

# HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT

283–285 MCLEOD STREET, OTTAWA



Commonwealth Historic Resource Management  
May 2023 Revision V3 Report

Kevin Zhang, REZY Developments INC.

## AUTHORS QUALIFICATIONS

---

**Commonwealth Historic Resource Management** offers professional services related to conservation, planning, research, design, and interpretation for historical and cultural resources.

**John J. Stewart**, B.L.A., O.A.L.A., C.S.L.A., CAHP, a principal of Commonwealth is a specialist in the planning and design of cultural resources, building conservation, and commercial area revitalization. A graduate of the University of Guelph, he received additional training at Cornell University (USA) and Oxford University (UK) and holds a diploma in the Conservation of Monuments from Parks Canada, where he worked as Head, Restoration Services Landscape Section. Before Commonwealth’s formation, Stewart served for four years as the first director of Heritage Canada’s Main Street Program.

Stewart is a founding member of the Canadian Association of Heritage Professionals. He has served as the Canadian representative of the Historic Landscapes and Gardens Committee of ICOMOS and the International Federation of Landscape Architects. Stewart is a panel member with the Ottawa Urban design Review Panel and a board member of Algonquin College Heritage Trades Program.



John J. Stewart  
Principal

### CONTRIBUTORS

The Heritage Impact Assessment was prepared for REZY Developments Inc. by John Stewart Commonwealth Historic Resource Management in collaboration with:  
Fotenn Planning;  
Colizza Bruni Architecture.

# Table of Contents

AUTHORS QUALIFICATIONS.....	1
1.0 INTRODUCTION.....	3
1.1 Purpose.....	3
1.2 Site Location, Current Conditions, and Introduction to Development Site .....	3
1.3 Built Heritage Context and Street Characteristics (Neighbourhood Character) .....	5
1.4 Relevant Information from Council Approved Documents.....	8
2.0 HERITAGE RESOURCE DESCRIPTION AND HISTORY.....	9
2.1 Neighbourhood History .....	9
2.2 The History of 283 and 285 McLeod Street.....	11
3.0 STATEMENT OF CULTURAL HERITAGE VALUE .....	16
3.1 Statement of Cultural Heritage Value .....	16
4.0 DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT .....	18
4.1 Project Overview.....	18
4.2 Massing & Scale.....	19
4.3 Low-rise Portion of the Development .....	20
4.4 Five-Storey Mid-rise Portion of the Development .....	20
4.5 Streetscape & Public Realm .....	21
5.0 IMPACT OF THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT .....	25
5.1 Centretown and Minto Park Heritage Conservation District Plan .....	25
5.2 Centretown Community Design Plan (CCDP) .....	31
5.4 Federal Heritage Buildings Review Office (FHBRO).....	32
5.5 Heritage Overlay.....	32
5.6 Development Impacts .....	32
6.0 ALTERNATIVES AND MITIGATION STRATEGIES .....	33
6.1 Alternatives and Mitigation Measures.....	33
6.2 Conclusions.....	34
APPENDIX A: 283-285 MCLEOD ST. SURVEY FORMS .....	35

# 1.0 INTRODUCTION

---

## 1.1 Purpose

The City of Ottawa has requested this Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA.) The purpose of the HIA is to identify the cultural heritage resources and values that may be impacted by the construction of a residential mid-rise residential apartment at 283-285 McLeod Street. The proposed development is located across the street from the Museum of Nature National Historic Site. It is in the Centretown Heritage Conservation District (HCD), and the City of Ottawa designated the two buildings under Part V of the Ontario Heritage Act (OHA) (By-law 269-97). In the 1970s both buildings were extensively altered to the point that they took on entirely different characteristics in terms of material finishes, window and door placement and orientation. Since these changes, the buildings have evolved with on their own character as ‘the pink flamingos.’

This HIA follows the content outline recommended by the City of Ottawa for Heritage Impact Assessments. The following documents were used in the preparation of this report:

- Parts IV and V of the Ontario Heritage Act;
- Guidelines for the Preparation of Heritage Impact Assessments, City of Ottawa;
- The Centretown Heritage Conservation District Study, 1996-1997.
- The Centretown and Minto Park Heritage Conservation District Plan, 2022.
- Centretown Community Design Plan (CCDP), Urban Strategies Inc., Delcan, ERA Architects, City of Ottawa. May 2013;
- Centretown Secondary Plan, Official Plan, City of Ottawa;
- Statement of Heritage Significance, Canadian Museum of Nature, 240 McLeod Street, Ottawa, ON;
- Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada, Second Edition, 2010;
- Pre-consultation meeting minutes and heritage staff review of the Cultural Heritage Impact Statement November 2022.
- Site plans, renderings, and elevations, Colizza Bruni Architecture May 2023

### **Owner and Contact Information:**

Kevin Zhang, REZY Developments Inc.  
283-285 McLeod Street, Ottawa, Ontario  
ZJ [kevinzhangj@gmail.com](mailto:kevinzhangj@gmail.com);

## 1.2 Site Location, Current Conditions, and Introduction to Development Site

The properties are adjoining lots fronting onto the Museum of Nature within the Centretown Heritage Conservation District. The block is bound by McLeod Street to the south, Metcalfe Street to the west, Elgin Street to the east, and Gladstone Avenue to the north. The two residences set to the east and west property lines share a common entrance to a large side and rear yard, which is paved and used predominantly as a parking area. There is a grassed front yard with a low brick retaining wall defining the property line.

This section of McLeod Street extending from O'Connor east has a consistent streetscape with buildings set back uniformly from the property line, the buildings address the street with sidewalks extending to the front entrance porches, with grassed and landscaped front yards. 283 and 285 McLeod Street are the anomalies on the streetscape in that neither front entrance address the street and there are no front verandas. There are few trees along the north side of McLeod where the overhead electrical distribution lines are located. The rear of the block facing Gladstone is zoned to allow construction of buildings up to 9-storeys. This zoning carries through to the rear portion of the subject property.





Figure 1: overview looking north with the two residences highlighted.



*Figure 2: Block plan of the area to the north of the Museum of Nature. Development site in red. Source Geoottawa*

The buildings have been identified as Group 2 heritage buildings in the 1997 survey. The revised 2022 HCD Plan categorizes them as “Character Supporting resources”. They are designated under Part V of the Ontario Heritage Act as attributes within of the Centretown Heritage Conservation District. Following research, inspection and an assessment of the two houses, it was determined that they had been mis-evaluated. Appendix A includes the revised evaluation of the two properties.

### 1.3 Built Heritage Context and Street Characteristics (Neighbourhood Character)

This is a relatively intact streetscape. The built context is consistent in that residences are typically 2-1/2 storeys in height, brick clad, with one- or two-storey porches, bay windows, with gables facing the street. The building styles range from vernacular Victorian, Queen Anne, Edwardian, Prairie, and Art Deco (Appin Apartments). All of the buildings on the street relate to the development of Centretown between 1870 through to 1912 when the Victoria Memorial Museum was constructed, through to the widespread introduction of apartment buildings in the 1930s. 381 and 370 Gladstone Avenue are taller apartment blocks that frame and provide an overview. The 9-storey zoning that permitted their construction extends partway onto the rear of 285-283 MacLeod Street lots.

The grounds encircling the museum have been identified as an area in Centretown that has a unique sense of place that must be given special attention to preserve that character. Infill buildings in the area must demonstrate how they integrate with existing surroundings and contribute to the enhancement of the areas’ character. Infill buildings are to have exemplary architecture.

#### Digital Images of Cultural Heritage Attributes



*Figure 3: Context view looking north at the intersection of O’Connor. At O’Connor, the grouping of two identical buildings define that corner. The third building in this grouping 385 McLeod was altered. The 12-storey high-rise framing the block at O’Connor and Gladstone is very visible. The 8-storey unit directly behind the subject property is not intrusive from this view. Source: Google Maps*



Figure 4: The Appin Apartment at the intersection of Metcalfe and McLeod Streets accents a relatively intact streetscape between O’Connor and Metcalfe. Source Google Maps



Figure 5: The Woolly Mammoth exhibit was a feature of the grounds of the Canadian Museum of Nature. The exhibit has since been replaced with William Lishman iceberg sculpture and tundra garden. Across the street in the background are 283-285 McLeod Street. Source Canadian Museum of Nature.



