

London Advisory Committee on Heritage

Report

1st Meeting of the London Advisory Committee on Heritage
December 12, 2018
Committee Rooms #1 and #2

Attendance PRESENT: D. Derek (Chair), D. Brock, J. Cushing, H. Elmslie,
H. Garrett, T. Jenkins, J. Manness, K. Waud and M. Whalley and
J. Bunn (Secretary)

ABSENT: S. Adamsson and S. Gibson

ALSO PRESENT: J. Dent, K. Gonyou, K. Gowan and J.
Ramsay

The meeting was called to order at 5:31 PM.

1. Call to Order

1.1 Disclosures of Pecuniary Interest

That it BE NOTED that no pecuniary interests were disclosed.

2. Organizational Matters

2.1 Election of Chair and Vice Chair for term ending June 1, 2019

That it BE NOTED that the London Advisory Committee on Heritage
elected D. Dudek and M. Whalley as the Chair and Vice-Chair,
respectively, for the term ending June 1, 2019.

3. Scheduled Items

None.

4. Consent

4.1 11th Report of the London Advisory Committee on Heritage

That it BE NOTED that the 11th Report of the London Advisory Committee
on Heritage, from its meeting on November 14, 2018, was received.

4.2 Municipal Council Resolution - Recruitment and Appointment of Advisory Committee Members for the Up-Coming Term

That it BE NOTED that the Municipal Council resolution, from its meeting
held on November 20, 2018, with respect to the recruitment and
appointment of Advisory Committee members for the up-coming term, was
received.

4.3 Zoning By-law Amendment Application - 446 York Street

That it BE NOTED that the City of London Planning Services Community
Information Meeting Notice as well as the Revised Public Meeting Notice,
dated November 28, 2018, both from M. Knieriem, Planner II, with respect
to a Zoning By-law Amendment for the property located at 446 York
Street, were received.

4.4 Notice of Public Information Centre #2 - Long Term Water Storage -
Municipal Class Environmental Assessment

That it BE NOTED that the Notice of Public Information Centre #2, from P. Lupton, City of London and N. Martin, AECOM, with respect to the City of London Long Term Water Storage Municipal Class Environmental Assessment, was received.

5. Sub-Committees and Working Groups

5.1 Stewardship Sub-Committee

That the following actions be taken with respect to the Stewardship Sub-Committee Report from its meeting held on November 28, 2018:

- a) it BE NOTED that the above-noted report was received; and,
- b) the Civic Administration BE ADVISED that the London Advisory Committee on Heritage supports the groupings of the 35 properties for Cultural Heritage Evaluation Reports, as they appear in the attached presentation from J. Ramsay, Project Director, Rapid Transit Implementation; it being noted that a verbal presentation from M. Greguol, AECOM, was received with respect to this matter.

6. Items for Discussion

6.1 Community Heritage Ontario 2019 Membership Renewal

That the London Advisory Committee on Heritage 2019 membership with the Community Heritage Ontario BE APPROVED; it being noted that the CHOnews newsletter for Autumn 2018, was received.

6.2 (ADDED) Heritage Planners' Report

That it BE NOTED that the attached submission from K. Gonyou and L. Dent and K. Gowan, Heritage Planners, with respect to various updates and events, was received.

7. Deferred Matters/Additional Business

7.1 (ADDED) Community Information Meeting - Byron Gravel Pits Secondary Plan

That it BE NOTED that the City of London Planning Services Community Information Meeting Notice from B. Page, Senior Planner, with respect to the Byron Gravel Pits Secondary Plan, was received.

8. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 6:07 PM.

London Advisory Committee on Heritage

Report

11th Meeting of the London Advisory Committee on Heritage
November 14, 2018
Committee Rooms #1 and #2

Attendance PRESENT: D. Derek (Chair), S. Adamsson, D. Brock, J. Cushing, H. Elmslie, S. Gibson, T. Jenkins, J. Manness, K. Waud and M. Whalley and J. Bunn (Secretary)

ABSENT: H. Garrett

ALSO PRESENT: R. Armistead, J. Dent, L. Dent, K. Gonyou and J. Ramsay

The meeting was called to order at 5:30 PM.

1. Call to Order

1.1 Disclosures of Pecuniary Interest

That it BE NOTED that no pecuniary interests were disclosed.

2. Scheduled Items

None.

3. Consent

3.1 10th Report of the London Advisory Committee on Heritage

That it BE NOTED that the 10th Report of the London Advisory Committee on Heritage, from its meeting held on October 10, 2018, was received.

3.2 ReThink Zoning Draft Terms of Reference

That it BE NOTED that the Memo dated October 31, 2018, from J. Adema, Planner II, with respect to the ReThink Zoning Draft Terms of Reference, was received.

3.3 Notice of Planning Application - Intent to Remove Holding Provision - 3400 Singleton Avenue

That it BE NOTED that the Notice of Planning Application dated October 17, 2018, from M. Sundercock, Planner I, with respect to the intent to remove a holding provision for the property located at 3400 Singleton Avenue, was received.

3.4 Notice of Public Information Centre No. 1 - Adelaide Street North Municipal Class Environmental Assessment Study

That it BE NOTED that the Notice of Public Information Centre No. 1 from H. Huotari, Parsons Inc. and M. Davenport, City of London, with respect to the Adelaide Street North Municipal Class Environmental Assessment Study, was received.

3.5 Notice of Planning Application - Intent to Remove Holding Provision - 3105 Bostwick Road

That it BE NOTED that the Notice of Planning Application dated October 17, 2018, from M. Sundercock, Planner I, with respect to the intent to remove a holding provision for the property located at 3105 Bostwick Road, was received.

