Frequently Asked Questions

What is a Heritage Master Plan?

- It guides the City’s plans for finding, assessing, conserving and celebrating heritage resources.
- It encourages development that respects the heritage character of Cambridge.
- It recommends policies for inclusion in the City’s Official Plan.
- It provides priorities and timelines for the City’s actions in heritage conservation.

How will it affect my property?

- It is an overall plan for the entire city and will not directly affect individual properties.
- It makes provision for new development to be compatible with existing settings.
- It guides growth in ways that avoid negative impacts on existing neighbourhoods.

Who prepared the plan?

- It was prepared by a consulting team hired by the City.
- The team included heritage planners, architects, tourism and economic development consultants, cultural resource specialists, historians and archaeologists.
- The plan was guided by a steering committee composed of the Mayor and representatives of Council and the major interest groups in Cambridge.
- Comments from the public (via interviews and surveys) influenced the plan.

How was the plan prepared?

- It followed terms of reference provided by the City.
- It reflects current Provincial, national and international best practices in heritage planning.
- It was reviewed at regular intervals by the steering committee.
- It culminated in a final report for adoption by Council.
What will happen after the City adopts the Plan?

- The recommended action plan and timeline provide a list of immediate and longer term projects to implement the plan.
- The study steering committee becomes the implementation committee responsible for carrying out the plan’s recommendations.
- It contains ways to monitor the effectiveness of the recommended projects.
- It leads to changes in the way heritage is managed by the City, and to revised policies in the City’s Official Plan.
- It encourages partnerships with other agencies and groups to act on its recommendations.

Who can I ask for further information?

- Contact Valerie Spring, Heritage Planner at (519) 740-4650 x 4580 or springv@cambridge.ca

Overview

The following Plan has several distinct but related sections. It is intended to be read as a whole, in sequence. However, for those interested in specific topics, there are key sections that should be noted:

- For an overview of what the plan is and what it hopes to achieve, see the Executive Summary.
- For questions about the study purpose and process, see Sections 1 and 2.
- For an explanation of the range of heritage resources considered, see Section 3.
- For a thematic history of the community, see Section 4.
- For a summary of comments received in interviews, surveys and meetings, see Section 5.
- For good ideas from elsewhere, see Section 6.
- For strategies for improving the City’s heritage inventory, planning policies, and economic development opportunities, see Section 7.
- For the recommendations and action plan, see Section 8.
- For background on the current state of heritage planning in Cambridge, see Appendix A.
- For meeting minutes, references and a list of persons interviewed, see the remaining Appendices B-D.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
**Scope and Purpose**

What is a Heritage Master Plan? It is a new approach to current issues surrounding the management of heritage places. In this it is both a vision document and a policy document, both a product and a process. At the highest level, the Plan expresses the shared values of the community, as manifest in buildings and landscapes and in the cultural uses of such places. The Plan explores these values, puts them in an historic context, and shows how they can have relevance now and in the future. Policies (and actions) in the Plan are intended to make that vision a reality. The Plan is a document to reference as well as a process to forge new ways of doing things.

The Heritage Master Plan is an essential first step in moving forward and focusing on the key issues around preparing heritage conservation policies and strategies. However, the Plan is no panacea: it depends upon acceptance by both the City administration and the public at large and, thus, will be proven if it results in new projects and improved management practices.

In terms of expectations for its effectiveness, the Plan *can*:

- Provide strategies for improving the delivery of heritage services, such as an upgraded inventory and evaluation process, and better management practices both within the City administration and in the voluntary sector;
- Pull together the best advice from previous studies, public comment, the steering committee and City staff review into a single, comprehensive document;
- Recommend revised or updated policies for inclusion in the Official Plan;
- Provide strategies for implementation, via a set of objectives and prioritized action steps; and
- Make it easier for the general public to become engaged in heritage activity.

At the same time, the Plan *cannot* be expected to:

- Resolve current controversies surrounding threats to heritage properties; or
• Show quick results in terms of economic benefits and improved community support for heritage conservation.

*Origins*

Even so, the Plan has a good chance of becoming a catalyst for success because it is the culmination of efforts by many local citizens, over many years. The Plan is based on several initiatives aimed at increasing public awareness of the city’s history. Driving and walking tours of the city prepared by Heritage Cambridge in the 1970s and 1980s provided an initial sense of the heritage resources available locally. Augmenting these were early attempts to forge consensus on overall heritage policy. The first was “Our Common Future”, prepared in 1994 by the Economic Development Advisory Committee of Council. It laid out a set of broad policy objectives and action plan steps for the city, including initiatives involving heritage conservation. From this initial recognition of the cultural and economic importance of heritage arose the Legacy Cambridge project, prepared in 2003 and focused specifically on policies for conservation of natural and cultural heritage resources. The first priority in the final report of Legacy Cambridge was the preparation of a Heritage Master Plan.

As a result of these efforts, this Plan is not starting from scratch, and is thus an efficient use of public time and money. The Heritage Master Plan updates and modifies recommendations made in previous studies to suit current conditions and revised Provincial planning and heritage legislation. In doing so, it ensures that the relevant ideas from earlier efforts are retained and given the opportunity to be implemented.

*Constraints and Proactive Responses*

The conflicts over heritage issues, and the missed opportunities to realize community and economic benefits from heritage conservation, have been addressed in the preparation of this plan. The current document offers a way to move beyond conflicts over heritage into new partnerships, providing there is the public will to do so. Recent events in Cambridge show an impasse between Council and heritage advocates in several instances, but the causes of this situation go deeper. There is an incomplete inventory of heritage resources. Lack of information stymies efforts to identify potential threats to heritage resources until the last stages of the development process, at which time it is usually too late to
change plans to incorporate heritage elements. Lack of information also inhibits formation of a public consensus on heritage values, and this muddies debate over future development.

In response, the Plan’s emphasis on inventory, character areas, partnerships and priority projects focuses future discussions on positive change and fosters informed debate over options.

There are challenges posed from outside Cambridge to which the City must respond. In particular, the Province has recently made requirements for significant intensification of downtown cores, especially in communities near Toronto, via a policy directive known as “Places to Grow”. Since Cambridge is one of the ring of communities within the Toronto-centred region, it has been added to the list of cities that the Province requires to expand in order to handle a rapidly growing regional population. The preferred form of the expansion is redevelopment within existing urban boundaries. As a response to Provincial requirements, the Heritage Master Plan offers approaches to redevelopment that help the City avoid having to sacrifice heritage resources to growth pressures. The Plan recommends directing new growth away from areas of heritage significance, and encourages suitable infill within heritage areas, as directed by urban design plans.

_Catalyst for Consensus_

The basis for good planning policy is public consensus on community values. The Heritage Master Plan can provide a start to discussions amongst local residents as to what is special about Cambridge as a place, and explore ways to preserve and enhance the qualities of the physical setting that are essential to its character. Using the opportunities presented by heritage planning, and by the _Ontario Heritage Act_, the City can work with local residents to identify meanings and values for places within Cambridge. The Plan suggests a focus on “character areas” and on a process of “bottom up” consultations with residents of such areas. The Plan offers ways of demonstrating local pride, as well as ways to foster economic development and improve local quality of life.
Principles

The Heritage Master Plan recommends four major initiatives and five planning principles, within which a series of objectives and related actions are found. The initiatives are:

1. build community support;
2. provide heritage “product”; 
3. establish an implementation framework, and; 
4. foster co-operation.

The principles to effect these initiatives are:

1. focus on character areas; 
2. set modest goals; 
3. use education as advocacy; 
4. promote heritage-friendly development, and; 
5. make partnerships work.

Priorities

The consensus reached by the study steering committee and the study team is that the following actions are priorities to be accomplished in the next five years:

- Add to the inventory by focusing on character areas.
- Conduct community workshops in each character area, to inform and engage local residents and business owners, and build consensus towards conservation and enhancement of the area’s heritage resources.
- Consolidate existing heritage walking and driving tours and programs under a single body or agency.
- Create new, themed walking tours of the downtown cores.
- Work with the Province to resolve issues involving revitalization of historic industrial buildings located in floodplains.
- Incorporate the Heritage Master Plan recommendations into the updated Official Plan and Zoning By-law.
- Begin to prepare urban design plans for the downtown character areas.
- Work with the development community and other industry and academic partners to promote heritage-friendly development, and develop pilot projects of same to demonstrate its benefits.
• Secure sources of additional funding and/or partnership opportunities for heritage projects.
• Monitor the success of the pilot projects/initiatives.

The main tasks this plan should accomplish in the longer term are to:
• Complete the inventory of character areas; where appropriate, designate character areas as Heritage Conservation Districts.
• Complete the urban design plans for the remaining downtown character areas.
• Prepare a municipal interpretation master plan, based on the Heritage Master Plan thematic history.
• Establish a city-wide urban design review panel, with an awards program.
• Work with regional partners to create a cultural tourism corridor along the upper Grand River.
• Establish a heritage awards program.

A Vision for the Future
If the Heritage Master Plan recommendations are adopted and implemented, what will Cambridge look like in 25 years? The following is a possible description of conditions then:

In how Cambridge relates to the presence of the past, it will be:
• re-united with its rivers, through enhanced trail networks, new public open spaces along the banks, added opportunities to interpret natural and cultural history alongside the National Heritage Rivers;
• reclaiming its countryside through preserved farmland, scenic routes and promotion of the farmers’ market;
• re-acquainted with its past, especially its early aboriginal, farming and industrial history, clear in its understanding of what parts of the city should be conserved, and what parts should change, and;
• eliciting stories that capture the essence of what it means to live here.

In how the City operates, it will be:
• able to provide inventory information on all heritage resources within the identified character areas;
• efficient in its planning and processing of heritage-related changes;
• careful in its monitoring of those changes;
• open to opportunities to derive social and economic benefit from heritage conservation; working towards becoming a centre of excellence for heritage-friendly planning, design and construction, in partnership with the university, community college and local trades organizations, and;
• promoting cultural tourism through emphasis on local heritage assets.

In how Cambridge looks, it will:
• have vibrant downtown cores in each of its component communities, re-populated with residents living in renovated buildings and in new infill, with an enhanced public realm of streets, parks, and pathways;
• have each downtown linked to the next by a transit system that is comparable in efficiency and scope to the former street railway;
• integrate new development within areas of heritage character, offering urban types of mixed-use development, and;
• be celebrating local pride of place through enhancement of the character areas within the city.
Part A:

STUDY PURPOSE
1.

Making a Case for Heritage Master Planning

1.1 What is “Heritage”?

The starting point for any discussion of heritage is an understanding of what a community values. Canadian communities are made up of many things – buildings, landscapes, social customs and routines, natural features, memories – that together help define that community’s character. What “heritage” means in this context is the essence of the place: what makes Cambridge distinct from anywhere else?

“Heritage” as applied to places used to be defined almost exclusively in terms of architectural history, with heritage significance being the extent to which the buildings (usually in isolation from their context) were of note for their style, design, construction, architect or detailing. These narrow definitions of heritage and significance have now been significantly broadened. In Ontario, both under the umbrella planning legislation stated in the Provincial Policy Statement, and under the specific heritage legislation stated in the *Ontario Heritage Act*, heritage now encompasses much more than buildings, and significance means much more than architectural value¹. In a nutshell, heritage is now defined in terms of “cultural resources” which include buildings (and other structures), landscapes (including individual gardens as well as entire urban or rural districts) and archaeological resources (including

---

¹ The Provincial Policy Statement (2005) provides clear definitions of the elements of a place that can be considered of heritage value: it also defines “significance” as applied to such elements. See Section 2.6 of the Statement for policies on cultural heritage and archaeology, and Section 6.0 for definitions of key terms such as “archaeological resources”, “built heritage resources”, “cultural heritage landscape”, and “significant”. See the Ontario Heritage Tool Kit for discussion of heritage resources, including criteria for determining significance.
artifacts as well as buried objects). The criteria by which heritage significance is defined include not only their excellence as designs or surviving examples of a building, landscape or archaeological resource type, but also their intangible value as places of recreation, retreat and solace. In summary, many more elements of a community have now been recognized as having value to that community’s “sense of place”, and as having a crucial role in defining that community’s character.

1.2 Why Make a Heritage Master Plan?

A heritage master plan is the best way for a community to identify those resources and both protect and celebrate them. It is the means by which community character can be defined and the key elements of that character conserved. The Cambridge Heritage Master Plan is both a response to current challenges in conservation of heritage resources and a description of aspirations for a preferred way of treating such resources in the future.

In essence, the plan is a means of managing change in ways that support the meanings and values the Cambridge residents have for their city. This process primarily involves changes to the physical setting but also includes impacts on a full range of cultural heritage resources such as artifacts or cultural practices and other such intangibles. It involves seeing these resources as assets. Once heritage resources are acknowledged as being important to the future development of Cambridge, then change can be managed in beneficial ways.

The Heritage Master Plan deals with two kinds of change:

- *quantitative*, in the retention of heritage resources, and;
- *qualitative*, in the enhancement of local quality of life as a result of what happens to heritage resources.

Planning for heritage resources focuses on the conservation and enhancement of such resources, and thus involves controls on market forces that, in some cases, if left unchecked, could cause the degradation or loss of heritage resources. Development is certainly encouraged, but only certain kinds of development are recommended as being “heritage friendly” and therefore suitable for construction in heritage settings. Such
an approach to development is relatively new in Canada and requires a higher degree of creativity than would be needed to build a standard development on a cleared site. As in any sort of planning, not just for heritage, a key issue to resolve is the balance between the rights and needs of individual property owners and those of the citizenry as a whole.

Generally speaking, heritage planning involves building community-wide consensus as to the proper relationship between individual and collective values, rights and responsibilities as applied to heritage resources. Discussions around heritage matters seek to clarify the specific resources that local people value, to identify them, and to describe them in ways that can be translated into planning policies and development guidelines. Consensus can be reached if the majority of local residents see the benefits of heritage planning, both as individuals and as a community. And as will be shown in this Plan, heritage conservation and enhancement has the ability to spark community pride and foster economic growth.

Accordingly, heritage planning is not a top-down exercise imposing policies on the community at large. Because heritage plans involve a discussion of cultural values, by necessity the discussion must include the opinions and suggestions of a greater proportion of the resident population. It should also include an assessment of what local character has been in the past, and of the ways in which that character has changed over time, and why. The following document does this.

In summary, the Heritage Master Plan has several purposes. It is both a vision document, to start a process of consensus building around heritage values, and a policy document, to foster Council’s decisionmaking and staff’s implementation. It is both a process – of making aware and building consensus – and a product – of strategies, policies, and actions in the form of pilot projects. Once in place, the Plan encourages the community as a whole to look at Cambridge in new ways so that both residents and visitors appreciate local history and are motivated to enhance the best elements of the local setting.
1.3 What are the Plan’s Terms of Reference?

The Heritage Master Plan is guided by the heritage policies of the Ontario government and by national and international best practices in heritage planning. These include, but are not confined to, guidelines from the *Ontario Heritage Tool Kit* and the federal *Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada*. Having said that, there are no specific guidelines for preparing such plans, and thus each heritage master plan is a specific response to a single community.

In the case of Cambridge, the study team used an approach to heritage planning that drew on a number of sources. It is modelled on Canadian precedents, especially the Heritage Master Plan recently prepared by members of this study team for the City of Niagara Falls. It is also modelled on local initiatives to promote heritage planning. As stated in the study terms of reference, the Heritage Master Plan is the culmination of several efforts by the City and its residents to start planning for heritage. Beginning with “Our Common Future: A Strategy to Guide Cambridge into the 21st Century (October, 2004)”, which was an overall strategic plan produced by the City and community groups, the next initiative was the Legacy Cambridge Task Force (2001), established by the City and comprised of representatives of key sectors of the community. Their final report (November, 2003) had as its primary recommendation the Heritage Master Plan for the City of Cambridge. The City of Cambridge formally responded to this recommendation by issuing the terms of reference for the Heritage Master Plan in July, 2005.

The study terms of reference position the heritage master plan as an important part of the City’s larger exercise of updating the Official Plan for Cambridge. Recommended policies and procedures for inclusion in the revised Official Plan are to be a component of the Heritage Master Plan. But the terms also refer to broader issues of community identity and future development. Overall, the Plan is to provide “a comprehensive strategy for the conservation of Cambridge’s built heritage resources [so that] key heritage features are valued, appropriately used and protected to the extent necessary to retain their integrity as the city grows”\(^2\). This

---

\(^2\) Note that the City defines “built heritage resources” (Official Plan, Section 21.7, Glossary) as including both cultural landscapes as sites of archaeological potential, so
another quote from the study terms: “The objective of the Heritage Master Plan is to develop a strategy to identify, manage, conserve and promote valued built heritage resources in the City of Cambridge”.

The key components of the Heritage Master Plan are:

- a broad assessment of the city’s heritage resources;
- identification of areas of distinct heritage character within the city;
- recommendations for improving the City’s process for inventorying and evaluating heritage resources; and
- strategies and policy recommendations for better managing the heritage resources.

that the Plan will address the full range of cultural resources cited in Provincial legislation.
2.

Producing a Heritage Master Plan

2.1 Study Method

There is no standard approach to heritage planning; it involves a wide range of approaches, some substantive, some instrumental, but following common practices in the preparation of planning reports. The Heritage Master Plan is contextual in that it covers the entire municipality in space and, because it deals with elements of the past as they affect current and future action, in time. The substantive elements are addressed in the form of technical recommendation and pilot projects, with instrumental elements being the recommended planning tools to implement them, all within an overarching set of objectives.

The study process involved research using historical, economic, and market data, and previous studies. As part of this Plan, the study team commissioned opinion surveys and conducted interviews, augmenting the information gained from these with comments from the steering committee, driving and walking tours through the various parts of the city, and any comparable heritage planning processes from other communities. The City’s heritage planner was the project manager who, with the lead consultant, was responsible for liaison with the steering committee and the public. Interview subjects were suggested by the steering committee, and public opinion surveys were co-ordinated and distributed by the heritage planner.

The methodology for this study was based on a three-fold approach: archival/field research; interviews/surveys, and; discussions with City staff and the study steering committee.
The archival research included reviews of existing studies and publications, local histories and oral histories, all of which formed the background to a thematic history of Cambridge (an overview of the main historical trends that defined the ways in which the city grew, and which constitute the city’s heritage character). We conducted approximately 35 interviews (by telephone and in person), followed by an opinion survey (distributed at the Cambridge Mall and in the newspaper) that garnered over 120 written responses. We reviewed City policy documents, procedures and programmes. We toured the city, both as part of a guided tour with the City’s heritage planner and on our own.

Our consulting team worked closely with City staff and members of the steering committee, initially to confirm the study scope, then to identify a list of interview subjects and to construct and administer an opinion survey. Comments from each steering committee meeting have informed the study.

The heritage planning process is intended to influence the Official Plan review in several ways. The Heritage Master Plan is reliant largely on the existing information upon which the current Official Plan is based, such as the current inventory of heritage resources, existing historical and archival material, and for broader trends, the City’s research to define demographic, social, economic and cultural trends in city as a whole. The Heritage Master Plan focuses on the heritage resource component of those larger trends and suggests ways in which heritage conservation can contribute to policy objectives in those other areas. The Heritage Master Plan also informs the City’s emerging response to the Province’s “Places to Grow” policy by identifying areas of heritage character and suggesting ways in which intensification of existing urban areas can be accommodated in a heritage-supportive fashion. Areas of heritage character may then become subject of further planning analysis in the form of Secondary Plans, special policy areas, urban design plans, or Heritage Conservation Districts. Guidelines for enhanced heritage planning as part of Site Plan Control are also addressed. Overall, the intent of the Heritage Master Plan is to find ways to enhance and implement the heritage policy tools found in the Official Plan.
2.2 Study Team

The study was led by BRAY Heritage (heritage planners), with ERA Architect Inc. (built heritage specialists), the Tourism Company (cultural tourism and economic development specialists), Maltby & Associates (conservators and cultural facility specialists), and Archaeological Services Inc. (historians and archaeologists). Our thanks go to the many members of the public who gave their time in interviews and in responding to surveys conducted for this study. Special thanks go to members of the project steering committee:

- Mayor Doug Craig
- Councillor Ben Tucci
- Janet Babcock, Commissioner of Planning Services, City of Cambridge
- Dan Currie, Director of Policy Planning, City of Cambridge
- Valerie Spring, Heritage Planner, City of Cambridge
- Lucille Bish, Director of Community Services, Region of Waterloo
- Deborah Hartt, Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee, City of Cambridge
- Kathryn McGarry, Committee Chair, Heritage Cambridge representative
- Jeff Lederer, School of Architecture, University of Waterloo representative
- Catherine Thompson, arts community representative
- Sam Head, development community representative
- Andrew Macdonald, citizen at large

Thanks also to Wendy Wright, former Commissioner of Planning Services, Alain Pinard, former Director of Policy Planning, and Anita Tomins, former representative of Cambridge Tourism, for their work with the steering committee in the early stages of this planning process.
Part B:

HERITAGE RESOURCES AND CONSERVATION OPPORTUNITIES
3.

The Range of Heritage Resources to be Considered

3.1 Introduction

The history of Cambridge can be seen as the foundation upon which strategies for conserving heritage resources is based. The main themes identified in the previous section can be the initial means of identifying types of resources that should be considered as a high priority for conservation, mainly because such resources are needed to both represent and interpret key aspects of the city’s past. As in a museum, the displays of authentic artifacts are vital parts of the overall story that reveals local history.

As has been discussed previously, Cambridge has made a good start in its inventory of heritage resources, but improvements are needed. As is the case with many other municipalities in Ontario, Cambridge has focused on a relatively narrow range of resource types, emphasizing buildings. Cambridge also shares the problem faced by other public agencies in having too few staff to adequately assess and administer the heritage resources in their jurisdiction. Added to these issues are the common misconceptions on the part of property owners and the public at large as to the affects of conservation policies on private rights.

Ways of dealing with these issues involve two approaches. On the one hand, the benefits of heritage resource conservation can be demonstrated, using precedents. This approach appeals to the rational side of human nature. On the other hand, a broader range of heritage resource types can be identified, bringing in more of the favourite places, and place experiences identified in the interviews and public surveys. This approach evokes more of an emotional response. Using an approach that offers a combination of “hearts and minds”, support for conservation can
be generated in a broader segment of the local population. The following section reviews the range of heritage resource types that should be considered for conservation, as a lead-in to a discussion of strategies for broadening public support.

3.2 Context for Conservation

What are Heritage Resources?
The federal government, in its Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada (2003), gives the overall definition by stating that: “The term “heritage” can cover a wide range of physical things from a railway station to a garden to a painting, and non-physical things such as traditional knowledge and language” (p. 4). All of these are, in a sense, an “inheritance” from past generations. There are material heritage resources, such as physical settings, and associative resources, such as traditional community festivals. Resources can be immoveable, such as buildings, or moveable, such as artifacts. All of these resources are products of human endeavour, and thus are “cultural” heritage resources.

Ontario is entering a new era of heritage awareness and, thus, stewardship of evidence of the past. New legislation in the form of significantly strengthened Provincial policies has put heritage conservation as a priority in land use policy planning and regulation. The Provincial Policy Statement and Ontario Heritage Act, both revised in 2005, are the key policy documents, and recent amendments to the Planning Act (e.g. Bill 51) provide municipalities with stronger tools for determining the form and type of new development. Provincial policies such as “Places to Grow”, with their requirements for significant intensification of existing built-up areas in the Greater Toronto Area, bring with them the implied need for coherent and comprehensive policies for dealing with a wide range of heritage resources.

These new policies describe what resources are to be considered. In accord with international best practices in heritage conservation, the Provincial Ministry of Culture’s Ontario Heritage Tool Kit (2006) lists the full range of cultural heritage resources to be considered in heritage conservation (Heritage Property Evaluation: 6):
• Residential, commercial, institutional, agricultural or industrial buildings;
• Monuments, such as a cenotaph, public art or a statue;
• Structures, such as a water tower, culvert, fence or bridge;
• Natural features that have cultural heritage value or interest;
• Cemeteries, gravestones or cemetery markers;
• Cultural heritage landscapes;
• Spiritual sites;
• Building interiors;
• Ruins;
• Archaeological sites, including marine archaeology;
• Areas of archaeological potential; and
• Built/immoveable fixtures or chattels attached to real property.

This comprehensive list shows that heritage can involve much more than buildings and, in doing so, can encompass many more aspects of people’s everyday lives than would a narrow focus on architectural history. As a result, the broad range of cultural heritage resources is more inclusive and, thus, more appealing, to the general public. Shared affection for special places in Cambridge is the starting point for more formal efforts to conserve and celebrate such places.

Such a long list of cultural heritage resources is somewhat unwieldy to use in the context of a municipal heritage master plan. Accordingly, this Plan will use the three main resource categories found in the Provincial Policy Statement, and in the City of Cambridge Official Plan and which can include the sub-types and both material and associative resources found in the above list. The three categories are:
• Built heritage resources;
• Cultural heritage landscapes; and
• Archaeological resources.

_How are Heritage Resources Identified and Conserved?_
Municipalities, as well as higher levels of government, make lists of properties that have potential cultural heritage value or interest. In Ontario, the list, or municipal register, of cultural heritage properties is the starting point for further initiatives to conserve such resources. The primary form of conservation is designation of a property on the list, under Section 29 of the _Ontario Heritage Act_. Designation requires
evaluation of the property’s cultural heritage value or interest using the criteria prescribed in Ontario Regulation 9/06, followed by passing of a municipal by-law designating the property and registering that designation on title and placing the designation on municipal, provincial and federal registers of cultural heritage properties.

The process of identifying cultural heritage resources is now defined in detail in the Ministry of Culture’s Tool Kit. Essentially, it is up to the community to find properties for inclusion on the list, and it is usually done by the volunteer members of the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee, assisted by other local heritage groups and by a municipal heritage planner, where one exists. The process usually involves two steps: listing properties that have been identified as having heritage value and, where such value is deemed to be significant, designation under the Ontario Heritage Act. Criteria for inclusion on the municipal list (or register) are not specified, but the criteria for designation are, and these are the best standard for judging potential heritage value or interest. The criteria given in Regulation 9/06 cover three main categories: design or physical value; historical or associative value; and contextual value. Properties may be designated under the Ontario Heritage Act if they meet one or more of these criteria. Research in the form of archival searches and site analyses is needed to make such evaluations, and there must be a written description of the “reasons for designation” in response to the prescribed criteria. The City of Cambridge has been following the main steps in this process for some time and is now able to comply fully with the new Provincial requirements.

In terms of improving existing municipal procedures to capture the full range of cultural heritage resources in Cambridge, there have been several attempts to do so over the past few decades. Over the past 30 years, Heritage Cambridge has produced an excellent series of documents, starting with a driving tour of architectural heritage in Cambridge, and followed by a series of walking tours and information papers. The Legacy Cambridge project cast a wide net over a range of heritage resources, and recommended that a heritage master plan be prepared. The City’s heritage planner has for many years researched and written the “Landmark” series of articles describing individual heritage properties in the city. Kenneth McLaughlin, historian, has written the definitive community history, and Jim Quantrell, City Archivist, has
provided short articles on a wide variety of historical topics, many of which describe types of heritage resources. But perhaps the most comprehensive of these earlier attempts to assess the overall urban fabric was the conservation report by Dilse (1981). In this report, the author provides a history of the city’s urban development, then assesses sub-areas in which he has found significant concentrations of cultural heritage resources. He then goes on to propose conservation policy for these areas, and for the city as a whole. Although the report’s recommendations have not been implemented fully, and the Provincial policy framework has changed since the report was submitted, the analysis remains a good starting point for assessing the cultural heritage resource base across the city.

The following summary is an overview of the resources Dilse identifies, augmented with items from the City’s inventory and using observations made as part of the current Master Plan process. Dilse has an architectural focus that is too narrow for today’s needs, and some properties he valued are now gone, thus his selections are not going to be mirrored throughout all of the following text. However, his notion of identifying groupings of cultural heritage resources is a valid one and will be used as a key strategy in the recommendations of this master plan (more on this in later sections).

### 3.3 Built Heritage Resources

**Inventory Listings**
The City’s inventory includes a range of buildings, most of which are residential, institutional and commercial, with fewer industrial or other building types. The majority of these buildings are from the 19th and early 20th centuries, with a few buildings of more recent vintage. There are some categories of buildings that are under-represented, such as tourist architecture and purpose-built accommodation for WWII female workers or recruits. Most of the surviving industrial buildings, as well as some of the commercial and institutional buildings, have been converted to new uses. Both the City inventory and Dilse manage to identify both grand and the humble buildings, recognizing the value of vernacular construction within the city fabric.
What is unfortunate is the loss of whole categories of buildings, and of concentrations of them, due to flood, fire, neglect or development pressure. Galt lost most of its riverside industrial buildings in one short period, thanks to remediation efforts following the 1974 floods, and has lost other important buildings for lack of better alternatives. Preston lost much of its industrial and tourism architecture thanks to road widenings and condominium development. Blair was largely spared, as was Hespeler, in both cases due to a lack of pressure for urban redevelopment. Luckily, the city as a whole is rich in architectural resources and still contains many significant buildings from all periods of its history.

**Industrial Buildings**

In Dilse’s analysis, Hespeler has by far the greatest concentration of older industrial buildings. He rates the core of the village as having high architectural quality, a high level of vernacular character overall, and identifies at least 44 individual heritage buildings within his suggested district boundaries. The area has changed little since he did his analysis and thus remains of high value. Not only are the buildings intact, but a few are still in industrial use.

Preston had a concentration of industrial buildings in the former Cambridge Village area flanking the Speed River, but demolitions since the time of his study have seriously eroded the industrial fabric. Survivals include the former industrial buildings flanking Eagle Street North as well as the mill at the river crossing, continuing an operation that is almost two centuries old.

Blair has a few surviving industrial buildings, including the Sheave Tower, all of which are now converted to other uses. The list includes a former tannery, grist mill, and sawmill. Designation of the village as a Heritage Conservation District has put in place comprehensive conservation policies.

Galt has lost its main concentration of industrial buildings thanks to the flood control measures undertaken in the 1970s. The surviving industrial buildings, most of them on the west side of the river, have been converted to retail or institutional uses.
Institutional Buildings

It is fortunate that the city has recognized the public value of institutional buildings, such that it has saved and found ongoing use for a wide range of them. Hespeler, Preston and Galt each have historic churches, schools and town halls as community icons in their downtown cores. Cambridge has also managed to list, as well as designate, a range of institutional buildings, including fire halls, libraries, public utilities buildings, municipal pumping stations, post offices, an armoury, and a hockey arena.

Commercial Buildings

The largest surviving collections of older buildings tend to be in the commercial cores of each component community. Dilse rates Galt’s core highest in terms of the architectural quality, vernacular character, and number of individual heritage buildings present there. The Heritage Conservation District in the core reflects this assessment. Most of the downtown commercial buildings were, or are still, mixed commercial/residential, with apartments over street level shops. Exceptions include the surviving spa hotel in Preston (now vacant) and other hotels, the farmer’s market in Galt, and the Gore Mutual insurance headquarters building, also in Galt. Although underuse of upper storeys in mixed use buildings remains a problem, commercial buildings in Cambridge for the most part have continued in use, and many have been listed or designated as further proof of their continuing value.

Agricultural Buildings

Cambridge has little farmland left within its municipal boundaries. What few agricultural buildings remain include former farmhouses and mills now incorporated within the urban fabric. Other agriculture-related buildings within the settlements include, for example, the Cambridge Farmer’s Market in downtown Galt, the nearby livestock exporter offices at 10-16 Water Street North, and the old Parr Dairy at 136 Cooper Street in Hespeler. Of potentially greater importance are the few surviving farm complexes in the northwest corner of the city, near the river. The latter are under threat from urban development pressures.

Residential Buildings

As in the institutional category, there is a large range of residential property identified as having heritage value in Cambridge. From the very
grand, such as Langdon Hall mansion, to the very humble, such as the vernacular cottages in downtown Hespeler, the spectrum of housing is large. Also included are both single family and multiple occupancy dwellings, although there are relatively few in the latter category. Dilse identifies several residential neighbourhoods, or portions thereof, as having potential for district designation. Most of the dwellings recognized by the City and Dilse are from the 19th and early 20th century, with a few exceptions such as the 1960s house in Preston designed by Arthur Erickson.

**Structures**
Cambridge has a variety of heritage structures, some of which are recognized in the municipal inventory. Of primary importance are the bridges over the Grand in Galt, as well as the Black Bridge outside Hespeler, but also included are a number of other structures, some utilitarian, some commemorative, some decorative. There are the Hespeler and Preston dams, more recent municipal water towers, memorials to wartime servicemen, monuments to commemorate ethnic groups and important persons, bandshells, salvaged elements from demolished buildings, and entrance gates to public parks. Streetscape elements such as the globe lights found in Dickson Hill and the east side neighbourhoods are also worthy of note, and the waterside art works recently installed may be eligible for consideration in the future.

3.4 Cultural Heritage Landscapes

**Inventory listings**
Because of their focus on buildings and structures, neither the municipal inventory nor Dilse’s report provides a comprehensive assessment of landscapes. Aside from the parks and cemetery in Dickson Hill, and such important public sites as Queen’s Square and Riverside Park, there are no listings as yet for the remaining landscapes that should be recognized for their heritage value. Pending the cultural landscape assessment to be provided by the Region of Waterloo, this Plan will identify some of the more obvious candidates for inclusion in the inventory.

Cultural heritage landscapes are defined in the Provincial Tool Kit as being “modified by human activities and…valued by a community. A landscape involves a grouping(s) of individual heritage features such as
structures, spaces, etc.”. As such, cultural heritage landscapes encompass designed settings, such as public parks, gardens and squares, and natural open spaces, such as those found along the riversides. They also include views and scenic routes - focal points or linear settings – and aspects of place that do not have a physical component, such as oral histories and cultural practices. All of these deserve recognition in the Master Plan.

Public Parks and Open Spaces

The major parks, especially older parks such as Dickson, Riverside and Soper Parks, should be considered for conservation. The public squares in Preston, Hespeler and Galt are also important, as are some of the landscapes associated with important churches. The market square in Galt is another public space worthy of recognition. The newly created publicly accessible natural settings along river banks and following former rail lines are also important. Popular sports venues, such as baseball diamonds and racetracks (e.g. in Dickson Park) can celebrate the long tradition of outdoor sports in Cambridge. And the environmental reserves in the conservation areas, and in the former Cruickston estate, are protected but still deserve recognition.

Private Landscapes

Aside from the formal designed landscapes in the Galt Mutual insurance company headquarters, and the restored period gardens associated with several of the heritage homes, there are few surviving private landscapes of heritage value. Former landscapes of this type worthy of consideration for restoration could include the private recreation venues at Idylwild Park and Leisure Lodge, and the terraced gardens behind the Del Monte spa hotel.

Views

The Waterloo Community-University Research Alliance (CURA) recently completed an assessment of viewscapes for downtown Cambridge (Galt). In their 2006 monograph, they identify the key views within this area as being north-south views along the river, primarily from the bridges, and east –west views to and from Queen’s Square, primarily along Main Street. Generally speaking, they note that the Galt skyline is defined by church steeples and the town hall tower, and is thus “legible”.

---
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No other assessment of views in the rest of the city has been undertaken so far. Should such assessments be made, it is likely that similar comments to those found in the CURA report could be made about the legibility of the cores of both Preston and Hespeler (especially the latter). There should be consideration given to views to and from the flanking hills overlooking the cores of Hespeler and Preston, and of the panoramic views across the Grand River flats from Highway 401 south to George Street. Views at the city entrances, such as the Fountain Street exit from Highway 401, and the north edge of the Galt downtown along Water Street, are two such examples. At pedestrian level, views of the water from the public sidewalk are rare, due to flood control levees or intervening buildings: these views should be identified and preserved.

**Scenic Routes**

Essential to the experience of place in contemporary communities is the view from the road. Aside from a few case studies in the Region of Waterloo’s Scenic Roads Handbook (1995), there has been no comprehensive assessment of heritage resources along roadways. However, there are several important routes to be considered for conservation.

The drive into downtown Cambridge via the Blair Road is a spectacular example of a rural scenic drive, with a historic village and farm estate on one side and the river flats on the other, but that is the only significant scenic drive to be preserved so far. The Avenue Road route has a natural edge as it passes alongside the Shade’s Mills Conservation Area, but the rest of the route has been visually altered by suburban development. The one remaining scenic drive still intact, but under development pressure, is Riverbank Drive, running diagonally from Highway 8 to Regional Road 17, along the east bank of the Grand River near the boundary with the City of Kitchener north of Highway 401. This route offers a range of views of farmland, woods, creeks, and historic farmhouses, interspersed with vistas across the river and glimpses of more recent rural residential development. The linking routes of Allendale Road and Middle Block Road traverse open farmland that still contains large farm complexes. The area is large enough to include woodlots, fields, and buildings within a visually coherent rural landscape. It should be preserved.
These scenic routes are the exceptions: the norm is the suburban strip or the downtown commercial or residential street. The city entrance on the east side of the river is either via the long stretch of strip commercial development on the Hespeler Road or the slightly less commercial route along Highway 8. It is difficult to see the rivers from the roadway in almost all parts of the city, a fact that divorces drivers from making a visual connection with the linking element of the waterway.

Sites of Sacred or Secular Value
This category of cultural heritage resource is rarely used outside the Provincial government’s own realty section, but is included here to capture some of the places considered to be important by those responding to the opinion survey and interviews. Sacred sites usually include memorials and cemeteries; secular sites are most often popular gathering spots. These places, which may have associative value but not historical or architectural value, include such things as community or ethnic group halls, popular hangouts on the highway strips and the most popular spot for younger respondents, the shopping mall. Whether or not they have heritage value remains to be seen, but their mention in a survey for the Heritage Master Plan warrants further discussion in terms of policy recommendations and action plan steps.

Oral Histories
Neglected so far in any inventory are the stories told by local residents, comprising an oral history of the city. A few have been collected as part of municipal local history projects or special events, but there is no comprehensive collection of such reminiscences. One recent attempt to do so is one component of the Company of Neighbours project in Hespeler, where an elderly resident of that village provided a guided tour of the village, and his comments were transcribed into a published tour guide, with illustrations. There is great potential for this type of historical recording, and the results will be an invaluable cultural heritage resource to inform the understanding and interpretation of local history.

Living Traditions and Cultural Practices
Annual community events such as Riverfest, seasonal activities such as shopping at the farmer’s market, and religious celebrations such as saint’s day parades, are all forms of living traditions, or cultural practices, worthy of recognition and conservation. Lapsed practices, such
as the Kirmess formerly celebrated by German-speaking residents of Preston, might be considered for revival. And other traditions and practices wait to be discovered and promoted.

3.5 Archaeological Resources

Archaeological Sites
The recent recognition of the importance of archaeological heritage resources within the Ontario Heritage Act and the Cemeteries Act, in part driven by First Nations concerns, now binds municipalities to have great regard for any areas of archaeological potential. Pending release of the Region’s updated Archaeological Master Plan, there is no comprehensive inventory available of such sites in Cambridge, although known sites are listed in the foregoing historical analysis in this Plan. Most archaeological master plans indicate that lands alongside rivers have high potential for both pre-and-post-contact archaeological remains and it can be assumed that the extensive shorelines along the Grand and Speed Rivers would share such potential. The thematic history provided in this plan also points to areas of the city where archaeological resources are likely to exist. Designation of the Grand as a Canadian Heritage River and the management oversight by the Grand River Conservation Authority implies that archaeological concerns will figure prominently in future land use planning discussions. Policies for addressing archaeological heritage resources now in the City’s Official Plan may have to be updated in response.
4.

Valued Aspects of Cambridge’s Past

4.1 Introduction

Before deciding what types of material and associative cultural heritage resources are valuable in Cambridge, it is necessary to understand the ways in which these resources came into being. The starting point is the land, since Cambridge was founded as an agricultural and industrial settlement dependent upon the natural resources available here. Now that the city and its region are heavily urbanized, conservation of the natural setting is becoming more and more important. And with conservation of the natural setting comes conservation of the traces that successive generations of human occupation have left on that setting.

4.2 The First Setting

The River and its Watershed

The story begins with the rivers. The Grand River and its tributaries were the primary sources of water, transport and power to the human occupants of this region. The Grand River comprises one of the largest watersheds contained within Southern Ontario, measuring approximately 200 miles in length. The main headwaters of the Grand are found in the townships of Amaranth and Luther in Wellington County to the north, as well as in the townships of Maryborough and Mornington to the west. Countless other tributaries rise in the various townships throughout Wellington County. The primary tributaries of the Grand River are the Irvine, Conestoga, Nith, Canagagigue, and Speed River systems which drain an estimated 2,600 square miles (Johnston 1964:xxvii).
Good Land
The geology and geomorphology of the area reflect its glacial origins. The City of Cambridge occupies land that is mainly rolling till plain, formed in the Pleistocene period of the Ice Ages and modified by post-glacial drainage patterns that are now reflected in the Grand River and its tributaries. Under layers of glacial debris is limestone bedrock, hidden for the most part except where exposed in river banks, such as the quarry area on the north bank of the Speed east of Preston. Glacial deposits also included granite boulders, later used by Scottish stonemasons for the distinctive stone masonry buildings in Galt, and clay deposits (for brickmaking) in the Preston area.

It is a fruitful landscape. The generally flat tableland drops steeply into wide riverbeds at each community. Upland soils are generally of good quality, with some pockets of lesser quality sandy and gravelly soils along the eastern margins of the city, where there are glacial moraines. The primeval forest was a rich mix of deciduous and coniferous species. White pine and hardwoods such as maple, beech, wild cherry, ash, elm and red oak predominated. A small pocket of more southern, Carolinian species is found along the west bank of the Grand at the former Cruickston Park estate (now rare). Rainfall is at a good level to support agriculture, and the growing season is marginally longer than that in neighbouring areas (Bloomfield 1995: 25-28). According to the accounts of early settlers, wildlife included a wide variety of wildfowl and animals such as fox, wolf, bear and deer; fishing was also excellent. According to a local tradition, two pioneer families named their lands “Little Paradise” (Bloomfield 1995: 37)

Human Alterations
Early changes to the primordial landscape began with aboriginal clearings for plantings of maize but it was not until European settlement began in earnest that this primordial setting began to change dramatically. The removal of forest cover and extensive cultivation of the underlying soil resulted in increased erosion. Dams built to provide headwaters for mills further altered natural drainage patterns. The legacy of human actions has been flooding throughout the watershed, for over a century, and culminating in the inundation of Galt in 1974. Nonetheless, all early settlement depended upon the rivers, and they continue to affect the city’s future.
Not all was lost in the transformation of virgin forest to farms and settlements. As shown in the paintings of 19th century artist Homer Watson, the rural landscape is a stable one, with prosperous farms and idyllic riverside scenes. Any views of urban settings are from afar, bathed in a golden light. It is a setting in which humans are in harmony with the natural setting. Any hints of the effects of rising industrialization and commercial trade are hidden behind this foreground of rural contentment. According to accounts of Watson’s life and work available at the Doon museum in his name, what he painted was, for much of the 19th century at least, an accurate portrayal of life outside the main towns (it has been left to the photographers to record life there). One can still get a sense of this farm-based landscape in the former Cruickston estate, where small farmsteads co-exist with mature woodlands and marshy river flats.

The dominant pattern of development was urban, however. As settlement progressed, the lower reaches of the Grand River were utilized during the nineteenth century as an important transportation link between Lake Erie and Brantford, while the hydraulic potential along the upper reaches of the river and its tributaries were an inducement for early milling and industrial sites. Despite the remote location of Waterloo County relative to the older, more established settlement centres along the shores of Lakes Ontario and Erie, nevertheless, the fertility of the soil and the availability of mill sites made this region attractive for settlement during the early nineteenth century. The establishment of grist and sawmills in particular - a necessity for life in early Upper Canada - acted as the nucleus for many settlements which later attracted artisans, labourers and a larger permanent population base. Most notable were the Pennsylvania German Mennonites who settled in Waterloo around 1800, and Scottish immigrants attracted to Galt and Dumfries following the War of 1812. But who were these people, and how did their cultural values and the economic forces they faced lead to the city we see today? It is in answering this question that we examine the waves of immigration that have influenced the city’s development.