Figure 6: A contextual view looking south towards the main entrance of the Museum of Nature. The Museum set in a park provides a distinct precinct for the buildings surrounding the open space.



Figure 7: Contextual plan highlighting Centretown Community Design Plan (CCDP), 2013 provides guidance specific to the area encircling the Museum of Nature.



## 1.4 Relevant Information from Council Approved Documents

### Official Plan 2022

The City of Ottawa’s Official Plan was amended and passed by City Council on October 27, 2021, with adoption of the revised version by Council on November 24, 2021. The Official Plan was approved with some modifications by the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing on November 4, 2022. The City of Ottawa includes provisions for Cultural Heritage Resources in Section 4.5 of the Official Plan. Section 4.5.1 addresses the requirements for a HIA when development has the potential to affect heritage resources contained within the development site that are designated under Parts IV and V of the OHA.

### Centretown Heritage Conservation District Study 1997

The development site is within the boundaries of the Centretown HCD, which was designated under Part V of the OHA By-law 269-97. The plan prepared 20 years ago has been revised as described below. currently under review.

### Centretown and Minto Heritage Conservation District Plan (2022)

An updated study to replace the 1997 Centretown Heritage Conservation District (HCD) report was adopted by the Built Heritage Sub-Committee meeting in June 2022. Updates to the study includes the classification of both contributing and non-contributing properties identified in the inventory. Contributing properties are considered to have design, historic and/or associative value or contextual value, as determined through the inventory. Non-contributing properties identified in the inventory are those that do not express or reflect the area’s heritage character. The subject site is identified as Contributing properties within the Museum of Nature Special Character Area.

The Plan contains Policies and Guidelines for Managing Change, including a set of general policies to provide overarching direction to the HCD, as well as sections relating to demolition and relocation, conservation and repair, alterations, additions, new construction, landscape treatment, and public realm.




Figure 8: Museum Special Heritage character Area. Source: City of Ottawa 2021.

### **Centretown Community Design Plan (CCDP), 2013**

The CDP provides guidance for the integration of heritage resources into new infill development and guidelines specific to the area encircling the Museum of Nature.

### **Urban Design Guidelines**

Urban Design Guidelines for High-rise Buildings

The City recently revised the urban design guidelines for high-rise buildings to reflect the High-Rise building policies currently under appeal within Official Plan Amendment #150. City Council voted in favour of these guidelines on May 23, 2018. They are still subject to approval process for the associated zoning by-law amendment.

### **Section 60 Heritage Overlay**

A Heritage Overlay is applied to encourage the retention of existing heritage buildings by offering zoning incentives to reuse the building and limits the size of additions to preserve the heritage character of the original building. Section 60 of the Zoning By-law contains provisions related to Heritage Overlays, and states:

- / Where a building in an area to which a heritage overlay applies is removed or destroyed it must be rebuilt with the same character and at the same scale, massing, volume, floor area and in the same location as existed prior to its removal or destruction.

## **2.0 HERITAGE RESOURCE DESCRIPTION AND HISTORY**

---

### **2.1 Neighbourhood History**

The history of Centretown is outlined in detail in the 1997 Heritage Conservation District Study. The built heritage context along McLeod streetscape dates between pre-1888 through to 1939 with a consistent expression typically 2-1/2 storeys in height, brick clad, with one or two storey porches, bay windows, with gables facing the street.



*Figure 9: An undated street view of the block between Metcalfe and O'Connor Streets framed with mature street trees. Source: Library and Archives Canada.*




Figure 10: Fire Insurance Plan dating from 1902 and revised 1911. 285 McLeod appears along with 287 and 289. The property at 283 is shown as a 1-1/2 front gable. The land at 263 is vacant.



Figure 11: 1928 Aerial view of the sites illustrating the development pattern at the time. McLeod Street between O'Connor and Metcalfe had been developed with single, semi-detached, and row houses. Note the land behind 283 and 263 McLeod Street appears disturbed suggesting recent construction on the two properties. The two sites are arrowed. Source: GeoOttawa



Figure 12: 1958 Aerial view of a portion of McLeod Street overlooking the Museum of Nature. Site arrowed. Source: GeoOttawa

## 2.2 The History of 283 and 285 McLeod Street

The redevelopment plan calls for the demolition of the two buildings. Despite being heavily altered, both on the interior and exterior, the importance of these two houses lies in their massing, setback, and heights as they relate to the streetscape. Conservation would require reconstruction of all historical attributes, including bay windows, masonry foundations, brick finishes, window and door locations, dormer, and roof profiles. The following discussion outlines the extent of changes, and the level of conjecture required to reinterpret these buildings.

### 283 McLeod Street (See Appendix A for the evaluation)

The property is one of two similar residences constructed circa 1925; the other being 263 McLeod Street. The two-and-one-half storey residence was substantively altered post 1975. The original two storey entrance porch, and hipped dormer above the entrance were removed. The brick veneer was stripped from the McLeod Street façade, the west or interior courtyard elevation, as well as most of the brick veneer from the east elevation. The doors and windows were then removed from the south and west elevations, new doors and windows cut and framed, and the old windows framed in prior to the application of a fibre cement board. The original fenestration pattern is evident on the north and east elevation, and the yellow/buff brick veneer was retained on the north elevation. A central gable with bargeboard and a finial were then added to the south elevation and Victorian brackets installed under the soffit. Sometime after 1975 the first floor was rehabilitated for a commercial use, the second and third floors for a residential use. The extent and scale of alterations have made an accurate restoration impossible. The importance of 283 lies in its massing, setback, and height as it relates to the streetscape.



Figure 16: . The original form and massing of 283 was very similar to the prairie style home at 263 above. 283 and 285 share a common entrance with the main front doors of both facing into the courtyard.




Figure 17: 1880-1901 Fire Insurance Map illustrating the 1-1/2 storey residence at 283 McLeod Street with a vacant lot on the corner. This building was replaced c.1925 with the 2-1/2 storey residence described above.

### Alterations and Integrity

The alterations that occurred after 1975 to the south or McLeod Street façade include:


- The removal of the two-storey entrance porch, landing, front door, and stairs fronting onto McLeod;
- The removal of a hipped dormer from the south roof, and the installation of a gable with bargeboard and finial;
- The stripping of the brick veneer and wood cladding to which the veneer was attached from the south, west, and east elevations;

- The removal of the main entrance door, and all windows from the first and second floor fronting onto McLeod (south) and west interior courtyard; and reframing of the old or removed and reframing for new window and door openings;
- The application of a fibre cement board to the façade to conceal the extensive alterations to the fenestration pattern and the brick cladding.

**285 McLeod Street (See Appendix A for a full discussion)**

Built as one of three identical residences to the west at 287 & 289 McLeod; (See figure 3). The three buildings were constructed during the same period (1901 – 1911).

The two-and-one-half storey residence was substantively altered post 1975. A set of floor plans (basement, first, second, and third) were submitted in 1975 to the City of Ottawa's building department. The plans illustrate the as-found form at the time. The plans illustrate the conversion of a single-family home to an apartment complex with three units - one unit per floor. The original two storey entrance porch, projecting bay window on the first floor, enclosed wood porch on the second floor, and fenestration pattern are evident in the floor plans. Sometime after 1975, the first and second floors were rehabilitated for a commercial use, and a residential use on the third floor was retained. The exteriors of both buildings were dramatically altered in a pseudo colonial revival treatment. It was concluded that with the extent and scale of alterations, a retention and reconstruction would be based on conjecture.







Figure 13: Views of 285 and 287 McLeod illustrating what 285 looked like prior to its 1970s renovation.

Figure 14: Goads Insurance Plan 1925 updated 1948. Site outlined in red.