3.6 Public Meeting Notice - Zoning By-law Amendment - 809 Dundas Street

That it BE NOTED that the Public Meeting Notice dated October 24, 2018, from S. Wise, Senior Planner, with respect to a Zoning By-law Amendment for the property located at 809 Dundas Street, was received.

3.7 Notice of Cancellation - Public Meeting - Zoning By-law Amendment - 131 King Street

That it BE NOTED that the Notice of Cancellation - Public Meeting dated October 18, 2018, from M. Corby, Senior Planner, with respect to a Zoning By-law Amendment for the property located at 131 King Street, was received.

3.8 Notice of Planning Application - Zoning By-law Amendment - 446 York Street

That M. Knieriem, Planner II, BE ADVISED that the London Advisory Committee on Heritage is satisfied with the research, assessment and conclusions of the Heritage Impact Assessment for the property located at 446 York Street; it being noted that the Notice of Planning Application dated October 31, 2018, from M. Knieriem, Planner II, with respect to a Zoning By-law Amendment for the property located at 446 York Street, was received.

3.9 Notice of Planning Application and Public Meeting Notice - Official Plan Amendment - Amendment to the Cultural Heritage Guidelines of The London Plan

That it BE NOTED that the Notice of Planning Application dated October 16, 2018, and the Public Meeting Notice dated October 22, 2018, from L.E. Dent, Heritage Planner, with respect to an amendment to the Cultural Heritage Guidelines of The London Plan, as well as the Heritage Places 2.0 document, dated November 2018, and the ~~attached~~ presentation from L.E. Dent, with respect to the above-noted matter, were received; it being noted that the London Advisory Committee on Heritage will make official comments at the February, 2019 meeting.

4. Sub-Committees and Working Groups

4.1 Stewardship Sub-Committee Report

That the following actions be taken with respect to the Stewardship Sub-Committee Report from its meeting held on October 24, 2018:

- a) NO FURTHER ACTION BE TAKEN with respect to the properties located at 536 and 542 Windermere Road based on the local knowledge and preliminary research of the Stewardship Sub-Committee; it being noted that this matter was brought to the attention of the London Advisory Committee on Heritage at their October 10, 2018 meeting;

b) priority levels presently used on the Register (Inventory of Heritage Resources) BE REMOVED; it being noted that all properties listed on the Register have the same level of protection and treatment under the provisions of Section 27 of the *Ontario Heritage Act*; and,

c) the remainder of the above-noted report BE RECEIVED;

it being noted that the attached presentation and handout from J. Ramsay, Project Director, Rapid Transit Implementation, were received with respect to an update on Bus Rapid Transit.

4.2 Education Sub-Committee Report

That the transfer of \$7925.00 from the 2018 London Advisory Committee on Heritage Budget allocation to the Public Art Acquisition Reserve Fund BE APPROVED in order to replace lost signs in the following locations:

- Harris Park;
- Gibbons Park Bathhouse; and,
- Graham Arboretum in Springbank Park;

it being noted that the Education Sub-Committee Report, from its meeting held on November 5, 2018, was received.

5. Items for Discussion

5.1 Request for Heritage Designation for Heritage Listed Property - 336 Piccadilly Street by N. and T. Tattersall

That, on the recommendation of the Managing Director, Planning and City Planner, with the advice of the Heritage Planner, with respect to the request for the designation of the heritage listed property at 336 Piccadilly Street, that notice BE GIVEN under the provisions of Section 29(3) of the *Ontario Heritage Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. O. 18, of Municipal Council's intention to designate the property to be of cultural heritage value or interest for the reasons outlined in the attached Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest; it being noted that the attached presentation from K. Gonyou, Heritage Planner, was received with respect to this matter.

5.2 Amendment to Heritage Designating By-law - 660 Sunningdale Road East

That, on the recommendation of the Managing Director, Planning and City Planner, with respect to the heritage designated property located at 660 Sunningdale Road East, notice of Municipal Council's intention to pass a by-law to amend the legal description of the property designated to be of cultural heritage value of interest by By-law No. L.S.P.-3476-474 BE GIVEN in accordance with the requirements of Section 30.1(4) of the *Ontario Heritage Act*, R. S. O. 1990, c. O. 18; it being noted that the attached presentation from K. Gonyou, Heritage Planner, with respect to this matter, was received.

5.3 Heritage Alteration Permit Application by Josef Dolezel - 508 Waterloo Street - West Woodfield Heritage Conservation District

That, on the recommendation of the Managing Director, Planning and City Planner, with the advice of the Heritage Planner, the application under Section 42 of the *Ontario Heritage Act* to replace windows at 508 Waterloo Street, within the West Woodfield Heritage Conservation District, BE PERMITTED with the following terms and conditions:

- a) the second floor main window replacement should mimic the same style, size and proportions as the original window;
- b) the first floor main window should be preserved; and,
- c) the Heritage Alteration Permit be displayed in a location visible from the street until the work is completed;

it being noted that the ~~attached~~ presentation from K. Gowan, Heritage Planner, with respect to this matter, was received.

5.4 Heritage Planners' Report

That it BE NOTED that the ~~attached~~ submission from K. Gonyou and L. Dent and K. Gowan, Heritage Planners, with respect to various updates and events, was received.

6. **Deferred Matters/Additional Business**

6.1 (ADDED) Ontario Heritage Trust - Heritage Matters Magazine - Autumn 2018

That it BE NOTED that the Ontario Heritage Trust - Heritage Matters Magazine for Autumn of 2018 was received; it being noted that a copy is on file in the City Clerk's Office.

7. **Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 7:55 PM.



