

HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT & CONSERVATION PLAN*

168 -174 MURRAY STREET, OTTAWA



Owner: David Yoo
Address: 168 – 174 Murray Street, Ottawa, Ontario

Revised March 2025



COMMONWEALTH


AUTHORS QUALIFICATIONS

Commonwealth Historic Resource Management offers services related to conservation, planning, research, design, and interpretation for historical and cultural resources. A key focus of the practice is planning and assessment of heritage resources as part of the development process.

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 former panel member with the Ottawa Urban Design Review Panel, having retired after 15 years, and continues as a board member of Algonquin College Heritage Carpentry Program.

*The following HIA (Heritage Impact Assessment) report is a revision of two earlier versions of what was previously called a CHIS (Cultural Heritage Impact Statement) A preliminary Conservation Plan was prepared and submitted in 2022 and a formal version was submitted in December 2024. The views and opinions expressed in the report are those of the author.



John J. Stewart
Principal

TABLE OF CONTENTS

AUTHORS QUALIFICATIONS 2

1.0 INTRODUCTION 4

1.1 Objective..... 4

1.2 Site Location, Current Conditions, and Introduction to Development Site 5

1.3 Street/Heritage/Contextual Character 6

1.5 Relevant Policy Information from Council Approved Documents 8

2.0 HERITAGE RESOURCE DESCRIPTION AND HISTORY 9

2.1 Neighbourhood and Development Site History..... 9

2.2 168 Murray Street 9

2.3 174 Murray Street 10

..... 12

2.4 Comparable Properties throughout Lowertown 12

3.0 STATEMENT OF CULTURAL HERITAGE VALUE..... 15

3.1 Statement of Cultural Heritage Value 15

4.0 DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT 17

4.1 Description of the Proposed Development..... 17

4.2 The Existing Residences at 174 and 168 Murray Street 21

4.3 Conservation Process 23

4.4 Procedure 23

5.0 IMPACT OF THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT..... 25

5.1 Lowertown West Heritage Conservation District Plan (2024)..... 25

5.2 Section 60 – Heritage Overlay: 30

5.3 Positive and Negative Impacts 31

5.4 Alternatives and Mitigation..... 31

5.5 Conclusions..... 31

6.0 PART 2 CONSERVATION PLAN..... 33

6.1 The Plan 33

6.2 Existing Buildings Statement of Intent: 33

6.3 Conservation Approach 33

6.4 Documentation and Recording..... 37

6.5 As-Found Record & Site Plan 37

6.6 Conservation Strategy for 168 Murray Street 38

6.7 Conservation Strategy for 174 Murray Street 42

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Objective

This CHIS/HIA identifies the cultural heritage resources and values that may be impacted by the construction of a four-storey infill apartment building at 168-174 Murray Street. The proposed development includes the retention and rehabilitation of the two detached houses, both of which have been identified as contributing resources within the context of the Lowertown West Heritage Conservation District (LWHCD). The authority for an HIA is derived from the City of Ottawa's Official Plan, the Ontario Heritage Act, Section 2(d) of the Planning Act, and the Provincial Policy Statement.

This Cultural Heritage Impact Statement (CHIS) and Preliminary Conservation Plan were prepared and submitted as requested by the City of Ottawa in 2021 with revisions in 2022. This was followed by the submission of a detailed Conservation Plan titled **Addendum #1 Conservation Plan, prepared by Commonwealth Historic Resource Management, dated 20 June 2024**. The following document responds to the city's most recent pre-consultation comments. Both the Conservation Plan and the CHIS update the January 2025 comments. As requested, this update includes a sentence/comment that explains that the CHIS and Addendum were prepared to fulfill the requirement of the HIA with Conservation Plan, and that the names are used interchangeably.

An HIA provides an objective review of a proposed development or site alteration from a heritage perspective. It is a comprehensive document designed to evaluate a proposed redevelopment's appropriateness and compliance by determining the cultural heritage values of a property, considering the impact of proposed interventions, outlining mitigate measures, and guiding a conservation strategy for a property's identified heritage attributes.

The Assessment considers the project at 168-174 Murray Street in terms of heritage conservation principles found in Parks Canada's "Standards and Guidelines", the Provincial Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism, and Culture Industries (MHSTCI) Culture and Sport's "Ontario Heritage Tool Kit" as well as local guidelines as in this case, Lowertown West Heritage Conservation District Plan, 2024.

Lowertown West was formally recognized under Part V of the Ontario Heritage Act by the City of Ottawa in 1994 (By-law 192-94). Previous versions of this report refer to policies and guidelines in effect at the time of the submission, relying on the Lowertown West Heritage Conservation District Guidelines. The (Updated) Lowertown West Heritage Conservation District Plan was approved by Council in December 2024. The HIA refers to relevant policies and guidelines found in the council-approved document.

This HIA follows the content outline recommended by the City of Ottawa for Cultural Heritage Impact Statements/Heritage Impact Assessment.

The following documents were used in the preparation of this report:

- Parts IV and V of the Ontario Heritage Act;
- Lowertown West Heritage Conservation District Study, 1993, and Lowertown West Conservation District Plan 2024;
- Summary Heritage Sheets 168 and 174 Murray Street;
- A collection of photographs documenting existing heritage buildings within Lowertown.
- Pre-consultation meeting, December 10, 2021.
- Community consultation meeting December 15, 2021
- On-site recording and selective stripping of finishes, April, and May 2022.
- Pre-consultation meeting pre-consult (PC2023-0180).
- Pre-consultation meeting, February 6, 2025.
- Planning Rationale + Design Brief, prepared by Fotenn Planning+Design, dated December 17, 2024;
- Zoning Confirmation Report, prepared by Fotenn Planning+Design, dated December 17, 2024;
- Survey Plan, prepared by Annis O'Sullivan Vollebakk, dated January 12, 2021;
- Site Plan, prepared by Redline Architecture Inc., Revision 1, dated 4 July 2023;
- Elevations, Plans, prepared by Redline Architecture Inc., Revision 1, dated 4 July 2023;

- Revised plans elevations prepared by Redline Architecture Inc. February 2025.
- Tree Conservation Report, prepared by Gendron Forestry Services, dated 30 March 2022;
- Landscape / Planting Plan, L-01 & L-02, Project No. 22-1682, prepared by Ruhland & Associates Ltd, Revision 4 dated 29 November 2024; Revision 5, February 2025.
- A Cultural Heritage Impact Statement & Conservation Plan 168-174 Murray Street, Ottawa, prepared by Commonwealth Historic Resource Management, 2021, Revised V4 dated June 2022, and Addendum #1 Conservation Plan, prepared by Commonwealth Historic Resource Management, dated 20 June 2024;
- Parks Canada's Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada, Second Edition, 2010.

Owner and Contact Information

Address: 168 – 174 Murray Street, Ottawa, Ontario

Owner: David Yoo

Contact: Levent Tatar BArch. OAA

Email Address: info@redlinearchitecture.ca

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

The development site is located in the Byward Market neighborhood in a block bound by Dalhousie Street to the west, Murray Street to the north, Clarence Street to the south, and Cumberland to the east. The two properties are located on the southern edge of the Lowertown West HCD. The mid-block development site contains two residences that have been identified as contributing resources within the context of the HCD; a two-storey brick clad flat roofed detached residence constructed in 1908 at 174 Murray and a two-storey flat roofed building originally constructed in pre-1861 as a squared log 1.5 storey side gable worker's cottage at 168 Murray Street.

The proposal is to retain and rehabilitate the two existing buildings exclusive of rear wings within the development site and construct a four-storey apartment building in the rear yards of the two properties.

Adjacent heritage properties include a 2.5 storey wood clad row house with a side gable and a series of gabled dormers constructed prior to 1870 to the west (162 Murray), and the Ecole Guiges a four-storey brick clad school now a condominium constructed in 1904 on the north side of Murray Street. Ecole Guiges was designated under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act. St. Brigid Catholic Church (St. Brigid Centre for the Arts) at the east end of the block is a provincially designated historic site.




Figure 1: Aerial view illustrating the built context within the block and adjacent to the development site. Note the large four-storey addition behind the adjacent building at 162 Murray. Site arrowed. Source: Google Earth



Figure 2: Block plan illustrating the built context surrounding the development site. Site arrowed. Source: Geoottawa



Figure 3: Street view looking east on Murray. The nave of St. Brigid is on the left.
Source: Google Earth




Figure 4: Street view looking south to 174 (left) and -168 (right) Murray Street, constructed in 1908 and c.1850, respectively. Source: Google Earth

1.3 Street/Heritage/Contextual Character

The heritage character of the mid-block site on the south side of Murray Street between Dalhousie and Cumberland Streets is established by the two detached residences within the development site and a side-by-side row house to the west. The group of heritage buildings are framed by two contemporary apartment buildings to the east and west.

The heritage character of the north side of Murray across the street from the development site is established by the four-storey brick clad flat roofed Ecole Guiges. The varying street setbacks from the Commonwealth Historic Resource Management

property line reflect the date of construction, where older buildings are set closer to the street. Front yards are a mix of hard surfacing (driveways and walkways) interspersed with turf and a limited number of street trees.



Figure 5: Street view of 162 Murray Street adjacent to the development site (left). Note the large five-storey addition behind the building. Source: Google Earth



Figure 6: View looking west on Murray Street, illustrating adjacent context. Ecole Guiges a property designated under Part IV of the OHA. The development site is to the left. Source: Google Earth




Figure 7: View of the entrance to a four-storey infill building to the rear of 162 Murray Street. Source: Google Earth



Figure 8: St. Bridget’s Centre for the Arts at the corner of St. Patrick Street, Cumberland Street and Murray Street,




Figure 9 & 10: A view from the rear yard of 168 Murray Street Illustrate the context and relationship to 162 Murray. The turquoise indicates the portion of the two buildings that will be removed to construct the apartment shown in dark grey with the two houses shown in white. Source: Red Line Architecture 2022.

1.5 Relevant Policy Information from Council Approved Documents

The Planning Rationale prepared for this project by FOTENN Planning Consultants provides a detailed policy analysis.