Figure 15: Plans illustrating the original layout of 285 McLeod, note the front porch and bay window. City of Ottawa Archives



## Alterations and Integrity

The alterations that occurred after 1975 to the south or McLeod Street façade include:

- The removal of the two-storey entrance porch, landing, and stairs fronting on McLeod offset to the west property line;
- The removal of a projecting bay window on the first-floor level, including brick cladding and horizontal wood boards to which the brick veneer was attached, and wood framing;
- The infill and capping of the projecting stone foundation below the bay window (a heat pump is set on top);
- The removal of a shallow projecting bay from the second floor, including brick veneer, board cladding, and wood framing;
- The removal of the main entrance door, and all windows from the first and second floor fronting onto McLeod and reframing of old and new window openings;
- The removal of the brick veneer, and wood framing to accommodate the symmetrically placement of three new windows on the first and second floor levels, in what was an asymmetrical fenestration pattern;
- Alterations to the roof form with the removal of a gabled dormer, and a projecting gable above the projecting bay window, and the insertion of a new gable centred on the south façade with bargeboard and finial; and,
- The application of a cement board to the façade to conceal the extensive alterations to the fenestration pattern, selective removal of the brick veneer, infill of removed windows, cutting in of new windows.

Alterations to the east or courtyard elevation include:

- The insertion of a new entrance door in what was a window with the removal of the brick, enlarging and reframing of the opening;
- The insertion of a new window to the north of the new entrance on the ground floor;

- The application of a cement board finish to conceal the extensive alterations to the east façade;
- The construction of a brick clad two-storey exit enclosure; and,
- The fenestration pattern on the second-floor level was retained during the rehabilitation.



## 3.0 STATEMENT OF CULTURAL HERITAGE VALUE

---

The following Statement of Cultural Heritage Value identifies the primary heritage values and attributes of the HCD. Source: Historic Places

### 3.1 Statement of Cultural Heritage Value

#### DESCRIPTION OF HISTORIC PLACE

The Centretown Heritage Conservation District is a primarily residential area, with some commercial corridors, within downtown Ottawa. Centretown is a large area in the centre of Ottawa, south of Parliament Hill, to the north of the Queensway corridor and to the west of the Rideau Canal. Since its development, Centretown has served as a residential community serving the government activities of Uppertown and has been home to many of the civil servants and government ministers of Parliament Hill. The buildings in the district were mainly constructed between the 1880s and the 1930s, and the original low to medium residential scale is relatively intact throughout the area.

The District was designated under Part V of the Ontario Heritage Act by the City of Ottawa in 1997 (By-law 269-97).

#### HERITAGE VALUE

The Centretown and Minto Heritage Conservation District is closely associated with the governmental character of Uppertown to the north. Centretown developed as a desirable neighbourhood for the transient population of government workers and ministers. Centretown still contains a large variety of intact historic streetscapes, reflecting the diverse nature of development that occurred in the area to serve the varied population. Throughout its development, the area reflected national politics and priorities of the time.

Centretown dates from the 1880-1940 period. This was a period of mature design and craftsmanship in the Ottawa area, related to the new prosperity of the expanding national capital and the availability of excellent building materials such as smooth face brick of Rideau red clay, a broad selection of sandstones and limestones, a full range of milled architectural wood products, and decorative components in terra cotta, wrought iron and pressed metal.

The buildings along McLeod Street front onto the Museum of Nature and its grounds. The north side of the street is intact, and the mix of homes includes representative styles range from vernacular Victorian, Queen Anne, Edwardian, Prairie, and Art Deco. The built heritage context on the streetscape extending between O'Connor and Metcalfe dates between pre-1888 through to 1939 with a consistent streetscape in that the residences are typically 2-1/2 storeys in height, brick clad, with one or two storey porches, bay windows, with gables facing the street, All of the buildings on the street relate the development of Centretown between 1870 through to 1912 when the Victoria Memorial Museum was constructed, through to the widespread introduction of apartment buildings in the 1930s.

In 9.6 of the Conservation Plan, the Museum of Nature Special Character Area is defined as the Centretown HCD Plan's most important and well-known building. It is individually designated under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act, a National Historic Site, a classified federal heritage building and a beloved museum. Conserving and enhancing its setting when the opportunity arises will ensure that its cultural heritage value is preserved.

The streets surrounding the Museum are predominantly residential with the typical mix of singles, semis and walk-up apartment buildings found throughout the HCD. The front yard setbacks on O'Connor, McLeod and Argyle are regular and the front yards provide a landscape setting to the Museum that complements its grounds. The relatively uniform height of the structures (with the exception of the tower of the YMCA on Argyle Avenue and the apartment building at 201 McLeod Street), allows the Museum to be the focus of this part of the HCD.

Centretown is the surviving residential community and informal meeting ground associated with Parliament Hill. Its residents have had an immense impact upon the development of Canada as a nation. Source: Centretown Heritage Conservation District Study, winter 1996-1997, City of Ottawa and Centretown Heritage Conservation District Plan 2022.

#### **CHARACTER-DEFINING ELEMENTS**

Character defining elements that contribute to the heritage value of the Centretown Heritage Conservation District include:

- The heritage residential character of the district, featuring low to medium scale development;
- The original grid block layout and plan;
- Relatively intact residential streetscapes;
- Predominant use of Rideau red clay decorative brick veneer with trim details in stone, wood, and pressed metal;
- Its varied building types and styles due to the diverse populations of the area;
- Its single-family homes executed in a vernacular Queen Anne style, with substantial wood verandas and elaborate trim, varying in size;
- its mid-rise apartment buildings with similar detailing to single-family dwellings but featuring horizontal layering and flat roofs;
- its commercial corridor on Bank Street, consisting of mid-rise commercial and mixed-use buildings set close to the street;
- Its development during a significant period in the growth of Ottawa as the government centre of Canada;
- Its connection with Uppertown and the governmental activities which occur there;
- Its associations with many people and institutions of national prominence who have played a significant role in shaping Canada; and,
- Its historical role as a meeting place for governmental and community groups, clubs, and organizations.

## 4.0 DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

### 4.1 Project Overview




Figure 18: Centretown Secondary Plan Schedule H2 Maximum Heights showing the zoning for 283-285 McLeod Street, supports building heights up to 4 storeys along the McLeod Street frontage and building heights up to 9 storeys along the rear of the subject property.

The proposed development is designed to adapt to the compact site with its relatively compact form, especially the massing of the 5-storey mid-rise. The approach taken is a ‘façade fragmentation’ approach which will not only help reduce the perceived size of the rear volume but also complement the 2.5 storey street facing volumes with smaller façade elements.




Figure 19: Landscape Plan and ground floor building plan. Source: Colizza Bruni Architecture 2023.

## 4.2 Massing & Scale

The proposed development includes two new three-storey low-rise buildings along McLeod Street transitioning to the infill development of a five-storey mid-rise residential apartment building. The two existing three-storey buildings at 283 and 285 McLeod Street are replaced, and the new residences will serve as podium to the proposed mid-rise building at the rear of the site. The residential dwellings offer separate accesses for individual units along McLeod Street, and to a lobby accessing the mid-rise building. Vehicular access to the site will be provided from McLeod Street to an underground parking structure containing one level of underground parking with 8 vehicle parking spaces, with the provision for 31 bicycle parking spaces. The proposed development

DEVELOPMENT INFORMATION				# OF UNITS
ZONING R4UD (478) - R4UD (479)				31
SITE AREA	SQ.M	832	8955.6	
% L.O.S	SQ.M	253	2728	
<b>AREAS ABOVE GRADE</b>				<b>SQ. FT</b>
TOTAL GROSS BUILDING AREA				22802
TOTAL GROSS FLOOR AREA OF APARTMENTS				18431
BUILDING EFFICIENCY ABOVE GRADE				81%
<b>AREAS BELOW GRADE</b>				<b>SQ. FT</b>
TOTAL GROSS BUILDING AREA				5205
TOTAL GROSS FLOOR AREA OF APARTMENTS				1038
BUILDING EFFICIENCY BELOW GRADE				20%
<b>AREAS ABOVE GRADE (INCLUDING BASEMENT UNITS)</b>				<b>SQ. FT</b>
TOTAL GROSS BUILDING AREA				23835
TOTAL GROSS FLOOR AREA OF APARTMENTS				19464
BUILDING EFFICIENCY				82%
<b>PARKING AREA</b>				<b>UNITS</b>
UNDERGROUND PARKING				7+1 VISITS
<b>GROSS AREA BY FLOOR</b>				
LEVEL	TOTAL	APART	UNITS	
FIRST FLOOR	5325	3929	6	
2ND & THIRD	10227	8715	13	
4TH TO 5TH	7250	5787	10	
BASEMENT	5205	1033	2	

will contain communal amenity space in addition to private balconies and terraces, including at-grade outdoor spaces and indoor amenity areas.

