Technical Memorandum

Date:	30 October 2026
To:	Ken Scullion Senior Planner, Planning Services Municipality of Port Hope
From:	Marcus R. Letourneau, PhD, MPlan, MCIP, RPP, CAHP, CIPM II Senior Partner Denise Horne, MA, B. Ed., Dipl. Heritage Conservation, CAHP Principal Planner, Heritage & Policy Planning
Re:	**REVIEW OF RE-SUBMITTED HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT AND SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION 86 JOHN STREET, PORT HOPE – NPG FILE #26142**

Background

NPG Planning Solutions Inc. (NPG) was retained by the Municipality of Port Hope (the Municipality) to complete a review in relation to a revised Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) prepared by ARA (original dated 20 February, revised 15 August 2025, and further revised 7 January 2026) for the property at 86 John Street (the Subject Property) in the Municipality of Port Hope.

The HIA prepared by ARA was subject to several reviews by M. R. Letourneau and Associates Inc. (MRLA) in association with Bray Heritage (reviews dated 20 February 2025, 15 August 2025, and 19 November 2025). This version of the HIA by ARA (dated 07/01/2026) was revised in response to the latest MRLA review. Also provided are a supporting letter from Piccini Architects (dated 14 September 2026, attached as **Appendix A**), and revised architectural renderings showing new colours for materials on the proposed building (no date, but attached hereto as **Appendix B**). The revised HIA and earlier HIA reviews should be consulted for more fulsome background information.

This Technical Memorandum specifically addresses any outstanding matters for review and provides a position on the revised HIA.

It is understood that the Subject Property is currently designated under both s. 29 Part IV of the *Ontario Heritage Act* (OHA) through By-law No. 34/81, as well as under Part V of the OHA as part of the John, Ontario, and Queen Street Heritage Conservation District.

Based upon our review, the revised HIA has addressed most issues identified within the 19 November 2025 review by MRLA and Bray Heritage. However, there remain a few minor outstanding items that are outlined in Table 1.

Table 1 – Minor outstanding items to be addressed in revised HIA by ARA

Review by M. R. Letourneau and Associates Inc. (MRLA) in association with Bray Heritage (dated 19 November 2025)	Additional Notes
2) Within Section 2.2.1 The Planning Act, a reference to the 2020 Provincial Policy Statement remains. This needs to be removed.	The last paragraph still references the Provincial Policy Statement. However the title as of October 2024 is the *Provincial Planning Statement*.
6) Within Section 8.1.7, the heritage attributes should be linked with the heritage values identified in Section 8.1.4.	The heritage attributes in section 8.1.7 of the revised HIA have not been explicitly linked to the heritage values as identified within the O. Reg 9/06 assessment. This list should be revised to better reflect the requirements of O. Reg. 385/21 s. 3.(1)4, specifically: *The description of the heritage attributes of the property must explain how each heritage attribute contributes to the cultural heritage value or interest of the property.*

It is further understood that the Heritage Port Hope Advisory Committee (Heritage Advisory Committee) provided the following conditions at their meeting on 17 March 2025:

> *THAT the Heritage Port Hope Advisory Committee recommends the approval of Heritage Application 2025-03, 86 John Street, for the construction of a stand-alone residential building abutting the western wall of the existing one-storey kitchen annex to the rear of the existing Hotel Carlyle, subject to the following comments:*
>
> - *That the proposed residential building does not impair the street scape [sic]; and*
> - *That the proposed residential building is complementary of the current Hotel Carlyle*

With respect to the revised HIA and revised renderings (attached in **Appendix B)**, it is the opinion of the authors that the recommendations of the Heritage Advisory Committee recommendations have been sufficiently addressed. The revised HIA

considered a 4-storey option for the building that would have had a more monolithic footprint, which would be not in keeping with the HCD. The 5-storey design with stepped back terraces assists in reducing the visual massing of the proposed building at street level. In addition, the change in proposed materials to a buff brick with black trim details on the first three floors better reflects the materials of the Carlyle Hotel, but with a contemporary design for the proposed building that enables it to remain distinguishable.

The current design proposes a dark grey cladding on the 4th and 5th storeys. It is recommended that the architects explore a lighter colour cladding material. This would help lighten the appearance of massing of those storeys.

Conclusion

It is the authors' opinion that the revisions to the HIA have addressed most outstanding items. Two minor items identified within previous reviews remain and should be corrected. It is also recommended that a lighter coloured material be explored for the 4th and 5th storeys. Otherwise, it is our opinion that the conditions recommended by the Heritage Advisory Committee have been fulfilled.



_____

Marcus R. Létourneau (he/him), PhD, MPlan, MCIP, RPP, CAHP, CIPM II
Senior Partner
NPG Planning Solutions Inc.