- Provincial Policy Statement, PPS 2020. The cultural heritage policies of the PPS apply to this property. The two properties have been designated under Part V of the *Ontario Heritage Act*; Policy 2.6.1 applies, as it directs “significant built heritage resources” to be conserved.
- City of Ottawa Official Plan 2022 has many of the same heritage policies as the 2003 Official Plan. In addition, however, it identifies the adjacent Ward Market as a Special District (Section 6.6.4).
- Mature Neighbourhoods By-law.

- Heritage Overlay provisions in Zoning By-law 2008-250 (Section 60) are applicable to the subject lands. Relief from the Heritage Overlay will be necessary to permit the proposed development.
- Lowertown West Heritage Conservation District Plan. 2024. The HCD Study was completed before the 2005 changes to the *Ontario Heritage Act* and subsequent changes to the PPS. The Lowertown West Heritage Conservation District Plan was approved by Council in December 2024 and is in effect. This HIA refers to relevant policies and guidelines in assessing impact and appropriateness of the proposed development.

2.0 HERITAGE RESOURCE DESCRIPTION AND HISTORY

2.1 Neighbourhood and Development Site History

The history of the area is outlined in the Lowertown West Heritage Conservation District Study and Plan. The two existing buildings at 168 & 174 Murray Street are both located within the Lowertown Heritage Conservation District (“the HCD”) and designated under Part V of the Ontario Heritage Act. Both properties are identified as category 3 properties and considered contributing to the HCD.

The property 168-174 Murray Street is between Cumberland Street to the east and Dalhousie Street to the west in the Lowertown neighbourhood in the City of Ottawa. The site currently contains two (2) buildings; a two-storey detached brick building municipally addressed as 174 Murray Street, and a two-storey detached building municipally addressed as 168 Murray Street. Each of the existing buildings has been altered over time, including the addition of the second floor and façade alterations to 168 Murray Street and later additions to both buildings to the rear. The remainder of the rear yard contains a landscaped outdoor area. The two existing buildings have been identified as contributing properties within the Lowertown West Heritage Conservation District (LWHCD).

2.2 168 Murray Street

The building at 168 Murray is a one-and-one half storey squared log cottage with a side gable roof and gabled dormers facing the street. The City of Ottawa’s census record dated 1861 indicates that the property was owned by the McManus family. The front portion of the building measures 7.7m (24’) in width by 6.4n (21’) in depth for a square footage of 500sq.ft. The house was subsequently modified c. 1965 to a two-storey structure when the flat roof and the existing exterior finishes were applied (Figure 13). The building retains its ground floor fenestration pattern with a central entrance and two side windows that are repeated on the second-floor level, approximately in the same position as the original gable dormer openings with a third slightly smaller window set directly above the door. Figure 12 documents the original one-and-one half storey side gable roof with gabled dormers facing the street.

The image shows two pages from the 1861 Census. The left page is a household schedule for the McManus family, showing 11 individuals (5 males and 6 females) living in a log house. The right page is a building inventory schedule, showing a building constructed in 1876, measuring 66 x 99 feet, and valued at \$265. The building is described as a log house.

Figure 11: 1861 Census documents the McManus family owned a 66 x.99 lot at 168 Murray and were living in 11/2 storey log house. The Lowertown building inventory recorded that the building was constructed in 1876 based on Fire Insurance plans. The Source: Lowertown Community Association



Figure 12: The house at 168 Murray appears in the background of the c.1949 parade. The house is a 1 1/2 storey side gable with two dormers facing the street, a centre front door with no canopy, horizontal siding on the front and squared timber chinked and whitewashed on the gabled side elevation. Source: Marc Aubin Collection



Figure 13: A view of 168 Murray Street as altered circa 1965. The house has been remodelled with a flat roof, second floor added, and three windows replacing the dormers. The exterior was reclad in an angel stone on the ground floor and aluminum siding on the upper floor. A canopy over the front door has been added. Source: City of Ottawa Heritage Survey Forms 1991.

2.3 174 Murray Street

The two-storey brick clad frame building with a flat roof at 174 Murray was constructed in 1908. Exterior features include galvanized metal cornice roof trim and detailing, stone window lintels brick voussoirs and decorative hoods and coursed limestone foundations. The house appears in a c1949 photo (Figure 14).




Figure 14: A c.1949 picture with the two houses in the background clearly documents the brick siding of 174 Murray Street and the cottage form of the neighbouring 168 Murray. The textured sidewall of 168 suggests the squared log that has been covered over on the front façade with a horizontal siding. The off-set door on the 2-storey has an arched header. Source: Marc Aubin’s collection



Figure 15 and 16: This collage of pictures documents the extensive alterations. Two views 1992 and 2022. 174 Murray (left) before the vinyl siding being removed and rehabilitated front. Note the different brick at the corner (both size and colour consistency) and the lack of corbelled banding and the transom treatment.

The house appears in a c.1949 photo, which highlights its attributes (Figure 14). The 1992 view of the building retains its form, with the exterior re-clad with a vinyl siding. The finials and a portion of the cornice detail are retained. The offset door is evident in the 1949 picture, but the distinctive hood has been covered or altered. In the 2022 view, the front door’s arched brickwork (voussoir), masonry hood and band of corbelled brickwork at the transom, were not incorporated into the replaced brick at the corner.

Figure 17: 1901 Fire Insurance Plan Volume 1 Detail Sheet 27. The building at 174 is shown as a 11/2 storey mirror image of 168 Murray indicating that the existing building at 174 is post 1901. A small worker’s cottage is on the lot at 174 Murray. Source: Library and Archives Canada.






Figure 17a: The 1912 Fire Insurance Plan Sheet 21 documents the 2-storey brick veneer at 174 Murray had been constructed and the little residence at 172 was demolished. The 'P' on the roof of 168 indicates that at that period, the roofing cover was a composite material.

2.4 Comparable Properties throughout Lowertown

The proposed development will include the conservation and rehabilitation of both the two-storey brick clad frame building located at 174 Murray and the one and one half-storey log/frame building at 168 Murray. Both are significant heritage features along Murray Street.



Figure 18: View of small workers cottages that were typical of Lowertown (left).The two-storey brick building with metal cornice and limestone foundations is also a typical form. Note the slight variations in the setback of all three buildings. Source: CIHB



Figure 19: Lowertown Streetscape with a series of 1 1/2 cottages and 2-storey Italianate flat roof semi-detached. Source: Low grade residential buildings in Ottawa's Lower Town. Many have now disappeared. Canadian Inventory of Historic Buildings.




Figure 20: A restored cottage with standing metal seam roof. The offset front door suggests that the building is log with the horizontal siding. Source Lowertown inventory.



Figure: 21. View at the intersection of Dalhousie and Boteler Streets and Figure 22: Aubin House St. Andrews Street. Source: Marc Aubin Coll.



Figure 22: The example of a log cabin at 161 Guiges Avenue with the second-floor addition. Source: Luis Juarez



Figure 23: View in Lowertown Source: a027047



Figure 24: View of the two-storey painted brick duplex at 109 Dalhousie and the cottage duplex at 111-115 Dalhousie are uncanny in the similarities with the Murray Street property. Source: Google Street view.

3.0 STATEMENT OF CULTURAL HERITAGE VALUE

The following text is taken from Historic Places in Canada website.

3.1 Statement of Cultural Heritage Value

Description Of Historic Place

The Lowertown West Heritage Conservation District comprises many blocks of residential and institutional development within Ottawa's central core. The district is immediately north of the Byward Market, south of the Ottawa River and east of the Rideau Canal. Lowertown is one of the earliest settlement areas in the City of Ottawa, with development starting in 1827 and continuing until the beginning of the twentieth century. The dwellings in Lowertown West demonstrate a wide range of architectural types. The richness of the heritage character of Lowertown West is strongly related to the variety of these buildings, their various materials, scale and form, and the layering of additions and alterations, which have occurred over time.

Lowertown West was formally recognized under Part V of the Ontario Heritage Act by the City of Ottawa in 1994 (By-law 192-94).

Heritage Value

Lowertown West is associated with the early settlement of Bytown (later Ottawa) and exhibits a unique architectural character. Lowertown's general form derives from the distribution of land in 1827 when Colonel John By laid out Bytown as an Upper and Lower Town. Streets were principally east-west between the Rideau Canal and the Rideau River, with north-south connectors as needed. This original street grid is primarily intact today, although some of the names have changed to commemorate prominent figures in the development of the area. After the Vesting Act in 1843, land was finally granted with deeds of ownership and institutions gained a greater prominence in Lowertown, most notably the Roman Catholic Church. The ensuing development of Lowertown was largely speculative, driven in part by the coming of the railway in 1854, and by the expansion of the city after the announcement of the choice of the national capital in 1857.

Lowertown experienced another boom period starting in the 1870s, despite a crushing depression that greatly affected its working-class inhabitants. During this period, Sussex drive was built up and the Catholic institutions expanded. The boom period ended abruptly at the outbreak of World War I, and little further development took place until the urban renewal projects starting in the 1960s.

The heritage value of Lowertown West is also derived from its associations with the histories of the working-class Irish and French settlers of Ottawa. Most inhabitants of Lowertown were itinerant labourers, working on the canal in the earliest years, or connected with the squared timber trade. The early population of Lowertown was more than half Irish Catholic, with the remainder being French Canadian. However, toward the end of the 19th century, the French presence in Lowertown grew as the Irish Catholics moved to other parts of the city. While overall ethnic and religious profiles remained stable in Ottawa, occupational profiles shifted strongly as the Civil Service tripled its employees between 1900 and 1910 and Lowertown quickly evolved from a labourer's neighbourhood to one, which served government employees.

Lowertown West exhibits variety, scale, coherence, sense of place and landmarks within its architectural composition. The age, style, or architectural attractiveness of individual buildings is less important to the urban character than the aggregate urban quality that results. The range of building materials, proportions, setbacks, and profiles varies considerably along each street, but an overall similarity emerges from the diversity that dignifies the older buildings and embraces the newer ones.

Most of the buildings are vernacular in character and cannot be clearly identified stylistically. The richness of the heritage character of Lowertown West is strongly related to the variety of these buildings, their

various materials, scale and form, and the layering of additions and alterations, which have occurred over time. The effect is one of generally small-scale buildings, with patterns of lot occupation, building forms and styles that have evolved but do not differ dramatically in urban effect from their historic precedents. These qualities are distinctive to the area, are representative of the earliest phases of settlement, and are a unique part of the city's heritage.