### **4.3 Low-rise Portion of the Development**

The proponent determined that the commemoration and interpretation of the defining features of the Museum and the McLeod streetscape could be accommodated without the retention of the existing buildings. Due to the extent of changes and the lack of documentation it was decided to replace both 285 and 283 and construct new units accessed directly from McLeod Street. The proposed massing and use of brick is a contemporary expression maintaining the consistent streetscape in terms of massing, rhythm, and materials. The proposed material palette is a red/orange brick mirroring the colour and size of brick on the existing buildings along McLeod. The black or charcoal grey (a synthetic vertical ‘rib-textured’ wood) and the light grey ‘panelized’ concrete board or metal siding.

The scale and massing of the two replacement-built forms, the facade materials and fenestration patterns are designed to complement and reference the cadence and character of the adjacent historic residential buildings along McLeod Street.

### **4.4 Five-Storey Mid-rise Portion of the Development**

In order to preserve the heritage character along McLeod Street the front façade of the mid-rise portion of the building is setback 9.8 m from the front property line. A ‘façade fragmentation’ approach has been explored that will not only help reduce the perceived size of the rear volume but also complement the 2.5 storey street facing volumes with smaller façade elements.

The upper floors of the mid-rise are carved away and articulated with balconies to reduce the mass at upper levels. The front facade of the five-storey mid-rise portion is set well back from the front property line, providing a strong transition, and conserving the character of the streetscape along McLeod Street. The upper floors are stepped back and articulated with balconies, a differential colour pallet and materiality. Setbacks, step backs and the architectural articulation are carefully considered to shape the building to fit on the street and preserve the lower scale massing of the street’s public realm.

In terms of materiality and colour the facade of the mid-rise will be clad in a lightweight warm colour metal cladding material, with vertical seams that add a subtle texture to the building. Incorporating black / charcoal grey materials (synthetic vertical ‘rib-textured’ wood), responds to existing roof colours of buildings along McLeod Street. The use of light grey materials (‘panelized’ concrete board or metal siding) softens the built form while responding to the streetscape of McLeod Street and the nature of the existing built form in the backdrop, which is highest in the western portion.



Figure 20: McLeod Street elevation illustrating the low-rise relating to the street and the Museum park with the new apartment in the background. Source: Colizza Bruni Architecture 2023.

#### 4.5 Streetscape & Public Realm

The revised design incorporates defined heritage attributes and architectural elements in response to comments obtained during public information sessions with the city and community, including decreasing the overall height of the building from eight (8) down to five (5) storeys, removing the communal outdoor terrace on the second floor, maintaining an appropriate rear yard setback, and incorporating stepbacks to reduce impacts on abutting properties.

Located in the urban core of Ottawa, the project promotes the concept of ‘15-minute neighbourhoods’ for day-to-day needs that are within walking distance of amenities such as public transit, grocery stores, parks, and bicycle routes. The convenience reduces the dependency on cars and greenhouse gas emissions. As well, the building design and its amenities promote accessibility and inclusivity. The rendering illustrates the scale of the development in comparison with other developments surrounding the Museum.



Figure 21: A view looking north-west with the proposed mid-rise development and surrounding apartments framing the museum lands. In terms of scale and height it fits comfortably into the neighbourhood. Source: Colizza Bruni Architecture 2023.



Figure 22: A view looking north-east along McLeod Street. Source: Colizza Bruni Architecture 2023.



Figure 23: The Streetscape elevations illustrate the consistency of building form, height, and materials along the street with the new development integrating well with neighbouring residences. Source: Colizza Bruni Architecture 2023.



Figure 24: Views from the west and east of the proposed entry court with the driveway between the two buildings and the apartment set back. Source: Colizza Bruni Architecture 2023





Figure 25: Views of the development along the street from both directions indicating the scale and massing of the 5-storey building incorporating setbacks, step backs and architectural articulation designed to mitigate the prominence of the apartment building and reduce the massing of the upper floors. Source: Colizza Bruni Architecture 2023.



Figure 26: View of the rear yard illustrating the treatment of the west and north elevations. Source: Colizza Bruni Architecture 2023.





Figures 27 & 28: Basement Plan view and a section through the building. Source: Colizza Bruni Architecture 2023.

## 5.0 IMPACT OF THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

This section specifically addresses the impacts of the development proposal on the cultural heritage values of the Centretown Heritage Conservation District (CHCD) from two perspectives:

- The impact of an 5-storey mid-rise to the Museum District Special Character Area and broader city plan; and,
- the appropriateness of replacing the two grade 2 building, designated under Part 5 of the Ontario Heritage Act and integrating new units into a mid-rise development.

The heritage attributes of the HCD are itemized in Section 3.0. A number of documents were used to determine the impact. C&MPHCDP (2022) was used to frame the discussion 9.1 New Houses and Apartment Buildings along with The Museum of Nature Section 9.6 of the new CCDP.

### 5.1 Centretown and Minto Park Heritage Conservation District Plan

The 1997 Centretown Conservation District Study has been replaced with the recently approved 2022 Plan. The Plan sets out policies and guidelines for new mid-rise building types in section 9.1 New houses and Apartment Buildings 9.3 and 9.6 Museum of Nature Special Character Area.

5.0 Demolition and Relocation	
<p>1. Demolition, relocation, or partial demolition of Contributing properties will not normally be supported (Policy 1);</p> <p>2. Any application to demolish an existing building must be accompanied by plans for its replacement. New construction must be compatible with, and sympathetic to, the character of the HCD and meet the policies and guidelines of this Plan (Policy 2); and,</p> <p>3. At least one of following must, as determined by Heritage Staff, be included as part of a complete application under the Ontario Heritage Act for the demolition of a Contributing building:</p> <p>Confirmation through an assessment that there is structural instability or damage resulting from an extraordinary circumstance;</p> <p>Confirmation through an assessment that the building is damaged, compromised, or altered to the extent that it no longer contributes to the cultural heritage value of the HCD;</p> <p>An analysis of the building that demonstrates that alternative retention options (such as preservation, rehabilitation, restoration, reinvestment, adaptive re-use, mothballing, etc.) have been meaningfully considered (Policy 3).</p>	<p>2. <i>Through ongoing discussions with City Planning, Heritage, and Urban Design Staff, it has been agreed upon that the most appropriate approach for the redevelopment of the subject site is demolition of the existing Contributing buildings. An updated Heritage Impact Assessment has been prepared to assess the compatibility to the character of the HCD and provide further detail.</i></p> <p>3. <i>The rationale for demolition is related largely to impacts to their integrity from previous renovations, and the misinterpretation of the buildings stemming from the 1996 Evaluations. The section 2.2 History of 283 and 285 McLeod Street documents the changes to both buildings c.1975. These alterations dramatically impacted the two buildings and their integrity. A full discussion of the extent of changes presented in ‘Appendix A’ explains why they were incorrectly interpreted with the 1996 evaluation. The extensive changes have resulted in the loss of character defining attributes leaving both buildings as non-contributing structures.</i></p>

