



January 9, 2021

Justin Teakle
Planning Services, Town of Collingwood
55 Ste. Marie Street, Unit 301
Collingwood, ON
L9Y 0W6

Sent by email only: afarr@collingwood.ca; jteakle@collingwood.ca; bboucher@collingwood.ca

**PEER REVIEW OF REVISED HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR 222 HURONTARIO STREET,
COLLINGWOOD**

Revised Reich & Petch HIA

The *Heritage Impact Assessment for the Proposed Commercial Development at Collingwood, Site: 222 Hurontario Street* prepared by Reich & Petch (“Reich & Petch HIA”) was first submitted to the Town of Collingwood (“Town”) on October 9, 2020. Preliminary comment on the Reich & Petch HIA was provided to the Town by the Peer Reviewer (Su Murdoch) on October 15, 2020. No site visit was conducted in advance of the preparation of that comment, nor subsequent. The Peer Reviewer is familiar with this stretch of Hurontario Street and the Collingwood Downtown Heritage Conservation District Plan (CDHCD Plan).

In response to the preliminary comment of October 15, the Reich & Petch HIA was revised and resubmitted to the Town on November 25, 2020 (“Rev. HIA”). It appears that the revision constitutes a new section “The Immediate Context Surroundings of the Site” and minor changes.

This Peer Review considers whether the concerns identified on October 15 have been adequately addressed in the Rev. HIA. The format for this Peer Review follows the content of the October 15 comment.

Location

The subject property fronts on the west side of Hurontario Street and also has frontage on the north side of Fourth Street stepped back from the northwest corner of Fourth and Hurontario. The entire parcel is within the CDHCD.

Traditionally, the east and west character of this stretch of Hurontario was/is residential. The streetscape transitions north to two storey commercial buildings, then to the three storey commercial downtown core. Beginning in the 1960s, the residential section notably on the west side, was partially replaced mostly with one storey, commercial and service structures.

The proposed development is for a two storey, commercial building to replace a structure that burned. The proposed building is depicted in Item 11 in the Reich & Petch HIA. It is a contemporary design with the front façade facing Hurontario and the south façade facing the site interior (north and parallel to Fourth Street). The parking lot has Fourth Street frontage.

October 15 Comment and Rev. HIA Response

1. October 15: *The attention of the Reich & Petch HIA is on the Hurontario Street frontage. There is no discussion of the impact of the proposed parking lot on the Fourth Street frontage (as shown on Proposed Site Plan A007). Fourth Street is a streetscape within the CDHCD and the heritage impact of development at that location also warrants an assessment.*

Rev. HIA Peer Review Comment

The impact of the parking lot on the Fourth Street frontage is not resolved in the Rev. HIA.

2. October 15: *There is no in-depth discussion of the larger role of 222 Hurontario to the context of the south (secondary with modern infill) to north (primary traditional) transition of the built form along Hurontario.*

Rev. HIA Peer Review Comment

The Rev. HIA does not entirely analyze the role of this property within the south to north transition of Hurontario Street. The concept is that although contemporary in design, the new structure could hint at the form and design of the authentic heritage buildings to the north. It is recommended that the Town be cognizant of this transition role. This may be more productive than requesting a further attempt at analysis in the HIA.

3. October 15: *The massing and rhythm for the proposed structure is referenced to the built form of 202-206 Hurontario. The division of the storefront and horizontal elevations as illustrated in Item 11 have merit, as does the use of red brick. The concern is that the built form of No. 220, which abuts the site on the north, is ignored. Item 11 shows only No. 220 and does not extend to showing 202-206. This leaves the question of how the proposed structure will visually harmonize with its immediate (No. 220) and then its north neighbours.*

Rev. HIA Peer Review Comment

This is unresolved. It is recommended that the Item 11 rendering be extended to include No. 222 and all structures north to 202-206 Hurontario so the proposed structure is conceptualized in an

actual and measured streetscape setting. Although No. 218 may in future be replaced with a more compatible design, this stretch of Hurontario will always be within one viewscape. There are overall considerations of the proportion, alignment, and compatibility of the massing, detailing, etc., of each new structure relative to the existing built form. An extended rendering of the streetscape would better illustrate the proposed design in context.