Sources: Lowertown West Heritage Conservation District Study, May 1993, City of Ottawa

Character-Defining Elements

Character defining elements that contribute to the heritage value of the Lowertown West Heritage Conservation District include its:

- large variation of vernacular architectural styles and expressions
- early “workers' cottages,” commonly one-and-a-half or two-and-a-half-storey double houses with central or side chimneys, built using traditional materials and techniques.
- single or double houses of the mid-19th century with front gable, wood verandas and distinct wood decorative elements
- flat roofed structures of the late 19th century, which predated the modern apartment complex and often included wood verandas and carriageways.
- use of various local materials, including wood, brick veneer and grey stone
- primarily low-density residential streets marked with institutional buildings.
- grand scale institutional buildings, mainly in the Gothic Revival and Second Empire styles
- dominant institutional landmarks, most notably those of the Roman Catholic Church
- general form and land distribution that recalls the original survey by Colonel John By for the English Crown in 1827.
- east-west street layout with north-south connectors, as originally planned by Colonel By.
- relatively intact streetscapes built to a human scale.
- layout as the first settlement area in the City of Ottawa.
- features that reflect the original French and Irish working-class settlers of Bytown.

*Highlighted elements can be specific to 168 and 172 Murray Street



Figure 25: Lowertown Heritage Conservation District delineated with the blackline. The property is arrowed.
Source: City of Ottawa.

4.0 DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

4.1 Description of the Proposed Development

The development proposal includes the retention and rehabilitation of two existing houses, and the construction of a four-storey infill apartment building in the rear yard. The rear wings of both buildings and an accessory shed will be demolished to accommodate the eighteen (18) unit apartment building. The separate street entrances to both houses will be maintained, with a recessed entrance foyer to the apartment between the two homes, reminiscent of carriageways between buildings defining access to the rear yard and establishing a hierarchy. The glazed treatment is intended to display the squared timber of the cottage and maintains the consistent setbacks characteristic of the streetscape.

The development is proposed to contain a total of 20 units, where the proposed addition will contain thirteen (13) one-bedroom units, and five (5) two-bedroom units. A total of 157 square metres of amenity space is provided via the communal rear yard space. As permitted by the Zoning Bylaw, no residential parking is required for the site, however a total of 22 bicycle storage spaces are provided.

The proposed addition is set well back, allowing both extant historic buildings to stand proud. The adjacent development (166-162 Murray) incorporates a six-storey addition setback from the 2.5 side gable. The 4-storey height of the proposed addition respects the neighbouring buildings.



Figure 26: site Plan and context and building zoning. Source: RedLine Architecture Inc. 2022, revised 2025.

Scale, Massing, Setbacks

The four-storey scale of the proposed building is sensitive to the visual context of the area. It is a contemporary expression clad in traditional brick and comfortably set back from the two existing residences and the public streetscape. The proposed development achieves the intention of small-scale development and relies on the existing buildings and the recessed entrance between the buildings to interpret and maintain the existing lot divisions. In combination with the retention and restoration of the existing buildings, there is a clear distinction and integration of existing and new.

The increased height, decreased side yard setback, and front and side yard projections attributed to the addition will require relief from the Heritage Overlay provisions in Zoning By-law 2008-250 (Section 60).

Materiality and Design

The proposed apartment building is a contemporary expression that incorporates architectural features that compliment and take their cue from features of the existing heritage buildings. These include cornice details, window composition, tan/beige brick cladding, decorative brickwork, and entrance setback reminiscent of colonial, covered carriageways.

The new apartment will incorporate natural materials, including brick cladding along the front and side façades. The colour is a tan-beige tone, distinct but complimentary to the restored cladding of the 2-storey semi-detached. The windows will be a painted metal clad.

The rear roof slope of 168 Murray will be closed with a flat roof extending back from the ridge, and the flat roof of 174 Murray street will be reinforced to serve as rainwater storage.

168-174 Murray Street			
Zoning 2008-250: RAUD [952] 674; Heritage Overlay: Mature Neighbourhood Overlay			
Dwelling Type: 4-storey addition to existing 2-storey buildings			
Zoning Mechanism	Required	Provided	Compliance
Minimum Lot Width (Section 152)	15 m	20.46 m	Yes
Minimum Lot Area (Section 152)	450 m ²	645.2 m ²	Yes
Front Yard Setback – Existing (Section 144)	Required front yard setback must align with the average of the abutting lots (not less than 1.5 m or more than 4.5 m) 0.2 m + 1.83 m / 2 = 0.915 m	Existing setbacks: 0.16 m, 1.45 m, 1.59 m	Non-complying (Existing building)
Front Yard – Addition (Section 65)	Must not extend in the front yard beyond that of the heritage building	Addition setback: 3.72 m	Yes
Interior Side Yard Setback – Existing (Section 162)	1.5 m	Existing setback (east): 1.638 m Existing setback (west): 0 m	Non-complying (Existing building)
Interior Side Yard Setback – Addition (Section 65)	Must be at least 60 cm, greater than that of the wall of the building located closest to the side lot line	Addition setback (east): 1.48 m Addition setback (west): 1.223 m	No Yes
Rear Yard Setback – Existing (Section 144)	Any lot with a lot depth > 20m, distance equal to 30% of the lot depth must comprise at least 25% of the area of the lot Minimum Setback: 9.69 m Minimum Area: 163.5 m ²	Existing setback: 23.09 m & 29.86 m Rear Yard Area: 158.77 m ² in area	Non-complying (Existing buildings)
Rear Yard Setback – Addition (Section 65)	Must be located entirely within the rear yard, or in the interior yard abutting the rear yard and complies with the rear yard setback of the underlying zone, except where the building has a non-complying rear yard setback the addition may be built to that rear yard setback, but in no case may be less than 3.0 metres Minimum Setback: 9.69 m	Addition setback: 7.916 m	No
Building Height Addition (Schedule 74)	168 Murray: 5.8 m (9.14 m from front lot line), 9.3 m (rear) 174 Murray: 7.0 m (9.14 m from front lot line), 10.5 m (rear)	13.38 m	No
Projections into Required Yards (Section 65)	Open Stairways, Stoops, Landing Steps: where at or below the floor level of the first floor and in the case of the front yard or corner side yard: no closer than 0.6 m to a lot line Eaves, eaves-troughs, and gutters – 1m, but not closer than 0.3m to a lot line.	Existing heritage building stairways projected beyond the front lot line, abutting the front lot line Only the existing heritage building at 168 Murray has existing eaves on the property line but will be removed.	Non-complying (Existing buildings) Yes

Vehicle and Bicycle Parking Requirements (Area X, Schedule 1A)			
Required Parking Spaces (Section 101, 102)	Section 101 (1), where a residential use is located within a building of four or fewer storeys, no offstreet vehicle parking is required to be provided	0 spaces	Yes
Visitor Parking Spaces (Section 102)	20 – 12 x 0.1 = 1 space required	0 spaces	No
Bicycle Parking Rates (Section 111)	0.5 / dwelling unit 20 x 0.5 = 10 spaces required	22 spaces total (stacked)	Yes
Bicycle Parking Space Dimensions (Section 111)	Horizontal: 0.6 m x 1.8 m Stacked: 0.37 m x 1.8 m	Stacked: 0.37 m x 1.8 m	Yes
Bicycle Parking Aisle Dimension (Section 111)	Minimum width: 1.5 m	1.5 m	Yes
Other Applicable Zoning Provisions			
Front Yard Softscaping (Table 161)	No minimum, but all lands within the front yard that are not used by permitted projections, driveways and walkways, must consist of soft landscaped area	All lands within the front yard that are not used by permitted projections and walkways consist of soft landscaping	Yes
Rear Yard Softscaping (Section 139)	15%	75.7%	Yes
Front Façade Fenestration (Section 161)	Must comprise of at least 25% windows Recessed front façade where no balconies or porches are provided - At least 20% of the front façade must be recessed an additional 0.6m from the front setback line	N/A as subject lands are within a district designated under Part V of the Ontario Heritage Act	N/A



Figure 27: A street elevation of the proposed development and an elevation of the east façade in the context of the neighbouring properties. Source: Redline Architecture Inc. 2025.



Figure 28: A view looking south and west, with the proposed grey panelled 4-storey apartment positioned behind the heritage buildings. It fits comfortably within the context of the streetscape and neighbouring built forms. Source: Redline Architecture Inc. 2025.



Figure 29: Plan views of the basement, ground floor, second, third, and fourth floors Source: Redline Architecture 2025





Figure 30 and 31: Renderings looking south-east with the new addition clad in a beige/ tan brick and setback from the Street. The two-storey brick cladding at 174 Murray is its most prevalent character defining attribute. Constructed in 1908, the east, north, and west facades will be preserved in their existing form and detailing. The squared log of 168 Murray is its most defining attribute. The east façade will be preserved. Source: RedLine Architecture, 2025.



4.2 The Existing Residences at 174 and 168 Murray Street

The conservation work required for both buildings follows best practice as prescribed in the Lowertown Heritage District Conservation Plan, as well as Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places. The required work is outlined in **Part 2: The Conservation Plan** of this report.

Defined attributes of 174 Murray Street

Conservation Treatment: Restoration of the Exterior and Interior Adaptive Reuse

The two-storey brick cladding at 174 Murray is its most prevalent character defining attribute. Constructed in 1908, the east, north and west facades will be preserved in their existing form and detailing with repointing and focused repairs to the brickwork and detailed restoration of features such as the arched transom over the entrance including the decorative hood, repairs to the brick veneer at the second floor where




Figure 32: Landscape Plan Source: Rutland and Associates Landscape Architects 2025.

it has separated from tie backs, and replacement of the brick on the east corner, replacement of deteriorated sills, repairs to the foundation and leveling of floors.

Exterior features to be conserved include galvanized metal roof trim and detailing, stone window lintels, and leveling and repointing of the coursed limestone foundation. The casement windows are a recent installation and are in good condition. Given their condition, they will be maintained. The front door and front porch will be replaced relying on period Lowertown examples.