<p>4. Demolition of certain Character-Supporting Resources may be considered where the applicant can demonstrate that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the attributes of the building or reasons that express its contribution to the HCD and its streetscape have been compromised or altered;</li> <li>the history of the property will be appropriately recorded and commemorated as part of the new development;</li> <li>the proposed replacement building meets the policies and guidelines outlined in Section 9; and the proposed redevelopment will facilitate achieving broader city-building goals.</li> </ul> <p>6. In the rare instance that a Contributing property is approved for demolition, the City will require that the building be recorded, and the information be deposited at the City of Ottawa Archives.</p> <p>7. When demolition is contemplated, property owners are encouraged to consider salvage and reuse of historic materials.</p>	<p>4. <i>The proposed development will replace 283 and 285 McLeod Street with contemporary 3 storey-built forms, which have been designed to be compatible with the character of the HCD and meet the policies and guidelines of the Plan.</i></p> <p><i>The changes to the two homes have been compromised. A history of both properties is outlined in Appendix A.</i></p> <p>6. <i>A condition report was prepared for the two buildings documenting their condition and the changes that have been made.</i></p> <p>7. <i>Consideration is being given to salvage the red brick from the west elevation of 285. On other parts of the building the brick has been removed and/or stuccoed over and will not be reusable.</i></p>
<p><b>9.0 New Construction Policies and Guidelines</b></p>	
<p>1. New buildings shall contribute to, and not detract from the heritage character of the area as outlined in the Statement of Cultural Heritage Value and the list of the District's heritage attributes.</p> <p>2. Respect the “Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada” when constructing new buildings: ensure they are “physically and visually compatible with, subordinate to, and distinguishable from the historic place.” The level of distinction between new infill construction and its neighbours can be subtle.</p> <p>3. The design of new buildings must respect and be sensitive to the HCDs’ cultural heritage value and attributes in terms of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>exterior materials and cladding;</li> <li>architectural elements and treatments such as window patterns and design,</li> <li>location of datum lines, roof profile and roof lines,</li> <li>overall vertical and/or horizontal proportions;</li> </ul>	<p>1. <i>The new buildings are a contemporary expression that reference traditional residential attributes such as Rideau red brick, colour and material palette, direct access from the street, raised entrances with front porches, dormers and bay windows setback from the street soft landscaping and street trees. The building also support the evolutionary nature of the District defined by varied building types and styles.</i></p> <p>2. <i>The character defining features of the street and the Museum distinctive character area are well documented. In terms of <b>subordination</b> the mid-rise portion of the development is set back from the street and is designed as a fabric building intended to blend with the distinctive character of the Museum precinct. In terms of <b>visual compatibility</b>, the two red brick clad replacement buildings sit comfortably as part of the McLeod streetscape and the entire development presents a <b>distinguishable</b> well integrated piece of contemporary architecture.</i></p> <p>3. <i>The proposed development is a new construction within the Centretown HCD, which has been designed to meet high quality design standards through selection of building materials, continuous building lines, articulation, and fenestration, while helping to define and conserve the McLeod Street streetscape.</i></p>

<p>existing pattern of building setbacks; massing, height, and scale.</p> <p>4. The front yard setback of a new building shall be consistent with its adjacent neighbours to ensure the continuity of the streetscape. Buildings that do not generally reflect the setbacks of the street are not appropriate.</p> <p>5. Respect the site’s historic context and surrounding Contributing properties when constructing a new building by providing meaningful elements of transition between the new development, any existing heritage resources on site, and surrounding properties. This can be accomplished through the use of design measures such as, but not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the incorporation of setbacks, stepbacks, architectural details and the use of complementary materials;</li> <li>• the sensitive placement of new buildings on the site to provide appropriate distances between them and existing heritage resources or surrounding Contributing buildings; and</li> <li>• maintaining architectural proportions and visual relationships within, and to the streetscape.</li> </ul> <p>6. Applications for new construction must consider the retention of existing protected trees (as defined by the Tree Protection By-law) and planting of future forest canopy.</p>	<p><i>The proposed development incorporates similarly proportioned new builds at 283 and 285. Both are predominantly brick, they respect the original placement, and set back from the sidewalk with individual entrances, and the relationship to the street and adjacent buildings is maintained. The design incorporates similar materials and proportions as the heritage façade, contributing to a cohesive building. Both serve as a well-articulated podium and fit well into the built form along McLeod Street. Above the third floor, the building steps back into a slender residential mid-rise articulated on both the south and north facades.</i></p> <p><i>4. Maintaining the proportions and visual relationships along the street has been successfully addressed. Retaining the vacant lot and the separation distances between the two homes is an essential contributing factor.</i></p> <p><i>5. A consistent front yard setback is provided, while public realm and landscaping improvements are introduced along the streetscape of the building. The massing and scale of the proposed development is designed with traditional materials to complement the public realm and provide a distinct built form which enhances and contributes to both the mid-rise and mid-rise context of the site.</i></p> <p><i>6. The existing street tree in front of 285 will be replaced. The historic photograph (Figure 9) provides an excellent image of what the street looked like and offers an indication of how a concerted effort by the City, and the Museum could help recreate that image.</i></p>
<p><b>9.1 New houses and Apartment Buildings Policies and Guidelines</b></p>	
<p>1. Conserve and be sensitive to the character of surrounding Contributing properties, the cultural heritage values, and attributes of the HCD, particularly within, or across the street from identified intact streetscapes.</p> <p>2. Ensure that new construction on the east-west streets will be compatible with the HCD in terms of the building’s position on the lot, scale, massing,</p>	<p><i>The proposed apartment building respects the surrounding varied scale and context of the historic Centretown neighbourhood. Setbacks, stepbacks, podium heights, and architectural details are incorporated to enhance the public realm along McLeod Street, specifically where new residential uses are designed at a scale consistent with the existing streetscape.</i></p>

<p>fenestration pattern and design, datum lines and other architectural elements.</p>	<p><i>An increased setback from the west interior side yard is provided to transition the proposed development to the abutting properties finally, parking is located underground, away from the public realm, accessed internally to the subject site.</i></p>
<p>a) New mid-rise building types should reflect the rhythm of early lot development, with gables, balconies or other features providing an appropriate scale.                  b) the roof profile and location of eaves lines or the roof parapet of new buildings should be designed so that the apparent overall height and form is compatible with that of neighbouring buildings.                  c) Small scale apartment buildings on residential streets, up to four storeys, should reflect the character of existing walk-up apartments in the HCD, and should generally feature flat roofs, cornices and symmetrically placed front entrances with simple door surrounds.                  f) When new residential development is proposed across several lots, the proposed massing should be broken up or articulated to reflect the historic built form patterns and rhythms on the street.</p>	<p><i>The raised foundations and front porches reflect the character of existing walk-ups as does the 5-storey height of the apartment.</i></p> <p><i>Retaining the vacant lot and the separation distances between the two homes is an essential contributing factor. The retention of raised porches and individual entrance also supports the rhythm of a pedestrian realm.</i></p> <p><i>The proposed mid-rise apartment provides a U-shaped built form, where the rear addition is setback from the frontages along McLeod Street and provides a built form and massing which transitions from McLeod Street to a mid-rise and mid-rise context to the north.</i></p>
<p><b>9.3 MIDRISE AND HIGHRISE BUILDINGS</b></p>	
<p>1. The conservation of the cultural heritage value and heritage attributes of the HCD and Contributing properties surrounding and across the street from a new mid- or high-rise building may constitute a limiting factor in terms of the height, scale, or massing of development on the designated property (Policy 1);</p> <p>2. As noted in Section 9.0, new buildings must respect a property’s historic context and provide meaningful transition between existing and pro-posed buildings. Accordingly, mid-, and high-rise buildings must be located on a lot of sufficient size and appropriate shape that can adequately pro-vide such transition in massing, scale, and height on the subject site.</p> <p>3. When a mid- or high-rise building is proposed adjacent to, or across the street from a lower scale Contributing property, careful consideration must be given to the use of podia/base sections as well as their architectural treatment to ensure the new building can be sensitively integrated into its historic context.</p> <p>5. Conserve and maintain the established front yard setback on the street. In the instance of a corner lot consider the established setbacks on both streets (Policy 5).</p>	<p><i>1. The proposed development provides a compatible built form to the existing buildings along McLeod Street, where heritage attributes are incorporated in the design of the new building. Materials, colours, and architectural elements have been carefully considered as to provide a development which is complementary, yet distinctive from existing conditions on site and surrounding the property.</i></p> <p><i>2. The lot is adequate in size to support the scale of the 5-storey mi-rise that is set back from the street behind the two 2.5 residential units. The midrise portion transitions easily with the lower residential units and with the neighbouring contributing buildings along the street.</i></p> <p><i>3. The 5-storey midrise is setback from the street with the two residential units serving as a podium in the foreground provides a quiet integration of the entire development into the historic setting.</i></p> <p><i>5. The established front yard setback, which is a feature of MacLeod overlooking the Museum has been retained. The reduction of visual parking and the greening of the front area also contributes to the streets character.</i></p>

