory, designed specifically for and in response to this important heritage landscape.

The reasons for the Church's decision to construct a new building include:

- .1 The potential final cost of the restoration of a heritage building that has been seriously compromised during its service life. There is significant risk that discoveries during demolition and construction will reveal additional challenges. The Designated Substance Report also identifies challenges for materials within the building that are not likely included within the cost estimates made to date.
- .2 The structural challenges inherent in the original design of the rectory that have been the subject of numerous and largely unsuccessful, attempts to remediate the situation.
- .3 Contemporary rectories throughout the Hamilton Diocese are accessible and the suites designed for priests are larger than those provided within the existing rectory. The new suite design and the contemporary insulation and air infiltration controls are part of the means to ensure the viability of the parish. These features attract and retain priests.

This report is intended to perform the following functions:

- .1 To support and supplement the documents that illustrate the new design for the rectory.
- .2 To describe the context for the design: the historical, cultural and heritage landscape contexts are discussed and it describes some of the key aspects of the relationship of the contemporary parish landscape within the historical and cultural context.
- .3 To outline the reasons for some of the key architectural design decisions.

The design of the building is intended to be the conservation plan for the rectory. In addition, it is hoped that the documents created for this project and the design of the rectory itself will play a role in the conservation plan of the entire significant heritage landscape for future generations.

A. Background: History and Site Design

It is the writer's opinion that Fr. Granottier had made or at least heavily influenced the key architectural decisions which formed the basis for the current heritage landscape at the St. Mary of the Assumption site in Owen Sound and that the church had been intended as the focal point of the site. Further, it is the writer's contention that Fr. Granottier's bold decision to place the church very near the edge of the

escarpment landform and his subsequent decision to obtain through trade¹, the hillside immediately west of the church were decisions that were intended to ensure the continued visibility of the church from the heart of the City of Owen Sound. The steeple itself guarantees visibility from great distances and this visibility is enhanced by the placement on the top of the escarpment.

The history of the parish described within the "Golden Jubilee" document created during 1921 states the following about the first Roman Catholic Church in Owen Sound:

"The First Catholic Church in Owen Sound was built about where the west corner of the present Separate School rises. It was set back from the street-line in a gully. It was constructed of stone, it is generally referred to as the Old Stone Church."²

This statement and the reference to a trade made in the Robinson HIA about the land exchange suggest that the Parish had owned some portion of the 15th Street East right-of-way, either on the northern or southern edge of the right-of-way and Fr. Granottier's references to a "goat path" which may have been the commonly travelled portion of land between the church site and the former site of the Old Stone Church.

The writer has no mandate to seek a record of the reasoning behind this land transfer; however, one can assume that the desire for visibility must have been very strong. It would have been strong enough to overcome the typical and practical risks of the venture, including the very real risk that the soil below the chosen location would be unstable. If Fr. Stephen LaCroix's commentary concerning removal of gravel from the hillside south of the 15th Street right-of-way is a true account³, it is the writer's contention that Fr. Ganottier wished to preempt the taking of gravel from the hillside immediately west of the church since this would be an obvious threat to the stability of the church's foundation. If gravel extraction was occurring or immanent near the site of the church, he would have been highly motived to trade the future 15th Street East right-of-way for the parcel(s) immediately west of the church. Whether this transfer might have been made strictly for reasons of visibility or due to fear of the extraction of the gravel is conjecture. However, it is likely true that the path leading to the front door of the church had already existed and perhaps Fr. Granottier simply wished to control it.

B. The Rectory:

The rectory at St. Mary of the Assumption Parish is said to have been completed during 1872: "...the Rectory, of red brick, two storeys high, with mansard-roof, was built by Father Granottier shortly after the church was opened, probably about the year 1872." ⁴ Fr. F. X. Granottier of the Congregation of St. Basil⁵ was appointed Superior of the Mission during 1864 and continued in that role until 1887. He had been re-

¹ Robinson HIA, Section 4.3 page 20.

² St. Mary's Church Owen Sound: Church of St. Mary of the Assumption, Owen Sound, Ontario, "Golden Jubilee" history 1871-1921, pages 46.

³ Fr. Stephen LaCroix, CSB, history of St. Mary of the Assumption Parish Church and Rectory, page 1 and Robinson HIA, Section 4.3, page 21.

⁴ St. Mary's Church Owen Sound: Church of St. Mary of the Assumption, Owen Sound, Ontario, "Golden Jubilee" history 1871-1921, pages 57.

⁵ Fr. Stephen LaCroix, CSB, history of St. Mary of the Assumption Parish Church and Rectory, page 1 and St. Mary's Church Owen Sound: Church of St. Mary of the Assumption, Owen Sound, Ontario, "Golden Jubilee" history 1871-1921, pages 48 and 57.

appointed to the position of Superior during the period 1889 to 1901. The rectory is one of at least three structures built in Owen Sound under Fr. Granottier's tenure. These also included the church (1870-71) and a separate school during 1891⁶ located near the current St. Mary's high school across 15th Street East⁷ from the current rectory. It is the writer's opinion that it is extremely likely that Fr. Granottier would have had a significant role in the decisions made regarding the position and the appearance of the church because the church is made to resemble the Catholic Church of Fr. Granottier's birthplace in France - Sanctuaire Notre-Dame-de-Valfleury⁸. It seems equally likely that he would have directed the builders to position the original rectory immediately to the rear of the church building with its front door facing the rear of the church. It is the writer's view that this location for the rectory is practical since parish priests could walk out of their front door directly into the church, and, perhaps more important, it would allow the church itself to completely obscure the rectory from the view of parishioners climbing the hillside path toward the west front of the church.

In contrast with the direction given to designers and builders to construct a church that is significant in the life of Fr. Granottier⁹, it is the writer's opinion that the design of the rectory is very likely derived from pattern books available at the time. Further, the rectory's general form, which is a centre-hall plan covered by a Mansard roof, evokes vaguely French precedents and it is the writer's belief that this aspect of the rectory's design may have appealed to Fr. Granottier. More significantly, the centre hall plan would facilitate a simple division of the upper two storeys into separate rooms that were reasonably similar in size. The Mansard roof form may have also been appealing as a means to create a practical and useable attic storey when compared with gable-roof alternatives. These features may have been more conducive to accommodation of priests in a parish that was growing quickly. Indeed, it seems reasonable to assume that Fr. Granottier's concern had been to maximize the amount of space created for the cost paid to construct the building, an opinion that is supported by the St. Mary's Church "Golden Jubilee" history document written during 1921 which summarizes a description of the rectory with this statement:

"Taken all in all, the grounds are planned for beauty and the House itself, of fair proportions, is calculated mainly to be a useful haven for the number of priests necessary for the missions."¹⁰

Elsewhere within the "Jubilee" document, there is this statement:

"Out of doors he stays a moment to look about. Concrete walks surround the church; a pergola, a real Italian creation flanks the south-western wall; a commodious Rectory with wide sweep of veranda; a lane of chestnut to the street; the balsam hedge, the spacious grass plots, the grove before the church, the pleasant homelike path down the bosky descent."¹¹

⁹ Robinson HIA, Section 4.5, Robert Sadler, Builder and Architect, page 27 and figure 17.

⁶ St. Mary's Church Owen Sound: Church of St. Mary of the Assumption, Owen Sound, Ontario, "Golden Jubilee" history 1871-1921, page 56.

⁷ Robinson HIA, Section 4.3, page 19.

⁸ Fr. Stephen LaCroix, CSB, research list for his history of St. Mary's Church and Rectory, page 1 (also published on the St. Mary's and the Missions parish web site). Robinson HIA, Section 4.3, page 20

¹⁰ St. Mary's Church Owen Sound: Church of St. Mary of the Assumption, Owen Sound, Ontario, "Golden Jubilee" history 1871-1921, page 57.

¹¹ St. Mary's Church Owen Sound: Church of St. Mary of the Assumption, Owen Sound, Ontario, "Golden Jubilee" history 1871-1921, page 51.

These words reiterate the importance of the landscape to the site and the parishioners and they reinforce its romantic nature. The writer infers from the quotation above that the "lane of chestnut to the street" is a reference to the 15th Street East access driveway which was closed during 1932¹². The reference to the pergola is interesting: it would have been positioned at the prospect immediately outside the front doors of the church and it would have overlooked the centre of the City to the south. This pergola would have reinforced the importance of this viewpoint and through its placement; it acknowledged the significance of the siting of the church. The reference to "bosky path" suggests that parishioners may have commonly used the path rising up the west face of the escarpment hill through the trees. For the writer, this western path on the escarpment hill and the southern slope of the escarpment hill flanking the church are the two most interesting and important features of the heritage landscape.

The historical record available to the writer also suggests that the rectory may not have been a particularly elaborate structure¹³ and the kind words of the "*Golden Jubilee*" document quoted above suggest that the rectory, although large, was not particularly notable for its architectural style. This supports the notion that the rectory has a secondary status in the development of the site.

Since the construction of the church and the rectory, no buildings or additions to the rectory had been constructed between them for a period of about 29 years until approximately 1900 when the construction of the sacristy and apse had commenced¹⁴. However, prior to 1900, a two-storey addition had been constructed immediately against the north-western corner of the rectory building. This is illustrated in Fr.



Stephen LaCroix's history of the rectory by inclusion of the photograph¹⁵ depicted to the left. (**Figure 1**).

Within this image, the two-storey kitchen and servant quarters addition to the rectory can be seen and it is likely that this addition had also been constructed under the direction and care of

ST. MARY'S CHURCH AND PRESBYTERY

Fr. Granottier. The conifer trees planted in front of the rectory in this image have clearly been growing for some years and the writer suspects that these trees are intended to screen the view of the rectory when the site is viewed from the south and thereby reduce the prominence of the rectory. These trees may be the reference to "balsam hedge" made in the "Golden Jubilee" document quotation above. It is also possible, however, that they are the beginning of a wind screen. Nevertheless, it is the writer's contention that these trees may have been placed at the direction of Fr. Granottier.

¹² Fr. Stephen LaCroix, CSB, history of St. Mary's Rectory, page 3; Robinson HIA, Section 4.3, page 21.

¹³ Fr. Stephen LaCroix, CSB, history of St. Mary's Rectory, page 2.

¹⁴ St. Mary's Church Owen Sound: Church of St. Mary of the Assumption, Owen Sound, Ontario, "Golden Jubilee" history 1871-1921, page 48.

¹⁵ Fr. Stephen LaCroix, CSB, history of St. Mary of the Assumption Parish Church and Rectory, page 1.

It seems likely that the majority of the parishioners residing in the valley would have approached the front doors of the church on foot using the path aligned with the church's front doors that leads upward from the base of the escarpment. Parishioners using carriages arriving from the valley may have circumnavigated the church and rectory along the route which may exist approximately within the 15th Street East right-of-way and circled around the rectory to access stables shown on fire maps produced at the early part of the 1900's.¹⁶ These stables are likely the buildings visible beyond the kitchen addition in the photograph. It does seem likely that a drainage route did exist along the route of the future 15th Street East road based a review of the contours illustrated on Historic Atlas maps of the period including the one depicted as Figure 5 within the Robinson HIA on page 18. The old maps suggest that the church itself was flanked by valley formations on both its southern and northern sides and to this day, the northern valley formation exists, although it is partly filled by the Parish Centre construction. These formations would have contributed to the drama of the site of the church. It seems that there is little doubt that it had been Fr. Granottier's intent to give the church prominence and situate it in a highly visible location.



Left: **Figure 2** - Segment of a Map of the County of Grey, City of Owen Sound, circa 1880, Historical Atlas, collection of the writer.

The sacristy is said to have been added to the church during 1901¹⁷ and this further closed the gap between church and rectory. Fire and Insurance Plans of the City from 1907¹⁸ illustrate a connecting link between rectory and church, the two-storey kitchen addition from prior to 1901 and the completed sacristy. The precise nature of the connecting link between the sacristy and the rectory is unknow; however, this is the location of the proposed new connecting link between the sacristy and the rectory for the new rectory project.

It is the writer's opinion that these various changes, occurring as they had during the early years of the parish and possibly during Fr. Granottier's tenure (1864-1887 and 1890-1901), the likely author of the arrangement of the buildings as well as one who had important influence over the character and appearance of the buildings, are an indication that those who managed the parish considered that the rectory is of much lesser importance

than they did the church. The symmetrical and reasonably careful alignment of the front of the historical rectory as a continuation of the centre axis of the church is ignored in favour of what must have been the practical positioning of the two-storey kitchen and servant quarters near the historic front door of the rectory. It is true that this addition may have occurred during the gap in Fr. Granottier's tenure (between 1887 and 1890); however, the report available to the writer and referenced within the Robinson HIA¹⁹ suggests that the kitchen enlargement had occurred near the turn of the century.

¹⁶ Robinson HIA, Section 4.4, Figures 14 and 15, page 26.

¹⁷ Fr. Stephen LaCroix, CSB, history of St. Mary's Church and Rectory, page 1. St. Mary's Church Owen Sound: Church of St. Mary of the Assumption, Owen Sound, Ontario, Golden Jubilee history 1871-1921, pages 48

¹⁸ Robinson HIA, Section 4.3, Figure 14, page 26.

¹⁹ Robinson HIA, Section 4.3, page 20 and Fr. Stephen LaCroix, CSB, history of St. Mary's Church and Rectory, page 1.

Following the construction of the circa 1900 kitchen, porches were added to the east side of the rectory (its historical back) and the along the southern side. These porches were eventually enclosed to provide more ground floor administrative office space²⁰.

The access to the church site had also evolved with the growth of Owen Sound road network and vehicles eventually entered the southern side of the site directly from 15th Street East. During the 1932, the vehicle entrance was moved to 6th Avenue East²¹, much as vehicle entrance to the site is managed today.

It is evident that the rectory is less well-adorned than the church; this is true even if one considers the ornamentation that was lost over time. The rectory is clearly not enhanced and enlarged with the same care as had been exercised when changes had been made to the church. Therefore, it is not for lack of knowledge or experience, but rather a deliberate judgment made by the custodians to keep the rectory relatively humble and practical. This is a pattern that persists into the 1980's. Indeed, all of the various renovations and modifications undertaken and referenced within the Robinson HIA (which are the history provided by Fr. Stephen LaCroix²²) are intended to address functional, practical and structural failings of the rectory building.

The site of the Parish in Owen Sound has changed significantly since the 1870 commencement of the construction of the church. These changes continue to this day and the community remains active and vital. Throughout its history, the church remains the primary feature of the site and the effective heart of the Roman Catholic presence in the Grey-Bruce region.

The development of the 1996 Parish Centre using a plain, contemporary architectural style is clearly subservient to the church itself and its form directs visitors to the historic front entrance of the church. It also changes the nature of the valley landforms at the top of the hill and partially obscures the nature of the site near the church entrance. Indeed, it is possible that contemporary parishioners seldom consider the nature of the church's siting on the verge of the escarpment and the long, romantic path leading from the base of the hill to the historic front doors.

It is the writer's opinion that the primary features of the heritage landscape are as follows:

- .1 The position of the church facing west and placed near the edge of the escarpment hill;
- .2 The presence of the path leading up the escarpment to the historic front doors of the church;
- .3 The prominent steeple and its visibility from great distances including from across the harbour;
- .4 The southern side yard of the church along 15th Street East.
- .5 The alignment of the church and the rectory with the connection between rectory and church occurring at the centre of the sacristy.
- .6 The subservient nature of the rectory relative to the church.
- .7 It is the writer's opinion that parking and other uses secondary to worship and community (garages and similar out-buildings or future community housing should be positioned north and east of the church, and to create an urban enclave for the site if new structures are of a significant size.

²⁰ Fr. Stephen LaCroix, CSB, history of St. Mary's Church and Rectory, page 4; Robinson HIA, Section 4.3, page 22.

²¹ Robinson HIA, Section 4.3, page 21.

²² Robinson HIA, Section 4.3, pages 20 to 24.

It is the writer's opinion that the presence of the rectory as an extension of the church's central axis is important to the heritage landscape and that a new rectory ought to be positioned to maintain the original relationship to the church that was established in 1872. It is also the writer's contention that, the architectural style and even the shape and character of the original rectory is not nearly as significant to the heritage landscape as is its position: a floor plan that placed the primary circulation approximately, but not quite exactly, on the central axis of the church it serves.

It is fitting that the church is preserved as it was designed and that it is designated as a heritage building and that it was subsequently rehabilitated significantly during the 1980's. It is also significant and fitting that the new rectory, as proposed, continues the story of this heritage landscape in the twenty-first century. It is hoped that the use of key architectural features and their positioning on the site will do justice to the initial maneuvers made by Fr. Granottier. The forward trajectory for the rectory, and the creation of a new expression within the heritage landscape, is the wish and the expressed goal of the project established by the Diocese and the parishioners.

The design of the new rectory enhances the experience of the church as the most significant and powerful architectural expression on the site from all vantage points, including from the eastern and northern viewpoints. In this way, the legacy of the founders of the site is continued in an age that experiences this boldly sited church from its back yard.

C. Condition of the Rectory - a Summary and Commentary:

The condition of the rectory is well described within the Robinson HIA and the engineering reports attached within this report as appendices.

C.1 Summary:

There are three primary challenges to the restoration of the rectory:

- .1 The interior load-bearing structural framing within the building does not align from top to bottom. This circumstance has prompted many attempts to rectify the effects of the deflection of floor joists and to shore sagging beams. This condition likely causes the distortion of the brick shell referenced within the HIA and recalled by Fr. LaCroix²³. This deflection may have necessitated the 1977 interior bracing and tie rods. The condition referenced within the Engineering Company report under the heading First Floor Framing, page 4, is likely related. These are serious defects that will require significant reconstruction on the interior. The cost of such work is high as existing building components that must remain in place must be supported throughout the prosecution of the work.
- .2 The shell of the building is not insulated. The Mansard roof cladding must be replaced and potentially restored and there may be a requirement for significant remedial roof framing due to ice and water damage. Soffits and fascia require replacement; all existing flat roofing must be replaced. All windows and doors must be restored or replaced. Extensive brick repair is required there is a significant risk that some of the load-bearing brick walls require stabilization. Should these repairs

²³ Robinson HIA, Section 4.3, Page 23.

Proposed New Rectory for St. Mary of the Assumption Roman Catholic Church

be made as part of an historic restoration, the cost will well exceed the value of a similar amount of new construction.

.3 The historic core of the rectory (the 1872 portion) is not sufficiently large to accommodate the current complement of priests with reasonable living suites in addition to the rooms required for the collective life of the priests. Therefore, an expansion to the existing footprint is required and this addition would have a significant size. It also seems reasonable to consider the removal of the current kitchen as it constitutes an unsympathetic, recent addition. The three-storey building necessitates the installation of an elevator to ensure that a reasonable number of the suites created for the priest would be available to elderly priests and priests with mobility challenges. It is the writer's opinion that such an addition would have an impact on the heritage landscape that is similar to the impact of the project as designed. It seems inevitable that

C.2 Details:

When the CSB Parish was reverted to a Diocesan Parish during 2008²⁴, the direct responsibility for the management of the Parish and its priests had been shifted to Hamilton, the seat of the Diocese. During 2017, the inadequacies of the rectory, and in particular, the mixture of Parish administrative offices with the residence for the priests had become intolerable enough to warrant action by the Parish. An expansion to the 1996 Parish Centre became the initial project as a means to remove administrative offices from the residence. This expansion also involved completion of finishes and fittings (washrooms, flooring, painting, etc.) within the basement level of the Parish Centre.

It is clear from a cursory review of the rectory that many exterior components are not in their original state and that deterioration of various parts has continued. The best example, selected from several obvious issues referenced within the attached Appendices, is the cladding of the Mansard roof with a relatively contemporary metal siding together with the associated failing eave construction. The rectory must have originally had a slate or wooden shingled Mansard roof which is evident within Figure 1 of this report and within the *"Golden Jubilee"* document photograph (circa1921) of the rectory on page 56. The building's eaves appear to be suffering from effects of ice dams which contort the fascia. It is not known how much damage to the framing behind the siding has occurred, but ice formations and leaking through the soffit and the deformations of the fascia are readily observed. The eave had also lost the brackets which had existed at each of the voids remaining in the brick construction below the eave. These brackets are visible within a photographs of the rectory included within the *"Golden Jubilee"* history²⁵. The buff accent bricks below the eave would have accentuated these brackets.

The masonry exhibits cracking in the exterior wythe through various clay brick units and within the masonry joints. These defects signal significant stress on the masonry, which is likely predominantly due to the effects of weather, but also likely associated with seasonal movement of the building due to the effects of freezing in the soil (heaving). The bricks used to enclose the porch are in very bad condition at their lower region likely due to splash-back from adjacent pavements and this effect is exacerbated by the use of road salt in the parking area.

 ²⁴ Fr. Stephen LaCroix, CSB, Reference List for his history of St. Mary's Church and Rectory, page 2.
 ²⁵ St. Mary's Church Owen Sound: Church of St. Mary of the Assumption, Owen Sound, Ontario, "Golden Jubilee" history 1871-1921, page 56.

The Parish and the Diocese had determined that action was required in order to provide appropriate accommodation for the priests, which in part, is an important part of the goal to ensure the long-term viability of the Roman Catholic community.

D. Rectory Redevelopment Options and Process:

The Building Committee, following appropriate assessment of needs, functionality and recognition of the necessity to separate the administrative offices from the rectory developed a two part plan that would involve the construction of an addition to the 1996 Parish Centre followed by the redevelopment of the rectory.

The Building Committee of the St. Mary of the Assumption Parish had recognized that the two options under consideration for the establishment of an appropriate, safe and sustainable Rectory were as follows:

- .1 Retain parts of the existing rectory and construct an addition and a comprehensive renovation program that would restore a portion of the existing exterior construction. It was recognized that the interior of the building could not be restored due to the required reconstruction of load-bearing elements.
- .2 Design and construct an entirely new Rectory building.

The architectural design implementation strategy conveyed within the documents prepared for the new rectory project was developed through a comprehensive design process that included the following activities and considerations:

- .1 The establishment of goals and objectives for the project including careful consideration of the heritage features of the site and its buildings, the characteristics of the site, the needs of the building's inhabitants and the cost of the project.
- .2 The careful review of the Heritage Impact Assessment and the options presented within it.
- .3 A thoughtful assessment of the priorities for the project developed in consultation with the Catholic community.
- .4 The commissioning of studies of the condition of the existing rectory including a Designated Substance Survey and structural condition assessments.
- .5 The commissioning from an experienced building contractor of cost estimates for a renovated and partially restored existing rectory and alternatively, for the demolition of the existing rectory followed by the construction of a new rectory.
- .6 The Committee undertook an analysis of the benefits and risks associated with the project's primary options renovation and restoration VS demolition and new construction.
- .7 The Committee commissioned conceptual architectural designs for both primary options and to undertake field measurement of the existing rectory.
- .8 A careful consideration of the nature and extent of building additions that would be required in the context of a renovated and restored existing rectory building together with consideration of the features of the existing rectory that could realistically be restored.

Proposed New Rectory for St. Mary of the Assumption Roman Catholic Church

.9 The Committee conducted a careful review of the site with the architect and gave due consideration for the heritage landscape and the various means through which the legacy of the existing rectory could be honored within the design of a new rectory building.

The Building Committee, having examined the options and assessed the potential cost, consulted with parishioners about the prospect of a new rectory constructed in place of the existing rectory building. The results of the consultation had shown that the parish would support the new construction over the partial demolition, restoration and expansion of the existing rectory building. Following this step, the development of the design of the new rectory building was advanced.