Defined Attributes of 168 Murray Street

Conservation Treatment: Restoration/Reconstruction of the Exterior and Adaptive Reuse of the Interior

Beneath all of the pastiche, the building at 168 Murray is a rare 1.5 storey squared log cottage with a side gable roof and dormers facing the street. The City of Ottawa census record dated 1861 indicates that the property was owned by the McManus family. The front portion of the building measures 7.7m (24') in width by 6.4m (21') in depth for an exterior square footage of 500sq.ft. The building retains its ground floor fenestration pattern with a central entrance and two side windows that are repeated on the second-floor level, possibly the original gable dormer openings. The rear additions as indicated on Figure 18 will be demolished to make room for the 4-storey apartment.

As the 1949 photograph (Figure 13) illustrates, it had a dressed front façade with horizontal siding and exposed squared log on the other elevations. Over the course of its history a lexicon of exterior claddings were introduced, including tin panels, insul-brick, angel stone, stucco, sheet insulation and vinyl siding. As well as being re-sided multiple times, the house was subsequently altered c.1965 to a two-storey structure when the flat roof and the existing exterior finishes were applied. A 1991 view of the house (Figure 15) documents the substantive alteration from its original one-and-one half storey side gable roof with gabled dormers facing the street.

The conservation plan focuses on the exterior and the integration of the house with the planned addition. The main elements that need to be addressed are the demolition of the second floor and reconstruction of the roof with dormers replaced and roof re-shingling. The position of the chimney, the condition of the dove tail squared timber siding, roof cladding material, and repairs to the foundation and leveling of the floor will require structure review once access to the building is made available. Doors and windows will be replaced, and the building set on a new foundation.

4.3 Conservation Process

Documentation and Recording

In accordance with the Standards and Guidelines, an accurate record of intervention will be required to document existing, as-found conditions, as well as the design and construction stages. A collection of period photographs documenting comparable buildings in Lowertown will serve as a resource for any required restoration work. There is a fairly good collection of photographic material which chronicles the buildings after 1949. Once the demolition of interior partitions and alterations is complete, a set of drawings and a photographic record of the exposed interior, for deposit in the City Archives.

Salvage

The brick cladding on the rear façade will be dismantled, cleaned stacked on pallets for reuse in repairing damaged brick, and replacement of the brick around the front entrance door.

The decorative hood and brick voussoir above the window on the west façade will be dismantled and reused as part of the front door restoration.

Monitoring

The project heritage consultant, in concert with the project architect and City Heritage Planning staff, will monitor the conservation process during construction, at times and intervals to be determined by the City. Monitoring will be undertaken to ensure that the conservation process conforms to the Conservation Plan.

4.4 Procedure

The following provides an outline to sequencing the work:

- Document all existing conditions, as discussed above.
- Undertake a structural assessment of the foundations of both existing buildings. This will include removal of sections of the interior floor at 168 Murray to gain access to the crawl space.
- Perform a detailed review of the masonry to determine deterioration, repointing, and construction of lost elements.
- Undertake a more detailed assessment of the windows and doors, including frames, sashes, sills, and surrounds.
- Perform any masonry repairs required by the masonry specialist (e.g., rake and repoint; crack repairs; limited dismantle and rebuild around fractured areas; replacement brick; repairs). Note: Masonry work should not be scheduled to occur during the winter months.
- Ensure that the replacement parapet/top of the wall is weathertight prior to flashing and roofing installation.
- Following an inspection of the log walls a specialist in log restoration should undertake a program of stabilization of the original cladding and carry out repairs.
- Complete the rehabilitation of all interior work.




Figure 33: Preliminary site plan of the proposed development. The footprints of the existing buildings have a floor plate of approximately 500sq.ft. (48msq.). Note the relationship of the building at 168 Murray with the adjacent apartment building set behind the two-storey row house. The two existing buildings are white, and the rear sections that will be demolished are in blue. The 4-storey apartment block appears as a darker grey. Source: Red Line Architecture, February 2021.



Figure 34: A c.1949 picture with the two houses in the background clearly documents the brick siding of 174 Murray Street and the cottage form of the neighbouring 168 Murray. The textured sidewall of 168 suggests the squared log that has been covered over on the front façade with a horizontal siding. The off-set door on the 2-storey has an arched header. Source: Marc Aubin’s collection



Figure 35: 1861 Census documents the McManus family owned a 66 x.99 lot at 168 Murray and were living in 1.5 storey log house. The Lowertown building inventory recorded that the building was constructed in 1876 based on Fire Insurance plans. The two views illustrate the multiple layers of finishes including squared timber, tin panels insulation, ridged insulation, and vinyl siding. Source David Yoo 2022.

5.0 IMPACT OF THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

This section specifically addresses the impacts of the development proposal on the cultural heritage values of the Lowertown West Heritage Conservation District (LWHCD) 2024 itemized in Chapter 6.0. Existing Buildings Conservation and Repair; Chapter 7. Alterations; Chapter 9. New Construction, and Chapter 10. Landscape.

5.1 Lowertown West Heritage Conservation District Plan (2024)

The Lowertown West Heritage Conservation District Plan was adopted by City Council on October 11, 2024. The original Lowertown West HCD was designated in 1994 and included approximately 560 properties. No changes to the boundaries of the HCD were made with the adoption of the updated plan. Given the variety of buildings and structures within the boundaries, the plan now provides specific direction according to building type and how a property contributes to the cultural heritage value of the neighbourhood.

Part 2 of this report is a Conservation Plan that contains a series of recommendations and design guidelines related to conservation and integration of the new addition within the District and the conservation of both the brick 2-storey and the squared log façade of the 1 1/2-storey neighbour. Both properties are ‘Contributing Properties’ and are designated under Par V of the Ontario Heritage Act, which, for the purposes of this HCD Plan, are considered to have design, historic and/or associative or contextual value, thereby expressing the overall cultural heritage value of the heritage conservation district.

These properties are classified as “Contributing Property” as they met the following criteria:

- / They feature buildings that were constructed during the HCD’s period of highest significance (pre-1880-1957); and
- / Their built form and attributes reflect the values, history, and themes identified in the Statement of Cultural Heritage Value and List of Attributes.

Applicable policies and guidelines include:

Section 6.1: Conserving Altered Buildings:

Policies:

1. Before undertaking work, carefully examine the building itself and undertake historical documents to evaluate the extent to which a building has been altered.
2. Conserve remaining historic attributes.
3. Consider the removal of cladding, details, and finishes which obscure the original character of a building.
4. Where possible, restoration based on adequate historic documentation is encouraged.

Response: The proposed concept retains and conserves both of the existing structures (not including the later rear additions) and plans for the construction of an apartment building set well behind the existing structures to maintain the massing of the original street character. Historic attributes have been identified and where possible they will be preserved and used as templates if too deteriorated to restore.

Both properties have been extensively altered, See 2.1 and 2.2 for a discussion of the research documenting the properties' history; and 4.2, 4.3 4.4, 4.5, and 4.6 for a discussion of the defining attributes, alterations, and their conservation.

Section 6.2: Roofs and Rooflines:

Policies:

1. Conserve and retain historic roofs (profile and roof forms), materials and details (e.g. soffits, eaves, bargeboard, parapets, cornices, and finials).
3. Conserve and retain historic wooden shingles or metal roofs when possible.

Guidelines:

- b) Metal shingles and standing seam roofs can be repainted and should be cleaned and primed prior to painting.
- c) New metal shingles should be installed to replicate the original shingle pattern.
- f) Character-defining attributes such as gables and decorative dormers should not be covered by siding.
- g) If eave troughs are desired to minimize water damage, they should be discretely located, be of appropriate materials and installed in a manner to ensure water is directed away from building fabric.

Response:

Conservation Treatment: Restoration of 174 and Reconstruction of 168

The plan includes the preservation of the flat roof at 174 with its metal cornice and finials. The roof structure will be reinforced and utilized as a retention area for rainwater.

The restoration of the side gable at 168 necessitates the demolition of the existing second floor and reconstruction of the two dormers along with the original gable slope. Based on existing details and photographs, such as the Aubin house (Figure 19), common features of the Lowertown cottages will be incorporated into the new roof. It remains undetermined whether the chimney on the gable end is original. The 1949 photograph suggests the use of composite shingles. Earlier historical records, like the 1912 fire insurance plan, indicate that the cladding was composite.

Note: Key features to consider include the shallow eave extension, shingle roof, double dormer, entrance doors without shutters, absence of eave troughs, and lack of canopy over the front door. Following the removal of later claddings, the log siding can undergo thorough inspection to assess the condition of the logs on the east elevation and identify any covered openings.

Section 6.3: Materials

Policies:

1. Conserve, maintain and repair historic exterior building materials, including stone and brick as well as other historic cladding materials, particularly remaining buildings with exposed log construction; repairs and any necessary replacement materials should be like-for-like.
2. Avoid covering or conceal historic masonry or cladding with new materials.
3. Do not paint previously unpainted brick or stone.

4. Remove inappropriate recent cladding materials when possible and replace them with cladding that reflects the original character of the building.

Guidelines:

e) Replacement bricks should match the existing in size, colour, and texture.

h) Owners are encouraged to remove inappropriate contemporary cladding (stucco, vinyl and aluminum siding, Angel stone, also brick and stone) as the materials can have a negative effect on historic masonry.

Response: *Figure 32: A c.1949 picture with the two houses in the background clearly documents the brick siding and metal cornice of 174 Murray Street. The off-set entrance door features a transom and an arched brick header with hood.*

Next door at 168 the cottage form speaks to its early construction date as does the squared timber log construction and the front façade with horizontally dressed ship lap siding. Source: Marc Aubin's collection Throughout their history, both residences have sported a range of different sidings including angel stone vinyl, aluminum, and stucco. Figures 13 and 33 record the pastiche of materials used at 168, and Figure 15 documents the contemporary recladding of the brick façade at 174.

Section 6.4: Windows and Doors

Policies:

1. Conserve and retain historic windows and doors, including their type/ or opening style, design, details (e.g. glazing pattern, sills and lintels, surrounds, sidelights, and transoms etc.), and proportion, particularly those that are decorative, or feature leaded or stained-glass.
2. Consider historic window and door restoration and rehabilitation before replacement.

Section 6.5: Front Façade Features

Policies:

1. Conserve historic front entrances, porches, sunrooms, carriageways, and balconies including decorative elements such as (but not limited to): railings and balustrades, columns, brackets, and porticos etc.