<p>c) Reduce overshadowing and provide a human scale pedestrian environment by considering the use of podia for multi-storey new construction.</p> <p>d) Proposals for new mid- and high-rise buildings should focus on integration and compatibility of the lower floors/base with surrounding Contributing properties and streetscape, as these areas will have the greatest impact on character of the HCD. This can be achieved by using the patterns of the surrounding built form in terms of using similar and compatible materials, reflecting datum lines in cornices or other horizontal features, window designs or other references to the HCD.</p> <p>e) When new residential development is proposed across several lots, new development should be articulated to reflect the historic built form patterns and rhythms on the street.</p>	<p><i>The two-replacement buildings create a strong podium for the 5-storey mid-rise set back.</i></p> <p><i>Retaining the vacant lot and the separation distances between the two homes is an essential contributing factor. The retention of raised porches and individual entrance also supports the rhythm of a pedestrian realm.</i></p> <p><i>The view below looking north-east provides a clear illustration of the way this development fits into the neighbourhood.</i></p>
--	--



<p><b>9.6 The Museum of Nature special Character Area</b></p>	
<p>To the immediate south of the subject property, is the Canadian Museum of Nature and the surrounding park. The Museum is a National Historic Site of Canada. It has been designated by the City of Ottawa under Part IV, with FHRBO designation as a “Classified” Site. The whole complex was designed as the southern terminus for Metcalfe Street with Parliament Hill serving as the northern end of the barbell.</p>	
<p>The Museum of Nature is identified as a unique area and guidelines are set out specific to infill on those streets fronting directly onto the Museum of Nature (portions of Elgin, McLeod, Argyle and O’Connor):</p>	
<p>1. New development will respect the established front yard setbacks on the surrounding streets to preserve the established street walls that encircle the museum.</p> <p>2. New development will have regard for the character-defining elements identified in both the</p>	<p><i>1. See the comments above addressing established front setbacks. Section 9.3.5.</i></p> <p><i>2. Both the FHRBO defining elements and the Part 4 designation have been considered and addressed. Elements such as the residential function, the height and massing are intended to present a fabric building</i></p>

<p>Museum’s Federal heritage and Part IV designations.</p> <p>3. The design and placement of new buildings on streets to the north of the Museum on McLeod, Metcalfe or Gladstone must respect its iconic location at the terminus of Metcalfe Street. This should be accomplished through retaining the current setbacks and predominate four storey street wall on Metcalfe Street between McLeod and Gladstone.</p> <p>4. The north side of McLeod Street forms a strong urban edge across from the Museum of Nature’s front façade. New development on the north side of McLeod Street will strengthen the urban edge and reflect the predominantly low-scale residential character of the street, complementing current heights and setbacks.</p>	<p><i>that serves as a background. The relationship to the street, the landscape treatment, and the incorporation of red brick as the primary building material also support the primacy of the Museum.</i></p> <p><i>3. The design of the building and site layout takes reference from the neighbouring properties and the Museum of Nature through the public-facing landscaped courtyard and by using red brick materials similar to surrounding heritage buildings. The mid-scale development at the rear of the building strengthens the urban edge, while design features including materiality, balconies and stepbacks reflect the predominantly low-scale residential character of the street.</i></p> <p><i>See the site plan and elevations that support this policy in chapter 4.</i></p> <p><i>4. The replacement buildings are a contemporary expression that will maintain the existing cornice lines, horizontal and vertical articulation of the façade, opening sizes, proportion and rhythm and building materials all of which are key heritage elements.</i></p>
<p>b) New buildings on the streets surrounding the Museum should be subordinate to it in character and design, allowing the Museum to remain the focal point.</p> <p>c) Buildings should be clad in brick, stucco, or wood to complement the stone of the museum. New buildings should not be clad in rough-cut stone to ensure the visual primacy of the Museum.</p> <p>d) Development or additions in the rear yards for properties on the north side of McLeod and the west side of O’Connor Streets should be designed to ensure that the mid-rise character of the streetscape continues. New development should be no more than two storeys taller than the existing building on the property[ies].</p> <p>h) Lighting details (e.g., what elements to light, type and location of fixtures, use of colour, temperature etc.) should be consistent with the National Capital Commission’s Capital Illumination Plan’s General Guidelines.</p>	<p><i>The proposed development fronting onto the museum has been treated as background/fabric building while introducing the highest level of architectural articulation, materials, and detail.</i></p> <p><i>The original use of brick along this section of McLeod is a defining element of the overall building. The building design employs a combination of exterior materials that take their cue from the street and the museum.</i></p> <p><i>The proposed development meets the front yard setbacks of the surrounding lots.</i></p> <p><i>Per Guideline d., development in the rear yards of properties on the north side of McLeod Street allows for building heights which are two storeys taller than the existing buildings on the property. As the existing two and a half storey buildings on site are proposed to be replaced with a three-storey massing. The mid-rise form along the streetscape and additional five storey building height located at the rear of the subject site responds to this guideline and the surrounding streetscape character along McLeod Street.</i></p>

## 5.2 Centretown Community Design Plan (CCDP)

### Centretown Community District Plan

The subject property is designated "Residential Mixed-use" in both the Centretown CDP and the implementing Centretown Secondary Plan and permits a building height of nine (9) storeys along the rear of the property and up to 4 storeys on the south portion of 283-285 McLeod site.

Section 6.5 of the CDP contains Heritage policies regarding integration and context. The CDP states that Group 1 and Group 2 heritage buildings must be protected and properly integrated with new development. The CDP encourages restoration, reuse, or integration of heritage structures into new mid-rise, mid-rise, or high-rise building development. It also discusses the need to respect key heritage features.

- New development should be respectful of key heritage elements. This can include, but is not limited to building stepbacks, cornice lines, façade horizontal and vertical articulations, opening sizes, proportion, and rhythm, and building materials. New development should maintain a cornice line consistent with the existing heritage building through appropriate stepbacks(s).

**Discussion:** *The history and buildings evolution is documented in the revised evaluation (Appendix A). The replacement buildings are a contemporary expression that will maintain the existing cornice lines, horizontal and vertical articulation of the façade, opening sizes, proportion and rhythm and building materials all of which are key heritage elements.*

- Where heritage buildings are low scaled, the podium of a new building will respect and reflect the urban grain and scale, visual relationships, and materials of the surrounding historic building(s). Compatible building materials should be used. Creative use of materials is encouraged.

**Discussion:** *The new buildings create a foreground podium with the mid-rise set back and rising above the house forms. The development respects and reflects the existing urban grain and scale, visual relationships, and materials of the two buildings and adjacent buildings along the street.*

- When adding a new building adjacent to a heritage building or streetscape, the following guidelines shall apply:
  - Use compatible materials.
  - Use stepbacks, front and side, to appropriately transition with adjacent building heights.
  - Minimize the use and height of blank walls.
  - Inform new development with adjacent building ground floor heights and heritage character to enhance the public realm.
  - Modulate façades using vertical breaks and stepbacks in a manner that is compatible with the surrounding heritage structures.

**Discussion:** *The new proposed development embraces the guidelines.*



## 5.4 Federal Heritage Buildings Review Office (FHBRO)

The FHBRO’s heritage character statement provides further direction in looking at the broader urban planning issues as they relate to the Museum and its interface with neighbouring properties. It places emphasis on the principle of axial symmetry, which should govern all relationships on site. It notes that the features of the town planning scheme, including the scale and elevations of the properties bordering the property and processional approach towards the main entrance are integral.

*Discussion: The FHBRO’s emphasis on axial symmetry and the broader features of town planning, including scale and elevations of properties are supported as part of the new development’s relationship to the Museum.*

## 5.5 Heritage Overlay

Section 60 of the zoning by-law refers to the heritage overlay, which affects the subject property. The intention of this section is to protect the character of heritage areas and significant heritage buildings.

*Discussion: As it is noted in the proposed zoning by-law amendment, relief from section 60 is being requested.*

## 5.6 Development Impacts

**Positive impacts** of the proposed development on the cultural heritage values of the Centretown HCD and McLeod Street include:

- The form and massing of 283 and 285 will be retained;
- The new residences at 283 and 285 provide a contemporary well-designed replacement that serves as the podium for the mid-rise that is set back from it.
- The additional height of the mid-rise is set back from the street, which provides a stepped backdrop to the museum.
- The building form at 283 and 285 are respectful of the streetscape and provide a handsome foreground to the mid-rise apartment infill.
- Preservation of a scale-appropriate streetscape with improvements to enhance the existing heritage fabric.
- Provision of residential units with street-facing entrances and active frontages.
- Aligning the three-storey building facades along McLeod Street with the facades of the adjacent buildings to form a consistent street-fronting edge.
- Landscape treatments will articulate the walkways to the residential units with autonomy. The landscaping is intended to connect with the public realm seamlessly, transitioning from the private realm and providing a united landscaped strip along McLeod Street.
- The large existing ‘gap’ in the streetscape between the existing buildings has maintained the lot divisions along the street with a landscape public-facing courtyard.
- A 6.8 metre rear yard setback is maintained, where the backyard open-space corridor is consistent with the existing rear yards of this portion of McLeod Street. This space will function as a ‘backyard,’ designed as common amenity space for the residents. A private patio is provided for the north facing ground floor apartment unit.