Therefore, as described within the Heritage Impact Assessment Report (HIA), Section 7.3, Option 3, an architectural design was commissioned and its intent is to reduce negative impacts to the heritage landscape of new construction.

E. Architectural Design - General Site Analysis:

The following reflections on the nature of the ensemble of buildings that comprise St. Mary of the Assumption Parish are the conclusions of the writer derived from the review of the HIA, a detailed study of the site and the buildings and careful consideration of the landscape surrounding the site in addition to the architectural features present. The writer's reflections and conclusions drawn from the history of the site are described earlier in this report.

It is the writer's contention that the siting of the church is the primary architectural gesture of the design of the site. It is a bold maneuver since it would have been known that there was some risk that the soil would be unstable in that location and that the building might have to be moved following the start of construction if unstable ground was uncovered. The siting and the desire to maximize visibility is reinforced and supported by the Gothic style of the building which exhibits ornaments, details, buttresses and other elements that emphasize the vertical axis. Finally, the church would be highly visible in this location from the construction stage onward.

The original rectory was constructed with a front door and vestibule facing the rear of the church during 1872. The position of the rectory is such that its centre-hall floor plan design continues the axis developed by the church and the path to its front door. However, it is not aligned precisely with the axis established by the church and the original alignment of the original rectory is preserved within the proposed design. Further, the maps referenced earlier in this report illustrate a connecting link between the centre of the sacristy and the entrance to the original rectory²⁶ and this connection is present in the proposed design using a narrow corridor which may have a width that was similar to the links illustrated in the maps.

The change in access to the property made during 1932 (referenced earlier as part of Fr. LaCroix's research) alone results in a significant change to the heritage landscape and this adjustment, likely necessitated due to the increase in car traffic, has radically altered the original founding intent of a significant landscape and urban design at a relatively early stage.

²⁶ Robinson HIA, Section 4.4, Figures 14 and 15, page 26.

F. Architectural Design and Conservation Plan Goals:

The goals for the architectural design had been established through analysis of the site and through detailed and frequent discussion with the Church and the Building Committee. The summary of goals below is written such that the key features of the heritage landscape provide the organizational structure to the list of goals.

F.1 Retain the key features of the heritage landscape:

The primary features of this landscape are:

- The **prospect**: the church is placed on a promontory on the Niagara Escarpment and as such, its steeple is visible for great distances and the setting at the historic front of the church is dramatic. The prospect must be retained and should be reinforced much as the historical Italian pergola had once done²⁷.
- The **foot path**: a path originating from the base of the escarpment rises up the escarpment to approach the historic front doors of the church. The front doors of the church face toward the west which at this site, is directed over the city below and toward the bay and the distant escarpment landform on the western side of the city. The western orientation is the traditional orientation for Catholic Church planning and the congregants look toward the east during services. The path is very likely inspired from the Romantic period in art history which would have been prevalent during Fr. Granottier's formative years.
- The **central axis:** The centre axis of the church form is extended from the front door of the church down the foot path to the base of the escarpment and from the front doors of the church to the altar and eventually through the back of the sacristy to the former front door of the existing rectory. The rectory design of 1872 terminates the axis with casual outdoor space beyond the rear doors of the rectory. The casual nature of the lawn east of the rectory is reinforced by the construction of a veranda after the turn of the twentieth century.
- The **southern hillside** along 15th Street East: the view of the church along its southern flank much as depicted within the Figure 1 photograph should be maintained. The subsequent growth of trees in this region is the current iteration of the hillside landscape. The Figure 1 photograph depicts a vineyard in this location. These trees may play some part in soil retention, but they are not necessarily a part of the original landscape intention. However, the trees continue to provide a screen from the traffic on 15th Street East and as such, they contribute to the sense peace and of place along the southern side of the church.
- The primacy of the church: The church had been considered the focal point in the landscape and, as discussed within this report, the rectory is a secondary necessity. As such, the rectory should be conceived to provide the following:
 - .1 Views from priest suites focused on the church and the landscape flanking the southern side of the church. The design accomplishes this by creating a private outdoor space focused on the rear of the church and the southern hillside and the priest's suites are positioned in a wing that

²⁷ St. Mary's Church Owen Sound: Church of St. Mary of the Assumption, Owen Sound, Ontario, "Golden Jubilee" history 1871-1921, page 49.

Proposed New Rectory for St. Mary of the Assumption Roman Catholic Church

gently turns toward the church. This internal courtyard and the view of the church are the primary views from the priests' suites.

- .2 Views from the north and from the east that emphasize the size and architectural character of the church and that place the rectory in a secondary position: The proposed new rectory presents a single-storey elevation at its northern face and this façade is aligned with, but slightly behind (south) the line of the church's northern face. The views from Sixth Avenue East feature the church rising above the rectory and views from the north clearly demonstrate the primacy of the church over the single-storey rectory.
- .3 Minimize the Height of the Rectory: The small, second storey portion of the rectory is positioned above the ground level priests' suites and it houses the Pastor's suite. This higher section of the building is kept away from the northern wall of the rectory to allow the single storey nature of the rectory to dominate the northern elevation of the new building.
- .4 Retain Existing Trees: The existing trees are maintained to the south of the church and the proposed rectory and to the east of the proposed rectory. It is anticipated that there will be no need to cut a tree down in order to permit the construction. These trees will ensure that the outward appearance of the landscape is consistent with the current outward appearance of the landscape. However, the size of the church is such that it will appear dominant and rising out of the treed landscape.

F.2 Honour the features of the original rectory that represent its nature throughout its history:

The important features of the original rectory and the way in which the proposed design conserves these are as follows:

.1 General Form: The Robinson HIA, Section 5.2.1, page 30 states the following:

"What remains of the building is its original three-storey form, its distinctive footprint with a full height frontispiece facing the church and its upper level brick and fenestration."

The design proposal described below and illustrated on associated drawings retains the memory of the existing rectory in placement, shape (footprint) and most of the volume for the frontispiece or "tower" in an abstracted form. The outline of the load-bearing brick "heart" of the 1872 building in location and in its footprint is also conserved in the proposed design. The porches, Mansard roof, the three storey bulk of the existing building and the insensitive 1977 kitchen addition are considered to be unessential to the current mandate for the new rectory. As describe below, the removal of the three storey bulk of the existing rectory opens the views of the top of the church to the east making the church the dominant form from the eastern perspective.

The Robinson HIA goes on to list many situations of insensitive change made to the building on pages 30 through 32.

.2 **The Tower:** The outline of front entrance feature or "tower" that is placed in the centre of the front elevation of the original rectory is retained in new design in the form of a contemporary, red-bricked "tower" placed exactly on the location of the original entrance to the rectory. This emphasises and retains the axial nature of the rectory relative to the church together with the slight skew originally present in the siting of the 1872 rectory. The internal circulation in the proposed rectory is aligned with this tower feature.

Architectural Design Implementation Strategy

Proposed New Rectory for St. Mary of the Assumption Roman Catholic Church

- .3 **The Connecting Link**: The current rectory's connection to the church is concealed by the 1977 kitchen construction and this concealment is rectified within the new design. The new connection causes contemporary priests to make the same physical maneuver made by their predecessors: a slight jog occurring at the former rectory's front door to align with a narrow connecting link leading into the sacristy. The connecting link is proposed as a glass construction using obscured glass to minimize the effect of construction that could be seen as an extension of the church proper and to highlight this linkage as a passage or "bridge" between rectory and church.
- .4 **The Brick Walls:** The position and the outline of the 1872 rectory's load-bearing brick walls are retained within the proposed design. The new walls in the proposed design replace the existing rectory's northern wall to form the exterior wall of the dining room and the kitchen. The main interior corridor for the public areas of the new rectory replaces the central east-west corridor of the existing rectory's primary circulation (its centre-hall plan main corridor). The position of the southern side of the existing rectory's brick shell is used to define the terrace associated with kitchen, dining and living spaces. This boundary is marked with low, landscaping walls and by the extent of hard surfaces used for the terrace.
- .5 **The Courtyard Private Outdoor Space**: The terrace described above is proposed within a partially enclosed, secluded courtyard that is reminiscent of a cloister. This contemporary terrace is conceived as a private space in contrast with the open lawn beyond the existing rectory's southern porch and the parking area outside of the existing eastern rectory porch. In this way, the private outdoor space of the rectory is focused on the church and the lawn along the southern flank of the church rather than the surrounding urban landscape and parking facilities.
- .6 **Existing Trees:** The existing trees to the east and south of the existing rectory are retained. These serve to maintain consistency in the external appearance of the site when viewed from the adjacent 6th Avenue East and 15th Street East. These trees currently occlude the view of the rectory and this phenomenon will continue and the effect will be enhanced because the new rectory, as proposed, is not as tall as the current rectory. The writer recommends that a planting program should be instituted to replace aging tree specimens to retain the feeling of the landscape expressed in the "Golden Jubilee" history quoted earlier in this report.
- .7 **Site Arrangement and Parking**: The existing rectory parking area is awkwardly blended into the general parking lot and the new rectory proposal creates a narrowing in the parking area between the existing rectory garage building and the rectory itself in order to enhance the apparent separate nature of this parking area. Although any parishioner could utilize this parking area, the arrangement would act as a mild deterrent.

.8 Protection of and Enhancement of Landscape Features:

.1 The architect has corresponded with the GSCA and met on the site with a representative of the Authority to review the proposed placement of the rectory. The GVCA representative indicated that a Building Permit application to the Authority would be required, but that there should be no cause for the Authority to object to the proposal. The proposal is outside of the hazard area for slope stability identified on GSCA maps.

Proposed New Rectory for St. Mary of the Assumption Roman Catholic Church

- .2 No building construction associated with the rectory is proposed to occur immediately south of the historic church and no such construction should be permitted, although enhancement of the prospect near the entrance to the church should be given serious consideration and no prohibition on sensitive improvement to the southern landscape and in particular to the areas immediately south, west and north of the front doors of the church. Ideally, this region would be developed to reinforce the existence of the path and the prospect overlooking Owen Sound to the south.
- .3 It is the writer's opinion that development of Catholic community housing or a similar, appropriate and reasonably linear building use could be arranged along the Sixth Avenue East and 16th Street East frontages on the setback assigned to the property. Such a development could enhance the urban design in the neighbourhood and accentuate the experience of the church within the resulting urban enclosure. The church steeple and possibly part of the peaked roof could be visible above a two or three storey structure and the scale and nature of the church would be partially concealed from the eastern and northern prospects. The visitor entering the urban enclosure would potentially feel surprise, through sudden proximity, at the size of the church.

F.3 Proposed Exterior Materials:

The primary exterior materials for the new construction are as follows:

- .1 The "tower" feature referenced above and the new exterior walls would be constructed using red clay brick veneer of a shade similar to the church.
- .2 The roof of the rectory is proposed to be metal shingles, wood shingles or asphalt shingles, subject to cost analysis. The selection of shingles is intended to maintain visual parity with the church. The discussion of material relates to cost. It is understood that asphalt shingles have a relatively short service life and these initial shingles can be replaced in the future with appropriate wood or metal shingles.
- .3 Windows and doors are proposed as dark frames to match or otherwise obtain a similar effect as those used for the Parish Centre. The window shapes will be simple rectangular forms to maintain the understated role of the rectory. However, key elements, including the aforementioned "tower" and clerestory windows associated with the private chapel will act as subtle signs of important, interior functions within the rectory. Windows looking into private outdoor areas will be large and the openings will be generous.

Readers are invited to review the drawings submitted as part of the application for a Heritage Permit and the Site Plan Approval process. As is usually the case, the architectural expression and the ideas embodied in the planning are numerous and difficult to describe using text. The writer invites dialogue in person, as necessary, to complete the reader's understanding of the design proposal.

Sincerely,

Grant M. Diemert, OAA G. M. Diemert, Architect Inc., December 2, 2019.

Section E: Demolition and New Construction Strategy:

The Rectory of St. Mary of the Assumption Roman Catholic Parish, Owen Sound The Roman Catholic Episcopal Corporation of the Diocese of Hamilton in Ontario



November 2019

G. M. DIEMERT ARCHITECT INC.

Suite 201 - 957 Fourth Avenue East Owen Sound, Ontario N4K 2N9 Telephone: 519 - 376 - 1975 gdiemert@gmda.ca The following material is prepared with consideration of the drawings provided within Appendix A of this Report for the proposed new rectory at St. Mary of the Assumption Roman Catholic Church.

- .1 Identification of buildings and description of the existing situation:
- Refer figure i Building Identification and Description.
- **The original church** is now the sanctuary: The current sanctuary and the steeple were completed during 1871 are constructed on rubble stone walls with mortar in the joints. There is a crawl space with a central aisle of walkable height below the sanctuary and there is exposed earth throughout the crawl space. The crawl space is accessible from a hatch located within the original eastern wall of the sanctuary foundation wall that now separates the sacristy's basement from the sanctuary's crawl space. The earth below the church appears to be a gravel and sand mixture which is dry over the entire surface. The material appears to be stable and the sides of the central walkway are not collapsing.



Figure i: Buildings - Identification and Description

- Refer figures ii and iii.
- **The apse and sacristy** are a rectangular plan form housing the altar(s) and the apsidal form is contiguous with the end of the rectangular plan and formed by the use of 5 angled wall segments of equal width. If the apsidal form as constructed were mirrored to create a complete, segmented shape in plan, the resulting geometric shape would have 12 equal sides. This portion of the church had been constructed during 1901 and therefore, it is constructed after the rectory was built and after a small kitchen and servant quarters addition had been constructed as an addition to the rectory. The sacristy addition has a full height basement which formerly housed a Winter Chapel¹

¹ St. Mary's Church Owen Sound: Church of St. Mary of the Assumption, Owen Sound, Ontario, "Golden Jubilee" history 1871-1921, page 54.

that had pews, an organ and a seating capacity of nearly 100. The basement has a concrete floor and the foundation wall is visible within it. The foundation wall is finished with mortar parging which is typical of this time period and the parging is painted where it forms part of the finished space. The interior of the basement is partially finished as useable space and it had been in use as office space in recent memory. Added to the central face of the sacristy apse (the segment of the apse that faces east) is an extension which contains a corridor connecting the Sacristy to the rectory and a staircase leading from ground level to the basement of the sacristy. The apse is nearest the proposed new construction and the exterior side of its foundation will be exposed during demolition of the rectory and during the new construction of the proposed rectory. Although an exact foundation wall thickness cannot be determined at this time, the foundation wall appears to be in excess of 650 mm thick.



Figure ii - Sacristy Basement

Figure iii - Sacristy basement access to Main Church crawl space

- Refer appendix A, Drawings for the following commentary:
- **The Existing rectory** was completed in stages commencing during 1872 and ending with the contemporary kitchen extension completed during 1977. The rectory is connected to the eastern face of the stair and corridor extension of the sacristy, only. The sacristy, with its full basement, separates the original church (the sanctuary which is the oldest part of the building) from the existing rectory. The distance between the sanctuary and the rectory building is approximately 14m.

- The heating system for the church is located within the basement of the existing rectory. The current proposal under discussion is to establish a new boiler room within the sacristy basement that will serve the church independently. This will ensure that the church building is heated throughout the demolition and construction phases of the rectory project.
- A basement level service passage between rectory and church currently exists to permit piping and electrical wiring to pass between the buildings and this passage will be enlarged to permit the installation of a fire-rated service door and a corridor that will connect the sacristy and the new rectory's basements.
- The 1977 kitchen construction project had followed the demolition of the 1901 two-storey kitchen and servant quarters together with the walkway connecting the former rectory to the sacristy's rear door. This work had transpired without documented or apparent adverse effect to the existing sacristy. The work planned for the proposed 2020 rectory project will have a very similar scope of work immediately adjacent to the sacristy; however, the new construction that will follow demolition of the current rectory will be smaller in the immediate vicinity of the sacristy when compared with the scope of the new construction undertaken during 1977.
- Previous remedial foundation work: During 1982, the church commissioned a project to design and construct a new brick facing for the entire church building including the sacristy. Emonts Masonry had performed the construction work and Emonts masonry (Gary Emonts) is building the brick veneer on the extension to the Parish Centre that is currently under construction. This project involved excavation to the depth of existing foundations all around the church building and the casting of a new concrete foundation against the existing stone rubble walls. New footings had been placed at the base of the new wall. During this work, deficiencies in the existing foundation could have been rectified if any deleterious conditions had been uncovered and the writer assumes that any defects or damage uncovered would have been repaired.
- This masonry project is not referenced within the Robinson Heritage Impact Assessment.
- The necessity for such an extensive brick replacement speaks to the quality of the brick units utilized for the church. It is the writer's opinion that the brick units used for the original rectory have also experienced damage that must have been readily apparent on the church itself, but to an extent sufficiently great as to cause this costly project to be initiated. Nevertheless, the new foundation work is also extended around the rear of the sacristy and therefore, the original bearing conditions for the existing sacristy will be buttressed by concrete placed during circa 1980 under the direction of a structural engineer. The new work proposed will occur on each side of the connection point between the sacristy and the existing rectory.

.2 Demolition and New Construction:

Proposed new rectory and demolition of the existing rectory: The Parish intends to commence construction of the new rectory building during 2020. The current design connects with the sacristy at the face of the 1901 sacristy stair and corridor extension, only. The proposed new connection point is a narrow corridor with foundations and a full basement that will be connected to the sacristy and that could act, as necessary, to buttress the existing sacristy foundation. These new

foundations will be constructed at the elevation of the bottom of the existing foundation walls that had been cast in place during the brick replacement project.

- It is expected that the existing rubble foundation wall will be retained very effectively behind the more recent cast-in-place concrete foundation walls installed during the brick replacement project.
- Further, no disturbance of the soil below the existing sacristy foundation wall will be required. An
 opening large enough to permit a door to be installed will be cut in the eastern-most wall of the
 sacristy extension created for the corridor and stairs to permit access to the new rectory's basement
 from the basement of the sacristy.
- This new opening will be placed directly below and aligned with the existing main level doorway such that the cut in the foundation wall will have no influence on the support of the existing sacristy roof structure.
- The existing opening within the existing sacristy's rear wall has a gable roof over it and the roof bears on the sidewalls which will be unaffected by the cutting.
- The new door opening width will be restricted to the width of the opening at the main sacristy level in order to minimize the impact on the existing building.
- The new foundation walls below the new connecting link proposed between the sacristy and the proposed new rectory will be designed to buttress the sacristy or to be uncoupled from the sacristy as necessary by the design. The decision to buttress the sacristy walls or to permit both structures to move independently of one another will be made in close consultation with the structural engineer. It is likely that there will be a desire to permit the new building to act independently from the existing church.
- Professional Design Services: Incorporated into the scope of architectural services for the design of the new rectory is the design of the demolition process of the existing rectory and the documents associated with demolition will be submitted to the Chief Building Official as part of the application for a permit to construct or demolish which will be provided following the completion of the site plan control and heritage permit processes. The design team will include structural, mechanical and electrical engineering consultants qualified to perform their services and these will be under the direction of the architect. During construction, a separate, third-party engineering firm will be engaged through the construction contract as the Field Engineering Consultant who will be tasked with the responsibility to monitor the soil conditions, the status of the existing building and the effect of demolition and construction on the existing building. This firm will also verify foundation conditions and soil bearing conditions for remedial measures associated with any deleterious conditions uncovered during the work in progress or to rectify situations that threaten the existing buildings.
- Materials Testing: During the construction process, the Field Engineering Consultant will assess the bearing capacity of the soil uncovered at the base of the sacristy foundation. Given the height of the existing sacristy basement, no excavation lower than the bearing level of the sacristy foundation wall is anticipated and therefore, there would be a minimal threat to the stability of the sacristy foundation. No undermining and underpinning of the sacristy foundation will be required.

- Testing of concrete for mix and strength, the testing of the compaction of granular material used as backfill and inspection of reinforcing steel and welding will be a part of the scope of the Field Engineer during construction.

.3 Demolition Strategy:

- The architect will engage a structural engineer to provide structural engineering services for the new rectory project and to assist with the development of documents that will govern the demolition of the existing rectory.
- The demolition, new design and construction documents will specify work and processes that meet or exceed the Ontario Building Code and legislation governing demolition.
- Prior to commencement of the work, safety barriers will be erected around the area of the work which will encompass the entire territory affected by the demolition work. These will be positioned to avoid interference with pedestrian and vehicular circulation on the site including access to buildings unaffected by the work. The fencing will be positioned to maintain in clear and serviceable condition for fire and EMS emergency vehicles for the entire duration of the work.

- Refer figure iv.

- During demolition, the existing rectory will to be separated from the Sacristy along the existing construction joints. It is anticipated that this location will permit removal of the rectory elements in contact with the small area of the sacristy affected with minimal damage to the existing materials on the sacristy. As discussed above, the portion of the existing rectory that is attached to the sacristy was constructed during 1977. The joinery between the two buildings is expected to be clear and predictable.
- Due to the present distance between the rectory and the existing sanctuary, the impact of demolition and new construction on the oldest section of the church should be very slight. The greatest threat to the oldest section of the church is likely vibration.
- Demolished materials will be stockpiled to the East of the existing rectory to avoid interference with pedestrian and vehicular circulation on the site.
- Excavation for the proposed Rectory will not to be lower than the level of the exiting foundation walls and the height available within the existing sacristy is more than is required for the basement of the proposed rectory. This measure avoids underpinning work to the sacristy foundation at the connection point.
- New waterproofing materials are available at a reasonable price and these membranes will be applied to the joints formed between the existing sacristy foundation wall and the new rectory foundation wall.
- Following construction of the foundation walls and the elapse of appropriate curing time for the concrete, the excavation adjacent to the existing sacristy can be filled with compacted, well-drained backfill material.
- The balance of new foundation construction occurs a distance of approximately 6.2 meters or approximately 20'-4" from the sacristy extension. This separation will ensure that very little serious excavation and construction work will take place near the sacristy following removal of the current rectory's kitchen.



Figure iv - Existing construction join between Rectory and Sacristy

Given the history of the work around the church and particularly the work of similar scope that had occurred during the 1970's and early 1980's within close proximity to the sacristy, it is evident that construction work can be accomplished with little or no damage to the existing church building.

It is the writer's opinion that the risk to the existing church may be over-stated within the Robinson HIA and that the new work can be accomplished safely and with minimal risk to the existing building. The writer acknowledges that the designers must prepare construction and demolition contract documents thoughtfully, using good judgement. It is also important that a reasonable and appropriate level of on-site supervision by field engineering consultants is provided during construction executing a scope of work that is similar to the scope of work described above.

Readers of this material are invited to contact the undersigned to address questions or seek clarifications.

Sincerely,

Grant M. Diemert, OAA

The Rectory for St. Mary of the Assumption Roman Catholic Parish, Owen Sound The Roman Catholic Episcopal Corporation of the Diocese of Hamilton in Ontario



Architectural Drawings.

Attached 8.5" x 11" drawings are reductions. Printed to scale at ANSI "D" size Dated 2019, Dec. 04 Prepared by G.M Diemert Architect Inc. Numbered as follows:

- A1 Demolition Plan
- A2 Rebuild Plan
- A3 Site Plan
- A4 Ground Floor Plan
- A5 2nd Floor Plan
- A6 Tree Retention Plan

A7 – East & North Elevation – Comparative Existing and Proposed

A8 – View Corridor Study from 6th Ave. East & 16th Street East

A9 – View Corridor Study from C/O 15th St. & 6th Ave. E.

GM BluePlan Engineering, drawing SP1, ANSI "D" size, Parish Hall Addition, St. Mary's and the Missions, 554 15th Street East, Owen Sound Overall Site Plan Existing Conditions.