4. October 15: *According to Reich & Petch HIA, “the proposed structure utilizes visible façade divisions, decorative architectural elements, and addresses the street directly resulting in a building that embodies the core principles of the Collingwood Downtown Heritage District Plan.” This design proposal is contemporary and has minimal “decorative architectural elements” when compared to the examples provided (Items 5-9). There may be an opportunity to have the new design hint at, and thereby support, what will be seen architecturally farther north on Hurontario. The use of some subtle architectural embellishments, such as a more defined cornice and brick band, could result in a better integrated Hurontario streetscape from south the north.*

Rev. HIA Peer Review Comment

This is not suggesting that the new structure should mimic the 19th century commercial architecture along Hurontario. Rather, when the opportunity arises in a contemporary design that purports to incorporate traditional architectural elements, examples could be drawn from along Hurontario (such as the proposed cornice and the perimeter base stone and cap). This will result in a better integrated streetscape from south to north.

5. October 15: *The Proposed Site Plan (Drawing A007) describes the structure as “One Storey Building.” Elsewhere it is described and drawn as a two storey structure. This inconsistency in description needs to be corrected.*

Rev. HIA Peer Review Comment

No new Drawing A007 was provided for this Peer Review.

6. October 15: *Other inconsistencies in description exist, such as “stone or concrete base” in Item 14, being identified as a “natural stone base” in Item 11.*

Rev. HIA Peer Review Comment

Inconsistency in this labelling continues. The new Rev. HIA section “The Immediate Context surrounding of the Site” describes the intent to use “reconstituted stone material” with a precast top of sill.” This is an acceptable building material.

7. October 15: *The intent of what is described in Item 14 as “brick band forming a proportional arch” lacks clarity.*

Rev. HIA Peer Review Comment

This is now phrased as “brick detail framing the opening,” but elsewhere as “soldier courses to express the lintels” or possibly a “brick band forming a proportional arch.” The identity of this element is still not clear.

8. October 15: *The Reich & Petch HIA statement that “The proposal for #222 Hurontario Street satisfies the intent of the HCD and will be a successful gateway building for the downtown retail district” lacks explanation, especially in how “gateway building” is being defined.*

Rev. HIA Peer Review Comment

Similar to Point 2, it is recommended that the Town be cognizant of this gateway positioning. The concept is that the design is an introduction to the built form progressing north to the authentic heritage structures.

9. NEW Content in Rev. HIA: “The Immediate Context Surrounding of the Site”

A new section in the Rev. HIA, “The Immediate Context Surrounding of the Site,” considers “corporate brand and values” expressed, in part, in the choice of “loft style interior.” It also states that “the intent of a brick band forming a proportional arch is intended to express historic warehouse larger structural grids with brick columns and connecting brickwork, articulated in the design as brick bays. There are examples of these warehouse structures, common in the shipbuilding era.” (The warehouse inspiration is mentioned in the first Reich & Petch HIA.)

The discussions of corporate brand and interior design are not directly relevant to compliance with the CDHCD Plan provisions for new construction. “Warehouse aesthetic” in deference to the shipbuilding era is not the architectural type prevalent along Hurontario Street.

This new section explains the use of “brickwork articulated with relief in plan and section and coursing. Corbelled brick courses at the top express the roof line and soldier courses to express the lintels. Two types of colour and brick are proposed to emphasise the façade relief.” The south side façade with a side canopy and metal suspension rods/struts are said to be “reminiscent of heritage retail walkways/promenades/arcades.” Essentially, this is an effort to apply language descriptive of a traditional commercial storefront, to a contemporary design. For review purposes, the more useful component of the new section is the conceptual drawing.

Summary

As commented on October 15: “The division of the storefront and horizontal elevations as illustrated in Item 11 have merit, as does the use of red brick.” The two storey form, horizontal alignment, and recessed entrance at the southeast are acceptable, as is the updated proposal to use red and buff coloured brick. The use of a perimeter stone base and cap is commendable, but

as rendered, is not traditional in its proportion or ratio to the building mass. The rendering of the cornice type is not distinct enough to reveal the type of corbelling. These two elements (base and cornice) should consider historic examples found on Hurontario.

A better conceptual depiction of how the new structure integrates within the existing streetscape is needed. A rendering of the proposed No. 222 in the context of all buildings north to 202-206 Hurontario, would be useful in determining streetscape compatibility. The rendering should depict the proposed structure in its final form, alignment, proportion, rhythm, architectural embellishment, and materials.

The Town is advised to be cognizant of the role of this property within the south to north transition along Hurontario and as a gateway into the CDHCD. Although contemporary, the design could still hint at the form and elements of the authentic heritage buildings north into the core of the CDHCD.

Of continuing concern is the unknown impact of the parking lot on the Fourth Street streetscape.

Yours truly,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "S. Murdoch". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long, sweeping underline that extends to the right.

Su Murdoch