4.3 Rural Beginnings

The bountiful resources of the land allowed human settlement to flourish. The aboriginal occupation of the Grand River valley far outlasted the
European, but little evidence remains from that period. Later immigrants moulded the setting in diverse and distinctive ways, many of which are still obvious today, and worthy of conservation.

Aboriginal Occupation at the Time of Contact.
Aboriginal peoples came to the area first, and stayed the longest. Archaeological excavations carried out in the vicinity of Cambridge, as well as from surface finds uncovered by farmers in their fields, show that the Grand River Valley has had a long history of aboriginal occupation, but evidence of early aboriginal settlement within the city limits is scanty. Although some Paleo-Indian fluted spear points exist at Doon Pioneer Village, there were no documented aboriginal habitation sites from this period within the Cambridge area (Dilse 1981:3). Camp sites and chipping stations have been excavated and documented from the Archaic and Woodland periods, especially in the Hespeler and Preston area, which date from about 1,000 B.C. The concentration of find spots around Preston-Hespeler was due to the fact that the Speed River was “the major watercourse in the area at this time” which “provided a desirable environment for these hunters and fisherman” (Dilse 1981:3). Some of the sites in and near Cambridge include: the Kite Site (AhHb62), Idylwild (AiHc73, AiHc75, AiHc76), Chimney Hill (AiHb64), Pine Bush (AiHb131, AiHb133, AiHb144), Britpark (AiHb155, AiHb156), and Blackmere Road (AhHb39).3

The earliest historically recorded inhabitants of Southern Ontario were Iroquoian people from Western New York and Pennsylvania, particularly the Huron (Wendats), Neutrals (Attiwandaronks) and Petuns. Native lore maintained that these tribes fled to Ontario during the fifteenth century in order to avoid the more bellicose Five Nations Confederacy which was composed of the Mohawks, Senecas, Onondagas, Cayugas and Oneidas. During the late seventeenth or early in the eighteenth century, this group was joined by the Tuscaroras after which time it became known by the familiar name of the Six Nations Confederacy.

The Huron settled primarily around Georgian Bay and the headwaters of the Grand, the Petun located themselves around the Bruce Peninsula and the Neutrals were located around Lakes Erie and Ontario and throughout.

---
3 The archaeological literature concerning the aboriginal period for Cambridge was annotated and published in Bloomfield (1993) pp. 21-28.
the Niagara Peninsula. It has been suggested that these tribes, who hunted, farmed and traded in semi-sedentary villages, may have migrated to Ontario on commercial grounds, “the desire to establish control over the productive beaver grounds of the upper lakes” rather than in an attempt to evade their more hostile brethren (Johnston 1964:xxviii). The culture of maize, rather than a strict dependency on the hunting, fishing and gathering of food for subsistence, permitted a more organized system of village life. As a result, these Iroquoian people established a matriarchal, longhouse society, with various clans who possessed their individual totems. This society embraced complex religious beliefs and “political” councils which regulated the various aspects of trade, treaties and war were established.

Between 1649 and 1651, however, the control of the Neutrals and Hurons over Southern Ontario was shattered. This was partly due to an outbreak of smallpox, followed by the dispersal of these people by the Six Nations who were in pursuit of commerce and new farmlands (Coyne 1916:13-23). The reasons for the dispersal may have also came about as a result of the European political influence of the English and Dutch over the Six Nations in New York and Pennsylvania, versus the influence of the French over the Hurons in Ontario. The Six Nations did not, however, thickly inhabit Southern Ontario following this dispersal, choosing instead to remain in their traditional territory around the Finger Lakes in Western New York while much of Southern Ontario remained “an Iroquoian game preserve” (Coyne 1916; Dilse 1981:4). The area around Lakes Erie and Ontario became populated by the Mississaugas, an Ojibwa or Chippawa people, who defeated the Iroquois in a series of skirmishes during the early eighteenth century (Smith 1987:3).

The Iroquoian name for the Grand River has been variously rendered as either “Tintaatuoa” or “Tinaouataoua,” while another native name is said to have been “O-es-shin-ne-gun-ing” (McLaughlin 1987:12; Johnston 1964:23; Wintemberg 1929:125-133). But this name does not survive in modern day Cambridge, nor does any physical evidence (beyond archaeological remains) of the long periods of occupation by successive groups of aboriginal peoples. Recognition of the role of aboriginal people in shaping the Grand River watershed is yet to come.
Euro-Canadian Settlement: French explorers and missionaries.
The French presence within the Grand River Valley was tenuously established as early as 1626-27, when the Recollet Father Joseph de la Roche Daillon arrived there in order to preach the gospel (Johnston 1964:1-7). In 1640, the Mission des Anges (Mission of Angels) was established by the Jesuit Fathers Jean de Brébeuf and Joseph Marie Chaumonot along the Grand River (Johnston 1964:11-22). In 1669, some Sulpician priests and an party led by Dollier de Casson and René de Galinée explored the Grand River which Galinée named the “Riviere le Rapide” on account of the swift current (McLaughlin 1987:12; Johnston 1964:xxxi). Additional names given to the Grand River by Europeans during the eighteenth century included the “River Urse,” also spelled as “Ours” and “Ouse,” as well as “La Grande Riviere” (McLaughlin 1987:12). Due to the navigational limitations imposed upon the French by the river, it did not seriously rival the strategic or economic importance established by the Humber River and the Toronto Carrying Place trail. Nor was the French presence strongly maintained along the Grand River as a result (Johnston 1964:xxxii).

Upper Canadian Political and Administrative Divisions.
The most enduring and widespread influence on present day Cambridge came from later European settlers, most prominently German-speaking immigrants from the United States and English-speaking immigrants from the British Isles. Their determination to settle the land led them to establish the first surveys, as well as the legal and administrative framework within which to establish new communities. As a result, a history of this area’s development begins with a review of early methods of land subdivision and management.

The political and electoral divisions for the former County of Waterloo are complex and difficult to follow, but should be properly understood in order to locate historical records for the City of Cambridge prior to 1851.

The lands which contain the city of Cambridge were originally located within the District of Hesse or the Western District between July 1788 and October 1792. Upon the arrival of John Graves Simcoe in Upper Canada, the old provincial boundaries established by Lord Dorchester were abolished, at which time the lands containing Waterloo County became part of the West Riding of York in the Home District. Between
1795 and January 1800, when the Niagara District was separated from the Home District, all property deeds for Waterloo would have been registered at Niagara. From 1800 until 1816, Waterloo deeds fell under the jurisdiction of the Land Registry office at York (Toronto). In March 1816, the Gore District was created by legislation with the county seat located at Hamilton (56 Geo. III c. 19). All registrations of deeds and other legal instruments would have taken place at Hamilton, and lesser court cases and matters relating to road maintenance were determined there at the Court of General Quarter Sessions of the Peace. In April 1838, Wellington County was established by legislation (7 William IV c. 116). At that time Waterloo Township, including Preston and Hespeler, fell within the jurisdiction of Wellington County while the town of Galt in [North] Dumfries Township remained under the jurisdiction of the Gore District.

The former Districts of Upper Canada were abolished by legislation in 1849 (12 Vic. c. 78), at which time parts of the Gore and Wellington Districts were succeeded by the County of Waterloo. In 1851, when Brant County was established by legislation, Dumfries Township was divided into North and South Dumfries. North Dumfries was temporarily annexed to Halton County, but was later included within the boundaries of Waterloo County, while South Dumfries formed part of Brant County (Armstrong 1985:143, 148, 151, 152, 170, 172, 195, 196.)

Part of the lands contained within North Dumfries and Waterloo Townships was first purchased from the native Mississaugas under instructions from Governor General Haldimand and set aside for the use of the Six Nations in October 1784. The remainder of the lands in Waterloo County was alienated by the British from the Mississaugas in a treaty concluded at Niagara in January 1793 (Johnston 1964:50-51; Indian Treaties I:9, 251; Patterson 1921:221).

*Disputed Title over Indian Lands.*

The lands purchased along the Grand River in 1784 to a depth of six miles on both banks from Lake Erie to the headwaters of the river were granted to the Six Nations as Loyalists by George III “in Consideration of the early Attachment to His Cause manifested by the Mohawk Indians, & of the Loss of their Settlement they thereby sustained.” This tract was for the enjoyment of them and their posterity, as “a Safe and Comfortable
Retreat” (Johnston 1964:50-51). A census conducted in 1785 showed that 1,843 members of the Six Nations had settled upon this tract of land (Johnston 1964:52).

One of the difficulties which manifested itself shortly after the Haldimand grant was whether or not the Six Nations had the right to dispose of these lands. By 1787, under Chief Joseph Brant, white settlers had been invited to take up tracts of land along the Grand River including one named Preston who settled in the vicinity of Galt (Johnston 1964:xlii). Some of these white settlers had been given deeds by Brant under long-term leases of 999 years, while others had made an outright purchase of the fee in the land (Johnston 1964:xliii). Simcoe refused to allow the natives to sell their land unless it was first offered to the Crown, for fear that they be taken advantage of by “land jobbers.” However, Lord Dorchester reaffirmed the opinion that Haldimand had conferred the right of land alienation upon the Six Nations, and Brant himself argued that the natives required income from such land sales (Johnston 1964:xlvi-xlvii). In 1797, three trustees—Alexander Stewart, David William Smith and William Claus-- were appointed to act on behalf of the Six Nations.

Township Surveys.

The lands belonging to the Six Nations Indians was originally surveyed by Thomas Welch during July and August of 1796, while some additional work was undertaken by Augustus Jones during August and September of 1797 (Johnston 1964:120-126).

Waterloo Township (Block Number 2) was first surveyed in 1800 for the owner Richard Beasley. However, two subsequent surveys were undertaken by James Mitchell and Richard Cockrel (1805) in order to determine the correct total acreage contained within this Block. Although the amount of land established differed between the surveyors, Cockrel’s figure was accepted as being accurate. Although it was less than the amount of land which Beasley had originally purchased with Wilson and Rousseau, he was compensated by the government and awarded the balance of lands owing to him from another township (Johnston 1964:lx, 161-162).
North Dumfries Township (Block Number 1) was first surveyed in 1816 by Adrian Marlett of Ancaster for the owner, William Dickson (Dilse 1981:19). The *Survey Diaries* from these projects are extant.

**North Dumfries Township (Block Number One.)**

The history of land sale in this Block is so convoluted that it could have been treated as fiction were the historical record not so complete. The process began with the entire Block of land (containing 94,305 acres) being sold to Philip Stedman, a resident of Fort Erie and proprietor of the ferry, in March 1795 for £8,841 (Johnston 1964:147-148). Stedman did little to improve his holdings, nor had he given any security for the purchase money for these lands. He “died in Prison in the United States altogether insolvent” a few years after he acquired these lands (Johnston 1964:132). Title to this Block remained uncertain between 1802 and 1811, when three American claimants—Elisha Welles, Peter Hogeboom and Daniel Penfield—each claimed to have come into lawful possession of these lands. After careful consideration of the facts, the American claims were deemed “spurious” and the alleged transfer of lands from Stedman was “nothing but a clumsy forgery.” The lands eventually came into the possession of Mrs. John Sparkman, the sister of Philip Stedman, as the heirs at law to the estate. Due to financial difficulties, Sparkman sold the Block to the Niagara merchant Thomas Clark, who sold it in 1816 to the Niagara lawyer William Dickson. Dickson paid £15,000 cash for the land and he assumed the mortgage which was eventually discharged (Johnston 1964:lvi-lvii). The township was named by Dickson after his place of birth in Scotland (Dilse 1981:19). It is by this circuitous route that one of the founders of the City of Cambridge came into possession of his lands.

**Waterloo Township (Block Number Two.)**

Equally odd was the process for disposing of this other major part of the current city. In this case, the entire Block of land containing 94,012 acres was sold to Richard Beasley, James Wilson and Jean Baptiste Rousseau (Rousseaux) on February 5, 1798 for £8,887. These partners issued a security for the purchase price in the form of a mortgage, with the annual interest to be payable to the Six Nations by the trustees. Beasley bought out the interests of his partners in this land leaving him as the sole proprietor of the Block (Johnston 1964:lvii-lx). As early as 1800, Beasley sold his first parcel of land to Joseph Sherk and Samuel Betzner,
Mennonite settlers from Pennsylvania. However, the title to any lands sold by Beasley was in question due to a large outstanding mortgage which had not been discharged. In May 1804, Beasley agreed to sell a 60,000 acre tract of this land to a joint stock company of Mennonite settlers from Pennsylvania for £10,000 with the provision that the mortgage be discharged. This joint stock company, known as the German Company, was responsible for the first large scale immigration into the Waterloo area in the years immediately preceding the War of 1812 (Johnston 1964:157-160; Leibbrandt 1980:8-10). As a result of this large influx of Pennsylvania German settlers, Waterloo during the early nineteenth century is said to have become “the earliest settled of any inland township” in Upper Canada (Dilse 1981:5). By 1817 the population of the township was estimated to number 850 people, and the nucleus of the future village of Preston had already been established. It is after this rocky start that the first influx of Mennonites came to the area.

Some scholars assert that there was clear division along ethnic and cultural lines between the Germans in Waterloo Township and their Scottish neighbours to the south in Dumfries (McLaughlin 1987:33). However, evidence suggested by other scholars indicates that Germans were attracted to Galt and Dumfries in the period after the initial take-up of farmland by their ethnic brethren. In the period after 1822, many people, the majority of whom were European-trained artisans (Bloomfield 1995: 77), were brought to the area through the exertions of William Dickson and Absalom Shade. “With Shade’s employment begins one of the most fruitful chapters of Scottish-German cooperation in Waterloo County, and the Hon. William Dickson had every reason to be proud of ‘his’ Mennonites. Not only did they get along well with their Scottish neighbours, but they brought the pioneering know-how from which recent arrivals from Europe could benefit” (Leibbrandt 1980:13).

United Empire Loyalists.
The Loyalist presence in Cambridge was small during the nineteenth century. The original tract of land was granted to the Six Nations who had been considered “Loyalists” since they supported the British cause during the American Revolutionary War and were displaced from their homeland in New York State after the cessation of hostilities in 1783. Some of the lands within this tract were purchased by Loyalists such as Beasley for speculative purposes; however, due to their geographic
isolation, Waterloo and Dumfries Townships were not heavily populated by the UE Loyalists, unlike other townships along the shores of Lakes Ontario and Erie and the St. Lawrence River corridor.

Scottish Immigrants.
The first Scottish settlers in Dumfries Township arrived in Upper Canada via New York State in 1817. Many of them were actively recruited from Roxboroughshire and Selkirkshire by William Dickson himself, who published articles about the new town and township in popular literary magazines such as Chambers’ Journal. These men were skilled labourers and artisans, or knowledgeable in husbandry, and were viewed as an asset to a developing province such as Upper Canada (Young 1880:41). A later generation of Scottish settlers was recruited for work in the textile mills at Galt and Hespeler during the latter half of the nineteenth century. Evidence of their building skills, especially stonemasonry, is found throughout Cambridge, and the physical layout of Galt especially shows their cultural affinities for the form of traditional Scottish towns.

Pennsylvania Dutch.
It is unusual to note that although the Blocks of land along the Grand River had been sold to Euro-Canadian purchasers by 1798, there was no mention made of this fact by D’Arcy Boulton in his early Sketch of Upper Canada, nor that settlement had been commenced within the Block by the Pennsylvania Germans. Boulton simply referred to the “tract of land upon the Grand River, in the occupation of the Indians of the Six Nations” (Boulton 1805: 21).

The main Mennonite immigration into Waterloo County may be divided into the early settlers who arrived there between 1800 and 1812, and those who left Pennsylvania between 1815 and 1829.4 A smaller migration occurred during the early 1830s, but by about 1835 the exodus from Pennsylvania was all but over. It has been suggested that there are two main reasons why these people left the United States for Canada: 1) the lack of inexpensive, available farm land within Pennsylvania after the close of the American Revolutionary War; and, 2) scepticism that the state legislature and Congress would continue to guarantee that the Mennonites be exempt from bearing arms and continue to enjoy freedom

4 The main history of Mennonite migration from Pennsylvania ends in 1829 in the “Moyer Journal” manuscript. See Sherry 1997 p. 28.
of worship (English 1996:17). The migration of 1826-29 was due to economic hardship in the United States, “hard times in old Pennsylvania” and “many failed financially and in order to procure homes for themselves and children, they came to Canada where land could be had very cheap” (Weber 1978:13)\(^5\)

Evidence of their building techniques and development patterns has been noted in the “Pennsylvania German Village” in the southern part of the downtown core of Preston (Dilse 1981: 61).

**European German Settlement.**

The large migration of European German settlers in Waterloo County began during the late 1820s and continued into the second quarter of the nineteenth century. Many of these European Germans arrived at the port of New York via Hamburg or Le Havre. They were induced to leave Germany, especially the Palatinate, following the economic hardships and devastation caused by the Napoleonic Wars and also due to the famine caused by crop failures in 1816-17 (Leibbrandt 1980:24-25)\(^6\).

They were attracted to settle in Upper Canada on account of the inexpensive price asked for good land, as well as the proximity of a large market for the goods which these craftsmen were able to produce. These men and their families, who were tradesmen, artisans and craftsmen, and industrialists, were “eager to make use of the opportunities that seemed to lie in Waterloo Township, and apparently very much encouraged in finding an area already well-settled by a people who spoke a form of German that they could understand” (English 1996:21).

The pre-1848 migration into Waterloo County consisted of Southwest Germans, who were mainly farmers or skilled labourers and predominately Roman Catholic. During the 1850s, the main migration was from Lutheran Central and Northern Germany (Leibbrandt 1980:28). Evidence of their European German influence, combined with that of the Mennonites/Pennsylvania Dutch is found in the early buildings and urban


\(^6\) It is estimated that some 50,000 Germans came to Canada from Europe between 1820 and 1870 (Leibbrandt 1980:26).
form of downtown Preston and Hespeler: as late as 1881, Preston was regarded as a “sleepy old German village” (Dilse 1981: 11).

Portuguese.
There were approximately 10,000 people of Portuguese descent living in the vicinity of Cambridge in 1975, making them one of the largest ethnic groups in Kitchener-Waterloo. Many of them originally hailed from the Azores, settling in the area during the mid 1950s (McLaughlin 1987:125). One of the first Portuguese arrivals in the Waterloo area was American-born Manuel Cabral, who settled in Ayr in 1928 and subsequently opened a business in Galt. Once Canadian immigration requirements relaxed in the early 1950s, he sponsored small groups of Portuguese men to come to work with him.

Thus began a steady influx of Portuguese from the islands of the Azores, as well as from former colonies in Africa and from the Portuguese mainland. After initially working at menial jobs, these immigrants established themselves in the construction trades as well as in industry and commerce. Subsequent generations have become established professionals and entrepreneurs. The community has also developed its own churches, social centres, shops, newspaper, and sports facilities (Costa-Pinto 1987). Despite the number of people of Portuguese descent in the area, and aside from small concentrations of Portuguese-owned businesses catering to that community, this ethnic group has had relatively little influence on the development of the city, and aside from a small monument in Queen’s Square and the annual Portugal Day event, its history and contribution to the community have not been widely celebrated (Pereira 2006: int.).

Newfoundlanders.
It is estimated that there are between 12,000 and 15,000 people in the Cambridge area whose families came from Newfoundland during the period between World War II and the 1960s. They were initially attracted to Hespeler during the wartime labour shortage at the textile mills and they remained here afterwards. Additional workers moved to Hespeler during the early 1960s when the Dominion Iron and Steel works ceased operations on Bell Island (McLaughlin 1987:125, Noseworthy 2006: int). Today there is a Newfoundland Club and a store with Newfoundland produce, but aside from mentions in the local histories prepared by
residents of Hespeler, the role of Newfoundlanders in the development of modern-day Cambridge has not been explored or recognized.

Other significant ethnic groups.
Studies published by Wynnyckyj (1990) and Lamb (1991) show that other significant ethnic groups in and around Cambridge are the Ukrainians and Armenians.

4.4 Historical Development of the Component Communities

Once settlers arrived in what was to become the City of Cambridge, they set to work shaping a new community. The ways in which they did do not only reflect their own cultural heritage, but also show their abilities to adapt that heritage to the physical, social and economic conditions of a new place. Over time, these traditions and adaptations formed the layers of urban development that make up the current city.

Settlement Centres and Amalgamation in the former Waterloo County.
It has been observed that the history of Cambridge during the nineteenth century “is the history of a host of small communities [i.e. Preston, Hespeler, Galt and Blair]…and the history of two townships- Waterloo and Dumfries. While important connections existed between these settlements (i.e. common manufacturing interests and shared transportation facilities), their establishment and growth patterns are as independent of one another as to warrant separate historical descriptions” (Dilse 1981:5). The history of each settlement thus warrants a more complete assessment., via an analysis of its evolution over time.

Galt.
In 1816, the future town site of Galt was surveyed for William Dickson (1769-1846), a prosperous lawyer from Niagara who had acquired Block 1 from a Niagara merchant named Thomas Clark. Dickson engaged Absalom Shade, “a young shrewd, energetic and pushing Pennsylvanian” as his agent for the new settlement. Shade, who was a carpenter by trade, set up a rough log dwelling where he set up the first store in the future village site. A decayed grist mill, said to have been built here for Alexander Miller by a squatter named Nathaniel Dodge in 1802, was repaired by Shade and set into operation (Dilse 1981:19) Other scholars state that Shade “built” this mill in 1818 (Mika 1977:332). “When it
became fully known that he could give good titles, settlements commenced pretty rapidly in the Township of Dumfries. The first settlers were Scotch from New York, but after some years settlers came direct from Scotland” (Sherry 1997:23).

By 1820, the settlement contained numerous buildings including a distillery and blacksmith shop, and was known by the name of “Shade’s Mill.” The first frame building within the village was a tavern built by Morgan L. Hermonts in 1821. By 1827, the village was connected by road to Guelph. The first post office was opened in the village in that same year, and the name of the community was changed to “Galt” in honour of John Galt, a novelist, who was the commissioner of the then recently established Canada Company. Several amenities were quickly established within the village, such as a wooden church (1828), school house (1832), St. Andrew’s Presbyterian Church (1833), and a subscription library (1836). The early growth of Galt was adversely affected due to the outbreak of cholera in 1834, said to have been brought into the village by a troupe of traveling entertainers. A newspaper, the Dumfries Courier, was established in the village in 1844 (Mika 1977:332; Mika 1981:90-92).

By 1846, Galt was described as a village “prettily situated on the Grand River, in a valley surrounded by high hills.” It contained “valuable water-power, by the employment of which, in milling and manufacturing, the place is fast rising into prosperity; and already begins to assume the appearance of a town. The streets are neatly laid out, and the employment of stone in building...gives the houses and other buildings, a very substantial appearance.” The population, which was mainly of Scottish origin, numbered around 1,000. The village was connected by a daily stage to both Hamilton and Guelph, and by another stage to Goderich, and contained a post office which was established around 1825 (Armstrong 1985:232). Although the records are not clear, the name of the first postmaster may have been Absalom Shade who served in that capacity in 1832. The spiritual needs of the village were met by five churches (Anglican, Presbyterian and Methodist).

The community was protected by a fire engine company, which was established in 1842. Despite the presence of the fire engine, the Main Street in Galt was badly damaged in two “Great Fires” and one lesser
blaze. The first, which consumed wooden structures on the south side of the street, took place in 1851. The second fire destroyed a number of buildings on the north side of the street in November 1856. The third broke out in May 1862 when a barrel of naphtha caught fire in Fleming and Robinson’s grocery (Young 1880:226, 251.) Some of the stone buildings within the downtown core were built immediately after these destructive conflagrations, and although they were designed “in a self-consciously Scottish style” it has been noted as “one of the finest examples of Pre-Confederation commercial blocks in the province.” This building style is in sharp contrast to the structures erected in Preston and Hespeler, where German masons employed a heavily mortared style of construction “more European in its’ ambience than Galt’s” (McLaughlin 1987:61-62).

Besides a wide variety of professions and trades, the village also supported other cultural amenities such as a curling club, mechanics’ institute and circulating library, and the first English newspaper in Waterloo County called the *Dumfries Courier* (Smith 1846:62). Two other newspapers, the *Galt Reporter*, and *Dumfries Reformer*, were established in 1846 and 1850 (Moyer 1971:118-119).

Due to the wide variety of manufactories within the town, by the early 1860s it had been nicknamed the “Manchester of Canada” (Young 1880:230). The town was not only one of the most important manufacturing communities in Ontario during the nineteenth century, but it was also one of the most picturesque due to the proximity of the river and the variety of architecture it contained. As a result of the large number of stone structures erected there, Galt was also referred to as the “Granite City” (Dilse 1981:25).

In 1850, Galt was incorporated as a village (Young 1880:207). By 1851, the population of Galt had reached approximately 2,000 inhabitants. A *Directory* published in 1851 enumerated some 118 business and professional men within the village. Among the expected businesses found in communities at the time, some “niceties” in life were catered to through E. Arnold (confectioner), James Geddes (auctioneer), Mrs. Johnston and Miss Manning (milliners), James Kay (carriage maker) and George Lee (watchmaker.) The town also contained several lawyers and
barristers, a dentist named Donald McKeand and land surveyor James Pollock (MacKay 1851:85).

By 1857, the population had increased sufficiently that the village was officially incorporated as a town (Young 1880:252; Mika 1977:333). A new stone town hall was constructed on Dickson Street in 1858, which later served as the City Hall. It was restored in 1965, and remains an important heritage landmark within the city to this day.

By 1851, the town was connected by stage to Hamilton and Goderich. The importance of the community within the surrounding districts was reflected in the fact that it then contained three banks and three assurance companies. Additional prosperity was brought to the town in 1855-56 when the Great Western Railway and the Galt and Guelph Railway were constructed (Young 1880:244). Slightly later, in 1872, these were joined by the Grand Trunk and in 1879 a fourth rail service was provided by the Credit Valley Railway (Moyer 1971:124).

By 1873, additional businesses and industries located in the town included: two newspaper and printing offices, telegraph offices, twelve hotels, thirty stores, brewery, flour mills, axe manufactory, iron castings works, paper mill, soap and candle factory, plus works for producing lasts, pails, leather, woollen and wooden wares. In 1873 the population had attained an estimated 3,827 (Crossby 1873:122), 5,000 by 1877-8 (County of Waterloo Gazetteer and Directory) and 7,600 by 1893 (Dilse 1981:26).

Galt was incorporated as a city with a population of 11,852 in 1915 (Moyer 1971:126). The new city of Cambridge, which is an amalgamation of the former city of Galt and the towns of Preston and Hespeler, officially came into being on January 1, 1973. The name for the new city, decided by a public ballot, commemorates one of the early names for Preston since the province would not permit the use of a current municipal name (Mika 1977:329, 333; Rayburn 1997:53).

In summary, Galt became the dominant community amongst the four that now comprise Cambridge. Its possession of a large population derived from a diversified local economy and important cultural and civic institutions gave it prominence. The concentration of wealth, industry
and commerce made Galt the most urban of the four. Its identity included elements of industry, retail trade, institutions and residential neighbourhoods. Its distinctive architecture and dramatic riverside setting also set it apart.

_Preston._

Preston has the distinction of being the oldest established village within the limits of the modern city of Cambridge, and by the mid-nineteenth century it was the pre-eminent community within Waterloo Township. The roots of Preston may be traced back to 1806-7, when John Erb, one of the Pennsylvania German settlers, constructed a sawmill on part of his land on the west side of the Speed River. Shortly thereafter, a gristmill was added which stood on the site of the Dover Flour Mills. Two stores were constructed at Preston in 1815 and 1818. The name assigned to this early settlement was “Erbs Mills” (Mika 1977:329) and later “Cambridge Mills” (Rayburn 1997:281). Other businesses and amenities which were established during the 1820s and 1830s included a school, taverns, stores, a brewery and warehouse (Bloomfield 1995:79; Dilse 1981:8).7

The early growth of the community is said to have been unfortunately hampered due to an obstinate reluctance on the part of John Erb to sell any land for urban development. Erb was uninterested in farming, and had strategically located his mills where the Great Road from Dundas crossed near the confluence of the Speed and Grand Rivers. Erb wished to retain his monopoly over this natural fording spot, and in utilizing the hydraulic power for his milling operations (McLaughlin 1987:24). His mill was convenient by virtue of its being the closest one for the early settlers of Waterloo Township, who undoubtedly felt comfortable in conducting their business transactions with a fellow German speaker.

Following the death of Erb in 1832, his lands were inherited by his son, John Erb Jr. In 1834, part of the Preston village site was surveyed by “Squire” William Scollick with the streets and lots laid out at right angles to the Great Road. It is said that this “long, narrow village” layout reminded Scollick of his home village in Lancashire, England, and it was re-named “Preston” in honour of that place (Dilse 1981:8; McLaughlin 1990:31). Village lots were advertised for sale shortly thereafter, and it is

---

7 Some attribute the date of construction for the school as early as 1809 (Mika 1977:329).
recorded that by 1835 the Speed River had been bridged and twenty houses had been constructed within the village.\textsuperscript{8} The new village attracted large numbers of predominately German speaking tradesmen, artisans, craftsmen and other labourers. As a result, the population grew quickly with forty resident families by 1836. A diverse manufacturing and economic base was soon established (Bloomfield 1995:79).

During the late 1830s and early 1840s, Preston experienced a building boom. New structures and businesses which were established here included Guggisberg’s furniture shop, hotels constructed by Cornell and Klotz, Jacob Beck’s iron foundry and sawmill, Hiram Kinsman’s wool carding mill, and Jacob Hespeler’s store, grist mill and distillery complex. A free school opened in the village in 1848 (Dilse 1981:8).

In 1846, Preston was described as a village of approximately 600 inhabitants who were predominately German. A post office was established in the village in February 1837, with Adam Ferrie Jr. acting as the first postmaster. The community contained two churches at that time, for the Lutheran and Catholic congregations. The village contained a wide variety of trades and professions and included: a steam grist mill, distillery, tannery, stores, taverns, breweries, pottery, drug store, saddlers, wagon makers, baker, shoemakers, watchmaker, tinsmith, cabinet makers, cooper and tailors (Smith 1846:153). The early village developed around the mills—Erb’s mill on the north side of the Speed and the Anchor Mills on the south side—and the community was notable for the use of dolomite in the construction of some its early buildings (Smith 1851:118; Bloomfield 1995:81).

By 1851, the population of the village had nearly doubled to approximately 1,100 inhabitants who were “principally Germans, and by people of German descent.” Four years later, the population had reached 1,600 (Bloomfield 1995:80). The growth of the village was undoubtedly due to its situation on the river, as well as to the excellent access to the village provided by the (then) recently macadamized Dundas and Waterloo Road which attracted many labourers and artisans to the community. A period Directory listed at least 162 business and profession men within the village, which showed that a solid economic

\textsuperscript{8} This bridge was washed out in 1857 (Bloomfield 1995:79).
base had been quickly established. In addition to the expected saw and gristmills, blacksmiths, carpenters, shoemakers, and storekeepers, the trades and professions included: potter, starch factory, basket maker, plasterer, stone mason, brewer, distiller, iron founder, lime-burner, saddler, vinegar works, weaver, grain cradle maker, milliner, hatter, insurance agent, moulder, physician, tobacconist, tinsmith, printer, coopers, teachers, music teacher, chair and cabinet maker, watch maker, butcher, cloth factory, tailors, pump maker, brick maker, fanning mill factory and stocking weaver (Mackay 1852:285-6.) Several of these trades not only reflect the rapid growth of the village, but also the fact that some the residents could afford a few luxury items soon after the establishment of the community. The village was connected by daily stages to Hamilton, Guelph, Goderich and Woolwich. The village contained two churches—Roman Catholic and a Free Church—and three schools, a court house, town hall, engine house and fire company, Odd-Fellows’ Lodge, and one German newspaper (Smith 1851:118-119.) The newspaper was called the _Bauernfreund (Farmer’s Friend)_ which was succeeded by the _Beobachter (Observer)._

By 1851, the population of the community had reached a sufficient size that the inhabitants were able to successfully petition the government for incorporated village status independent of Waterloo Township. Preston therefore became the first independent village within the township in 1852 (Dilse 1981:9; Bloomfield 1995:146).

By the early 1850s, the telegraph and railways had been extended to Preston. The Preston and Berlin Railway and the Galt and Guelph Railway provided rail service to the community. Additional growth and prosperity was brought to the village in 1856 with the opening of the Great Western Railway through the east half of the community.

The village reached its greatest size in 1866, when the population was estimated at approximately 2,000 residents. During the third quarter of the century the population of the village declined and by 1873, it numbered about 1,408 (Crossby 1873:259). In the 1880s it was described as “a sleepy old German village” containing a number of buildings “in the old fashioned German style” (Dilse 1981:11) Preston regained its’ former population by the final decade of the nineteenth century, and it attained incorporated town status in 1899 (Dilse 1981:13).
These population estimates may not be entirely representative, since it is said that the census required for incorporation was taken during the hops picking season when migrant labourers temporarily swelled the population of the community to over 2,000 inhabitants. However, the community grew steadily over the next century and, at the time of amalgamation, the population of Preston was estimated to number over 14,000 (Mika 1977: 330).

Preston also achieved a brief burst of activity during the Second World War when it was a training centre for WRENS at the Preston Springs (Jellicoe) Hotel. Nearby Galt was a training centre for women in the Women’s Royal Canadian Naval Service after 1942, for service on the HMCS Conestoga (McLaughlin 1987:98).

In summary, Preston never retained its early advantages and remained largely static from the mid-19th century onwards. Yet its very stability is part of its identity. Certainly it is no longer a predominantly German town, nor is it a resort, but elements of these remain, as does the grain mill that continues an operation that began in the early 19th century. From the history of its development it could be said that, given the elements it shares with the other three communities, such as industry and German influence, Preston’s distinctive identity is most closely tied to tourism, with the spa hotels and the privately-run riverside parks.

Hespeler.

The monopolistic influence exerted by Jacob Erb in nearby Preston undoubtedly led to the establishment of rival industries in Hespeler, and these enterprises flourished and contributed to the prosperity of this village beginning around the middle of the nineteenth century.

The early growth of Hespeler may be traced back to the decade between ca. 1825-35, when a German settler named Michael Bergey purchased land along the Speed River from his brother-in-law, Joseph Oberholtzer, where he set up a sawmill and small foundry. The community was first named Bergeytown in his honour (McLaughlin 1987:31; Rayburn 1997:156). Another early mill and blacksmith shop were established in Hespeler by Joseph Oberholtzer and Cornelius Pannabecker during the 1830s or early 1840s. The first mills in the village were located along the Speed River adjacent to Queen Street, between present-day Guelph...
Avenue and Winston Boulevard (Dilse 1981:16). The addition of a second mill built by Bergey, plus the influx of enterprising European German settlers such as Theobald Spetz and Philipp Lautenschlager, caused the village to be rechristened “New Hope” during the mid-1830s (Dilse 1981:15; McLaughlin 1987:28-29; Mika 1981:277-278).

In 1846, New Hope was described as a small village along the River Speed on the road to Guelph, with a population estimated at a mere 100 inhabitants. The community contained one gristmill and one saw mill, a tannery, tavern, store, pail factory, two blacksmiths, two tailors and two shoemakers (Smith 1846:122). By May 1851, a post office was opened in the village with Conrad Nahrgang appointed as the first postmaster.

By 1851, New Hope was connected by stage to Guelph and other communities. The population had increased to approximately 250, and it was described as “a thriving little place” (Smith 1851:119). A Directory published at that time listed twenty business and professional men in the village which included: three general stores, two shoe stores, school teacher, two innkeepers, four cabinet makers, tannery, five sawmills, two gristmills, wagon maker, two blacksmiths and one cooper (Mackay 1851:257). An additional industry opened in the village during the 1850s was a cotton textile mill and a woollen mill built by George Allendorf. Some limited prosperity was brought to New Hope when the Great Western Railway was extended across this corner of Waterloo Township in 1856, and by the following year the population of the village had increased to about 700 (McLaughlin 1987:31).

The name of this post office village was officially changed to Hespeler in October 1858, the year in which the village was incorporated. This was in honour of Jacob Hespeler (b. 1810), a European German businessman who had initially settled in Preston. He moved to New Hope, where in 1845, he purchased Bergey’s mill. By 1847, he had replaced it with a substantial stone edifice and a large masonry dam which was known locally as “Jacob’s Landing” (McLaughlin 1987:135). Among his other business ventures within the village were a distillery, vinegar works, cooper’s shop and general store. Hespeler gradually expanded his sphere of influence within the community and bought out the interests of other businessmen, such as Joseph Oberholtzer, so that, by the 1860s, he was the village’s leading businessman. His prominence was furthered by his
involvement in civic affairs, for Hespeler also served as the village reeve and postmaster (Dilse 1981:15; McLaughlin 1987:29-30).

The population of Hespeler continued to increase during the remainder of the nineteenth century, unlike nearby Preston which experienced a decline in its population between the 1860s and the 1890s. By 1873, the population in Hespeler numbered about 797 (Crossby 1873:144), 900 by 1877-78 (County of Waterloo Gazetteer and Directory) and by 1893 the population had reached 1,700. Additional areas of the village continued to be subdivided for residential purposes during the second half of the nineteenth century, causing it to be described as “one of the pleasantest villages in this part of Ontario” (Parsell 1881:7). Among the amenities enjoyed by the residents of the town was one of the earliest steam-driven generating plants which provided enough electricity to light homes and some of the main downtown streets (Mika 1977:331).

By 1901, the population of Hespeler had increased to the point that the citizens successfully petitioned the legislature for incorporated town status. George Forbes, by now the owner of the town’s large textile mill, was elected first mayor of the new town (McLaughlin 2006:22). Three quarters of a century later, at the time of amalgamation, the population of Hespeler was approximately 6,300 (Mika 1977:331).

During the twentieth century, perhaps the single most important employer in Hespeler was the Dominion Woollens and Worsted. A later version of the R. Forbes Company, this enterprise was one of the largest woolen mills in the British Empire and it was probably the largest in Canada producing a high quality textile. It is estimated that approximately 1,200 people (40% of the population of the town) were employed there, which caused it to be known as “The Company of Neighbours” (McLaughlin 2006:15, 63). Forbes continued the paternalistic role begun by Hespeler, and even with the sale of the company in 1928 to the Toronto-based syndicate who renamed it “Dominion Woollens and Worsted”, the benevolent dominance of the company in town affairs continued (McLaughlin and Fleuren 2006).

The origins of this mill may be traced back to Jacob Hespeler’s cotton mill which he sold in 1863, to a group of businessmen who renamed it Randall Farr & Co. The business was expanded during the 1860s, and
sold to Jonathan Schofield and Robert Forbes in 1874. Forbes bought out the interest of Schofield in 1880, after which the firm was known as “R. Forbes & Co.” During the late nineteenth century, textile workers from Scotland were enticed to settle in Hespeler with the promise of steady employment at the mills, and new subdivisions were developed in order to provide housing for the mill workers during the 1920s. During both World Wars, this firm produced much of the khaki for soldier’s uniforms and wool for socks. The wartime boost to the local labour market necessitated construction of workers’ housing, especially for the many young, unmarried women who filled the factory jobs while the men were in the armed forces. Distinctive dormitories, such as Gordon Hall and Winston Hall, offered clean, safe (and chaperoned) housing for women and were designed with a full range of facilities, including comprehensive social and recreational programs (McLaughlin and Fleuren 2006: 33-51).

Workers from other parts of Canada, notably from Newfoundland, were recruited to work in the mills during the labour shortage experienced throughout the war years in the 1940s (McLaughlin and Fleuren 2006:17-22, 35-40). However, business at the mills began to decline during the 1950s, and the Dominion Woollens and Worsted was placed in receivership in 1958. The plant was sold to Silknit, a textile manufacturing firm, in 1959. This company survived until 1984 when it was forced into receivership (ibid: 58).

In summary, Hespeler is the most closely connected to its industrial past of the four communities. Recent community history efforts (e.g. The Company of Neighbours project) confirm this and emphasize the tightly knit character of what has traditionally been a factory town. So intertwined has been Hespeler’s history with local industries that the current setting, in which many of the former industrial buildings and sites survive, seems an entirely apt expression of local sense of place.

**Blair**

This village on the west bank of the Grand River went through several name changes, initially Durhamville (after a local mill) or Shinglebridge (after the local bridge), then Lamb’s Bridge (after a local tavern and store), then Carlisle (after another local mill), then Blair (after a local judge and Parliamentarian) (Quantrell 2000: 30).
Aside from reports of aboriginal burial grounds and seasonal campsites in and near the village, the recorded history of Blair begins in the early years of Mennonite settlement. As summarized in recent accounts (Quantrell 2000: 29-30; Hill 1999: Appendix 2-7), Blair came into being in 1800 with the arrival of Mennonites from Pennsylvania led by Samuel D. Betzner, who purchased lands acquired from the Six Nations natives by land speculator Richard Beasely. After initial financial and legal problems confirming their ownership of the land, Betzner and his fellow Mennonites purchased more land in the area with the intent of settling. However, they changed their mind and sold the lands upon which Blair now sits to the Bricker, Bowman and Bechtel families, and it is these who built the village.

The Brickers built the first schoolhouse and cemetery in the area. Bowman built the first dam and first sawmill; his descendents built a substantial flour mill and tower (Sheave Tower) to supply additional water power. The Bowman family also donated land for schools and a church. The Bechtels developed various industries including a tannery and a lime kiln which enabled them to construct a variety of stone industrial, commercial and residential buildings.

Improved access added to local prosperity. The main overland route along the west bank of the Grand River became the village main street and the focus of retail activity. Local creeks continued to be the focus of the milling industries. By the mid-19th century, new and larger mills had been constructed, the first hotels were established, and new shops opened. A covered bridge over the Grand River linked Blair to Preston as early as 1835 but was damaged by ice and replaced by an iron bridge in the 1850s. The greatest boost to the local economy came a few years later, in 1873-74, when Blair was linked to Galt and Berlin (Kitchener) via a branch line of the Grand Trunk Railway. The village became a depot for local farmers wishing to ship their produce to regional markets; it also provided passenger service to villagers and local farm families.

By the end of the 19th century, Blair had evolved from a predominantly Mennonite farm service village to a community with a mixed economy containing industry, commerce, and transportation links. The old mill and tannery were converted to supply power to nearby towns; other mills continued in operation. However, the local population remained small, at
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around 170 persons. Soon to be added to this small rural population was a very wealthy family, the Wilks, who developed the Cruickston Park estate and built the Langdon Hall mansion.

In the 20th century, Blair began to stabilize. While some of the mills continued in operation, other industries such as the woollen mill closed. Passenger rail service ended in the 1930s, and by the Second World War, the population of around 200 residents worked for the most part in nearby towns and also socialized there. After a brief postwar boom which saw the creation of several new businesses, Blair began to decline as the railroad tracks were torn up and the post office was closed. The village was subsequently absorbed into Preston in 1969 and then into Cambridge in 1973.

Since then, new suburban development and some limited infill have been developed in the village, in part the result of Blair’s proximity to Highway 401. Although the presence of a large and wealthy estate did little to increase the local population, the result of its owners’ conservation and development efforts has been the creation of a charitable conservation trust (called “rare”) controlling the majority of the 1000 acre estate, within which Langdon Hall and its surrounding property have been restored and enlarged as a luxury hotel. Designation as a Heritage Conservation District in the late 1990s ensured that future changes to the village would respect local heritage character.

In summary, Blair has retained its small village character, in large part thanks to its designation as a Heritage Conservation District. The scattered urban form and interplay with adjacent farm and riverside landscapes gives it an enduring rural character. Hilly terrain hides new development on the periphery and maintains historic views; less easy to restrain is the impact of increasing vehicular traffic along Blair Road. Visually, however, the village remains largely intact, though shorn of the industries and railway that once were prominent in its central core.

Cambridge
The City of Cambridge is, of course, the name given to the consolidated urban unit made up of the four preceding communities, plus the intervening rural and suburban lands. Its short history is largely focused
on coming to terms with amalgamation and forging a common future for the new, larger community.

Since amalgamation in 1973, debate over the identity of the new city has not ceased. Judging from historical accounts (McLaughlin 1987: 119-123; Bloomfield 1995: 396-398), the transition from four communities to one was far from easy. Residents of each community felt strong ties to their traditional place names and were not fully convinced that the new and larger entity encompassed the sense of place they had developed at a local level.