December 2019

G. M. DIEMERT ARCHITECT INC.

Suite 201 - 957 Fourth Avenue East Owen Sound, Ontario N4K 2N9 Telephone 519 - 376 - 1975 gdiemert@gmda.ca







| Zoning Statistics | |
|-------------------|--|
|-------------------|--|

Institutional Zone (Section 9) Use: Place of Worship (Section 5.17.4)

| Use. Place of Worship (Section 5.17.4) | | | | | | | |
|---|---|----------------------|--------|----------|-------------------|--|--|
| Regulations: | | Required | | Proposed | | | |
| а | Lot Frontage | | Min | 20m | 139.217m | | |
| b Lot Area | | Min | 800m² | 16'364m² | | | |
| c Lot Coverage | | Max | 60% | 10.9% | | | |
| d Front Yard Setback | | Min | 7.5m | 7.5m | | | |
| e Rear Yard Setback | | Min | 2.0m | 2.0m | | | |
| f Interior Side Yard Setback | | Min | 1.0m | 1.0m | | | |
| g Exterior Side Yard Setback | | Min | 3.0m | 3.0m | | | |
| h Building Height | | Max | 12m | 12m | | | |
| i | Landscaped Open | Space Min 250 | | 25% | 64.7% | | |
| е | Floor Space Index | ex Max 1.5 | | 1.5 | 0.11% | | |
| Parking Requirements (5.18.2) | | | | | | | |
| Exi | sting Parking: | 70 Spaces Incl. 3 Ba | arrier | Free & | 6 in garage | | |
| Re Po Loa | Required Parking: Posted Occupant Load 300 person | | | | | | |
| Proposed Parking: 70 Spaces Incl. 3 Barrier Free & (2.65mx6.0m) | | | | | 6 in garage | | |
| Building Area | | | | | | | |
| Exi | Existing Church 502m | | | | | | |
| Existing Parish Centre | | | | | 593m² | | |
| Existing Rectory | | | | | 361m ² | | |
| Existing Garages | | | | | 234m² | | |
| Existing Total | | | | | 1,691m² | | |
| Proposed New Rectory | | | | | 453m² | | |
| PROPOSED TOTAL | | | | | 1,783m² | | |
| · | | | | | | | |
| Notes | | | | | | | |
| Infromation for logal boundary was referenced from Drawing: | | | | | | | |

Infromation for legal boundary was referenced from Drawing: Parish Hall Addition, St. Mary and the Missions, SP1, April 2018, Overall Site Plan Existing Conditions, by GMBlueplan





| | Building Area (Me Level | etric) Area |
|---|--|--|
| | New Rectory Floor New Rectory 2nd Floor Grand total: 2 | 453 m² 61 m² 514 m² |
| | Building Area (Imp Level | erial) Area |
| | 1. New Rectory 2nd Floor 2. New Rectory 2nd Floor Grand total: 2 | 4873 SF 657 SF 5530 SF |
| ع | | |
| | | |
| | NORTH | |
| | G.M. DIEMERT ARCH | FOURTH AVE EAST EN SOUND, ONTARIO TE 201 |
| | St Mary of the Assumption Roman Catholic Paris Owen Sound Proposed Rectory | otion, h, |
| | Ground Floor Plan Issue Date. Scale: 1:100 WHEN PRINTED AT ANSI D 22X34 Project No. 1722 ISSUED FOR: PERMIT APPROVALS | 2019 Dec 04 |


| | Existing 6 bay garage | |
|---|--|---|
| | | |
| | | 1/- |
| | | ° — │ ∕ |
| | | |
| 7 | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| 9 | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | Reducer Norm | |
| | | |
| | 957 F OWE SUIT N4K : | OURTH AVE EAST N SOUND, ONTARIO E 201 2N9 (519) 376-1975 |
| | St Mary of the Assump Roman Catholic Parish | ition, |
| | Owen Sound Proposed Rectorv | |
| | 2nd Floor Plan | |
| | | 2019 Dec 04 |
| | Scale: 1:100 WHEN FRINTED AT ANSID 22X34 Project No. 1722 | A5 |
| | ISSUED FOR: PERMIT APPROVALS | |

 \sim

| | | ° |
|---|--|---|
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | 7 |
| No existing trees with a trunk diameter of 100m Infromation for existing tree positions and lega Parish Hall Addition, St. Mary and the Missions SP1, April 2018, Overall Site Plan Existing Conditions | nm (3,9") or more will be removed. Il boundary was referenced from Drawing: [;] , | |
| by GMBlueplan 0. Tree Retention Plan | | |
| 1.200 | | |

Spire roof:
 Oxidised lead. Grey

General quoiniing:
 Clay brick, Yellow

Spire walls:
 Clay brick, Red, with natural unstained colour mortar

Windows: Stained glass with dark metal frame & lead frames

Concrete molding: Natural unstained concrete colour

Existing Parish Hall:
 Walls: Clay brick, Red
 Quoiniing: Clay brick, Yellow
 Roof: Asphalt shingles, Brown
 Window Frames: Aluminum, Bronz.

1722 Project No. ISSUED FOR: PERMIT APPROVALS

Project No. 1722 ISSUED FOR: PERMIT APPROVALS

² View from 15th St middle

Appendix B: to the Urban Design Study

December 2019

<u>Heritage Impact Assessment</u> -<u>Rectory Building at St. Mary's and the Missions</u>, Roman Catholic Parish, Owen Sound Author: Robinson Heritage Consulting – September, 2018.

Heritage Impact Assessment

Rectory Building at St. Mary's and the Missions

Roman Catholic Parish, Owen Sound

Prepared by Robinson Heritage Consulting

for Father Wojciech Kuzma St. Mary's and the Missions 554 - 15th Street East, Owen Sound, Ontario

September 2018

Heritage Impact Assessment – Rectory Building at St. Mary's and the Missions 554 15th Street East, Owen Sound, Ontario Robinson Heritage Consulting (September 2018) Page 1

Table of Contents

| 1.0 | Executive Summary | 8 |
|-----|---|----|
| 2.0 | Study Rationale and Methodology | 10 |
| 3.0 | Legislation and Policy Framework | 11 |
| 3.1 | Planning Act | 11 |
| 3.2 | Provincial Policy Statement 2014 | 11 |
| 3.3 | Ontario Heritage Act | 12 |
| 3 | 3.1 Ontario Regulation 9/06 | 12 |
| 3.4 | City of Owen Sound Official Plan | 15 |
| 4.0 | Historical Summary | 16 |
| 4.1 | Grey County | 16 |
| 4.2 | City of Owen Sound | 17 |
| 4.3 | History of St. Mary's and the Missions Church and Rectory | 19 |
| 4.4 | Historical Plans of Owen Sound | 24 |
| 4.5 | Robert Sadler, Builder and Architect | 27 |
| 5.0 | Property Description | 28 |
| 5.1 | St. Mary of the Assumption as a Historic Place | 28 |
| 5.2 | Description of the Rectory Building | 30 |
| 5 | 2.1 Exterior | 30 |
| 5 | 2.2 Interior | 33 |

| 6.0 | Cultural Heritage Value or Interest |
|--------|--|
| 6.1 | Changes in the Ontario Heritage Act |
| 6.2 | Designation of St. Mary of the Assumption |
| 6.3 | Evaluation of the Rectory using Regulation 9/06 |
| 6.4 | Character-Defining Elements of the Rectory as a Heritage Attribute |
| 7.0 | Proposed Development, Impacts and Mitigation |
| 7.1 | Proposed Development |
| 7.2 | Potential Negative Impact of the Proposed Development46 |
| 7.3 | Recommended Alternative Options with Mitigation Measures |
| 8.0 | Conclusion |
| Inform | ation Sources |

| Figure 1 - Location of St. Mary and the Missions (Image: Google Maps 2018) |
|--|
| Figure 2 - Orthographic photo showing subject property. (Image: Google Maps 2018) |
| Figure 3 - Grey County, 1880. (Image: Illustrated Historical Atlas of Grey and Bruce Counties) |
| Figure 4 - Detail of Sydenham Township, Grey County, 1880. (Image: Illustrated Historical Atlas of Grey and Bruce Counties) |
| Figure 5 - Detail of Owen Sound, 1880. (Image: Illustrated Historical Atlas of Grey and Bruce Counties) |
| Figure 6 - Father F. X. Granottier, n.d. (Image: North Grey and Owen Sound Public Library) |
| Figure 7 - St. Mary of the Assumption church and rectory before 1901. (Image: Grey Roots Archives) |
| Figure 8 - View to east hill with church and rectory, 1880. (Image detail from Illustrated Historical Atlas of Grey and Bruce Counties)21 |
| Figure 9 - View of St. Mary's spire at cliff - seen from north, 1880. (Image: Illustrated Historical Atlas of Grey and Bruce Counties)21 |
| Figure 10 - Rectory, before 1901. (Detail from Figure 7)22 |
| Figure 11 - North wall with tie rod ends (Photo: RHC 2018) |
| Figure 12 - Detail of Owen Sound, 1880. (Image: Illustrated Historical Atlas of Grey and Bruce Counties) |
| Figure 13 - Detail from Plan of the City of Owen Sound, Compiled by W. G. Waddell (City Engineer and O.L.S.), 1935. (Image: Grey Roots |
| |
| Archives) |
| Archives) 25 Figure 14 - Detail from Fire Insurance Plan of the City of Owen Sound, 1907. (Image: Grey Roots Archives) 26 Figure 15 - Detail from Fire Insurance Plan of the City of Owen Sound, 1923. (Image: Grey Roots Archives) 26 Figure 16 - Originial cupola and 1920s clock tower on Owen Sound Town Hall and Market. (Images: Grey Roots Archives) 27 Figure 17 - Church in Val Fleury, France (Images: Google Maps 2018) 27 Figure 18 - St. Mary of the Assumption church and rectory before 1901. (Image: Grey Roots Archives) 28 Figure 19 - St. Mary of the Assumption church and rectory after 1901 (Image: Grey Roots Archives) 28 Figure 19 - St. Mary of the Assumption church and rectory after 1901 (Image: Grey Roots Archives) 28 Figure 19 - St. Mary of the Assumption church and rectory after 1901 (Image: Grey Roots Archives) 28 Figure 19 - St. Mary of the Assumption church and rectory after 1901 (Image: Grey Roots Archives) 28 |
| Archives) |
| Archives) |
| Archives) 25 Figure 14 - Detail from Fire Insurance Plan of the City of Owen Sound, 1907. (Image: Grey Roots Archives) 26 Figure 15 - Detail from Fire Insurance Plan of the City of Owen Sound, 1923. (Image: Grey Roots Archives) 26 Figure 16 - Originial cupola and 1920s clock tower on Owen Sound Town Hall and Market. (Images: Grey Roots Archives) 27 Figure 17 - Church in Val Fleury, France (Images: Google Maps 2018) 27 Figure 18 - St. Mary of the Assumption church and rectory before 1901. (Image: Grey Roots Archives) 28 Figure 20 - St. Mary of the Assumption, Owen Sound (Image: Ontario's Places of Worship Inventory) 29 Figure 21 - Rectory, Church and Parish Centre (Photo: RHC, 2018) 20 St. Rectory - front elevation. (Photo: RHC, 2018) 30 |
| Archives) 25 Figure 14 - Detail from Fire Insurance Plan of the City of Owen Sound, 1907. (Image: Grey Roots Archives) 26 Figure 15 - Detail from Fire Insurance Plan of the City of Owen Sound, 1923. (Image: Grey Roots Archives) 26 Figure 16 - Originial cupola and 1920s clock tower on Owen Sound Town Hall and Market. (Images: Grey Roots Archives) 27 Figure 17 - Church in Val Fleury, France (Images: Google Maps 2018) 27 Figure 18 - St. Mary of the Assumption church and rectory before 1901. (Image: Grey Roots Archives) 28 Figure 20 - St. Mary of the Assumption, Owen Sound (Image: Ontario's Places of Worship Inventory) 28 Figure 21 - Rectory, Church and Parish Centre (Photo: RHC, 2018) 29 Figure 22 - Rectory - front elevation. (Photo: RHC, 2018) 30 Figure 23 - Rectory c. 1921. (Photo from: St. Mary of the Assumption, Golden Jubilee, 1871 to 1921) 30 |

| Figure 25 - Re | ectory c. 1917. (Photo from: St. Mary of the Assumption, Golden Jubilee, 1871 to 1921) | 31 |
|-----------------|--|----|
| Figure 26 - Vie | ew from west. (Photo: RHC 2018) | 32 |
| Figure 27 - Vie | ew from north (Photo: RHC 2018) | 32 |
| Figure 28 - Be | efore 1980 (Photo: City of Owen Sound) | 32 |
| Figure 29 - Of | ffice in enclosed front porch showing closed in window and exposed brick wall (Photo: RHC 2018) | 33 |
| Figure 30 - As | s found drawing of first floor. (G.M. Diemert Architect Inc.) | 33 |
| Figure 31 - Of | ffice space #2 thru #5. (Photo: RHC 2018) | 33 |
| Figure 32 - Up | oper hall showing segmental arches. (Photo: RHC 2018) | 34 |
| Figure 33 - Sit | tting room 2A. (Photo: RHC 2018) | 34 |
| Figure 34 - Be | ed and sitting rooms 2B. (Photo: RHC 2018) | 34 |
| Figure 35 - As | s found drawing of second floor. (G.M. Diemert Architect Inc.) | 34 |
| Figure 36 - Th | nird floor upper hall. (Photo: RHC 2018) | 34 |
| Figure 37 - De | esignation Plaque, City of Owen Sound. (Photo: RHC 2018) | 35 |
| Figure 38 - His | storic Photo pre 1901 before apse and sancristy added. Vineyard along slope | 36 |
| Figure 39 - Vie | ew from east. (Photo: RHC 2018) | 36 |
| Figure 40 - Vie | ew from top of fire escape to church. (Photo: RHC 2018) | 37 |
| Figure 41 - De | etail highlighting detailed brickwork. (Photo: RHC 2018) | 38 |
| Figure 42 - Vie | ew of details in mansard roofline, bi-chromatic brickwork, window arches and dormer. (Photo: RHC 2018) | 39 |
| Figure 43 - Pr | oposed main floor plan and elevation. (G.M. Diemert Architect Inc.) | 42 |
| Figure 44 - Vie | ew of the parish hall addition. (Photo: RHC 2018) | 42 |
| Figure 45 - Pr | oposed Site Plan. (G.M. Diemert Architect Inc.) | 42 |
| Figure 46 - Ma | ain Floor plan for proposed new rectory. (G.M. Diemert Architect Inc.) | 43 |
| Figure 47 - Co | plour perspective drawing of proposed rectory. (G.M.Diemert Architect Inc.) | 43 |
| Figure 48 - Co | plour perspective drawing of proposed rectory. (G.M. Diemert Architect Inc.) | 44 |
| Figure 49 - Lo | ower level of the proposed rectory. (G.M. Diemert Architect Inc.) | 44 |

| Figure 50 - Colour perspective drawing of proposed rectory (G.M. Diemert Architect Inc.) | 45 |
|--|----|
| Figure 51 - Colour perspective drawing of proposed rectory. (G.M. Diemert Architect Inc.) | 45 |
| Figure 52 - View of historic rectory and church from similar angle. (Photo: RHC 2018) | 45 |
| Figure 53 - Rectory from 15th Street East through the trees with church just visible among trees. (Photo: RHC 2018) | 46 |
| Figure 54 - Detail of slope down to 15th Street East and existing rectory. (G.M. Diemert Architect Inc.) | 48 |
| Figure 55 - View from top of slope looking towards 15th Street East under the canopy of large trees. Photo: (RHC 2018) | 48 |

Client/Proponent Contact Information

Father Wojciech Kuzma St. Mary's and the Missions 554 15th Street East, Owen Sound, Ontario (519) 376-0778 wkuzma@hamiltondiocese.com

Figure 1 - Location of St. Mary and the Missions (Image: Google Maps 2018)

Figure 2 - Orthographic photo showing subject property. (Image: Google Maps 2018)

Heritage Impact Assessment – Rectory Building at St. Mary's and the Missions 554 15th Street East, Owen Sound, Ontario Robinson Heritage Consulting (September 2018) Page 7

1.0 Executive Summary

St. Mary's and the Missions Catholic Church in Owen Sound, Ontario seeks approval for the demolition of the historic parish rectory, completed c.1872 by Rev. Francois Xavier Granottier, one year after the church of St. Mary of the Assumption. The parish proposes to make an addition to the Parish Centre north of the rectory, then demolish the historic rectory to make way for a new, single-storey rectory with a walk out basement and internal courtyard. This step was taken after consideration for rehabilitating the historic rectory for the parish needs and an associated cost estimate was higher than budget permitted. The committee was further advised that new build was a less expensive way to proceed. The proposed rectory has roughly the same square footage as the historic rectory with modern amenities, layout and accessibility as some of the major improvements to be made.

As part of a complete application for building permits for the addition to the Parish Centre and to demolish and replace the historic rectory, a heritage impact assessment (HIA) has been prepared to determine the cultural heritage value or interest and heritage attributes of the subject property and to identify any impacts the development poses to the heritage attributes of the cultural heritage resource making recommendations as to how negative impacts may be avoided or mitigated.

After completing the HIA study, the consultant has found that the historic rectory building not only has physical, design, historical and associative merits unto itself but it also is a significant heritage attribute of the cultural heritage landscape of Owen Sound's "Catholic Hill" and has been so since 1872. As the rectory satisfies more than one of the criteria of Regulation 9/06 under the Ontario Heritage Act it is recommended that the building be retained, restored and rehabilitated to better serve the parish on the interior. Further, this report recommends that the designation bylaw be updated to reflect the current requirements of Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act and that it

clearly outlines the character-defining elements of the church, rectory and site as heritage attributes of the cultural heritage landscape of the St. Mary's and the Missions.

It is recommended that fundraising and grant programs be explored as well as some consideration for a staged rehabilitation of the rectory. It is also recommended that the consultants reporting, reviewing, costing and advising on the project be experienced heritage professionals with membership in the Canadian Association of Heritage Professionals.

There is also concern that demolition, heavy machinery and construction so close to the designated church may put it at risk given the knowledge that the church was built upon a base of gravel, stone and sand without footings or basement. Also, the act of constructing the proposed rectory that far out on the slope may put at risk some of the mature trees that also help to keep the slope from eroding. Either of these scenarios at the time of construction or afterward could be associated with significant damage with associated high costs of stabilization and repair. It is recommended should a new building be built at this location that engineers specializing in heritage structures and erosion protection be consulted and a contingency fund planed for in case costly repairs and stabilization are required as a result.

The consultant understands that the recommendations of this report may not be those the Building Committee hoped for. RHC's opinion is that the proposed rectory building design has merit in other ways but is not recommended for this site.

2.0 Study Rationale and Methodology

This study was undertaken according to guidelines set out in the Ontario Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport's booklet "Heritage -Resources in the Land Use Planning Process" from the *Ontario Heritage Toolkit*. A Heritage Impact Assessment is a study that:

- evaluates the significance of a cultural heritage resource;
- determines the impact that a proposed development or site alteration will have on a cultural heritage resource;
- recommends an overall approach to the conservation of the cultural heritage resource.

Research was conducted using archival and secondary source material gathered from St. Mary's and the Missions Church Archives, Grey Roots Archives, Archives of the Jesuits in Canada, and the Archives of Ontario. A site inspection and photographic documentation without any invasive or destructive measures was undertaken by Robinson Heritage Consulting on June 8,2018. The day of the inspection was warm and sunny.

3.0 Legislation and Policy Framework

3.1 Planning Act

Part 1, Section 2 of the Ontario Planning Act identifies matters of provincial interest, which includes the conservation of significant features of architectural, cultural, historical, archaeological, or scientific interest. Section 3 of the Planning Act allows the province to issue policy statements on matters of provincial interest. In respect of the exercise of any authority that affects a planning matter, Section 3 of the Planning Act requires that decisions affecting planning matters "shall be consistent with" policy statements issued under the Act.

3.2 Provincial Policy Statement 2014

The Provincial Policy Statement (issued under the authority of Section 3 of the Planning Act) was introduced in 2005 and updated April 30, 2014. PPS (2014), Section 2: Wise Use and Management of Resources, states that

Ontario's long-term prosperity, environmental health, and social well-being depend on conserving biodiversity, protecting the health of the Great Lakes, and protecting natural heritage, water, agricultural, mineral, and cultural heritage, and archaeological resources for their economic, environmental, and social benefits.

Policy 2.6.1, in Section 2.6: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology states that "significant built heritage resources and significant cultural heritage landscapes shall be conserved".

The 2014 Provincial Policy Statement provides definitions of key terms in the heritage planning process.

Built heritage resource: means a building, structure, monument, installation, or any manufactured remnant that contributes to a property's cultural heritage value or interest as identified by a community, including an Aboriginal community. Built heritage resources are generally located on property that has been designated under Parts IV or V of the Ontario Heritage Act, or included on local, provincial, and/or federal registers.

Conserved: means the identification, protection, management and use of built heritage resources, cultural heritage landscapes and archaeological resources in a manner that ensures their cultural heritage value or interest is retained under the Ontario Heritage Act. This may be achieved by the implementation of recommendations set out in a conservation plan, archaeological assessment, and/or heritage impact assessment. Mitigative measures and/or alternative development approaches can be included in these plans and assessments.

Heritage attributes: means the principal features or elements that contribute to a protected heritage property's cultural heritage value or interest, and may include the property's built or manufactured elements, as well as natural landforms, vegetation, water features, and its visual setting (including significant views or vistas to or from a protected heritage property).

3.3 Ontario Heritage Act

Typically, the significance of a built heritage resource is identified by evaluation criteria that define the characteristics that have cultural heritage value or interest to local, provincial, or federal jurisdictions. Criteria to define local cultural heritage significance is prescribed in Ontario Regulation 9/06 made pursuant to section 29(1) (a) of the Ontario Heritage Act.

3.3.1 Ontario Regulation 9/06

A property may be designated under Section 29 of the Ontario Heritage Act if it meets one or more of the following criteria for determining cultural heritage value or interest:

- 1. The property has design value or physical value because it,
 - i. is a rare, unique, representative, or early example of a style, type, expression, material, or construction method,
 - ii. displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit, or
 - iii. demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement.
- 2. The property has historical value or associative value because it,
 - i. has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization, or institution that is significant to a community,
 - ii. yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of a community or culture, or

iii. demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer, or theorist who is significant to a community.

3. The property has **contextual value** because it,

i. is important in defining, maintaining, or supporting the character of an area,

- ii. is physically, functionally, visually, or historically linked to its surroundings, or
- iii. is a landmark.

The assessment of potential impact by development on cultural heritage resources is guided by Ministry of Culture, Tourism and Sport

(MCTS) InfoSheet #5 – Heritage Impact Assessments and Conservation Plans contained within Ontario Heritage Tool Kit booklet Cultural

Heritage Resources in the Land Use Planning Process: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology Policies of the Ontario Provincial Policy Statement, 2005.¹

MCTS InfoSheet #5 describes "Principles in the Conservation of Historic Properties" as:

Respect for Documentary Evidence Do not base restoration on conjecture. **Respect for Original Location** Do not move buildings unless there is no other means to save them. Respect for Historic Material Repair/conserve rather than replace building materials and finishes, except where absolutely necessary. **Respect for Original Fabric** Repair with like materials. Respect for the Building's History Do not restore to one period at the expense of another period. Reversibility Alterations should allow a resource to return to its original conditions. Legibility New work to be distinguishable from old. Maintenance With continuous care, future restoration will not be necessary.