London
CANADA

P.O. Box 5035
300 Dufferin Avenue
London, ON
N6A 4L9

November 21, 2018

C. Saunders
City Clerk

I hereby certify that the Municipal Council, at its meeting held on November 20, 2018 resolved:

That the following actions be taken with respect to the recruitment and appointment of Advisory Committee members for the up-coming term:

- a) the recruitment for voting members, BE UNDERTAKEN;
- b) the appointments for the above-noted recruitment BE LIMITED to a term from June 1, 2019 to February 28, 2021; it being noted that the current terms of Advisory Committee members will be extended to the date of June 1, 2019; and
- c) the City Clerk BE DIRECTED to report back to the Corporate Services Committee with respect to input from current Advisory Committee members related to existing Terms of Reference and the recommendations from the Diverse Voices for Change project, prior to the end of February 2019. (2.4/20/CSC) (2018-C04)

C. Saunders
City Clerk
/hw

cc: B. Westlake-Power, Deputy City Clerk
M. Schulthess, Manager of Legislative Services
H. Lysynski, Committee Secretary
J. Bunn, Committee Secretary
P. Shack, Committee Secretary



London
CANADA

City of London Planning Services COMMUNITY INFORMATION MEETING

M. Knieriem

Tel. 519-661-CITY (2489) ext. 4549 | Fax: 519-661-5397

Email: mknieriem@london.ca | Website: www.london.ca

WHAT

The Middlesex-London Health Unit and the Regional HIV/AIDS Connection have submitted a Zoning By-law Amendment application for 446 York Street to permit a clinic, in addition to the other uses already permitted on the subject site. This clinic is intended to be used for a Supervised Consumption Facility. City of London Planning Services is holding a Community Information Meeting, which provides an opportunity for members of the public to find out more about this application and provide comments.

WHERE

London Public Library - Central Branch
Richmond Room
Located at: 251 Dundas Street

WHEN

Monday, November 26, 2018
6:30 pm to 8:30 pm

WHO

Everyone, including residents, businesses, property owners and anyone interested in contributing, your opinion is needed.

HOW TO GIVE COMMENTS

Please call in, mail, e-mail, or fax your comments to the City of London Planning Division, 206 Dundas Street, London, ON, N6A 1G7, Attn: Michelle Knieriem



PLEASE NOTE: This meeting is a community meeting which the City's Planning Services at times convenes when in the opinion of the Managing Director, Planning and City Planner, the community should have a further opportunity to obtain information regarding a planning application. There will be a future public participation meeting required under the Planning Act, held at the Planning and Environment Committee, which will give you an opportunity to comment to Municipal Council on the planning application.


Personal information collected at this meeting is collected under the authority of the Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990 and may be used for the purpose of informing you of future information meetings and Statuary Public meetings relating to this matter.



REVISED - PUBLIC MEETING NOTICE

Zoning By-Law Amendment

446 York Street



File: Z-8971

Applicant: Middlesex-London Heath Unit

What is Proposed?

Zoning amendment to allow:

- Allow office uses, a clinic in association with an office use, and medical/dental offices as permitted uses.
- The requested uses are intended for a Supervised Consumption Facility.

YOU ARE INVITED!

Further to the Notice of Application you received on October 31, 2018, you are invited to a public meeting of the Planning and Environment Committee to be held:

Meeting Date and Time: Monday, December 10, 2018, no earlier than 5:15 p.m.

Meeting Location: City Hall, 300 Dufferin Avenue, 3rd Floor

For more information contact:

Michelle Knieriem
mknieriem@london.ca
519-661-CITY (2489) ext. 4549
City Planning, City of London,
206 Dundas St., London ON N6A 1G7
File: Z-8971

london.ca/planapps

Please note, the Ward 13 Councillor will change as of December 1st, 2018. Please contact the Councillors Office at 519-661-5095 for the new Ward 13 Councillor, Arielle Kayabaga's contact information.

To speak to your Ward Councillor:

Councillor Park
tpark@london.ca
519-661-CITY (2489) ext. 4013

If you are a landlord, please post a copy of this notice where your tenants can see it. We want to make sure they have a chance to take part.

Date of Notice: November 28, 2018

Application Details

Commonly Used Planning Terms are available at london.ca/planapps.

Requested Zoning By-law Amendment

To change the zoning from a Restricted Service Commercial (RSC2/RSC4) Zone to a Restricted Service Commercial/Restricted Service Commercial Special Provision (RSC2/RSC4(_)) Zone. Changes to the currently permitted land uses and development regulations are summarized below. The complete Zoning By-law is available at london.ca/planapps.

This notice has also been revised to modify the requested additional permitted uses from clinics, to office uses, clinics in association with an office use, and medical/dental offices. This revised notice also identifies that Municipal Council may also consider modifications to the requested special provisions, including the addition of office and medical/dental office as permitted uses, the requirement for clinics to be accessory to an office use, parking reductions, and minimum size requirements for intake and waiting areas for consumption booths and minimum post consumption area. The addition of a holding provision may also be considered.