Few authors have speculated as to the identity of the new city, preferring to discuss the historical evolution of the component communities. McLaughlin (1987: 123-126) suggests that the floods of 1974 brought people together. Another binding force was the influx of newcomers, especially Newfoundlanders and Portuguese, who were slowly able to diversify the predominant Anglo-German ethnic mix. He ends on an optimistic note, hoping that a renewed emphasis on heritage conservation and appreciation of the rivers’ attributes will provide a proper focus for the new city, one based on its history as a series of waterside settlements.

This vision seems to accord with ongoing efforts by the City to promote the distinct character of each component community, while emphasizing the collective heritage. The result has been the official naming of “Hespeler Village”, “Preston Towne (sic) Centre”, and “Cambridge City Centre” in downtown Galt. Blair retains its name. Other efforts to develop a collective identity have come through the management plans for the Grand River, championed and overseen by the Grand River Conservation Authority, and by the Grand River’s designation as a Canadian Heritage River. An emphasis on the river as the linking element between distinct places also appears in local and regional promotions for cultural tourism, most notably the “Grand River Country” program. It remains to be seen whether these initiatives succeed in blending what were fierce local loyalties with an affinity for the amalgamated whole.
4.5 Patterns of Urban Development

The influence of the land, of the cultural background of each new group of settlers, and the resulting adaptations to an evolving culture, all left distinctive marks on the physical setting. Beyond the characteristics of each separate component community are some common elements which, it is hoped, may become the focus for efforts to conserve, enhance and celebrate the collective identity of the city as a whole.

Settlement Forms
Underneath the layers of modern development in Cambridge there remains physical evidence of two different forms of settlement, based on differing world views. Cambridge and the agricultural areas to the north have two dominant settlement patterns: Mennonite and other European. The Mennonites looked at land from a farmer’s viewpoint: their focus was on developing a network of rural farmsteads. Broadly speaking, they did not aspire to build towns, rather, they sought to create a utopian agrarian society. Their religious beliefs and their desire to be set apart from mainstream society resulted in a unique development pattern of scattered farmsteads, linked by roads that followed the contours of the land or used old native trails. Roads linked farms to other parts of the rural setting that supported farm life. Such elements included gentler terrain, good soils, and stands of useful timber, as well as economic and cultural institutions such as mills and marketplaces, schools and churches. And since there was no legal requirement in the early 19th century that all settlers must clear roads on a surveyed grid, they were able to lay out a transportation network in the manner best suited to their needs (Dilse 1981: 6; Bloomfield 1995: 73). The resulting network of roads and farms in Waterloo County therefore bore a strong similarity to those left behind in Pennsylvania, described in the 1881 Illustrated Atlas as “a system of the most regular irregularity” (Parsell 1881:6).

While there are many instances of this pattern in and around the City of Waterloo, little evidence remains within the City of Cambridge. Farming areas outside of major settlements still show traces of the organic pattern, especially when roads and property boundaries bend to fit the topography. In places such as Preston, where Mennonites developed the early mills, their early occupation of key riverside sites and refusal to sell their water lots for non-agricultural uses precluded development of other
uses for many years. However, these immigrants from what is now the northern United States also included amongst them a great number of skilled artisans, and these settlers contributed to the early development of the component settlements in Cambridge (Bloomfield 1995: 77).

By contrast, overlain on this organic settlement pattern is the rectilinear surveyor’s grid, brought to this area as part of the overall survey of Upper Canada, but an essential part of the economy and culture of immigrants from the British Isles and continental Europe. The orderly parcelling of land was a necessary precursor to land speculation and sale. The ethnic origins of settlers in what is now Cambridge tended to be other than Mennonite, and the settlement pattern reflects this. These settlers tended to concentrate on town building, with its attendant emphasis on establishing good trading networks along efficient transportation routes. The rise of a society based increasingly on merchandising and manufacturing drew the newly formed settlements of Preston, Hespeler and Galt away from an early role as agricultural service centres and towards an emerging role as components in a broader network of economic and cultural relationships. The river was no longer an essential element of this network; roads and railways assumed this role.

The European form of settlement was based on the grid pattern of streets and blocks. In Preston, the grid became elongated as urban development spread outward and flanked the main thoroughfare, giving it the appearance of a typical road town or, as several sources speculate, of Preston, a linear settlement in Lancashire, England that was home to the townsite’s surveyor (Dilse 1981: 8; McLaughlin 1990: 31). In Blair and in Hespeler, the grid skewed to accommodate the hilly terrain and the curving riverbank, resulting in a tightly knit village pattern. In Galt, the grid remained regular with a series of small blocks flanking the river, but several key roads cut across this grid (perhaps reflecting pre-survey routes) and to the north of the downtown core, a bend in the river results in a corresponding skewing of the grid pattern. Here the result is a town-like urban form, with greater depth and variety than is evident in the smaller centres.

Later development in the early-mid-20th century shows a steady movement away from grid layouts and towards more curvilinear,
suburban patterns. In Hespeler, the higher income housing, built in the early 20\textsuperscript{th} century north of the mill pond, begins with a pattern of large blocks (to accommodate the large houses and gardens built there) and evolves into a series of curving culs de sac. The initial extensions of Preston still follow a grid pattern, but the outer edges of all the four component settlements have had late 20\textsuperscript{th} century additions that follow suburban forms. In most cases, those citizens with the means to do so moved out of the downtown core and built substantial residences on the hills overlooking the town, beginning in the late 19\textsuperscript{th} century and continuing since. Only with the more recent trends towards downtown revitalization has this trend been somewhat reversed.

There are several unusual urban forms developed in the 19\textsuperscript{th} and 20\textsuperscript{th} centuries that merit notice. One is the concentration of mills and resort hotels at the river crossing in Preston (now sadly reduced to one representative of each type of development); another is the surviving cluster of industries along the river banks in central Hespeler. Equivalent industrial concentrations have been removed in Galt as part of flood control measures and, in Preston, through the process of residential intensification, but industrial riverbanks were once common throughout the city. There are also some unusual residential developments, including an elegant workers’ terrace (Riverside Terrace) in Hespeler and the planned neighbourhood at Dickson Hill in Galt. The former is an example of enlightened paternalism by an early industrialist, the latter a pioneering effort by a visionary heiress.

\textit{Roads}

As has been noted earlier, the rivers were important transportation routes for a relatively short period of time. Disadvantages such as frequent rapids along the watercourse, steep banks in many places, and fluctuating water levels made the rivers unsuitable travel routes. Early bankside trails soon became formalized into roadways, and road improvements figure prominently in the early development of the region.

One of the earliest and most important major roads established in Waterloo Township was the Great Road (Highway 8) which was opened between Dundas and Guelph around 1818-19. The purpose of this road was to offer new settlers improved travel and communications east to Hamilton which was then the County seat for the Gore District. The
formal opening up and improvements made on this road also enabled travelers to bypass parts of the Beverly Swamp which had to some degree hindered the development of the interior township (the road was macadamized in 1837). This road also served to end the period of isolationism favoured by the early Mennonite settlers within Waterloo Township, as did the availability of inexpensive land offered for sale to new settlers by the Canada Company in neighbouring Wellington, Perth and Huron Counties after 1826 (English 1996:21).

Although prior to the survey of large areas of the current city there was no requirement of settlers to make or improve public roadways, once the land was surveyed in the early 19th century and the population increased, residents began petitioning the government to construct an adequate road network. Petitions from a majority of local inhabitants were submitted to the Magistrates presiding at the General Court of Quarter Sessions of the Peace held at Hamilton. Several of these petitions survive from the period 1818 to 1833 (Weber 1978: N22-N26). The Galt-Guelph road (Highway 24) also followed an old native trail through the core of what was to become Hespeler, and the Huron Road (Fountain Street/Regional Road 17), linking Galt to the Canada Company’s lands in the Huron Tract, intersected the Great Road at Preston and the Speed River (McLaughlin 1987: 33).

During the 1920s, Highway 8 was lit and properly paved. Somewhat later during the 1950s and 1960s, Highways 24 and 401 were constructed and paved. The “Golden Strip” along Highway 24, particularly noted for its abundance of fast-food outlets, has been described as “one of Ontario’s most complete monuments to the car” and a “manifestation of the petrochemical revolution.” Nevertheless, these highways fostered greater suburban growth and industrial activity in the vicinity of Preston and Hespeler (Dilse 1981:29). However, the construction of Highway 401 divided the city, severing Hespeler from the other component settlements and increasing the draw of major centres to residents of Cambridge who were willing to commute.

**Railways**

In common with most other new communities in North America in the mid-19th century, the four component settlements in Cambridge made great efforts to attract the railway. More than the road system, which at
the time was neither reliable nor complete, the railway promised great economic and social benefits to any community able to secure a route through its boundaries.

Galt got the railway first in 1855-56 with construction of the Great Western and Galt and Guelph Railways, later to be joined by the Grand Trunk (1872) and Credit Valley (1879) Railways. In 1882 the Great Western amalgamated with the Grand Trunk, and Galt was now on a direct line to Toronto. When Credit Valley was taken over by Canadian Pacific, Galt was now fully linked with the major Canadian and US centres. This degree of connection gave Galt the economic boost that made it the “Manchester of Canada”. Preston and Hespeler lobbied and won railway links, although Preston suffered from two setbacks, one when the line bypassed the downtown core, and another in its failure to make a success of the fledgling Preston to Berlin railway, an enterprise that began in 1857 and lasted less than a year (McLaughlin 1987: 40-52).

Also notable was the early transit system provided by the interurban railway. The availability in the 1890s of hydroelectric power from Niagara made interurban electric railways viable, and the first in the area began operating in 1894. The Galt, Preston & Hespeler Railway made travel between these towns convenient and brought urban services within reach of residents in the adjoining countryside. The initial purpose of transporting commuters and commercial freight became expanded as the demand grew for holiday excursions to such lakeside towns as Port Dover on Lake Erie. Electric railways were also instrumental in the success of the tourist trade in Preston, where mineral springs offered supposed health benefits, and resort hotels such as the Kress and Del Monte provided luxurious accommodation for convalescents. Preston also manufactured interurban rail cars (Bloomfield 1995: 257). The railway company went further than simply providing a transportation service and developed its own recreational venues, most notably Idylwild Park, a riverside picnic and recreation ground built on the banks of the Speed north of Preston and accessible only by rail. The interurban railway prospered until the First World War, when the rise of motorized road transport and declining attendance seem to have doomed it (Bloomfield 1995: 209-212).
4.6 Industrial Heart

Industries for the British Empire
Cambridge may have had rural origins, but it soon made its reputation as a manufacturing centre. The advantages of an influx of skilled artisans and entrepreneurs from Great Britain and central Europe, combined with improved transportation links to major markets, put Galt and Hespeler in the forefront of industrialization in Upper Canada in the 19th century (Blair and Preston were less successful in sustaining industrial growth, and seemed to have stabilized by the middle of the century). Although only Hespeler retains any substantial industries in its downtown core, Galt once had comparable factories lining the riverbanks. The identities of these communities are also founded on the industries they once had, with Galt being named the “Manchester of Canada” and Hespeler, more of a company town, calling itself the “Company of Neighbours”. It is therefore surprising that current residents of Cambridge know so little about this industrial legacy (more on this issue below).

All four component communities began around mill sites and river crossings. Early water-powered mills ground flour and sawed timber; later steam-powered mills and factories produced a wide range of raw materials and manufactured goods. Early industries supplying captive local markets, such as distilleries and carriage works, gave way to operations such as specialty engineering and textile works that were directed to national and, later, international markets. As is described in the profiles of each community provided below, Preston was known for flour milling, woollen textiles and furniture; Hespeler for textiles but also for metal goods and wood products, and Galt for metal foundries, engineering works and textiles. The area produced high quality finished goods for well over a century.

Decline and Recovery
The decline of this industrial base must have come as a profound shock to Cambridge but its effects have not been well recorded. The causes, however, are better known. A number of factors contributed to the decline, few if any of them the fault of local industries. Consolidation of companies within the manufacturing sector, increased foreign competition, and globalization of both corporations and markets are influences common to most of the industrialized world, and shared with
many other Canadian communities. But because communities such as Galt and Hespeler were so closely tied to their key industries, the loss of these enterprises meant the loss of local identity. Demolition of the factory buildings removed visual evidence of this important past and the rise of new forms of economic activity that have little to do with manufacturing further strained connections with the city’s industrial origins. Surviving industries, such as Babcock & Wilcox, and community organizations such as the Company of Neighbours, are current attempts to continue the industrial legacy. And new enterprises, such as the massive Toyota automobile factory, and knowledge-based industries, created as part of Ontario’s “Technology Triangle”, promise a new era of economic development.

4.7 Public Spaces

*Early Diversions and Gathering Places*

Unlike other places that were planned with an urban model in mind, the four component communities grew spontaneously in response to the demands of economic growth. That is not to say that there was no thought given to anything more than utilitarian requirements, but rather that there was a conspicuous lack of formal public space in each place during the early years of development. As each community matured, however, the “public realm” became established, sometimes through deliberate design, and sometimes through gradual evolution of use.

Each community is different. Preston’s wide main street was once lined with mature trees and, if photographs of the time can be interpreted correctly, the street functioned as an informal public square, with pedestrians strolling amidst the carriages tied to posts under the trees and alongside the wooden sidewalk and shopfront awnings (Kirkwood Walker 2002: 50). The grand verandahs of the resort hotels in Preston also would have offered excellent vantage points for viewing the “passing parade”, and the concentration of such hotels at the north end of town would have made that area a popular spot in which to see and be seen (Kirkwood Walker 2002: 85). Preston also had a town square and bandshell flanked by the main street and the large public school.

And as if this weren’t enough, local entrepreneurs offered two regional attractions: Idylwild Park and Leisure Lodge. The Park, as has been
mentioned previously, was the creation of the interurban railway company and catered to local families and company picnics from the 1890s to 1916. Although nothing evident remains of it today, photographs show a winding watercourse along the Speed River, with boaters rowing alongside bridges, picnic spots and open lawns surrounded by mature forest, all accessed from the railway (Bloomfield 1995: 211). By contrast, Leisure Lodge was a later development (1949-1981) that catered to those who could drive. It too was located alongside the Speed River on the edge of town, and offered accommodation, in the form of rustic cabins, and entertainment, in the form of concerts in an outdoor bandshell. Photographs from the mid-20th century show new cars next to cabins, and big bands playing on summer evenings (McLaughlin 1987: 108; Kirkwood Walker 2002: 156).

Most of these public resources are gone. The Park closed in the early 20th century when the interurban railway ceased operation, and Leisure Lodge struggled on into the 1980s before closing. The hotels are closed and only one former hotel building remains; the street trees likewise have been removed to accommodate road widenings and parking. But the town square has recently been revitalized, and the main street sidewalks are broad enough to support outdoor patios and displays of merchandise. Riverside Park, also established in the early 20th century, continues to offer some of the waterside picnicking and relaxation that Idylwild once had, as well as providing large fields for a wide variety of organized sports. Today, much of what was once provided by the private sector is now part of the municipal infrastructure.

Hespeler also grew up quickly as a gritty mill town. Its hilly site precluded the laying out of extensive public open spaces in the downtown core, but over time, the natural setting, as well as former industrial sites, became venues for informal recreation. As is amply shown in the new interpretive panels installed along the main street, Forbes Park, located not far uphill from the main street on former industrial lands, is one such site; the mill pond is another. Riverside trails alongside former industries and using former rail lines link Hespeler with Preston, via substantial conservation areas. What distinguishes Hespeler, however, is its concentration of churches and civic buildings in the centre of town. The square that opens onto the main street is flanked by a church, the town hall and the library. Even with its narrow streets and
sidewalks, downtown Hespeler’s proximity to water and to public buildings offers many public benefits in a confined space.

Blair had a coaching inn (with large verandahs) as early as 1837 (Bloomfield 1995: 169) and benefited from proximity to the river flats and mature woodlots. It did not, however, develop formal public open spaces: the cemetery uphill from the main street is an informal space, as is the former school playground. More recently, the creation of waterside parks and links to the Trans-Canada Trail and the riverside rail trail have given the village excellent public open spaces, as has proximity to the former Cruickston estate (rare).

Of all the communities that make up contemporary Cambridge, Galt had the greatest number of formal public spaces. Principal amongst these were Queen’s Square and Market Square. Queen’s Square is located on the west bank of the Grand River adjacent to the main bridges. By the early 20th century the Square contained formal plantings, monuments and a fountain and was flanked by such major buildings as the opera house, the Grand Hotel, and many prestigious shops and offices. Market Square had the large outdoor market space as well as a spacious market building on one side and the landmark Town Hall on the other. Both of these public squares continue in their original functions and, while the buildings flanking Queen’s Square have changed, the public library and gallery and the University of Waterloo Architecture School and gallery provide public facilities to replace those formerly provided by privately-run hotels and entertainment venues.

Galt also boasts many parks. Some, like Dickson Park, are large sports venues, in this case formerly including a large baseball stadium and a racetrack (Kirkwood Walker 2002: 147-148) Others, such as Victoria Park, offer large open spaces, tennis courts and woodlots that are integrated within a planned residential neighbourhood, while Mountview Cemetery is another designed landscape offering public access. Although the racetrack in Dickson Park is gone, the site remains a principal public open space, while the Victoria Park and the cemetery continue in their original functions. Soper Park could also be restored to its former glory as a designed landscape (Welsh 2006: int.) The major new addition to the public realm in Galt is the waterside walkway system, created as part of the reconstruction of the river banks to control flooding. The “Living
Levee” is now a grand promenade along the retaining walls on the east side of the river and, although it replaces many of the massive factories that once lined the river banks, its flood control berms still restrict views of the river from the downtown. The best views of the river are from the bridges.

From these bridges one other key element of downtown Galt is also very evident: the skyline is dominated by institutional buildings. Church spires cluster on both sides of the river, and the Town Hall clock tower completes the ensemble. Although more recent high rise development has somewhat obscured the clarity of what was once a completely “public” skyline, the main elements remain, and the key views from bridges are intact.
5.

Shared Community Values Expressed in Place

5.1 What People Said About Cambridge

The search for common heritage values in the amalgamated city can be furthered by looking at the city through the eyes of those who know it now, and who have visited it in the past. “Place imagery” is a fancy term for the ways in which ordinary people understand their community and are able to describe its physical and cultural attributes. By examining a small sample of earlier place images, and by asking for opinions from a broad range of current residents (via surveys and interviews), the study team has attempted to bring into sharper focus the heritage character of the city as a whole, as a key step towards developing priorities for conservation action, and strategies to ensure that these actions become a reality.

*Traveller’s Tales*

In the past, comments from residents and travellers have given a sense of what each of the component communities was like. Preston may have been described in 1881 as a “sleepy old German village” (Dilse 1981: 11), but accounts in Smith’s Gazeteer in 1851 remark on its vibrancy, industry and fine buildings (Dilse 1981: 8-9). Hespeler gets a more poetic description in 1851, when it was still known as New Hope; Smith calls it ‘prettily situated on the Speed’ and “a thriving little place” (Dilse 1981: 15). Accounts of Galt in the 19th century tend to be sober descriptions of its many industrial and commercial enterprises, but the prose gets more promotional in the early 20th century, when *Picturesque and Industrial Galt* showed photos of the many industries and claimed that such views “will give the reader a very fair idea of the massive character of the
industrial establishments that have made Galt and which never fail to impress the visitor” (McLaughlin 1987: 88). Although this is a description of a place also known as the “Manchester of Canada”, the same sense of pride in the area’s industrial economy was common to all three major towns.

This common industrial legacy, combined with a strong work ethic, a law abiding nature and an urge towards home ownership, came to define the essentially conservative nature of the component communities in the past. Aligned with this were strong loyalties to local sports teams and places of recreation. Overall, it is a sense of place that, on the one hand, describes a circumscribed view of community, composed of smaller, tightly knit groups allied by ties of work, family, religion and ethnicity and, on the other hand, is confidently moving into the future, welcoming growth and fostering greater links to the outside world. How well it accords with current views is the subject of the next section.

5.2 Current Values for Place

Surveys and Interviews
In order to probe more deeply into the heritage values of contemporary residents of Cambridge, it is now necessary to explore this set of seemingly divergent views and bring in current opinions. One way to determine local residents’ current attitudes to place is to ask them directly. As part of this Master Plan, the consulting team and City staff prepared surveys for distribution at the Cambridge Mall and in the local press. In addition, the consulting team asked for and received a list of potential interview subjects, suggested by the project steering committee, and proceeded to conduct approximately 25 telephone interviews with these people (in some cases involving several interviews with the same person). The results of these inquiries show some common values, as well as some divergent ones.

Survey Results
The survey provided a broad insight into local values by asking questions that related to the overarching historical themes described above. The survey asked a series of basic opinion questions: where are your favourite places in Cambridge; why are these places important to you; with respect to your favourite place, what would you hate to see changed; what things
can be done to improve those favourite places, and; is there anything else you would like to tell us about Cambridge? The survey was handed out over a weekend in the Cambridge Mall and later placed in the local newspaper. The survey responses were not intended to be validated statistically but were simply to be indicative of general attitudes to place. From the approximately 123 responses received, the results can be summarized as follows:

**Favourite places:**
- There is widespread support for conservation and enhancement of both natural and cultural heritage resources, with an almost even split between those who identified riverside parks and trails as their favourite places and those that highlighted historic downtowns.
- Within these general categories, respondents identified a wide variety of favourite places.
- In a few cases, respondents identified specific buildings, such as GCI, Knox Presbyterian Church, the architecture school, Southworks, and the former Del Monte Hotel, or specific places, such as Queen’s Square, the market, Riverside Park, the Cambridge Mall.
- In general, the Grand and Speed River park system was clear favourite, with older downtowns and residential areas close behind.
- Several people mentioned the bridges in Galt.
- The mall is popular with young adults: they complain that existing downtowns offer nothing for this age group.
- There were several favourable comments on the architectural and landscape details found in older residential and commercial districts.

**Potential threats to favourite places:**
- Poor maintenance is a consistent complaint in downtowns especially but also in open spaces (litter, graffiti, vandalism).
- Demolition of old buildings.
- There were some complaints about poor vehicular access to historic areas (traffic, parking) but others emphasized pedestrian/bicycle/transit access as being desirable.
• Many people were opposed to high rise buildings as being out of character and blocking views of the river and older buildings.
• Many people also complained about the poor quality of design in new buildings, especially those constructed as infill in older settings.
• Several people expressed concerns about crime and drug problems downtown.
• There were many objections to the design, location and approval process for the new Civic Centre.

*Actions needed to conserve and enhance favourite places:*

• The most common response to the question about change was to keep the place the way it is and maintain it better.
• Many people wanted to preserve as many old buildings as possible.
• Making downtowns easier to walk in was a priority, with convenient parking, attractive paving and lighting, interpretive signage, decorative planting, and seating.
• More tree planting was a priority, as was care of existing trees and special streetscape features, such as the Dickson Hill globe streetlights.
• Another priority was improved roads and related traffic movement and parking.
• Several people wanted an emphasis on the single city, not on its component communities.
• There was strong support for more small shops (including upscale ones) in the downtown, offering personal service, and for festivals and other events to enliven downtowns.

*Interview Results*

By contrast, the interviews were conducted using an open-ended format whereby interview subjects were asked to give suggestions for issues to be addressed in the Heritage Master Plan, and strategies for doing so. As a result, the responses tended to be specific and focused on the process of heritage conservation rather than the values underlying heritage activity. Nonetheless, there were some good insights into the level of heritage awareness in the community and suggestions on ways to make heritage a
higher priority. Overall, the interviews resulted in comments on the current state of:

_Heritage inventory, evaluation and policy:_

- The current City inventory of heritage properties is a good basic record and guide for policy; given the physical character and recent development history of Cambridge, it could be enhanced by the addition of categories for cultural landscape and for more recent properties of architectural or historic merit (e.g. Arthur Erickson-designed house in Preston), it also needs to be expanded to include industrial buildings and should include all properties of heritage significance, not just those whose owners support potential heritage designation (thus the inventory is well behind and not up to date).
- Industrial heritage is widely noted in local histories, yet is not really considered in either the heritage inventory or popular conceptions of heritage values in the community.
- City archives also needs assistance in updating its collections, as repository of city history; especially needs a searchable database.
- Cultural landscapes such as rare (Cruickston Park, a portion of which is within Cambridge) and associated river landscapes are essential unifying elements linking the component communities, yet they do not figure prominently in municipal heritage policy.
- The heritage values of the component ethnic communities are not well articulated; although the Scots, English and Germans have made an obvious mark on the physical setting, their values do not inform more recent developments, nor do those of the more recently arrived Portuguese or Newfoundlander communities.
- Heritage conservation must be seen in a broader context of rapid urbanization driven by Provincial requirements for intensification within existing urban boundaries, thus vulnerable areas must be identified and means of protecting them prepared.
- A survey of heritage resources across the whole city should be done before getting down to the level of potential district designation.
- Inventory needs to identify stable areas, areas suitable for new development, and policies need to define densities and built form.
• Promotion of cultural tourism should be seen as a means to the end of improving life for local residents.

**Heritage administration:**

• There is some confusion regarding the respective roles of MHAC and Heritage Cambridge.
• Developers and property owners are frustrated by the current difficulties raised by both the City and heritage advocates in the municipal process required for redeveloping older properties, want new ways of dealing with older properties (e.g. tax incentives; urban design guidelines for rehabilitation and new infill) and want to be involved in future discussions about heritage policy.
• Urban design guidelines may be preferable to district designation, at least as a first step.
• The Heritage Master Plan should not be seen solely as a means of updating Official Plan policy; it must be an effective way of galvanizing widespread community support for heritage activity, through educating/informing local residents about heritage resources and about ways in which heritage can benefit the community as a whole.
• Heritage awareness must become part of the ethos of the City administration, integral to its daily operation.
• Heritage planning needs to become proactive, not reactive.

**Heritage awareness in the community:**

• There is a need to help local people see Cambridge “with new eyes” in order to appreciate heritage resources.
• Heritage advocacy groups have felt marginalized, in part due to disagreements over City development policies, and in part due to personality conflicts between Heritage Cambridge members and others in the community. At the same time, there is the feeling that heritage issues are not taken seriously by the community.
• Cambridge lacks a way of telling its own story, as in a city museum (other than the existing house museum); arts and culture also do not seem to be included in discussions of heritage.
• Opposition to designation (e.g. of districts, such as Dickson Hill) in the past has been driven by concerns over property values, cost
to homeowners of meeting conservation guidelines, and restrictions on alterations; lack of government financial support was also an issue.

- By the same token, support for heritage conservation is likely to be found at a neighbourhood level.
- People are now more concerned about cultural landscape conservation (e.g. riverside settings, views, scenic drives, trees) than about building conservation.
- Cambridge should support natural and cultural resource conservation in order to be able to attract investment (e.g. Toyota supposedly chose city for its quality of life as well as workforce skills); the economic benefits of heritage need to be emphasized, especially to Council.
- Community support for heritage is there but remains untapped.
- The poor standard of design and development in recent construction has galvanized community concern.
- Role of the Portuguese and Newfoundlander in local history is not widely recognized or celebrated.

The interview comments also produced some general observations:

- There is a general reluctance to see value in older properties, especially empty buildings and lots, and a lack of appreciation for certain aspects of local history, especially industrial and multi-cultural history.
- The Legacy Cambridge project seems to have engendered good public participation in the past; more recent events to raise awareness of heritage have been well attended (e.g. GRCA workshop on Heritage Day).
- The Province’s “Places to Grow” and “Growth Plan” will put great pressure on existing downtowns, thus there is a need to identify vulnerable areas.
- Property owners are having trouble affording upkeep on heritage properties, and need incentives to do so.
- Despite the comments above, there is growing support in a general way for heritage conservation, especially amongst newcomers.
- Problems still arise from inter-town and Region-City rivalries that stymie action.
• Some respondents also complained of resistance to heritage conservation from some elements of City staff and Council, indicating the lack of a common policy on the City’s part towards heritage, or at least some resistance to implementing such heritage policies as do exist.

• The Civic Centre controversy has galvanized some local residents to support heritage.

• A city museum (or local history collection) is needed to focus awareness of local heritage.

• The City needs to encourage development that suits heritage settings.

• The City inventory needs to be expanded in scope and harmonized with the Regional inventory of cultural heritage resources.

• Downtown cores are decaying, are under-maintained, and need more residential and better care.

• There is poor access to the river and a poor standard of new architecture.

5.3 Common Values

An Emerging Consensus

Generally speaking, the interviews reiterated frustrations over the divide between heritage advocates and City staff and Council but expressed hope that this impasse can be resolved and that heritage conservation can be promoted. They revealed what appears to be a growing interest in local history and heritage conservation amongst many local residents, not necessarily as a result of the efforts of City staff and local heritage advocates, but driven by a wide range of people who appreciate Cambridge’s setting and, in some cases, recognize the economic benefits of heritage conservation. There were plenty of suggestions for promotion of heritage via public education and tourism. More respondents were aware of the poor quality of new development and were demanding better design. Few were aware of the intense development pressures resulting from Provincial growth management policies but sensed a need to protect existing older settings from unsympathetic development.
Overall, the survey results to date show an affection for older neighbourhoods and a focus on riverside parks, with some worries about the condition, new architecture and function of the existing downtown cores. A dominant theme is that the river(s) and old buildings are what define Cambridge. Young people especially complained about a lack of things to do in the downtown and favoured the malls. Regardless of these concerns, however, in many of the responses, the final comment was something to the effect of “what a great city!”.

In summary, there is an emerging consensus that says:

- Heritage is important, but how it is handled needs to be improved (both in terms of building conservation and municipal administration).
- The city’s “brand” is its heritage architecture and riverside setting, not the highway strip or new highrises.
- Many residents who don’t live downtown, and many young people, avoid the central city and have greater affinities for the malls and public open spaces and wish to conserve their special qualities.
- The riverside trails and public parks rival the downtown cores and malls as meeting places for local residents and thus rate highly as settings that are both beautiful and social.
- Leave the place as it is, but maintain it better, and celebrate its unique qualities.

Such responses might suggest that the riverside park system is the common element with which most residents can agree to value as an essential cultural heritage resource in Cambridge. Buildings in existing downtowns, and downtown public spaces, are valued by many respondents, but opinions vary considerably as to what to do to conserve and enhance them. The popularity of new places, such as the suburban malls, as gathering places, suggests that much remains to be done to make downtowns attractive to all citizens. And since downtowns contain the highest concentrations of heritage buildings and formal public spaces, specific improvement strategies will be needed for them. By contrast, the riverside parks may simply need better maintenance of their settings and better interpretation of their natural and cultural resources.
5.4 From Values to Themes

The foregoing examination of the city’s evolution, and the values current residents place on that history, form the basis for examining in greater detail the heritage resources that the Heritage Master Plan seeks to conserve and enhance. One way to place the past, and the values associated with it, into a coherent structure that can be the basis for action is to situate the discussion within a thematic framework. Overall historic themes, encompassing a series of related heritage resources, are a simple and easily understood way of discussing both the values given to heritage resources and the types of actions possible to conserve and enhance them.

For the purposes of the Master Plan, the suggested main themes emerging from the background information provided above are:

1. The Rivers and the Land
2. Settlement
3. Community Development
4. New Directions

Each of these themes is inter-related, and together they assist in both the identification of heritage resources and the preparation of community and economic development projects that interpret and promote these resources.

These are not the only themes that can be distilled from the city’s history. The past is a very rich resource, offering many different stories to tell. What is important in the Heritage Master Plan is to identify stories that are especially resonant for local people while, at the same time, providing compelling ideas that will both spur community action and attract visitors and, it is hoped, new investment. These stories, known as interpretive themes and storylines, are a core component of initiatives to promote community development and cultural tourism, the twin goals of a Heritage Master Plan. Below is an expanded list of interpretive themes and related storylines that are proposed as being best suited to helping achieve these goals.
Over-arching theme:
Cambridge is a historic city on the river.

Main Themes and Storylines:
Themes and storylines best suited to the elucidation of life in Cambridge include:

1. THE RIVERS AND THE LAND
Primordial Settings
- Geology and soil
- Primeval forest
- Rivers

2. SETTLEMENT
Early Settlers
- Aboriginal
- Mennonite
- Scots/Anglo
Ethnicity
- German
- Scots/Anglo
- Later arrivals (e.g. Portuguese, Newfoundlanders)
Communities
- Blair
- Hespeler
- Preston
- Galt
Local Lives
- Pioneer life
- Farm life
- Factory life
- Shop life
- Home life
- Ongoing traditions
Important Local People
- Erb
- Hespeler
- Dickson
3. COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Industry
- Milling
- Manufacturing
- Craft industries

Transportation
- River
- Road
- Rail

Building
- Styles
- Types
- Materials
- Functions

Public Realm
- Parks and squares
- Farms and woods
- Trails
- Views
- Drives

Tourism and Recreation
- Spas
- Interurban railway excursions
- Idylwild Park
- Leisure Lodge
- Sports grounds
- Sports teams
- Farmers’ market
- Southworks

4. NEW DIRECTIONS

Turning Points
- Floods
- Wartime (training, factory workers)
- De-industrialization
• Suburbanization
• Amalgamation
• Heritage Conservation
• New Development
A Toolkit of Ways of Celebrating the Past

6.1 Good Ideas from Elsewhere

*Municipal Case Studies*

Other municipalities share with Cambridge the challenges of poorly co-ordinated heritage activities, under-funding, and staff shortages that inhibit their ability to achieve their full potential in conserving and enhancing heritage resources. However, some have overcome these obstacles and can offer valuable lessons for application here. The following case studies from communities across Canada offer some initial insights into ways of making the City of Cambridge heritage policies as effective as possible. These are three extremes of municipal involvement in heritage planning; they are not necessarily examples of direct relevance to Cambridge. However, what they do is illustrate the range of roles cities can play in planning for heritage conservation. In the following section, there will be further analysis of best practices in heritage conservation, exploring the roles of the public sector, the private sector, and the public in making implementation work well.

In Canada, the few cities that have actively embraced heritage are still in the early stages of developing comprehensive heritage plans. The three municipalities selected here each take a different approach to heritage management. Victoria emphasizes the role of municipal government and ancillary heritage agencies, using a combination of planning policies, guidelines and incentives that are primarily focused on buildings and downtown revitalization. Montreal is another strong civic government that promotes heritage as a cornerstone of francophone identity and a key marketing image for use in the city’s economic development. Old Town Toronto is a citizen initiative that addresses threats to heritage resources
by partnering with the landowners and volunteer groups to produce a “heritage-friendly” development process. In all cases, the municipal role is defined as an enabler, educator and promoter of heritage activity, with much of the detailed management of resources devolving to site staff or to other agencies.

Victoria B.C.

Victoria won the Heritage Canada Foundation’s Prince of Wales Prize for municipal government commitment to conservation of its heritage resources. The award confirms what many citizens already know: the majority of its population values heritage. The City has provided staff and funds to support this widespread view. Even so, the draft Heritage Strategic Plan (November, 2002, Commonwealth Historic Resource Management Limited) notes the threats of reduced funding under municipal requirements to cap spending, set against increasing needs for support. However, at present the successes of the City’s approach outweigh these worries and should be examined for their application to other places.

As stated in the Draft (p.57), “(the fact that) the City commits substantial expenditures on the (heritage) program and this leverages millions of dollars in private investment, helps make Victoria a billion-dollar-a-year tourism destination, increases property tax assessments, and contributes to several non-heritage policy objectives.” Managed by the City Planning and Development Department, the Heritage Program has a dedicated staff person as well as substantial assistance from two City-owned arm’s-length organizations: the Victoria Heritage Foundation and the Victoria Civic Heritage Trust. Respectively, these organizations manage disbursements of funds for restoration of heritage residential properties (plus run educational programs), and operate interpretive and advocacy programs in support of heritage activity. The Heritage Advisory Committee, appointed by Council, monitors the heritage register, reviews significant development applications and alterations to heritage structures, and recommends buildings for designation. Various historical societies supply volunteer support to the overall program as well as provide tours, educational programs and special projects. Heritage is seen as an economic and cultural benefit, encouraging development and enhancing local quality of life.
The key advantage of the Victoria model is that it has money to support its goals. There is a heritage planner on staff, there are funds to help landowners restore heritage properties, and there are tax incentives to revitalize the historic downtown as well as other commercial and institutional properties. Planning policy and regulatory tools include a full register of heritage properties, as well as a series of conservation areas and “development permit” areas in which any changes to heritage settings are under municipal review. The success of the program is summed up in the Draft Plan (p. 10): “Victoria’s Heritage Program works well for a number of reasons. It is made up of components that have been well conceived to meet a community need, it has benefited from a long-term commitment from Council, it is managed by competent and dedicated staff, and it is monitored and assisted by articulate and devoted volunteers. Most important is a spirit of cooperation amongst the various players.” The combination of these factors has led to a longstanding and robust program.

Montreal, P.Q.
This municipality uses the power and influence of a strong city government to control and promote heritage. In this case, however, heritage is defined in very broad terms, essentially as a reflection of the community’s sense of itself, and embracing every conceivable type of heritage resource. Heritage is an integral part of the city’s identity and thus includes both respect for the past and confidence in the future. In the City’s mind, heritage becomes allied to economic development and can be used to advantage in competing with rival cities. As stated in the recent Draft Heritage Policy prepared by the City (n.d., p.1), “Montreal can thus build on its distinctive urban nature against a contemporary backdrop of competition between major cities, where heritage – a reflection of the history of a city in constant change – inspires contemporary production and becomes a cultural, social and economic lever of development.”

The municipality clearly wishes to show by example. Its goals include establishing a strong organizational framework to spark action on heritage, using City-owned and managed properties as test cases. Funds are dedicated for conservation and enhancement of municipal heritage properties and policies are made to govern the use of such buildings. While supporting the wider heritage community and encouraging
partnerships, the City is taking the lead. Private landowners are assisted through streamlined approvals, information, and incentive programs.

The Montreal model benefits from a vibrant and diversified local economy and culture, from which support for heritage (as broadly defined) is substantial. The top-down management framework is effective if the city government is willing to act and to dedicate staff and funds to such actions. The City works with its partners in concerted fashion but it uses its considerable powers to be the catalyst for change. There is no faint-hearted sense of heritage as a luxury or an obstacle to change: here heritage is central to the City’s future and is part of a dynamic process of continual development.

**Toronto Old Town, Ont.**
The Toronto example turns the normal municipal model on its head. Instead of having the City take the initiative in developing and supporting heritage activity, here a coalition of local citizens groups put together a policy paper that shows how heritage action can work from the bottom up. South East Downtown Economic Redevelopment Initiative (SEDERI)/Citizens for the Old Town focused on the oldest part of Toronto (generally speaking the area east of the downtown over to the Don River) and produced a response to development pressures there that threatened heritage buildings and landscapes. The important insight they had was to use existing economic and cultural forces but bend them in ways that supported heritage. The result is what is termed a “heritage-friendly development process” in which developers and other property owners are rewarded for conserving and enhancing heritage resources through removal of regulatory barriers. Novel also is the absence of direct financial incentives: there are no tax breaks or renovation grants here. Where before community goals and those of the private sector collided, now development pressures are channelled in heritage-supportive ways.

The core of the “heritage-friendly development process” is an understanding of market forces. The process identifies the barriers to conservation within municipal regulatory processes as well as the other factors that tip the balance in favour of demolition or neglect. It attempts to deal directly with property owners through education, support and consultation. Much of what the local residents and the City do is alert
everyone, but most particularly property developers, to the advantages of conserving and enhancing heritage, and show examples from within Old Town itself that are successful heritage projects. A positive marketing image is also important: the area’s character has become a chief selling point and those who have capitalized on it are able to show by example that there is more profit in a product whose appeal is created by the character of the historic area (note: this is not a designated heritage conservation district and contains a variety of old and new buildings, but its cachet comes from a vibrant mix of the two).

Benefits of the proposed approach are many. For owners, they are improved investment opportunities, lower costs, clearer regulations, and fewer steps in the development approval process. For renovators, the benefits are skills training, moves towards certification, and increased demand for their trades. For residents, there are assurances against unanticipated and unwanted change.

The City’s role is to act as a catalyst for change: defining the vision, upgrading skills, bringing people together to network and initiate pilot projects. The City is also hoping to offer a pilot project in Old Town in which the Planning and Development Department would use computer modelling of the existing streetscapes to provide an accurate and flexible means of assessing proposed infill projects. Otherwise, the City steps back and allows the private sector to buy and improve property, and local citizens’ groups to sponsor studies, complete inventories, collect and disseminate information as well as fully participate in the planning and development process, helping to forge consensus on goals for the future.

Further Ideas from Other Places
Cambridge could also benefit from ideas used in some other communities where heritage has become central to local regeneration. In Perth, a small town outside of Ottawa, the loss of local industry was seriously affecting the town’s future until Perth made itself the pilot project for Heritage Canada’s national Main Street program. Since then, the town has emphasized heritage as its “brand” and has attracted substantial new investment as well as many new residents whose spending and volunteering have secured the town’s future. At a larger scale similar to Cambridge, St. John’s Newfoundland has used heritage conservation as the core of its strategy for downtown economic development, in response
to pressures from an expanding oil industry for new office space and
downtown residential development. As the final report on the downtown
redevelopment strategy states (June 7, 2001: ii):”Economic development
can co-exist with heritage and can be mutually complementary, with
sound city planning, a nurturing of investor confidence and a
knowledgeable heritage renovation sector. Strong, committed and visible
municipal leadership is essential.”

The message here is that heritage conservation should be considered as a
beneficial form of development, not as an impediment to growth and
change. Properly promoted, supported and managed, heritage
conservation can become an integral part of a community’s economic
and cultural development. In a city as rich in heritage resources as
Cambridge, supporting heritage conservation is an excellent goal. (Note:
the final sections of the Heritage Master Plan will provide detailed
strategies for implementing this goal).

6.2 Conservation and Development Tools

*Designation of Individual Properties and Entire Districts*

Achieving the twin goals of conservation and development begins with
the resources at hand. Cambridge’s sense of place is largely determined
by its older buildings and landscapes. These heritage resources are
precious and warrant good stewardship; they are also the building blocks
for community and economic development. Designation is a way for
owners to express pride in their property and in the community as a
whole, and for local residents to promote an appreciation of local history.
Changes brought about by urban development can threaten these settings
and erode local pride, as well as remove resources that could support new
initiatives.

In response to these threats, district designation is one of the most
effective tools for change management available to Ontario
municipalities. While the *Planning Act* handles most of the land
development issues, it is virtually silent on matters of community identity
and heritage. As is the case in other communities, in Cambridge the
special buildings and landscapes that have evolved over the past one
hundred and fifty years are not protected in any meaningful way by the
current policies in the City’s Official Plan or Zoning By-law. By
contrast, the recently updated *Provincial Policy Statement* and *Heritage Act* offer concrete policies and guidelines for ongoing conservation and enhancement of heritage resources. It is the policy vacuum left by existing planning tools that both individual and district designation under the *Heritage Act* is able to fill. The municipality can use the designation process and site specific as well as district conservation plans as a means of ensuring the ongoing conservation and care of heritage resources in Cambridge.

**Options to heritage designation**

There are other policy means by which heritage conservation can be achieved. The City of Cambridge Official Plan has several sections addressing other forms of community improvement in which provisions already exist for heritage, or for consideration of the existing built and landscape context. They are:

- Section 2, Chapter 4.3: Community Improvement, Renewal and Revitalization; and
- Section 3, Chapter 17: Special Districts.

Also worth considering are other components often found in municipal Official Plans, such as:

- Secondary Plans and Neighbourhood Plans;
- Conservation Easements and Covenants;
- Subdivision development agreements;
- Demolition control by-laws;
- Interim control by-laws; and
- Urban design guidelines.

Community Improvement policies generally address rundown parts of the city and attempt to re-establish basic services and improve property standards. However, they can be an umbrella approach to comprehensive rehabilitation of an existing district, rundown or not. Such Area policies offer a combination of “carrot and stick”, encouraging infill and providing improvements to public infrastructure while at the same time enforcing property standards and zoning controls. Where a potential heritage area is in need of significant improvement, then a Community Improvement project area and the resulting community improvement plans may be the best way of combining heritage conservation with enhancement of existing communities. In common with the Official Plan
 provisions for Special Districts, Community Improvement policies already include heritage conservation (Section 4.3.1 e).