¹ The Provincial Policy Statement was subsequently updated in 2014.

Negative impacts on a cultural heritage resource identified in MCTS InfoSheet #5 include, but are not limited to:

- Destruction of any, or part of any, significant heritage attributes or features;
- Alteration that is not sympathetic, or is incompatible, with the historic fabric and appearance;
- Shadows created that alter the appearance of a heritage attribute or change the viability of a natural feature or plantings, such as a garden;
- Isolation of a heritage attribute from its surrounding environment, context or a significant relationship;
- A change in land use such as rezoning a battlefield from open space to residential use, allowing new development or site alteration to fill in the formerly open spaces;
- Land disturbances such as a change in grade that alters soils, and drainage patterns that adversely affect an archaeological resource.

MCTS InfoSheet #5 recommends methods of minimizing or avoiding a negative impact on a cultural heritage resource. These include, but are not limited to:

- Alternative development approaches
- Isolating development and site alteration from significant built and natural features and vistas
- Design guidelines that harmonize mass, setback, setting, and materials
- Limiting height and density
- Allowing only compatible infill and additions
- Reversible alterations
- Buffer zones, site plan control, and other planning mechanisms

3.4 City of Owen Sound Official Plan

The City of Owen Sound's Official Plan (Office Consolidation dated February 2017) includes in its goals to be a community that celebrates its cultural heritage and among its objectives seeks to recognize, respect and nurture the City's cultural heritage in making decisions and undertaking actions and to preserve and celebrate the City's unique history through architectural preservation and historical interpretation.

The City's urban design goals are to enhance the exceptional natural setting and built heritage of the City by ensuring quality urban design and protecting significant features.

The Official Plan policies state that if the City has identified a property as having significant cultural heritage value or interest, it may, when necessary, initiate the process of designating the property by bylaw under the Ontario Heritage Act. The City shall maintain a register of built heritage properties and cultural heritage landscapes within the city, including all properties designated under the Ontario Heritage Act.

All new development and public works should have regard for designated heritage resources and heritage resources listed in the Heritage Conservation and Interpretation Plan. The City encourages, wherever possible, incorporation of these resources into any development plans that may be proposed. Development and site alterations may be permitted on adjacent lands to protected heritage property where the proposed development and site alteration have been evaluated and it has been demonstrated that the heritage attributes of the protected heritage property will be conserved. Mitigative measures and/or alternative development approaches may be required in order to conserve the heritage attributes of the protected heritage property affected by the adjacent development or site alteration.

The City's **Register of Properties of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest (Heritage Register)** is a record of properties of cultural heritage value or interest. It includes not only designated heritage properties, but also other properties that Council believes are of cultural heritage value or interest - these properties are called heritage listed properties. At the time of writing this HIA report, the Heritage Register lists the St. Mary of the Assumption property as designated under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act.

4.0 Historical Summary

4.1 Grey County

Originally within the District of Wellington and forming part of the County of Waterloo for electoral purposes from 1840 until the District of Wellington was dissolved in 1849 and the United Counties of Wellington, Waterloo and Grey was formed in 1852. Grey County was named for the Charles Grey, the 2nd Earl Grey and the British Colonial Secretary's father. Waterloo County was withdrawn from this arrangement by 1853 and in 1854 the United Counties was dissolved with Wellington and Grey counties remaining. Comprised of nearly 4,662 square kilometres of land on the south shore of Georgian Bay bounded by the Counties of Simcoe, Bruce and Wellington, Grey County included the historic townships of Artemesia, Bentinck, Collingwood, Derby, Egremont, Euphrasia, Glenelg, Holland, Keppel, Melancthon, Normanby, Osprey, Proton, Sarawak, Sullivan, Sydenham and St. Vincent as well as the towns of Durham, Meaford and Owen Sound and the villages of Shelburne and Chatsworth.

Charles Rankin surveyed most of Grey County beginning in 1833 with the townships of St. Vincent and Collingwood. Settlers would need to purchase their lots generally from the Canada Company or the Crown. These lots were sold for approximately seven shillings and six pence per acre. Once the lot had been purchased, travel to the site was extremely difficult as there were few roads. Once settlers arrived in the general location of their lot it would

Figure 3 - Grey County, 1880. (Image: Illustrated Historical Atlas of Grey and Bruce Counties)

often be hard to determine the actual lot lines with few man-made features to identify them. Five acres would need to be cleared and fenced with a house built within 100 feet of the road.

The county's main gravel roads were the Garafraxa, the Durham, the Toronto and Sydenham, and the Northern. Charles Rankin surveyed the Garafraxa Road from Fergus to the mouth of the Sydenham River in the newly acquired lands from the indigenous people and laid out free grants on either side to encourage settlement. The Durham Road ran from a point in the Meaford from south of Collingwood to the shores of Lake Huron through Singhampton, Flesherton and Durham.

The Toronto and Sydenham Road was surveyed in 1848 and runs across several counties before joining the Garafraxa Road at Chatsworth.

4.2 City of Owen Sound

Charles Rankin began surveying a "town plot" for a significant population due to its location by the mouth of the Sydenham River in 1837 but shortly returned to York leaving the survey unfinished. Sydenham would be abandoned until 1841 when a newly minted Crown Lands agent Mr. Telfer and his companion Thomas Rutherford arrived as Sydenham's earliest settlers after an arduous journey by land and water from York. After making it a short way up the Sydenham River they came ashore near the historic market location and cleared land, built a log shanty and resided for the winter. In spring they built and long log shed near the historic second bridge

Figure 4 - Detail of Sydenham Township, Grey County, 1880. (Image: Illustrated Historical Atlas of Grey and Bruce Counties)

crossing and called it the "Government House" and was used to house settlers until they could clear their own lands and raise a shelter. He remained in this post for nine years until the Crown Lands office was moved to Durham and he resigned.

Charles Rankin returned to the area to continue surveying the county including the Garafraxa Road and the Town layout of Sydenham (1845) before settling in Sydenham (Owen Sound) in 1851. Meanwhile in the intervening years settlers began arriving settling largely along the Garafraxa Road and at various points at the mouth of the Sydenham River calling the place Sydenham as well. The small village grew and prospered and was considered to become a great harbour and place of significant commerce and trade. The Toronto and Sydenham Railway and the Northern Railway were both courting the community to bring the terminus of their railways to Sydenham. The community was divided, favouring one proposal over the other and were resistant to offer any financial or other concessions to the railway companies believing that it was unnecessary as they were the best and only practical terminus for any railway. While this was being debated a man named Sherriff Smith came to an agreement with the Northern Railway for the purchase of his rather swampy land as a terminus at Georgian Bay. When the offer was accepted Collingwood was founded forever dashing the hopes of a great bustling city for the Sydenham community. The community quickly learned its lesson and began to flourish in other ways and were rewarded for this ambition by being chosen over Durham for the County Seat with the county buildings being completed in 1853. The Town of Owen Sound

Figure 5 - Detail of Owen Sound, 1880. (Image: Illustrated Historical Atlas of Grey and Bruce Counties)

was incorporated in 1856 by a Special Act of Parliament with a recorded population of 1,945. Richard Carney was elected as the first mayor while William Miller was elected as Reeve to the new Town which came into effect January 1, 1857.

4.3 History of St. Mary's and the Missions Church and Rectory

Before Owen Sound had a Catholic church, Jesuit missionaries from Wikwemikong, and later from Guelph, visited periodically. St Mary's and the Missions was established in 1854 as a parish of the (then) Diocese of Toronto in Owen Sound. The first dedicated pastor for St. Mary's was Fr M. Muncog who purchased the lot and had the first small church built of stone and a rectory in wood frame. Unfortunately Fr Muncog drowned in 1856 off Walpole Island necessitating the Jesuits to minister the Catholics in the area again.

The Diocese of Hamilton, founded in 1858, sent Fr. Vincent Bardou to Owen Sound but he left due to poor health. Five years later, the Basilian Fathers arrived. First Fr. M. J. Ferguson, then Fr. John Cushing, then Fr. Francois Xavier Granottier (Figure 6), who was assistant to Fr. Cushing. The years under Fr. Granottier's care were busy ones that included the construction of the current St Mary of the Assumption church, rectory and first school as well as the mission churches in Chatsworth, the Irish Block, Wiarton, Meaford, Thornbury, Dornoch, Glenelg, Melanchthon, and Hepworth. Fr. Granottier saw

Figure 6 - Father F. X. Granottier, n.d. (Image: North Grey and Owen Sound Public Library)

the greatest need for church buildings was in the outlying missions and he was able to have a number of them built in 1870 before turning his attentions to St. Mary's in Owen Sound. He had made much change in his long service (1864-1887 and again 1890- 1901) exchanging for what he refers to as "the goat path" to the town for the lot in front of the church and in this he preserved the views to and from St. Mary's. Built in 1871, Fr. Granottier had the church design modelled upon the church of his youth in Val Fleury, France and engaged Robert Sadler, a master builder, to complete it. The building boasted steam powered heating and a cabinet organ and all necessary and fine alter furniture. The construction of the church cost \$8,075 and was opened October 1871. The three-storey brick Second Empire styled rectory was completed right afterward with the priests occupying it by 1872.

St. Mary's Rectory History by Stephen Lacroix

The following are excerpts from the St. Mary's rectory history generously provided by historian and parishioner Stephen Lacroix:

 The main entrance was directly below what are now the second and third floor bathrooms, and it faced the church. The rectangular structure beyond that was a kitchen with a housekeeper's apartment above, added to the original building sometime before early 1901. It provided a second entrance to the house, although its ground floor

Figure 7 - St. Mary of the Assumption church and rectory before 1901. (Image: Grey Roots Archives)

was about 30" lower than the rectory's. The building visible beyond that was a stable and driving shed. (Figure 7)

- The rectory was completed in 1872, a year after the church. Both were heated by steam. This picture must be dated before early 1901, as in that year the sanctuary apse and sacristy were added to the church and connected directly to the house through the main entrance.
 (Figure 7). A new front door was (then) opened on the opposite side of the house. In 1917 this was sheltered by a pillared, concrete-floored porch which ran the length of the east wall and around the corner to the west end of the south wall.
- The church's front entrance is flanked by two octagonal towers with conical peaks. The northward of these is built around a very large riveted iron water tank filled by a windmill from a spring-fed pond northeast of the rectory. From there a gravity system supplied water to the church and rectory. The spring was later captured and is now piped down the hill from the foot of 16th St. E.
- Points of interest arising from the church photo:
 - The vineyard on the south-facing slope below the church. Early clergy were French. At that time and place one made one's own wine or went without.
 - The camera position, 30 or 40 feet above present ground level. The hill to the south of what is now 15th Street was later dug away for its sand and gravel, and to allow what is now 4th Avenue to connect with 15th St. (Figure 7)
- In 1932 Father Emil Welty built the stone wall which runs up the 15th St. hill and built a shorter one on the school side, recently replaced. Around that time the vehicle entrance to the property was moved, for safety reasons, from partway down 15th St. E. to 6th Ave. E. 80 years

Figure 8 - View to east hill with church and rectory, 1880. (Image detail from Illustrated Historical Atlas of Grey and Bruce Counties)

Figure 9 - View of St. Mary's spire at cliff seen from north, 1880. (Image: Illustrated Historical Atlas of Grey and Bruce Counties)

later the postal address is still 554-15th St. E., to the confusion of 1st-time visitors.

- Sometime in the early to mid-60s the east porch with its concrete floor was walled in to provide two new offices. A few years later, parishioners excavated the crawl space under the east half of the rectory to create a proper meeting space with a stairwell to the front foyer. There was already a basement under the west (church) side of the building, housing a large steam boiler that served both church and rectory. At this time the coal-fired boiler was replaced by one fuelled by natural gas. The new east basement room was dubbed The Coal Bin in its memory.
- Heating both church and rectory with one boiler began sometime before the war. A large chimney was added to the side of the building for its flue. Access to that basement was through a wooden shed beside the chimney. In February of 1977 the shed was demolished by the collapse of a 3-storey-high icicle that had grown down from the roof.
- Original chimneys (4, with double flues) are capped, except for one flue from the 1st floor fireplace. This was in use as late as 2008. Other 1st floor fireplaces have disappeared. Until recently, circular stovepipe dimples in some 2nd floor walls indicated that the original steam heating needed the occasional boost.

Rectory Renovation

 In 1976 we found a 20-year-old letter from (parishioner & contractor) John McArthur warning of impending rectory joist failure. It said that the floor joists were 2 feet apart instead of the standard 16 inches, and that loadbearing walls from floor to floor were offset from each other by several feet.

Figure 10 - Rectory, before 1901. (Detail from Figure 7)

- In the spring of 1977 McArthur Construction undertook to raise and reinforce the 1st, 2nd & 3rd floors. They positioned steel beams under each floor's unsupported loadbearing wall, then raised all the floors simultaneously with 18 or 20 (maybe more) coordinated hydraulic jacks. Once everything was level they installed permanent steel jackposts to keep it that way.
- They also ran 3 tie rods out through the north wall between the 1st & 2nd floors to stabilize the brickwork. 5
- At the same time general contractor Laurie McConnell began the following:
 - Demolition of the old kitchen & housekeeper's quarters, construction of a new kitchen on the same level as the house, with an office on the south side and a meeting room in the basement.
 - Conversion of the concrete south porch into 3 new offices.
 - Re-partitioning of former 1st floor bedrooms into office & corridor space.
 - New plumbing and wiring everywhere, refurbished bathrooms.
 - Re-insulation of roof and 3rd floor mansard walls (badly needed, winter icicles were spectacular).
 - Converting the unfinished attic to living quarters with 4 bedrooms, a storage room and a bathroom.
 - Converting 2 windows to fire escape doors. The building permit required fire escapes, since the City classifies the building as public. Ours was donated to the parish by J. D. McArthur from an oil storage tank he was dismantling near the harbour.

Figure 11 - North wall with tie rod ends (Photo: RHC 2018)

The Basilian fathers continued their work for St. Mary's and the Missions for 145 years before they relinquished its care to the Diocesan priests when their own numbers dwindled in 2008.

The parish currently covers the northern half of Grey and Bruce counties (approximately 1/3 the area of the entire Diocese of Hamilton). Besides the Owen Sound church, there are seven missions, three elementary schools (one of them French), and a high school. Four hospitals and 12 extended care facilities round out the priests' pastoral responsibilities.

4.4 Historical Plans of Owen Sound

The Illustrated Historical Atlas of Grey and Bruce Counties, published in 1880, indicates the general location of the Roman Catholic church lands bound by streets known at that time as Garafraxa, Princess and St. Vincent (Figure 12). The 1880 plan also shows the general topography and undulating cliffs of this portion of the east hill of the city,

Figure 12 - Detail of Owen Sound, 1880. (Image: Illustrated Historical Atlas of Grey and Bruce Counties)

A plan of the City of Owen Sound was compiled by W. G. Waddell (City Engineer and O.L.S.) in 1935 from crown survey plans and subsequent plans of subdivision. Waddell's plan was updated by Hewett & Milne (O.L.S.) in 1962 and 1970. RHC has indicated in yellow the lots described as follows in Schedule A of the 1979 heritage designation by-law.

All and singular that certain parcel or tract of land and premises situate, lying and being in the City of Owen Sound, in the County of Grey and being composed of Lots 2, 3, 4 and 5 on the Northeast side of Garafraxa Street; Lot 1 on the east side of High Street South of St. Vincent Street; and Lots 1 and 2 on the west side of Princess Street South of St. Vincent Street; and Lot A on the Northeast side of Garafraxa Street in the said City of Owen Sound.

Figure 13 - Detail from Plan of the City of Owen Sound. Compiled by W. G. Waddell (City Engineer and O.L.S.), 1935. (Image: Grey Roots Archives)

Two of Charles Goad's *Fire Insurance Plans for the City of Owen Sound* were published in 1907 (Figure 14) and 1923 (Figure 15). Both plans indicate details about the buildings on the ground at St. Mary's at that time. The 1907 fire plan shows the 1901 church apse and the original 2-storey, brick kitchen addition connected to the rectory via a single-storey, wood frame corridor. The kitchen also is connected to what appears to have been a long corridor that may have been to house carriages. A detached drive shed fronts onto 16th Street East. The open porch on the south east side of the rectory is indicated by dashed lines.

By 1923 the drive shed is still there but the long stable corridor has been replaced by a detached, brick veneer out building and a detached, metal-clad garage for cars. The rectory's wrap-around verandah had been enclosed by 1917.

Figure 14 – Detail from Fire Insurance Plan of the City of Owen Sound, 1907. (Image: Grey Roots Archives)

Figure 15 - Detail from Fire Insurance Plan of the City of Owen Sound, 1923. (Image: Grey Roots Archives)

4.5 Robert Sadler, Builder and Architect

The church of St. Mary of the Assumption, under the direction of Rev. Francois Xavier Granottier, was designed by an Owen Sound architect Robert Sadler (1833-1884). The Biographical Dictionary of Architects in Canada has described Sadler as a bricklayer and builder that by 1869 had "styled himself as an architect". In this biography, Robert Hill states that Sadler's most accomplished work was the Owen Sound Town Hall and Market built in 1868-1870 at the corner of 2nd Avenue East and 8th Street South. Sadler's design provided a cupola with a non-functioning clock face (Figure 16). It was not until the 1920's that a functioning clock was included in a tall, brick clock tower (Figure 16).

Father Granottier had Robert Sadler base the design for St. Mary of the Assumption on the medieval church in Granottier's birthplace at Val-Fleury in the Loire Valley area of France (Figure 17). The proportions and forms of the stone church were closely copied to create a similar tall spire that would be a landmark from all around.

It is reasonable to surmise that Sadler also played a role in the design the rectory building.

Figure 16 - Original cupola and 1920s clock tower on Owen Sound Town Hall and Market. (Images: Grey Roots Archives)

Figure 17 - Church in Val-Fleury, France (Images: Google Maps 2018)

5.0 Property Description

5.1 St. Mary of the Assumption as a Historic Place

St. Mary of the Assumption church and its rectory have been prominent pair of buildings at the precipice of the east hill overlooking Owen Sound (Figure 18) for more than 145 years. The 1880 engraving (Figure 8) and photos taken before and after 1901 (Figures 18 & 19 respectively) show how visible these buildings were from the downtown in a way that gradually become obscured in the summer months by the growth of many mature trees. After the apse and sacristy additions was made in c.1901 the tree growth had begun to obscure views (Figure 19). Even with the church and rectory partially screened by trees the sense of place one experiences from a distance or from within the church grounds itself remains a very important spiritual and historic place for Owen Sound. It is the opinion of this consultant that St. Mary's church rectory is an important heritage attribute within the church grounds as a cultural heritage landscape.

Following Parks Canada's Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of *Historic Places in Canada* (S&Gs), the property associated with the church of St.Mary of the Assumption and its associated rectory is a historic place with heritage value. The S&Gs define the heritage value of a historic place as

"the aesthetic, historic, scientific, cultural, social or spiritual importance or significance for past, present and future generations. The heritage value of an historic place is embodied in its character-defining materials, forms, location, spatial configurations, uses and cultural associations or meanings.

Figure 18 - St. Mary of the Assumption church and rectory before 1901. (Image: Grey Roots Archives)

Figure 19 - St. Mary of the Assumption church and rectory after 1901 (Image: Grey Roots Archives)

The close relationship of this church and rectory has existed since they were built. Three significant buildings in the architectural history of the Catholic community in the area - St. Mary of the Assumption Church, the parish rectory and St. Mary's School (1891) have stood as a group of three venerable structures, each inextricably linked by their common purpose and related use. Each edifice has represented one of three important architectural styles in Owen Sound during the 19th Century - the French Gothic Revival, Second Empire and Romanesque Revival respectively.

While this Heritage Impact Assessment is focused on establishing the architectural and historical significance of the church rectory, it is necessary to introduce this building as an important member of a historic grouping of buildings. Together, these three buildings firmly established the presence of Catholic worship, ministry and education respectively for Owen Sound and its surrounding areas of Grey and Bruce Counties.

There are strong similarities in the relationship of St. Mary's buildings in Owen Sound and Guelph's 'Catholic Hill' - the Basilica of Our Lady Immaculate overlooking its city and flanked by its original 1850s rectory, convent and late Victorian school buildings.

Figure 20 - St. Mary of the Assumption, Owen Sound (Image: Ontario Heritage Trust -Ontario's Places of Worship Inventory)

Figure 21 - Rectory, Church and Parish Centre (Photo: RHC, 2018)
5.2 Description of the Rectory Building

5.2.1 Exterior

When comparing the present rectory building with historical images, we see that many alterations have occurred inside and out. Although (unlike the church itself) the rectory has retained its original bi-chromatic brick exterior on the second floor, many important character-defining elements of this built heritage resource are covered, disintegrated or removed. What remains of the building is its original three-storey form, its distinctive footprint with a full height frontispiece facing the church and its upper level brickwork and fenestration.

The three remaining chimney stacks have two flues are separated by inset red brick and each flue is accentuated by an inset panel of red brick under an arch of buff brick. Each chimney rises from a base of buff brick. The steep Mansard slope of the Second Empire roof was originally clad in a combination of square and diamond wood shingles. The roof is now clad in metal.

All ten of the original dormers are still in place and although the original casement window sashes have been replaced with modern hung sashes the semi-circular arches of each window opening have been retained. Each dormer has a segmentally arched top moulding.



Figure 22 - Rectory - front elevation. (Photo: RHC, 2018)



Figure 23 - Rectory c. 1921. (Photo from: St. Mary of the Assumption, Golden Jubilee, 1871 to 1921)

Heritage Impact Assessment – Rectory Building at St. Mary's and the Missions 554 15th Street East, Owen Sound, Ontario Robinson Heritage Consulting (September 2018) Page 30 The portion of the roof, soffit, eave and wall on the north elevation was damaged in the installation of the metal fire escape (Figure 24). All original brackets that helped to support the soffits have been removed. The installation of a later chimney stack for the heating boiler has damaged the south elevation.

The metal roof cladding beneath the fire escape on the porch roof of the southwest elevation has covered what was originally a square plan, open balcony accessed by a half-glass door below a transom off the second storey hall (Figure 24).

The brick, half wall constructed in 1917 below the verandah hand rail has become badly disintegrated and the raised column pedestals have been flattened to become part of a single band of stone. The verandah could be entered through an open bay at the southwest corner (Figure 25). What was an open colonnade was subsequently filled in with modern brick walls and windows.

Today the only integrity that remains in the verandah would be its hip roof form.



Figure 24 - South elevation (Photo: RHC, 2018)



Figure 25 - Rectory c. 1917. (Photo from: St. Mary of the Assumption, Golden Jubilee, 1871 to 1921)

The tall mansard roof is balanced by a wide frieze band created with a raised pattern of buff brick with horizontally rectangular relief panels of red brick and a denticulated bottom edge. Each of the four corners of the rectory have raised quoins of buff brick. The second-floor window heads all have a jack arch of coursed buff brick.

One original 2-over-2, wood sash window has survived within its original opening in the second storey of the north wall of the frontispiece (Figure 26). The other two frontispiece windows at that level have been widened and the sill raised with brick infill to accommodate smaller, modern bathroom windows. Figure 28 shows the pre-1901 two-storey wing with the kitchen on the lower level and housekeepers rooms above. This was replaced by a single-storey building by 1978 (Figure 27). The same photo shows that the corbelled brick tops of the three extant, original chimneys had already been removed and that the chimney in the north corner had been removed altogether.