Current Zoning

Zone: Restricted Service Commercial (RSC2/RSC4) Zone

Permitted Uses: animal clinics; automobile rental establishments; automobile repair garages; automobile sales and service establishments; automobile supply stores; automotive uses, restricted; catalogue stores; duplicating shops; home and auto supply stores; home improvement and furnishing stores; kennels; repair and rental establishments; service and repair establishments; studios; taxi establishments; self-storage establishments; bulk beverage stores; dry cleaning and laundry depots; liquor, beer, and wine stores; pharmacies; bulk sales establishments; bake shops; convenience service establishments; convenience stores; day care centres; duplicating shops; financial institutions; florist shops; personal service establishments; restaurants; video rental establishments; brewing on premises establishment; self-storage establishments

Special Provision(s): none

Height: 12 metres

Requested Zoning

Zone: Restricted Service Commercial/Restricted Service Commercial Special Provision(RSC2/RSC4(_)) Zone

Permitted Uses: offices, clinics in association with an office use, and medical/dental offices in addition to the other uses already permitted on the subject site (note: the requested uses are intended for a supervised consumption facility)

Special Provision(s): allow office uses, a clinic in association with an office use, and medical/dental offices as permitted uses

Height: 12 metres

This notice has also been revised to modify the requested additional permitted uses from clinics, to office uses, clinics in association with an office use, and medical/dental offices. This revised notice also identifies that Municipal Council may also consider modifications to the requested special provisions, including the addition of office and medical/dental office as permitted uses, the requirement for clinics to be accessory to an office use, parking reductions, and minimum size requirements for intake and waiting areas for consumption booths and minimum post consumption area. The addition of a holding provision may also be considered.

Planning Policies

Any change to the Zoning By-law must conform to the policies of the Official Plan, London's long-range planning document. These lands are currently designated as Office/Residential in the Official Plan, which permits a variety of office and residential uses as the main uses. Clinics are a secondary permitted use.

The subject lands are in the Neighbourhoods Place Type in *The London Plan*, permitting a range of residential uses. Municipal Council adopted Official Plan Amendment 679, permitting Supervised Consumption Facilities in all place types and providing criteria for their location.

How Can You Participate in the Planning Process?

You have received this Notice because someone has applied to change the zoning of land located within 120 metres of a property you own, or your landlord has posted the notice of application in your building. The City reviews and makes decisions on such planning

applications in accordance with the requirements of the *Planning Act*. If you previously provided written or verbal comments about this application, we have considered your comments as part of our review of the application and in the preparation of the planning report and recommendation to the Planning and Environment Committee. The additional ways you can participate in the City's planning review and decision making process are summarized below. For more detailed information about the public process, go to the [Participating in the Planning Process](#) page at [london.ca](#).

See More Information

You can review additional information and material about this application by:

- visiting Planning Services at 206 Dundas Street, Monday to Friday between 8:30am and 4:30pm;
- contacting the City's Planner listed on the first page of this Notice; or
- viewing the application-specific page at [london.ca/planapps](#).

Attend This Public Participation Meeting

The Planning and Environment Committee will consider the requested zoning changes at this meeting, which is required by the *Planning Act*. You will be invited to provide your comments at this public participation meeting. A neighbourhood or community association may exist in your area. If it reflects your views on this application, you may wish to select a representative of the association to speak on your behalf at the public participation meeting. The Planning and Environment Committee will make a recommendation to Council, which will make its decision at a future Council meeting.

What Are Your Legal Rights?

Notification of Council Decision

If you wish to be notified of the decision of the City of London on the proposed zoning by-law amendment, you must make a written request to the City Clerk, 300 Dufferin Ave., P.O. Box 5035, London, ON, N6A 4L9, or at docservices@london.ca. You will also be notified if you speak to the Planning and Environment Committee at the public meeting about this application and leave your name and address with the Secretary of the Committee.

Right to Appeal to the Local Planning Appeal Tribunal

If a person or public body would otherwise have an ability to appeal the decision of the Council of the Corporation of the City of London to the Local Planning Appeal Tribunal but the person or public body does not make oral submissions at a public meeting or make written submissions to the City of London before the by-law is passed, the person or public body is not entitled to appeal the decision.

If a person or public body does not make oral submissions at a public meeting or make written submissions to the City of London before the by-law is passed, the person or public body may not be added as a party to the hearing of an appeal before the Local Planning Appeal Tribunal unless, in the opinion of the Tribunal, there are reasonable grounds to do so.


For more information go to <http://elto.gov.on.ca/tribunals/lpat/about-lpat/>.

Notice of Collection of Personal Information

Personal information collected and recorded at the Public Participation Meeting, or through written submissions on this subject, is collected under the authority of the *Municipal Act*, 2001, as amended, and the *Planning Act*, 1990 R.S.O. 1990, c.P.13 and will be used by Members of Council and City of London staff in their consideration of this matter. The written submissions, including names and contact information and the associated reports arising from the public participation process, will be made available to the public, including publishing on the City's website. Video recordings of the Public Participation Meeting may also be posted to the City of London's website. Questions about this collection should be referred to Cathy Saunders, City Clerk, 519-661-CITY(2489) ext. 4937.

Accessibility – Alternative accessible formats or communication supports are available upon request. Please contact accessibility@london.ca or 519-661-CITY(2489) extension 2425 for more information.

Site Concept



Site Plan – submitted by applicant

The above image represents the applicant’s proposal as submitted and may change.



**City of London
Long Term Water Storage
Municipal Class Environmental Assessment**

NOTICE OF PUBLIC INFORMATION CENTRE #2

The City of London is supplied with water from the Lake Huron Regional Water Supply System and the Elgin Area Water Supply System. In the event of a disruption or reduction in water supply, and to supply adequate water pressure, the City has reservoirs to maintain uninterrupted service. These reservoirs include the Arva Reservoir and Pump Station, the Springbank Reservoirs and Pump Station, and the Southeast Reservoir and Pump Station. To address future water storage needs, the City is undertaking a Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (EA) study to determine a preferred site (or sites) for additional water storage to meet future growth and ongoing emergency supply and distribution needs. Additionally, this project will consider the feasibility of retiring the existing Springbank Reservoir #2, the McCormick Reservoir, disconnected previously, and the White Oak Filter Plant. The City is also considering options for standby power for the water distribution pumps at the existing Arva Pump Station as part of this process.