Response: *None of the existing windows or doors on either building are original. The existing casement windows at 174 were installed by the present owner. They are assessed as in good condition and will be retained. New windows will be installed at 168 to match the one over one double hung storm windows that are seen in the 1949 photo. Both 168 and 174 appear to have a simple stoop treatment leading to the front door. The plan calls for a simple stairs and landing at the front door. The 4-storey apartment is setback behind the two existing residences, with its entrance reminiscent of a carriageway.*

Section 6.6: Architectural Details

Policies:

1. Conserve, maintain and repair existing architectural details and character-defining attributes.
2. Do not cover, remove, or obscure existing character-defining attributes and details on the primary façade of buildings (and on side elevations on corner lots).

Response: *Mid 20th century photographs document the original appearance of the buildings. The detached at 174 is a brick clad Italianate structure and its neighbour at 168 is a 1 1/2 squared timber log building with the front façade clad in a ship lap wood siding and the sidewall exposed whitewashed log. The space between the buildings will be treated as a glazed carriage-way, providing lobby and access for the 4-storey apartment.*

Section 6.8: Upper Stories

Policies:

1. Conserve remaining historic components, including stone, brick and cast-iron columns, decorative brickwork, stone trim and string courses, historic window openings and trim, bay windows and decorative wood or metal cornices.

Guidelines:

a) Historic window details, such as voussoirs, decorative brick work, terra-cotta panels, cornices, and other architecture details should be retained and restored wherever possible.

Response: Window surrounds at 174 document the Italianate influence with masonry hood and arched brick headers, and stone lintels. The conservation plan calls for the retention of these attributes and the restoration of lost features over the main entrance, including replacement of mismatched brick and the restoration of the corbeled brick band.

Section 7.1: Alterations to Contributing Properties

Policies:

1. Make alterations compatible with, subordinate to and distinguishable from an existing Contributing property, adjacent Contributing properties as well as the cultural heritage value and attributes of the District. Consider materials, scale, form, proportions and massing, height, and location on the lot.

Guidelines:

- a) The adaptive reuse of existing Contributing buildings is often a good way to conserve and give new life to significant heritage buildings. When converting or altering an existing building, consider the contribution a property makes to its streetscape and how a property reflects or represents the cultural heritage values of the HCD.
- b) Avoid irreversible alterations that would negatively impact a building's heritage character or its streetscape.

Response:

Conservation Treatment: Preservation and Restoration of the street façade and side elevations of the exterior of both buildings. The interiors will be adaptive for their continued use as rental housing.

Section 7.1.4: Windows and Doors:

Policies:

- 1. Conserve the design of original windows and doors including their original opening styles and muntin patterns when installing new replacement windows.
- 2. Conserve the overall fenestration pattern and general solid-to-void ratio on primary façades.
- 3. Conserve the arrangement of traditional door openings.

Section 8.0: Additions (Contributing and Non-Contributing):

General Policies:

- 1. Make new additions physically and visually compatible with, subordinate to, and distinguishable from an existing Contributing building on the property.
- 3. Design new additions to be compatible with and not detract from adjacent Contributing properties including those that are to the rear or across the street, particularly those on the HCD's east-west streets.
- 4. Ensure that new additions will be compatible and sensitive by:
 - Having regard for the scale, form, proportions, massing, and location on the lot of a Contributing building to which they are being added.
 - Employing similar or compatible materials and reflecting architectural characteristics such as fenestration patterns, the design of windows and doors, datum lines and other vertical or horizontal reference points of the existing and/or adjacent Contributing buildings.

5. Property owners are encouraged to retain an architect and/or heritage professional when designing an addition to a building in the District.

Noted

6. Locate ground-oriented additions sensitively and away from the front façade of buildings so as not to detract from the cultural heritage value and attributes of the HCD.

The ground oriented entrance leading to the new addition is setback from the historic structures and interpreted as a traditional carriage way.

7. Conserve the rooflines and roof profile of Contributing buildings, as well as roof-related attributes such as cornices, parapets, and dormers that are visible from the street.

Noted

General Guidelines:

- a) New additions to Contributing buildings should aim to strike a balance between imitation of historic character and pointed contrast in order to complement and respect the cultural heritage value of the HCD.
- b) New windows should be compatible with those of an existing Contributing building and adjacent Contributing buildings in size, window to wall ratio, shape, and divisions.
- c) Cladding materials for additions should reflect and be sensitive to the historic character of the existing building and its neighbours. Contemporary cladding materials for additions to Non-contributing properties may be appropriate if they do not detract from the cultural heritage value of the HCD.

Response:

Section 9.1: New Construction: Incorporating Contributing Buildings

Policies:

1. Given that the conservation of Contributing properties is one of the objectives of this Plan, any proposal that incorporates a “Contributing Building” shall do so in a meaningful way that respects the building and its attributes. Meaningful retention has regard for the building’s original three-dimensional form and the features that express its cultural heritage value and its contribution to the HCD. To achieve this, a development proposal shall consider and aim to incorporate the following elements of the contributing building project shall consider and aim to incorporate: Height, width, and depth; Massing; Original roof form and rooflines; Character-defining attributes and features such as chimneys, porches, and other architectural details.
3. When a project incorporates existing Contributing building(s) into a larger development, the existing buildings will continue to be featured prominently on the lot and in the streetscape. The proposed development will complement the existing structure[s] through the use of compatible materials, fenestration pattern, relationship to the street or other measures.
5. If a ‘Contributing building’ is to be retained and incorporated into a development, make every effort to retain it in its original location during the construction process. Where an engineer or architect specialized in heritage conservation concludes that retention of the resource in-situ poses unacceptable risks, the City may permit the temporary removal of the resource during the construction process, followed by its restoration after reinstatement in its entirety on the original site.
6. Staff may require a Heritage Impact Assessment and Conservation Plan for any applications proposing to incorporate or relocate a Contributing building as part of a proposal. This may include a structural assessment to determine stability for relocation or other reports as indicated in Section 5.

Guidelines:

- b) 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.

Response: The existing heritage buildings are proposed to be retained and will continue to occupy the majority of frontage along Murray Street. As such, their relationship to the public realm will remain largely unchanged. The two-storey building to the east will remain residential, and the existing entrances will remain as the primary entrance for these units. The one-and-a-half storey existing workers’ cottage style building will also remain in residential use. The buildings will be joined at the rear with a lobby that includes a front entrance accommodating an amenity space and stairwell access and includes floor to ceiling windows that provide natural light and a welcoming entry point to the building. The two historic buildings will have direct access to the street.

Section 9.2: Other Development Considerations

Policies:

2. Building heights should generally be low in profile to allow for the conservation of Contributing buildings and the contribution they make to their streetscape, as well as the primacy of the spires of Notre Dame Basilica and former St. Brigid's Church within the skyline.

Response: The four-storey scale of the proposed building is sensitive to the visual context of the area. It is a contemporary expression clad in traditional beige/tan brick and comfortably set back from the two existing residences and the public realm streetscape. The proposed development achieves the intention of small-scale development and relies on the existing buildings and the recessed entrance between the buildings to interpret and maintain the existing lot divisions. In combination with the retention and restoration of the existing buildings, there is a clear distinction and integration of existing and new.

The increased height, decreased side yard setback, and front and side yard projections attributed to the addition will require relief from the Heritage Overlay provisions in Zoning By-law 2008-250 (Section 60).

Section 10.1: Streets, Trees, and Landscaping in the Public Realm

Policies:

1. Conserve and enhance the public street layout, and mature tree canopy throughout residential parts of the HCD.

5. Tree removal is strongly discouraged and when undertaken, shall be in accordance with the Tree Protection By-law

Section 10.3: Front Yards and Private Landscapes

Policies:

1. Conserve and reinstate the soft landscaped character of front yards (and side yards on corner lots), as well as mature trees on existing properties.

2. Retain existing front walkways.

3. When a new structure is contemplated, its front yard setback shall be consistent with those of its neighbours in order to maintain the special historic character of the residential streets.

Guidelines:

a) The replacement of lawns by shrubs and flowerbeds is appropriate if the proportion of the property devoted to soft landscaping stays the same.

b) Avoid the replacement of soft landscaping with gravel or pavers. Linear walkways (usually about one metre in width) oriented perpendicular to the street are common and should be maintained.

Response: The proposed development adheres to several of the recommendations from the Lowertown West Heritage Conservation District Plan. Through the conservation of the existing two storey Contributing Properties, the proposed development conserves the streetscape character along Murray Street. The exclusion of parking further ensures the streetscape is maintained along the full frontage of the subject site. As detailed in the HIA submitted as part of this application package, the conservation of the existing heritage buildings is undertaken using historic documentation and a review of conservation guidelines and best practices. The proposed infill development is of a scale, setback, and architectural design which complements the heritage buildings on and surrounding the subject site, while providing a contemporary design distinct from the heritage fabric of the area.

5.2 Section 60 – Heritage Overlay:

Relief from Section 60 of the Zoning By-law is sought as part of this application to permit the proposed development, which seeks demolition of a rear portion of each of the existing buildings to the north of the site to permit an addition where the overlay applies. Although the proposed development does not meet provisions of the heritage overlay related to rear addition, side yard setbacks, projections and building heights, relief from these provisions is appropriate in accommodating the restoration and

conservation of the existing cultural heritage resources while providing for an infill development at the subject site.

5.3 Positive and Negative Impacts

Describe the positive and adverse impacts on the heritage resource or heritage conservation district that may reasonably be expected to result from the proposed development.

Positive impacts include:

- Retention and restoration of the 1.5 storey side gable worker’s cottage (168 Murray) and the two-storey brick building (174 Murray) are major assets to the proposal.
- Efforts to ensure accurate restoration work reflect the guidance in the Lowertown West HCD Study and the updated HCD Plan.
- Clear references provided through the community offer more appropriate materials and forms that are based on research and documentary evidence.
- The proposed upgrade and conservation plan is in keeping with the Lowertown guidelines and will serve as an example.
- Maintaining the rhythm and character of the streetscape;
- The proposal retains the direct front entrances to the two houses;
- The entrance for the new infill development in the rear yard of the site will be located between the two existing buildings and setback;
- The proposal includes the restoration of the small worker’s cottage including a new side gable roof, with gabled dormers, chimney, the squared log siding, horizontal ship lap wood siding and trim, wood shingle or standing seam metal roof;
- The proposal retains the existing fenestration pattern and includes the rehabilitation of the window and door assemblies for both buildings.