Figure 26 - View from west. (Photo: RHC 2018)



Figure 28 - Before 1980 (Photo: City of Owen Sound)



Figure 27 - View from north (Photo: RHC 2018)

Heritage Impact Assessment – Rectory Building at St. Mary's and the Missions 554 15th Street East, Owen Sound, Ontario Robinson Heritage Consulting (September 2018) Page 32

5.2.2 Interior

First Floor

The first floor interior has seen the most significant change and less of the original features remain than the second floor with the majority to be found in the living room and dining room which includes fire place (living room), window, door and baseboard millwork and original layout.

Office 1 to the right of the front foyer has filled the original windows with builtin bookshelves and the original red brick exterior wall has been left exposed (Figure 29). On the opposite wall of Office 1 is the Living Room containing the only extant fireplace.

The area containing Offices 2 to 5 has retained no known original features (Figure 31).



Figure 30 - As found drawing of first floor. (G.M. Diemert Architect Inc.)

Heritage Impact Assessment – Rectory Building at St. Mary's and the Missions 554 15th Street East, Owen Sound, Ontario Robinson Heritage Consulting (September 2018) Page 33



Figure 29 - Office in enclosed front porch showing closed in window and exposed brick wall (Photo: RHC 2018)



Figure 31 - Office space #2 thru #5. (Photo: RHC 2018)

Second Floor

Some of the interior doors on the second floor are in their original locations but several leading off the hall have been closed in. The extant interior doors, window casings and baseboards are in their original form. Of note are the double segmental arches the top of the stairs in the upper hall and balustrade(Figure 32).

Door and window trims and baseboard have all been retained in Bedrooms and Sitting Rooms 2A and 2B (Figures 33 & 34)



Figure 34 - As found drawing of second floor. (G.M. Diemert Architect Inc.)

Third Floor

Apart from a high ceiling there are no known interior original features retained in the third floor interior as this was an unfinished space originally (Figure 36).

Heritage Impact Assessment – Rectory Building at St. Mary's and the Missions 554 15th Street East, Owen Sound, Ontario Robinson Heritage Consulting (September 2018) Page 34





Figure 33 - Sitting room 2A. (Photo: RHC 2018)



Figure 32 - Upper hall showing segmental arches. (Photo: RHC

2018)

Figure 35 - Bed and sitting rooms 2B. (Photo: RHC 2018)



Figure 36 - Third floor upper hall. (Photo: RHC 2018)

6.0 Cultural Heritage Value or Interest

6.1 Changes in the Ontario Heritage Act

Since the St. Mary of the Assumption property was designated under the Ontario Heritage Act in 1979, provincial legislation, regulations and polices have evolved making heritage property evaluation more rigorous through the establishment of statements of significance and the requirement to identify heritage attributes and their character-defining elements to help in the understanding of why a built heritage resource or a cultural heritage landscape may have cultural heritage value or interest.

The main change in the process of heritage property evaluation came in 2006 with the introduction of Ontario Regulation 9/06 under the Ontario Heritage Act. "9/06" provides criteria to be used to determine cultural heritage value or interest. In 2018, a municipal council must consult its heritage advisory committee and be satisfied that the property meets at least one of the criteria of the regulation before it can be designated under section 29 of the Act.

In order for a property to have cultural heritage value or interest, it must satisfy at least one of the following three criteria set out in Ontario Regulation 9/06 under the Ontario Heritage Act. A property may be designated under Section 29 of the Ontario Heritage Act if it meets one or more of these criteria for determining cultural heritage value or interest.



Figure 37 - Designation Plaque, City of Owen Sound. (Photo: RHC 2018)

6.2 Designation of St. Mary of the Assumption

In August 1979, just five years after the Ontario Heritage Act was created, the Corporation of the City of Owen Sound approved By-law No. 1979-15 which designated the real property and premises known as St. Mary of the Assumption at 554-15th Street East as being of architectural and historical value or interest.

The property (land and premises) of St. Mary of the Assumption in Owen Sound is designated under section 29, Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act and therefore is a protected property as defined by the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS). The church and rectory are therefore significant built heritage resources that, along with significant cultural heritage landscapes, "shall be conserved" according to provincial policy.

The church of St. Mary of the Assumption is the most significant building on the property as it is the most prominent architecturally and houses the sanctuary for the congregation to worship. The immediate surroundings, topographic context and relationship of the church to the rectory is key to understanding the property's full cultural heritage value or interest. The property location at the edge of the hill at 15th Street East looking over the city and its pairing with the rectory building create a unique and valuable cultural heritage landscape.



Figure 38 - Historic Photo pre 1901 before apse and sancristy added. Vineyard along slope.



Figure 39 - View from east. (Photo: RHC 2018)

6.3 Evaluation of the Rectory using Regulation 9/06

RHC has evaluated the rectory beside St Mary of the Assumption using Regulation 9/06 under the Ontario Heritage Act. The regulation is used to determine cultural heritage value or interest by the application of three criteria – design/physical value, historical/associative value, or contextual value. Interpretation of the prescribed criteria may be found in *Heritage Property Evaluation: A Guide to Listing, Researching and Evaluating Cultural Heritage Property in Ontario Communities* provided by the Ministry of Culture, Tourism and Sport in the *Ontario Heritage Toolkit.*²

Design or Physical Value

The extant form of the original rectory building at St. Mary of the Assumption is a fine and representative example of Second Empire style popular in the mid-late Victorian era of Canadian architectural design. The original exterior displays a high degree of craftsmanship in its bi-chromatic brick construction method.

Historical value or associative value

The rectory has historical value and direct association with an institution that is significant to the Owen Sound community and the surrounding counties in that it played (and continues to play) an important role in the accommodation



Figure 40 - View from top of fire escape to church. (Photo: RHC 2018)

² http://www.mtc.gov.on.ca/en/publications/Heritage_Tool_Kit_HPE_Eng.pdf

Heritage Impact Assessment – Rectory Building at St. Mary's and the Missions 554 15th Street East, Owen Sound, Ontario Robinson Heritage Consulting (September 2018) Page 37 of the ministry of Catholic faith in Owen Sound and throughout the parish in Grey and Bruce Counties. The rectory was built to house priests that travelled to serve parishioners across the two counties for over 145 years. The rectory has direct association with two significant people in Owen Sound's community history as it was built under the direction of Rev. Francois Xavier Granottier and was designed by Owen Sound builder and architect Robert Sadler.

Contextual Value

The rectory at St. Mary of the Assumption is a heritage attribute within the church grounds as a cultural heritage landscape. The rectory is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of the church grounds setting and is functionally, visually and historically linked to its surroundings. Since its construction c.1872, the rectory has been a part of the view that has long established St. Mary of the Assumption as a landmark in the City of Owen Sound.



Figure 41 - Detail highlighting detailed brickwork. (Photo: RHC 2018)

6.4 Character-Defining Elements of the Rectory as a Heritage Attribute

The recommended heritage character-defining elements of the c.1872 rectory at St. Mary and the Missions in Owen Sound are as follows;

- 3-storey form and frontispiece of the original rectory as a representative example of Second Empire architectural style in Owen Sound
- original mansard roofline form
- three original brick chimneys
- ten original dormers
- exterior of bi-chromatic (red and buff) brick (walls) with raised brick frieze band under soffit and raised brick quoins
- location of the rectory behind the apse of the church of St. Mary of the Assumption
- view of the original pairing of the church and rectory as seen from 15th Street East



Figure 42 - View of details in mansard roofline, bi-chromatic brickwork, window arches and dormer. (Photo: RHC 2018)

7.0 Proposed Development, Impacts and Mitigation

The assessment of potential impact by development on cultural heritage resources is guided by Ministry of Culture, Tourism and Sport (MCTS) InfoSheet #5 – Heritage Impact Assessments and Conservation Plans contained within Ontario Heritage Tool Kit booklet Cultural Heritage Resources in the Land Use Planning Process: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology Policies of the Ontario Provincial Policy Statement, 2005.³

MCTS InfoSheet #5 describes "Principles in the Conservation of Historic Properties" as:

Respect for Documentary Evidence

Do not base restoration on conjecture.

Respect for Original Location

Do not move buildings unless there is no other means to save them.

Respect for Historic Material

Repair/conserve rather than replace building materials and finishes, except where absolutely necessary.

Respect for Original Fabric

Repair with like materials.

Respect for the Building's History

Do not restore to one period at the expense of another period.

Reversibility

Alterations should allow a resource to return to its original conditions.

Legibility

New work to be distinguishable from old.

Maintenance

With continuous care, future restoration will not be necessary.

³ The Provincial Policy Statement was subsequently updated in 2014.

Heritage Impact Assessment – Rectory Building at St. Mary's and the Missions 554 15th Street East, Owen Sound, Ontario Robinson Heritage Consulting (September 2018) Page 40

Negative impacts on a cultural heritage resource identified in MCTS InfoSheet #5 include, but are not limited to:

- Destruction of any, or part of any, significant heritage attributes or features;
- Alteration that is not sympathetic, or is incompatible, with the historic fabric and appearance;
- Shadows created that alter the appearance of a heritage attribute or change the viability of a natural feature or plantings, such as a garden;
- Isolation of a heritage attribute from its surrounding environment, context or a significant relationship;
- A change in land use such as rezoning a battlefield from open space to residential use, allowing new development or site alteration to fill in the formerly open spaces;
- Land disturbances such as a change in grade that alters soils, and drainage patterns that adversely affect an archaeological resource.

MCTS InfoSheet #5 recommends methods of minimizing or avoiding a negative impact on a cultural heritage resource. These include, but are not limited to:

- Alternative development approaches
- Isolating development and site alteration from significant built and natural features and vistas
- Design guidelines that harmonize mass, setback, setting, and materials
- Limiting height and density
- Allowing only compatible infill and additions
- Reversible alterations
- Buffer zones, site plan control, and other planning mechanisms

7.1 Proposed Development

The site plan, floor plans and colour perspective drawings for the proposed development have been prepared by G. M. Diemert Architect Inc. with assistance from Marilyn Trudell and David Trudell (Civil Engineer).

The proposed development involves two parts. The first would be to construct an addition to the east gable wall of the existing Parish Centre to create office space separate from the rectory building. The design of the addition would use the same architectural vocabulary of the existing Parish Centre building using red brick to match. It is recommended that details such as buff brick window heads and the simulated bull's eye window or vent near the peak of the existing gable wall be incorporated into the design of the proposed addition.



Figure 45 - Proposed Site Plan. (G.M. Diemert Architect Inc.)



Figure 43 - Proposed main floor plan and elevation. (G.M. Diemert Architect Inc.)



Figure 44 - View of the parish hall addition. (Photo: RHC 2018)

Heritage Impact Assessment – Rectory Building at St. Mary's and the Missions 554 15th Street East, Owen Sound, Ontario Robinson Heritage Consulting (September 2018) Page 42 Following the construction of the Parish Centre addition and occupation by Parish staff, the rectory and all buildings connected to the single-storey gable roof portion to the church apse would be completely demolished with the exception of the boiler system that is intended to continue heating the church and subsequently the new rectory.

The proposed rectory would have square footage roughly similar to the original rectory but in a single-storey spreading down the slope toward 15th Street East. The grade would allow walk-in access to two basement suites on the south elevation. The new building is to accommodate three priests, a seminarian and two guests.

The proposed floor plans show three suites, two guest rooms, a dining room and kitchen as well as a chapel/library on the ground floor (Figure 46) with two suites and a mechanical room on the basement level (Figure 49). The ground floor plan is a U-shape that creates a cloister or open quadrangle with a walkway colonnade on three sides. The proposed rectory turns inward unlike the 1872 rectory which developed an external colonnade by adding the porch as seen in Figure 25.

According to a feasibility study of this project by the Diocese of Hamilton (dated March 2018):

There is an attempt in this design to build suites around a courtyard with natural space in a private setting. It is intended to have a



Figure 46 - Main Floor plan for proposed new rectory. (G.M. Diemert Architect Inc.)



Figure 47 - Colour perspective drawing of proposed rectory. (G.M.Diemert Architect Inc.)

Heritage Impact Assessment – Rectory Building at St. Mary's and the Missions 554 15th Street East, Owen Sound, Ontario Robinson Heritage Consulting (September 2018) Page 43 monastic feel. The commitment to privacy within community has been achieved in this plan.

The Diocese has stated that it is preferred that the project creates a rectory that is barrier free, handicap accessible and senior friendly. There are ways to create such conditions when conserving a multi-storey heritage building. The removal of items that are not considered heritage character-defining elements and the sensitive introduction of an elevator would go a long way in creating an accessible rectory.

It has been recommended by the building condition assessment (Lanhak Consultants Inc.) that the existing rectory building is salvageable. Lanhak goes on to state that the building has problems and deficiencies that require major renovations to extend its life for a limited number of years and that renovation of the existing rectory "would only delay the inevitable". It is not clear what in this case is "inevitable". The eight conservation principles recommended by the provincial guidelines (cited above) advise that when conservation and maintenance are done properly - with continuous care, future restoration will not be necessary.

The Diocese has supported the construction budget estimation (Allen-Hastings Limited) of a \$400,000 addition to the Parish Centre to house the parish offices and to build a new 5,000 square foot rectory at a cost of \$1.7 million chosen over the \$3 million option to fund a rehabilitate the original rectory. It is not clear if the option to rehabilitate included the cost of an



Figure 48 - Colour perspective drawing of proposed rectory. (G.M. Diemert Architect Inc.)



Figure 49 - Lower level of the proposed rectory. (G.M. Diemert Architect Inc.)

elevator or if both options included the cost associated $($154,000)^4$ with the demolition of the c. 1872 rectory.

Lanhak Consultants Inc. and Allen-Hastings Limited are recommending that the existing rectory is salvageable but with a higher price tag. They feel it is "cheaper and more cost effective to build a new building than to renovate". This line of thinking has only considered the monetary cost of the situation. In full-cost accounting it is important to consider the loss of cultural heritage value when demolition is proposed for a building that in the opinion of a qualified heritage consultant has been identified as a significant built heritage resource and a heritage attribute of the St. Mary of the Assumption cultural heritage landscape.

Demolition that is intended to salvage character-defining elements of a built heritage resource is generally more costly than traditional, indiscriminate demolition with a backhoe. Proper heritage conservation requires the advice of heritage professionals with experience that involve traditional construction methods and materials for structural assessments and costing advice. The reports also note that deferred or inappropriate alterations is part of the problem and associated costs⁵.

A current example of practical compromise made by the Diocese of Hamilton that will conserve a significant listed (but not designated) built heritage

Heritage Impact Assessment – Rectory Building at St. Mary's and the Missions 554 15th Street East, Owen Sound, Ontario Robinson Heritage Consulting (September 2018) Page 45



Figure 50 - Colour perspective drawing of proposed rectory (G.M. Diemert Architect Inc.)



Figure 51 - Colour perspective drawing of proposed rectory. (G.M. Diemert Architect Inc.)



Figure 52 - View of historic rectory and church from similar angle. (Photo: RHC 2018)

 ⁴ Allen-Hastings Budget Report pg. 3
⁵ Lanhak Report pg. 5

resource within an identified cultural heritage landscape is the partial demolition and creative rehabilitation currently underway at the Guelph Parish Rectory. The first and second floors are being rehabilitated with suites and communal rooms to accommodate retired priests while the third and fourth floors will be mothballed until required. It is important to note that that elevator being installed goes to the top floor with a view to future rehabilitation of those floors. This is an example of partial demolition of unsympathetic alterations, restoration of the exterior heritage character-defining elements and renovation of interiors to meet modern needs and accessibility all within a responsible staged rehabilitation.⁶

7.2 Potential Negative Impact of the Proposed Development

The most detrimental of negative impacts that a proposed development can have on a cultural heritage resource is the destruction or demolition of any, or part of any, significant heritage attributes or character-defining elements. Partial demolition is often a necessary action when elements with no cultural heritage value need to be removed before rehabilitation may begin. The heritage character-defining elements recommended for retention and incorporation into the proposed development are limited to the original, 3storey building (identified in the Lanhak report as "Area A"). There is no reason to object to a partial demolition of the balance of the current rectory building elements. The Ontario Heritage Toolkit advises that when evaluating a cultural heritage property using 0. Reg. 9/06 we need to consider the integrity and physical condition of the subject property.

A cultural heritage property does not need to be in original condition. Few survive without alterations on the long journey between their date of origin and today. Integrity is a question of whether the surviving physical features (heritage attributes) continue to represent or support the cultural heritage value or interest of the property

Some cultural heritage properties are found in a deteriorated state but may still maintain all or part of their cultural heritage value or interest. The ability of the structure to exist for the long term and determining at what point repair and reconstruction erode the integrity of the heritage attributes, must be weighed against the cultural heritage value or interest held by the property.



Figure 53 - Rectory from 15th Street East through the trees with church just visible among trees. (Photo: RHC 2018)

Heritage Impact Assessment – Rectory Building at St. Mary's and the Missions 554 15th Street East, Owen Sound, Ontario Robinson Heritage Consulting (September 2018) Page 46

⁶ The Guelph parish has retained Larkin Architects, Tacoma Engineers and Collaborative Structures Ltd. to carry out the rehabilitation of their parish rectory.

As the proposed rectory design builds closer to 15th Street East, it would be more visible on the south slope than the existing rectory and would impact the principle view of the cultural heritage landscape. The new rectory could be perceived in the foreground as opposed to in line with and therefore secondary to the church as with the location and design of the historic rectory.

The hill supporting the church is also mostly sand and gravel, 60 feet or more above bedrock. In 1979-80, when the church needed new brick walls to cover the spalling and disintegrating older ones, it was discovered to have no footings. Except for the sanctuary apse, which has a basement, the whole structure simply sits on top of the ground, and has for a century and a half, on an 18" bed of loose stones. Despite the differential loading of walls and tower, and at least 3 minor earthquakes (2000, 2005, 2010), there's been no sign of settling or cracking. Engineer consultants say, "Do not dig under the church! Do not dig near the church! Do keep trees on the hill to consolidate and stabilize it!" (The parish hymn is "The Church's One Foundation is Jesus Christ our Lord.") In the early 1980s, new footings were poured around (not under) the church walls, shallow but with a wide footprint, to support the new outer layer of brick.

In the mid 1990s excavation for the Parish Centre was shored up on the church side by a concrete buttress wall. Sand, gravel and clay were removed far below basement level to reach a layer solid enough for the new structure, then replaced by truckloads of compacted fill, up to the present basement level. The concrete buttress remains in place...⁷.

This advice and experience with other areas on the site should go further in warning that the costs of a new building could be significantly higher than quoted to date and the risks to the church itself even more so. The extent and type of excavation and compaction activity even before the construction begins adds risks that should be addressed by an engineer with proven experience with heritage conservation and a member in good standing with the Canadian Association of Heritage Professionals so that the parish is making fully informed decisions.

⁷ St Mary's Church and Rectory Research, Stephen Lacroix

The excavation for the new rectory foundation may also put at risk the root system of the large, mature trees on the slope leading to 15th Street East. Diemert Architect's existing condition site plan (Figure 54) indicates tree crown sizes but these do not necessarily match the apparent size of the same trees seen in Figure 55.

The existing, mature tree canopy and the steep slope of the bank dropping down to 15th Street East appears to already provide a significant amount of privacy for the rectory. The lawn and garden area between the church, rectory and slope to the road also can be enjoyed for its sense of seclusion from the traffic below. It would seem possible to add to the privacy currently available on the rectory grounds by simply extending a new cloister-like structure with fencing and landscaping out from the historic rectory to create a new courtyard.

The proposed rectory is more in keeping with the parish hall than St. Mary's church and its cultural heritage landscape. Not unlike urban sprawl, the tendency when looking to design for accessibility is long low structures but technology and simple mechanics like elevators provide so much more opportunity for creative solutions.

The proposed design is a good likeness of the Parish Hall and its low form does not project as much modern built form in the way of views of the church except from the south where it comes into the foreground because it is not built in line with the church but rather in front of the south façade of the church. The most significant views of the church and any rectory historic or proposed are from



Figure 54 - Detail of slope down to 15th Street East and existing rectory. (G.M. Diemert Architect Inc.)



Figure 55 - View from top of slope looking towards 15th Street East under the canopy of large trees. Photo: (RHC 2018)

the south all along 15th Street East and from the west at the front of the church. The common approach the church complex is now from the parking area but it is important to remember the historical significance of the outward face of the property.

In good heritage practice where alterations to heritage sites are made, and in particular to designated sites, additions and alterations are kept back beyond the most significant facades in order to reduce the impact to the cultural heritage resource. The proposed rectory projects beyond the two most historically significant facades (the south and west or front of the church) forever altering the intended design for the church and rectory which goes beyond the negative impact of the demolition itself.

7.3 Recommended Alternative Options with Mitigation Measures

Robinson Heritage Consulting recommends the following options for development as proposed in the form of demolition of the historic rectory and in order of preference based on the level of negative impact of each.

1. Retain the exterior form of the original 3-storey rectory, conserving its character-defining elements; removing or retaining and altering building elements that connect it to the church; rehabilitating the rectory interior to achieve the needs of the parish by improving accessibility with introduction of an elevator; establishing appropriately sized doorways, washrooms and bed/sitting room suites.

2. If the parish community cannot find a way to embrace the historic rectory and rehabilitate it to support parish needs to reach out and find a community partner that may be willing to do so and relocate the new rectory space away from the church. Finding partners that have a compatible use to the spiritual and practical service St. Mary's provides the community.

3. If the historic rectory should be found to have no possibility for restoration and/or rehabilitation, as confirmed by multiple heritage professional disciplines, a new design for a replacement rectory should be achieved by reducing the negative impacts outlined in this report.

8.0 Conclusion

After completing this study, the consultant has found that the rectory building not only has historical, associative and design merit unto itself but it is a significant heritage attribute of the cultural heritage landscape of St. Mary's and the Missions on Owen Sound's "Catholic hill" and has been so since 1871. As the rectory satisfies more than one of the criteria of Regulation 9/06 under the Ontario Heritage Act it is recommended that the original building be retained, restored and the interior rehabilitated to better serve the parish.

While the consultant respects the need for the parish to have a rectory that meets requirements of modern living and privacy we also believe that the loss of the original rectory would be a significant negative impact to the cultural heritage landscape. Having witnessed so

many buildings that have been rehabilitated to continue to serve the function for which they were created while being brought up to modern standards, we believe that St. Mary's rectory would be an excellent example.

Demolition is not recommended except for partial demolition of unsympathetic later additions and alterations in order to restore the original character-defining elements or to make improvements to existing additions to make them more functional and sympathetic to the character of the heritage building.

As part of the scope of this report there is a review of the proposed new rectory and comments have been provided. While there are merits to the design it is not recommended for this site.

It is recommended that fundraising and grant programs be explored as well as some consideration for a staged rehabilitation of the rectory. It is also recommended that the consultants reporting, reviewing, costing and advising on the project be experienced heritage professionals familiar with this building age and type and have membership in the Canadian Association of Heritage Professionals.

Further, this report recommends that the designation bylaw be updated to reflect the current requirements of Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act and that it clearly outlines the character-defining elements of the church, rectory and site as heritage attributes of the cultural heritage landscape of St. Mary's and the Missions.

Information Sources

Architectural History

Blumenson, John. Ontario Architecture: A Guide to Styles and Building Terms (1784-1984). (Toronto: Fitzhenry & Whiteside, 1990) Ontario Heritage Trust. *Ontario's Places of Worship Inventory*. <u>https://www.heritagetrust.on.ca/en/places-of-worship/places-of-worship-database</u>

Maps

Google Maps, 2018

McGill County Atlas Project <u>http://digital.library.mcgill.ca/countyatlas/grey.htm</u>

Illustrated Historical Atlas of Grey and Bruce Counties (Toronto: H. Beldon & Co., 1880)

Charles Goad, *Fire Insurance Plans for the City of Owen Sound*. Toronto: (1907, 1923 and 1931) located in the Grey Roots Archives Collection, Owen Sound.