- An outdoor communal patio is proposed to be located in the rear yard below grade with access from the basement. This space will be landscaped to offer privacy between abutting properties.
- The number of parking spaces provided conforms to Official Plan policies, supporting the viable active transportation character of the area.

**Adverse impacts** of the proposed development include:

- The loss of two early 20<sup>th</sup> century residential buildings (Category 2 listed buildings) designated under Part 5 the Ontario Heritage Act. This is mitigated by the aggressive remodelling in the late 1970s that extensively altered their original character.
- The introduction of a five -storey mid-rise development adjacent to the Museum and its potential precedent for other developments.
- Traditional views from the Apartment block at 381 Gladstone will be altered.

## 6.0 ALTERNATIVES AND MITIGATION STRATEGIES

---

### 6.1 Alternatives and Mitigation Measures

The following alternatives and mitigation measures have been considered for integrating into the new development:

- The use of the red brick and a unified colour palette as part of the mid-rise exterior finishes supports the traditional materials commonly used in the district.
- On the west elevation of 285 McLeod the red brick has not been removed and replaced with a stucco finish. With demolition it would make sense to salvage the brick and incorporate it into the new development.
- The black panelled siding used on the five-storey mid-rise could potentially be heat sink. Consider a lighter tone.
- The front and the rear facades are well articulated if possible additional attention should be given to the east and west elevations of the apartment.
- The ‘rear balcony’ has been replaced with building on 5 levels so there is an increase in building area and an increase in 2-bedroom units.
- Due to 287 McLeod concerns, unit layouts and window locations have been revised.
- The rear elevation still needs some work that will be formalized at SPA.
- The existing street tree in front of 285 will be removed and a new street tree planted. The historic photograph (Figure 9) provides an excellent image of what the street looked like and offers an indication of how a concerted effort by the City, and the Museum could help reinterpret that image.

The city has provided the following suggestions to help integrate the development into its setting:

These comments have been addressed in the revised submission. The Rideau red brick is a character attribute that defines buildings along McLeod.



- This vertical brick element appears out of place and breaks with the two storey brick context in an uncomfortable way. Rather than mimicking the vertical chimneys, as a two dimensional planar object it re-inforces the modular five storey facade instead. I recommend reconsideration of this.
  - This floating box really competes with reading of the two storey red brick with dark third floor pitched roof (especially as seen from the view looking west at the third storey roof line.)
- VIEW FROM ACROSS THE STREET
- Can the modern interpretation of the stacked and covered porches be developed a little more to reflect the quality of the context?


## 6.2 Conclusions

This is a high-profile project overlooking the grounds of the Museum. It is part of an intact streetscape of the HCD and within the project there are opportunities to add value to the visual continuity of the neighbourhood. Over a five-year period, the development team has considered alternatives including demolition of one of the existing buildings and replacing the other with a new 3-storey residence along with constructing a new 9-storey mid-rise. Another option was retaining the two buildings with their existing character and building a new 6 storey building behind. These options have been evaluated and set aside.

The third alternative that is being presented is demolition of the two existing buildings and construction of a 5-storey apartment. This proposal, including the salvaging and reusing building fabric, is considered a reasonable balance that ensures that the development supports the concept of protection and reuse of a valuable grouping of heritage resources that can comfortably integrate with the heritage precinct. The new build, particularly as it relates to the historic streetscape is compatible with the Centretown Heritage Conservation District Plan and its expectations. The development respects the defined values of the urban grain, introduces a scale and visual relationship to the Museum landscape, and reflects the forms and materials of the adjacent buildings along the street.

The new development supports the objectives of the Museum Special Area and the policies and guidelines of the Conservation District, it is well proportioned, and offers a compact sympathetic design that demonstrates a creative approach to integrating contemporary treatment within a heritage area and its defining context.

## APPENDIX A: 283-285 MCLEOD ST. SURVEY FORMS

HERITAGE SURVEY AND EVALUATION FORM						
Municipal Address	283 McLeod Avenue	Building or Property Name				
Legal Description		Lot		Block		Plan
Date of Original Lot Development	1888 – 1901 FIP 1-1/2 Storey Residence	Date of current structure	1925 – 1946 FIP Altered Post 1975			
Additions	Exit enclosure at the rear of the building.	Original owner				
						
283 McLeod.						
<b>Garden / Landscape / Environment</b>		Prepared by: Ian Hunter				
		Month/Year: February 2018				

one tree dating to the renovation period post 1975. The building is set on the east property line.

**Contribution of Property to Heritage Environs**

Landscape / Open Space: The low retaining wall extending the length of the property muddles the streetscape with the introduction of a feature that is out of character with the typical late 19<sup>th</sup> early 20<sup>th</sup> century residences on McLeod.

Architecture / Built Space: The building retains its original massing; however, has lost its original orientation to the street and much of its original character, detailing and features.

**Landmark Status**

This is one of two similar residences constructed circa 1925-46 along McLeod the other being 263 McLeod. The building 283 McLeod is not a landmark.

**Summary / Comments on Environmental Significance**

<b>History</b>	Prepared by: Ian Hunter
	Month/Year: February 2018
Date of Current Building(s)	1925 – 1946 FIP Altered significantly Post 1975

**Trends**

Infill of vacant lots in the second quarter of the 20<sup>th</sup> century and the conversion of residential buildings to office or commercial use beginning in the 1970s.

**Events**

**Persons / Institutions**

**Summary / Comments on Historical Significance**

Historical Sources
Fire Insurance Plans; 1888-1901; 1901-1912; 1925-1946; July 1956;

<b>Architecture</b>	Prepared by: Ian Hunter
	Month/Year: February 2018

Architectural Design (plan, storeys, roof, windows, style, material, details, etc)



1965 Aerial view of McLeod with 283 McLeod (left) and 263 McLeod (right) both arrowed. Note the four-square plans with similar hip roofs and entrances fronting onto the street with porches.



View of 263 McLeod Street which was constructed during the same time period 1925-46 as the building at 283 McLeod.

Architectural Style

Vernacular Prairie Style (low pitch hip roof, horizontal orientation of windows, hipped dormer above entrance, window divisions multi-pane upper with a single pane lower sash). Rehabilitation – Colonial Revival (symmetrical front façade, gable centred on main façade, brackets applied to soffits, and main entrance detailing).

Designer / Builder / Architect / Landscape Architect

Architectural Integrity

The two-and-one-half storey residence was substantively altered post 1975. The original two storey entrance porch, and hipped dormer above the entrance were removed. The brick veneer was stripped from the McLeod Street façade, the west or interior courtyard elevation, as well as the majority of the brick veneer from the east elevation. The doors and windows were then removed from the south and west elevations, new doors and windows cut and framed, and the old windows framed in prior to the application of a fibre cement board. The original fenestration pattern is evident on the north and east elevation, and the majority of the brick veneer was retained on the north elevation. A central gable with bargeboard and a finial was then added to the south elevation and brackets installed under the soffit. Sometime after 1975 the first floor was rehabilitated for a commercial use,

the second and third floors for a residential use.

The alterations that occurred after 1975 to the south or McLeod Street façade include:  
 The removal of the two storey entrance porch, landing, and stairs fronting onto McLeod;  
 The removal of a hipped dormer from the south roof, and the installation of a gable with bargeboard and finial;  
 The stripping of the brick veneer and wood cladding to which the veneer was attached from the south, west, and east elevations;  
 The removal of the main entrance door, and all windows from the first and second floor fronting onto McLeod (south) and west interior courtyard and reframing of the old or removed and reframing for new window and door openings;  
 The application of a fibre cement board to the façade to conceal the extensive alterations to the fenestration pattern.

The residence was constructed during the same time frame (1925 – 1946) as the building to the east at 263 McLeod.