Adverse impacts include:

- There are no negative impacts. The conservation of both existing buildings and the opportunity of interpreting the log 1.5 storey home is a significant benefit to the Lowertown community.

5.4 Alternatives and Mitigation

Massing

Retain both of the existing buildings exclusive of rear wings on the site and incorporate them into the development. The footprints of both existing buildings is in the neighbourhood of 500 sq. ft.

In earlier proposals, the foyer to the apartment was positioned between the two existing buildings as a tower feature. It was rejected, and the foyer feature was treated as a traditional carriageway setback from the front façade of the two houses.

Materials: a stucco finish was proposed for the new apartment. Brick is the logical choice for the new infill. A wood finish would be the logical choice for the small worker’s cottage that would be compatible with the adjacent row house.

Throughout the redevelopment process, multiple mitigation measures and alternatives were considered and implemented in response to community and city suggestions, good conservation practice and the owner’s expectations: Below are sketches of some earlier alternatives including retaining the second floor and insul-brick on 168 Murray.



5.5 Conclusions

This property is located in a Design Priority Area and is within the boundaries of the Lowertown Heritage Conservation District. A high-quality design with an emphasis on conservation of the two existing Commonwealth Historic Resource Management

residences has been achieved where the original buildings continue to define the lot patterns, the streetscapes public realm has been enhanced, a rare square log timber building dating back to the city's colonial past has been retained and will be restored. The new addition integrates well with the street and functions as a backdrop to the heritage components of the project and surrounding buildings. The design team took the project through multiple iterations to assure that the 4-storey addition is subordinate to the two heritage houses. This was achieved by pushing back the mass away from the street and both buildings, by refining and setting back the entrance to the apartment, treating it as a covered carriage way, thus improving the compatibility of the design and refining the material palette. The use of a beige\tan brick helps focus views on the heritage assets. The proposed development achieves the intention of small-scale development and relies on the existing buildings and the recessed entrance between the buildings to interpret and maintain the existing lot divisions. In combination with the retention and restoration of the existing buildings, there is a clear distinction and integration of existing and new. The retention and restoration of the 1.5 storey side gable worker's cottage (168 Murray) and the two-storey brick building (174 Murray) are defining features and major assets to the project. The landscape plan and proposed plantings will help to integrate the entire composition of original and new as a welcome renewal of this section of Murray Street.

The conservation program is informed by the heritage documentation, including census reports and a collection of historic photographs provided by the Lowertown Community Association. Research indicates that the worker's cottage may date from the 1850s. Section 7.5.6 of the Lowertown West HCD Study provides conservation guidance and served as a practical and informative guide specific to Lowertown. The updated heritage plan 2024 compliments and focuses the impact assessment.

Opportunities for on-site interpretation include:

- The exposed and restored square timber log provides a visual cue to the early colonial history of Lowertown, and the importance of the lumbering industry.
- The multiple layers of different sidings offers an intriguing statement of changing tastes and efforts by property owners to care for their properties.

6.0 PART 2 CONSERVATION PLAN

6.1 The Plan

The Plan lays out the procedures to successfully rehabilitate the two designated properties at 168 and 174 Murray Street and assure their conservation as part of the redevelopment plan, including the addition of a 4-storey apartment. This report updates and elaborates on the information previously submitted. Additional details are and will be presented as addendums to this document.

The properties making up the development site include a 1.5-storey log cottage and a 2-storey brick clad house. The homes will be integrated as ground floor units linked to the proposed 4-storey. The oldest property is the 1.5-storey squared log cottage, with the east façade butting up against the neighbouring property. Over time, a second floor was added, and the log structure reclad with different sidings including wood, stucco, insul-brick, metal panel siding, and vinyl. Once this encrustation is removed and a detailed investigation carried out by an experienced timber-log expert, some of the recommendations in this report will need updating. The brick clad 2-storey has also undergone extensive alterations, including vinyl siding over the brick and major repairs to the corner and east side of the house. Issues with the structural stability of both building foundations will need to be addressed by a structural engineer, and it will be important to bring on a masonry consultant as part of the development team.

6.2 Existing Buildings Statement of Intent:

The following summarizes information sources as part of the HIA research and provides a statement of intent.

- 168 and 174 Murray Street are both located within the Lowertown West Heritage Conservation District (HCD). The guidelines are the focus of the next chapter, determining the impact of the proposed development;
- The buildings are both considered contributing properties in the Lowertown West HCD (identified as category 3 in the heritage survey forms);
- These properties are located in a Design Priority Area. A high-quality design is expected in this area.
- The 1861 Census documents the McManus family owned a 66-x.99 lot at 168 Murray and were living in 1.5 storey log house. The Lowertown building inventory recorded that the building was constructed in 1876 based on Fire Insurance plans. Source: Lowertown Community Association
- Mid 20th century photographs document the original appearance of the buildings. The detached at 174 is a brick clad Italianate structure and its neighbour at 168 is a 1 1/2 squared timber log building with the front façade clad in a ship lap wood siding and the sidewall exposed whitewashed log.
- Fire Insurance Plans from as early as 1901 and as late as 1965 indicate that 168 Murray Street was constructed as a 1.5 storey dwelling. Construction of 174 Murray is estimated to be 1908 based on insurance plans.
- The proposed concept retains and conserves both of the existing structures (not including the later rear additions) and plans for the construction of an apartment building set well behind the existing structures to maintain the massing of the original street character.
- The space between the buildings will be treated in the spirit of carriage-way, providing glazed lobby and access for the 4-storey apartment.
- The overall design of the apartment building sets well back from the existing buildings, will blend in with the area. In keeping with the PC Standards and Guideline 11 the use of the tan\beige brick helps to distinguish the historic buildings from the new addition. Limiting the height to 4-storeys is in keeping with low rise neighbouring developments.

6.3 Conservation Approach

Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places In Canada

A detailed conservation plan for the buildings has been developed after an inspection of the exterior walls was completed. As defined in the Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada the main treatment recommended is Rehabilitation of the interior and a mix of preservation,

rehabilitation, and restoration of the character-defining features of the buildings' exteriors. The secondary structures at the rear of the property will be demolished and character defining attributes from the demolished portions reincorporated.

The Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada (revised 2010) are used as the benchmark; Provincial guidelines in the Ontario Heritage Tool Kit are harmonized with the federal guidelines. The City of Ottawa adopted the federal guidelines as the basis for heritage conservation policies in the Official Plan. The "Standards" offer an overview to the conservation decision-making process, conservation treatments, standards for appropriate conservation, and guidelines for conservation. In the context of the Standards, the following terms are defined:

Conservation encompasses actions or processes that protect the character-defining elements of a historic place, thereby preserving its heritage value and extending its physical lifespan. This may include preservation, rehabilitation, restoration, or a combination of these methods.

Preservation involves the 'protecting, maintaining and stabilizing of the existing form, material, and integrity of an historic place or individual component, while protecting its heritage value.'

Restoration involves accurately revealing, recovering, or representing the state of an historic place or individual component as it appeared at a particular period in its history, while protecting its heritage value. Restoration may include removing non-character-defining features from other periods in its history and recreating missing features from the restoration period.

Rehabilitation is defined as 'the sensitive adaptation of an historic place or individual component for a continuing or compatible contemporary use, while protecting its heritage value.'

Procedure for Addressing Specific Attributes - Restoration of the Exterior and Interior Adaptive Reuse

All work will rely on documentary evidence from the CHIS and on-site investigation. Existing, original materials will be preserved, repaired, or reused; if this is deemed not possible, identified attributes will be replaced with modern versions. Later additions lacking heritage value will be removed. The 2nd–storey addition to 168 Murray will be removed and the original roof will be reconstructed. The new 4-storey apartment is designed to be architecturally distinct from the existing residences.

The small worker's cottage will retain its form, with a new side gable roof, gable dormers, and restored exterior finishes. Wood siding will replace the vinyl on the front façade, and the side elevations will feature the exposing squared timber log. The second storey will be removed, dormers replaced, and a composite shingle will be reintroduced. A 1949 photograph clearly shows the original finishes for both buildings. The brick house at 174 Murray, built in 1908, will be preserved with repairs to the brickwork and detailed restoration of features like the entrance transom.

The proposed interventions will refer to the information found in Section 3 and guidelines found in the Lowertown West HCD Plan and will incorporate federal *Standards and Guidelines*. For images of the proposed conservation and intervention components, see the plans and elevations in Appendix A.

Demolition and Salvage:

Demolition is not considered a conservation activity and will be limited to the removal of the rear additions of both buildings and the removal of the second storey at 168 Murray street. Figure 31 below delineates structures that will be demolished (shown in turquoise); they are both in poor condition. They will be replaced with the 4-storey apartment shown in the darker grey.

The plan calls for original brick from the rear wall and the arched brick and hood from the side window of 174 to be reclaimed and used to restore the front entry and the brick cladding around the entrance and façade at the corner.

Commonwealth undertook an inspection of the exteriors of both buildings in March 2022 to determine the condition of the exteriors.

The scope of conservation work for both 174 Murray and 168 Murray is outlined in the conservation plan, including a set of annotated as-found elevations that will include the exterior masonry walls, windows, metal parapets, and other character-defining features. A set of specifications will also be developed as part of the rehabilitation.

This proposal is assessed using the Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Properties in Canada and are in *italic*. It is followed by a discussion of the conservation guidelines.

Standard 1. *Conserve the heritage value of a historic place. Do not remove, replace, or substantially alter its intact or repairable character-defining elements.*

Primary Treatment : Both buildings are retained in-situ except for the one-storey rear additions and the upper floor installed at 168 Murray. Defining features including exterior wall assemblies, including squared timber (if extant), brick veneer, fenestration patterns, all of which are being preserved and\or restored.

Standard 5. *Find a use for a historic place that requires minimal or no change to its character-defining elements.*

Primary Treatment : Both buildings will continue in residential use.