Policy and Legislation

Ontario Heritage Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. 0.18

Ontario Regulation 9/06 (under the Ontario Heritage Act)

Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. P.13

Provincial Policy Statement (2014), Policy 2.6.3.

"Heritage Property Evaluation: A Guide to Listing, Researching and Evaluating Cultural Heritage Property in Ontario Communities" in the *Ontario Heritage Toolkit*, (Toronto: Queen's Printer for Ontario, 2006) available online at: http://www.mtc.gov.on.ca/en/publications/Heritage_Tool_Kit_HPE_Eng.pdf

"Heritage Resources in the Land Use Planning Process" from the within the Ontario Heritage Toolkit. Ministry of Tourism, Culture, and Sport (Toronto: Queen's Printer for Ontario, 2000)

Owen Sound Official Plan, Office Consolidation dated February 2017

Owen Sound LACAC files

Heritage Impact Assessment – Rectory Building at St. Mary's and the Missions 554 15th Street East, Owen Sound, Ontario Robinson Heritage Consulting (September 2018) Page 52

General

Melba Morris Croft. Fourth Entrance to Huronia (The History of Owen Sound), 1980, pp. 124, 127 and 177. Robinson Heritage Consulting. St. Mary's High School, Owen Sound: Cultural Heritage Property Evaluation, February 2008.

Parish and Diocese

Basilian Centennial 1863-1963, Owen Sound Missions

Church of St. Mary of the Assumption, Owen Sound, Ontario, Golden Jubilee 1871-1921.

Diocese of Hamilton. Diocesan Feasibility Study for the Renewal of the Parish Office and the Rectory: St. Mary's and the Missions (Mar 2, 2018)

Allen-Hastings Limited. Proposed Construction Budget for a New Rectory (Jan 15, 2018)

Roop Chanderdat and Associates Incorporated. Designated Substance Survey (DSS) (Sept 25, 2017)

Lanhak Consultants Incorporated. Building Condition and Assessment: Rectory at St. Mary's Parish and the Missions (Feb 27, 2017)



Appendix C: to the Urban Design Study

December 2019

Structural Condition Assessment, Rectory at St. Mary's and the Missions Author: the Engineering Company, dated September 25, 2018.







STRUCTURAL CONDITION ASSESSMENT

Rectory at St. Mary's and the Missions

Prepared for:

Father Wojciech Kuzma The Roman Catholic Episcopal Corporation of the Diocese of Hamilton in Ontario

BRENT FREIBURGER, P.ENG SENIOR ENGINEER, PROJECT MANAGER 8

294 Stickel Street, Port Elgin, Ontario NOH 2C1 Direct: 519-375-7886 brent@theengineeringcompany.ca theengineeringcompany.ca



September 25, 2018

The Roman Catholic Episcopal Corporation of the Diocese of Hamilton in Ontario 700 King St. West, Hamilton, Ontario L8P 1C7

Attn: Fr. Wojciech Kuzma

Re: Structural Condition Assessment of St. Mary's Rectory

Dear Sir:

At the request of Fr. Wojciech Kuzma, on behalf of The Roman Catholic Episcopal Corporation of the Diocese of Hamilton in Ontario (Client), Mr. Brent Freiburger P.Eng, The Engineering Company Ltd. (TEC) completed a structural condition assessment of the existing rectory at St. Mary's Parish and the Missions located at 554 15th Street East, Owen Sound, Ontario.

It is our understanding that the Parish and the Diocese are concerned about the condition of the existing structure and have requested that a visual structural condition assessment be completed to determine if the existing structure is suitable for the existing occupancy's. In addition, the client requested that a list of deficiencies and any necessary remediations be included within the report.

It should be noted that the structural condition assessment that was completed by The Engineering Company Ltd. was limited to a visual non-destructive review of the structure. The existing structure was assessed to Part 4 of the 2012 Ontario Building Code and all other applicable codes and standards.

If you have any questions or comments regarding the content of this report, please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned at your earliest convenience.

Yours Sincerely,

Brent Falign

Brent Freiburger, P.Eng Sr. Structural Engineer Director - The Engineering Company





Table of Contents

| BACKGROUND INFORMATION |
|---|
| BUILDING DETAILS |
| ASSESSMENT4 |
| PERSONNEL |
| OBSERVATIONS |
| Third Floor / Roof Framing |
| Second Floor Framing |
| First Floor Framing |
| Basement Framing6 |
| Interior Walls7 |
| Exterior Walls8 |
| CODE REVIEW - DESIGN LOADS |
| Roof Loading9 |
| 2 nd and 3 rd Floor Loading |
| 1 st Floor Loading10 |
| CONCLUSSIONS |
| RECOMMENDATIONS |
| EXCLUSSIONS12 |
| CLOSING |

List of Appendix

APPENDIX A - Photographs



BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The rectory is a three (3) story building that was originally constructed adjacent to the Parish center. The documentation provided states that the original building was construction in 1872 and was separate from the Parish center. The original building was constructed as a two story (with attic) and partial basement and crawl space. The building was originally intended to be the principal residence for the priests. However, in the following years subsequent building additions were completed that drastically changed the nature of the structure.

In 1901 the sanctuary apse and sacristy were built onto the church and connected to the Rectory through the main entrance located on the west side of the building. A new primary entrance was constructed at the east side of the building which was later sheltered with a porch that ran along the east and south sides of the building.

In the mid 1960's the existing porch along the east side of the building was walled in to provide additional office space. Documentation provides conflicting information as it is claimed that both of the porches along the east and south sides of the building were concrete floored porch however inspection confirmed that along the south side there is a crawl space with wood floor. In the 1960's the partial basement on the east side of the building was fully excavated to create an additional meeting area with a new stairwell to the east foyer.

The documentation provided indicates that in 1976 they found a 20 year-old-letter, which would indicated that it was written in 1956. However, after reviewing the content it is more likely that the letter was written in 1976 and found in 1996. The letter indicates that the existing structure had significant structural issues and there was concern about impending structural failure as the joists were only spaced at 20" on center instead of the standard 16" on center. It was also claimed that the load bearing walls between floors were offset from each other by several feet.

In the spring of 1977, a significant renovation was completed to repair and reinforce the existing structure. Additional steel beams were installed under the load bearing walls where they were currently offset from each other. The floor was raised where it currently had been sagging and new steel posts had been installed. The movement of the structure had been so drastic that three (3) tie rods were installed in the flooring assembly between the 1st and 2nd floors to stabilize the exterior brickwork. In addition, the south porch was converted into three (3) new offices, the first floor was re-partitions to remove the bedrooms and to create additional office space, converted the attic space into new living quarters, and removed two (2) windows to install the required fire escape.

In the late 1980's or early 1990's a single-story addition was built on the west end of the building. This addition created a connection between the rectory and the Parish Center while also providing a kitchen, bathroom, office, and laundry area on the main floor in addition to a meeting / assembly area in the basement.

The background information was obtained from the documentation provided by the Church building committee and the Building Condition Assessment report prepared by Lanhack Consultants Inc.





BUILDING DETAILS

The building was originally designed as the primary residence for the priests. Based on the age of the structure, and the type of construction it is our opinion that the building was constructed using the standard practices for residential construction prevalent at that time for residential buildings.

However, after reviewing the details and conditions of the structure the following points need to be considered in our assessment:

- The structure is attached to the Parish center with no firewall between the structures. The total building area of the rectory and the parish center exceeds 600m² which, in turn, exceeds the maximum size for a part 9 building and should be assessed in accordance with Part 3 and Part 4 of the building code.
- The structure has an office area on the main floor that is approximately 40% of the first-floor square footage.
- The remaining section of the main floor is a kitchen, dinning room, communal living / TV room, and prayer room. These common areas of the building are occupied by volunteers, who provide services to the residence.
- The upper two floors of the building are living quarters and bathrooms facilities for both the resident and visiting priests. There are common hallways and stairways as the primary path of travel for egress. In the current configuration there are potentially 4 bedrooms on the 2nd floor and 5 bedrooms on the 3rd floor.
- The west portion of the basement below the original structure is currently being used for the mechanical area with the east portion begin used for storage.
- The basement below the 1980's building addition is an assembly occupancy for community groups to use for meetings / gatherings/ etc. There are no fire separations (vertical or horizontal) separating the space from the rest of the building.

ASSESSMENT

The site assessment of the building was completed on August 15th, 2018. The structural condition assessment was a visual non-destructive review of the existing structure and was completed in accordance with the Professional Engineers Ontario Guideline - "Structural Condition Assessments of Existing Buildings and Designated Structures". It should be noted that during the assessment no material samples were taken, and no local demolition of the structure was undertaken.

The intent of the assessment is to:

- 1) Verify the adequacy of the primary structural systems to the extent possible using non-destructive methods.
- 2) Survey the condition of the building to identify:
 - a. structural construction defects;
 - b. signs of structural damage, distress or deformation; or
 - c. signs of significant deterioration.
- 3) Assess the use of the building to identify apparent deviations from intended use, misuse or abuse.
- 4) Assess the load conditions on the building to determine is load condition has changed.
- 5) Identify any building envelope conditions that may adversely affect the structural system.

To meet the intent of the structural condition assessment TEC completed a site review of the building, completed field measurements of the structural components, completed a visual assessment of the materials, and completed a code analysis of the anticipated loads on the structure.



PERSONNEL

The personnel involved in the completion of the structural condition assessment for this project were:

| PERSONNEL | COMPANY |
|-------------------------|------------------------------|
| Brent Freiburger, P.Eng | The Engineering Company Ltd. |

Additional assistance was provided by the Neil Devlin who provided additional information about the history of the structure and provided TEC with access to all the locations within the building to complete the condition assessment.

OBSERVATIONS

The visual assessment of the structure was completed without the removal of any of the existing interior finishes. As such, we were unable to determine the specific size and spacing of any of the structural members in the roof, floor, or wall assemblies. Therefor our assessment is a qualitative assessment of these systems.

We have included addition photographs for your reference that are located in appendix 'A' at the end of this report.

Third Floor / Roof Framing

The existing roof located on the three (3) story section of the building is a flat mansard roof that appear to span east to west. The assumed direction of the span was determined from the presence of what appear to be a beam that spans north to south and is located at the mid-span of the corridor. At the time of the structural assessment there was no significant signs of deflection that would indicate imminent structural concern. Based on the age of the structure the roof joists would by rough sawn timber that are likely either 2" x 8" or 2" x 10" and would be spaced between 16" to 24" on center with solid wood plank decking. TEC was unable to confirm this assumption as the interior finishes were not removed at the time of the assessment.

It should also be noted that based on the age of the structure, and the methods of construction, it is safe to assume that unless addressed by previous renovations, the framing of the roof may not meet the minimum construction standards and building code requirements specified today.

Subsequently, based on the documentation provided it is assumed that the existing roof over the renovated porch areas is the original structure as the documentation refers to this section as being "walled in". A limited review of the attic space confirmed that the existing roof is 2" x 6" wood joists spaced at approximately 20" with 2" x 8" ceiling joists. The review of the rafters and ceiling joists identified no signs of water damage or deterioration and the existing condition does not indicate imminent structural concern. However, our review did confirm that the anchorage for the rafter nailer to the existing brick wall is under designed for the anticipated snow loading. From our experience it is our opinion that an analysis of the existing rafters, for the 9'-0" span with the existing spacing, for the anticipated snow accumulation will not meet required design capacity of the Ontario Building Code for a Part 4 building. A further detailed review of snow loading is discussed later in this report.

Lastly, the roof/ceiling over the 1980's addition appears to be in good condition with some indications of previous water damage that resulted from a leak in the roof that was visible within the kitchen. It is our understanding that this leakage has be previously repaired and is no longer a concern. Our review of the remaining sections of the ceiling did not identify any significant signs of deflection that would indicate imminent structural concern.





Second Floor Framing

The structural framing supporting the third floor was not visible at the time of the site review. However, based on the visible condition of the interior finishes located on the third-floor floor, and the ceiling of the second floor, the framing appears to be in fair condition. It should be noted that many of the interior walls on this floor do not line up with the walls above on the third floor. This creates additional stress on the floor joists that now carry the load from the floor above. TEC is unable to provide confirmation about the capacity or acceptability of the construction without removing interior finishes.

First Floor Framing

The structural framing supporting the second floor was not visible at the time of the site review. However, based on the visible condition of the interior finishes located on the second floor, and the ceiling of the first floor, the framing appears to be in fair condition. It should be noted that many of the interior walls on this floor do not line up with the walls above on the second floor. This creates additional stress on the floor joists that now carry the load from the floor above. TEC is unable to provide confirmation about the capacity or acceptability of the construction without removing interior finishes.

Our review did identify some potential movement of the North exterior walls that was identified by the gaps visible between the flooring and the trim along the north wall of the living room at the east end of the original building. The full extent of the movement is not able to be determined without the installation of a long-term monitoring program to record potential movement between the floor and the wall. TEC was unable to determine if this observed movement occurred prior to the installation of the steel beams within the living room or if it occurred after. The building committee should review when the trim / floor was installed to compare the dates. If it is determined that the movement occurred after the beam was installed, then the interior finishes need to be removed to complete a detailed assessment.

Basement Framing

The structural framing that supports the first floor was partially visible at the time of the condition assessment. However, based on the visible condition of the interior finishes on the first floor, and the ceiling of the basement, the framing appears to be in fair condition.

It should be noted that most of the structural framing in the basement was concealed behind drywall however from our limited review it appears that additional beams and columns were installed to support the upper floors. Based on our field measurements it appears that many of these supports do not line up with the walls on the first floor. This displacement creates additional stress on the floor joists that now carry the load from the floor above. It does appear that the additional steel beam and columns on the first floor (living room) is supported on a column in the basement that was placed on a new footing.

In addition, our review of the existing framing also identified the following deficiencies within the basement:

- Numerous columns did not have the required anchorage of the base plates into the floor/footings including the columns supporting the steel beam in the living room.
- Multiple columns adjacent to the recessed floor area were located along the edge of the concrete slab with a portion of the base plates overhanging the edge. This is not acceptable as the base plates do not have sufficient bearing area for the columns.
- It appears that existing wood columns are in contact with the concrete floor. Removal of the drywall is required to confirm.
- The existing original timber beam is in direct contact with concrete support walls and is exhibiting signs of dry rot along its length.



- Numerous columns, stud walls, and concrete walls support the original timber beam which potentially indicates that previous repairs were required to address ongoing deflection. TEC has significant concerns about the long-term capacity of the member. Complete replacement of the beam is required.
- Capacity of the additional support beams and floor joists, based on observed conditions, needs to be confirmed.
- Top plates of existing columns were not connected to the supported beams.
- Significant corrosion at the base of the steel columns and base plates in the recessed mechanical floor area was observed. Repair /Replacement of the columns is required.
- Moderate corrosion of the steel columns outside of the recessed area was observed. Cleaning and painting of these columns is required.
- The sizes of the footings located under existing columns and support walls are unknown. Verification of the adequacy to support the loads is required.
- Insufficient bearing for the stair stringers at bottom landing. Additional supports for the stringers are required.

TEC is unable to provide confirmation about the existing capacity, or the acceptability of the construction methods used for the existing floor joists and additional support beams. Capacity and acceptability of the members would only be able to be verified after removing the existing interior finishes to expose the structural components.

It should be noted that we were unable to review the framing around the stairwell due to the presence of interior finishes. The capacity of the structure will need to be confirmed for the 100 PSF loading that the stairwell is required to support as the primary exit from the area.

The foundations and footings for the structure were reviewed for condition only. The assessment was unable to determine the thickness of the foot / foundation wall. With the change in occupancy and the change from a Part 9 structure to a Part 4 structure the loading on the foundations would increase. While the assessment was unable to identify any deficiencies in the foundation or signs of deterioration TEC is unable to confirm that the existing footings have the required capacity in accordance with current design loads.

As an alternative to the review of the individual members, TEC will complete a code review of the current loading on the existing members based on the existing occupancy type and compare it to the assumed original design loads.

Note: The existing framing and floor assemblies were not reviewed to Part 3 of the code for fire rating requirements as part of this assessment.

Interior Walls

The visual assessment, and field measurements, confirmed that the interior walls of the structure have been significantly modified from the original construction. These modifications have resulted in the relocation of load bearing walls which previously required the installation of new steel beams, posts and tie rods during the 1977 renovations to address the additional stress on the wood floor joists. While our reviews did identify locations of localized hairline cracking it did not identify any locations where there was visible signs of significant deformations, deflections, or stress that would indicate imminent structural concern.

Based on these field measurements, it appears that the layout of all three (3) floors has changed significantly from the original construction with very little, if any, of the layout remaining true to the original design. To confirm the suitability of the existing structural elements for the continued use a detailed



assessment and evaluation of the interior wood framing would need to be completed. This assessment would require the removal of interior finishes to identify the member size, location, and orientation of each of the structural members. This is especially the case in all areas which are considered primary paths of travel for egress.

Exterior Walls

The review of the exterior walls of the original building confirmed that the structure is a multi-wythe (assume 3 layers) clay brick wall assembly. The existing brick is in fair to good condition with some localized poor sections with cracking and spalling of the face brick. These poor sections were more prevalent on the south and east walls of the structure. Based on the age of the building the existing brick and mortar have performed better than expected apart from the original chimney's and the section of the wall in the north east corner where the tie rods were installed to secure the movement of the exterior wall. As previously indicated this work was completed when the major building renovation was completed in 1977.

A review of the documents provided confirmed that the chimneys originally serviced the first and second floors of the building. However, these have since been abandoned with the final fireplace removed from the first floor around 2008. Previous repairs that were completed to the exterior veneer of the chimney have performed poorly as a result of the repair methods and the brick type selected (modern brick does not mat well to older softer clay brick).

In addition, the brick for the porch enclosure is in poor condition with significant spalling and cracking of the brick and mortar visible along the south and east face. Large sections of the clay brick have disintegrated along the lower sections of the wall on the east side of the building with similar deterioration on the south wall. Based on the condition of the existing brick, the age and softness of the brick, and the original construction methods we anticipate that significant repairs to these sections of the wall will be required. Due to the age of the existing brick, and the current condition it is very likely that the walls of the original porch will require a complete reconstruction of the wall assemblies.

The exterior walls for the 1980's construction appear to be in good condition with no visible deficiencies that are of structural concern. This is to be expected based on the age of the addition and the cavity wall construction type.





CODE REVIEW – DESIGN LOADS

As identified in the Observation section of the report, a review of the design loads will be completed in leu of completing an analysis of the individual members. This is required due to the limited inspection of the existing structural members that were concealed behind the existing interior finishes.

The challenge with completing this review is that the building was constructed prior to the establishment of an official building code to outline design loads. As a result, we will have to make reasonable assumptions on the original design loading based on standard design practices for the period of construction.

The largest challenge to consider is that when the building was constructed it was separate from the Parish center and was constructed as a standalone building. In its current configuration the structure is connected to the Parish center with no fire walls to separate the two buildings. To further complicate the review the basement below the kitchen is used as a meeting hall which would be classified as an assembly occupancy group A2 while the office area is group D, and the remaining portion of the building would be considered a group C. Since there is no horizontal or vertical fire separations between the assemblies we have to consider the building as a Part 3 & 4 structure and not a Part 9 building.

Roof Loading

From our review of the documents provided, the existing roof was constructed during the original construction of the building. It would be safe to assume that the building would have been constructed in accordance with the standard construction practices for a residential building. It is a known fact that snow loads used in design during this period ranged from 25-50psf which typically was found to be under designed for the local climate. In comparison the current ground snow load for our region is 58 psf.

To further complicate the issue the method in which we determine roof snow loads has significantly changed from the original construction of the building. If we assume that the structure was constructed with an adequate factor of safety for a residential building than we can assume that it has a Factor of Safety of 2. If we consider the current building code requirements we typically have an equivalent Factor of Safety of approximately 1.7 which means that if the building was constructed for the high end of the snow load that current code requirements would be approximately the same.

However, we need to consider that the original building construction would fall into what would now be classified as a Part 9 building which is used for most residential and small building construction. However, as previously discussed, due to the current occupancies this structure needs to be assessed as a Part 4 building which results in the design snow load increasing by approximately 35% compared to a Part 9 building which is a significant increase and would most likely exceed the capacity of the existing roof structure.

On top of the increase for the change of occupancy we also need to consider the additional impact of snow accumulation on the lower roofs over the original deck and over the kitchen area. Based on the building height and size the anticipate snow load accumulation on the lower roof would be a total increase of 275% over the original design load for a residential building.

Based on this review it is our opinion that the existing roof system will need a detailed structural assessment to determine adequacy. The size and spacing of the existing structural elements will need to be determined to complete a detailed analysis of the structure to the current building code requirements for the occupancy types.





2nd and 3rd Floor Loading

From our review of the documents provided, the existing floors were constructed during the original construction of the building. However, there has been a significant amount off modifications to the structure since the original construction which includes the moving of walls, installation of additional beams and columns, and installation of tie rods to secure the North wall.

It would be safe to assume that the building would have been originally constructed in accordance with the standard construction practices for a residential building. It is standard knowledge that live loads used in design during this time was typically 40psf which is the same as the current live load for a group C residential occupancy. So, provided that the 1977 repairs mentioned in the documents provided were completed, the floor should be adequate within the bedroom areas.

We need ton consider that on the 2nd floor there are sections of the hallways that exceed 4'-0" in width, and on the 3rd floor the landing on top of the stairs exceed the requirements of Section 4.1.5.4. This section would allow the loads to be as per the occupancy served. However, since they exceed 4.1.5.4. these areas would require an increased load of 100PSF which is significantly higher than it would reasonable be assumed that they were designed for.

Based on this review the existing floor system will need a detailed structural assessment in the areas mention above to confirm the size and spacing of the existing structural elements to complete an analysis of the structure to current code requirements.

1st Floor Loading

From our review of the documents provided, the existing floors were constructed during the original construction of the building. However, there has been a significant amount off modifications to the structure since the original construction which includes the moving of walls, and installation of additional beams, joists, and columns.

It would be safe to assume that the building would have been originally constructed in accordance with the standard construction practices for a residential building. It is standard knowledge that live loads used in design during this time was typically 40psf which is the same as the current live load for a group C residential occupancy. However, it should be noted that based on the current occupancy types and the fact that this structure should be considered a Part 4 building; the loads on the main floor should be as follows:

- Office Area 100 PSF
- Corridors 100 PSF
- Living Areas 40 PSF

So, provided that the 1977 repairs mentioned in the documents provided were completed the floor should be adequate within the living areas. However, within the office area, and primary corridors the current occupancy loads greatly exceed the original design loads.

Our review of the framing from the basement did determine that within the east section of the basement, below the original building, the joists were reinforced with two (2) additional 2" x 12" joist for every existing joist. This reinforcement is sufficient for the intended occupancy however it would also need to be verified within the west section of the basement, and around the stairwell.

Our review of the framing also determined that the floor joist within the office area, along the south side of the building, were observed to be 2" x 8" joists @ 12" on center with spans of approximately 8'-6". This is sufficient for the intended load however the joist would also need to be confirmed along the east side of the building where the deck was also converted to confirm that they are of similar construction.


