



M. R. Letourneau and Associates Inc.
706 Front Rd.
Kingston, Ontario, K7M 4L5
(1) 613-331-0988
marcus@mrltourneauassociates.ca

19 November 2025

Theodhora Merepeza, M.C.P., MCIP, RPP
Manager, Planning
Municipality of Port Hope
56 Queen Street, Port Hope, ON, L1A 3Z9
e. tmerepeza@porthope.ca

Memo: Review of Revised Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) for 86 John Street, Port Hope.

Dear Ms. Merepeza:

M. R. Letourneau and Associates Inc. (MRLA), in association with Bray Heritage, was retained in October 2025 by the Municipality of Port Hope to undertake a Peer Review of the revised Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) prepared by ARA for 86 John Street (the Subject Property). This review was completed by Dr. Marcus Letourneau and Dr Carl Bray, who undertook the original peer review. The purpose of this review is to ensure that all matters identified within the previous Peer Review prepared by MRLA and Bray have been addressed and to ensure there are no outstanding matters.

Review

Overall, ARA has addressed most of the issues identified within the original peer review and the documents provided is a substantial improvement. The accompanying chart prepared by ARA showing how identified issues were addressed or providing additional background was particularly helpful. The additional details provided within the report helped provide clarity on how the relevant cultural heritage resources will be conserved. Nevertheless, there are a few outstanding matters that need to be addressed. Most of these are relatively minor, and include the following:

- 1) Within the Executive Summary, the reference to the local heritage advisory committing approving the HIA should be revised to reflect the advisory role of such committees under the *Ontario Heritage Act*. Further, caution is recommended as the motion itself, as presented within Section 4, only refers to approval of the proposed work.
- 2) Within the Executive Summary, the reference to the property being significant for its historical and architectural significance should be updated to reflect current terminology or it should be clarified that this reflects the original *Ontario Heritage Act* bylaw wording.
- 3) The Executive Summary states the following:

The proposed development does not include the removal of any materials or portions of 86 John Street

As this project is located on the real property of 86 John Street, this wording is a little confusing and should be revised.

The corrections identified above should be carried through the report as applicable. The following should also be addressed:

- 1) Within Section 2.1 Federal Guidelines, it should be made clear if the *Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada* has been formally adopted or if this is being used as an example of best practice.
- 2) Within Section 2.2.1 *The Planning Act*, a reference to the *2020 Provincial Policy Statement* remains. This needs to be removed.
- 3) Within Section 2.2.4 of the report, a reference to *Places to Grow* policies remains. This needs to be removed.
- 4) Within Section 4, the reference to The Minister of the Environment and Climate Change needs to be updated to reflect the current ministerial title. (Please see the following: <https://federal-organizations.canada.ca/profil.php?OrgID=PC&lang=en>).
- 5) Within Section 5.6 there is an error message regarding a reference. There is a similar error message in 8.1.7.
- 6) Within Section 8.1.7, the heritage attributes should be linked with the heritage values identified in Section 8.1.4.
- 7) Section 9.0 should include a plan view that shows the footprint of the proposed building as well as parking and landscaping.
- 8) Section 11.3 should be expanded to show Option 3 (4 storey version) in plan, elevation and rendering to make a fair comparison with the preferred option. Alternatively, a more robust description should be provided outlining why the 4-storey structure, which is permitted, cannot be built. This is important in addressing the Council approval of the Heritage Permit which outlines the need to consider potential impacts on the streetscape on the current Hotel Carlyle which states:

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; and
- That the proposed residential building is complementary of the current Hotel Carlyle.

- 9) Within Sections 11.6.3 and 11.6.4, a good list of further studies needed is provided. It is understood that that site plan control may be required depending on the total number of units proposed. If site plan is required, it is recommended that the analysis in support of the site plan application provide a general description of the slope (degree of slope, soil type) as well as a more detailed consideration of the potential impact on the mature tree grove on the adjacent protected heritage property at 68 John/47 Pine through a geotechnical analysis. Specifically, while not listed as a heritage attribute in the OHA by-law and with the understanding that the report has identified measures to address these trees, potential

impacts on the root zone and the structural capacity of the trees and slope could lead to secondary impacts, and this should be discussed in more detail through a geotechnical analysis. If site plan is not required, it is recommended that HIA be amended to outline this approach, given that a geotechnical analysis will be required to permit the proposed development

Several typos were also noted, including the following:

- On page 50 - “hilt” for “hill”; and
- On page 51 - “jot-line” for “lot line.” The quoted text on this page needs an edit for other potential typos.

Summary

We trust the foregoing is helpful, and if there are any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Signature



Marcus R. Létourneau, PhD, MPlan, MCIP, RPP, CAHP, CIPM II