Public Information Centre

Public involvement is an important part of the Class EA process. Comments and information regarding this project are being collected to assist the project team in meeting the requirements of the Environmental Assessment Act. Residents and community organizations are encouraged to participate by providing input and attending the Public Information Centres (PICs). The second of two PICs will be held to present the recommended servicing strategy. Project team members will be available to discuss the project and to receive your input. This PIC will be a drop-in event with no formal presentation.

You are invited to attend the PIC to be held:

Date: Wednesday November 28, 2018

Time: 5pm to 7pm

Location: City Hall, 300 Dufferin Avenue, London (Committee Room #2, Second Floor)

Display materials will be available on the City of London website.

To provide comments, receive additional information or be added to the study mailing list, please visit <http://www.london.ca/residents/Environment/EAs/Pages/LongTermWaterStorageOptions.aspx> or contact either of the following team members below:

Pat Lupton

Project Manager,
Corporation of the City of London
300 Dufferin Avenue
London ON, N6A 4L9
Tel: 519-661-CITY (2489) x. 5613
Email: plupton@london.ca

Nancy Martin

Environmental Planner,
AECOM Canada
250 York Street, Suite 410
London ON, N6A 6K2
Tel: 519-963-5862
Email: nancy.martin@aecom.com

With the exception of personal information, all comments will become part of the public record of the study. The study is being conducted according to the requirements of the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment, which is a planning process approved under Ontario's Environmental Assessment Act.

**LACH Stewardship Sub-Committee
REPORT**

Wednesday November 28, 2018

Location: Planning Office, 206 Dundas Street

Time: 6:30pm – 8:30pm

Present: M. Whalley, J. Hunten, J. Cushing, M. Tovey, K. Waud, T. Regnier; K. Gowan, K. Gonyou (staff)

Agenda Items:

1. New Chairperson

The Stewardship Sub-Committee is looking for a new chairperson, as well as sub-committee member. Jim Cushing, Chairperson, is seeking to step down.

Rapid Transit – Cultural Heritage Evaluation Reports (CHERs)

2. General Comments on CHERs

- Some inconsistencies in the order of reports was noted.
- A photograph on the front cover of each of the CHERs would be appreciated.
- The information (e.g. date) included in the legends of the figures included in the CHERs prepared by WSP are too difficult to read.
- Further research and description of cultural heritage value and heritage attributes may be appropriate or needed to pursue designation under the *Ontario Heritage Act*.
- Some of the geo-references included on the historical maps are wrong, and must be corrected. For example, Figures 5-6 in the 16 Wellington Road CHER which do not map the correct location for the subject property; Figure 4 in the same report is sufficiently correct as the road alignment has changed.
- The use of blue in the tables included in the CHERs prepared by AECOM resulted in digital and print copies that were difficult to read.
- In the Wellington Road CHERs, please clarify the spelling of the historic landowners: Albert Scriver Odell, Enor Schriver. Is this difference correct?

3. CHER 1110 Richmond Street

- The Stewardship Sub-Committee reviewed the Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report prepared by WSP for the heritage listed property located at 1110 Richmond Street. The Stewardship Sub-Committee supports the conclusions of the evaluation (based on the criteria of Ontario Regulation 9/06) that the property demonstrates sufficient cultural heritage value or interest to warrant further cultural heritage assessment related to the Rapid Transit project, with the following comments:

- The property was noted on the ACO London Region’s Geranium Heritage House Tour, “Gateway to the North” (1996).
- The Historic Sites Committee of the London Public Library plaque affixed to the building is appropriately noted.
- The Stewardship Sub-Committee disagrees with the statement that the barbershop is not significant to the community; the Taylor Barbershop at 1110 Richmond Street is significant to the community. It is one of the longest continually operating businesses in Broughdale. The property has direct associations with an activity, the Taylor Barbershop, which is significant to the community.
- Regarding contextual value, while the building at 1110 Richmond Street may not visually stand out from its context, it does have longstanding association with the Taylor’s Barbershop and could be considered a community landmark with this respect.
- The concrete foundation, identified as a heritage attribute, should be noted as a concrete block foundation
- Is the barbershop pole a heritage attribute?

4. **CHER 44 Wharncliffe Road North**

The Stewardship Sub-Committee reviewed the Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report prepared by WSP for the heritage listed property located at 44 Wharncliffe Road North. The Stewardship Sub-Committee supports the conclusions of the evaluation (based on the criteria of Ontario Regulation 9/06) that the property does not demonstrate sufficient cultural heritage value or interest to warrant further cultural heritage assessment related to the Rapid Transit project, with the following comments:

- The information presented in the CHER suggests that the current building (construct c.1951, per the research presented in the CHER) replaced an earlier building, but this is not plainly stated in the CHER.

5. **CHER 16 Wellington Road**

The Stewardship Sub-Committee reviewed the Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report prepared by AECOM for the heritage listed property located at 16 Wellington Road. The Stewardship Sub-Committee supports the conclusions of the evaluation (based on the criteria of Ontario Regulation 9/06) that the property demonstrates sufficient cultural heritage value or interest to warrant further cultural heritage assessment related to the Rapid Transit project, with the following comments:

- The comparative analysis reinforces the rarity and representative nature of the cultural heritage resource at 16 Wellington Road as an example of the Art Moderne style.
- The Stewardship Sub-Committee disagrees with the evaluation of the contextual value for the property at 16 Wellington Road; the property is a landmark because of its site and relation to Wellington Road, its Art Moderne style which is tailored to its corner location, as well as its one-storey form which makes it stand out.