_____

Denise Horne, MA, B. Ed., Dipl. Heritage Conservation, CAHP
Principal Planner, Heritage & Policy Planning
NPG Planning Solutions Inc

Appendices

Appendix A – "Heritage Application 2025-03 Condominium Adjacent Hotel Carlyle & Restaurant, 86 John Street" Letter from Piccini Architects (dated 14 September 2026)

Appendix B – Architectural Renderings by Piccini Architects (undated)

PICCINI
ARCHITECT

September 14, 2026

Mr. Ken Scullion, RPP, MCIP, Senior Planner
Municipality of Port Hope
5 Mill Street South, Port Hope, ON L1A 2S6

Heritage Application 2025-03
Condominium Adjacent Hotel Carlyle & Restaurant, 86 John Street

Good morning Ken,

In response to the conditional approval of the Heritage Application for the proposed condominium adjacent to the Hotel Carlyle, I have prepared a summary of ARA's revisions to the Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) report that responded to comments received from the peer reviewer. While several revisions to the HIA report were made in response to the peer reviewer's comments, this summary focusses on revisions that address the comments provided by the Heritage Advisory Committee (HAC), upon which their conditional approval is based. Their recommendations were as follows:

- That the proposed residential building does not impair the streetscape; and
- That the proposed residential building is complementary of the current Hotel Carlyle.

I assume that the Heritage Advisory Committee has been provided with a copy of the revised HIA report dated January 7, 2026. Information added to address the HAC's comments is contained in Section 9.0 Proposed Development of the January 2026 report, beginning on page 57.

On page 57, following the paragraph that begins with what the proposed development consists of, ARA added a paragraph that states they agree with the placement of the proposed building at the rear of the Hotel to "*minimize any impacts to the legibility of the subject property and ensures it remains prominent and readily visible from the John Street streetscape.*"

On page 58, following the paragraph referring to views of the hotel, ARA added a paragraph that states they agree that views of the hotel and it's character defining features "*remain fully intact and that no views along the streetscape, into and from the subject property, specifically to the heritage attributes, will be compromised, removed or obscured.*"

On page 59, following the paragraph referring to the perception of height and massing, ARA added a paragraph agreeing that the 5-storey height is softened because of the stepped back nature of the upper floors and topography of the site. ARA state "*the intentional architectural articulation on the lower three levels works to complement the subject property but ensures it remains distinctive and subordinate to the subject property.*"

On page 59, following the paragraph referring to the south façade, ARA added a paragraph noting that the proposed development is 1-storey higher than what the heritage conservation guidelines allow, and that a mitigation measure to reduce the impact of height is to "*step back the upper level, the latter which has been applied to the design*".

On page 60, the first paragraph of the January 2026 report states that the proposed development is anticipated to be finished with white brick and grayish blue cladding. However, this has changed. The final design iteration shows brick for the 3-storey base in a colour that is close to and intended to complement the colour of the Hotel brick. The terraced 4th and 5th floors will be finished in a dark gray cladding. A sample of the brick colour will be shown to the HAC at the September 21 meeting. The glass railings have also been changed to metal railings, another change to be more complementary to the existing Hotel. Two renderings are attached that show the proposed exterior finishes and are to replace Figures 11 and 12 on pages 69 and 70 in the January 2026 report.

Page 60 also contains 3 additional indented paragraphs that were added to describe a series of angular plane diagrams, comparing the angular planes of the existing Hotel building, the proposed 5-storey building, and a hypothetical 4-storey building. The diagrams are shown in Figure 16 on page 74 of the January 2026 report. The purpose of the diagrams is to illustrate how a 4-storey building with no terraced setbacks would result in a steeper angular plane and be more obtrusive to the existing streetscape.

The first indented paragraph mentions reducing the height of the centre section of the building that divides the base into 2 sections by switching the position of the elevator and exit stair. This has been done and has resulted in a recessed centre section that no longer projects beyond the face of the 3-storey base.

The implications of considering a 4-storey building is discussed further in several paragraphs that were added to Section 11.0 Alternative Development Options and Mitigative Measures, on page 82 and 83 of the January 2026 report. Refer to 11.3, Option 3: 4-Storey Building at Rear of Property. I believe a wider, more prominent and monolithic 4-storey development fronting onto Augusta Street with the same setback as the proposed building would negatively impact the legibility and readability of the existing Hotel. As such, this option was not considered.

Sincerely,
PICCINI ARCHITECT

Reno Piccini
B.E.S., B.Arch., O.A.A.

Attach: Updated Renderings (2)
Cc: William & Ingrid Laurin, Asunder Trade & Capital
Bob Clark, Clark Consulting
Amy Barnes, ARA

NPG PLANNING SOLUTIONS

Appendix A – "Heritage Application 2025-03 Condominium Adjacent Hotel Carlyle & Restaurant, 86 John Street" Letter from Piccini Architects (dated 14 September 2026)

Appendix B – Architectural Renderings by Piccini Architects (undated)

Figure 1. Proposed Development – Rendering View from Augusta Street (Courtesy of Piccini Architects, 2024)



Figure 2. Rendering View from Augusta Street at John Street (Courtesy of Piccini Architects, 2024)