Special Districts offer a way to address the special character or concerns of a part of the municipality. This special character can include heritage and, it is hoped, heritage character can be defined and translated into development policy. For example, Special District Area “7” covers Blair Village and is identified for its historic significance through Heritage District designation. The very general intent of this particular District can be is made more specific through more detailed policy requirements of the Heritage Conservation District Plan. In areas not designated as heritage districts, many of the built form, urban design and land use issues affecting heritage areas can be addressed in detail within Special District policies.

Secondary Plans are a traditional method of providing comprehensive and detailed policies for a defined area. They are most often used to define new areas, but they can also apply to redevelopment areas. Since they cover transportation, servicing, environmental constraints, as well as land use, they can include heritage policies. Similarly, neighbourhood plans, which deal with smaller areas (often within a larger Secondary Plan area), offer opportunities to include heritage policies. A Secondary Plan could be a useful framework for redevelopment of underused or vacant areas (for example, in the downtown core), and incorporate a range of heritage policies affecting the existing heritage buildings and streetscapes. These policies can be innovative, as in the case of two downtown areas in Toronto (King-Parliament and King-Spadina). Here, massing and built form controls replaced traditional land use controls in order to both encourage a full range of redevelopment but also to ensure development that was compatible with the existing heritage streetscapes.

Site Plan Control mechanisms are another way to address heritage conservation, in this case, the details of built form and landscape design. The scope provided for municipalities under Provincial legislation allows for a detailed analysis of a development proposal for its potential impact on an existing heritage resource, or an historic setting. Criteria for such an analysis should be provided through guidelines supplied in an urban design plan, or a Heritage Conservation District Plan, for the area within which the development property is located.
The remaining tools include easements or covenants, which are specific requirements that are registered on title and run with the property in perpetuity, regardless of owner. They are tough and, as a result, are voluntary agreements between the municipality (or Ontario Heritage Trust) and the private owner. Some can be made as a condition of an owner receiving a grant, or as a condition of development approval. In a similar fashion, subdivision control agreements can include requirements for heritage conservation. Other tools are essentially holding provisions to allow policies or actions to catch up to events, in the case of imminent threats to heritage resources. And as the name implies, urban design guidelines work through encouraging property owners (both private and public) to integrate heritage resources with new development and improve the overall standard of design.

**Incentives**
Aside from direct financial assistance from the municipality in the form of façade or renovation grants and loans (often within a Community Improvement Plan), there are other ways of assisting conservation efforts that do not involve these standard monetary measures. From experience gained in urban cores across Canada, the incentives that are most effective are those that tip the balance in favour of “heritage-friendly” development. These include:

- reduced permit fees for minor repairs or maintenance;
- Exemption from development charges of revitalization of all or portions of a building’s floor space;
- exemption from parking and parkland requirements or cash-in-lieu levies (or rebates for same);
- property tax exemptions for heritage properties;
- priority processing for development applications on heritage properties or in heritage districts;
- City provision of pre-inspections (for Code compliance) as well as issuing building permits for stages of redevelopment, to minimize delay and reduce unforeseen costs; and
- dedicated City staff advisory assistance for heritage buildings and areas, especially information packages and technical advice, and in working with the business community to provide volunteer building technical assistance to property owners and to promote heritage properties and areas.
Interpretation

Interpretation of heritage resources is an effective way of providing both a cultural tourism “product” and a marketing tool to raise community awareness of heritage and, through this, build support for conservation. Interpretive programming is provided by municipal agencies and other heritage groups, but without a municipal museum, Cambridge has had to rely on the Region of Waterloo to interpret local history. McDougall Cottage and Doon Heritage Crossroads interpret aspects of local history, and the latter is the primary repository of artifacts from Cambridge. Their efforts, however, are one of the few attempts within the region to provide accurate and consistent information on the city’s past. Perhaps the most successful recent event in raising awareness of heritage is the annual Doors Open festival, during which a variety of buildings are open to the public for viewing. The annual Heritage Day is also a venue for heritage-related presentations and events.

Even with this range of interpretive activity, there is as yet no concerted effort by public agencies to commemorate and promote history in the area. Little attention is paid to the everyday life of local people, nor are many of the other themes (discussed in the thematic history, above) interpreted in any substantial way.

Character Areas as Priority Areas for Conservation Activity

Having seen the range of heritage resources available in Cambridge, and the ways in which heritage conservation has been promoted in other places, there is an obvious conclusion that Cambridge has significant opportunities at its doorstep. For a variety of reasons outlined in previous sections of this report, these opportunities have not been realized. The City has a surfeit of choices to make in heritage-related projects; what is needed now is a way to make choices that not only capitalize on the parts of the city with the best heritage resources, but also use an approach that ensures public support for conservation projects.

To accomplish these twin goals, the study team is suggesting the following approach to identifying priorities for heritage activity. Using the idea of seeing the city as a collection of distinct but related parts, or districts, the team has identified bundles of heritage resources in these areas. However, instead of the word “districts”, our team has used the term “character area”. The reason for doing so is to ensure that there is no
pressure on the City to choose Heritage Conservation District designation under the *Ontario Heritage Act* as the only conservation tool, an approach that has had mixed success in the past, and to allow consideration of other ways of protecting local places. A flexible approach allows a more relaxed public debate on the character of the selected area, a debate that, it is hoped, will then lead to a consensus on means of conserving and enhancing that character via some form of conservation initiative.

The character areas have been chosen using criteria based on the Provincial Policy Statement’s definition of a Cultural Heritage Landscape, which is “a defined geographical area of heritage significance which has been modified by human activities and is valued by a community. It involves grouping(s) of individual heritage features such as structures, spaces, archaeological sites and natural elements, which together form a significant type of heritage form, distinctive from that of its constituent elements or parts. Examples may include, but are not limited to, heritage conservation districts designated under the *Ontario Heritage Act*, and villages, parks, gardens, battlefields, mainstreets and neighbourhoods, cemeteries, trailways and industrial complexes of cultural heritage value”.

In order to identify potential cultural heritage landscapes, the project team took this understanding and used the existing municipal inventory, as well as previously prepared consultant reports (e.g. Dilse) to identify clusters of heritage resources. The team then toured the city, reviewing the urban scene using criteria found in Regulation 9/06 of the *Ontario Heritage Act*, namely Design or Physical Value, Historical or Associative Value, and Contextual Value. The team found clusters of heritage resources that represented important historical patterns of development in Cambridge and it is these “character areas” that are identified below as being worthy of further investigation for potential conservation and enhancement.

The chosen areas highlight different aspects of each community, such as the downtown core, or workers’ housing, and are a first step in defining key aspects of the city’s character. They are by no means definitive – other areas may be suitable, and the boundaries shown on our mapping are flexible – but they are intended to spark public debate. Since the key
to success in conserving whole areas of a city is in nurturing bottom up initiatives, the identification of character areas should help local residents begin to put their thoughts into words, and to clarify their often subconscious feelings for their area so that meanings and values for place can be defined and then discussed. Once the discussion has progressed, then positive responses can be identified, and priorities made.

The following text identifies character areas within each of the four constituent communities. Also included are significant riverbanks and scenic roads. *(see map next page)* The range of areas chosen reflects the range of heritage resources identified in earlier sections of this report and thus includes buildings and structures, cultural landscapes, and archaeological sites; other heritage resources referred to also have associations with these areas. In each case, an attempt is made to describe heritage character and to identify both the challenges and the opportunities for conserving and enhancing this character. Where applicable, cultural assets with potential for enhancement and interpretation are also identified.
6.3 Character Areas

**Blair**

*General Comments*
Blair has a distinct identity as a rural village, a character that has been conserved as a result of the village core being designated as a Heritage Conservation District. While threats to this character still exist in the form of suburban development on the fringes and increased traffic through the village core, the visual image of a stable rural setting remains intact. Because this is a village and not a larger settlement, the density of building is lower and the prevalence of landscape more evident. Informal development patterns can be seen in both the irregular street layout and the scattered placement of buildings. Of particular note is the survival of a representative sample of a range of former building types, including mills, inns, shops, institutional and agricultural buildings. The village’s rural character is further enhanced by the conservation of its surrounding natural setting, with the Grand River on the east and the rare land trust to the south and west.

Several themes from Blair’s history can be used to guide conservation and development. They include:

- The close proximity to the river, creeks and the rural, agricultural countryside;
- The long relationship of the village with its “manor farm” (Cruickston Estate);
- The presence of very early buildings linking it with the initial phases of Mennonite settlement; and
- The ongoing tradition of environmental stewardship, from early farming to rare.

*Heritage Character*

The historic village of Blair is a combination of historic buildings, landscapes and streetscapes. While the number of historic buildings is relatively small they make up some of the oldest in Waterloo Region and are defining in their architectural presence. Most were built between 1817 and 1850 by Mennonite families who emigrated from Pennsylvania. They include houses, barns, mills, inns, a church, a school, and a store.
Associated with them are a number of historic landscapes that include three mill ponds and the former wagon tracks and farm lanes. The Village grew little over the next 100 years adding mainly small but attractive Ontario Gothic and Cottage style houses. The exception is the magnificent Langdon Hall, built in 1898-1901 by Eugene Langdon Wilks in the Classical Revival design by well-known Toronto architect Eden Smith. Other than the Langdon House and a few outlying houses, the historic buildings of Blair form a fairly compact grouping of properties on Blair and Old Mill Roads. The setting of the village on the Grand River and enclosed by the landscapes of the Blair and Bechtel Creeks provide a rich rural character. The whole is a wonderful heritage, largely authentic and unspoilt.

Character Defining Elements
As described in the Blair Village Heritage Conservation District Plan (Hill, February, 1999: 10), the character defining elements, by category, are as follows:

- Atmosphere
  - Rural, spacious, historic
- Buildings
  - Close to the street, variety of sizes, styles and setbacks, mix of old and new, mix of land uses
- Building lots
  - Spacious, variety of sizes, shapes, frontages
- Streets
  - Short and narrow, winding vertically and horizontally, hedgerow edges, treed canopies, no curbs, gutters, sidewalks or street lights
- Landscapes
  - Rolling land with abundance of trees, creeks and ponds, Grand River, birds and wildlife

Cultural assets:
- Institutional buildings (churches);
- rare estate headquarters; and
- trail system and riverside public open space.
Conservation and Development Concerns and Opportunities

The main challenge in Blair is to keep it small and sheltered from the intensive urban development underway throughout Cambridge and its surrounding region. While infill development is controlled and guided by the Heritage Conservation District Plan, municipal and regional planning controls will be needed in order to manage traffic through the village and expansion of residential development outside of the District boundaries. There are opportunities to capitalize on Blair’s proximity to both the Grand River trail system and the Trans Canada Trail by enhancing the pedestrian realm and calming traffic. Similarly, there are opportunities for the village to enhance both its physical and economic links to the rare estate, as is already evident with the estate headquarters occupying the restored inn on the main street.

Hespeler

General Comments

Of all the component communities in the City of Cambridge, Hespeler remains closest to its industrial roots. Not only are the factory buildings still there (and, in some cases, still in operation), but the tightly packed village core is still relatively untouched by the development that has spread over the surrounding countryside. The village was founded by Pennsylvania Mennonites and grew as a result of the efforts of a few major industrialists. Their paternalism resulted in many of the important buildings that remain today. These firms also changed the ethnic mix of the community as their mills expanded. They actively recruited labourers from further afield, initially from Scotland and, during WWII, from Newfoundland. Women from northern Ontario were also brought in to replace men taken for the war effort and many of these women were provided lodging in specially built company dormitories. In this way, the mills provided a social setting that extended beyond working hours and helped the newcomers blend with the existing population.

The working class, factory town atmosphere persists, in large part because of the intact physical setting, but also because of the local sense of pride that residents have for their community. One of the reasons for this closely knit community is the recent memory of Dominion Woollens and Worsted, at its height in the 20th century one of the largest textile mills in the British Empire, employing as much as 40% of the village
population, hence its nickname of “the Company of Neighbours.” The celebrations and other community events that demonstrate that pride are tangible evidence of longstanding local cultural traditions associated with factory work.

This local pride is an asset when it comes to conserving local traditions but it can be a problem if it entails resistance to new ideas in the realms of community revitalization and tourism development. The inward-looking, industry-focused attitude typical of Hespeler may need to be tempered with an acceptance of changes that will conserve local buildings through adaptive re-use and welcome visitors and new investment that will revitalize the downtown. Fortunately, there are several themes drawn from Hespeler’s past that can be used to guide new development. These include:

- A tradition of strong family ties to local industries and to the community as a whole, whether through the self-help networks of factory workers or through the corporate paternalism of the local industrialists;
- Strong local sporting traditions, whether through teams sponsored by the industries or through production of sports equipment (e.g. hockey sticks);
- Intact industrial settings, from large factory complexes to workers’ housing;
- Textile mills that, in their heyday, were amongst the largest in the world;
- A setting on steep hillsides flanking a broad valley that naturally contains the original settlement;
- A wide variety of vernacular worker’s buildings, punctuated by the few large houses of the mill owners and managers; and
- A largely intact downtown core, with commercial, residential and institutional buildings.

**Hespeler Village Character Area**

**History**

As with the other communities in Cambridge, Hespeler began as a mill village and expanded into a major manufacturing centre. Of the original tract of Six Nations lands purchased by land speculator Richard Beasley,
the core of the current village came to the attention of a group of Pennsylvania Mennonites wishing to establish a new agricultural community. By the 1830s, this group had built the community of New Hope, flanking the Speed River. This small settlement grew to become the core of the village of Hespeler largely thanks to the efforts of German businessman Jacob Hespeler, who purchased 145 acres along the banks of the Speed in 1845 and built an industrial complex of dams and mills. He was instrumental in bringing the Great Western Railway to the village in 1859 and continued to promote local development throughout the 19th century. As it grew and evolved, the village (which soon bore his name) became an internationally famous centre for the manufacture of high quality woollens, and other regionally and nationally important industries grew up alongside the textile mills. After the peak of local employment was reached in the mid-20th century, local industries declined and the village is now sustained largely as a bedroom community for regional urban centres.

**Heritage Character**

Due to the steep slopes of the river valley at that location, the village core developed in a very compact fashion, with residential, commercial, institutional and industrial land uses crowded together on the hillsides and in the narrow valley. The street grid is also skewed by the topography, resulting in many interesting views and vistas along the streets. The downtown core resulting from this pattern of settlement is a modest collection of retail and residential buildings, punctuated by more architecturally expressive institutional buildings such as the churches, post office, town hall and library, and dominated by the impressive bulk of the surviving mills and factories. The core contains a concentration of mid-late 19th century structures, many in limestone or plaster, as well as yellow brick. Mills and church steeples define the skyline, and the prevailing three storey height of the commercial and industrial buildings lining Queen Street creates a canyon-like effect.

**Character Defining Elements:**

- commercial centre of the village;
- large collection of heritage buildings – stores, inns, industries, town services;
- typical 2-3 storey retail buildings large portion built of stone;
• Stamped and Enamel Ware Ltd. Building, later known as American Standard;
• furniture factories located on north bank of river across bridge from commercial town centre;
• Spring Street and south side of Queen Street east maintain late 19th century worker cottages and rowhouses;
• no setbacks, broad sidewalks; and
• a tradition of fine public buildings, continuing with the new library.

*Cultural Assets:*
• intersection of Adams, Tannery and Queen Street East (formal square) – three churches, fire hall, public library, former post office building;
• Speed River, canoe launch (Jacob’s landing); and
• Forbes Park.

*Conservation and Development Concerns and Opportunities*
The key to successful conservation of Hespeler’s downtown is in finding viable uses for its historic buildings. The largest threat, therefore, comes from neglect. Adaptive re-use of former commercial and industrial buildings is needed to revitalize the core. Traffic along Queen Street is another concern, as will be traffic generated by new housing subdivisions on the periphery. Emphasis on the existing natural settings, especially the mill pond and Forbes Park, is also needed in order to improve the public realm in the downtown. This core area is a prime candidate for a study to determine its suitability for designation as a Heritage Conservation District.

*Neighbourhood of Millvue Street*

*History*
This residential neighbourhood grew up close by the largest of Hespeler’s mills and included a wide range of house types. In 1888 and 1892 the Forbes Company bought these lands to develop them for worker’s housing. This area grew as a result of a policy whereby mill owners encouraged men with families to build their own homes and provided financial assistance to help them do so. Mill owners also built subsidized housing. Given that the Forbes mill especially could employ entire families, this area began by having very close ties to the nearby
mill. Most of the houses were built in the two decades between 1890 and 1910. As a result, they reflect the dominant architectural styles of that period - High Victorian Gothic, Queen Anne, and Edwardian Classicism – as interpreted by the working class owners.

*Heritage Character*

The skewed street grid, caused by the steep hillside topography, the orientation of streets at right angles to the main street, thus giving views that terminate in the mill, and the predominance of frame houses clad in “ashlar” plaster, comprise this area’s character.

*Character Defining Elements:*

- industrial/residential neighbourhood located to the south of Queen Street and uphill from Hespeler’s original mill;
- working class residential dwellings for factory workers;
- some wartime residential development;
- informal street grid, driveways and gravel laneways;
- large setbacks and mature street trees;
- rural, small town character; and
- clusters of early subdivision housing, both late 19th (stone construction) and early 20th century.

*Cultural Assets:*

- remnants of Hespeler’s major factory building; and
- Queen Street West as the main link between the village core and downtown Cambridge.

*Conservation and Development Concerns and Opportunities*

This small area is sheltered from major development pressures but is subject to traffic infiltration from adjacent subdivisions and to inappropriate alterations as the original fabric and cladding ages. Opportunities exist to conserve and restore original building fabric and to bolster the streetscape character by retaining the rural street cross section and by conserving and adding street trees. Initiatives to improve this neighbourhood should attempt to resist the trend towards gentrification of what is now a modest working class area.
Neighbourhood of Walker Street

History
Named after members of the Rife family, this neighbourhood contained the homes of some prominent members of the local community. The Panabakers are one such family (No.180 Walker) with executives in Dominion Woollens and Worsted and nationally famous painters amongst its members.

Heritage Character
The hilly topography and variety of architecture define this area.

Character Defining Elements:
- residential neighbourhood south of Queen Street East;
- turn of the century urban residential development with a variety of architectural styles and finer detail;
- situation on a hill, sloping towards Queen Street East;
- deeper setbacks on many properties, larger lots and mature tree canopy; and
- formal paving, sidewalks on both sides.

Conservation and Development Concerns and Opportunities
Conservation and enhancement of the existing streetscape (trees and setbacks) and buildings should be the main focus of ongoing efforts in this area.

Neighbourhood of Guelph Avenue

History
Hespeler’s “northern survey” is a residential neighbourhood developed primarily in the late 19th and early 20th centuries to house the prosperous middle class and, in several cases, the owners of the major local industries. Much of the land east of Guelph Avenue was owned by the Forbes family, owners of the largest mill in Hespeler.

Heritage Character
This area has a wide variety of housing ages and styles, from the mid-19th century to the mid-late 20th century, and a variety of materials, from
limestone rubblestone, plaster, clapboard, and brick. It is characterized by large houses on large lots.

**Character Defining Elements:**
- neighbourhood boundary signified by the site and remnants of the original Hespeler estate house;
- early century estate style developments on the east side, with generous lots;
- some middle class residential development on the west side; and
- wider street, mature tree canopy.

**Cultural Assets:**
- site of original Hespeler estate;
- estate houses of the early industrialists.

**Conservation and Development Concerns and Opportunities**
Any neighbourhood having large houses on large lots is vulnerable to subdivision and insensitive infill, as well as potential demolition of existing heritage buildings in order to increase the amount of buildable lands. Through traffic will also be an issue. Another potential threat to the area’s heritage character is inappropriate alterations. Conservation and enhancement of the streetscape and heritage buildings will help to counter this threat.

**Preston**

**General Comments**
Preston today is not what it was during its heyday in the mid-19th century. Demolitions have eroded much of the streetscape in the oldest part of town – the lands flanking the river – and the predominance of traffic in the core diminishes what was once a vibrant urban setting. The former cluster of spa hotels and industries at the river crossing has been greatly reduced. The strengths of the current setting lie in its intact residential areas flanking the downtown, and in the surviving portions of the commercial streetscape in the downtown core. Riverbank parks are also a prime asset.

Opportunities abound for economic development based on community revitalization and cultural tourism. Preston’s history provides several
important themes that can guide new investment in infrastructure and marketing. These include:

- A tradition of skilled artisans working in a wide range of craft workshops;
- Strong affiliations with German culture, both from the Pennsylvania Mennonite traditions and from European sources;
- Former spa and health facilities (sulphur springs, grand hotels) that were internationally famous;
- Formerly rich pedestrian realm along King Street, with large shade trees set in a boulevard beside broad sidewalks;
- Grain mills in continuous operation since the community’s founding;
- “firsts”: first free schools in Ontario, famous long distance runner (Scotty Rankine), women’s hockey team (Rivulettes), marching band (Scout House Band), female mayor (Claudette Millar);
- Strong retail core;
- Former public transit system (electric street railway);
- Ongoing links to the rivers (industrial and recreational); and
- Former site of regional entertainment and recreation attractions (Leisure Lodge, Idylwild Park).

**Preston Towne Centre**

*History*

Preston is the oldest established village within the limits of the modern City of Cambridge and, by the mid-19th century, it was the pre-eminent community within Waterloo Township. It was founded by John Erb, a Pennsylvania German, who constructed a sawmill and gristmill alongside the Speed River in the first decade of the 19th century to serve a rural Mennonite farming community. Subsequently, the mills formed the nucleus of a new village that developed as a long, narrow settlement flanking the main road, reminiscent of the Lancashire village of Preston, after which it was named. Preston began as an industrial town but reached its economic peak as a spa, with several grand hotels catering to visitors seeking cures from the sulphur springs that were discovered there. It also had an unusually high number of skilled artisans. Although named after an English town, Preston’s population was predominantly German well into the late 19th century.
**Heritage Character**
The mill site that began by serving a rural Mennonite population, blossomed into an industrial and spa village, evolved into a “sleepy German town”, and later merged into the City of Cambridge has retained key components of each of its development stages, from the early mills to the spa hotels to residential and retail districts. One of its outstanding features is its broad main commercial street that still retains many of its fine 19th and early 20th century buildings. The ornate detailing found on several of the commercial buildings contrasts with the simpler treatment common elsewhere in the City’s commercial cores. The development pattern of commercial flanking the main road, off which is a town square, relates Preston to many other Ontario towns built in the mid-19th century.

**Character Defining Elements:**
- the town square, anchored by the former Preston Public School;
- retail concentrated along both sides of main highway, interspersed with residential and institutional buildings;
- at south end, remnants of “Pennsylvania German Village” with its distinctive Georgian style 2 1/2 storey commercial blocks and residences;
- early century retail/commercial main street;
- predominantly 2-3 storey retail buildings;
- no set backs, broad sidewalks;
- high quality architecture, brick construction, with skilled craftsmanship evident;
- some large Victorian “avenue” residences with mature trees; and
- mill and factory buildings anchor King Street at the south and north ends of retail strip.

**Cultural Assets:**
- library, post office, banks, firehall, churches, town square.

**Conservation and Development Concerns and Opportunities**
The very feature that distinguishes the downtown is also its most vulnerable point; namely, its frontage on a major highway. Traffic has had a profound impact on the buildings and streetscape, diminishing what was once a coherent grouping of harmonious buildings and an attractive pedestrian streetscape. Opportunities exist to reclaim the street from the dominance of vehicles by reviving the emphasis on public
transit (as with the original street railway system) and improving the pedestrian realm. Conservation and enhancement of the remaining heritage buildings to create a more visually coherent retail precinct will also be necessary, along with urban design guidelines to produce compatible infill, in order to fully revitalize this important district.

**Neighbourhood of Queenston Road**

*History*
As with the neighbourhood of Kitchener Road, the houses in this area reflect the economic strength of Preston in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, a strength based on a solid base of industry and agricultural services. Upper middle class residential areas were typically located next to the downtown core and this pattern is repeated here, in this case with the housing area conveniently placed between the river and the retail strip.

*Heritage Character*
This stable residential area has been relatively untouched by the traffic and resultant destruction of parts of the downtown core. Its mature streetscape and substantial houses set it apart from older areas in transition and from newer subdivisions.

*Character Defining Elements:*
- similar to Dickson Hill in Galt, middle and upper class residential development;
- large lots, mature streets, shared setbacks;
- late Victorian, early Edwardian, Queen Anne architectural styles, skilled craftsmanship;
- street oriented design, large porches, sidewalks;
- formal street grid;
- brick construction; and
- close proximity to King Street.

*Conservation and Development Concerns and Opportunities*
Stable residential areas are generally able to resist threats to their character by restricting traffic access and maintaining property standards. However, the proximity of this neighbourhood to the downtown core makes it vulnerable to any economic downturn of the retail core on the
one hand, and to potential overspill parking and traffic should the retail trade increase. Care must be taken to preserve the streetscape, especially street trees, and traffic management and parking policies must be developed and enforced. Urban design guidelines and advice on suitable home improvements are both needed in order to conserve and enhance area character.

**Neighbourhood of Blue Heron Ridge**

**History**
This subdivision was developed in the early-mid-20th century by one of Preston’s leading industrialists and philanthropists, Percy Hilborn. As an employer and citizen, he had a life-long interest in community development and environmental conservation. To that end, he developed the Grandview Drive neighbourhood (now Blue Heron Ridge) as a rural retreat, and also acquired several farms just east of the neighbourhood, across Highway #8, as an environmental reserve. Over the years he reforested these lands and, in 1967, donated them to the Province, to become the Dumfries Conservation Area. Within the neighbourhood, on the river side, is a significant complex of buildings, made up of Hilborn’s house (designed by an American architect) and, on lands developed by one of Hilborn’s sons, a house designed by Canadian architect Arthur Erickson.

**Heritage Character**
This rural suburb is an oasis located just off the main highway along the east bank of the Grand River, sandwiched between the Galt Country Club and the Dumfries Conservation Area. It has a decidedly non-urban character and an orientation towards the golf course and river below the bluff on which the houses sit. It developed in the 20th century and thus contains good examples of residential architecture from that period, including two architecturally significant houses.

**Character Defining Elements:**
- rural road cross-section;
- large houses set back from the road, on large lots;
- informal road pattern, gravel driveways; and
- woodland setting.
Cultural Assets:
- house designed by Arthur Erickson; and
- Hilborn House and grounds.

Conservation and Development Concerns and Opportunities
This area is vulnerable to intrusions from more development if the large lots are subdivided, and from public works that would install urban standard curbs and gutters and remove trees. Also of concern is the potential for construction of a bridge across the river near this area, although the proposal now appears to be in abeyance. To address these and other impacts of urban intensification, guidelines for conservation of existing character may be required.

Neighbourhood of Kitchener Road

History
This older residential neighbourhood has ties to the origins of Preston. It straddles what was the first road leading north to Freeport, Berlin (now Kitchener) and Waterloo, and west to Doon. Its houses are built on lands formerly associated with the founder of Preston, John Erb: the unique stone house at 127 Jacob Street was built in 1845 by his son, Jacob. Further along Kitchener Road is further evidence of this Germanic influence; an 1837 Pennsylvania Georgian house with an attached dwelling for grandparents. The hillside location also sets this neighbourhood apart from the otherwise level terrain common elsewhere in Preston. At the foot of the hill are remnants of the fine residential, industrial and commercial architecture that once characterized downtown Preston. Nearby the former spa hotel, a Greek Revival house, and the surviving grain mill all line streets that have now become major thoroughfares.

Heritage Character
The hill and curve of the riverbank distort the street grid to follow the topography and result in interesting views and an irregular placement of buildings. The emphasis here is on individual buildings along the main streets and on a residential streetscape on the hillside. Subsequent 20th century residential infill has diluted the area’s heritage character.
**Character Defining Elements:**
- located on hill northeast of river and town centre, east of the former spa hotel and on an historic highway;
- residential development centred around John Erb’s estate (founder of the town’s mill);
- eclectic mix of smaller and larger late 19\(^{th}\) and early 20\(^{th}\) century housing;
- informal lot divisions, some sidewalks, rural, small town character; and
- mature trees, large landscaped lots.

**Cultural Assets:**
- John Erb’s son’s house; and
- proximity to the former spa hotel.

**Conservation and Development Concerns and Opportunities**
The construction of Shantz Hill Road in 1938 removed through traffic from Kitchener Road but completion of Highway 401 in 1960 and subsequent rapid urbanization in the surrounding region have increased the effects of traffic on the adjacent streets. Kitchener Road can continue to be an attractive neighbourhood if the streetscape is preserved and infill development controlled. Conservation of individual remaining buildings and traffic management methods, including revival of public transit, will be needed to improve conditions along nearby Fountain, Kress Hill and King Streets.

**Galt**

**General Comments**
Galt retains much of its original heritage character despite being badly affected by the 1974 floods and by the sometimes insensitive infill development that was common in the years following World War II. What the floods and poor development spared were the residential neighbourhoods on the hillsides; what they claimed were most of the industrial buildings along the riverbank, and some key buildings along the main commercial streets. Galt has received much of the municipality’s attention in identifying and seeking protection for heritage
buildings and settings, in large part because of the substantial proportion of surviving properties worthy of conservation.

As in the other component communities in Cambridge, there is an opportunity here to celebrate the urban legacy of fine buildings and cultural landscapes. Some of the important themes from the history of Galt can be used to guide new efforts to save and improve these settings. They include:

- A strong link to British cultural traditions in architecture and craftsmanship, enlivened by substantial contributions from citizens with roots in German, Portuguese and Newfoundland cultures;
- A predominance of stone construction in all types of buildings;
- Excellent examples of public buildings and civic squares, on prominent sites, and defining the downtown skyline;
- A long-established market linking the city to the surrounding farmland;
- An industrial history in mills and foundries, examples of which continue today;
- Elegant bridges spanning the river;
- The continuing presence of the railway;
- Renewed links between the downtown and the river, in large part a response to serious floods; and
- A long tradition of citizen activism in conserving and enhancing the urban setting, from the paternalism of the early industrialists to the more recent efforts of local heritage organizations.

**Galt City Centre**

*History*

As is evident in the history of Cambridge described earlier in this report, the centre of the former town of Galt was, in many respects, the business and administrative hub of the surrounding area. For a variety of reasons, Galt dominated the cultural and economic scene for much of the 19th and 20th centuries. As a result, its downtown core was built to both accommodate and show off its important functions as an industrial, institutional, commercial and political centre. The skyline is dominated by church spires and civic buildings, the flanking hills have
neighbourhoods of substantial homes, and the river edges formerly held concentrations of factories and mills. Although the floods caused removal of much of the riverside industry, the core today contains some very significant streetscapes (such as those found in the downtown Heritage Conservation District) and compelling views to and from its centre. There is a surfeit of high quality architecture.

**Heritage Character**

As stated in the Cambridge (Galt) Heritage Conservation District Plan, “The Galt City Centre Heritage Conservation District is located in the heart of the former city of Galt and bounded by Main Street, Ainslie Street, Imperial Lane and Water Street. The district is distinguished by a block of commercial buildings that collectively form one of the outstanding historic streetscapes in Ontario. While the block exudes visual unity and strength there is a rich variety of architectural style and building age from the masculine stone Granite Block of 1862 to the flamboyant High Victorian Osborne Building of 1895. It is this subtle variation of detail and style within the discipline of the streetscape as a whole that makes the district worthy of long-term conservation and enhancement.”

**Character Defining Elements:**

- skyline dominated by public buildings;
- fine examples of stone and brick masonry construction;
- a variety of architectural styles, in high quality designs;
- scenic views along key streets (e.g. Main) and from the river bridges; and
- key public buildings at the centre, especially the Market and City Hall.

**Conservation and Development Concerns and Opportunities**

This area is under increasing development pressure yet contains underused floor space. While old buildings such as the former Royal Hotel languish, new infill is being developed on many downtown sites, including the lands adjacent to the Historic City Hall. As in many communities, there is not yet sufficient investor confidence in the viability of redeveloping older properties to provide the catalyst for revitalization of the downtown core. Certainly the existing stock of older buildings offers many opportunities for creative projects in adaptive re-
use, but the familiar issues of parking, access, perceived regulatory barriers and uncertain market conditions have so far inhibited efforts to make significant progress in conservation and enhancement of the downtown core. However, the assets found in this area are too important to be let go by either neglect or inertia; more effort must be made to overcome these constraints and spur compatible development.

Dickson Hill

History
The history of this part of the former town of Galt is tied to one of its founders: William Dickson. As described in the Dickson Hill Heritage Conservation District Plan (draft 1999: 2), Dickson set up his office and home on the west river bank in the early 1830s and, by the middle of that decade, had built a hotel on what was to become the major public square in the new community (Queen’s Square). Soon the river flats were developed for commerce and industry. Not until the 1880s did development begin on the bluffs above, but in 1882, the Dickson estate released a large land holding for development and, under the inspired guidance of Florence Dickson, created an extensive residential neighbourhood for the expanding middle and upper classes. Along with its generous public parks, the area’s high quality architecture and streetscapes make it a distinctive part of the city.

Heritage Character
Dickson Hill is one of the most distinctive communities in the City of Cambridge. It is named after the Honourable William Dickson, a prominent Galt settler who arrived to the area in 1816. Dickson is credited with founding the Village of Galt thanks to his considerable land holdings and commercial development on the west bank of the Grand River, including the prominent Queen’s Square.

His son, William Dickson Jr., acquired most of the lands that currently make up the residential area of Dickson Hill, located on the hilltop overlooking the river. His own residence, located at 16 Byng Avenue was constructed in 1832. Residential development of the area occurred over several decades and was undertaken by a series of developers. Most important of these was Florence Dickson, niece to William Dickson Jr., and his heir, who controlled the development of this area until the 1890s.
Overall, Dickson Hill features a very high concentration of significant buildings of various types including residential, institutional, commercial and manufacturing.

**Character Defining Elements**
As noted in the draft District Plan, these elements include:

- evidence of the early settlement period (1830s);
- elegant streetscapes, spacious and tree-lined, with distinctive globe streetlights;
- a variety of residential architectural styles, from late 19th century Italianate and Queen Anne to Craftsman and various revival styles typical of the early 20th century;
- large and well designed public landscapes, including parks, squares, fairgrounds and cemeteries;
- a system of rear lanes;
- rich urban composition of tree-lined streets, panoramic views, bluffs and river flats, urban green spaces and densely packed urban development; and
- good recent examples of adaptive re-use of older buildings.

**Cultural Assets:**
- Queen’s Square (including landscaping and memorials);
- University of Waterloo School of Architecture and gallery;
- churches;
- library and gallery; and
- public parks and cemeteries.

**Conservation and Development Concerns and Opportunities**
As noted in the draft District Plan, a key concern is pressure to develop high density residential buildings, primarily in the area around Queen’s Square. The height, bulk and concentration of buildings possible under the current planning policies could have a substantial and negative impact on this area’s heritage character. Within the mature residential neighbourhood on the hilltop, concerns are centred on the potential for insensitive alterations and infill, as well as traffic and poor stewardship by the municipality of the public streetscapes (Note: the public realm of streets and parks has been designated as a Heritage Conservation District). However, the obvious merits of the historic buildings,
streetscapes and landscapes in Dickson Hill give ample opportunities for compatible development, as is evidenced by recent conversions of industrial buildings and new infill adjacent to Queen’s Square.

**Neighbourhood of Oak Street**

**History**
As described in Dilse (1981: 99), this part of the eastern hill area of Galt is an established residential district with heavily treed streets and large homes. The earliest parts developed in the mid-19th century but the majority of houses are from the late 19th and early 20th centuries. They display a wide range of styles and are, for the most part, substantial homes built for the middle and upper classes.

**Heritage Character**
Large homes in a variety of later 19th and early 20th century architectural styles, on heavily treed streets, some with globe streetlights, characterize this area. As with Dickson Hill across the river, this area has been relatively unchanged since the time of its development.

**Character Defining Elements:**
- middle and upper class residential development located on a ridge east of the City Centre; mix of historic architectural styles – Victorian and Edwardian designs predominate;
- mature street tree canopy, with some globe street lighting;
- typical streetscape elements such as common setbacks, front lawns and porches; and
- unique laneway of cottage style houses among generally formal and regular lot patterns.

**Conservation and Development Concerns and Opportunities**
As in other mature residential neighbourhoods, the main concerns centre on traffic, insensitive alterations and infill, and poor stewardship of the public realm. The overall harmony of this area suggests opportunities for sensitive alterations and enhancement of streetscapes.
Riverbanks

General Comments
The public trails and parks that border the Grand and Speed Rivers were amongst the most valued places in the responses given to this study’s opinion survey. It seems evident that local residents find it necessary to foster strong links with the rivers that flow through Cambridge, both in everyday routines and in ways of understanding their community’s origins. Particularly in the accessible parts of the riverbanks, such as in Hespler and Preston, the riverside is a cultural landscape much altered by human activity, in some cases salvaged from former industrial or transportation uses. Nonetheless, contact with the water, physically and visually, remains an important element in local life. As a result, the cultural landscapes along the two main rivers are important heritage resources as well as popular public open spaces.

Grand River

History
Both the Grand and the Speed Rivers occupy former drainage channels for the glacial meltwaters that once flowed through this region. The Grand is one of the oldest rivers in Ontario and is designated as a Canadian Heritage River. It has associated glacial landforms in Cambridge that include aquifers, drumlins, eskers and moraines, as well as smaller features such as kames, kettle lakes and erratics. As noted in the Cambridge Natural History Tour (2005: 5), “these rivers were the lifeblood and reason for the original settlement (pre-and post-European) of the area.”

Heritage Character
The river as it flows through Cambridge has created a variety of landforms along its banks, from the broad flats at Preston to the higher bluffs in the northern corner of the municipality. Artificial banks predominate in Galt thanks to flood control levees. The heritage character of the river includes elements of its natural and cultural history, with an emphasis on the early phases of settlement, early industries, and more recent environmental conservation efforts.
Character Defining Elements

As summarized in the reasons for nomination as a Canadian Heritage River (GRCA 1994: 37), the river as it passes through Cambridge has the following distinctive elements:

- evidence of the groups that have settled and retained their culture since the mid-19th century through settlement patterns, buildings, arts and events;
- recognition of the stewardship role of First Nations peoples;
- significant concentrations of 19th century industrial buildings and structures;
- associations with famous people such as artist Homer Watson; and
- varied natural habitats, some of them Provincially significant.

In addition, there are:

- areas of archaeological potential;
- distinctive bridges, flood control levees, converted rail corridors; and
- former riverside industrial buildings adapted to new uses.

Conservation and Development Concerns and Opportunities

Stewardship of the river is managed by the Grand River Conservation Authority, whose overall conservation plan (the Grand Strategy) includes conservation and interpretation of cultural heritage resources. The majority of riverbanks are not eligible for urban development but concerns arise when urbanization of adjacent bluffs affects views to and from the river, as well as public access. Significant progress has been made recently in creating an extensive public trail network along the rivers, most recently including links over Highway 401. Judging from public responses in the opinion survey and interviews in this study, there are abundant opportunities to enhance appreciation of the rivers through interpretation of existing built, landscape and archaeological heritage resources. Improved stewardship of existing public spaces would also be required.
**Speed River**

**History**
Also created as a result of glaciation, this river was the first to be harnessed for industrial use and continued to be important for that purpose through most of the 19th century. Both Hespeler and Preston were founded on the Speed, and the river later gained additional prominence as a recreational venue through outdoor attractions such as Riverside Park, Idylwild and Leisure Lodge.

**Heritage Character**
This much smaller river has been heavily altered by human intervention and thus is defined by industrial development within Hespeler and Preston, but is otherwise a continuous public open space contained within parks or conservation areas. Dams in both settlements, and the Hespeler mill pond, are distinctive alterations of the river itself, while continuing uses, such as the mill in Preston and the factories in Hespeler, are key heritage resources with direct historical ties to the river.

**Character Defining Elements:**
- dams and mill ponds;
- public parks and natural areas;
- industrial buildings; and
- areas of archaeological potential.

**Conservation and Development Concerns and Opportunities**
The Speed is redolent with human history, thus it has great potential for interpretation. Concerns over the number of redundant or underused industrial buildings can turn into realization of opportunities for adaptive re-use of such structures. More so than with the Grand, there are great opportunities here for local residents to re-connect with their industrial history. Riverside recreational history should also be recognized, with interpretation and, potentially, archaeological investigation of the former sites of Idylwild Park and Leisure Lodge.
Roadscapes

General Comments
Although driving for pleasure has been one of the most popular leisure activities for North Americans for many years, the idea of conserving scenic drives is relatively new. Roads tend to be viewed as utilitarian transportation corridors, not a visual amenities or heritage resources. However, some roads follow historic trails, others pass through areas in which there are many types of heritage resources. In both cases, roads have excellent potential to be enhanced as interpretive venues, augmenting their role as visual amenities.

Most roads considered for their heritage value run through countryside, and thus are vulnerable to the negative effects of urbanization. Widenings require trees to be cut, straightenings remove visual interest and, in some cases, roadside buildings and landscapes. Adjacent development changes countryside into suburb. And the sheer volume of traffic the roads must carry makes driving a chore rather than a pleasure. But creative enhancement of roadscapes can provide communities with a valuable public resource and tourist attraction, in much the same way that scenic drives such as the Seaway Trail or the Niagara Parkway contribute to the communities along their routes.

The roadscapes identified below are within the more rural areas of Cambridge. All have considerable heritage value in their current state, but each is vulnerable to adjacent development. The three roadscapes have the best potential for conservation; others, such as Maple Grove Road and Townline Road in Hespeler are compromised by suburban industrial or residential development. Another candidate for consideration is Limerick Road in Preston; it has a few heritage resources and significant scenic value, but its future remains uncertain due to plans for significant residential development on adjacent lands.

Blair Road
[note: only the north portion, including Langdon Hall, is within the City; the most attractive parts are within the Township of North Dumfries, thus must be protected via Township or Regional cultural landscape policies]
**History**

According to the Blair Village Heritage Conservation District Plan (1999: 54), “Blair Road is one of the earliest roads in Blair, established as a wagon track leading southeast from the ford to the Bechtel farmstead. It was recorded as an existing traveled road by surveyors in a report of 1816 when they traversed the northern boundary of North Dumfries, and circa 1840 it was extended through the Bechtel farm towards Galt.”

**Heritage Character**

Thanks to its links to Highway 401 via Fountain Street (itself a major collector road), Blair Road now carries a significant amount of traffic. However, the scenic values of the route, and its original alignment, are essentially unchanged. In the portion that runs through the City of Cambridge, Blair Road provides a sequence of views north to south, beginning with the tight urban scale of the village core, then broadening into the residential fringe of the village and the Bechtel Creek mill pond, and then quickly moving into a heavily wooded slope on the inland side, around Langdon Hall (hidden from view during summer), and gradually opening into views of the river flats to the east. The character is that of a rural road through a village.

**Character Defining Elements**

Using comments from the Heritage Conservation District Plan (1999: 54), the character defining elements are:

- curving alignment and narrow road width (through the village);
- roadside trees and plantings;
- deep setbacks;
- forested hillside; and
- views of the river flats.

**Conservation and Development Concerns and Opportunities**

Traffic management is a key issue, especially as it affects demands for road widenings and re-alignment. As recommended in the Conservation District Plan (1999: 54), the existing width and alignment should be maintained, roadside plantings carefully managed, and compatible signage and lighting installed. In other words, the road’s current character should be preserved and its amenity managed.
Riverbank Drive

History
According to accounts in Bloomfield (1995: 6, 74, 204), this route would have linked the river crossing at Freeport with Breslau, along the east bank of the Grand River. The Freeport bridge was built in the early 1830s and by 1831, a map of the area shows a route following the alignment of the current road (op. cit :74). This map also shows a ford at the river bend connecting to a road leading up the slope to intersect with what is now Middle Block Road. North of this, where the road runs close to the riverbank, the site of a sawmill is shown. Although they are not listed in the City inventory, there are several houses on this road that date from at least the mid-19th century, and this includes several fine farmsteads. Improvements to Highway 17 (Fountain Street) have resulted in Riverbank Drive being made into a dead end at the northern edge of the municipal boundary such that it no longer continues on its way to Breslau.