- The addition to the original building is well-designed; because it is setback, it preserves the character of the original building.
- The posts located at the rounded entrance should be noted as a heritage attribute.
- The use of large expanses of glass block should be clarified in the description of that heritage attribute. Within the Statement of Cultural Heritage Value, the use of expansive glass block windows can be explained as essential to the original function of the building as a printing press. Other examples of expansive windows related to the original function of a building include the former McCormick Factory (1156 Dundas Street, designated under *Part IV* of the *Ontario Heritage Act*).
- The term “awning” should be clarified in the description of the frontispiece – it is more clearly described as a “curved projection,” which is an integral part of the Art Moderne style of the building. The term “awning” could be confused with the canvas awnings located on the building.

6. **CHER 122 Wellington Road**

The Stewardship Sub-Committee reviewed the Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report prepared by AECOM for the heritage listed property located at 122 Wellington Road. The Stewardship Sub-Committee supports the conclusions of the evaluation (based on the criteria of Ontario Regulation 9/06) that the property does not demonstrate sufficient cultural heritage value or interest to warrant further cultural heritage assessment related to the Rapid Transit project, with the following comments:

- The name of the restaurant is Tak Sun.
- The pagoda is a decorative addition to the building, to make it look as though it is a Chinese building.
- Reference to the 744 Richmond Street and 746 Richmond Street (comparative analysis): the building at 746 Richmond Street was completed in 1950; 744 Richmond Street was built as a single storey building in 1949 and had its second storey constructed in 1955. The angelstone is original to the construction of the buildings.
- The effort put into the comparative analysis was commendable.

7. **CHER 126 Wellington Road**

The Stewardship Sub-Committee reviewed the Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report prepared by AECOM for the heritage listed property located at 126 Wellington Road. The Stewardship Sub-Committee supports the conclusions of the evaluation (based on the criteria of Ontario Regulation 9/06) that the property does not demonstrate sufficient cultural heritage value or interest to warrant further cultural heritage assessment related to the Rapid Transit project, with the following comments:

- The building located at 126 Wellington Road, since its new cladding applied in 2015, has become very striking and distinctive.
- Reference to the 744 Richmond Street and 746 Richmond Street (comparative analysis): the building at 746 Richmond Street was completed in 1950; 744

Richmond Street was built as a single storey building in 1949 and had its second storey constructed in 1955. The angelstone is original to the construction of the buildings.

8. CHER 220 Wellington Road

The Stewardship Sub-Committee reviewed the Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report prepared by AECOM for the heritage listed property located at 220 Wellington Road. The Stewardship Sub-Committee supports the conclusions of the evaluation (based on the criteria of Ontario Regulation 9/06) that the property does not demonstrate sufficient cultural heritage value or interest to warrant further cultural heritage assessment related to the Rapid Transit project, with the following comments:

- A vacuum cleaner dealer was formerly located at 220 Wellington Road.

9. CHER 243 Wellington Road/49-55 Foxbar Road

The Stewardship Sub-Committee reviewed the Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report prepared by AECOM for the heritage listed property located at 243 Wellington Road/49-55 Foxbar Road. The Stewardship Sub-Committee supports the conclusions of the evaluation (based on the criteria of Ontario Regulation 9/06) that the property demonstrates sufficient cultural heritage value or interest to warrant further cultural heritage assessment related to the Rapid Transit project, with the following comments:

- The evaluation of the property was unclear with respect to the Rectory; the Rectory needs to be included in the evaluation as well as the Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest and heritage attributes identified.
- Double check the headings in Sections 3.2.2 and 3.2.3.
- Is the sculpture from St. Andrew Undershaft still located at St. Andrew Memorial Anglican Church?
- The campus landscape of the property is unusual, and worthy of conservation. The 1941 church building, 1957 church building, and 1957 rectory have contextual value together. The collection represents an evolution.
- Further research and evaluation may be necessary for this property in particular, including the windows and interior, as recommended by this CHER.
- The St. Andrew the Apostle Roman Catholic Church (built c.1964), located at 1 Fallons Lane, could be a potential comparison to the property as it also has a Mid-Century Modern place of worship with a Rectory.

10. CHER 253-255 Wellington Road

The Stewardship Sub-Committee reviewed the Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report prepared by AECOM for the heritage listed property located at 253-255 Wellington Road. The Stewardship Sub-Committee supports the conclusions of the evaluation (based on the criteria of Ontario Regulation 9/06) that the property does not demonstrate sufficient cultural heritage value or interest to warrant further cultural heritage assessment related to the Rapid Transit project, with the following comments:

- The house with the commercial addition are distinct, and reflects a period of business-operations.
- None of the comparisons are specific to the subject property, particularly the asymmetrical gable of the residential buildings. Potential comparisons: 1 Franklin Avenue, 15 Ingleside Place, and others.

11. Richmond 5 Group CHER

It was noted that the Stewardship Sub-Committee was anticipating the receipt of the Richmond 5 Group CHER (736 Richmond Street, 740 Richmond Street, 742 Richmond Street, 744 Richmond Street, and 746 Richmond Street) at its meeting on November 28, 2018. However, further time to complete comprehensive research and evaluation was required, and the Richmond 5 Group CHER was delayed until the January meeting of the Stewardship Sub-Committee. The Stewardship Sub-Committee expressed concerns with the number of CHERs scheduled for its review and comment at its January meeting.