View of the first floor interior. Note the introduced window sill which extends almost to the floor, supporting the theory that the building originally had a more horizontal fenestration pattern similar to 263 McLeod. Note the original window to the right of the fireplace, and the simple casement detailing which is in keeping with a construction date in the 1925 – 30 period. The fireplace brickwork and pattern are also typical of the 1920 – 1930 period.

Outbuildings

Other

Summary / Comments on Architectural Significance


The rehabilitated building retains its original massing four square 2-1/2 storey, exterior frame walls, hip roof, and original fenestration pattern on the north and east elevations.

The building has been categorized as a Group 2 heritage resource – significant from an architectural and streetscape perspective. The 1996 survey and evaluation form noted the building as being a 'good example of a turn of the century residential design' with a 'stucco finish with decorative wood trim and shutters' in a vernacular Georgian Style.



## HERITAGE SURVEY AND EVALUATION FORM

Municipal Address	285 McLeod Avenue	Building or Property Name			
Legal Description		Lot		Block	Plan
Date of Original Lot Development	1901 – 1912 FIP	Date of current structure	1901 – 1912 FIP Altered Post 1975		
Additions	Exit enclosure, Post 1975	Original owner			



285 McLeod (right) 287 McLeod (left). The building to the right looked very similar to the building on the left prior to 1975.

<b>Garden / Landscape / Environment</b>	Prepared by: Ian Hunter
	Month/Year: February 2018
Heritage Conservation District name	Centretown HCD
Character of Existing Streetscape	

This section of McLeod extending from O'Connor east has a consistent streetscape with buildings set back uniformly from the property line, the buildings address the street with sidewalks extending to the front entrances porches, with grassed and landscaped front yards. There are few trees along the north side of McLeod where the overhead electrical distribution lines are located. This property and the adjacent property at 283 McLeod are the anomalies on the streetscape in that neither address the street.

The built heritage context on the streetscape extending between O'Connor and Metcalf dates between pre-1888 through to 1939 (Appin Apartments). The built context is fairly consistent in that the residences are typically 2-1/2 storeys in height, brick clad, with one or two storey porches, bay windows, with gables facing the street. The building styles range from vernacular Victorian, Queen Anne, Edwardian, Prairie, and Art Deco (Appin Apartments). All of the buildings on the street relate to an important time period in the development of Centretown between 1870 through to 1912 when the Victoria Memorial Museum was constructed, through to the widespread introduction of apartment buildings in the 1930's.




View of the streetscape extending east along McLeod. 285 McLeod is to the left and 283 centre right.

#### Character of Existing Property

The property is adjacent to a large side and rear yard which is paved and used predominantly as a parking area. There is a grassed front yard separated from the street with a low brick retaining wall with pillars at each end capped with a concrete coping extending the width of the property. The property shares a common entrance to the parking at the rear of the lot. The grassed front yard with shrub foundation planting extends into the property to a side entrance. The front yard has been planted with one tree dating to the renovation period post 1975. The building is set on the west property line adjacent to another building with no side yard.

#### Contribution of Property to Heritage Environs

<p>Landscape / Open Space: The low retaining wall extending the length of the property muddles the streetscape with the introduction of a feature that is out of character with the typical late 19<sup>th</sup> early 20<sup>th</sup> century residences on McLeod.</p> <p>Architecture / Built Space: The building retains its original massing; however, has lost its original orientation to the street and much of its original character, detailing and features.</p>	
<p>Landmark Status</p>	
<p>This is one of three nearly identical residences constructed in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century at the corner of O'Connor and McLeod. The building 285 McLeod is not a landmark.</p>	
<p>Summary / Comments on Environmental Significance</p>	
<p> </p>	
<p><b>History</b></p>	<p>Prepared by: Ian Hunter</p>
	<p>Month/Year: February 2018</p>
<p>Date of Current Building(s)</p>	<p>1901 – 1911 FIP Altered significantly Post 1975</p>
<p>Trends</p>	
<p>Conversion of residential buildings to office or commercial use beginning in the 1970s.</p>	
<p>Events</p>	
<p> </p>	
<p>Persons / Institutions</p>	
<p> </p>	
<p>Summary / Comments on Historical Significance</p>	
<p>One of three similar 2-1/2 storey detached residences built in the 1901 -1911 period on the north side of McLeod adjacent to O'Connor Streets.</p>	
<p>Historical Sources</p>	
<p>Fire Insurance Plans; 1888-1901; 1901-1912; 1925-1946; July 1956                  Floor plans dating to post 1975, City of Ottawa, Building Department;</p>	

<b>Architecture</b>	Prepared by: Ian Hunter
	Month/Year: February 2018
Architectural Design (plan, storeys, roof, windows, style, material, details, etc)	
	
<p>First and second floor plans submitted to the building department in 1975. Note the two storey entrance porch, the bay window on the first floor with a shallow projecting bay at the second floor level. Note the asymmetrical arrangement of fenestrations on the McLeod Street façade. Note the fenestration pattern on the east elevation.</p>	
Architectural Style	
<p>Vernacular Queen Anne (asymmetrical facade, irregular roof lines – dormers, gables, two storey balconies, red brick exterior with stone and wood trim. Rehabilitation – Vernacular Colonial Revival (symmetrical front and side façade, side entrance detailing).</p>	
Designer / Builder / Architect / Landscape Architect	

<b>Architectural Integrity</b>
<p>The two-and-one-half storey residence was substantively altered post 1975. A set of floor plans (first, second, and third) were submitted in 1975 to the City of Ottawa building department. The plans illustrate the as-found form at the time. The plans illustrate the conversion of a single family home to an apartment complex with three units - one unit per floor. The original two storey entrance porch, projecting bay window on the first floor, enclosed wood porch on the second floor, and fenestration pattern are evident in the floor plans; Sometime after 1975 the first and second floors were rehabilitated for a commercial use and a residential use on the third floor was retained.</p> <p>The alterations that occurred after 1975 to the south or McLeod Street façade include:          The removal of the two storey entrance porch, landing, and stairs fronting on McLeod offset to the west property line;          The removal of a projecting bay window on the first floor level including brick cladding and horizontal wood boards to which the brick veneer was attached, and wood framing;          The infill and capping of the projecting stone foundation below the bay window (a heat pump is set on top);          The removal of a shallow projecting bay from the second floor, including brick veneer, board cladding, and wood framing;          The removal of the main entrance door, and all windows from the first and second floor fronting onto McLeod and reframing of old and new window openings;          The removal of the brick veneer, and wood framing to accommodate the symmetrically placement of three new windows on the first and second floor levels, in what was an asymmetrical fenestration pattern;;          Alterations to the roof form with the removal of a gabled dormer, and a projecting gable above the projecting bay window, and the insertion of a new gable centred on the south façade with bargeboard and finial; ;and,          The application of a cement board to the façade to conceal the extensive alterations to the fenestration pattern, selective removal of the brick veneer, infill of removed windows, cutting in of new windows.          Alterations to the east or courtyard elevation include:          The insertion of a new entrance door in what was a window with the removal of the brick veneer, enlarging and reframing of the opening;          The insertion of new window to the north of the new entrance on the ground floor;          The application of a cement board finish to conceal the extensive alterations to the east façade;          The construction of a brick clad two storey exit enclosure; and,          The fenestration pattern on the second floor level was retained during the rehabilitation.</p> <p>The residence was constructed during the same time frame (1901 – 1911) as the two buildings to the west at 287 &amp; 289 McLeod.</p>
<b>Outbuildings</b>
<b>Other</b>
<b>Summary / Comments on Architectural Significance</b>
<p>The rehabilitated building retains most of its original massing – exterior walls, truncated hip roof and one dormer, the two storey rear wing, and the original fenestration pattern on the north wing, and the second floor level on the east elevation. The residence has lost most of its original detailing on the McLeod Street elevation including: two storey wood porch, bay window with gable over, main entrance and the original asymmetrical fenestration pattern. The exterior brick veneer would have been largely removed along with the wood board cladding to which the veneer was attached in order to frame in the old and introduce new window and door openings.</p> <p>The building has been categorized as a Group 2 heritage resource – significant from an architectural</p>

and streetscape perspective. The 1996 survey and evaluation form noted the building as being a 'good example of a turn of the century residential design' with a 'stucco finish with decorative wood trim and shutters' in a vernacular Georgian Style.