Heritage Character
This road has most of the components associated with an historic rural route: an undulating profile and rural cross section, mature trees on each side, established farmsteads on large farm properties, and smaller houses along the riverbank. Views of the river punctuate scenes of farm fields and woodlots or more intimate views of the roadside lined with dense vegetation. Aside from a few more modern houses, the road offers an excellent summary of rural visual and historic characteristics. It is one of the earlier roads in Waterloo Township and one of the few rural roads remaining within the City of Cambridge.

Character Defining Elements:
- rural cross section, curving alignment and undulating profile;
- historic residential and agricultural buildings;
- farmsteads and woodlots; and
- archaeological potential (First Nations, ford and sawmill sites).
**Conservation and Development Concerns and Opportunities**
The removal of through traffic makes conservation of this road easier, but the area of the city in which it is situated is under development pressure for expansion of adjacent industrial uses. If conserved, the road could be an excellent heritage resource that offers unique interpretive opportunities as well as a high quality agricultural setting.

**Blackbridge Road**

**History**
As noted in supporting documentation for the North Hespeler Community Plan (2006), this route traverses the north edge of Hespeler and is currently a minor rural route through farmland and wetlands. The road followed the line dividing two major land subdivisions, Wilson’s Upper and Lower Blocks, and is shown as a point of reference on maps as early as 1805. The principal buildings along this road are within the Panabaker farmstead at 655 Blackbridge Road, dating from the early 1860s and designated under the *Ontario Heritage Act*.

**Heritage Character**
The road runs through countryside, traversing two streams and their heavily wooded banks. The road, railway bridge, road bridge, and historic farmstead are all heritage resources listed in the City’s inventory; the farmstead and bridge are designated. The road bridge dates from 1916 and is notable for its steel construction, the only one of its kind in Cambridge. The heritage character is thus a sum of cultural landscapes (farms and early road), structures (bridges), and a farmstead.

**Character Defining Elements:**
- rural setting of fields, streams and woodland;
- rural road cross section and undulating vertical alignment;
- railway and road bridges; and
- Panabaker farmstead.

**Conservation and Development Concerns and Opportunities**
The North Hespeler Community Plan, a major residential subdivision planned for the lands abutting this route to the south, proposes substantial changes to Blackbridge Road, essentially altering it from a minor rural
route to a major urban collector by widening and straightening it to accommodate high volumes of traffic. The designated farmstead is to be incorporated into the new residential subdivision by retaining the farmhouse, at least. The future of the road bridge is to be determined through an environmental assessment but it is assumed that the bridge will not be altered to accommodate the increased traffic volumes and a new bridge will be built alongside it. As a result, the heritage character of this road will be significantly altered to the extent that the majority of heritage features will be lost. The opportunities remain in conserving and interpreting the farmhouse and any other farm buildings, and the road bridge. Should the proposed community plan not proceed, however, there are many more opportunities for conservation of all of the character defining elements, and enhancing this road as an interpreted scenic drive linked to the heritage resources of downtown Hespeler.

Avenue Road

History
The length of roadway running west of Townline Road to Chimney Hill Drive survives as an essentially intact example of an unimproved rural road. There is little historical information available on the development of this road, but it is evident from its layout that it is an early road built to wind around the rocky outcrops and swamps that typify this part of Cambridge. There is a single original farmhouse (Ferguson).

Heritage Character
The Shade’s Mills Conservation Area along the south side of the road contains several significant wetlands and natural habitats, and the roadside contains many mature trees that enclose the route, frame views along it, and screen adjacent suburban residential properties. The Ferguson stone cottage at 879 Avenue Road (not designated) is of cultural heritage interest. The heritage character derives from its “unimproved” design and the scenic character of its natural edges.

Character Defining Elements
- rural setting, with a variety of vegetation types, hilly topography;
- winding alignment; and
- closure created by the canopy of roadside trees.
Conservation and Development Concerns and Opportunities

This part of the City’s road network has been under increasing pressure from traffic using the route as an alternative east-west link, and as a commuter route between Franklin Boulevard and Townline Road, connecting to Highway 401. The road is not designed to handle higher speed commuter traffic and, in response, the municipality in 2003 commissioned a Class EA environmental assessment to assess options to upgrade the route to accommodate such traffic. Local residents expressed strong concerns over the impact such upgrades would have on the road’s scenic qualities and on the adjacent Conservation Area and residential subdivision. From the EA study documentation, it would appear that a compromise design may be possible that improves the traffic safety of the route with minimal impact on the road’s winding, tree-lined character but, so far, the City has not pursued upgrades. Given that this is one of the few surviving rural scenic routes within the City, it would be advisable to conserve its heritage character.

6.4 Individual Resources

General Comments

Opportunities abound for conserving and enhancing individual heritage properties; what is missing is a more complete inventory of such resources that would allow priorities to be set and action taken. However, the City’s current inventory lists plenty of properties that merit further conservation measures, in most cases this being designation under Part IV/Section 29 of the Ontario Heritage Act. Additional properties of potential heritage value can be added to the properties listed in the current inventory using the Dilse study, as updated from 1981 to reflect subsequent demolitions and alterations. Priorities can be established in areas of the city under the most intense development pressure. The resulting “endangered species list” could give the City the chance to focus listing and any subsequent designations in the areas of most need.

Generally speaking, conservation of individual resources, rather than of areas or districts, is recommended where the overall heritage character of the area is not evident, either because of demolitions or subsequent development. For example, a former farmhouse now surrounded by urban development, or a single factory building remaining from riverside
flood control remediation, are both isolated heritage resources meriting conservation, but now existing in a substantially changed context. Archaeological heritage resources are also conserved most often through designation of specific sites rather than larger areas. Individual designation can also be used in conjunction with other comprehensive revitalization policies, such as Community Improvement Plans or Special Districts.

Using Dilse (1981) as a starting point, as augmented by this study’s current understanding of development pressures, the following areas of the city have the best potential for identifying properties suitable for individual listing and/or designation:

- In Hespeler:
  - industrial buildings west of the rail bridge in the downtown, on both sides of the river;
- In Preston:
  - residential, commercial and industrial properties west of the King Street river crossing in the downtown, on both sides of the river, including the existing mill;
  - industrial buildings on Eagle Street east of King, on both sides of the street;
- In Galt:
  - houses identified in Dilse on York Place, on the east side of the downtown;
  - commercial buildings in the downtown core located outside of the Heritage Conservation District;
  - houses identified in Dilse within Galt’s Eastern Hill, outside of the Oak Street Neighbourhood character area discussed above; and
  - houses identified in Dilse in Craigie Lea (centred on Albert, Elliott and Birch Streets in the southern part of the Eastern Hill).
6.5 Personal Histories

*General Comments*
In many of the interviews for the Heritage Master Plan, it became evident that there were personal stories that gave unique insight into local history. Meanings and values for place are often made explicit in the diaries, letters, memoirs and interviews offered by local residents. In some cases, the only record of an event, or a place, is a memory recorded by someone who knew that subject well.

Gaps exist in the historical record for Cambridge and physical reminders of events and places are often gone too. The oral histories collected to date by the City’s heritage planner, and by local historians, are important ways to begin filling these gaps and providing information on former settings. They can also give information on the origins of current traditions, and reveal previous cultural practices that may have been forgotten. Anecdotal evidence is also an important means of identifying sites that may contain significant archaeological resources. Especially now that the regional museum is likely to be built, there is a pressing need for Cambridge to interpret its past, and oral histories are an essential part of this interpretation. Such accounts can be assembled by City staff but also by students and volunteer organizations, as community legacy projects.

From the research conducted for the Heritage Master Plan, it is possible to identify subjects that personal histories may by especially suited to interpret. These include:

- First Nations legends and accounts of pre- and post-contact aboriginal life in the Cambridge area;
- Family histories from the early settlers, especially the Mennonites, Germans and Scots;
- Personal histories of the founding individuals, such as Dickson, Erb, Hespeler, and Forbes;
- Accounts of everyday life during the key periods in the city’s history, such as the early days of settlement, the mid-late19th century, the war years and Depression, and post-WWII;
- Visitor’s impressions of the city, through time;
• Community histories of later immigrant groups, especially the Portuguese and Newfoundlanders;
• Accounts from those who made temporary but important contributions to Cambridge, such as the WWII female workers in the Hespeler mills, and the WREN trainees; and
• Personal histories of local heroes, such as those individuals or teams who excelled in sports.

In addition to these accounts, which should be audio or video taped and placed in the City archives, there is another use for personal accounts. As was discussed in the context of the inventory of heritage resources in Cambridge, there is a great opportunity to have local residents put into words their reasons for liking their city. As has been done in other communities (such as the “East-West” guidebook in Toronto), descriptions of the character of individual parts of a city can be written by local people who have a special knowledge of that part, and the accounts by these various authors can be assembled into a collection that can serve as a form of community memoir, focused on heritage resources. The memoir can also be used as a guidebook to assist in tourism development. Most important, getting a variety of local people to put into writing those aspects of Cambridge they most value is an excellent way of building support for efforts to conserve and enhance those things, and thus promote heritage conservation.
Part C:

OPTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
Strategies for Improvement

7.1 Introduction

Now that the current state of heritage resources in Cambridge has been reviewed, strategies are needed to address the issues raised. The consulting team, using comments from the steering committee and the public, prepared a series of strategies for action in each of the main areas of concern namely:

- Inventory and evaluation of heritage resources;
- Management of heritage resources; and
- Community and economic development potential of heritage.

In the discussion of each strategy, the report will identify the extent to which the response should be primarily technical or managerial/political, acknowledging that elements of each are involved.

The following text reviews these issues, discusses options, and suggests the best course of action for the municipality. The final part of this report provides detailed recommendations for action by the agency responsible for each component of heritage activity.

7.2 Enhancing the Inventory

7.2.1 SUMMARY OF CURRENT SITUATION

Introduction

The objective of the municipal inventory is to identify and evaluate the full range of cultural heritage resources in Cambridge so that these resources can be protected and enhanced. To be successful, however, the
inventory should be more than a dry list of details: it should also help tell the story of the subject property in ways that help local residents start (or continue) a narrative about their history in this place. Once underway, this narrative becomes the means by which local people elucidate the ways in which heritage resources influence their daily lives and, thus, warrant protection.

As discussed in Appendix A, the current inventory is basically sound but is not adequate to meet the needs of an increasingly complex, growing city in which choices must be made as to which areas of the municipality are targeted for significant changes to the existing setting, and which areas are intended for “heritage friendly” development. As recommended in Section B, Cambridge needs to be able to set priorities for conservation and for change; to do so, it needs a better system of identifying and evaluating its heritage resources. And the conclusion from much discussion with the client and steering committee is that the best way forward is to focus on groupings of heritage resources – the “character areas” described earlier – instead of doing one property at a time. It is with this new focus in mind that the following strategies have been proposed.

7.2.2 STRATEGIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

Options

The Ministry of Culture’s Ontario Heritage Tool Kit provides the basic outline of a municipal inventory (or “register”): how this is put in place varies.

There are several versions of a municipal inventory worth considering for use in Cambridge. At one end of the spectrum is the very comprehensive inventory prepared by the City of Brantford in which each property on the list is given an extensive description, including photographs (both historical and current). The inventory is based on thorough research that ties in both the material and associative heritage values of the property through an assessment of the property’s design attributes and its history of occupation. The inventory is placed on a highly searchable database that includes over 11,500 properties and is capable of being updated continuously. Mounted on the City’s corporate database platform, the
inventory is linked with other municipal databases such as the Financial Information System and the Geographical Information System. The result is an excellent research tool and a very accessible means of both identifying heritage properties and tracking changes to them.

Would this system work well in Cambridge? In an ideal world, yes, it would. The benefits are many, and the technological means are becoming widely available. However, there are several important constraints on that goal being realized. The first is cost. Brantford, it is understood, received a one time grant from the casino corporation to produce the inventory: in 2001 dollars, the cost of production was $330,000 over three years, an amount most heritage planning components of municipal bureaucracies could not normally hope to receive. The second constraint is operational. The ongoing maintenance and updating of the inventory has, we understand, been a significant problem, since the staff resources needed to do so are not adequate and are unlikely to be authorized by City Council. The third is structural. The inventory focuses on built heritage resources and, so far, has not been fully expanded to include cultural heritage landscapes or archaeological heritage resources. While this should not be a technical issue, it points to an ongoing problem with most municipal inventories in that they tend to emphasize individual buildings and ignore the wider context. Such an emphasis, while understandable, constrains efforts to conserve significant groupings of heritage resources and tends to leave municipalities in a situation where they “can’t see the forest for the trees”.

More modest options include the more common hybrid approach to inventory creation and maintenance, which is for the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee members, along with the heritage planner (if there is one) and volunteers, to do the research and write the text. The City of Kingston’s pioneering inventory was prepared in this way and the City continues to rely on this sort of joint effort to add to its listings. The most extreme version of the bottom-up process is perhaps the Cabbagetown district of Toronto in which local residents - on their own - prepared the inventory of properties as a means of pushing the City to initiate a heritage conservation district study. Such efforts require both a long time and a very dedicated, and persistent, core group of resident volunteers.
The advantages of more modest approaches are that they can be implemented within the ongoing financial and operational constraints placed on Ontario municipalities: they are “do-able”. The disadvantage is that they are prone to contain inconsistent and inadequate information. While much of the often arbitrary and sometimes quirky means of recording a property used by individuals can now be eliminated by following the template given in the Ontario Heritage Tool Kit, there is still the need to provide some kind of trained oversight to the each stage of the inventory process, from research through recording, evaluation and monitoring.

It is rare that municipal heritage planning staff have the time or resources to provide this kind of oversight. As a result, the inventory, though naturally a work in progress, is perpetually behind in its identification of prospective properties. In consequence, properties that are threatened with significant impact from proposed development may not have been assessed by the time of a development application and the municipality is then forced into a reactive mode that often, if not usually, results in the loss of the heritage resource.

Cambridge is a city rich in all types of heritage resources. It thus needs strategies that are capable of addressing the inventory backlog and providing a means for strengthening the City’s hand in dealing with change.

Technical Strategies
Improvements to the Template

The City should address the inadequacies of the current inventory template by moving to the version developed by the Ontario Ministry of Culture in the Ontario Heritage Tool Kit. Since passage of the revised *Ontario Heritage Act* in 2005 and the publication of the Tool Kit the following year, Ontario municipalities now have a common template from which to work. The template is a robust one, based as it is on best practices as adapted to the Ontario context, and refined through extensive consultation with conservation experts. By harmonizing its inventory and evaluation methodology with that of the Province, Cambridge will not
only gain a more efficient process but will also align with Provincial and federal requirements for the conservation of cultural heritage resources.

The new template has several practical advantages. It is easy to understand and easy to follow. As a result, it lends itself well to use by volunteers who may not have heritage conservation expertise. The same result applies to the template’s application within municipal bureaucracies, where few outside the planning department understand heritage resource conservation but must still be convinced of its value to the city’s future. Clear and consistent inventory and evaluation listings also make easier the planning and political decisions required in setting municipal priorities and processing development applications. With the new template, both property owners and development control staff have a common means of discussing proposed changes to existing settings.

The Tool Kit provides the necessary information for the inventory to proceed. In the “Heritage Property Evaluation” section, there is a full description of the steps needed to identify, research, record and evaluate properties. A sample survey form is also provided (p. 11). Both built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes are discussed, in support of the compilation of a municipal register of heritage properties that lists such resources (some of which may be eligible for subsequent designation, or be already designated). Archaeological resources should also be recorded, augmenting information provided in the Region’s archaeological master plan. The Tool Kit emphasizes that listing on a municipal register is a vital first step in securing protection for properties that have been identified as having heritage value (as required now by the Provincial Policy Statement).

The inventory template should be provided in an electronic format. Hard copy versions should be scanned into the City’s database so that the current inventory information is readily available on the municipal website. The inventory should also be linked to the City’s GIS mapping system so that links from the property address to a location map are made available (except for locations of registered archaeological sites, where security concerns normally preclude detailed mapping of resource sites).
Evaluation Processes

Evaluation should follow the same Heritage Tool Kit process and use or adapt the categories provided. As with the inventory templates, the evaluation templates in the Provincial Tool Kit are thorough and clear. They provide a logical means of determining the heritage significance of the resource, which then offers the City a way to meet the requirements in the *Ontario Heritage Act* for supplying “reasons for designation”. For areas larger than individual properties, such as the “character areas” suggested in this report, the City should consider augmenting the Tool Kit’s description of heritage attributes for potential heritage conservation districts by using the federal government’s process, developed by the Federal Heritage Building Review Office (FHBRO) for assessing all federal properties for potential heritage value. This process uses a format called a Heritage Character Statement; a distillation, usually in one sentence, of the heritage significance of the resource. Following this succinct statement is a list of Character Defining Elements that may be as long and detailed as necessary, but which describes the key components of the resource’s heritage character. In adapting the federal system, the City will use the criteria for determining local significance provided in the Tool Kit.

The advantage of the format provided in the Tool Kit is its simplicity as well as its ability to encompass a wide variety of heritage resource types. It is also easy to translate into heritage policy so that, for example, heritage character statements for whole districts, or even entire communities, can be placed within the municipal Official Plan, and there provide explicit descriptions of heritage significance, more so than do most current Official Plan heritage policies in Ontario municipalities. Such definition of heritage significance is especially valuable when the heritage resource is threatened by potential development and the resource’s conservation must be defended at Council or the Ontario Municipal Board.

Evaluation rating systems can either be numeric or alphabetic. The latter system is most often used, with the most common being “A” for resources eligible for designation because of their heritage significance, “B” for resources eligible for listing on the municipal register (and
eligible for further consideration for potential designation), and “C” for average resources (e.g. background buildings within a streetscape). A more precise rating system found in the Provincial Ontario Realty Corporation’s Cultural Resource Process has “E” for Excellent, “VG” for Very Good (both eligible for designation but with different levels of heritage significance), “G” for Good, or average, with potential for listing on the municipal register, and “F/P” for Fair/Poor, or having no heritage significance.

Managerial Strategies

Evaluation Criteria

Criteria for identifying potential heritage resources should be based on guidelines supplied by the Ministry of Culture. Inventory forms and report format guides included in the Tool Kit provide an excellent template for recording all of the essential information on a particular resource, using common terminology. The template is comprehensive enough to meet the standards of professional heritage practice yet is easily understood by non-professionals. The clear layout makes the templates able to be completed by volunteers who, with a small amount of orientation and training, could help staff update the inventory. Training can be supplied in workshops sponsored by the municipality or the Provincial Ministry of Culture or in programs provided by local heritage groups and community colleges.

Inventory Management

As for administration, the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC), with suggestions from municipal staff and the public, should be responsible for identifying properties for inclusion on the list. As in London, the MHAC might strike a sub-committee whose sole task was to manage the inventory. As in Victoria, the MHAC might, in turn, delegate some of its other responsibilities, such as grant administration, to an arms-length City organization, such as a civic foundation or trust. Whatever choice is made, MHAC must be able to provide the inventory by dedicating sufficient time and resources to this task.
Volunteers, or students hired on contract, are the necessary partners in compiling and managing the inventory. The City’s current use of architectural students hired on contract is an excellent move in this direction. Training volunteers and contract workers will be needed, but it can be both educational and fun. Via training exercises and subsequent use in practice, the municipality and volunteer heritage groups and students can develop a working relationship that can extend beyond inventory into evaluation. Evaluation can be a group effort, with the heritage planner facilitating discussion leading to consensus on the heritage value and heritage attributes of each property. The evaluation process should provide a rating system so that individual resources can be listed in order of relative significance (i.e. Excellent, Very Good, Good, Fair/Poor). The rating system then sets the stage for preparation of conservation strategies that determine the types of changes, or interventions in the historic fabric, that are possible, especially in response to a proposed development plan.

Once the above process has been adopted by the City, then updating it is a task suited to municipal staff, trained volunteers or heritage professionals. Ideally, the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee would establish an annual update and, working with the heritage planner, co-ordinate the augmentation of the current inventory and organize the subsequent evaluation process.

Stretching beyond the template provided by the Tool Kit are innovative methods of engaging the wider public in identifying heritage resources. Oral histories are a proven way of doing so, although their focus is on people in place rather than the place alone. However, by steering the discussion towards descriptions of place, and explanations of meanings and values associated with such places, those compiling oral histories can discover valuable information to add to the inventory. Descendants projects, with a genealogical emphasis, are another means of revealing aspects of local history worth preserving and celebrating.

This more inclusive approach to inventory coincides with current trends in planning “the creative city”. As advocated by followers of Richard Florida, author of the “Rise of the Creative Class”, “cultural mapping” is
an essential first step in revealing the types of community resources that will become catalysts for economic growth. Cultural mapping includes two streams: “resource” mapping, which identifies physical or tangible cultural resources, and; “identity” mapping, which find and record local stories that reveal meanings and values people have for a particular place. Although in practice the cultural mapping process includes a very broad range of cultural objects and activities, a key component of the process is the inventory and evaluation of cultural heritage resources. The Heritage Master Plan, by providing an inventory of both tangible and intangible heritage resources, offers the base information from which Cambridge can build a comprehensive cultural plan, should it wish to do so in future.

The many ways in which cultural heritage resource information can be recorded include a wide range of media. Photography and film are obvious ways of augmenting recorded conversation. Recently, the forms of description and interpretation of stories about place, and thus descriptions of heritage value, include the “murmur’ project in Toronto (an audio tour accessed via cell phones) and the “East-West” collection of essays in which individuals with deep knowledge of, and affection for, a particular district describe the physical and cultural attributes of different parts of Toronto.

Each of these should be considered for use in Cambridge because of their potential to make history engaging and, thus, to build public support for conservation efforts. As has been pointed out several times during interviews and discussions in the steering committee, stories bring history to life, making the physical setting associated with them personal, as in “my neighbourhood”. History revealed in this way provides an obvious bridge between the recommendations of the heritage master plan and the policy tools and political will needed to implement them.

In conclusion, the current inventory is adequate but should be augmented and improved. Managerial priorities for the inventory should be to concentrate on new listings, with updates to existing listings as a secondary objective. The consensus during this study has been to begin assessing areas of resource potential - character areas – rather than individual properties. However, it behoves the City to immediately
prepare an “endangered species list” of properties most under threat from anticipated development or neglect. These must receive urgent attention. As a corollary, the choice of character areas to assess should be guided by the degree of development pressure each of the character areas is under.

7.3 Enhancing Planning Tools

7.3.1 SUMMARY OF CURRENT SITUATION

Introduction
The objective of the Official Plan policies for heritage conservation is “to encourage the conservation of built heritage resources” (5.1.1). In the Plan, “built heritage resources” is an inclusive term that covers buildings, cultural landscapes and archaeological sites. The Official Plan also promotes conservation of “cultural heritage resources” which are defined in the Plan as the intangible resources that would include oral histories, for example, and movable heritage resources, such as artifacts. In these two definitions, the Plan covers the full range of cultural heritage resources as defined in this Heritage Master Plan exercise.

These planning objectives reflect current Provincial planning legislation. The Provincial land use planning system requires that attention be paid to heritage in all municipal planning decisions. The Provincial Policy Statement (revised 1 March, 2005), a statement of Provincial interest on matters of municipal planning, includes heritage as one of its components. The Statement (2.6) lays out specific policies requiring conservation of “significant” heritage resources (including buildings, cultural landscapes, and archaeological sites). It binds municipalities to make their planning decisions “consistent with” the Statement; a requirement confirmed in the revised Planning Act (1 March 2005). And the revised Ontario Heritage Act (also passed in 2005) adds to these requirements for municipalities to take heritage conservation seriously.

What is missing so far are good examples of municipal policies that put this requirement into effect. Although it has comprehensive Official Plan heritage policies, Cambridge has had some difficulty implementing them. However, in response to strengthened Provincial heritage policies, the
City is now in a good position to make substantial improvements in its heritage conservation activity. Beginning with policy tools available under current legislation, the following section proposed strategies for improving municipal activity in organizational structure, funding and community support, and implementation.

7.3.2 STRATEGIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

Options
Different cities impose different levels of control over conservation. Within the limits of Provincial and federal legislation, individual municipalities can be highly regulatory or leave most decisions to the market place. Choice of a strategy depends upon the political culture of the city, its growth rate, and the priorities placed by its citizens on retaining elements of the past. In cities that have made a commitment to heritage conservation, the range of policy tools begins with heritage planning policy and extends into innovative partnerships with other agencies.

The three examples reviewed in Section 6.1 illustrate this range of approaches in heritage master planning. Victoria combines strong Official Plan policies with creative partnerships with volunteer heritage groups (for promotion, grant administration and research) and uses financial incentives to further its objectives. Montreal uses a strong overarching vision of the role of heritage conservation in the culture of the city and in its community and economic development. Management is held within the city bureaucracy and the emphasis appears to be distinctly top-down. The reverse is true in Toronto Old Town, where market forces are tamed by channelling them in heritage-supportive ways, using initiatives by local residents, renovation contractors and property developers. The City steps back into the role of facilitator and catalyst, with heritage policies as the backdrop to locally generated heritage activity. A similar process has been established in St. John’s, Newfoundland, where strong local trends in renovation of older properties were beginning to collide with commercial demands for high quality downtown office space for oil companies. Once again, existing forces in the market place were recognized and adapted so that both trends were able to be mutually supportive.
Closer to the scale of Cambridge are some of the communities reviewed in the comparables chart in Appendix A. In most cases, small-to-medium sized cities have heritage planners and an established heritage advisory committee appointed by, and reporting to, Council. Cambridge has some of the best Official Plan heritage policies of the municipalities reviewed. In all cases, however, heritage needs to be more fully integrated within the municipal planning process and not seen as an afterthought or obstacle to local development. The following strategies provide suggestions for moving beyond these constraints.

**Technical Strategies**

*Introduction*

The effectiveness of the current Official Plan heritage policies can be improved if a better means of implementing them can be found. The technical strategies for doing so include some additional steps in the implementation process as well as some potential amendments to the Official Plan itself.

From comments made in the study process and from further reviews of the current Official Plan, it seems that there are some missing steps in the process of putting policies into effect. The Plan goals, objectives and policies are clear: what is not clear is the specific nature of the result intended. For example, the urban design policies in Section 4.4.1 e) and g) address heritage resources, and the latter sub-section makes reference to the “existing or intended character of the area, the community or the building use”. This is a good policy, but it will be difficult to implement unless the character of the subject area, community or resource is defined.

*Heritage Planning Process*

The heritage master plan provides the first step in making these definitions by providing heritage character statements for the “character areas”. The suggested next steps are:

**Step 1: Identifying Local Character**

- Identify priority character areas and begin an inventory of heritage resources within them;
- Use the heritage master plan heritage character statements for each character area as the starting point for community-based
discussions, via workshops, on-line surveys and public open houses;

- Use these public participation exercises to encourage residents to add information to the inventory of heritage resources within each character area, via oral histories; and
- Complete the inventory and evaluation of heritage resources in each character area using field and archival research, and refine the heritage character statements for each area accordingly.

**Step 2: Defining/Refining Planning Policies**

- Create policies that specifically implement heritage objectives, such as Secondary Plans (not mentioned in the current Official Plan), Community Improvement Plans, and Heritage Conservation Districts; and
- Place the revised heritage character statements for each character area within these Plans, as part of local area policies.

**Step 3: Define the Physical Character of Compatible Development**

- Produce urban design plans for each character area, based on the revised heritage character statements and planning policies for each area.

**Additions to Official Plan Policies**

Finally, there are some omissions in the current set of policies that may need to be filled. The Official Plan contains Special District policies (Chapter 17), which address exceptions to the Plan land use policies, but the Official Plan does not seem to have policies for the creation of Special Policy Areas or of Secondary/Neighbourhood Plans.

This omission leaves the City without some important planning tools. In each case, these tools are comprehensive plans used by other municipalities. Such plans typically address areas that are either under significant development pressure or exhibit significant constraints on development (such as brownfield sites). These plans examine areas of the city in detail and provide specific policy direction for them. Such policies may be required for Cambridge in order to produce the sorts of area-specific policies recommended in the foregoing discussion of character areas. Community Improvement Areas are addressed. Section 4.3.3 of the Official Plan states that the entire city is designated as a community improvement area and that the City, by by-law, may designate all or part of the municipality as a community improvement project area and
prepare a Community Improvement Plan. The criteria for initiating such a plan include conservation of built heritage resources (Section 4.3.2).

Each of these plans has specific characteristics and advantages.

Special Policy Areas offer a way to address the special character or concerns of a part of the municipality. This special character can include heritage and, it is hoped, heritage character can be defined and translated into development policy. Many of the built form, urban design and land use issues affecting heritage areas can be addressed in detail within a Special Policy Area. In common with the other forms of heritage designation, Special Policy Areas provide a step towards Part V district designation, if designation is the chosen objective. They might be especially useful in designating a linear area, such as a scenic drive, where the building groupings along the route are not the primary reason for designation, but where scenic values and agricultural land uses may be the most important heritage attributes.

Secondary Plans are a traditional method of providing comprehensive and detailed policies for a defined area. They are most often used to define new areas, but they can also apply to redevelopment areas. Since they cover transportation, servicing, environmental constraints, as well as land use, they can include heritage policies. Similarly, neighbourhood plans, which deal with smaller areas (often within a larger Secondary Plan area), offer opportunities to include heritage policies. A Secondary Plan could be a useful framework for redevelopment of underused or vacant areas (for example, in the downtown core), and incorporate a range of heritage policies affecting the existing heritage buildings and streetscapes. These policies can be innovative, as in the case of two downtown areas in Toronto (King-Parliament and King-Spadina) Here, massing and built form controls replaced traditional land use controls in order to both encourage a full range of redevelopment but also to ensure development that was compatible with the existing heritage streetscapes.

Community Improvement Area policies generally address rundown parts of the city and attempt to re-establish basic services and improve property standards. They can be an umbrella approach to comprehensive rehabilitation of an existing district. Such Area policies offer a combination of “carrot and stick”, encouraging infill and providing
improvements to public infrastructure while at the same time enforcing property standards and zoning controls. Where a potential heritage district is in need of significant improvement, then a Community Improvement Area may be the best way of combining heritage conservation with enhancement of existing communities. Other kinds of heritage resources should also be considered here, and community-based, private sector and volunteer initiatives encouraged as part of improvements undertaken by the municipality.

Although Heritage Conservation District designation under Part V of the Ontario Heritage Act is only one of the planning tools available to conserve and enhance heritage areas, it is the most formal and complete type of recognition currently possible under Provincial planning legislation and is thus a powerful change management tool.

Heritage Conservation District designation may be considered as the preferred policy direction for the character areas described above if there is sufficient community support. In each case, designation will bring with it development guidelines and the development control process required by the Heritage Act. Designation will also confirm and establish the distinct identity of each of these districts. Area-specific signage, street furnishings and plantings are one obvious means of confirming identity, but also important is the marketing image created by designation. Highlighting individual, historic communities will add variety to the rather uniform image that the City currently portrays. Such emphasis will also aid creation of heritage tourism product in the form of district-based tours and events. Most important, an explicit description of heritage character will both spur and guide new development that will revitalize these districts.

Areas Needing Specific Policies
Defining heritage character will be an important step in making progress on other key areas of Official Plan policy. One of the key areas in need of special attention is development on flood plains. Since many existing heritage resources are located in flood plains, there is an urgent need to assess current policies to ensure that the conservation and enhancement of such resources is encouraged. However, the current policies appear to significantly inhibit the type of rehabilitation of former industrial buildings, for example, that the heritage master plan promotes.
In flood plains under the current Official Plan policies, commercial (retail and office) and residential are not mentioned specifically as prohibited land uses and may appear to be permitted, providing flood control measures are built into the structure (6.2.3.1.1-10), yet section 6.2.3.2 prohibits development in flood plain except for public works and in zone 2 flood fringe areas. Section 6.2.3.2.3 allows minor alterations and expansions of existing buildings and thus seems to free up development in existing industrial buildings, and existing buildings will be zoned as existing non-conforming uses within the Zoning By-Law (6.2.3.5.2). As a result, it appears that conversion and minor alteration and/or expansion of existing buildings in flood plain is allowed, but not new construction.

What is needed are pro-active policies that state the types of rehabilitation and redevelopment that the City wants to see built; the current policies hint at such definitions but are too vague to act as a catalyst for private sector initiatives. The Grand River Conservation Authority (GRCA) must also be satisfied by any new policy, but the objective of conserving and re-using heritage buildings in flood plain will have to be achieved somehow. The City needs to meet with Provincial Ministry officials, GRCA management, and developers with properties in such areas to reach consensus on an overall strategy for heritage resource conservation in floodplains. This strategy would also support the City’s emerging response to the Provincial “Places to Grow” initiative.

The City could also implement recommendations already in the Official Plan. An important policy recommendation needing action involved trees. Section 6.4.1 recommends that the City produce Tree Management Policies and Guidelines and consider a tree-cutting by-law, to be implemented under the Municipal Act.

Tourism is another area of Official Plan policy that needs enhancement. While Section 8.2.8 encourages tourism, especially cultural tourism, the means for reaching this objective, such as product development and marketing, partnerships with other municipalities and agencies, and other initiatives, are not mentioned.
Management Strategies

Introduction

Making the heritage plan a reality will be a challenge in a city management structure that, like many others in Ontario, is short on staff. On the positive side, the City has a heritage planner, an effective Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee, and active volunteer heritage groups. These, allied with strong Official Plan policies, provide a robust framework for making decisions and getting projects done. The problem so far has been an overload of work, on the one hand and, on the other hand, a disconnect between the various persons and groups for whom heritage is a priority. The result has been both a lack of political support for some heritage initiatives and a high level of frustration amongst those who are trying to promote heritage conservation.

The following management strategies are suggested means of overcoming some of these problems. They do not simply recommend adding more staff and budget to the current municipal organizational structure, although both would be welcome; rather, they suggest ways of using existing resources and activities in a more co-ordinated and pro-active fashion. Any increased investment in heritage activity of the sort that would make full use of the city’s many heritage resources will only come if, and when, the current participants work more effectively together.

Roles for Different Public and Private Organizations

The City can best support heritage activity by acting as a catalyst for public education and engagement. The heritage planner’s existing role as the primary producer of the heritage resource inventory is vital; what is needed in addition is a role as initiator of public processes of information gathering and sharing. Closer co-operation with other sections of the Planning Department is also necessary, especially those planners who are dealing with downtown revitalization, environment, recreation, and development control. With other heritage groups and agencies, the planner can co-facilitate public workshops in which residents of a character area can define in greater detail the heritage resources they wish to conserve and enhance. The heritage planner can continue to provide historical research for the inventory, in association with the City Archivist and local volunteer heritage groups.
Aside from specific tasks the City’s heritage planner does, the City government as a whole can also be a leader by adopting a “heritage first” policy in all of its public works, so that ongoing infrastructure and upgrading projects make good use of public heritage resources. Here the strategies include proactive policies such as rehabilitation and reuse by the municipality of its own heritage properties, investments in community improvement projects (such as Community Improvement Plans) that revitalize older urban areas and highlight their history, as well as tourism development projects that use heritage themes and storylines. Once local residents see tangible evidence of benefits stemming from heritage-related work, then political support for funding and programming will be easier to obtain. Local area improvements, along with a few City-wide projects, offer residents a full range of examples of initiatives that show results and obviously improve quality of life in the city.

Both the members of the downtown Business Improvement Associations (BIAs) and members of the Core Areas Revitalization Advisory Committee (CARAC) have a key role in assisting the City to revitalize downtown character areas. They can provide information and encouragement to property owners through sponsoring workshops on conservation and enhancement guidelines for older properties, can identify properties or public lands that could serve as pilot projects for the Heritage Master Plan recommendations, and can help secure funding and partnerships in order to implement such projects. These committees can also serve as the liaison between the City and the development community, building support for conservation and facilitating discussions on the future development of Cambridge’s downtowns.

The City can also actively promote heritage conservation by providing information (see also the discussion of heritage inquiries, below). In the absence of its own communications strategies and staff, the City should work with the Regional Municipality of Waterloo’s new Communications Team to provide information on a wide range of planning initiatives, including the Heritage Master Plan.

The Regional Municipality of Waterloo can assist the City in these initiatives by providing and enforcing over-arching heritage policies, and by supporting heritage activity. The Regional policy initiatives related to
heritage should be implemented in partnership with area municipalities, especially the Arts, Culture and Heritage Master Plan, the Archaeological Master Plan, and the Cultural Landscapes Strategy. Emerging Regional initiatives responding to growth pressures and Provincial growth management policies are another way for the City of Cambridge to address heritage issues in a broader planning context. Two new groups within the Region’s Community Planning Division – Greenfield and Reurbanization – have particular relevance to the issues addressed in the Heritage Master Plan and should have active participation from representatives of the City of Cambridge.

The Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC) can, in addition to its advisory role to Council, focus on adding to the heritage resource inventory. With City staff, and using guidelines found in the Ontario Heritage Tool Kit, the Committee can establish training programs for volunteers and students who will do the bulk of the work, monitor their progress, and review the results. Also in consultation with City staff, MHAC can help establish priorities for character areas and prepare and “endangered species list” of individual heritage resources under threat and requiring urgent attention.

The Heritage Master Plan steering committee can continue the momentum generated by the Master Plan by staying on as an implementation committee for the Master Plan’s recommendations. Committee members are perfectly placed to explain and promote the Plan to other agencies and to the public; they are also representative of the community at large and can provide good advice to Council on heritage planning. Finally, they are in a position to provide strategic oversight for the long term, in much the same way that a management board or board of governors would do, and thus assist in monitoring and modifying the Plan over time.

The private sector can also contribute, first by accepting conservation of heritage resources as a new reality under the current planning and heritage policies required by Provincial and federal regulations, something most developers in larger cities have already done. Conserving heritage resources should be considered as part of the normal development process in Cambridge. The private sector can also work to regulate the renovation industry through training, co-ordination of effort
and support for certification of qualified contractors. Finally, it can make its needs known and work with the City, local citizens and other agencies to meet those needs.

Students and faculty at local colleges and universities can play a role in fostering a culture of conservation. As seasonal employees, students can work for the City by inventorying character areas. As part of their course work, students can research best practices in heritage conservation, conduct historical research on selected parts of the city, and prepare designs for the rehabilitation of older properties. Of particular use in implementing the Heritage Master Plan recommendations would be history students in local high schools and in the University of Waterloo and Wilfred Laurier University undergraduate and graduate programs. The City could also offer internships or co-op placements to students in history, architecture and planning programs, to further the inventory and evaluation process.

Local citizens can participate in workshops on their character area and provide ideas, oral histories and archival documentation. They can continue to sponsor studies, help complete heritage resource inventories and spread information about the benefits of heritage conservation. As individuals and as groups, they can help build support for heritage activity and make this support evident to their elected representatives.

There is still a role for advocacy within this suggested framework. It has been a recurrent theme in comments received during the course of this study that support for heritage activity must come from the general public: it cannot be seen to be the sole purview of a small advocacy group. Heritage Cambridge has not always been cast in this role, but has come to be the primary advocate for heritage matters largely by default, since no other non-governmental group has taken on this task, and both City staff and MHAC are constrained by their advisory role to Council.

The Heritage Master Plan is suggesting that Heritage Cambridge return to its roots in education and communication in order to help local residents realize the benefits of valuing local history and of conserving and enhancing heritage resources. In essence, this is a form of advocacy, but one undertaken in partnership with the residents of the areas of the city in which heritage resources are concentrated. From sponsoring
community workshops to updating their excellent walking and driving
tours of the city, Heritage Cambridge can provide a range of vital
initiatives that promote heritage conservation and tie in with the overall
municipal objectives of community and economic development. In this
way, the group can build a supportive constituency with which to
encourage City Council to promote and implement heritage policies and
projects.

City Regulatory and Planning Mechanisms
The next step is to improve the effectiveness of municipal staff in support
of heritage activity. First, the heritage planner needs to be relieved of
many of her administrative tasks and be freed to provide research,
technical advice and heritage planning policy. Second, heritage planning
must be accepted as a vital part of municipal operation, as an area of
expertise that requires specific professional training and as an integral
part of the ongoing policymaking and development control functions of
the Planning Department. Third, the City as a whole can start improving
efficiencies and removing barriers in the current regulatory process as
ways of fostering a ‘culture of conservation” across the municipality.

The last point entails a number of initiatives that municipalities use to
promote “heritage friendly development”. These can take the form of
incentives to prospective developers, not necessarily in the form of
bonuses or even outright financial assistance by the municipality, but still
in the form of “goods” that will help spur investment in compatible
development projects. In a moderately sized but rapidly growing
municipality such as Cambridge, some of the most effective incentives
have been shown to be:

- Reduced permit fees for minor repairs or maintenance;
- Exemption from development charges of revitalization of all or
  portions of a building’s floor space;
- Exemption from parking and parkland requirements or cash-in-
ilieu levies (or rebates for same);
- Property tax exemptions (or “tax holidays”) for heritage
  properties;
- Priority processing for development applications on heritage
  properties or in heritage districts;
• City provision of pre-inspections (for Code compliance) as well as issuing building permits for stages of redevelopment, to minimize delay and reduce unforeseen costs; and
• Dedicated City staff advisory assistance for heritage buildings and areas, especially information packages and technical advice, and in working with the business community to provide volunteer building technical assistance to property owners and to promote heritage properties and areas.

Managing Heritage Inquiries
Another issue in the current organization is dealing with inquiries on matters relating to heritage. Since these questions can cover a very large range of topics, and since there has been no single agency within the municipality mandated to handle heritage inquiries, there has been duplication on the one hand and missed opportunities on the other. Following a review of current activity, it may be useful to establish a process by which questions from the public can be channelled to the appropriate municipal department, agency or committee.

The process is premised on development of links on the City’s website, and procedures at the City’s main information desk, that route heritage questions in one of three directions: to Planning Services, to Community Services, or to the Library. The reason for this is that questions involving heritage policy and process are handled by planning staff, especially the heritage planner, while the questions about heritage programs, events, and cultural tourism development and marketing are best handled by Community Services staff, especially the community services planner. All of the larger category of questions on local history, local museum and library collections, genealogy and should flow to the Library and Archives. If the on-line information is still not enough, staff at the Library and Archives can provide further help.

Volunteer committees, groups and individuals may also be called upon to answer specific questions or to advise on process. The Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee guides the listing and designation of heritage properties and, as steward of the City’s inventory, is the logical destination for calls involving proposals for listing or requests for property histories. Heritage Cambridge can answer questions from volunteer arts organizations and can advise on intangible heritage
resources (e.g. locally-significant music, dance, arts). The City Archives is responsible for property records, including those of heritage buildings and landscapes. And the City Archivist is available to answer questions about local history stemming from his collections of articles on that topic.

Managing Designations
Designation under the 2005 *Ontario Heritage Act* is a more straightforward process for municipalities. The criteria for heritage significance (and, thus, the reasons for designation) are clearly explained in the Regulation and in the Ontario Heritage Tool Kit. There are also greater municipal powers of designation and the ability of the Minister of Culture to step in and designate a property deemed to be of Provincial significance. Municipal Councils have the ability to designate with the assurance that the appeals process no longer goes to the Ontario Municipal Board but, rather, to the Conservation Review Board, whose ruling is advisory: the decision ultimately rests with the municipal Council. In effect, this now means that municipalities can designate private property with, or without, the owner’s consent.

But will they? There is nothing in the legislation that gives advice on how to deal with so-called “hostile” designations. However, if the municipality avoids controversy in every case and only proceeds with designations where full consent exists, how many heritage resources will be lost? The problem is especially evident in the case of district designation, where unanimous consent is almost impossible to achieve. Here the *Act* does state that municipalities should seek broad support for designation from area residents, but Council need not have a majority in favour. So, if full consent is not needed in order to designate an area, should not the same apply to an individual property? With the new legislation now in place, there is increasing evidence to show that municipalities are making decisions on designation that favour collective values over those of individuals\(^9\). They accept that designation will entail

\(^9\) Recent rulings by the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB) support this assumption, asserting the right of municipalities to “interfere with private property rights”. For examples of the Board’s rulings on property rights, levels of public support for designation, and minor variance applications, see Toronto College Street Centre Ltd. v. Toronto (City), 1986 OMB Decision #0193; and Erik Kurtz et. al. v. Ottawa (City), July 24, 2002 OMB Decision #1044, respectively. Section 68.3 (1) of the *Ontario Heritage Act* also
controversy and recognize that the value of the property to the community can trump the objections of the property owner. The appeals process offers the owner rights to argue his or her case, and the municipality may consider forms of compensation in extraordinary cases. But, in general, the strategy with the new Act should be to designate properties because of their heritage significance to the whole community, whether the owner agrees or not. Only by doing so will the municipality ensure that the heritage policies in the Official Plan will be fully implemented.