REVISED DRAFT REPORT – NOVEMBER 5, 2018

CULTURAL HERITAGE EVALUATION REPORT

TRANSIT PROJECT ASSESSMENT PROCESS
LONDON BUS RAPID TRANSIT

1110 RICHMOND ST
CITY OF LONDON
PROVINCE OF ONTARIO





CULTURAL HERITAGE EVALUATION REPORT

1110 RICHMOND ST

CITY OF LONDON
PROVINCE OF ONTARIO

REPORT

PROJECT NO.: 141-21085-00
DATE: OCTOBER 2018

WSP

WSP.COM

SIGNATURES

PREPARED BY

DRAFT

Chelsey Tyers, BES
Cultural Heritage Specialist

REVIEWED BY

DRAFT

Joel Konrad, PhD.
Cultural Heritage Lead – Ontario

This report was prepared by WSP Canada Inc. for the account of the City of London, in accordance with the professional services agreement. The disclosure of any information contained in this report is the sole responsibility of the intended recipient. The material in it reflects WSP's best judgement in light of the information available to it at the time of preparation. Any use which a third party makes of this report, or any reliance on or decisions to be made based on it, are the responsibility of such third parties. WSP accepts no responsibility for damages, if any, suffered by any third party as a result of decisions made or actions based on this report. This limitations statement is considered part of this report.

The original of the technology-based document sent herewith has been authenticated and will be retained by WSP for a minimum of ten years. Since the file transmitted is now out of WSP's control and its integrity can no longer be ensured, no guarantee may be given with regards to any modifications made to this document.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

WSP Canada Inc. (WSP) was retained by the City of London to complete a Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report (CHER) of the property located at 1110 Richmond Street as part of the Preliminary Design and Class Environmental Assessment Study for the proposed London Bus Rapid Transit system. The purpose of this report is to identify the cultural heritage value or interest of the property, which has been identified in the City of London Cultural Heritage Screening Report (October 2018) as being directly impacted and as a heritage property listed on the City of London's Inventory of Heritage Resources.

The subject property includes a one-and-a-half storey varied red-brown brick dwelling with half-timbering likely built in 1937. Based on the results of the background historical research, site investigation, and application of criteria from *Ontario Regulation 9/06*, the subject property was determined to demonstrate cultural heritage value or interest.

The completion of the study has resulting in the following recommendation:

- 1 The property located at 1110 Richmond Street was determined to demonstrate cultural heritage value or interest. As such, a Heritage Impact Assessment is required for this property to identify appropriate mitigation measures.**

PROJECT PERSONNEL

CLIENT

Client Contact Jennie Ramsay, City of London

WSP

Project Manager Douglas A. Yahn, M.E.S., CAHP
Senior Cultural Heritage Specialist
National Archaeology and Heritage Lead

Cultural Heritage Specialist Chelsey Tyers, BES
Cultural Heritage Specialist

Report Preparation Chelsey Tyers, BES
Cultural Heritage Specialist

Jacqueline Bradica
Cultural Heritage Assistant

GIS and Mapping Andrew Turner
GIS Technician

Report Review Joel Konrad, PhD.
Cultural Heritage Lead, Ontario

Administrative Support Lyn Pedersen
Administration/Document Control



TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1	Development Context	1
2	LEGISLATION AND POLICY CONTEXT	2
2.1	Provincial and Municipal Context and Policies.....	2
2.1.1	Provincial Policy Context	2
2.1.2	Ontario Regulation 9/06	3
2.1.3	Municipal Policies.....	3
2.2	Methodology	4
2.3	Consultation.....	4
3	HISTORICAL CONTEXT	6
3.1	Local Context and Settlement History	6
3.2	Euro-Canadian Land Use History	7
3.2.1	1860 – 1889.....	7
3.2.2	1889-1923.....	8
3.2.3	1923-Present.....	8
4	EXISTING CONDITIONS	10
4.1	Description of Study Area and Landscape Context	10
4.2	Architectural Description	10
4.2.1	West Elevation.....	11
4.2.2	East Elevation.....	11
4.2.3	North Elevation	11
4.2.4	South Elevation	12
4.2.5	Detached Accessory Structure	12
5	HERITAGE EVALUATION	13
5.1	Ontario Regulation 9/06 Evaluation.....	13
5.2	Comparative Analysis.....	15
5.3	Discussion of Integrity.....	17

6	CONCLUSIONS	18
6.1	Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest	18
6.1.1	Description of Property	18
6.1.2	Cultural Heritage Value	18
6.2	Description of Heritage Attributes	19
7	RECOMMENDATIONS	20
8	IMAGES	21
9	HISTORICAL PHOTOS AND MAPPING	28
10	BIBLIOGRAPHY AND SOURCES	34
11	APPENDICES	37

FIGURES

FIGURE 1: LOCATION AND CONTEXT OF 1110 RICHMOND ROAD, CITY OF LONDON, ONTARIO.....	28
FIGURE 2: 1110 RICHMOND STREET, CITY OF LONDON, ONTARIO, 1862 TREMAINE'S MAP OF THE COUNTY OF MIDDLESEX, CANADA WEST	29
FIGURE 3: 1110 RICHMOND STREET, CITY OF LONDON, ONTARIO 1878 ILLUSTRATED HISTORICAL ATLAS OF THE COUNTY OF MIDDLESEX	30
FIGURE 4: 1110 RICHMOND STREET, CITY OF LONDON, ONTARIO, 1926 TOPOGRAPHIC MAP	31
FIGURE 5: 1110 RICHMOND STREET, CITY OF LONDON, ONTARIO, 1957 TOPOGRAPHIC MAP	32
FIGURE 6: 1110 RICHMOND STREET, CITY OF LONDON, ONTARIO, 1967 AERIAL IMAGER.....	33

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 DEVELOPMENT CONTEXT

WSP Canada Inc. (WSP) was retained by the City of London to complete a Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report (CHER) for 1110 Richmond Street as part of the Transit Project Assessment Process for the proposed London Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) system. The purpose of this report is to identify the cultural heritage value or interest of the subject property (Figure 1). The BRT system is comprised of four segments, combined into two operational routes: the north and east corridor, and the south and west corridor. The BRT network was approved by City of London Council through the Rapid Transit Master Plan in July 2017.