CONCLUSSIONS

After completing the structural condition assessment of the building, it is our opinion that that the existing structures original construction (method and materials) does not meet the building code requirements for the current occupancies. The structure will require a detailed structural analysis to determine if the existing structure is adequate in the areas previously indicated. The detailed structural analysis would require the localized removal of interior finishes to expose the concealed framing at all required locations.

It is our opinion, based on previous experience, there is a strong likelihood that the existing roof structure will be found to be deficient. Similarly, we anticipate that the existing floor framing around each of the stairs, in the primary corridors, will also be found to be deficient for the current occupant loads.

The greater concern is the existing structural framing in the basement. Base on our review a complete removal of the drywall will be required to expose the steel/wood framing to determine if the existing floor system is adequate for the increased office / corridor loads. Similarly, a review of the existing floor joists in the location of the original deck area along the east face of the building is required. Based on our review we are uncertain about how to access the area below the floor area will be achieved as it appears to have be sealed.

In addition, there is also significant repair work required in the basement to address visible deficiencies which include:

- Replacement / Repair to the existing columns in the recessed mechanical area to address corrosion.
- Relocate or install new bearing supports for the columns located adjacent to the recessed mechanical area to address the bearing concerns.
- Installation of anchorage at the base of all columns as required.
- Install proper connections between columns and supported beams.
- Removal and replacement of the primary timber beam that is located at the middle of the structure.
- Install additional support at base of stair stringers.
- Complete any additional repairs to address inadequacies identified in the detailed structural analysis.

It should be noted that our review of the structure did not consider the requirements for fire separations, insulation, ventilation, and egress.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on our review The Engineering Company Ltd. is recommending that the Diocese complete the following:

- 1. Have a Structural Engineer and contractor complete a detailed structural analysis of the building to confirm the adequacy of the structural members identified previously within this report.
- Have and Architect complete a Part 3 Ontario Building Code compliance review of the entire building completed. This review should consider the current and future Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA) requirements in addition to path of travel, fire protection, and fire separation requirements for the mixed occupancy building.



3. Complete all repairs and upgrades identified within this report as well as those identified in the recommended detailed structural analysis report, and the recommended Part 3 Ontario Building Code compliance review report.

EXCLUSSIONS

The Engineering Company Ltd. shall take no responsibility for any portion of the building that was not visible at the time of the assessment. TEC did not complete any destructive review of the structure and no materials were sampled or tested. TEC did not complete a review of any components of the structural that fall within the real of Architecture or Mechanical / Electrical Engineering.

CLOSING

After completing the assessment of the structure, it is the opinion of The Engineering Company Ltd. that the existing building has significant concerns regarding the continued use. As previously discussed, based on the building size, location, and occupancy's, the building falls under the requirements of Part 3 and Part 4 of the Ontario Building Code and should not be considered a Part 9 building. This change has significant impact on the loading of the structure regarding Snow Loading and Live Loading. The preliminary review of the revised loads identified various building components that will require a detailed analysis that will involve the removal of the finishes to expose the structural members.

The condition assessment also identified a significant list of deficiencies in the basement that will require the replacement of most of the interior supports. Based on previous experience the cost value associated with this work should be considered to be at a premium due to the difficulty of the work. The reason that this work will be difficult is due to the limited access, and the requirement to install temporary supports around the numerous existing supports which will greatly reduce the workable area.

The Diocese will need to weigh the benefits of salvaging the building with an increased cost that will be associated with it. Consideration should also be made to additional retrofits that will be required to address the deficiencies that will be identified by the architect to meet accessibility, egress, and fire safety requirements.

Prepared by:

Brent Freiburger, P.Eng Sr. Structural Engineer Director - The Engineering Company





APPENDIX A



294 Stickel Street, Port Elgin, Ontario NOH 2C1 Direct: 519-375-7886



Photograph 2 - Base plate of existing columns are not anchored into the foundation.

BRENT FREIBURGER, P.ENG SENIOR ENGINEER, PROJECT MANAGER



294 Stickel Street, Port Elgin, Ontario NOH 2C1 Direct: 519-375-7886





BRENT FREIBURGER, P.ENG SENIOR ENGINEER, PROJECT MANAGER



294 Stickel Street, Port Elgin, Ontario NOH 2C1 Direct: 519-375-7886





294 Stickel Street, Port Elgin, Ontario NOH 2C1 Direct: 519-375-7886





Photograph 8 - Top plates of the columns are not secured to the support beam.

BRENT FREIBURGER, P.ENG SENIOR ENGINEER, PROJECT MANAGER



294 Stickel Street, Port Elgin, Ontario NOH 2C1 Direct: 519-375-7886





BRENT FREIBURGER, P.ENG SENIOR ENGINEER, PROJECT MANAGER



294 Stickel Street, Port Elgin, Ontario NOH 2C1 Direct: 519-375-7886







294 Stickel Street, Port Elgin, Ontario NOH 2C1 Direct: 519-375-7886



Appendix D: to the Urban Design Study

December 2019

Building Condition Assessment, Rectory at St. Mary's Parish and the Missions Author: Lanhack Consultants Inc., dated February 27, 2017.



BUILDING CONDITION ASSESSMENT

RECTORY AT ST. MARY'S PARISH AND THE MISSIONS 554 15th Street East Owen Sound, Ontario



Prepared For

ST. MARY'S PARISH AND THE MISSIONS

Prepared By

LANHACK CONSULTANTS INC.

Project No. 17087 February 27, 2017





LANHACK Consultants Inc. Consulting Engineers 1425 Cormorant Road Suite 302 Ancaster, ON L9G 4V5 Tel.: (905) 777-1454 Fax: (905) 336-8142

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Lanhack Consultants Inc. was retained by St. Mary's Parish and the Missions on November 28, 2016, to conduct a visual review of the rectory building at 554 15th Street East in Owen Sound. The purpose of the site visit was to review and comment on the structural integrity of the building and comment on the cost benefit to renovate the existing building or build an entirely new building.

A representative from our office visited the site on Wednesday, December 7, 2016. A review of the interior, as well as the exterior, of the building was conducted. A summary of our findings and comments are enclosed in the following text.

2.0 OBSERVATIONS AND COMMENTS

The rectory building under review is located at 554 15th Street East, in the town of Owen Sound, Ontario. Owen Sound is approximately 185 km northwest of Hamilton and is bordered by Georgian Bay to its north. The map below, Figure 1.0, shows the location of the building, relative to the surrounding area.



Figure 1.0

2.1 <u>General Residence</u>

The existing building consists of three (3) building areas. There is the original, three-storey home with two building additions that were constructed over time. See Figure 2.0, identifying each area.

The original building, identified as Area A on Figure 2.0, is a three-storey (plus basement) structure. This portion of the building is approximately over 140 years old (according to the present representative of the Parish) and the primary materials of construction used were rubble stone for the foundation walls, clay brick for the exterior wall, and timber for the interior walls, floors and roof framing. This portion of the building contains three bedrooms, one bathroom, storage room, and a common living space on the third floor; three bedrooms and one bathroom on the second floor; and the dining room, living room, family room, storage room, and common open office area on the main floor; and the mechanical systems are in the basement.





Building Area B (See Figure 2.0) is a one-storey structure with a crawl space below. This portion of the building appears to have been added to the original building. This building is approximately 50 years old. The primary materials of construction used were concrete and concrete block for the foundation walls, clay brick and conventional wood studs for the exterior walls, and conventional 2x wood for the floors and roof framing. This portion of the building contains the offices, which are on the main floor.

Building area C (See Figure 2.0) is a one-storey structure with a basement. This addition appears to be of more modern times and is approximately 30 years old (according to the representative of the Parish). The primary materials of construction used were concrete for the foundation walls, clay brick and conventional wood studs for the exterior walls and conventional modern wood framing for the main floor, roof and walls. This portion of the building contains a kitchen, a bathroom, an office, and a laundry room on the main floor. The basement contains a finished recreation room. This addition also contains a link between the church and the rectory.



2.2 <u>Roof</u>

The roof on the original building, identified as Area A, has a flat roof. The roof area appears to be covered with a conventional built-up roofing system. Based on limited available pictures, the roofing system appeared to be in satisfactory condition. The roof framing for this portion of the building was not accessed at the time of our visit. However, due to the age of the building and layout, one can deduce that the roof framing consists of rough sawn timber of true dimension. Based on past experience with this type and age of building, the roof can be assumed to consist of a minimum of 2x8 roof joists at 18" to 24" o/c, spanning between the exterior walls and interior corridor walls, with wood plank decking. This method of construction was common to this time, however some of the methods used for framing the roof may no longer conform to today's building code requirements. Based on our visual review of third floor ceilings, no signs of structural distress or excessive fatigue of the wood framing members was evidently visible. Hence, it is our opinion at this time that the existing roof is structurally adequate.

With respect to the roofing system and insulation value of the roof in this area identified as Area A, the built-up roofing system appears to be in satisfactory condition and based on the age of this portion of the building, there may be no, or little insulation in the roof. Hence, consideration to replacing the roof system and upgrading the insulation value of the roof should be considered for future energy saving costs.

The roof on the one-storey addition, identified as Area B, has a low pitched wood roof. The roof is covered over with conventional asphalt shingles. From our visual vantage point on the ground, the shingles appeared to be in good condition.



The roof framing for this addition was not accessible for review. However, based on the age of construction, one can deduce that the roof framing consists of conventional 2x framing. Based on the configuration and age of the addition, the roof can be assumed to consist of 2x6 or 2x8 roof rafters and ceiling joists, spaced at 16" o/c or 24" o/c, with conventional plywood sheathing. This method of construction was typical to this time. Based on our visual review of the ceilings and exterior roof, no sign of structural distress, instability or fatigue of the wood members was visible. Hence, it is our opinion at this time that the existing roof is structurally sound.

The attic space in this roof area, identified as Area B, was not accessible to determine the amount of insulation in this roof area. However, based on my conversation with the parish's representative, the offices in this area were cold in the winter months. This leads one to assume there is a lack of proper insulation in this area. This should be addressed and reinsulating or enhancing the insulation value in this area should be considered. This would allow for a more comfortable working environment, while at the same time, saving energy costs.

The roof on the one-storey addition, identified as Area C, has a flat roof. The roof is covered over with a conventional, built-up roofing system. From our visual review of the roof, ponding was evident, which indicates a poor slope to the drain. In addition, the roof was covered with moss and the gravel ballast, in some areas, had been displaced. It is our opinion that the roofing system was in poor condition. The roof framing for this portion of the structure was not accessible for review. However, based on the age of construction, one can deduce that the roof consists of conventional 2x framing with plywood sheathing. This method of construction was common to this time. Based on our visual review of the ceilings and exterior roof, no structural distress, instability or fatigue was noted. Hence, it is our opinion at this time that the existing roof is structurally sound.

The space between the roof joists, in this area, was not accessible at the time of the site visit. However, based on the age of the addition, this area appears to be fully insulated and does not require any remedial upgrade.

2.3 Interior Wall and Floor Framing

The interior walls for building Area A consist of rough, sawn timber studs, forming each of the rooms. In general, the interior walls were found to be structurally sound. This portion of the overall building has undergone extensive renovations over its 140 plus years. The structure, at all floor levels, has been altered or modified to accommodate new living quarters. The floors on the third and second floors appeared sound. However, the floor framing of the main floor was questionable. A visual review in the basement revealed the addition of numerous new steel posts, steel beams and concrete walls that were added in an attempt to prop-up and stabilize the floor framing. It appeared that some posts were sitting on the concrete slab-on-grade, with no evidence of a proper footing below it. The present main floor currently has a notable slope from front-to-back. This may be attributed to the building settling over time or more notably, a result of the many renovations done to the structure over its life time and not taking into account the effects of a previous renovation and/or not taking into account the proper load effects onto a member.

A further, extensive review of the structural framing on this part of the building would be required to determine the effects of all the renovations and how it has affected the structural integrity of the building's structural components. Based on our visual review, it is our opinion that there are some structural deficiencies with the framing and some concern with all the permanent and temporary posts added in the basement.

The interior walls and floor system for the areas identified as Area B and Area C were found to be in good condition. The walls and floors were framed using conventional 2x lumber and were found to be in good, sound condition.



2.4 Exterior Wall

The exterior of building Area A, consists of a multi-wythe brick wall, assumed 8" (±) thick between the main floor and roof, with a lath and plaster finish on the inside. The wall, in general, appeared to be in good, sound condition, especially when considering the age of the building. Some minor cracks and delaminated mortar joints were noted; however they were not significant deficiencies. The chimney appears to have undergone some repair in the past. The new brick veneer appears to be deteriorating and will require some repair in the immediate future.

The brick veneer in the area identified as Area B, was in poor condition. Spalling and deteriorating brick veneer was evident throughout, however more evident in the lower area of the wall, where the pavement is salted. Similarly, the stone plinth below the brick veneer showed signs of distress. Cracks were noted in mortar joints and missing or spalled mortar was evident. Based on our visual review of the veneer in this area, extensive repair and replacement of the brick is required.

The brick veneer of building Area C was found to be in good condition. No deficiencies with the brick or mortar joints were noted.

2.5 <u>Foundations</u>

The foundation walls in building Area A consist of the original rubble stone walls, mortared together. In general, the original walls around the perimeter were found to be in good, sound condition. Some hairline cracks were found, however, appeared minor and are typical of a building this age. This type of construction method was common to the time this building was constructed. However, it is our opinion that this type of construction does not meet current construction standards or building code requirements of today.

The foundation walls for building Area B consist of concrete block and stone. It appears that this area, at some locations, was originally constructed as an exposed deck. The foundation walls in this area were in satisfactory condition. Cracks in the mortar joints, due to movement, were evident in some areas, however, it is our opinion that the foundation walls, in general, were structurally sound. Some minor repairs to mortar joints are required. The stability of the footings and bearing below the footings cannot be commented on at this time since destructive testing to expose the footings was not within the scope of this current report.

The foundation walls for building Area C consist of a poured-in-place concrete wall. Based on our review of the exposed areas of the foundation wall, it is our opinion that the wall is in good condition. No structural deficiencies were visibly noted during our site visit.

2.6 <u>Cost Estimates</u>

The estimated costs associated with renovating the existing overall building or constructing a new building, are based on the following:

- Our experience with Contractors specializing in this field.
- Industry-accepted costing tools.
- General construction experience.

The estimates are intended only for global budgeting purposes. They should be used as a guide only, as costs may vary according to the time of year, quality of material used, volume of work, actual observed conditions, etc. Note that any estimates do not include applicable taxes. Actual costs for work can only be determined after preparing specifications and tender documents, and understanding site restrictions that may impact work.



It is estimated that the present structure as a whole consists of approximately 6000 (±) square feet of usable space. If one considers a complete renovation: gutting the entire interior of all finishes, electrical and mechanical systems, with exception to the newly added kitchen, we guesstimate a cost of approximately \$250.00 to \$310.00 per square foot. A contingency fund allowance will also have to be added of approximately 15% of the construction budget, to allow for any unknowns not apparently visible at the time the tender documents were prepared.

To demolish and construct a brand new facility on site, of approximately $4000 (\pm)$ square feet of usable space, with a complete basement, we guesstimate a cost of approximately \$200.00 to \$250.00 per square feet. A contingency fund allowance of 10% to 15% of the construction budget should be carried, to allow for unknown site conditions and add-ons.

3.0 CONCLUSION

Based on our visual observations, it is our opinion that there are some structural concerns with the building areas, identified as Area A and Area B. An additional, more extensive review of these areas is required to determine the full extent of the structural deficiencies, however for the purpose of this report, it is our opinion that some remedial repairs are required. Further to the structural concerns, the original building has been modified and added too in such a way that the space throughout does not flow efficiently. There are many chopped up rooms on the main floor and there is not a proper separation between the office area and the private living quarters. In addition, the building Area A and Area B are poorly insulated and the exterior brick veneer in building Area B requires a complete rehabilitation.

From our visual observation of the building and assessment of the structure, it is our opinion that the present building is salvageable, however at a much higher price tag than a new build. Based on previous, similar projects, we have found it cheaper and more cost effective to build a new building rather than renovate a building. A renovation to an existing building will give you what you need from a functional point of view, however there are always compromises due to existing parameters with the existing structure. With a new build, you are more likely to get what you want, as you want it, with less or no compromises due to existing building constraints. Based on our findings, it is our opinion that a new build will be more cost effective in the long run.

We trust this report meets your present requirements. Please do not hesitate to contact us, if any questions arise.

Yours truly,

ancia inancarlo

Giancarlo Lancia P.Eng.

GL/lg



Appendix E: to the Urban Design Study

December 2019

Designated Substance Survey, Rectory at St. Mary's and the Missions Parish Author: Roop Chanderdat and Associates Inc., February 25, 2017.





Roop Chanderdat and Associates Inc.

Industrial Hygiene and Environmental Consultants

DESIGNATED SUBSTANCE SURVEY (DSS)

St. Mary's and the Mission Parish 554 15th Street East Owen Sound, Ontario September 25th, 2017

> 1669 Westdel Bourne London, Ontario Canada N6K 4R1 Phone/Fax: (519) 471-6770 Email: roop@golden.net



TABLE OF CONTENTS

| 1. | INTRODUCTION |
|-----|---|
| 2. | BACKGROUND AND SITE DESCRIPTION |
| 3. | SURVEY METHODOLOGY 8 |
| 4. | DESIGNATED SUBSTANCES |
| 4.1 | ASBESTOS CONTAINING MATERIALS (ACMS)10 |
| 4.2 | LEAD |
| 4.3 | MERCURY |
| 4.4 | OTHER DESIGNATED SUBSTANCES |
| 4.5 | POLYCHLORINATED BIPHENYLS (PCBS)14 |
| 4.6 | OZONE DEPLETING SUBSTANCES (ODSs)14 |
| 4.7 | UREA FORMALDEHYDE FOAM INSULATION (UFFI) 14 |
| 4.8 | MOULD |
| 5. | LEGISLATIVE REQUIREMENTS AND GUIDELINES 16 |
| 6. | RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS 17 |
| 6.1 | ASBESTOS CONTAINING MATERIALS (ACMS)17 |
| 7 | Cable 1: Asbestos |
| 7 | Cable 1 continued: Asbestos |
| 7 | Fable 1 continued: Asbestos |



| 6.2 LEAD | 20 |
|--|----|
| Table 2: Lead | 20 |
| 6.3 MERCURY | 21 |
| 6.4 OTHER DESIGNATED SUBSTANCES | 21 |
| 6.5 POLYCHLORINATED BIPHENYLS (PCBS) | 22 |
| 6.6 Ozone Depleting Substances (ODS) | 22 |
| 6.7 UREA FORMALDEHYDE FOAM INSULATION (UFFI) | 22 |
| 6.8 MOULD | 22 |
| 7. CONCLUSION | 23 |
| LIMITATIONS AND DISCLAIMER | 26 |



1. INTRODUCTION

Roop Chanderdat and Associates Inc. was retained by Mr. Neil Devlin, Chair Building Committee, to conduct a Designated Substance Survey (DSS) for the St. Mary's and the Mission Parish located at 554 15th Street East in Owen Sound, Ontario. The DSS was specifically for the Rectory (Parish's offices and apartments/living area).

The purpose of the survey was to identify the presence of Designated Substances in the space in accordance with Section 30 of the *Occupational Health & Safety Act* (OHSA), in advance of planned renovation/demolition work (note: the roof and equipment were not sampled for asbestos content to maintain the integrity and minimal destructive sampling was carried out since the building was occupied during the study).

The duty of the project owners as per Section 30 (1): before beginning a project, the owner shall determine whether any designated substances are present at the project site and shall prepare a list of all designated substances that are present at the site.

OHSA lists eleven (11) designated substances that require special handling and removal in accordance with provincial regulations. These designated substances are as follows:

- Acrylonitrile
- Arsenic
- Asbestos
- Benzene
- Coke Oven Emissions
- Ethylene Oxide
- Isocyanate
- Lead



- Mercury
- Silica
- Vinyl Chloride

The following Designated Substances are not typically found in building materials in a composition / state that is hazardous:

- Acrylonitrile
- Arsenic
- Benzene
- Coke Oven Emissions
- Ethylene Oxide
- Isocyanate
- Vinyl Chloride

Although Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCB's), Ozone-Depleting Substances (ODSs),

Urea Formaldehyde Foam Insulation (UFFI) and mould are not defined as Designated Substances, if not properly managed, they may be hazardous to workers involved in the renovation work, and therefore have been included in the survey.

This DSS is intended for renovation purposes only and may not provide sufficient detail for management of asbestos containing material (ACM) as required by Section 7(3) of Ontario Regulation 278/05 – "Asbestos on Construction Projects and in Buildings and Repair Operations".



2. BACKGROUND AND SITE DESCRIPTION

On September 25th, 2017, Roop Chanderdat and Associates Inc. conducted the DSS at the Rectory of St. Mary's and the Mission Parish located at 554 15th Street East in Owen Sound, Ontario. Building access was arranged through Mr. Barry Mellish and Mr. Neil Devlin. The rectory building at the parish is a three-story wood frame building with an unfinished basement (boiler room). The first floor of the building contains Office Area and Living Area (including kitchen). The second and third floors of the building consist of all Living Areas. The rectory building is approximately 2500 to 3000 ft². A basic description of the rectory building is as follows:

Basement (Boiler Room)

- Unfinished
- Approximately 78 ft² of floor tiles, remainder of floors concrete or packed earth
- Fire door at stairs to first floor not sampled
- 30 asbestos pipe fittings (8 damaged or exposed) not sampled
- Approximately 30 ft. of air cell pipe insulation inside walls and bulk head

First Floor

Office Area

- Office area includes enclosed porch (date of enclosure unknown)
- Offices have wood paneling, drywall or exposed brick walls, drywall or stucco ceilings (south offices), and wood floors (9x9 vinyl tiles underneath two layers of wood floors)



Living Area

- Living area consists of a TV room, kitchen (approx. 380 ft²), dining room and small prayer room
- The kitchen has floor tiles (beige & gray), drywall walls and a drywall ceiling
- The remainder of the first floor has drywall and wood paneling on walls, drywall ceilings and wood floors (9x9 vinyl tiles underneath two layers of wood floors)
- There is transite panel located throughout the entire stairwell (sampled on first floor)

Second Floor

- 3 bedrooms/sitting areas and 1 bathroom (approx. 70 ft²)
- Plaster walls in hallway
- Drywall walls in bedrooms/sitting areas
- Laminate floor with wood underlay (unknown what is under laminate floors)

Third Floor

- 3 bedrooms/sitting areas, 1 bathroom (approx. 70 ft²) and 1 storage room
- Plaster walls in hallway
- Drywall walls in bedrooms/sitting areas and storage room
- 12 x 12 self-stick VCT in bedrooms, hallways and stairwell
- Linoleum sheeting in storage room and washroom closet



3. SURVEY METHODOLOGY

The survey conducted by Roop Chanderdat and Associates Inc. involved completing a "walk-through" visual assessment (including sample collection where necessary) in the Rectory of the St. Mary's and the Mission Parish located at 554 15th Street East in Owen Sound, Ontario. The survey was carried out on September 25th, 2017 and was performed with all good intent and purpose to determine the location and condition for the various designated substances present. The audit approach relied on practical observations and investigative techniques.

During the site visit, the experience of Roop Chanderdat and Associates personnel was relied upon for identification of common building materials known to contain designated substances and/or hazardous substances. Where identification could not be determined visually or by experience, a sample of the material was obtained.

Our survey did not include any demolition to view concealed conditions.



4. DESIGNATED SUBSTANCES

The scope of this survey was to establish the location, condition and type of designated substances present in the building. The survey included designated substances that were used in the structure and finishes.