Managing Heritage Impact Assessments
An issue in the current heritage planning process is the way in which Heritage Impact Assessments (HIAs) are used. Questions are raised as to when an HIA is required, and how effective it is in conserving heritage resources.

As discussed in Appendix A, the requirement for HIAs for properties on the City inventory of heritage resources, and on adjacent sites, is too much for staff and MHAC to handle. The preferred strategy is to follow practices in other municipalities and delegate to staff much of the review of development applications affecting heritage resources and allow staff to use their judgement as to when, or if, an HIA is required. In the City of Toronto, for example, the only instances in which an HIA would automatically be required are applications for site plan approval. Heritage staff have delegated authority to approve site plan applications without going to the MHAC. MHAC’s review role would also be reduced to assessing only those site plan applications and their HIAs that are major in nature, or those that staff feel will be detrimental to a heritage resource. Building permit applications would not require one but heritage staff have the authority to request additional information providing details of proposed work on heritage resources. This combination of delegation and focused committee review responsibilities should reduce workload for volunteers and, for staff if the heritage planner is freed of everyday administrative tasks.

stipulates that owners are not entitled to compensation for any designation or other municipal decision under the Act.
Funding Mechanisms

Many of the improvement strategies recommended here depend upon additional funding. Finding such funds within already stretched municipal budgets will always be a challenge. This Plan argues that funding heritage is necessary in order to reap the considerable benefits available from increased private sector investment, more tourism revenue, higher property values and improved quality of life for local residents. However, the search for funds must be undertaken within the context of ongoing fiscal restraint.

Some of the financial strategies the City should consider in order to make necessary funds available include:

- Building community/political support for heritage so that Council can make heritage a funding priority in future municipal budgets;
- Generating revenue from new municipal services, such as fee-for-service research (e.g. genealogy);
- Supporting marketing, maintenance, interpretation of heritage resources so that they are able to help generate economic benefits (i.e. product development);
- Co-ordinating efforts by the City and the Provincial Ministry in promoting cultural tourism and demonstrating economic benefits to Council;
- Looking more closely at other sources, such as corporate donors, individual donors and local charities and service organizations;
- Directing a larger portion of the City’s overall budget to promotion of heritage attractions (i.e. marketing); and
- Beyond public sector actions, fostering heritage-friendly development such that the private sector is able to accomplish many of the City’s heritage conservation objectives (via incentives, information, and demonstration projects, as discussed above).

Other funding sources

Alternatives exist to direct funding by the municipality of heritage management and heritage activity. As noted in precedents listed in Victoria’s draft Heritage Strategic Plan, some cities, such as Vancouver, B.C., have established non-profit foundations that operate at arm’s length from the City while supporting the City’s heritage goals and objectives.
Vancouver Heritage Foundation uses its charitable status to fundraise and attract donations to support and endowment for heritage projects. Major fundraising events organized by the Foundation attract a variety of donors from many organizations, not the least of which are large corporations such as Benjamin Moore Paints, who see a good marketing opportunity in heritage-related activity. Much of the actual event organization is provided by volunteers, thus freeing most of the revenue for addition to the endowment. Similarly, private foundations have supported heritage work, as in the example of the Samuel and Siyde Bronfman Family Foundation’s support of Vancouver’s Strathcona Porch Program.

Other municipalities channel available funds in innovative ways. Canadian cities such as Kingston and St. John’s and American cities such as Pittsburgh have foundations that, at one time or another, have established revolving funds for the acquisition, renovation and sale of heritage property, or for loans to private landowners for conservation work on their property.

In all cases, however, the basic fact remains that the municipality must commit long-term funds to support heritage activity. There must be a regular component of the annual budget, and defined staff positions, for any sustained progress to be made in realizing the benefits from heritage conservation and heritage-related economic and community development. Funds for capital improvements may come from other sources, as discussed above, but operating monies must come out of the budget. As for community foundations, the current Waterloo Regional Heritage Foundation and the Cambridge and North Dumfries Community Foundation may provide a suitable basis for the funding roles suggested here.

7.4 Enhancing Community and Economy

7.4.1 SUMMARY OF CURRENT SITUATION

Introduction

It is the assertion of this Heritage Master Plan that heritage conservation is a boost to local economies and the communities that such economies
support. Themes and storylines developed in this study suggest that the future for Cambridge involves a renewed interest in its history through interpreting the past and using the physical and associative elements that still exist as the catalyst for economic and social growth.

But the question now arises as to how to create the desired effects of heritage conservation? In responding to this question, heritage conservation needs to be seen in a broader context. Stepping back for the moment from a review of the city’s heritage resources specifically, the municipality needs to identify its key assets before discussing ways of putting such assets to best use.

Put in general terms, the city’s principal capital assets include:

- Its setting in a river valley (i.e. natural heritage resources);
- Its history and setting (i.e. cultural heritage resources);
- Its community (i.e. people and their activities);
- Its economy (i.e. industrial, residential, commercial, institutional, tourism); and
- Its public infrastructure (i.e. facilities and services).

All of these assets are interlinked, but the linkages with heritage resources are often misunderstood or ignored. This is unfortunate, because it is “cultural capital” that is becoming the basis for economic activity in North American cities. As is evident in much recent literature on the emerging sources of economic strength in urban areas (e.g. Florida’s work on the “creative class”), culture is being recognized as a major influence on local quality of life and, thus, the attractiveness of an urban area to potential visitors and investors. At the same time, it is evident from previous urban regeneration efforts that support for such efforts must come from below – the residents themselves – if their elected representatives and City staff are to be able to implement regeneration plans. In other words, cultural benefits from regeneration come from the ongoing involvement of local residents in the planning and sustenance of community development plans.

Will Cambridge residents get involved? Comments made in the surveys and interviews in this study show an emerging consensus on community values, focused on the rivers and the existing downtowns. Regeneration efforts can benefit from these commonly held values by harnessing
community support in principle for such efforts into action on specific projects that will show quick and tangible results.

### 7.4.2 STRATEGIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

**Options**

Options range from economic development led initiatives, such as St. John’s, and situations where the development market is very hot, such as Old Town Toronto, to slow growth situations such as much of Niagara Falls. Cambridge falls somewhere in the middle of this spectrum, with significant development pressures building up while older portions of the municipalities are only attracting a fair amount of development interest. In order to address growth pressures, especially in light of the Provincial Places to Grow initiative, Cambridge must seek its own path in balancing conservation with new development. The following text outlines strategies for doing so.

**Technical Strategies**

An essential path to reaching the goal of heritage conservation is to foster heritage-friendly development. Several factors come into play once an area has been identified as having opportunities for heritage friendly development.

First, the significant contributions made by heritage-related industries to the local economy need to be recognized. Generally speaking, renovation is not widely recognized as an industry in Canada and renovators lack a co-ordinated marketing and business development strategy, thus inhibiting their efforts to win consumer confidence and gain a prominent profile. Bringing together the local heritage revival industry and helping it to become self-supporting would be an excellent role for the City to play. Training, with the ultimate goal of certification of contractors with skills in heritage building trades, is a vital missing component.

Second, and related to the first point, there is no easy way for local consumers to get reliable renovation work done at a reasonable price because the information is lacking on where to find competent tradespeople. Lack of regulation in the industry pits reputable contractors
against disreputable ones, and leaves consumers with little assurance of satisfaction. A central source of information that could also offer referrals is one step the City could take to improve this situation, in partnership with the national renovators’ organizations. A local architectural/urban design advisory committee, such as that established in St. John’s, NF, can both review renovation proposals and provide preferred counter-proposals (which have been shown to be both better designed and less expensive than the original proposal).

Third, it is not only the renovators who lack a coherent approach: local property owners and land developers need to have confidence in their abilities to make money out of heritage development projects. Older properties are not easily converted, and the financial and regulatory processes needed for success are complicated. Because of the relatively few successful projects in Cambridge involving heritage properties, the level of investor confidence in heritage development is lower than it could be. However, there is every reason to publicize the few notable successes in heritage renovation in Cambridge, as case studies of development using heritage properties. In addition, the City and business partners could offer information seminars for the local real estate investment and development community to improve their abilities in rehabilitating heritage properties.

Finally, the role of cultural or heritage tourism in sparking economic growth remains to be recognized in Cambridge. As is shown in the accompanying analysis of heritage tourism potential in the city and region (Section 7.5), Cambridge could benefit significantly from developing its cultural tourism product, as part of a larger regional initiative.

Managerial Strategies
Heritage conservation can be promoted as a form of urban development – and extension and enhancement of normal development activity. However, no matter what the urban context, factors needed to build and sustain investor confidence include:

- growth management policy (especially in response to Places to Grow);
- comprehensive planning policy; and
• development and design guidelines. These factors assure investors that their investment will be protected by consistent municipal policy and by the understanding that the areas in which they are investing will be likely to improve over time.

As applied to areas of the city that are rich in heritage resources, these general factors need to be bolstered by the City’s actions in fostering:

• an inclusive, consensus-building process of public consultation;
• a phased, targeted strategy for municipal investments in improvements to the public realm;
• conservation and enhancement of heritage resources, both for their cultural value and their potential to generate economic benefits; and
• maintenance and marketing of the community as an attractive and desirable place in which to live and invest, as well as to visit.

In these areas, it will be necessary to create an improved physical setting that has:

• conserved and rehabilitated heritage buildings, some converted to new uses;
• new buildings that complement the existing streetscape through construction of well-designed infill; and
• re-invented downtown cores as vibrant mixed use centres focussed on the existing natural and cultural heritage resources (i.e. rivers and streetscapes).

7.5 Enhancing Heritage Tourism

7.5.1 SUMMARY OF THE CURRENT SITUATION

The Big Picture
Canada’s tourism sector overall continues to perform well. However under the surface there are some serious issues. With a healthy economy, the domestic market continues to grow, but the US market continues a drastic decline and key overseas markets are sluggish while key emerging markets (i.e. China, Mexico) are offsetting the US declines. At the same time, record numbers of Americans are travelling to overseas destinations. Nobody fully understands the hurdles Canada is facing in
the US but most assume it is a mixture of a number of factors ranging from the passport issue, the rising Canadian dollar, increasing global competition, terrorism and perhaps a feeling that Canada is not unique enough.

These trends are similar for Ontario. Numbers of visitors from the US have continued to decline sharply over the past few years and January to June 2007 numbers show a 16.4% decline. Overseas visitation has seen mixed results with 3 of the 4 traditional markets showing declines (UK, Japan and France) so far in 2007, being offset by emerging markets such as Mexico, South Korea, India and China. Looking forward, travel from overseas is expected to do well while visitation from other provinces is expected to be sluggish. As in the rest of Canada, domestic tourism is the bread and butter of the industry and continues to grow in a healthy economy, representing over 60% of total tourism receipts in the province.

The Regional Perspective
While there are no statistics on tourism visitation to Cambridge available, statistics for the Kitchener Census Metropolitan Area (covering Cambridge, Kitchener and Waterloo) provide some useful insights into the regional tourism characteristics and trends. As with the provincial tourism sector, there has been a high degree of fluctuation in both same-day and overnight visitation to the region since the late 90’s. In comparison to other analogous municipalities (i.e. Hamilton) in Ontario, the Kitchener CMA compares reasonably well but lags behind London in total and overnight visitation. Comparisons would also suggest that the Kitchener CMA experiences a relatively short length of stay (2.4 nights in 2004).
The opportunity for tourism as an economic stimulus and distinct economic sector is commonly recognized by most municipalities today, so Cambridge is competing for tourism in an increasingly competitive marketplace. Recent efforts by the communities within the Region of Waterloo to create a regional Destination Marketing Organization (DMO) will help all partner communities including Cambridge to compete more effectively. A collaborative regional approach should enable more integrated and effective marketing and help to leverage greater marketing resources. Under a regional DMO structure, the role for local communities then becomes one of attracting a fair share of visitors once they are in the region. For Cambridge, attracting a fair share of the regional tourism visitation will require a concerted effort with product development, local/regional marketing tactics and servicing market needs and expectations. In order to do this, Cambridge will need to draw on all of its tourism assets and charm, and particularly those that are unique or authentic to Cambridge, including heritage tourism products/experiences. Heritage resources and assets can offer a unique competitive advantage for Cambridge.

What Role Can Heritage Tourism Play?
The recently released 2006 TAMS (Travel Activities & Motivations) research provides some interesting insights into the scale of interest in heritage tourism products for both American and Canadian travellers. A representative sample of US and Canadian travellers were interviewed on their travel characteristics and interests within the past 2 years (2004/05). One of the categories was visiting exhibits, architecture and historic sites in towns and cities they visited. This category included the following activities:

- Art galleries;
- Historical replicas;
- Museums;
- Archaeological sites;
- Strolling around cities to observe architecture;
- Well known historic sites and buildings;
- Other historic sites, monuments and buildings; and
- Well known natural wonders.
A total of 52% of all American travellers (95 million travellers) and 57% of Canadian travellers (11.8 million travellers) participated in this activity – one of the most common activities next to shopping and dining (which represented close to 80% of all US and Canadian travellers). To place it in context, interest in these heritage activities exceeded total interest in each of themes parks, spectator sports, performing arts and festivals and events. The largest proportion of these people was interested in strolling around a city to observe buildings and architecture (32% of US and 39% of Canadians). Visiting and observing well known historic sites and buildings ranked next (29% of travellers). Although they may not be the primary motivating factor in destination selection or holiday plans, heritage features, attractions and programs are playing a growing role in the destination experience. There is a large and growing market interested in these activities. It is also a proven fact that the Heritage Traveller is a high yield market segment, typically spending more than the average traveller.

The following chart illustrates the scale of interest in heritage activities in comparison to other common activity categories.

Consumers are increasingly seeking uniquely different experiences when they travel, and are beginning to express new requirements of the
destinations and travel providers they choose. Research conducted in 2002 by the Tourism Industry Association of America for National Geographic Traveller magazine characterized over one third of the American travelling public as Geotourists. These are travellers who are concerned with preserving a destination’s geographic character – the entire combination of natural and human attributes that make one place distinct from another. There are at least 55 million Americans who can be classified as Geotourists (30+%), and likely an equal proportion of Canadians. They are looking for unique and culturally authentic travel experiences. Over 61% of these travelers believe the experience is better when the destination they visit preserves its natural, historic and cultural sites. They prefer to experience the local culture (49%) and support local businesses (49%) at the destination.

Unfortunately, uniformity is becoming commonplace with tourism attractions and infrastructure in many North American towns and cities, each of which seems to have the same wish list consisting of:

- Brand hotels and restaurants;
- Conference facilities;
- Hotels with water theme features;
- Large box stores and shopping malls;
- Multi-plex movie theatres; and
- Festival retail/entertainment districts.

Some of these attributes may be necessary, but they no longer help to differentiate one place from another. Instead, these towns and cities should be striving to be unique and build on their indigenous assets and attributes, heritage being one of them. From a tourism perspective, Cambridge has a significant opportunity to capitalize on its own rich heritage resources/assets (both physical and intangible). In addition to the obvious wealth of heritage buildings in Cambridge, there is a wide range of heritage assets such as heritage landscapes, historic sites, archaeological sites and a diversity of historical stories that could be interpreted.

**Existing Situation**

Market-ready heritage tourism product is lacking in Cambridge today. For example, aside from a house museum managed by the Region, and a
promised place in the planned regional museum, Cambridge does not have a well-developed museum sector. There is a need and opportunity to present Cambridge history to visitors and residents alike through museums and other more creative interpretive methods. The arts and cultural sector is stronger, with a library, gallery, local amateur theatre and a variety of crafts organizations. There is need and opportunity to develop or encourage further cultural tourism attractions and services in Cambridge to capitalize on the rich cultural heritage of the area.

The City does have a diverse range of heritage architecture. Adaptive reuse and preservation of these buildings will be critical to maintaining the town’s unique architectural resources as a tourism draw. There is significant undeveloped opportunity to better capitalize on archaeological resources, heritage landscapes and features and historic sites through interpretation for tourism. It is also a fact that these types of unique attributes in a community help make the community more appealing and attractive to residents, prospective residents and business travellers. In this way, tourism becomes supportive of community development; tourism product becomes an extension of local pride of place.

Bringing heritage assets to life requires creativity. As Richard Florida suggests through his ‘creative class’ economic arguments, attracting creative workers such as artists, poets, dancers, musicians, designers, architects and engineers to a community can lead to a much stronger economy – a creative city. The relocation of the University of Waterloo School of Architecture to downtown Cambridge is an excellent example of a recent attempt to implement such policies. The heritage assets in Cambridge can provide part of the impetus to attract and retain a ‘creative class’. A vibrant city is not only reliant on a healthy business climate but perhaps more importantly today it requires a strong, healthy ‘people climate’.

7.5.2 STRATEGIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

Options
Many successful American tourism destinations have capitalized on their heritage assets and developed compelling heritage tourism products and experiences. Often communities struggle to articulate the heritage that
makes them unique, but the following examples illustrate how it can be done to the benefit of tourism. In the following review of selected precedents, each case study demonstrates a strong link between heritage conservation and economic development through community revitalization and tourism. Municipalities in each case facilitate, but do not necessarily manage, the development and interpretation of heritage resources. Most use partnerships with volunteer groups, charitable foundations and the private sector to accomplish their aims. Many foster local pride as part of tourism development. And all, in different ways, put heritage and culture as a priority for marketing their community to the wider world and for improving local quality of life for their local residents.

The following are examples of cities or counties in the US that have successfully embraced cultural and heritage tourism to diversify their product offerings. Note that, in the US, the most common term used is “cultural tourism” embracing both heritage and cultural activities and attractions.

Colorado Has Evaluated the Impacts of Historic Preservation
With funding from a State Historical Grant from the Colorado Historical Society the Colorado Historical Foundation completed an assessment of the economic benefits of historic preservation throughout the State. The research concluded that Colorado’s historic resources are extremely diverse and contribute significantly to the cultural, aesthetic, social and educational values in the state. More specifically they found the following:

- Preservation protects and revitalizes historic resources – there is extensive use throughout the state of available incentive programs such as federal and state tax credit programs, and the State Historical Fund to rehabilitate old historic buildings and adaptively re-use them;
- Preservation creates jobs and income – it was calculated that since 1981 rehabilitation activities created almost 29,000 jobs and generated over US$2 billion in direct and indirect economic impacts;
- Preservation benefits downtowns and commercial areas – the research found that historic preservation can function as an
economic development strategy, enhance property values, reuse public infrastructure and maintain a sense of community and place; and

- Preservation attracts visitors – heritage tourism has become a key part of the tourism sector in Colorado.

In 1994 Lancaster County Launched a Heritage Tourism Initiative
Lancaster County in Pennsylvania has historically been known for Pennsylvania Dutch and Amish cultural attractions as well as Hershey chocolates. In 1994 a concerted effort was made to diversify the Lancaster County tourism appeal by providing a diversity of authentic heritage experiences.

In 1994 Lancaster County became a pilot area (one of 4 pilot projects) for the Pennsylvania Heritage Tourism Initiative. This program was led by the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission with technical support from the National Trust for Historic Preservation. The programs goals were as follows:

- To enhance community pride in local heritage resources while providing economic opportunities and benefits; and
- To provide a diversity of authentic heritage experiences for both residents and visitors.

The Lancaster County Heritage initiative was led by an Executive Committee representing each of the partners, and an Advisory Committee which provides the Executive Committee with direction and advice. A Subcommittee works under the direction of the other two committees addressing all issues related to authenticity, marketing, product development and finding.

This program has already accomplished a significant amount as follows:

- Prepared a community-based heritage tourism strategy;
- Helped to create new heritage tourism products as well as a framework for the facilities to work together with the tourism industry to achieve common goals;
- Produced an inventory of over 100 heritage resources;
- Published a county-wide Explorer’s Map and Guide;
- Published 4 automobile tour maps;
• Published one bicycle tour map;
• Published one thematic map;
• Published one walking tour map; and
• Hosts an annual Lancaster County Heritage event.

One issue that came up as this program was being developed was that many attractions were not authentic in their interpretation and/or physical presentation. In response to this the Lancaster County Heritage Advisory Committee established clear guidelines and criteria for authenticity which need to be met in order for a facility or program to be designated an official heritage site, service or event. Designated sites, services and events are encouraged to display the Lancaster County Heritage logo at their site and in their promotional materials. The program has been able to achieve the following:

• Help visitors find authentic heritage resources;
• Encourage heritage resource managers to strive for higher standards of preservation, interpretation and accessibility; and
• Assist operators in meeting the standards and to provide a clear framework for overall heritage development throughout the County.

Research in 1999 determined that heritage tourism in Pennsylvania has become a critical component of the tourism sector accounting for a significant share of travel to the state and an even higher share of tourist spending in the state. Growth rates at the time for heritage tourism were more than twice that of the state’s total leisure travel market, and disproportionately higher spending.

Washington DC Recognized the Value of Neighbourhood Heritage Assets

Washington DC is known as a cultural destination with abundant historic and cultural icons and monuments. The city has also been very successful in bringing visitors to sites in all areas of the city.

Cultural Tourism DC a grassroots, non-profit coalition of more than 130 arts, heritage, cultural, tourism, and community organizations throughout Washington, DC, has been instrumental in linking the city’s
neighbourhoods since it was formed in 1996. The organization’s Mission and Vision are as follows:

MISSION:
Cultural Tourism DC works to strengthen the image and the economy of the nation's capital by engaging visitors and residents of the metropolitan area in the diverse history and culture of the entire city of Washington.

VISION:
Cultural Tourism DC envisions a nation's capital whose diverse local and international culture and heritage is appreciated around the world, is embraced and celebrated at home, and is the source of civic pride, economic prosperity, and neighborhood revival across the city.

Some of the key accomplishments since 1996 are as follows:

- Publication of *Capital Assets* the city’s first comprehensive inventory of heritage and cultural attractions, categorized by theme, neighbourhood and market readiness.
- Initiation of a 1998 conference on Culture and Commerce to plan for the launch of a significant heritage tourism initiative.
- Preparation of a comprehensive plan to promote neighbourhoods as tourist destinations including a “Beyond the Monuments” marketing campaign and special interest guided tours.
- Creation of a city wide system of marked heritage trails and centralized listing of guides.
- Inclusion of information on heritage and cultural attractions in downtown way finding maps that were installed by the Business Improvement District.
- Initiation of an annual Open House with 30 free walking tours and free admission at more than 50 cultural and arts organizations and museums in 12 neighbourhoods.
- Development of an annual marketing campaign (with the Metro, the Convention Center and area hotels) to promote neighbourhoods.
This program has resulted in increased tourism visitation, broader distribution of tourism benefits, more financially secure cultural institutions, healthier neighbourhoods, and a better place to live for local residents.

In cities that are within river systems, several US regions have created cultural tourism attractions along river corridors. Canada does not have legislation to designate heritage Corridors as does the US, and the legislation in the US seems to have facilitated the creation of more Heritage Corridors designed to preserve, protect and promote heritage resources (both natural and cultural). The following are models of Heritage River Corridors that are successfully marketed as linear destinations:

1. Blackstone River Valley National Heritage Corridor, Rhode Island. Key elements include:
   - John H Chafee Blackstone River Valley National Heritage Corridor was designated by Congress in 1986.
   - A corridor consisting of 24 cities and towns on 500 square miles of land in the watershed.
   - The 46 mile long Blackstone River (designated American Heritage River) is the focal point and main artery of this destination area.
   - This area provided the setting for the Industrial Revolution from farm to factory, beginning with the Slate Mill, which opened in 1790.
   - The corridor is promoted as a living landscape with a wide range of interconnected historical stories that form a broad tapestry – the river is the thread that ties all the stories together.
   - The Heritage Corridor is managed by a Commission – it does not own or manage any land but instead works in partnership with federal, state and local agencies and the private sector to protect and maintain the history and culture of the area and maintain the spirit of innovation and ingenuity.
   - The Blackstone Valley Tourism Council is the state-designated tourism planning and development agency.
The Tourism Council serves Rhode Island and the Blackstone Valley National Heritage Corridor communities with sustainable Geo-tourism programs and policies that support residents, and enhance the character, environment, culture, heritage, aesthetics and businesses of the Valley.

The corridor’s management is working with National Geographic (Center for Sustainable Destinations - www.nationalgeographic.com/travel/sustainable/programs_for_places.html) to develop a Geotourism strategy and a Geomap.

2. Hudson River Valley – Hudson River Valley Institute (www.hudsonrivervalley.net). Key elements include:

- The Hudson River Valley is a designated National Heritage Area.
- The Hudson River Valley Institute at Marist College is the academic arm of the Hudson River Valley National Heritage Area. Its mission is to study and to promote the Hudson River Valley and to provide educational resources for heritage tourists, scholars, elementary school educators, environmental organizations, the business community, and the general public.
- Projects include the publication of the Hudson River Valley Review and the management of a dynamic digital library and leading regional portal site.
- The Digital Library contains a collection covering heritage sites, documents, organizations, lesson plans, and related links designed to draw people—electronically and physically—to the Hudson River valley from around the world to experience its scenic, cultural, economic, and historical resources.
- The Hudson River Valley Greenway is a state sponsored program created to facilitate the development of a voluntary regional strategy for preserving scenic, natural, historic, cultural and recreational resources while encouraging compatible economic development and maintaining the tradition of home rule for land use decision-making.
- The Greenway Act created two organizations to facilitate the Greenway process: the Hudson River Valley Greenway
Communities Council and the Greenway Conservancy for the Hudson River Valley.

- The Greenway Conservancy, a public benefit corporation, works with local governments, organizations and individuals to establish a Hudson River Valley Trail system, promote the Hudson River Valley as a single tourism destination area & assist in the preservation of agriculture.

3. RiversWest Red River Corridor Inc (www.riverswest.ca). Key elements include:
   - The corridor covers the Red River from Emerson to Lake Winnipeg.
   - It is managed by a non-profit association reporting to a Board of Directors – established in 1999.
   - It is working towards having the Red River designated a National Heritage River by June 2007.
   - The mandate is to:
     - Identify and further economic development opportunities;
     - Promote the development of resources and expertise, attractions and infrastructure;
     - Facilitate a coordinated approach to programming and marketing; and
     - Provide direction for conservation and stewardship initiatives.
   - Overall, RiversWest is establishing the corridor as a destination and the long term strategy is to develop and implement a tourism and conservation strategy focusing on the natural, tourism, cultural/heritage, and recreational resources.

4. New York Canal System (www.canals.state.ny.us). Key elements include:
   - In 2000, the State of NY passed legislation to establish the Canal Corporation as a wholly owned subsidiary of the New York State Thruway Authority. Its mandate is to operate, preserve and renew the Canal System for recreation and economic development in an area covering the Erie,
Champlain, Oswego and Cayuga-Seneca Canals – 524 miles of navigable water.

- The Canal Recreationway was established as a linear park to be developed for boating and other recreational use, taking advantage of the historic heritage and conserving the beauty and natural character.
- The first Recreationway Master Plan was prepared in 1995.
- The Canal Corporation is the main DMO responsible for marketing the canal as a linear destination.
- More recently, the Governor has announced plans to develop the Canal Corporation as a stand-alone public benefit corporation, create an Erie Canal Greenway modeled after the successful Hudson Valley Greenway and the more recent Niagara River Greenway, and form the Empire State Greenway Alliance to combine resources and marketing strategies and planning.
- The management is also working to establish more interpretive centers along the corridor and enhance marketing as a corridor destination.

**Technical Strategies**

How can heritage be incorporated into the tourism experience? The following are examples:

- Packaging between attractions, facilities and services around a heritage theme;
- Performing arts built around local/regional heritage themes;
- Character or themed accommodation and restaurants – historic inns, B&B’s etc.;
- Festivals and events with a heritage theme – commemorative or celebration events;
- New or expanded interpretive experiences and attractions; and
- Historic re-creation.

There are a number of steps that Cambridge needs to follow in capitalizing on the heritage tourism opportunity:

1. Complete an inventory of key heritage assets;
2. Identify potential themes;
3. Assess suitability for heritage tourism development;
4. Involve partners in developing the heritage tourism product – the City can play a facilitator role by providing incentives and being proactive in marketing the opportunities; and

5. Base all heritage tourism products on sound business principles, while ensuring the conservation and enhancement of cultural heritage resources.

Managerial Strategies
A key future direction for the Cambridge tourism sector will be to increase the yield from tourism, and in turn increase the economic benefits to the local business community and local residents. Higher yield can be achieved by attracting more visitors from further afield, to stay longer in the community. Tourism marketing should specifically target higher yield market segments. The large and growing Culture and Heritage Traveller is one of the higher yield market segments. These travellers are better educated and more affluent than the average North American traveller and they are increasingly sophisticated and discriminating in their search for new experiences.

Cambridge has the heritage resources to create unique tourism experiences to attract a portion of this market, particularly when combined with some of the heritage opportunities found through the broader Waterloo and Grand River regions. Another important consideration is the fact that cultural and heritage attractions and activities are appealing across a wide range of market segments, beyond just the Cultural and Heritage Travellers. They can help keep tourists in the community longer, spending more, and provide a more fulfilling experience.

However, on its own, any individual heritage asset that can be developed into a heritage tourism product in Cambridge may not be a strong tourism draw (i.e. adaptive reuse of a heritage building, or interpretation of a heritage landscape). However, if heritage products and experiences throughout Cambridge and the Waterloo Region are bundled together, they can become a major draw. Linking heritage assets and tourism products in a region through a broader narrative or story can present sufficient critical mass of points of interest that can motivate tourist visitation. Given the importance of critical mass in tourism, one of the most significant opportunities is to develop and leverage Cambridge’s role as a focal point in the larger Grand River heritage corridor. The river
itself is already designated a National Heritage River. Many of the heritage stories and attributes in Cambridge extend beyond current political boundaries. Developing heritage tourism along a theme such as the Grand River heritage (there are others as well) can present a number of significant benefits. These include:

- Providing an organizational principle for linking the experience;
- Enabling development of a coordinated and coherent heritage tourism experience; and
- Contributing to a critical mass of visitor experiences.

The following are suggested strategies for developing heritage tourism product, and marketing that product successfully to target audiences:

- Adopt a Grand River approach – broaden the geographic area;
- Create partnerships to broaden the critical mass of tourism attractions and appeal – i.e. with Doon Regional Museum for the Cambridge museum presence;
- Market existing heritage resources (e.g. library, gallery, theatre, crafts, walking tours) in a proactive, co-ordinated fashion;
- Define a clear mandate to develop and promote heritage-based tourism and develop product, with committed staff and financial resources;
- Explore opportunities and issues, linkages with tourism partners, as has been done for example with Lancaster County and Philadelphia, PA.; and
- Help the local business community to support heritage-related activities, through education (e.g. workshops, design guidelines, enhancements to special events, promotional campaigns, incentive programs).
Part D:

HERITAGE MASTER PLAN
PRINCIPLES, OBJECTIVES AND ACTION PLAN
8.

The Role of Heritage in the City’s Future

8.1 Introduction

This report has presented arguments supporting the idea that Cambridge has the heritage resources needed to attract new visitors and improve quality of life for local residents. In this final section, these arguments are summarized and placed within an action plan in anticipation of Council adopting the Master Plan recommendations.

Heritage conservation has the potential to save and enhance the key components of local identity. Heritage-based development has the potential to substantially improve the local economy and quality of life. How to achieve such potential remains a critical issue, however. Barriers to success have already been identified: conflict between heritage advocates and City Council; the lack of co-ordination of heritage activity; the lack of funding and staff to conserve, manage and promote heritage; and little recognition locally of the potential of heritage conservation and heritage tourism. Overcoming these barriers will require concerted efforts by all parts of the community.

The Heritage Master Plan is intended to be a call to action for the City and its citizens. Nothing will change unless the community and its elected representatives realize the opportunities for improved quality of life and economic development that heritage offers. The Plan will only be effective if it is used.
8.2 Four Major Initiatives

8.2.1 INTRODUCTION
Heritage conservation will become important if local people decide that change is needed. We suggest that there are four local initiatives that, when combined, will make the difference. These are described below as an introduction to the specific objectives and actions we recommend in the final action plan.

Initiative #1: Build community support
Ways must be found to make heritage important to local residents. Stereotypical notions of heritage as a stuffy and boring activity must be overcome. Heritage conservation must be seen as a desirable form of property development - and a way to increase property values - not as an impediment to positive change. Definitions of heritage must be broadened beyond the usual focus on architecture and important events and extended to include a wider range of resources that can be appreciated within the context of a shared past.

Events such as Doors Open, Heritage Day, gallery displays, as well as genealogy, components of school curricula and columns in the local newspaper are all good initiatives. The public should be engaged in a debate over ways in which the past is viewed, and over the influence of the past on the future. This debate should be locally based but, given the city’s location as part of a nationally significant river system, there should be regional voices heard too. If the debate is sparked and fostered, then the importance of heritage to local quality of life can be understood, and its potential as an engine for community and economic development can be explored.

Initiative #2: Provide heritage “product”
Defining heritage and debating its uses are necessary steps, but developing heritage resources requires the provision of heritage “product” to be conserved, interpreted and marketed. As shown in the assessment of the city’s character areas, finding representative buildings, landscapes and artefacts to support interpretation and provide attractions
will not be difficult. As has been done in Hespeler, the places that remain can be made into demonstration projects for heritage appreciation in order to overcome public scepticism or indifference. But the enduring attraction of the rivers, and the deep emotional response they elicit, are powerful hooks with which to galvanize public support, capture visitors and create a potential audience for heritage-related activities. Certainly there are challenges; funding, staffing, development pressures, bruises from past conflict. New “product” must be created, in the stories to be told, in artefacts to be found, in buildings and landscapes to be revitalized.

Creating this product does not need to be an arduous task: in some cases, it is a matter of packaging, in others, a case of uncovering something that has been there all the time. For example, the Grand and Speed Rivers run through the city, along the way passing through all the major historic downtown cores, touching many of the key historic sites, and representing in themselves a major historic transportation route and natural corridor. Or, for instance, finding a tangible link to the city’s industrial past can be as simple as visiting downtown Hespeler on the one hand, or enjoying the exciting building conversion at the Architecture School on the other. If both residents and visitors are made aware of resources that are right under their noses, and of the development opportunities those resources entail, then the product is already well on its way to being in a marketable state.

Initiative #3: Establish an implementation framework

Establishing the value of heritage is one thing: making heritage policy work is another. Cities that successfully capitalize on their heritage do so thanks to having in place effective ways to deliver heritage projects and programs. Cambridge needs first to review its inventory of heritage resources and be able to judge their relative value as potential attractions as well as community resources. Second, the municipality needs a management structure that is effective in managing heritage resources. Third, heritage-friendly development needs to be promoted and directed, via municipal planning policy, urban design plans and guidelines and incentives of several kinds. Fourth, tangible support for conservation and
interpretation of heritage resources needs to be garnered from established local corporations and non-municipal agencies.

Some of these steps may entail upgrades to the existing city administration that strengthen existing departments, provide efficiencies in service delivery, and offer heritage the importance it deserves within the municipality’s operational mandate. Others may require establishment of new working relationships between the municipality and its partners.

Short-term responses may also be required. There is an urgent need to identify areas of high heritage potential, in advance of a full inventory, in order to stay ahead of pressure for redevelopment or demolition. Council needs to be able to identify and support projects that can be accomplished easily and are thus easy to fund. Here will be needed criteria for identification of such areas, protocols for landowners of potential/existing heritage property, and a rapid response strategy for City staff and politicians. A municipal “endangered species” list, updated regularly, may be needed to focus action.

**Initiative #4: Foster co-operation**

Emphasizing the value of heritage, improving “product readiness”, and streamlining service delivery are all important, but none will be effective if the individuals and groups with a direct interest in heritage cannot co-operate. The local tradition of segmentation and conflict must change to a system of partnerships. Here such initiatives as Doors Open and approval of the new regional museum show that such partnerships can be created. The City may have to assume a more active consensus-building role. Other links need to be made with such obvious candidates as the Regional Municipality, rare, the University and College, and the Conservation Authority. Local heritage groups also need to feel confident in modifying their mandate to include community-based education.
8.3 Heritage Master Plan Principles

8.3.1 INTRODUCTION
Assuming that these four initiatives are underway, what is the best way to proceed? To ensure that initial enthusiasm does not dissolve into frustration and disappointment, these initiatives need to be placed within a process that can offer them the optimum conditions for success. In our view there are several essential principles that a municipality should follow in order to have a successful heritage master plan. We have based the following principles on best practices used in other communities.

#1: Focus on Character Areas

- Make heritage visible through media coverage, newspaper columns, and publications.
- Make heritage meaningful through oral history, public buildings, community places and events, “a day in the life” interpretive focus.
- Make character areas the priority in augmenting the existing inventory.
- Focus community and economic development projects in character areas.
- Work with local residents to tell local stories, with regional stories told from a local perspective.

#2. Set Modest Goals

- Work on small projects that can be quickly completed; declare success often.
- Build on current successes; support activities that work now.
- Promote inexpensive activities, displays and events (such as Doors Open).
- Monitor experiments: listen to your audience, don’t risk too much in each project (e.g. staffing, product development).
#3. Use Education as Advocacy

- Refocus local heritage groups into community education, with City staff and advisory committees.
- Provide community workshops on local history and sense of place.
- Provide technical workshops for owners of historic properties.
- Provide heritage policy implementation workshops for City staff.

#4. Promote Heritage-friendly Development

- Provide urban design plans for character areas, especially downtown cores.
- Develop a coherent response to the Places to Grow that controls development pressure on character areas.
- Establish a city-wide design review board.
- Publicize and promote good examples of heritage-friendly development.

#5. Make Partnerships Work

- Enhance the municipality’s ability to act as a catalyst for heritage activity.
- Work with the private sector to support initiatives on skills training and economic development.
- Explore regional sources of funding for heritage initiatives.
- Foster working relationships with the Region and adjacent municipalities, local volunteer groups, NGOs, the private sector, the University and College.

8.4 Action Plan Objectives

8.4.1 INTRODUCTION
The following text summarizes the steps needed to achieve the potential heritage can achieve in Cambridge. The steps take the form of implementation strategies and are organized under the five major categories of:
• Inventory and evaluation;
• Heritage policy and interpretation;
• Heritage resource management;
• Economic development; and
• Community support.

The steps are taken within the master plan principles outlined above and implement the strategies discussed earlier in this report. Within each of the categories, and based on the 5 over-riding principles, there are overall objectives to be achieved. Each objective is accompanied by a list of recommended actions by which the municipality, its partners in the public and private sectors, and the mandated and non-mandated heritage groups can work together to achieve these objectives. As noted elsewhere in this report, the objectives and action steps reflect the comments and aspirations of the project steering committee and the many stakeholders whose views have been canvassed by the study team.

8.4.2 Inventory and Evaluation

**Objective 1: Continue to update and expand the City’s inventory of heritage resources.**

**Action 1:** Improve the inventory template. Adapt the template found in the Ontario Heritage Tool Kit in order to make the recording sequence consistent: create separate categories for the different types of heritage resources, with appropriate description standards, and enhance the historical information provided with longer descriptions in a consistent format.

*Priority:* High

*Responsibility:* Planning, in consultation with the MHAC

*Timeline:* Short term

**Action 2:** Expand the inventory’s scope to include a broader range of heritage resources:

- cultural landscapes
- structures and all types of buildings
- sites of sacred or secular value
- archaeological sites
• sites of natural and scientific interest
• building groupings/streetscapes
• building interiors
• post-WWII heritage resources (all types)

Priority: High
Responsibility: Planning, in consultation with Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC)
Timeline: Short term and ongoing

Action 3: Focus on new listings within the character areas identified in the Heritage Master Plan. Update existing inventory listings when time and personnel are available.
Priority: Medium
Responsibility: Planning, in consultation with the MHAC
Timeline: Short term and ongoing

Action 4: Augment new listings with local/oral history. Where possible, and as a result of community workshops and outreach initiatives, add local perceptions of heritage value to the descriptions of heritage attributes. Record these values using a variety of media, including audio and video recording.
Priority: Medium
Responsibility: Planning, in consultation with the MHAC and local residents
Timeline: Short term and ongoing

Objective 2: Improve the evaluation process.

Action 5: Adopt an alphabetic ranking system. Use either the A, B and C system or the E, VG, G and F/P system, as discussed in the Heritage Master Plan strategy text.
Priority: High
Responsibility: Planning, in consultation with the MHAC
Timeline: Short term and ongoing

Action 6: Use City heritage staff, MHAC and trained volunteers. Evaluations should be undertaken by a sub-committee of MHAC.
Priority: High
Responsibility: Planning, in consultation with the MHAC
Timeline: Short term and ongoing

**Action 7:** Map the inventory and evaluation on the municipal GIS database. Create a searchable database on a GIS platform to assist City staff, MHAC and property owners identify heritage resources.
Priority: High
Responsibility: Planning, in consultation with the MHAC and municipal staff
Timeline: Short term and ongoing

**Objective 3:** Use the inventory to improve the City’s ability to anticipate threats to heritage resources.

**Action 8:** Create a municipal “endangered species list” of properties of potential heritage value that are under immediate development pressure, whether or not they are on the municipal register (if they are not, add them to the inventory). Check the current inventory for any listed or designated heritage resources that are in areas of increasing pressure for redevelopment. In addition, assess the character areas identified in this Plan for the types of development pressures each is under, and identify key resources within each area that could be under most redevelopment pressure (whether or not such resources are currently listed or designated in the municipal inventory). If they are not included, ensure that these resources are a priority for inclusion in the municipal inventory.
Priority: High
Responsibility: Planning, in consultation with the MHAC and Heritage Cambridge
Timeline: Short term and ongoing

**8.4.3 Heritage Policy and Interpretation**

**Objective 4:** Focus on character areas.

**Action 9:** Based on the preliminary assessments provided in the Heritage Master Plan, develop updated heritage character statements, with character defining elements, for each character area. Use comments gathered from community workshops, oral histories, and further research.
Use the information gathered to create and/or update the municipal inventory and evaluation of heritage resources within each character areas.

*Priority:* High  
*Responsibility:* Planning, in consultation with MHAC and relevant City advisory committees and community groups  
*Timeline:* Short term and ongoing

**Objective 5:** Define the desired form of redevelopment suited to each character area.

**Action 10:** Based on the updated character statements, prepare urban design plans for each character area, with priority given to development and design guidelines for historic streetscapes in the downtown. Review and update any existing guidelines and make them an integral part of the current character area revitalization plans. Make the urban design plans part of any area-specific policies, such as Secondary Plans.  
*Priority:* High  
*Responsibility:* Planning, in consultation with relevant City advisory committees.  
*Timeline:* Short term

**Objective 6:** Provide new Official Plan policies to implement heritage policies.

**Action 11:** Consider using other policies under the Planning Act to spark conservation activity in each character area. Community Improvement Plans, Special Policy Areas and Secondary Plans could be used and both should include conservation and development of heritage resources as an integral part of their improvement policies. Bonusing provisions under Section 37 of the Planning Act are another tool when, for example, they are tied to density bonuses for conservation of the gross floor area of a designated structure. Use pilot projects to monitor the effectiveness of these tools.  
*Priority:* Medium  
*Responsibility:* Planning  
*Timeline:* Medium term and ongoing
Objective 7: Provide new Official Plan policies to address specific planning issues affecting heritage resources.

**Action 12:** Consider creating planning tools to delay redevelopment of threatened heritage resources. Interim control by-laws and holding provisions in the Zoning By-law are ways by which municipalities can create a pause in the development process in which threats to a heritage resource can be mitigated or alternative development proposals explored.

*Priority:* High  
*Responsibility:* Planning, in consultation with the MHAC and municipal staff  
*Timeline:* Short term and ongoing

**Action 13:** Create policies to promote conservation and adaptive re-use of heritage resources located within floodplains. Work with property owners and the Conservation Authority to identify issues and propose strategic options. Aim for consensus on amendments to the Official Plan and Zoning By-law that will achieve conservation goals while facilitating compatible redevelopment of property in floodplain.