Standard 7. *Evaluate the existing condition of character-defining elements to determine the appropriate intervention needed.*

Primary Treatment: A summary of the conditions will be noted in the survey and include:

- The structural system and potential changes to load bearing.
- The foundations are rubble stone walls, of unknown depth, with parging. There is a basement under 174 Murray and crawl space below 168 Murray.
- In general, the exterior brick veneer at 174 Murray is in fair\good condition but does have localized areas of eroded mortar joints, some bulging and face spalled bricks. These conditions were typically observed below the windowsills and other areas of high exposure to water.
- There appears to have been major work done to the right hand corner of the building that extends to the second floor
- At 168 Murray Street, the building siding and second floor will have to be stripped away to determine the condition of the original construction

Additional Standards Relating to Rehabilitation

Standard 10. *Repair rather than replace character-defining elements. Where character-defining elements are too severely deteriorated to repair, and where sufficient physical evidence exists, replace them with new elements that match the forms, materials, and detailing of sound versions of the same elements. Where there is insufficient physical evidence, make the form, material, and detailing of the new elements compatible with the character of the historic place.*

Primary Treatment: The conservation plan includes the reinstatement of the decorative brick corbel banding, gabled parapet, and metal cornice on the building. The height and form of the parapet will be guided by photographic evidence and detailed inspection. The proposal also includes the installation of new windows in the form and pattern of the existing single hung units with a similar light configuration.

Standard 11. *Conserve the heritage value and character-defining elements when creating any new additions to a historic place or any related new construction. Make the new work physically and visually compatible, subordinate to, and distinguishable from the historic place.*

Primary Treatment: The two buildings maintains their prominence in views along the street. The four-storey redbrick apartment is set well back from the structures. Visual compatibility is achieved with the use of brick on the new building.

The conservation work required for both buildings follows best practice as prescribed in the Lowertown Conservation Guidelines, as well as Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places.

The scope of conservation work for both 168 and 174 Murray Street focuses on the buildings' exterior facades and is outlined on annotated as-found elevations that include each building's character-defining features. A set of specifications will also be developed as part of the rehabilitation.

Rehabilitation is defined as 'the sensitive adaptation of a historic place or individual component for a continuing or compatible contemporary use, while protecting its heritage value.'

Preservation involves the 'protecting, maintaining and stabilizing of the existing form, material and integrity of a historic place or individual component, while protecting its heritage value.'

Restoration involves accurately revealing, recovering, or representing the state of a historic place or individual component as it appeared at a particular period in its history, while protecting its heritage value. Restoration may include removing non-character-defining features from other periods in its history and recreating missing features from the restoration period.

The conservation work will be a mix of preservation, rehabilitation, and restoration of the character-defining features of the buildings. As defined in the Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada, the main treatment recommended is **Rehabilitation**.

Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Properties in Canada and are in *italic*. It is followed by a discussion of the conservation guidelines specific to the Lowertown Conservation District.

Standard 1. *Conserve the heritage value of a historic place. Do not remove, replace, or substantially alter its intact or repairable character-defining elements.*

Primary Treatment : Both buildings are retained in-situ except for the one-storey rear additions, and the upper floor installed at 168 Murray. Defining features including exterior wall assemblies, including squared timber, brick veneer, fenestration patterns, all of which are being preserved and or restored.

Standard 5. *Find a use for a historic place that requires minimal or no change to its character-defining elements.*

Primary Treatment: Both buildings will continue in residential use.

Standard 7. *Evaluate the existing condition of character-defining elements to determine the appropriate intervention needed.*

Primary Treatment: A summary of the conditions are noted in the addendum and include:

- The structural system and potential changes to load bearing.
- The foundations are rubble stone walls, of unknown depth, with parging. There is a basement under 174 and crawl space under 168 Murray.
- In general, the exterior brick veneer at 174 Murray is in fair/good condition but does have localized areas of eroded mortar joints, some bulging and face spalled bricks. These conditions were typically observed below the windowsills and other areas of high exposure to water. There appears to have been major work done to the right-hand corner of the building. The repairs are poorly done, which resulted in the loss of details. It is recommended that the section be dismantled and restored based on the 1949 photo including the arched brick detail over the door and the reintroduction of the decorative hood.
- At 168 Murray Street, the building siding and second floor will have to be stripped away to determine the condition of the original construction and determine conservation work required.

Additional Standards Relating to Rehabilitation

Standard 10. *Repair rather than replace character-defining elements. Where character-defining elements are too severely deteriorated to repair, and where sufficient physical evidence exists, replace them with new elements that match the forms, materials and detailing of sound versions of the same elements. Where there is insufficient physical evidence, make the form, material and detailing of the new elements compatible with the character of the historic place.*

Primary Treatment: The conservation plan includes the reinstatement of the decorative brick banding gabled parapet and metal cornice on the building. The height and form of the parapet will be guided by photographic evidence and detailed inspection. The proposal for 168 Murray includes the installation of new windows in the form and pattern of the existing single hung units with a similar light configuration. For 174 Murray, the plan is to retain the existing casement windows.

Standard 11. *Conserve the heritage value and character-defining elements when creating any new additions to a historic place or any related new construction. Make the new work physically and visually compatible, subordinate to, and distinguishable from the historic place.*

Primary Treatment: The two buildings maintain their prominence in views from the street. The four-storey brick apartment is set well back from the structures. Visual compatibility is achieved with the use of a blond brick on the new building.

Lowertown West and ByWard Market Heritage Conservation District (HCD) Update 2024.

A draft Heritage Conservation Plan for Lowertown West is underway. While the draft plan is not yet in force, its guidelines and policies are anticipated to be considered by Council later this year and the relevant policies and guidelines have been incorporated in the conservation approach. In the draft plan, 168 & 174 Murray are contributing properties. City's website: [Lowertown West and ByWard Market Heritage Conservation District \(HCD\) Update](#).

6.4 Documentation and Recording

In keeping with the Standards and Guidelines, an accurate record of intervention will be required to document existing, as-found conditions, as well as the design and construction stages. A collection of period photographs documenting comparable buildings in Lowertown will serve as a resource for any required restoration work. As well, there is a good collection of photographic material, which chronicles the buildings after 1949. This material is included in the 2022 Murray Street CHIS prepared by Commonwealth.

6.5 As-Found Record & Site Plan



Figure 36: Elevations of the two heritage buildings being retained, with the planned 4-storey apartment setback and entered between the buildings. The two buildings have been recorded by Redline Architecture Inc. 2025.




Figure 37: Preliminary site plan of the proposed development. The footprints of the existing buildings have a floor plate of approximately 500sq.ft. (48msq.). Note the relationship of the building at 168 Murray with the adjacent two-storey row house, illustrating the development footprint. The two existing buildings are rendered in light grey, and the rear sections that will be demolished are in blue. The 4-storey apartment block appears as a darker grey.

6.6 Conservation Strategy for 168 Murray Street

The small worker’s cottage form was constructed pre-1861 and is designated under part V of the OHA and will be retained. The building has over its history been dramatically altered from its original appearance as a 1.5 storey side gable log cottage. City of Ottawa census records, dated 1861, indicate that the McManus family owned a 66 x.99 lot at 168 Murray and were living in a 1.5 storey log house. The Lowertown building inventory recorded that the building was constructed in 1876 based on Fire Insurance plans. The front portion of the building measures 7.7m (24’) in width by 6.4m (21’) in depth for a square footage of 500sq.ft.

As the 1949 photograph (Figure 3) illustrates, it had a dressed front façade with horizontal siding and exposed squared log on the side elevations (west side elevation is assumed). Changes include multiple layers of siding, replacement of windows and doors, the addition of a second floor, a rubble foundation that has settled, and multiple additions onto the rear. A collection of exterior sidings were introduced including tin panels, insul-brick, angel stone, stucco, and vinyl siding. As well as residing, the house was subsequently modified c.1965 to a two-storey structure when the flat roof and the existing exterior finishes were applied.



Figure 38: The house at 168 Murray appears in the background of the c.1949 parade. The house is a 1.5 storey side gable with two dormers facing the street, a centre front door with no canopy, horizontal siding on the front and squared timber chinked and whitewashed on the gabled side elevation. Source: Marc Aubin Collection.

Figure 4: A 1991 view of the house documents the substantive alteration from its original one-and-one half storey side gable roof with gabled dormers facing the street. The house has been remodelled with a flat roof, a second floor added, and three windows replacing the dormers. The exterior was reclad in an angel stone on the ground floor and aluminum siding on the upper floor. A canopy over the front door has been added. Source: City of Ottawa Heritage Survey Forms 1991.



Interventions to Specific Attributes

1. Roof and Chimney

Conservation Treatment: Restoration

The second storey addition will be removed.

Based on as-found details as well as historic photos, it has been determined that the original roof was a side gable with two dormers overlooking the street and a shallow eave extension. The roof cladding was either wooden shingle or standing seam metal roof - both were very common.

2. Cladding

West side wall -Squared log exposed and painted with whitewash

North façade – square log dressed with a horizontal board

Dormers – horizontal board siding

Conservation Treatment: Restoration

The building is a 1.5 storey squared log cottage. The intention is to reinterpret the 1949 photo with the log sidewall exposed, and the front façade dressed with a horizontal board siding.

- Removal of inappropriate cladding material (e.g., vinyl siding) and restoration of historic cladding material is encouraged.
- The condition of the original cladding will be determined and replaced in kind. Depending on their condition, only deteriorated portions will be replaced.



Figures 39 and 40 : The two views illustrate the multiple layers of finishes covering the squared timber, (tin panels insul-brick, ridged insulation, and vinyl siding.) Source David Yoo 2022.

3. Windows and Doors

Conservation Treatment: Restoration

The 1949 photo documents wood storm windows that were discarded when the siding was replaced, and the second floor constructed. The existing windows are single hung wood windows.

- Replacement windows for the two ground floor windows to match the historic windows in size, shape, materials, and divisions with thermal units replacing the single pane glass.
- Windows in the two dormers will replicate the former units in size and shape.
- A 6" window surround similar to the corner boards will frame both windows, the main door, and the dormer windows.
- the Front Door will match the historic opening. There is no record of the appearance of the door and will be selected from comparative examples.
- A coach light type fixture mounted on the wall beside the door and the house number mounted above the door as seen in photos.