The Occupational Health and Safety Act (OHSA) list eleven (11) designated substances that require special handling and removal in accordance with provincial regulations.

These designated substances are as follows:

- Acrylonitrile
- Arsenic
- Asbestos
- Benzene
- Coke Oven Emissions
- Ethylene Oxide
- Isocyanate
- Lead
- Mercury
- Silica
- Vinyl Chloride

The following Designated Substances are not typically found in building materials in a

composition / state that is hazardous:

- Acrylonitrile
- Arsenic
- Benzene
- Coke Oven Emissions



- Ethylene Oxide
- Isocyanate
- Vinyl Chloride

Not included during this survey was an assessment of personal articles within the building, sampling of roof materials that could result in major damage to the building, sampling of concealed materials or underground materials or equipment. In addition to these designated substances there are several hazardous substances that should also be considered and these are as follows:

- Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs)
- Ozone Depleting Substances (ODSs)
- Mould

4.1 Asbestos Containing Materials (ACMs)

Manufacturing and use of asbestos-containing building materials (ACMs) have continued to decrease since the late 1970's. There is no firm cut-off date outlining when asbestos in building materials was discontinued. It is commonly presumed that buildings constructed prior to 1980 are more likely to contain both friable and non-friable forms of ACM such as mechanical insulations, fire proofing, ceiling tiles, floor tiles, ceiling textures, etc. Even buildings constructed after 1980 may contain ACMs in the form of exterior window caulking, roofing materials, and/or transite piping.

Based on the age of the building it is likely that some building materials may contain asbestos, i.e. floor tiles, ceiling tiles and wall compound. Samples of suspected asbestos containing materials (ACMs) were collected for laboratory analysis for asbestos content



using Polarized Light Microscopy (PLM). Refer to Table 1 in the report for a list of detailed sample locations.

The bulk samples collected for asbestos analysis were submitted to LCS Laboratory Inc. in London, Ontario, which is AIHA-LAP accredited to the ISO 17025-2005 standard. Sampling of a number of possible materials which may contain asbestos could not be included in our survey. These suspect materials are listed below:

- Roof materials (in order to maintain integrity of building)
- Components or wiring within motors or lights

4.2 Lead

There are no regulated Canadian or Ontario criteria regarding the concentration of lead in existing paint coatings that define coatings as potentially hazardous for the purposes of protecting individuals who may come in contact with the paint surfaces as a result of repair, demolition or renovation work on lead-painted materials.

In October 2010, the Government amended the *Surface Coating Materials Regulations* to significantly lower the level of total lead allowed in paints and other surface coating materials from 600 mg/kg to 90 mg/kg - which is equivalent to a lead concentration of 0.009% or 90 ppm.

Lead is a designated substance in Ontario and regulated under Ontario Regulation 490/09 – "Designated Substance Regulation" and this specifies occupational exposure limits (OELs) for 11 designated substances including lead. Although O. Reg. 490/09 and the OEL for lead do not directly apply to an employer on a construction project or to their



workers at the project, employers still have a responsibility to protect the health of their workers and to comply with the Occupational Health and Safety Act (OHSA) and other applicable regulations. Section 25(2) (h) of the OHSA requires that employers take "every precaution reasonable in the circumstances for the protection of a worker". The primary routes of exposure (inorganic lead) include inhalation and ingestion. Legislation or guidelines pertaining to the abatement and management of lead is covered under Ontario Ministry of Labour 2004 Guideline Lead on Construction Projects. This Guideline has been prepared to assist persons, such as employers, who have duties under OHSA and its regulations to protect workers from exposure to lead. A key feature of this guideline is the classification of work. It is the classification of the work that determines the appropriate respirators, measures and procedures that should be followed to protect the worker from lead exposure. In this guideline, lead-containing construction operations are classified into three groups, Type 1, Type 2 and Type 3 operations and can be thought of as being of low, medium and high risk. From Type 1 to Type 3 operations, the corresponding respirator requirements and measures and procedures become increasingly stringent.

Twelve paint chip samples were collected to be analyzed for lead [Refer to Table 2] The paint samples were analyzed utilizing inductively coupled plasma (ICP) techniques at ALS Environmental Laboratory in London, Ontario (an accredited laboratory). The Certificate of Analysis reports from the laboratory is attached.



The historic use of lead gaskets (babbit) to seal sections of ductile iron pipes was common practice. It is probable that the gaskets on sanitary pipe connections are lead. Lead sheeting was frequently used as capillary breaks between foundation walls and the base of exterior perimeter walls. Such material could be present. However, extensive demolition is required to access these materials.

4.3 Mercury

Historically, mercury has been used as a switch mechanism in thermostats. Fluorescent light tubes also contain mercury vapour.

4.4 Other Designated Substances

There is no reason to believe the following designated substances are present in the construction materials in the building in a matrix or sufficient quantities which would cause an exceedance of Ministry of Labour (MOL) occupational exposure limits (OELs):

- Vinyl Chloride could be present in paints, plastics, etc.
- Coke Oven Emissions none
- Isocyanates could be present in paints, plastics, foam insulation, etc.
- Arsenic none
- Ethylene Oxide none
- Benzene none
- Acrylonitrile could be present in plastics



Silica could be present in mortar bricks or concrete blocks. Location of materials containing silica has not been specified in this report but should be considered to exist for the building. No sampling was performed.

4.5 Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs)

PCBs as defined by the MOL are not a designated substance, however PCBs are a concern to the environment and human health. PCBs are typically found in fluorescent light ballasts, transformers and other electrical equipment containing insulating fluids. No fluorescent light ballasts containing PCB's were found in the building.

4.6 Ozone Depleting Substances (ODSs)

Although not a designated substance as specified by the OHSA, refrigerants are ozone depleting substances and are a concern when discharged to the natural environment. All equipment containing ODSs must be serviced by contractors licensed to handle ozone depleting substances. ODS must be removed prior to disposal of equipment.

4.7 Urea Formaldehyde Foam Insulation (UFFI)

Urea formaldehyde foam insulation (UFFI) was used as post construction injection insulation in buildings. UFFI is not a designated substance as specified by OHSA. It should be noted that off-gassing of formaldehyde from the UFFI is a potential health concern to building occupants. UFFI was phased out in the early 1980's.



4.8 Mould

Mould is not a designated substance as specified by OHSA, however the MOL

recognizes mould as an occupational hazard. No mould growth was observed during the visual inspection.



5. LEGISLATIVE REQUIREMENTS AND GUIDELINES

Legislation or guidelines pertaining to the abatement and management of the suspected designated substances and hazardous materials are listed below.

| Agent | Regulation / Guideline |
|--|--|
| Asbestos | Ontario Regulation 490/09 under the Occupational Health and Safety Act |
| Lead | Ontario Ministry of Labour 2004 Guideline Lead on Construction Projects |
| Mercury | Ontario Regulation 490/09 under the Occupational Health and Safety Act |
| Silica | Ontario Ministry of Labour 2004 Guideline Silica on Construction Projects |
| UFFI | Ontario Regulation 833 made under the Occupational Health and Safety Act (Exposure for Formaldehyde) |
| PCBs | Environment Canada's guide "Identification of Fluorescent Lamp Ballasts Containing PCB's" |
| Mould Environmental Abatement Council of Ontario (EACO) 2010 Mould A | |
| ODS | Ontario Regulation 463/10 under the Environmental Protection Act (O. Reg. 198/94 Revoked as of January 1, 2011) |



6. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

6.1 Asbestos Containing Materials (ACMs)

Table 1 lists the locations of all samples collected for asbestos analysis. These tables

show the sample description and the analytical result.

| Sample No. | Description | Analytical Results (%) | | | |
|---------------|--|------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Basement | | | | | |
| 1A | Floor Tile | 0.5% Chrysotile | | | |
| 1B | Floor Tile – Mastic | <rl< td=""></rl<> | | | |
| 2 | Air Cell Pipe Wrap | 18% Chrysotile | | | |
| ЗA | Drywall Compound – from post in center of boiler area | <rl< td=""></rl<> | | | |
| 3B | Drywall Compound – from ceiling | <rl< td=""></rl<> | | | |
| 3C | Drywall Compound – from ceiling | <rl< td=""></rl<> | | | |
| 4 | Tar – on walls at front side of building (parking lot side) | <rl< td=""></rl<> | | | |
| First Floor | | | | | |
| 5A | Beige/Grey Floor Tile – underneath wood floors | <rl< td=""></rl<> | | | |
| 5B | Beige/Grey Floor Tile Mastic – underneath wood floors | NA ¹⁾ | | | |
| 6A | Spray in Insulation – above ceilings (access in office area) | <rl< td=""></rl<> | | | |
| 6B | Spray in Insulation – above ceilings (access in office area) | <rl< td=""></rl<> | | | |
| 6C | Spray in Insulation – above ceilings (access in office area) | <rl< td=""></rl<> | | | |
| 7A | Drywall Compound – from blue wall in Office Area | <rl< td=""></rl<> | | | |

Table 1: Asbestos

NOTES:

1) – Sample does not contain mastic



| 7B | Drywall Compound – yellow wall in Office Area | <rl< th=""></rl<> | | |
|--------------|--|-------------------|--|--|
| 7C | Drywall Compound – office off hallway across from window | <rl< td=""></rl<> | | |
| 8A | Green Floor Tile – under wood floor along SE wall | <rl< td=""></rl<> | | |
| 8B | Green Floor Tile Mastic – under wood floor along SE wall | <rl< td=""></rl<> | | |
| 8C | Green Floor Tile Paper – under wood floor along SE wall | <rl< td=""></rl<> | | |
| 9A | Stucco Ceiling – from Fr. Kuzma's office | <rl< td=""></rl<> | | |
| 9B | Stucco Ceiling – from cabinet area on South wall | <rl< td=""></rl<> | | |
| 9C | Stucco Ceiling – from 3 rd office of South wall | <rl< td=""></rl<> | | |
| 10 | Beige Floor Tile – from kitchen | <rl< td=""></rl<> | | |
| 11 | Gray Floor Tile – from kitchen | <rl< td=""></rl<> | | |
| 12 | Transite Paneling – from hallway cupboard beside kitchen (stairwell) | 10% Chrysotile | | |
| 13A | Floor Tile – from hallway cupboard beside kitchen | <rl< td=""></rl<> | | |
| 13B | Floor Tile Mastic – from hallway cupboard beside kitchen | <rl< td=""></rl<> | | |
| 14A | Plaster – from hallway cupboard beside kitchen | <rl< td=""></rl<> | | |
| 14B | Plaster – in stair well | <rl< td=""></rl<> | | |
| Second Floor | | | | |
| 14C | Plaster – from men's bathroom | <rl< td=""></rl<> | | |
| 14D | Plaster – from hallway | 1% Chrysotile | | |
| 15A | Drywall Compound – from South bedroom | <rl< td=""></rl<> | | |
| 15B | Drywall Compound – from stairwell hallway | <rl< td=""></rl<> | | |
| 15C | Drywall Compound – from bathroom | <rl< td=""></rl<> | | |
| NOTES: | 1) – Sample does not contain mastic | | | |

Table 1 continued: Asbestos



| 16A | Beige Floor Tile – from bathroom | <rl< th=""></rl<> |
|-------------|--|-------------------|
| 16B | Beige Floor Tile Mastic – from bathroom | NA ¹⁾ |
| 17A | Gray Floor Tile – from bathroom | <rl< td=""></rl<> |
| 17B | Gray Floor Tile Mastic – from bathroom | NA ¹⁾ |
| Third Floor | | |
| 18 | Paper under Vats – in access to attic | <rl< td=""></rl<> |
| 19 | Linoleum Sheeting – from bathroom | 9% Chrysotile |
| 20A | Gray Floor Tile – from bathroom | <rl< td=""></rl<> |
| 20B | Gray Floor Tile Mastic – from bathroom | NA ¹⁾ |
| 21A | Yellow Floor Tile – from bathroom | <rl< td=""></rl<> |
| 21B | Yellow Floor Tile Mastic – from bathroom | <rl< td=""></rl<> |
| 22A | 12x12 Self Stick VCT – from stairwell hallway | <rl< td=""></rl<> |
| 22B | 12x12 Self Stick VCT Glue – from stairwell hallway | NA ¹⁾ |

Table 1 continued: Asbestos

NOTES: 1) – Sample does not contain mastic

Five (5) of the samples collected during the survey tested positive for asbestos.

In the Basement, the sample of the floor tile revealed an asbestos content of 0.5% chrysotile and the sample of the air cell pipe wrap revealed an asbestos content of 18% chrysotile. In addition, there are 30 pipe fittings (approx. 8 damaged) that are insulated with ACM and all pipe hangars also contain ACM (these were not sampled). On the First floor, the sample of the transite siding in the cupboard beside the kitchen (stairwell) revealed an asbestos content of 10% chrysotile. On the Second Floor, the sample of


plaster revealed an asbestos content of 1% chrysotile. On the Third Floor, the sample of linoleum sheeting revealed an asbestos content of 9% chrysotile.

6.2 Lead

Table 2 lists the location and the analytical result of the lead paint chip samples collected during this study.

| Sample | Description | Analytical Results (mg/kg) |
|--------|---|-------------------------------|
| 1 | Red Paint – from fire door in Basement | 3280 |
| 2 | Yellow Paint – from 1 st Floor Office Area | 6.8 |
| 3 | Blue Paint - from 1 st Floor Office Area | 4.0 |
| 4 | White Paint – from door in Dining Room on 1 st Floor | 44500 |
| 5 | Purple Paint – from Dining Room on 1 st Floor | 5010 |
| 6 | White Paint – from ceiling in Kitchen (1 st Floor) | 6.0 |
| 7 | Blue Paint – from TV Room on 1 st Floor | 34.4 |
| 8 | Rust/Orange Paint – from Prayer Room (1 st Floor) | 106 |
| 9 | Beige Paint – from 2 nd Floor South Bedroom | 16.4 |
| 10 | White Paint – from window sill on 2 nd Floor | 2500 |
| 11 | Beige Paint – from bedroom on 2 nd Floor | 20.8 |
| 12 | Beige Paint – from hallway on 3 rd Floor | 7.2 |

Table 2: Lead

High concentrations of lead (above 90 mg/kg guideline) were detected in five (5) of the twelve (12) paint samples collected from the rectory at St. Mary's and the Mission Parish. The results for these samples are as follows:



- Red Paint (Basement fire door): 3280 mg/kg or 3280 ppm or 0.3280%
- White Paint (First Floor door): 44500 mg/kg or 44500 ppm or 4.4500%
- Purple Paint (First Floor dining room): 5010 mg/kg or 5010 ppm or 0.5010%
- Rust/Orange Paint (First Floor prayer room): 106 mg/kg or 106 ppm or 0.0106%
- White Paint (Second Floor window sill): 2500 mg/kg or 2500 ppm or 0.2500%

The remaining seven (7) paint samples revealed results below the 90 mg/kg guideline.

The concentrations for these samples ranged from 4.0 mg/kg (Blue paint in Office Area)

to 34.4 mg/kg (Blue paint in TV Room).

Other Lead Applications

Lead may be present in wiring connectors and solder in the building.

6.3 Mercury

Mercury may be present as a liquid in thermostats.

Fluorescent light bulbs (tubes) being used throughout the building should be disposed of in an appropriate manner. These bulbs are known to contain mercury.

6.4 Other Designated Substances

Silica (crystalline) is presumed to be present in cement, cement blocks, concrete, bricks, mortar, ceramics, granite, slate, stone, asphalt, etc. where present in the building. No sample collection or analysis was conducted.



Demolition and site clean-up of building materials containing silica should be conducted in accordance with the Ministry of Labour 2004 Guideline: Silica on Construction Projects (September 2004).

Precautions such as work practices, ventilation and personal protective equipment should be used to reduce worker exposure to airborne silica to the lowest practical level.

6.5 Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs)

No fluorescent light ballasts containing PCBs were observed during the survey.

6.6 Ozone Depleting Substances (ODS)

Any equipment containing ozone depleting substances must be serviced by contractors licensed to handle ozone depleting substances. ODS must be removed prior to disposal of equipment and this work must be completed by contractors licensed to handle ODSs. Applicable legislation is found in the Ontario EPA under Ontario regulation 189, Refrigerants Regulation, section 17 & 18.

6.7 Urea Formaldehyde Foam Insulation (UFFI)

At the time of this audit, no UFFI was observed, however because this was not a full destructive assessment, UFFI may be present within building walls. During the demolition a visual assessment should be carried out for UFFI.

6.8 Mould

No visible mould was observed during this study.



7. CONCLUSION

On September 25th, 2017, Roop Chanderdat and Associates Inc. conducted the DSS at the Rectory of St. Mary's and the Mission Parish located at 554 15th Street East in Owen Sound, Ontario.

In summary, based on our audit inspection, our findings are as follows:

Asbestos

- In the Basement, the sample of the floor tile revealed an asbestos content of 0.5% chrysotile and the sample of the air cell pipe wrap revealed an asbestos content of 18% chrysotile. In addition, there are 30 pipe fittings (approx. 8 damaged) that are insulated with ACM and all pipe hangars also contain ACM (these were not sampled). The damaged fittings should be repaired / removed immediately.
- On the First floor, the sample of the transite siding in the cupboard beside the kitchen (stairwell) revealed an asbestos content of 10% chrysotile.
- On the Second Floor, the sample of plaster revealed an asbestos content of 1% chrysotile.
- On the Third Floor, the sample of linoleum sheeting revealed an asbestos content of 9% chrysotile.

Lead

• High concentrations of lead (above 90 mg/kg guideline) were detected in five (5) of the twelve (12) paint samples collected from the rectory at St. Mary's and the Mission Parish. The results for these samples are as follows: Red Paint



(Basement fire door): 3280 mg/kg or 3280 ppm or 0.3280%, White Paint (First Floor door): 44500 mg/kg or 44500 ppm or 4.4500%, Purple Paint (First Floor dining room): 5010 mg/kg or 5010 ppm or 0.5010%, Rust/Orange Paint (First Floor prayer room): 106 mg/kg or 106 ppm or 0.0106% & White Paint (Second Floor window sill): 2500 mg/kg or 2500 ppm or 0.2500%.

• The remaining seven (7) paint samples revealed results below the 90 mg/kg guideline. The concentrations for these samples ranged from 4.0 mg/kg (Blue paint in Office Area) to 34.4 mg/kg (Blue paint in TV Room).

Mercury

- Mercury may be present as a liquid in thermostats.
- Fluorescent light bulbs (tubes) being used throughout the building should be disposed of in an appropriate manner. These bulbs are known to contain mercury.

Silica

• Silica (crystalline) is presumed to be in cement, cement blocks, concrete, bricks, mortar, ceramics, granite, slate, stone, asphalt, etc. where present in the building.

PCBs

• No PCB materials were identified during this study

Ozone Depleting Substances (ODS)

• Any equipment containing ozone depleting substances must be serviced by contractors licensed to handle ozone depleting substances. ODS must be removed prior to disposal of equipment and this work must be completed by contractors



licensed to handle ODSs. Applicable legislation is found in the Ontario EPA under Ontario regulation 189, Refrigerants Regulation, section 17 & 18.

Urea Formaldehyde Foam Insulation (UFFI)

• At the time of this audit, no UFFI was observed, however because this was not a full destructive assessment, UFFI may be present within building walls. During the demolition a visual assessment should be carried out for UFFI.

Mould

• No visible mould was observed during this study.



LIMITATIONS AND DISCLAIMER

This report presents the findings of a Designated Substance Survey, and does not constitute a legal opinion. The findings are professional opinions based on interpretation of information obtained through visual observations, sample collection and analysis made during the site visit.

The opinions apply to the site conditions existing at the time of the site visit. This report is intended to be used in its entirety, and no excerpts may be taken to be representative of the findings.

The methods used during this assessment, while aimed at minimizing the potential for undetected designated substances, cannot guarantee their absence. Services have been performed in a manner consistent with the level of care and skill ordinarily exercised by members of our profession. No other warranties are expressed or implied. Based on the aforementioned limitations, Roop Chanderdat & Associates disclaims responsibility for undisclosed or undetected designated substances, and any costs that may be incurred by any party as a result of such an omission. Any use of this document, or the findings, conclusions or recommendations presented, by any party other than by Allen-Hastings Limited and the St. Mary's and the Missions Parish is the sole responsibility of the user.

Chanderdet

Roop Chanderdat, EP, OHST, C.E.I., cCT, C.R.S. Principal Consultant



Appendix F: to the Urban Design Study

December 2019

St Mary's and the Missions, Report of Parishioner Engagement for the Rectory Renewal Project Prepared by Robert Foster, Member, St Mary's Building Committee, November 25, 2019.



St Mary's and the Missions

Report of parishioner engagement re: Rectory Renewal Project

In order to inform and engage the Parishioners and Catholic Community of St Mary's and the Mission Churches which encompass a large portion of Grey - Bruce, presentations to Parishioners were made in a town hall format as follows:

| April 8, 2018 | St Vincent's, Meaford |
|----------------|-------------------------------|
| April 8, 2018 | St Stanislaus, Chatsworth |
| April 19, 2018 | St Mary's, Owen Sound 10:00AM |
| April 19, 2018 | St Mary's, Owen Sound 8:00PM |
| May 9, 2018 | St Thomas Aquinas, Wiarton |
| June 9, 2018 | St Mark's, Lions Head |
| June 9, 2019 | St Thomas, Tobermory |
| July 14, 2018 | Holy Family, Sauble Beach |
| July 15, 2018 | Holy Family, Sauble Beach |

Presentations, made by members of the Building Committee included historic background; photo tour of present building; explanation of studied options i.e.: full restoration; major renovation; minor renovation; off-site build; do nothing; demolition and replace. Preliminary drawings were shown and made available to those in attendance. Drawings were posted in each church for several subsequent weekends with committee members being available for follow up queries.

The verbal response from attendees was overwhelmingly supportive, there was not a single objection to the project but there were comments for changes which were noted by the committee. A suggestion box was also made available at St Mary's. In order to better document feedback, survey forms were provided at each event and made available for subsequent weekends. In total about 150 completed surveys were returned, 96% were fully supportive, 4% conditionally supportive, none were opposed.

Robert Foster Member, St Mary's Building Committee Nov 25, 2019

RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS OF CONSENT FOR ST. MARY'S RECTORY DEMOLITION

APPLICABLE TO OPTIONS 2C AND 2D:

- A. The development of the site will require Site Plan Approval, Heritage and Building Permits, and any other approvals required for development of the lands to the satisfaction of the City of Owen Sound.
- B. That a Demolition Permit not be issued and demolition not proceed until such time as Site Plan Approval for the rectory reconstruction project has been received and a Heritage Permit for site alteration has been issued.
- C. That demolition and reconstruction occur under the supervision of a qualified structural Engineer to ensure protection of the apse, sacristy and sanctuary.
- D. That the structural Engineer retained to oversee the demolition and reconstruction cease all works and contact the City immediately if there is any evidence of damage or potential for damage to the apse, sacristy and/or sanctuary.
- E. The appropriate sediment and erosion controls, enhanced tree hoarding, and construction protection measures for the remaining buildings be planned and erected to the satisfaction of the Community Services Department and Engineering Services Division.
- F. That a provisional Heritage Permit for demolition be required, which shall include requirements for documenting the historic rectory and direction to salvage and securely store prescribed materials/items of historic value or interest.
- G. That Architectural Control Guidelines and any other warranted site conservation measure be finalized through the Site Plan Approvals process to the satisfaction of the Planning and Heritage Division and registered on title of the lands as part of the Site Plan Agreement.