*Priority:* High  
*Responsibility:* Planning, in consultation with the MHAC and municipal staff, GRCA and property owners  
*Timeline:* Short term and ongoing

**Action 14:** Create policies to promote conservation of trees, especially street trees. Work with property owners and relevant municipal staff to identify issues and propose strategic options. Aim for consensus on amendments to the Official Plan and Zoning By-law that will achieve conservation goals while facilitating ongoing municipal maintenance. Consider providing tree conservation policies under the Municipal Act.

*Priority:* High  
*Responsibility:* Planning, in consultation with the MHAC and municipal staff, GRCA and property owners  
*Timeline:* Short term and ongoing

**Action 15:** Consider offering tax incentives and enhanced grants to private property owners to rehabilitate designated heritage buildings and landscapes and to provide residential accommodation in the upper storeys
of commercial streetscapes in character areas. For example, financial incentives can be offered within a Community Improvement Plan (CIP).

**Priority:** High

**Responsibility:** Planning, Economic Development

**Timeline:** Short term and ongoing

**Objective 8:** Use innovative methods to interpret and promote heritage resources.

**Action 16:** Produce and update self-guided tours (walking, cycling, boating, driving) of the city and region, each exploring one of the themes and related storylines suggested in this study. Extend these tours (on a special events basis, or as a fundraising gambit) to include house and garden tours, cemetery tours, river tours, and ally closely with existing annual heritage tours and events such as Doors Open.

**Priority:** High

**Responsibility:** Planning, Economic Development, Parks and Recreation, City Clerk (Archives)

**Timeline:** Short term

**Action 17:** Train interpretive guides to lead thematically based tours of the city (whether as seasonal employees of the municipality or private sector operators).

**Priority:** Medium

**Responsibility:** Planning, Economic Development

**Timeline:** Medium term and ongoing

**Action 18:** Develop an interpretive master plan for the City, using as a starting point the thematic history, themes and storylines suggested in this Master Plan.

**Priority:** Medium

**Responsibility:** Planning, Parks and Recreation

**Timeline:** Medium term
8.4.4 Heritage Resource Management

Objective 9: Determine the optimum roles in for the City, other public agencies, volunteer groups and the private sector in managing heritage resources.

**Action 19:** City staff should become a catalyst for heritage activity by providing information on heritage resource conservation. City staff, in partnership with other agencies and volunteer groups, should be a clearing house for heritage information. The City can provide forums for stakeholder groups to come together to reach consensus on heritage values and conservation goals. The City can create a portal on the municipal website for heritage-related inquiries, and establish protocols with the City switchboard, to direct questions from the public to the appropriate information sources.

*Priority:* Medium  
*Responsibility:* Planning  
*Timeline:* Short-medium term

**Action 20:** Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC) should concentrate on heritage resource inventory and evaluation, and on the designation process for individual properties and conservation districts. MHAC should continue to have an advisory role to Council on heritage matters. Remaining heritage management duties should be delegated to the City’s heritage planning staff (see 26, below).

*Priority:* High  
*Responsibility:* Planning, consultation with the Master Plan implementation committee (see 25, below)  
*Timeline:* Short-medium term

**Action 21:** Heritage Cambridge should focus its efforts on public education on heritage conservation. It should be the primary source of technical information for the public. The group should sponsor workshops on local history, gather oral histories, produce tour guides and other interpretive material. In order to encourage heritage tourism, the group should also consider sponsoring “how to” workshops and guidelines sessions for those involved in all aspects of heritage tourism development and delivery.
Priority: High
Responsibility: Heritage Cambridge, with City staff and MHAC
Timeline: Short term and ongoing

Action 22: The Regional Municipality of Waterloo should work with the City to develop the Cambridge local history section of the regional museum and to interpret Cambridge within the history of the Region, at the museum and in regional tourism publications. The Region should promote and work with the City to implement the over-arching heritage policies in the Regional Arts, Culture and Heritage Master Plan, the Archaeological Master Plan, and the Cultural Landscapes guidelines. The Region should continue to offer grant support to City heritage organizations and work with the City to implement, in heritage-supportive ways, the policies of the Places to Grow initiative.
Priority: Medium
Responsibility: Regional Municipality of Waterloo
Timeline: Medium term and ongoing

Action 23: The City should foster partnerships with other public and non-governmental agencies such as adjacent municipalities, the University and College, the Grand River Conservation Authority, in promoting and implementing municipal and Regional heritage policies.
Priority: Medium
Responsibility: Planning
Timeline: Medium term and ongoing

Action 24: The private sector should make clear to the City its needs in redeveloping heritage properties. Concerns of property owners and property developers should be voiced in constructive ways such that the City, heritage groups and the private sector can work together to foster heritage-friendly development, provide skills training for workers in the heritage industry, and improve the heritage regulatory process.
Priority: High
Responsibility: Planning and representatives of the development industry
Timeline: Short term

Action 25: The Heritage Master Plan steering committee should evolve into an implementation committee of Council charged with overseeing the implementation of the policies and recommendations in the Heritage
Master Plan. The committee should continue to work closely with City staff and MHAC in ensuring results, monitoring progress, and fostering partnerships.

*Priority: High*

*Responsibility: the Heritage Master Plan steering committee*

*Timeline: Short term and ongoing*

**Objective 10: Provide support for the municipal heritage planner.**

**Action 26:** Assist the heritage planner by delegating administrative tasks to another staff member(s). Allow the heritage planner to concentrate on core tasks such as research, production and updating of the municipal heritage resource inventory, training volunteers and contract staff, managing consulting contracts, assisting senior planning staff in preparation of heritage policy, as well as acting as day-to-day liaison with other City departments, heritage agencies and volunteer groups. Give the heritage planner delegated authority to deal with minor changes to listed and designated properties and to determine the requirements for Heritage Impact Assessments.

*Priority: High*

*Responsibility: Planning*

*Timeline: Short term*

**Action 27:** Promote awareness of the Heritage Master Plan and support implementation of its policies and recommendations by ensuring that all relevant municipal staff understand the Plan and its contents. Provide City staff with in-house workshops to explain the Plan and underline the need to have regard to its policies. Consider forming inter-disciplinary (and inter-departmental) working groups to provide heritage responses to broad planning policy initiatives such as Places to Grow.

*Priority: High*

*Responsibility: Planning*

*Timeline: Short term and ongoing*
Objective 11: Promote “heritage-friendly” development.

**Action 28:** Adopt a “heritage first” policy for all municipal departments when considering space utilization, and undertake pilot projects in municipally owned heritage buildings. Fund improvements to public infrastructure that conserve and enhance heritage resources. Continue awards and incentives programs that recognize good heritage conservation and development practices.

*Priority:* Medium  
*Responsibility:* Planning, Public Works  
*Timeline:* Short term and ongoing

**Action 29:** Foster a “heritage friendly” development process in Cambridge. Examine a full range of means by which the municipality can work with market forces and existing legislation to encourage development that conserves and enhances heritage resources. Tools may include fast track approvals for suitable projects, concessions on such municipal regulatory requirements as Development Charges, parking and setback variances, and consider a switch from land use zoning to built form and performance standards.

*Priority:* Medium  
*Responsibility:* Planning, Building, Economic Development  
*Timeline:* Medium term and ongoing

**Action 30:** Encourage skills development in heritage trades and technologies. Collaborate with existing national centres for skills development (such as Algonquin College, Perth Campus) and foster local and regional versions (such as new courses at the University and College). Work with these programs to establish pilot projects in character areas.

*Priority:* Medium  
*Responsibility:* Planning, Economic Development  
*Timeline:* Medium term and ongoing
Objective 12: Improve the process for Part IV and V designations.

Action 31: Adopt the designation process in the Ontario Heritage Tool Kit. Ensure that the public is aware of the benefits of designation as well as the regulatory implications that designation entails.

Priority: Medium
Responsibility: Planning, Building
Timeline: Medium term and ongoing

Action 32: Adopt a proactive policy on designation so that important heritage resources can be designated, if necessary, without the owner’s permission. Proceeding with so-called “hostile” designations will be necessary on occasion in order to implement the Heritage Master Plan.

Priority: Medium
Responsibility: Planning, Building
Timeline: Medium term and ongoing

Action 33: Dedicate staff time to work with the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee in identifying candidates for designation, preparing designation documentation, and working with property owners to achieve success.

Priority: High
Responsibility: Planning, in consultation with the MHAC
Timeline: Short term and ongoing

Objective 13: Improve the Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) process.

Action 34: Restrict the requirement for a Heritage Impact Assessment to planning applications, especially those involving proposed demolition of a potential or listed heritage resource (demolition of designated heritage resources can be prevented by Council). HIAs should be required for any planning proposal that could have a significant impact on a heritage resource.

Priority: High
Responsibility: Planning
Timeline: Short term and ongoing
**Action 35:** Delegate to planning staff (especially the heritage planner) authority to review development applications affecting potential and registered heritage resources in order to determine if a HIA is required. Staff review is triggered by a property being on the municipal register and by the discretion of the heritage planner, in consultation with MHAC. If an HIA is required (especially for large planning applications), as an additional level of objective scrutiny, consider providing a peer review of HIAs submitted by developers.

*Priority:* High  
*Responsibility:* Planning and MHAC  
*Timeline:* Short term and ongoing

**Action 36:** Prepare an adjacent properties policy in order to meet the requirements of the Provincial Policy Statement within the City’s HIA process.

*Priority:* Medium  
*Responsibility:* Planning  
*Timeline:* Medium term and ongoing

**Objective 14:** Identify and foster sources of financial support for heritage conservation.

**Action 37:** Consider providing fee-for-service products to the public, such as genealogical research, archival searches, and reproductions of archival materials.

*Priority:* Medium to low  
*Responsibility:* Planning, City Clerk (Archives), Library and Galleries  
*Timeline:* Medium term and ongoing

**Action 38:** Work with local and regional corporations and foundations to provide project-based capital and operating funding to conserve and promote heritage conservation.

*Priority:* Medium  
*Responsibility:* Planning, Economic Development  
*Timeline:* Medium term and ongoing
**Action 39:** Consider forming partnerships with local non-profit registered charitable organizations to pursue grants for heritage activity and to offer financial assistance to heritage projects.

*Priority:* Medium  
*Responsibility:* Planning, Economic Development  
*Timeline:* Medium term and ongoing

**Objective 15:** Consider forming a non-profit community foundation to promote, fund and administer heritage activity.

**Action 40:** Examine the feasibility of creating a community foundation that has heritage conservation and interpretation as its mandate. Determine whether a non-profit organization can relieve some of the administrative burden from City staff as well as secure new sources of funding for use on community-based heritage projects. Attract corporate sponsorships via this foundation, and use it as a focus for specific fundraising events. The foundation may also be a vehicle for establishing a revolving fund for acquisition, restoration and re-sale of heritage properties. Address management, funding and reporting issues in the feasibility analysis.

*Priority:* Medium to low  
*Responsibility:* Planning, Economic Development  
*Timeline:* Medium to long term

**Objective 16:** Provide a monitoring system, with measurable targets, for implementing the Heritage Master Plan.

**Action 41:** Establish priorities for implementing the Heritage Master Plan, with short, medium and long term targets. Institute a regular review process for the Master Plan, ideally in tandem with the quinquennial review of the Official Plan.

*Priority:* High  
*Responsibility:* Planning, Economic Development  
*Timeline:* Short term and ongoing

**Action 42:** Identify projects that can be implemented immediately. Secure funding, Council approval and an implementing department or
agency responsible for project management. Monitor the projects once completed (on an annual basis) and learn from the results.

*Priority:* High  
*Responsibility:* Planning, Economic Development  
*Timeline:* Short term and ongoing

**Objective 17:** Integrate the Heritage Master Plan within a municipal and regional cultural master planning process.

**Action 43:** Work with the Arts and Culture Committee of Council to develop a comprehensive approach to fostering the development of arts, culture and heritage in Cambridge, as a municipal response to the Region’s Arts, Culture and Heritage Master Plan.

*Priority:* Medium  
*Responsibility:* Planning, Arts and Culture Committee  
*Timeline:* Medium term

**Action 44:** Link the Heritage Master Plan to current and future municipal and Regional cultural mapping exercises (for creative cities initiatives). The municipal inventory, with its expanded categories of heritage resources, will form a key part of the overall cultural mapping inventory.

*Priority:* Medium  
*Responsibility:* Planning, Regional Municipality, Provincial Ministries of Culture and Tourism  
*Timeline:* Medium term

8.4.5 Economic Development

**Objective 18:** Focus heritage product development on heritage resources within character areas.

**Action 45:** Begin by providing ongoing financial support for existing heritage events, such as Doors Open and Heritage Week but expand into new events that focus on the local heritage resources and historical associations related to each character area. Use the municipal inventory to identify properties within each character area that warrant rehabilitation and development as community facilities and/or heritage tourism products.
**Priority:** High
**Responsibility:** Planning, Economic Development, in consultation with MHAC and local area representatives
**Timeline:** Short term and ongoing

**Objective 19:** Prepare a heritage tourism development strategy for the municipality.

**Action 46:** Address the economic and social potential presented by heritage tourism by preparing a strategy to direct the efforts of the municipality, volunteer groups and the private sector. Specifically identify opportunities for partnerships and joint projects that relieve the municipality of sole responsibility for product development and marketing. Situate the strategy within the Regional strategy for heritage tourism development and work with the Region to assure that Cambridge’s goals are met.

**Priority:** Medium
**Responsibility:** Planning, Economic Development
**Timeline:** Medium term

**Action 47:** Conduct a heritage tourism product readiness assessment for the municipality’s key heritage properties, and encourage private owners of heritage product to do the same. Monitor the results and make available on the City’s database.

**Priority:** Medium
**Responsibility:** Planning, Economic Development
**Timeline:** Medium term

**Action 48:** Foster partnerships that will sustain a local/regional strategy for heritage tourism development. Support current successful partnerships. Create incentives to stimulate the development of new heritage tourism products and experiences and to adaptively reuse historic buildings. As a municipality, demonstrate commitment and capabilities with pilot projects in order to attract potential partners by showing competence and community support.

**Priority:** Medium
**Responsibility:** Planning, Economic Development
**Timeline:** Medium term
Objective 20: Market heritage products.

**Action 49:** Adequate funding for promoting existing heritage resources (e.g. museums) must be made available in the municipal budget. Support the regional efforts to establish a Destination Marketing Organization (DMO) to promote the Grand River region and to create a regional museum. Coordinate efforts by the City and the Provincial Ministry in promoting heritage tourism and demonstrating economic benefits to Council.

*Priority:* High  
*Responsibility:* Economic Development and the Regional DMO  
*Timeline:* Short term and ongoing

**Action 50:** Assess the effectiveness of and monitor all types of marketing activities. In addition to the standard measure of return on investment, other measures should include such indicators as changes in awareness, changes in interest, and visitor satisfaction. The key measurement is change. Ideally, the change should be measured in a quantitative and statistically sound manner.

*Priority:* High  
*Responsibility:* Economic Development and the Regional DMO  
*Timeline:* Short term and ongoing

Objective 21: Secure funding for heritage activity.

**Action 51:** Use municipal incentives to stimulate heritage-friendly development. Consider dedicating a percentage of the funds collected from building demolition permits to the conservation and enhancement of heritage structures. Encourage private investment in heritage property by providing clear guidelines for redevelopment of heritage properties and by streamlining the development approval process for such properties.

*Priority:* Medium  
*Responsibility:* Planning, Economic Development  
*Timeline:* Medium term and ongoing

**Action 52:** Invest municipal infrastructure funds on City-owned heritage properties. Leverage funds from other public sources by targeting municipal infrastructure upgrade funds to heritage areas/districts (e.g. the
downtown). Dedicate portions of existing local and regional tourism marketing budgets to promoting both existing heritage resources and raising heritage awareness within the community.

*Priority:* Medium

*Responsibility:* Planning, Public Works, Economic Development

*Timeline:* Medium term and ongoing

**Action 53:** Consider creating an endowment fund for heritage conservation through a community non-profit heritage foundation. Attract corporate sponsorships via this foundation, and use it as a focus for specific fundraising events. Consider using the foundation to establish a revolving fund for acquisition, restoration and re-sale of heritage properties.

*Priority:* Medium

*Responsibility:* Planning, Economic Development

*Timeline:* Medium term and ongoing

**Action 54:** Use any available Provincial incentive programs, such as property tax reductions in return for conservation easements, to support heritage conservation. Create eligible projects that revitalize communities as well as conserve heritage resources.

*Priority:* Medium to low

*Responsibility:* Planning, Economic Development

*Timeline:* Medium term and ongoing

**Action 55:** Provide fee-for-service research (e.g. genealogy).

*Priority:* Medium to low

*Responsibility:* Planning, City Clerk (Archives)

*Timeline:* Medium term

**Action 56:** Look outside of public agencies for other sources of funding, such as the Casino Community Cares program, individual donors, local charities, and corporations operating within the region.

*Priority:* Medium

*Responsibility:* Planning, Economic Development

*Timeline:* Medium term
Objective 22: Monitor heritage tourism activity in the city to determine market trends and identify local and regional economic benefits.

**Action 57:** Initiate an annual voluntary heritage business monitor providing businesses with simple questionnaires to complete and return – including fill in the blank questions covering number of paid visitors, free visitors, visitor origins percentages (local, regional, international). Monitor the introduction of new heritage businesses/facilities/packages and their success. Conduct visitor surveys, or require visitor surveys (to an established format) for all supported heritage events. Initiate an accommodation monitor requesting accommodation operators to submit an annual report on the value of heritage attractions and events to their business (qualitative assessment).

*Priority:* Medium  
*Responsibility:* Planning, Economic Development  
*Timeline:* Medium term

8.4.6 Community Support

Objective 23: Promote heritage awareness throughout the community, and especially in the business sector.

**Action 58:** Define heritage in clear terms that the general public can understand. In the Official Plan, as well as in City publications, define heritage so that it includes a full range of heritage resources, including modest ones that relate to everyday life in the City’s downtown and neighbourhoods.

*Priority:* Medium  
*Responsibility:* Planning  
*Timeline:* Medium term and ongoing

**Action 59:** Bolster an informed debate on local and regional heritage. Begin with the existing newspaper column (Landmarks), expand to business person’s working breakfasts, the local schools curricula, lecture series, symposia, annual theme-based conferences, and municipal webpage topic links. Consider using devices such as an “endangered species
list” of heritage resources under threat from neglect or change to alert the public and direct civic action.

Priority: Medium
Responsibility: Planning
Timeline: Medium term and ongoing

**Action 60:** Make heritage relevant to everyday life in Cambridge. Organize home and garden tours (as spinoffs from Doors Open), cemetery tours, supervised archaeological digs, and walking tours throughout the city. Collect oral histories and family records and mount regular exhibits of these. Promote heritage activity through awards programs.

Priority: Medium
Responsibility: Planning, Economic Development, MHAC
Timeline: Medium term and ongoing

8.5 Priority Projects and Time Line

These objectives and their component actions provide detailed responses to the strategies outlined for each of the five principles of this Master Plan (outlined in 8.3, above). Now it is necessary to set priorities for these objectives and actions and establish an implementation timeline so that effort can be focused on the most pressing items and the most immediate concerns. The following action plan steps are arranged in order of priority, within each of the five categories of Master Plan principles, and in two time periods: years 1-5, and years 5-10. Note that Principle #2, Set Modest Goals, is the over-riding principle guiding the implementation process.

*Priorities and Timeline*

**YEARS 1-5**

**FOCUS ON CHARACTER AREAS**

- Conduct a windshield survey of the character areas, identifying preliminary boundaries and character defining elements.
- Within each character area, prepare a preliminary list of properties worthy of further investigation, including properties
and/or areas that are under high redevelopment pressure. Examples include downtown Galt and Hespeler, and Blue Heron Drive in Preston.

- Focus additions to the inventory on character areas, starting with Hespeler (in that instance, ideally within a Heritage Conservation District Study).
- As part of the inventory process, develop, test and refine an improved inventory and evaluation template.
- Within the updated Official Plan, designate all character areas as areas of further study, such as Special Policy Areas.

USE EDUCATION AS ADVOCACY

- Conduct a series of community workshops in each character area, to reach consensus on local character and to build awareness of and support for heritage conservation.
- Develop oral history projects in local public and high schools.
- Update and reprint the Heritage Cambridge walking/driving tours, for wide distribution.
- Continue the “Landmarks” series in the local newspaper.
- Support and enhance heritage-related events, such as Riverfest and Doors Open.
- Partner with the University of Waterloo and rare to sponsor annual symposia on sustainable development, with a component involving conservation of cultural heritage resources.
- Begin a public campaign to encourage people to donate artifacts, photos and documents to the Cambridge section of the regional museum/Cambridge Archives.

PROMOTE HERITAGE-FRIENDLY DEVELOPMENT

- Initiate discussions regarding renovation and revitalization of heritage buildings in floodplains with the Provincial Ministries, the GRCA and property owners.
- Prepare a presentation of compatible infill projects in Cambridge, for meetings with area interest groups, and to have as a package for developers, as part of the Planning and Building Departments’ development review process.
- Initiate workshops with private landowners regarding heritage-friendly development, and use the University of Waterloo’s
“Lazarus Effect” document as a starting point for discussions of best practices.

- Begin to prepare urban design plans for each downtown character area, starting with Galt (as the downtown under the most development pressure).
- Dedicate funding to heritage-supportive projects, for example, enhanced grants for façade restoration in character areas.
- Initiate pilot projects of heritage-friendly development.
- In Preston, work with the owners of former spa hotel to acquire funding to complete the renovation and provide a demonstration project of heritage conservation.

MAKE PARTNERSHIPS WORK

- In Galt, develop a downtown walking tour (e.g. a “Spirit Walk”) as a partnership between the City (Archives, Planning) and Heritage Cambridge.
- Have the City and Heritage Cambridge co-sponsor the proposed character area workshops.
- Have CARAC and the BIAs co-sponsor downtown revitalization workshops, in partnership with the City, the community college, the University of Waterloo architecture and planning schools, as well as local branches of the Canadian Homebuilders Association and the renovators association.
- Prepare an annual review of all initial projects, judging success using the criteria of the Heritage Master Plan principles, objectives, and action plan steps (see below).
- Forge marketing partnerships with regional municipalities for Grand River region cultural heritage resources and products.
- Use a pilot project (e.g. the river confluence interpretive development proposed by Legacy Cambridge) as a way to develop partnerships between environmental and heritage groups.
YEARS 5-10

FOCUS ON CHARACTER AREAS
- Complete the inventory of character areas, and recognize each using appropriate planning tools, such as Heritage Conservation Districts.
- Complete urban design plans for all downtown character areas in order to guide intensification.
- Using the guidelines from the urban design plans, undertake improvements to the public realm in all downtown character areas.

USE EDUCATION AS ADVOCACY
- Plan and develop the Cambridge history section of the new regional museum, with artifacts acquired as a result of the public search campaign.
- Develop a city-wide interpretation master plan, based on the Heritage Master Plan thematic history.

PROMOTE HERITAGE-FRIENDLY DEVELOPMENT
- Establish a City-wide architectural and urban design review board.
- Foster an annual urban design awards program.

MAKE PARTNERSHIPS WORK
- Create a cultural tourism corridor along the Grand River, in partnership with the Region and its component municipalities.

Measures of Success

In general, the measures of success are the degree to which Heritage Master Plan objectives and action plan recommendations have been achieved. Specific indicators of achievement can include, but not be restricted to:
- Number of properties listed and designated under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act;
• Number of character areas studied for potential designation under Part V of the *Ontario Heritage Act*; number of such studies that resulted in Heritage Conservation District Plans, and adopted designating by-laws;
• Number and range of cultural tourism products developed;
• Percentage increase in bed nights/tourism visitation levels;
• Number and type of new businesses attracted to downtown character areas;
• Integration of Heritage Master Plan recommendations in the updated Official Plan and Zoning By-law, and in the City’s response to “Places to Grow”;
• Attendance levels at heritage-related workshops and degree of public participation and support expressed for Heritage Master Plan recommendations;
• Percentage increase in volunteerism for heritage-related projects and groups;
• Emergence of new community partnerships for heritage-related projects;
• Percentage increase in public and private sector investment in downtown character areas, and;
• Percentage increase in downtown character area resident and business population.
APPENDICES
Appendix A: Assessment of Current Situation

1. OVERVIEW OF HERITAGE RESOURCES

1.1 ADDRESSING IDENTIFIED RESOURCES

The current inventory is a good example of a list of built heritage resources prepared by a local architectural advisory committee. In our comparison analysis, Cambridge’s heritage inventory is consistent with best practices and is a good example of a municipal inventory. For a research base, it makes good use of published local histories (e.g. McLaughlin) and consultant reports (e.g. Dilse) as well as the often-extensive information available in the individual property files. It has also benefited from the articles prepared by the Heritage Planner and MHAC – the “Landmarks” series – that features histories of individual buildings in Cambridge. As with most such inventories prepared before the recent Heritage Act and its accompanying guidelines for inventory preparation, the Cambridge inventory emphasizes buildings and tends not to address industrial heritage, cultural landscapes, streetscapes, urban districts or archaeological sites. It is focussed on residential and commercial properties and has only some industrial and institutional buildings. Many of the listings are in Galt because of the high proportion of significant older buildings found in that community. However, the result is that less attention has been paid to the other communities and rural areas within the amalgamated municipality. The exception is Blair, a Heritage Conservation District.

What emerges from the inventory and from subsequent responses from local residents is a disconnect between the focus on individual heritage resources found in the City’s inventory and the more holistic understanding of the physical setting expressed in public comments. However, the city as commonly experienced is greater than the sum of its parts. If heritage conservation is to be successful, it should address the whole as well as the components. There is little consensus on what is of heritage value. To some it is individual buildings, to others it is districts, neighbourhoods and their integral natural areas, and to others, it is all of these and more. The inevitable result has been different priorities for the future.
The inventory is currently composed of designated properties (Part IV or V of the *Ontario Heritage Act*) and properties that may warrant designation. As noted previously, the broader spectrum of heritage resources that offer opportunities for cultural tourism development have not been identified, such as Cambridge’s strong industrial heritage. Intangible heritage resources, such as traditional events and the contents of oral histories, could be also be identified. Whereas it is not necessary for these types of heritage resources to all find a place in the inventory, it is important to discuss them in the context of the Heritage Master Plan.

For example, other cultural heritage resources from the City’s past include the McDougall Cottage, a house museum operated by the Region, and artifacts displayed at the Doon Heritage Crossroads museum in Kitchener. There is also an extensive text and photographic record in the City archives, displays at the local library and galleries, and a lively amateur theatre scene, located in such venues as the Cambridge Centre for the Arts.

Such aspects of local heritage are largely outside the mandate of the Heritage Master Plan. Arts and cultural policy is largely the responsibility of the Arts and Culture Committee of Council. In order to address the heritage aspects of local arts and culture, this Committee should be directed to consider a comprehensive approach to arts, culture and heritage, in concert with the Regional plan for same, for subsequent integration with the Heritage Master Plan. In this vein, comments received so far on the Region’s Arts, Heritage and Culture Master Plan indicated that, while it is a useful synopsis of regional heritage activity, it lacks detail and is its recommendations are too general for it to have direct application to Cambridge.

As for cultural tourism opportunities stemming from local heritage resources, the preliminary analysis (August 2006) shows that there is considerable potential for reaping economic benefit from heritage conservation and heritage-related activities. It is true that the assets of riverfront, historic buildings and attractive rural areas exist and are valued locally, but more could be done to develop them effectively as an
overall package of experiences capable of attracting significant numbers of visitors. Cambridge, in common with many other communities, has special qualities that remain hidden.

For tourists as well as business travellers and potential new residents and investors, improvements to the physical setting would be an immediate enhancement to the way in which Cambridge is perceived. From such simple things as better maintenance of downtown streets and riverside parks to higher standards of urban design for new construction, an upgraded setting is an important goal, providing tangible evidence of local pride of place. There is much more that can be done to enhance the city and to co-ordinate the individual parts into a compelling visitor experience across the entire community. Some of this can come through improved interpretation of the city’s industrial history, as told through the eyes of local residents. A good example of this is the Company of Neighbours project in the former village of Hespeler; similar efforts in the other parts of Cambridge could offer a major attraction, if co-ordinated and jointly promoted.

On a broader scale, there is an opportunity to develop a compelling regional cultural tourism package emphasizing the natural and cultural features of the Grand River. Several excellent examples of this in the United States and the UK show the many benefits of this regional approach. The Grand already has the cachet of a Canadian Heritage River and has an excellent Master Plan that integrates tourism with conservation (the “Grand Strategy”). According to our interview respondents, Cambridge is not enough of a tourist attraction on its own: it needs to be tied to a series of attractions throughout a region that is naturally defined by the Grand River watershed. Cambridge could develop its unique assets best if they were seen as part of this bigger offering. A prime example of how this process could work is the “Grand River Country” marketing initiative, an excellent first step in packaging the region as a whole while highlighting the individual parts, all of this bound together by the river.
1.3 CONCLUSIONS (HERITAGE RESOURCES)

THE CURRENT INVENTORY:

- compares well to other municipal heritage inventories in comparable jurisdictions;

- is successful in incorporating a large number of buildings;

- has a majority of properties accompanied by research prepared by the heritage planner;

- should expand its scope to include buildings from Hespeler and Preston;

- needs to be made consistent in levels of research and detail, in concert with the requirements of the Ontario Heritage Tool Kit;

- could include a broader range of heritage resources such as industrial heritage, cultural landscapes and oral histories, and be linked to strategic plans for museums, galleries, arts and cultural services (archaeological sites are currently being handled in a regional archaeological Master Plan);

- has a listing process that is onerous and probably not sustainable; help is needed to check current listings.

2. OVERVIEW OF HERITAGE ACTIVITY

2.1 HERITAGE POLICIES

One of the goals of the Heritage Master Plan is to provide the City with recommendations for new policy text to be included in the review of the City’s Official Plan. From the initial review of the current Plan (January 2004 consolidation), the study team is pleased to find that the City’s Official Plan is a very good example of a municipal planning document
in which heritage conservation policies are found throughout. The team is impressed by the ways in which the Plan incorporates heritage aspects in sections on land use, economic development, transportation, social and natural environment. The definitions of built heritage resources and cultural heritage resources are inclusive enough that, when combined, they cover all types of heritage resources, both immovable and movable, and including such intangible aspects of local life as cultural practices. The Plan text is clear and complete and the policies linked together so that the various aspects of urban planning work synergistically. Overall, it is an impressive document.

The issue with the current Official Plan appears to be one of implementation. There are a host of excellent policies in the current Plan that, if fully followed, would address many of the heritage-related issues the study has identified in Cambridge so far. Other related planning documents will also need to be assessed, especially the Province’s “Places to Grow” initiative and the resultant “Growth Plan” for the urban areas around Toronto. The Province’s growth targets for Cambridge are high and will require ingenuity in accommodating the anticipated development within the existing urban areas. Of particular concern is the potential effect of such intensification on the historic downtowns of the component communities. As noted in other planning reports for these downtowns, what potential that does exist for expansion is confined to relatively few sites due to issues of floodplain, lack of stable geological conditions, paucity of vacant land and the difficulties of successfully rehabilitating upper floors of existing commercial buildings. The related issues of parking, access and improvements to the public streetscape must also be addressed.

### 2.2 Heritage Procedures

#### Current Inventory Process

The inventory process is largely driven by MHAC and the Heritage Planner; it is they who often suggest properties for inclusion. Property owners sometimes request that their buildings be listed, but otherwise the City does not advise owners if their property is included on the list, or if the City intends to include it. However, Council endorsement of a
property’s inclusion does have financial and administrative consequences in that a development application for a listed property currently triggers a requirement for the property owner to complete a Heritage Impact Assessment. Best conservation practices would suggest that a letter be sent to property owners notifying them of their property being listed, and including information on the implications (especially the benefits) of inclusion on the list. Deputations from property owners on listings could be heard at MHAC.

There is no standardized template used for recording property information; some properties are well-researched, some are essentially thumbnail sketches (e.g. property descriptions taken from the 1981 Dilse report). In 1991, a summer student was hired to research 30 properties and the results were of high quality; unfortunately, the City has not been able to continue to hire summer students to complete and update this work. The heritage planner can vouch for the quality of research in the 300 to 400 listings she has prepared, but not for the remainder of the 800 listings. As a result, all 800 listings should be revisited to update the entries and ensure a consistent quality and type of information. This may not be identified as an urgent priority but could be undertaken on an individual as-needed basis. The higher priority would be to direct resources to consideration of properties not currently assessed. There has been an ongoing problem in obtaining consistently high quality inventory information, especially when volunteers or student groups are asked to contribute research and complete the listing. In the end, the heritage planner needed to closely monitor any such work and, in some cases, redo it completely.

2.2.1 ASSESSMENT OF THE CURRENT INVENTORY

According to the heritage planner, the current inventory began in the late 1980s as a list that had three categories: “designated”, “priority”, and “other”. The latter category included buildings on which some research had been completed. Some of the entries used research that had been prepared as far back as the 1970s. The inventory was consolidated in the 1990s and buildings on the list were researched. Council adopted the consolidated inventory during that decade.
From our review and from conversations with City staff, it is evident that the current inventory was never intended to be a comprehensive list of all heritage resources in Cambridge. If it were to be so, then it would be a much larger list, with well over 3,000 properties. Attempts by MHAC to expand the list by inventorying each ward were rejected by Council, as were suggestions to include all buildings within the City. At issue here were the time, effort and cost required both to do the inventory and to administer the resultant list.

Keeping in mind that an inventory is essentially an ongoing process rather than a finite goal (i.e. it is never finished), improvements to the inventory process are needed. The study team recommends that the emphasis in future should be on new listings rather than on attempts to revise previous listings and designations, a task that can be undertaken over time. This will keep the momentum going on the task of identifying other heritage resources.

There are three Heritage Conservation Districts in Cambridge: a downtown core; portions of a residential neighbourhood, and; an entire village. The Dickson Hill Conservation District illustrates very well some of the key issues related to municipal heritage conservation. The municipality’s support for designation of this significant historic residential neighbourhood was only partially endorsed by the community and in fact in the end only the public lands – principally the street rights-of-way – were designated. All the private residential property was excluded from the designation. While the district designation shows a high level of support for the process municipally it also indicates a low level of consensus regarding an understood value for the process within the very community the process is intended to serve.

The study team’s approach to the issue of identifying potential Heritage Conservation Districts has been to look more broadly at the community and identify what can be called “character areas”. These are clusters of heritage resources, some of which may merit either individual or district designation. The team has identified these clusters through a combination of research using existing studies and local histories, Provincial criteria, and site investigation. Identification of such areas is just the first step: There needs to be further study to identify area boundaries and the local community must not only be consulted but engaged in order to provide
solid support for any future conservation policies. These could include
district designation but also Part IV site-specific designation, Community
Improvement Plans, Business Improvement Areas, heritage overlay
zoning, or special policy areas in the Official Plan.

From the study team’s experience, it is evident that Heritage
Conservation Districts must be community driven and cannot be imposed
by the municipality. The planning and designation process described in
the Ontario Ministry of Culture’s “Ontario Heritage Tool Kit” supports
this assertion and also gives very clear direction for identifying potential
districts. One way to engage the community is to hold information
workshops in areas identified as having potential for district designation
(either by the municipality or by community groups) to explore area
character and discuss designation as a potential policy tool to conserve
that character.

2.2.2 CURRENT DESIGNATION PROCESS

As is the case in other municipalities, the City’s designation process
follows the requirements of the Ontario Heritage Act. Properties are
suggested for designation by their owners, by Heritage Cambridge or by
MHAC. In most cases, the heritage planner provides the research
required to satisfy the Heritage Act “reasons for designation”, and this
research also appears in her “Landmarks” series in the local newspaper.

MHAC’s primary role is that of a review body. Its members are
volunteers, many of whom have been encouraged by the heritage planner
to serve on this committee. The committee is an advisory committee of
Council, as specified in the Ontario Heritage Act. It meets once a month
and can have special meetings, if necessary. A typical agenda would
include reports from the heritage planner regarding designations, listings,
signage, funding, Heritage Impact Assessments, and consulting contracts
(the heritage planner prepares approximately 35 reports per year, on
average).

The process avoids ‘hostile designations’ (i.e. instances where the owner
is opposed to designation). In the few cases where the City has pursued a
designation despite owner objections, the City has been successful. The
Ontario Heritage Act anticipates that municipalities may be required to propose designations which are opposed by property owners. In the case of heritage conservation districts, the Dickson Hill case is an example of a designation process that was halted at a late stage by latent community opposition; however, the City went ahead with designation of public lands within the proposed district boundary.

Because designation of property involves legal obligations on the part of the property owner, it has been a source of controversy. Proposals for designation have sparked debate on heritage values and priorities in the future development of the city. This situation is inevitable in a city so rich in heritage resources, and it is a goal of this Heritage Master Plan to make the designation process into the culmination of a community-wide initiative to recognize valued aspects of the city’s past. Rather than being the starting point for debate, it should be the result. Potential sticking points such as the time and cost of registering designated properties on title can be addressed, for example, by the municipality assuming responsibility for registration of all properties within a Heritage Conservation District. If discussions of potential designation can include a broad range of heritage resources rather than individual buildings, then the opportunities for community involvement in the debate increase, and the chances for success improve.

2.2.3 ASSESSMENT OF CURRENT HERITAGE ADMINISTRATION PROCESS

The heritage planner is the staff person primarily responsible for heritage policy and administration within the City’s organizational structure. She is the primary staff liaison with MHAC. The reporting process for MHAC material is as follows: reports to MHAC are prepared by the heritage planner, reviewed by the Director of Policy Planning and signed by the Commissioner of Planning Services. Agenda face sheets for each MHAC meeting are sent to the City’s Management Committee. These face sheets contain only the recommendations to MHAC, not the full report. MHAC only sends certain reports on to Council once the Committee has made its recommendations, including recommendations regarding designations. As for heritage funding, the Commissioner of Planning Services approves monies for the City’s Heritage Grant programme. Comments from MHAC on other heritage-related matters, such as Heritage Impact Assessments, are included in other reports.
prepared by Planning Services staff (e.g. plans of subdivision or Committee of Adjustment applications).

The heritage planner also deals with other public agencies and the general public. The Planning Commissioner handles media relations. At present, the heritage planner is not a member of any other Council Committee (e.g. the Committee of Adjustment). The heritage planner does not currently attend meetings of the Tourism Committee or the committees for each of the three Business Improvement Areas in the municipality. However, she is routinely circulated on all relevant development applications from each Committee. Planners from other branches of the Planning Department also have the discretion to consult with her on any heritage-related planning matter, such as a property on the inventory that is affected by a development application.

The heritage planner’s role is currently somewhat problematic. On the one hand, the job involves research and heritage policymaking. On the other hand, however, the ongoing liaison with MHAC blossoms into a wide variety of administrative tasks, not all of which make best use of the planner’s professional training. Administrative staff support is needed. In addition, there could be better integration of heritage policy planning with both the policy planning and development planning functions of the Planning Services department. Using the policies in the existing Official Plan would provide a good basis for bringing an awareness of heritage conservation issues into the municipality’s ongoing planning process. Underlying this issue is an assumption that “anyone” can be a heritage planner, unlike the case with more clearly defined technical professions such as engineers, architects or environmental scientists. Too often, heritage matters are viewed as issues of aesthetics and, thus, of personal taste.

The current requirements for Heritage Impact Assessments (HIAs) are seen to be onerous by both the municipal staff and the general public. Properties on the City’s inventory require an HIA for development applications that result in proposed changes to the property. This also applies to adjacent properties to those on the list. MHAC and staff review HIAs and this is a great stress on both staff and volunteer time and resources. In addition, preparation of an HIA requires the services of a professional heritage consultant and thus entails added costs to property
owners. The current situation is one in which an average of eight HIAs are submitted annually, and this is more than staff and MHAC can handle.

There are ways to improve this situation. The current HIA process can be made much less onerous if it is confined to key resources. As well, best practices in cities such as Toronto and Ottawa have much of the review of development applications affecting heritage resources being delegated to municipal heritage staff. In these municipalities, HIAs are only required for planning approvals but not for building permit applications. MHAC only reviews those planning applications (with their HIAs) that are major in nature and/or that staff feels will negatively impact a heritage resource. Such administrative processes significantly reduce workload for staff and volunteers. Also useful would be external review of HIAs by a qualified review panel, using clear evaluation criteria. This review should also be used in concert with urban design plans for the city’s character areas, where guidelines for conservation and development can be area-wide in scope and provide sufficient context for assessment of impact. In this way, the HIA process (with urban design guidelines) can be a forerunner to designation, identifying a range of heritage resources and making preliminary assessments of heritage significance.

2.3 RELATED POLICY AND PROGRAM DOCUMENTS

Several other plans prepared by public or non-profit agencies impact heritage activity in Cambridge. The Grand River Conservation Authority’s master plan – “the Grand Strategy” – is a very good overall conservation policy for the Canadian Heritage River, and follows closely the federal requirements to support that designation. While it does not offer much detail on cultural heritage resource conservation, its value lies in its comprehensive approach to conserving, enhancing and interpreting the Grand River system. The Region’s Arts, Culture and Heritage Master Plan (reviewed above) is also a good step towards identifying heritage resources and outlining improved forms of resource management. The cultural landscape study undertaken by the Region offers policies and procedures for the listing and protection of areas containing a wide variety of heritage resources.
Funding is always an issue in communities seeking to conserve and develop heritage resources. Aside from museum assistance grants, neither the Province nor the federal government have any programs at present that offer financial support for heritage buildings; money comes to individual development projects. This funding vacuum leaves municipalities to develop their own financial incentives. While the Region, for example, will fund infrastructure projects that impact heritage areas, such as Queen’s Square and the bridges leading into it, there is limited funding available for capital and operating budgets related to heritage resources. Through regional organizations, such as the Waterloo Regional Heritage Foundation, there is funding for studies, publications and professional assessments of heritage resources, with some funds provided for capital works, based on that assessment. In the past, Heritage Cambridge has been able to fund production of guidebooks for heritage resources, as part of “Project 75”, for example. This group and the municipalities have also sponsored heritage-related events, such as Heritage Day, Doors Open, and topic-based workshops with visiting speakers. The City of Cambridge currently offers financial assistance to owners of designated heritage structures. Through its operating budget, the City has a Heritage Grant Programme that provides owners who apply and are eligible grants of up to one half the cost of work undertaken to conserve heritage elements of a building, up to a maximum of $3,000 per calendar year.

2.4 OUTSIDE RELATIONSHIPS

Heritage Cambridge is the most prominent non-mandated group promoting heritage activity in Cambridge. It is a branch of the Architectural Conservancy of Ontario and, as such, is mandated to promote heritage conservation, primarily by providing information. In the past, Heritage Cambridge has been very successful in producing documents such as driving and walking tours of Galt, Hespeler and Preston. As confirmed by staff of the Architectural Conservancy, Heritage Cambridge’s main role is in outreach and education. Aside from publications, this type of activity includes the annual Doors Open and Heritage Day showcase events. However, in recent years, Heritage Cambridge has found itself in the role of advocate for heritage conservation, both in promoting strategic planning for heritage (such as the “Legacy Cambridge” project) and in the protection of individual
Community outreach is one area the municipality is exploring. The City communicates on heritage matters via the media, in the City page in the local newspaper, through contributions to the GRCA Grand Strategy newsletter, and through the heritage planner’s role on the GRCA Heritage Working Group. However, the City lacks a media relations function within its organizational structure. Direct contact with the media on heritage matters is the responsibility of the Planning Commissioner; staff refer all inquiries to her. While the City contributes to community outreach through the Landmarks series in the local newspaper and participation in Doors Open and Heritage Day events, it has no advocacy strategy for heritage. Heritage Cambridge is the primary advocacy group.