4. Landscape Treatment

Conservation Treatment: Adaptive Reuse

A landscape plan includes a stoop extending just below the threshold with a single step to a sidewalk set perpendicular to the sidewalk. Low shrubs and perennials will create a parlour garden.


Procedure

The main elements that will be addressed are on the exterior. The following (figure 7.) provides an outline to sequencing the work required:



1. As part of demolition of the rear additions, remove the second floor addition and the exterior siding on the front and east facades to expose the squared timber. The west façade butts directly against the neighbouring house and will be exposed from the interior to determine its condition and stability.

2. Construct a new side gable roof, with two gabled dormers at the front with a flat roof behind the ridge.
3. Replicate the original two dormers and re-sheath the roof and dormers, with a composite asphalt / roof.
4. Strip and replace the vinyl siding, etc., on the front façade along with earlier siding materials.
5. Replace the horizontal wood siding, paint the siding of a light beige or white with bargeboards and window surrounds a darker tone.
6. Doors replaced with a period treatment glazed upper and panelled base. Windows will be replaced 2 over 2 hung windows. Incorporate a bargeboard trim around the door and 4 windows.
7. Install a coach light type fixture on either side of the door and the street number on the bargeboard above the door.
8. Undertake a structural assessment of the foundation. Set the building on a new concrete footing /foundation.
9. A single step stoop and sidewalk set perpendicular to the street will provide access to the new front door. Parlour gardens planted on either side of the entrance.



EAST ELEVATION

10. On the east elevation, the squared timber log will be exposed and repaired.

11. Engage an expert in timber construction to perform additional investigations and a more detailed review of the square logs, focusing on dovetails and the condition of logs set on the rubble foundation to

determine the extent of deterioration. This investigation should include the front façade, the east elevation, and the south return. The west elevation is butting directly against the neighbouring building and will have to be assessed from the interior.

- 12.** Infill above the roofline.
- 13.** Complete the rehabilitation of all interior work.

Note:

This elevation is submitted for Site Plan Control submission. Additional information and specifications will be provided once the second floor is removed and the condition of the logs along the adjoining house can be inspected.

6.7 Conservation Strategy 174 Murray Street

The brick clad house as constructed in 1908 will be retained in its existing form and detailing. The 2-storey **masonry** facade is its most prevalent character defining attribute. A mason specializing in historic masonry will advise what masonry work is required and address issues with the foundation and leveling of the floor. As well as repointing, conservation work will include focused repairs to the brickwork and detailed restoration of features such as the **arched transom** over the entrance, restoration of the **corbelled brick** band and brick on the east side of the door, restoration of the brick veneer at the second floor, replacement of deteriorated sills, repairs to the foundation and levelling of floors. The **wood casement windows** are a significant modification; however their condition appears to be good, and it is recommended they be retained rather than installing new units without a clear record that informs replication of the original units.



Figure 41: A c.1949 picture with the two houses in the background clearly documents the brick siding of 174 Murray Street and the cottage form of the neighbouring 168 Murray. Source: Marc Aubin’s collection





Figure 42 and 43: Two views 1992 and 2021 174 Murray (left) prior to the vinyl siding being removed and rehabilitated front. Note: A section of the cornice will need to be replicated. There is bulging of the brick along the 2nd floor between the windows. Also noted is the different brick at the corner (both size and colour consistency) and the lack of corbelled banding and the transom treatment. Earlier photos document a decorative hood over the door has been removed.

Character Defining Attributes



Figure 44: A c.1949 photograph clearly documents the 2-storey brick siding of 174 Murray Street with its off-set door and decorative arched headers over the door and windows. The cottage form of the neighbouring 168 Murray with the textured log sidewall of squared log. The log has been covered over on the front façade with a horizontal siding. Source: Marc Aubin’s collection

Procedure


The main elements that will be addressed are on the exterior – the metal cornice, the brick work, repairs to the area on the second floor where it bulges out, the replacement of the brick around the front door including replacement of the transom and metal hood, stabilizing and realigning the foundation, replacing the front porch, and repairing windows. The additions on the rear of the building will be demolished to allow for the construction of a 4-storey addition. Potentially, the brick at the rear can be salvaged for reuse. The metal hood over the window on the west façade could be removed and used over the front door.



Figure 45: As -found image with areas requiring repair and restoration highlighted in white.

The following figure 12. provides an outline to sequencing the work required:

- 1. Undertake a structural assessment of the foundation, realign the foundation at the west corner, undertake jacking for levelling the floors and setting the building on a repaired foundation.
- 2. Engage a brick mason with expertise in conservation to assess the condition of the brick.
- 3. Undertake a program of removals followed by an assessment. As part of demolition of the rear additions, salvage brick as matching replacement for masonry at the front.



- 4. The arched segmented brick and metal hood from the east side window of 174 can be reclaimed and used to restore the front entry.
- 5. repair the cornice and, where badly deteriorated, replicate the section.

- 6. Dismantle the section of brick on the second floor where there is bulging and potential separation of brick from the backing wall. Repair and repoint façade, as necessary.
- 7. Casement windows will be retained and painted.
- 8. Install a new stoop to provide access to the new front door
- 9. Undertake brick dismantling and replacing the salvaged decorative hood and segmented brick header over the front door, replace the brick between the door and the west corner and repoint, as necessary.



- 10. Dismantle the segmented brick and hood over the ground floor window on the east elevation, install a new brick header, and reinstall the window.
- 11. On the east façade, remove brick and install a new header and window on the second floor. Repoint as necessary the west and east elevations.
- 12. Complete the rehabilitation of all interior work.



CITY OF OTTAWA DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PLANNING BRANCH	HERITAGE SURVEY AND EVALUATION FORM	BUILDING FILE NO. CD 43 HERITAGE DISTRICT FILE NO. CD 43
Municipal Address _____ <u>174 Murray St.</u>		
Building Name _____	Lot _____	Block _____
Legal Description _____	Plan _____	
Date of Construction _____	Additions _____	
Final Use _____ <u>Single dwelling</u>	Original Owner _____	
Int Use _____ <u>Single dwelling</u>	Present Owner _____	
Present Zoning _____		
Planning Area _____		

PHASE ONE SURVEY


Potential Significance	Considerable	Some	Limited	None
History	(Pre-) () (to) ()	() (to) () ()	() (to) () ()	() (to) () ()
(Date of Construction)	3	2	1	0
Architecture	3	2	1	0
Environment	3	2	1	0
(Landscape or Design compatibility)				

Phase One Survey Score ____/9 Prepared By: _____

Potential Heritage Building Yes/No
Potential Heritage District Yes/No

COMMENTS:

PHASE TWO EVALUATION RESULTS
 (Summarized from Page 4)
 Category 1 2 3 4
 Part I Definite Yes/No
 Part IV Potential Yes/No
 -- IT IV, By-law/Date



PC-889-P-4
 CD-28-0073-1

HI STORY PREPARED BY: _____ DATE: _____

DATE OF CONSTRUCTION: 1904 FACTUAL/ESTIMATED

SOURCES: city Directories

TRENDS

EVENTS

PERSONS (ORIGINAL OWNER/TENANT)
original tenant: F. Cassan

(OTHERS)

SUMMARY/COMMENTS ON HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE

HISTORICAL SOURCES (CODED)

ARCHITECTURE PREPARED BY _____ DATE _____

ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN (PLAN, STOREYS, ROOF, WINDOWS, MATERIALS, DETAILS, ETC.)
2 storey wood frame dwelling that originally had a brick or
nagged veneer; uniform regular openings; off centre entrance
off shed canopy

ARCHITECTURAL STYLE

DESIGNER/BUILDER/ARCHITECT

ARCHITECTURAL INTEGRITY (ALTERATIONS)
aluminum siding; original window replaced with casement windows;
porch and canopy

OTHER (STRUCTURE, INTERIOR, BUILDING TYPE, ETC.)

RK:11-2
CITYARCH-1

CITY OF OTTAWA
DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

HERITAGE SURVEY
AND
EVALUATION FORM

BUILDING FILE NO.
CD 45
HERITAGE DISTRICT FILE NO.
CD 45

Municipal Address _____
Building Name _____

Legal Description _____ Lot _____ Block _____ Plan _____

Date of Construction _____
Final Use _____ Original Owner _____ Present Owner _____

Present Zoning _____
Planning Area _____

PHASE ONE SURVEY

Potential Significance	Considerable	Some	Limited	None
History (Date of Construction)	(Pre-) (to)	(to) (to)	(to) (to)	(to) (to)
Architecture	3	2	1	0
Environment	3	2	1	0
(Landscape or Design compatibility)				

Phase One Survey Score ____ / 9 Prepared By: _____

Potential Heritage Building Yes/No _____
Potential Heritage District Yes/No _____


COMMENTS:

PHASE TWO EVALUATION RESULTS
(Summarized from Page 4)
Category 1 2 3
Part V Definite Yes/No _____
Part IV Potential Yes/No _____
If PART IV, By-law/Draft _____

If Part VI:
Heritage District Name _____

By-law Date _____

IF PART V



VIEW SOURCE NEGATIVE NUMBER

HISTORY PREPARED BY: DATE:

DATE OF CONSTRUCTION: 1876 FACTUAL/ESTIMATED
SOURCES: 1P/PA

TRENDS

EVENTS

PERSONS (ORIGINAL OWNER/TENANT)
James H. Messer, owner/tenant

(OTHERS)

SUMMARY/COMMENTS ON HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE

HISTORICAL SOURCES (CODED)

ARCHITECTURE PREPARED BY: DATE

ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN (PLAN, STOREYS, ROOF, WINDOWS, MATERIALS, DETAILS, ETC.)
Originally a 1 1/2 storey wood frame lowtown vernacular with a gabled roof and probably dormers. The building has been altered and is now a 2 storey structure with a flat roof. Ground floor openings probably in original locations with two of the three upper windows probably in the original location of the dormers. Central upper window a later addition.

ARCHITECTURAL STYLE

DESIGNER/BUILDER/ARCHITECT

ARCHITECTURAL INTEGRITY (ALTERATIONS)
alum. iron siding and angelstone over original sheathing; original windows and door replaced.

OTHER (STRUCTURE, INTERIOR, BUILDING TYPE, ETC.)

HY11-2
20240075-1