2.5 COMPARABLES

As is shown in the accompanying chart (Section 2.7), Cambridge compares relatively well with other communities in terms of their procedures for dealing with heritage resources. It shares many of the same problems of heritage resource management, and of promoting heritage conservation, faced by other Ontario municipalities. It is so rich in heritage resources that these tasks are a major, ongoing challenge, one the City has been partially successful in meeting. Comparisons with other municipalities should be seen in this context. It is evident from the attached chart that there are a wide variety of municipal approaches to heritage activity in terms of staff, policy, and funding. Markham, for example, has a large heritage staff and comprehensive heritage inventory, and allocates substantial funds for maintaining heritage resources. This is especially significant because the municipality has relatively few heritage resources when compared to Cambridge. Similarly, the City of Toronto has a large and experienced heritage section within the municipal organization, and heritage staff have a large amount of delegated authority with which to address heritage matters. By contrast, a community as well known for its heritage resources as St. Jacob’s has no municipal heritage planner, no heritage advisory committee, no active registry and relies instead on the Region for heritage planning.
Most similar to Cambridge are London and Peterborough. City staff in London have a longstanding working relationship with their municipal heritage advisory committee and rely on it, through sub-committees, to monitor the register of heritage resources, research and prepare statements of significance for designations, and review recommendations for designation. Listing is a joint effort of planning staff and the advisory committee. In Peterborough, the heritage planning section was created several years ago within the Community Services Department and has an informal relationship with the Planning Department on such things as approvals of non-registered properties, but reviews all applications affecting registered heritage buildings. The City has delegated authority to staff for approval of alterations, to the heritage committee for approval of partial demolition or additions, and to Council for demolitions. The City has made extensive use of municipal interns to research and evaluate properties, using criteria provided by the heritage committee. The study team sees this as a viable strategy: rather than increasing staff, make better use of volunteers, students and outside professional advice.

2.6 CONCLUSIONS (HERITAGE ACTIVITY)

Although there are a number of issues to be resolved with the way in which heritage activity takes place in Cambridge, the City is fortunate to have a solid base of support for some common conservation objectives. Comments made in interviews and on survey forms indicate an understanding of the importance of the rivers as a defining characteristic of Cambridge and, stemming from this value, a respect for the older buildings and landscapes that humans have placed alongside those watercourses. There is tremendous community pride here, especially evident in the component communities of Galt, Preston, Hespeler and Blair. We have also found links to the agricultural past and the ethnic origins of original and later settlers to be of great importance to local residents. A hidden source of pride in all communities is the industrial past, with Hespeler beginning to recognize this legacy. We feel that recognition of the city’s industrial history is one of the key components of any conservation and revitalization effort.

Articulating that pride and putting it to effective use is the main challenge of this Heritage Master Plan. Over the years a confrontational relationship between heritage advocates and Council has slowed efforts
to achieve a common approach to heritage and thus move heritage initiatives forward. The Master Plan cannot resolve this conflict, but it can make suggestions and recommendations on ways in which heritage is managed in Cambridge and develop objectives and an action plan that can serve as catalysts for constructive, collective initiatives. We suggest, that a focus on shared values will be the key to reaching consensus. Discussions with the steering committee helped us craft strategies for improving heritage activity and identifying projects that can have demonstrable benefits. Our thoughts on the current situation are summarized below.

2.6.1 THE CURRENT STATE OF HERITAGE ACTIVITY:

- is based on good heritage policies in the Official Plan;

- has administrative and policy support from the staff heritage planner;

- has some policy support from other levels of government and other public agencies;

- is a situation in which the heritage planner currently has many administrative tasks and is less able to concentrate on core tasks related to heritage planning and implementation, and could benefit from better integration of heritage planning within the procedures of the City administration as a whole;

- has administrative procedures (such as the HIA process) that are onerous on staff, volunteers and the public;

- is problematic due to conflict between heritage advocates (primarily Heritage Cambridge) and Council.

Key messages for the steering committee (and Council) include:

- The current inventory compares well to those of other municipalities.
• The inventory can be improved by looking at a broader range of heritage resources, and a larger scale than the individual properties, but this doesn’t necessarily involve hiring more City staff.

• There is a great opportunity to interpret industrial history and to link this with conservation of the river system.

• If the municipality wants to showcase heritage in Cambridge, it has to be co-ordinated with regional initiatives (i.e. Cambridge is not a destination on its own) within the Grand River watershed.

• Cambridge has a long and successful history of promoting cultural tourism.

• Oral histories and other accounts from local residents are an important source of information and community support for heritage conservation.

• The municipality cannot get to the economic benefits of heritage without first conserving, enhancing and promoting/packaging heritage resources.

• Provincial growth strategies applied to Cambridge will have to address constraints posed by the compact downtown urban form, the floodplain and geological conditions.

• Identifying character areas within Cambridge, especially through community consultation, can be one of many tools used to protect historic districts.

• The current designation process can be improved to become the culmination of a community-wide exploration of heritage values.

• Inventory and designation processes can be the means of articulating a vision of shared heritage values.

• In order to facilitate this process, heritage planning should be more fully integrated within the City’s policymaking process.
- The focus of the inventory and of heritage activity should shift to the wider context of street, neighbourhood, and community, away from individual structures.

- Cambridge shares with most other Ontario municipalities the problems of finding the right ways to deal with heritage resources, and is doing quite well by comparison.

### 2.7: COMPARABLE CHART

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAMBRIDGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Heritage Policies</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Heritage Procedures</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Inventory:** compiled by the heritage planner and MHAC, includes approximately 800 listings, approximately half of which researched by heritage planner, the rest by MHAC or students. All listings are “properties of interest”; some of these are designated properties: all additions to the inventory are by Council resolution. Properties are added by the heritage planner in consultation with MHAC. No standard template.

**Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC):** up to 9 volunteers and one Councillor, meets monthly, advises Council on the heritage inventory, designation, signage, funding, Heritage Impact Assessments, and consulting contracts for heritage-related studies. Also provides information to public on heritage conservation via its research library. City’s heritage planner advises MHAC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Heritage Administration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff:</strong> One full time heritage planner, no administrative support. <strong>Responsibilities:</strong> • Reviews development applications for listed and designated properties • Informally works with policy and development planners to review policy, development application involving heritage resources • Prepares research, SOS, and reports to MHAC for listed and designated properties • Reviews inventory listings prepared by volunteers • Reviews HIAs • Liaises with and advises other City departments, outside groups and agencies, and the general public, on heritage matters • Coordinates consultants on heritage studies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Related Policy + Program Documents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Heritage Grant Programme:</strong> from City’s Operating Budget, grants to eligible applicants up to half the cost of conservation work on designated heritage properties, up to $3,000/year. <strong>Waterloo Regional Heritage Foundation:</strong> funds studies and publications, professional assessments and some conservation work, based on these assessments. <strong>Grand Strategy:</strong> primary policy document</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
governing conservation and enhancement of all types of heritage resources within this National Heritage River. **Regional Arts, Culture and Heritage Master Plan:** strategic planning document governing regional initiatives, co-ordinated efforts with area municipalities. Also important are the Region’s **Archaeological Master Plan** (now being updated) and recent initiatives on cultural heritage landscape inventory and evaluation. **Rare master plan:** overall conservation policy for non-profit conservation foundation with extensive landholdings in Cambridge.

| Outside Relationships | **Heritage Cambridge:** branch of the ACO; mandate to provide education on heritage conservation, increasingly in advocacy role. Has been instrumental in compiling information (e.g. driving/walking tours) and assisting with strategic planning (e.g. Legacy Cambridge). **GRCA Heritage Working Group:** City’s heritage planner is a member and contributes to newsletter. **Area museums and galleries:** McDougall Cottage is a house museum in Cambridge owned and administered by the Region; similarly, Doon Crossroads Pioneer Village is a Regionally-owned museum containing many Cambridge artifacts. City archives, library and UofW Architecture School all have extensive heritage resource collections and mount exhibitions and displays. Galleries and amateur theatre also present. Grand River a federally designated river but administered by regional conservation authority. |

**MARKHAM**

| Heritage Policies | **Section 2 - General Policies, Section 2.5 - Heritage Conservation** |
| Heritage Procedures | **Designation:** designation is generally a condition of development applications, but may be initiated |
by a property owner by contacting staff or heritage markham member

**Heritage Easements:** obtained through development agreements, gives the Town legal interest in the preservation of a property

**Heritage Inventory:** compiled by the Town and all development or building permit applications are reviewed by Heritage Markham as part of the Town's regular approval process. Purpose is to provide a complete record of current stock of buildings of interest to aid Council, Heritage Markham and Town staff in decision-making.

**Heritage Markham:** ten community reps and 3 Councillors, advise Town on designation, alteration or demolition of heritage buildings, also involved in archaeological resources, new construction in HCDs and generally promotion heritage conservation initiatives.

| **Heritage Administration** | **Staff:** Heritage planning section consists of a Manager of Heritage Planning, Senior Heritage Planner, Heritage Planner + shared administrative staff  
**Responsibilities:** • To coordinate + implement the Town's activities + policies involving HCDs, individual heritage sites, and Heritage Estates Subdivision.  
• Process all development applications in HCDs and provide technical assistance to Heritage Markham (LACAC)  
• Public out reach, to provide assistance to heritage property owners by answering questions, providing information on restoration techniques, and assisting with application for financial assistance,  
• review of all development applications for heritage issues, should issues be identified a report is submitted for the opinion of Heritage Markham and reported to the Planning dept., minutes of proceedings are adopted by Council  
• develop policies and programmes in support of the Town's heritage conservation efforts |
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### Related Policy + Program Documents

- **Town of Markham Heritage Fund**: makes low interest loans of up to $15,000 to designated heritage property owners for approved conservation or restoration projects.
- **Heritage Design Review**: review of new development applications for compatibility with the character of heritage districts, following design guidelines of establish district plans.
- **Markham Heritage Estates Subdivision**: a subdivision of last resort for heritage buildings that cannot be successfully retains on site.

### Outside Relationships

- **Markham Historic Village**: Pioneer village that is a joint effort between Town, Markham Historical Society and Lions Club.

### ST. JACOBS (Township of Woolwich)

#### Heritage Policies

- **Chapter 12 (OP)**: Expresses Town's intent to support heritage preservation within the limits of its capabilities. OP refers to assisting Waterloo Regional Heritage Foundation (WRHF) in preparing an inventory and will give consideration to the significance of identified properties when considering development applications. OP notes that developments in the Township must conform with the Heritage Conservation Policies of Chapter 6 of the Regional Official Policies Plan.

#### Heritage Procedures

- **Designation**: only 8 designated properties in Township, probably recognized by previous LACAC, there is no heritage review of alterations to these buildings, staff would request the approval of an additional body (the Region) for demolition applications.
- **Heritage Inventory**: No current inventory kept.
- **LACAC**: has been disbanded.

#### Heritage Administration

- **Staff**: There is no heritage planner for the Township, current planning staff do not review.
heritage issues, **Responsibilities:** If questions arise regarding heritage properties the planning dept directs owners to the Region of Waterloo's Heritage body, any regulation would be conducted by the Region.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Related Policy + Program Documents</th>
<th>All heritage activities are regulated under the terms of Chapter 6 of the Regional Official Policies Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outside Relationships</td>
<td><strong>Heritage Planning Advisory Committee (Region of Waterloo)</strong> advises the Regional Planning, Housing and Community Services Commissioner on Regional Heritage issues. Assists in developing, implementing and promoting Regional heritage policies. <strong>Waterloo Regional Heritage Foundation (WRHF)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TORONTO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Heritage Policies</th>
<th><strong>Chapter 3, Section 3.1.5 Heritage Resources</strong> - provides for listing, designating, heritage easements, and HCDs. Allows for HISs for development proposals for listed properties, requires HISs for amendments to OP or ZBL, requires respect of adjacent heritage properties. Provides for the creation of public incentives, requires maintenance of city owned resources and public access. Requires the assessment of all public works in relation to heritage, encourages reuse of heritage bldgs for public use, establishes zoning bonuses. Provides for the preservation of heritage landscapes and historic cemeteries. Requires the est. of an archaeological master plan, and archaeological development issues.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Procedures</td>
<td><strong>Designation:</strong> property owners may seek designation by contacting HPS, it may be directed by TPB, Council, or staff. <strong>Heritage Easements:</strong> are used and are often</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


requirements for incentive programs

**Heritage Inventory:** Compiled by Heritage Preservation Services for Toronto City Council, "Listed" is a term used for properties for which City Council has adopted a recommendation to be included on the Inventory. The recommendations are based on criteria that relate to architecture, history, and neighbourhood context. Their inclusion on the Inventory is a clear statement that the City would like to see the heritage attributes of these properties preserved. Properties are added through ongoing city surveys or individual investigations by HPS. Owners are notified of listing or designation and invited to attend TPB mtg to discuss the matter.

**Toronto Preservation Board:** advises HPS and Council on matters of heritage, comprised of 7 citizen volunteers and 3 councillors. Council seeks TPBs opinion on recommendations for listings and designations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Heritage Administration</th>
<th>Staff: 12 full time staff including mgr, senior coordinator, 2 coordinators, 1 archaeologist, 2 assistants, 1 admin and 1 researcher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Responsibilities:</strong></td>
<td>• Reviews and advises on development proposals which may affect heritage resources, monitors and the maintenance of heritage sites, develops heritage policies, administers financial assistance programs and provides educational services. • Conducts research on properties and districts; • Recommends the inclusion of properties worthy of designation in the City's Inventory of Heritage Properties; • Recommends that the City enter into Heritage Easement Agreements with property owners; • Advises owners and their consultants on proposed alterations to listed and designated properties; • Makes recommendations on those alterations to maintain the architectural integrity of the building, and on potential demolitions to attempt to prevent the loss of heritage buildings; • Advises on</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Related Policy + Program Documents | **Heritage Management Plan:** is currently being drafted, it will include additional policies on Cultural Landscapes  
**Archaeological Master Plan:** in the process of developing this plan to identify areas of archaeological potential and processes of assessment.  
**Heritage Grant Program:** part of Toronto's Community Partnership Investment Program  
Heritage Tax Incentive Program: in the works, trial period - requires designation and easements. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outside Relationships</strong></td>
<td><strong>Heritage Toronto:</strong> one of Canada's largest volunteer driven heritage charities; functions include, advocacy, programming and fund raising; Proactive with other heritage groups and individuals pressing for appropriate government ministries + dept for tax relief</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>LONDON</strong></th>
<th><strong>Section 13 (OP)</strong> - provides for the creation of an inventory, criteria for designation, conservation easements, applications for demolition, the creation of an archeological master plan, criteria for HCDs, HCD studies and plans, recognition of Cultural Heritage Landscapes, municipal intervention re: threatened heritage resources, bonus zoning for the preservation of identified resources. (quite comprehensive)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Heritage Procedures</strong></td>
<td><strong>Designation:</strong> property owners submit an application to designate thru city's heritage planner who forwards to the LACH. LACH refers request to its stewardship subcommittee to do research and prepare SOS. Heritage Planner contacts owner to</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

archaeological assessments; and • Defends Council's position before judicial tribunals such as the Ontario Municipal Board and the Conservation Review Board.
confirm intent to designate and review SOS. Subcommittee reports back to LACH and makes a recommendation to the city's planning committee to designate and then on to Council. Some properties are recommended for designation, by planning dept, or LACH's heritage property monitoring committee who oversees inventory.  

**Heritage Easements:** rarely used  

**Heritage Inventory:** est. 1991, updated 3rd time in 2005, listing conducted by LACH members + planning dept.  

**London Advisory Committee on Heritage (LACH):** volunteers and 2 councillors - subcommittees identify, monitor, research and recommend additions to the inventory.  

| Heritage Administration | Staff: Heritage planning section consists of one full time heritage planner (currently shared by two ppl)  
Responsibilities: • reviews development applications for all listed and designated properties,  
• issues staff reports to LACH and planning cmte on alterations of designated properties, designations w/o owners consent, or demolition of listed properties of significance  
• coordinates notification of property owners re: designation and/or contacts property owners during designation process,  
• liaison with other city depts re: ownership and funding of heritage properties,  
• coordinates w/ consultant regarding HCD studies,  
• liaison with heritage organizations. |

| Related Policy + Program Documents | **Archeological Master Plan:** is up for renewal, would be dealt with by the LACH  
**Heritage Property Tax Incentive Program:** just received approval for a 3 year trial but only a 1 year budget, would be administered by the heritage planner.  
**London Community Foundation:** small grants for projects on designated properties |
| **Outside Relationships** | **Landmarks London:** Allocates grants to museums  
**Architectural Conservancy of London**  
**Historical Societies** - various |

### PETERBOROUGH

| **Heritage Policies** | OP under review but no direct comment on heritage resources |
| **Heritage Procedures** | **Designation:** a property owner may request it through the heritage office, it may be recommended by heritage office or PACAC, or may be directed by council. SOSs are prepared by heritage office and presented to PACAC subcmte, cmte and council.  
**Heritage Easements:** used as a req't for property tax relief prg in addition to designation  
**Heritage Inventory:** Register was est. through student interns at the city, now maintained by heritage research assistant. Listings are not approved by heritage cmte.  
**Peterborough Architectural Advisory Cmte:** 9 member volunteer board that advises Council and staff on issues of heritage and architectural conservation. The cmte works with staff to est. evaluation criteria and scoring minimum for additions to heritage register. cmte meets 1x a month w/ subcmte meeting as needed. |
| **Heritage Administration** | **Staff:** Heritage Office is part of the Community Services Department and consists of 1 full time Heritage Officier and a full time Heritage Research Assistant, position is 3 years old  
**Responsibilities:**  • reviews all development or site plan applications for heritage properties but no formal permitting process;  • staff liasion to PACAC, issues designation briefs to PACAC subcmte for approval;  • approves alterations to heritage bldgs, issues reports to PACAC on additions and partial demolitions of heritage resources, issues reports to Council on demolitions |
of heritage resources; • manages municipally owned performing arts centre; • coordinates research listing by student intern; • meets with developers prior to the submission of applications; • informally works with planning dept. to review plans; involving heritage resources; • researches and prepares heritage designation descriptions.

| Related Policy + Program Documents | Heritage Property Tax Relief Program: provides 20% rebate on commercial and 40% for residential properties, program is very successful in spurring requests for designation (designated 30 bldgs in 3 years), administered by staff but PACAC reviews and approves the maintenance plans as part of easement Cultural Master Plan and Archaeological Master Plan: in progress Other policies in the works: a salvage policy to divert debris from landfill, minimum property standards for heritage properties and a permitting process for alterations to designation properties |
| Outside Relationships | Arts Culture and Heritage Advisory Group: broad based municipal cmte w/ reps from a number of cultural and heritage institutions  Downtown BIA: meets with heritage officer.  Peterborough Historical Society and ACO are represented on the PACAC. |
Appendix B: Meeting Minutes

CITY OF CAMBRIDGE
HERITAGE MASTER PLAN
STEERING COMMITTEE

MINUTES

Cambridge Room, Historic City Hall
46 Dickson Street
Tuesday, January 24, 2006
7:00 p.m.

Members in Attendance: Lucille Bish, Deborah Hartt, Sam Head *,
Jeff Lederer,
Andrew Macdonald, Kathryn McGarry,
Anita Tomins, Wendy Wright, Councillor
Ben Tucci and Mayor Doug Craig

Regrets: Catherine Thompson

Staff in Attendance: Alain Pinard, Director of Policy Planning
Valerie Spring, Heritage Planner

CALL TO ORDER: 7:10 p.m.

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

V. Spring advised that Council had appointed a representative from the
culture community. Unfortunately, Ms. Catherine Thompson was unable
to attend tonight’s meeting.

ELECTION OF CHAIR AND VICE-CHAIR POSITIONS

V. Spring advised that the members had two options regarding the
appointment of Chair and Vice Chair. The first option was to proceed
with the elections. The second was for her to chair this meeting and then
at the next meeting, when all members are present, hold the elections.
The Committee chose to proceed with the elections.

**Recommendation:**

Moved by Deborah Hartt  
Seconded by Councillor Tucci

THAT Kathryn McGarry be nominated for the position of Chairperson of the Heritage Master Plan Steering Committee.

THAT the nominations for Chairperson be closed.

The nominee was asked if she accepted the nomination. K. McGarry accepted.

With no further nominations, K. McGarry was acclaimed Chairperson.

Carried

**Recommendation:**

Moved by Mayor Craig  
Seconded by Deborah Hartt

THAT Jeff Lederer be nominated for the position of Vice-Chairperson of the Heritage Master Plan Steering Committee.

THAT the nominations for Vice-Chairperson be closed.

The nominee was asked if he accepted the nomination. J. Lederer accepted.

With no further nominations, J. Lederer was acclaimed Vice-Chairperson.

Carried
CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

Recommendation:

Moved by Lucille Bish Seconded by Anita Tomins

THAT the minutes of the November 16, 2005 Heritage Master Plan Steering Committee meeting be considered for errors and/or omissions and be adopted.

CONSULTANT SELECTION

Recommendation:

Moved by Councillor Tucci Seconded by Deborah Hartt

THAT in accordance with Section 239 (2)(b) of The Municipal Act, 2001, the Heritage Master Plan Steering Committee convene in Closed Session to consider personal matters about an identifiable individual including municipal or local board employees.

Carried

Recommendation:

THAT the Heritage Master Plan Steering Committee recommend the appointment of Bray Heritage to Cambridge City Council for the completion of the Heritage Master Plan.

Recommendation:

THAT the Heritage Master Plan Steering Committee reconvenes in Open Session
NEXT STEPS/NEXT MEETING

Staff advised that the report, generated by the Purchasing Division, regarding the Consultant Selection would be forwarded to Cambridge City Council on February 6, 2006. Copies of the report can be made available to the members of the Heritage Master Plan Steering Committee once the agenda has been made public. (February 3, 2006 noon).

Staff anticipates having the first meeting with the consultant and the Heritage Master Plan Steering Committee toward the end of February 2006.

ADJOURNMENT

On a motion by Mayor Doug Craig, the meeting adjourned at 7:40 p.m.
CALL TO ORDER: 7:00 p.m.

CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

The Committee noted that the minutes of March 7, 2006 listed Mayor Craig as present when in fact both he and Jeff Lederer had sent their regrets for the meeting.

Recommendation:

Moved by: D. Hartt Seconded by: A. Macdonald

THAT the minutes of the March 7, 2006 Heritage Master Plan Steering Committee meeting be considered for errors and/or omissions and be adopted as amended.

Carried

CONSULTANT PROGRESS REPORT

Carl Bray reviewed with the Committee his progress report dated May 12, 2006 in which he listed a number of relevant background documents that have been reviewed. C. Bray also listed a number of key issues that have been identified from interviews and research completed to this point. He discussed the opportunities for consensus building in the community which includes the twin historic economies of agricultural and industry. He also reported that there is widespread support for the heritage master plan process so far and is encouraged by the people who want to find ways of integrating the old and new.

C. Bray outlined one possible method of developing the inventory by which the community would be asked to identify the places that are important to them through photographs and text. He described the “East/West” project in Toronto that M. McClelland was involved in which re-introduces the residents to their community.

The economic benefit of a vibrant and viable heritage sector continues to be an area worthy of further exploration. The consultant will be exploring possible new economic opportunities such as jobs, skills
development, conversion of older properties and tourism and a way to keep and attract new visitors and residents.

The Steering Committee members were then asked to respond to what they had heard so far with respect to the consultant’s progress report. Below is a summary of comments:

- There is a need to identify which areas are to be developed in order to assist developers in determining the viability of a re-development project.
- There is a need to streamline the development process and to designate area for higher density.
- The concept of heritage buildings and background buildings is new to the Cambridge experience. Presently, all buildings are treated the same and there is an uncertainty of what is expected.
- The blending of new and old buildings can be very successful.
- The importance of the river system should not be minimized. Although they may not include buildings, the walkways along the river are of cultural significance and can act as a link between the natural and built environment.
- The concept of grey fields is a new one to Cambridge – that is the revitalization of abandoned commercial buildings or buildings that require limited environmental remediation. *Note: there is also the term blue fields which refers to the re-development of abandoned institutional buildings.
- While the buildings may be important it is more often the stories that go along with the buildings that evoke the emotions.
- Oral history is one way in which to collect these stories. The “murmur” project in Toronto has been a successful way of introducing people to neighbourhood stories.
- There is a need to offer workshops to owners of potential heritage conservation districts and to designated property owners. Education and information is essential if a community wants to support heritage conservation.
- There is a need to identify the districts and to think about how the city is developing.
- The idea of districts is really appealing in order to attract tourists.
• The City currently does a lot of things well; the City Archives are an amazing resource, the Landmark Series in the Cambridge Times, the spirit walks and house tours are examples of successful heritage initiatives.
• The question becomes how do you get people excited about what is here?
• Change is hard to accept – while some may embrace the concept of balancing the new with the old there may be some opposition.
• There is a tendency on the part of the Heritage Advisory Committee to look at the little picture – how the windows are going to be restored – rather than looking at the big picture – how is the entire building going to be revitalized.
• There is a belief that if the Heritage Master Plan is done well it will move heritage conservation in the city ahead significantly.
• The Places to Grow legislation is important to understand in terms of the potential impact it has on developing new heritage policies in the City of Cambridge.
• There is a need for heritage resource handbook – to help people know what is expected when dealing with heritage resources.
• There is a need for a design person on City staff who can assist developers.
• Interpretative signage is needed once key themes have been identified.
• Suggestion that Barb Veale of the Grand River Conservation Authority should be present at the next meeting to discuss the interpretation of cultural river landscapes.
• There is a need to revisit the sign by-law.
• The School of Architecture should consider offering heritage conservation courses.

Next Steps:

There was a discussion about the location and purpose of a public meeting. At this point, C. Bray feels that there isn’t a lot to show people and the purpose of the public meeting would be to gather information. The idea of tagging onto existing events such as the Mayor’s Celebration of the Arts, the Old Boys Re-union, Riverfest and the Highland Games was discussed. A. Tomins said that the Cambridge Tourism would be
pleased to hand out information about the Heritage Master Plan. A fax back questionnaire would be one way of soliciting responses, a display at the Cambridge Centre Mall or possibly an on-line survey are other possible ways of engaging the community. A. Pinard offered to forward the City of Kitchener link to its on-line survey about the downtown core.

It was determined that by the third week in June, the Steering Committee should have a display ready to exhibit in the Cambridge Centre Mall. In addition to photographs, there should be a brochure introducing the community to the Heritage Master Plan initiative and soliciting responses about what the community views as important with respect to heritage conservation. The suitability of adapting this information for insertion in the Cambridge Times will be explored. Any information that is to be disseminated to the public will first be circulated to the members of the Steering Committee for review and comment.

Adjournment: On a motion by Andrew Macdonald, the meeting adjourned at 9:00 p.m.
Consultant Team: Carl Bray and Susan Maltby

Regrets: Janet Babcock, Mayor Doug Craig and Anita Tomins

CALL TO ORDER: 7:05 p.m.

CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

Recommendation:

Moved by: D. Hartt Seconded by: A. Macdonald

THAT the minutes of the May 15, 2006 Heritage Master Plan Steering Committee meeting be considered for errors and/or omissions.

Carried

CONSULTANT PROGRESS REPORT

Carl Bray (C.B.) reviewed with the Committee his progress report dated September 13, 2006. He explained that he has had the opportunity to talk to approximately 50 people, and although he didn’t ask the same question of each person, he did get a general sense of what they viewed as important in the community. He has talked to people within the development industry, the tourism, culture and heritage sectors. C.B. found people very willing to talk and most are curious to see what will come out of this study. His conclusion, at this time, is that people aren’t seeing the full value of heritage. The questionnaire, with approximately 130 responses, represented a wider spectrum of the community in contrast to the individual telephone conversations. The conclusion C.B. is making at this time is that volunteers aren’t seeing the impact of their input.

The Committee discussed the possibility of a larger theatre and Catherine Thompson reminded people of the study which concluded that a larger theatre in Cambridge would have the added challenge of competing with
Kitchener and Brantford along with Stratford. There was also some discussion about a Regional museum and the suggestion, at the Regional level, that museum displays could be located in new buildings throughout the Region. The question with a local museum is what aspect of the community should be interpreted. C.B. noted that there were no (or few) monuments in Cambridge including war monuments.

C.B. then went on to discuss the City of Cambridge Official Plan which he said he liked, but the problem was its implementation. How do the policies in the Official Plan get translated into the way the City does business? He also likes the way that heritage was integrated into all the policies including the Economic section. The Official Plan will have to be flexible enough, in its revisions, to respond to the Places to Grow legislation.

C.B. discussed the merits of the City’s Inventory of Heritage Properties. C.B. noted that Galt had received the emphasis and the inventory needs to concentrate now on Hespeler and Preston. Ideally, the Inventory would be a device that brings the community together perhaps through a brochure. C.B. also suggested that if there was a template of attributes to be collected about a building then it could be filled in by municipal staff, consultants or community members. If a property owner was to fill in the template they could personalize the information.

The Committee discussed the possibility of design guidelines, not only for heritage districts and heritage buildings, but also for new design. There was consensus that Cambridge deserves better architectural design and that new buildings can become part of our legacy.

With respect to a tourism strategy, C.B. reiterated that Cambridge needs to avoid the uniformity that can be found in some areas of the City and focus on what is unique. C.B. cited the Grand as a Canadian Heritage River and the cache that surrounds that designation. An effort should be made to build on that existing heritage resource and network with other groups and agencies to promote the importance of the river.

C.B. then began to make an organizational chart of the both the City and the Region for the purpose of identifying who does what. The City could be seen as an enabler that has the policies and guidelines in place to assist
The role of the City could also be that of an educator by hosting workshops and training sessions on a variety of subjects. The public should continue to be involved in the volunteer activity providing support to advisory committees for pilot projects and working on the inventory. The private sector has an important role as corporate development. There are also a number of “non-government organizations’ that have a role including the funneling money for projects.

The Committee discussed the possibility of having the next meeting in either November 2006 or January 2007. The members were asked to contact Valerie Spring with their preference.

The meeting adjourned at 9:35 p.m.
The meeting commenced at approximately 7:15 p.m. Chair Kathryn McGarry asked each person to identify themselves, then directed Carl Bray to begin the presentation. He summarized the study progress since the previous steering committee meeting in September, as outlined in the report the committee was about to discuss. The focus in Report #1 was on the inventory of heritage resources, the current heritage regulatory process, and the current state of heritage activity in Cambridge.

The following is a summary of comments made in the meeting:

- The rivers are the binding element in Cambridge: they offer different views up and downriver, from within and outside of buildings, and enrich each downtown.
- A major issue is the fact that most Cambridge residents live and work in the suburbs and don’t come downtown.
- If they had reasons for doing so, this pattern might change (e.g. Architecture School is open to public, proposed Drayton Theatre would also be another draw).
- The river is difficult to see in the downtowns when driving (especially in Galt, where the levees block the street level view).
- Cambridge is too fiscally conservative: attractions such as the Farmer’s Market and the Hespeler Mill Pond are not well communicated to the public. There needs to be a communications strategy on heritage resources and values, which precedes the inventory.
- Many of these issues are already understood; we need responses and action.
- The rivers are a major eco-tourism resource and offer potential events venues.
- To promote heritage conservation and sustainable development, we need a combination of “carrots and sticks” (i.e. incentives and controls).
- Heritage resources are effectively brought to life through stories (e.g. oral histories).
- Heritage has to be seen as an important component of local quality of life.
- The proposed character areas include both cultural and natural heritage resources (i.e. not just buildings).
• The inventory is still the only trigger to alert the City to the potential impact on heritage resources of proposed development.
• The character areas should be identified first, then become the priority area for adding to the inventory of heritage resources.
• The Planning Department can also identify those areas under the most development pressure and make them a priority for inventorying.
• Heritage can become more personal and thus gain wider public support (e.g. “my” place, “our” neighbourhood”).
• Recent Mayor’s celebration brought forth comments on heritage and expressions of heritage values, personal stories about the rivers (Jeff has collected some of these).
• What are our expectations of Cambridge residents? Will they have shared values? Can viable uses be found for the heritage resources identified?
• Heritage conservation should include elements from all stages of the city’s evolution (i.e. representative components from each time period).
• For downtowns to be attractive, they must offer more than sightseeing (i.e. visitor experiences).
• Major attractions and events are also possible (e.g. the Venice Biennale, a Prosperity Council initiative).
• Special street signage can be a simple way of identifying and enhancing character areas.
• The book “Galt USA” is a good period-specific source of ideas on local community values and industrial history.
• Oral histories should be emphasized, perhaps using the rivers as a common theme or catalyst.
• The Grand River Country marketing initiative includes an inventory of mills and driving tours.
• The new buildings (Civic Administration Buildings and the Hespeler Library) are attractions in their own right and set a new standard for environmental quality.
• Suggestions for revisions to Report #1:
  o Mention need for height guidelines/controls, and viewsheds
Recommend that the City develop urban design guidelines that identify the character defining elements of the city’s evolution.

Identify issues to be addressed in revisions to the Official Plan (i.e. show the City’s co-ordinated response to Places to Grow: Growth Management Strategy, downtown urban design plans, OP review, in context of Regional and Provincial plans and policies).

Provide more detail on the survey results (Report #2).

In reviewing best practices/comparables, don’t spend much time reviewing standard approaches and provide specific strategies for Cambridge instead.

Suggest creating holding areas/zones for heritage resources which, at present, do not have viable re-uses.

Ensure that heritage remains the focus of the Heritage Master Plan, with economic benefit secondary.

Update Region of Waterloo’s initiatives: Archaeological Master Plan update is complete but aboriginal issues await resolution, via Ministry, cultural landscape study has the report complete and awaiting community consultation.

The next steering committee meeting is scheduled for some time in September. The consulting team is to revise Report #1 reflecting comments from the committee, and prepare the second report, for review by the committee in the next meeting.

The meeting ended at approximately 9:00 p.m.
Janet Babcock, Commissioner of Planning Services, Valerie Spring, Heritage Planner, Kathryn McGarry, Chair, Sam Head, development industry representative, Catherine Thompson, Arts and Culture representative, Lucille Bish, Region of Waterloo, Ben Tucci, City Councillor, Dan Currie, Director of Policy Planning.

Carl Bray, BRAY Heritage

Regrets:
Doug Craig, Mayor, Jeff Lederer, School of Architecture, Andrew MacDonald, community representative, Deborah Hartt, MHAC representative (note: Anita Tomins is no longer with the City tourism group and has not yet been replaced on the Heritage Master Plan steering committee).

The meeting commenced at approximately 7:10 p.m. Chair Kathryn McGarry reviewed minutes of the previous meeting and then turned the discussion over to Carl Bray. He summarized the intent of the report the committee was reviewing (report #2, entitled Conservation Opportunities and Priorities) and reviewed the main findings. He then directed the committee’s attention to the report’s conclusions and to the issues for the committee to consider. The following are notes taken by Dr. Bray during the meeting, augmented by notes taken by Valerie Spring.

Comments made during the discussion include:

- The final report should consider having an overarching theme (such as the rivers), within which are large character areas for each of the four component communities, followed by sub-areas within each community that we identify as character areas. Report #2 already has this sub-division implicit in the text, but formalizing it could be a way of both celebrating community and sub-area character while reminding local residents that they are part of a larger whole (there were concerns expressed that attempts to promote the individual character of each of the four communities would only perpetuate internecine bickering, but it was also noted that such bickering also occurs within each community, so there needs to be continued emphasis on the binding theme).
• The economic benefits of heritage should not be the primary focus of the heritage master plan, but they must still be emphasized if the plan is to gain Council support.
• The plan needs to set priorities overall, and within each character area.
• The Provincial “Places to Grow” plan requires intensification of core areas; the plan must address this so as to ensure conservation of heritage resources.
• For scenic roads to be identified in the plan, the surviving rural portions of Avenue Road should be considered.
• There was considerable discussion of themes and storylines, with several additional themes suggested, including:
  o Industries that are more recent, with such post-WWII examples as IMAX, Royal Metal, and furniture, sports equipment and shoe manufacturing
  o Schools, especially those pioneering or longstanding schools such as those in Preston and Galt (GCI)
  o Arenas, especially the Galt Arena Gardens
  o Bands, such as marching bands
  o Special events, such as visits by royalty
• There was general consensus that the opinions expressed in the plan’s survey and interviews were broadly representative of public opinion on heritage matters, although there was concern expressed that the negative responses to the new CAB were skewed and may have been specific to the year in which the survey and interviews were conducted.
• Downtown cores have to be able to re-invent themselves to be successful, thus older buildings need to have viable current uses if they are to survive and be conserved.
• There was considerable discussion of ways of getting the general public involved in heritage, and to support the Heritage Master Plan. The following are some of the ideas discussed:
  o The heritage master plan is to be an educational vehicle to help local residents gain an appreciation of local heritage.
  o With this as a priority, the plan and those implementing it have to be creative in finding ways of engaging the public, such as offering workshops for descendants of key local figures (e.g. Forbes, Erb, Hespeler) as a means of
generating interest as well as uncovering archival information and artefacts.

- Any further public consultation on the heritage master plan must be based on very clear goals, thus it is premature to go out to the public until the draft final report, with its recommendations, is available.
- The reasons for the recommendations must be made clear, and their relevance to current life in Cambridge made evident.

- The heritage master plan needs to have an implementation committee to ensure that its recommendations are carried out. Ideally, it should contain members from the current steering committee, and operate within a clear mandate from Council, addressing measurable goals and objectives.

- Next steps: report #3 draft will be ready for the committee to review in mid-late November, with a steering committee meeting in late November/early December. Following that meeting, the consultants will prepare a draft final report, incorporating reports #1-3, for review by the committee in late January/early February, with a final report for submission to Council before the end of March.
Kathryn McGarry, Catherine Thompson, and Councillor Ben Tucci

Regrets: Mayor Craig, Jeff Lederer and Deborah Hartt

Staff in Attendance: Janet Babcock, Commissioner of Planning Services
Dan Currie, Director of Policy Planning
Valerie Spring, Heritage Planner

And: Carl Bray – Heritage Consultant

CALL TO ORDER: 7:10 p.m.

Review of Minutes

Moved by Sam Head Seconded by Andrew Macdonald

THAT the minutes from the September 25, 2007 meeting be reviewed and approved

Carried

Introduction of Phase #3 Report – Master Plan Strategies, Objectives and Action Plan as identified by the consultant, Carl Bray. C. Bray summarized the study progress since the previous steering committee meeting in September and outlined the report the committee was about to discuss. The focus in Report #3 was on strategies for implementing the Heritage Master Plan, including the inventory, planning tools, community and economy, and heritage tourism and concluding with recommendations and a draft action plan.

The Committee discussed the Phase #3 Report and made some general comments about its contents which are summarized as follows:
The City of Guelph has a massive listing process based only on municipal addresses: launch was at a shopping mall and supplemented by a mail out to property owners. Discussion of applying this kind of mass listing to Cambridge as a pre-emptive move to require a 60 day waiting period prior to issuing a demolition permit. Listing could also be based on construction date. Guelph is using the 1920s as a cut-off date. Report #3 recommends listing based on character areas rather than individual properties. There could be a pilot project to demonstrate best practices.

Need to address issue of heritage buildings, especially former industrial buildings located in the floodplain. Need to bring the Grand River Conservation Authority (GRCA) into the discussions as well as the Ministry of the Environment (MOE).

Several members suggested that in order for this work to be meaningful the Steering Committee should evolve into an Implementation Committee. This Committee would be responsible for ensuring that the strategies, objectives and action plans are carried out. It was agreed that there needs to be a short list of priorities so that everyone knows when an objective has been carried out to completion.

The inventory was the focus of much discussion: if an inventory is based on dates it needs to be defensible. There was also a discussion about what are the shared values throughout the community – what connects everyone? American Standard was discussed as it has a lot of the elements discussed in the Report: the river; the potential for adaptive re-use and industrial heritage.

For the final report, need to define “heritage friendly development” more clearly, for each character area.

Kitchener has a good recent example of a community-led planning process that involved some older properties in the downtown core.

Urban design guidelines would be an effective first step/planning tool in implementing the Heritage Master Plan. St. John’s Newfoundland has an archaeology and urban design advisory committee that includes contractors. CARAC could incorporate urban design guidelines as part of a grant and loan programme to provide criteria for eligibility. Urban design guidelines are an
important component of heritage conservation. There needs to be a practical approach to revitalizing buildings.

➢ The CARAC meeting should include a request that each group identify their top 3 priorities, matching priorities to the group’s capabilities.

➢ Heritage Cambridge has found that in recent years, tours and workshops are not as popular as they were in the past. Need new partnerships to renew interest in conservation. Heritage Cambridge can attract grants because it is a non-profit community development organization.

➢ Property maintenance could be a new emphasis in grant eligibility.

➢ Implementation: the plan must be able to identify and generate key projects that can be funded and delivered. The final reports should include timelines setting priorities for such projects.

➢ The Heritage Master Plan needs to be presented to area groups, such as the Rotary, the Homebuilders and the GRCA. The Steering Committee is to suggest a list.

Discussion of Key Issues of consultant’s report

The Committee was in agreement with the principles and objectives of the Heritage Master Plan. At the next Committee meeting the discussion can focus on the following key issues:

a) Do you agree with the priorities and responsibilities in each step?

b) What time lines would you suggest, with priority actions, for the next 5 years? 10 years?

Next Steps/ Next Meetings

The consultant advised that he had a power point presentation ready for the meeting the following night with advisory committees and the Business Improvement Associations. Following that meeting, the Steering Committee will meet again to discuss the priorities and responsibilities for each action item and recommended time lines. Staff will be asking the advisory committees to provide comments on priorities.
No meeting date was set. Staff will contact members either in late February or early March for a meeting.

The meeting ended at approximately 9:15 p.m.

MINUTES

CITY OF CAMBRIDGE

HERITAGE MASTER PLAN
STEERING COMMITTEE

Wednesday, March 5, 2008
City Hall
50 Dickson Street
Secord Room, Second Floor
7:00 p.m.

MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: Janet Babcock (7:15 p.m.), Lucille Bish, Mayor Doug Craig, Sam Head, Kathryn McGarry (Chair), Jeff Lederer, Catherine Thompson and Councillor Ben Tucci

REGRETS: Andrew Macdonald

STAFF: Dan Currie, Director of Policy Planning
Valerie Spring, Heritage Planner

CALL TO ORDER: 7:07 p.m.

WELCOME: The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting.

REVIEW OF MINUTES:

Moved by Jeff Lederer
Seconded by Catherine Thompson
THAT the minutes from the December 4, 2007 meeting be accepted.

CARRIED

REVIEW OF COMMENTS ABOUT REPORT #3 FROM THE ADVISORY COMMITTEEES.

The Chair began with a review of the comments submitted to the Heritage Master Plan Steering Committee in response to Report #3. The first to be discussed were Ms. Karen Dearlove’s comments. The Chair advised the Committee that while Ms. Dearlove is a member of the Cambridge Archives Board, the comments submitted were hers and do not necessarily reflect the opinion of the Board. The Board did not pass any recommendation regarding its top three priority actions. The Steering Committee acknowledged Ms. Dearlove’s thorough review of the report and the carefully considered comments.

The second set of comments to be reviewed were those submitted by the Cambridge Environmental Advisory (CEAC). CEAC confirmed its priorities as education, broad public support and compensatory funding for designated property owners.

The next set of comments was from the Core Areas Revitalization Advisory Committee (CARAC). CARAC confirmed seven priorities: Inventory and Evaluation; partnerships; economic development and funding resources; heritage policy and interpretation; community support; communication and marketing; and linking the Heritage Master Plan with other projects and initiatives.

The final set of comments was from the Cambridge Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC). MHAC identified as its priority: Inventory and Evaluation; Revisions to the Heritage Policies in the Official Plan; and Community Support.

The Chair then asked each member to identify their priorities and give some reason as to their choices. They are as follows:
There were a lot of ideas discussed including the idea of approaching unions to get oral histories, to use co-op students from Conestoga College, Wilfred Laurier University and the University of Waterloo; the need for interpretative plaques on the trail system; the need for additional funding to carry out some of this projects; the need to celebrate the successes; and the use of partnerships to achieve some of the work identified through the Heritage Master Plan. The Committee agreed that
in order to move the Master Plan ahead, an Implementation Committee would need to be established. There was also general agreement that the people currently sitting on the Steering Committee would be willing to volunteer for the Implementation Committee.

There was also discussion around the need to meet again in April to discuss the final report in preparation of providing recommendations to Cambridge City Council. The Committee asked that a matrix be prepared which identified the priorities. The Committee discussed the need for meaningful public involvement that will become the responsibility of the Implementation Committee.

**ADJOURNMENT:**  The Committee adjourned at 9:25 p.m.
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