The property located at 1110 Richmond Street was identified as a listed property in the Cultural Heritage Assessment Report (CHAR) completed by WSP in October 2018. The CHAR concluded that the preferred alignment would directly impact the property through demolition and therefore a CHER was required to determine the heritage value of the property. The CHAR was completed as part of the Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP) for the London Bus Rapid Transit project. The TPAP process is regulated by the Environmental Assessment Act (EAA) under Ontario Regulation 231/08: Transit Projects and Metrolinx Undertakings (O. Reg. 231/08). This CHER forms part of the Environmental Project Report (EPR) completed under the TPAP.

2 LEGISLATION AND POLICY CONTEXT

2.1 PROVINCIAL AND MUNICIPAL CONTEXT AND POLICIES

2.1.1 PROVINCIAL POLICY CONTEXT

The Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport is charged under Section 2 of the *Ontario Heritage Act* (2006) with the responsibility to determine policies, priorities and programs for the conservation, protection, and preservation of the heritage of Ontario and has published guidelines to assist in assessing cultural heritage resources as part of an environmental assessment. The following guidelines have been utilized in the preparation of this CHER:

- Reference Guide on Physical and Cultural Heritage Resources (Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency, 1996)
- Guideline for Preparing the Cultural Heritage Resource Component of Environmental Assessments (1992),
- Guidelines on the Man-Made Heritage Component of Environmental Assessments (1981), and
- The Ontario Heritage Toolkit (2006).

An Environmental Assessment is required for all large-scale projects that have potential impact on the environment. These projects require approval from the Government of Ontario. Certain projects, such as transit projects, have more predictable environmental impacts or effects, and can be more readily managed. This streamlined approach protects the environment, but shortens the timeline to six months for commencement, review and approval. This Environmental Assessment process for transit projects is known as the Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP).

TPAP provides a framework for focused consultation and objection processes. Through TPAP, the Minister of the Environment may initiate a Time Out period if there is a potential for a negative impact on a matter of provincial importance that relates to the natural environment or has cultural heritage value or interest, or on a constitutionally protected Aboriginal or treaty right (TPAP Guide to Environmental Assessment Requirements for Transit Projects, 2014).

Additionally, the Planning Act (1990) and related Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) (2014) provide guidance for the assessment and evaluation of potential heritage resources. Subsection 2.6 of the Provincial Policy Statement, Cultural Heritage and Archaeological Resources, states that:

2.6.1 Significant built heritage resources and significant cultural heritage landscapes shall be conserved.

Criteria for determining significance for the resources are mandated by the Province in Ontario Regulation 9/06 of the *Ontario Heritage Act*.

2.1.2 ONTARIO REGULATION 9/06

Ontario Regulation 9/06 (O. Reg 9/06) provides the Criteria for Determining Cultural Heritage Value or Interest under the *Ontario Heritage Act* (2006). This regulation was created to ensure a consistent approach to the designation of heritage properties in Ontario under the *Ontario Heritage Act* (2006). All designations under the *Ontario Heritage Act* (2006) after 2006 must meet the minimum criteria outlined in the regulation.

Criteria

A property may be designated under section 29 of the *Ontario Heritage Act* if it meets one or more of the following criteria for determining whether it is of cultural heritage value or interest:

1. The property has design value or physical value because it,
 - i. is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, expression, material or construction method,
 - ii. displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit, or
 - iii. demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement.
 2. The property has historical value or associative value because it,
 - i. has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization or institution that is significant to a community,
 - ii. yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of a community or culture, or
 - iii. demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer or theorist who is significant to a community.
 3. The property has contextual value because it,
 - i. is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an area,
 - ii. is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings, or
 - iii. is a landmark. O. Reg. 9/06, s. 1 (2).
-

2.1.3 MUNICIPAL POLICIES

In addition to provincial legislation, policies and guiding documents, municipal policies regarding cultural heritage have also been considered as a part of this CHER.

The London Plan is the City of London's new Official Plan which was consolidated August 27, 2018. *The London Plan* focuses on three areas of cultural heritage planning: general policies for the protection and enhancement of cultural heritage resources; specific policies related to the identification of cultural heritage resources including

individual heritage resources, heritage conservation districts, cultural heritage landscapes, and archaeological resources; and specific policies related to the protection and conservation of these cultural heritage resources. The criteria outlined in *The London Plan* for the identification and designation of individual properties of cultural heritage value or interest reflect the criteria defined in O.Reg 9/06 and are listed on pages 572-574 of the document.

2.2 METHODOLOGY

A Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report examines the subject property as a whole, the relationship to its surroundings, and its individual elements – engineering works, landscape etc. The recommendations of the report are based on an understanding of the physical values of the property, a documentation of its history through research, an analysis of its social context, comparisons with similar properties and mapping.

This CHER is guided by key documents such as the *Reference Guide on Physical and Cultural Heritage Resources* (Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency, 1996), the *Ontario Heritage Toolkit* (Ministry of Tourism Culture and Sport (MTCS), 2006), and the *Guidelines for Preparing the Cultural Heritage Resource Component of Environmental Assessments* (Ministry of Culture and Communications, 1992). The following report follows the Terms of Reference prepared for the London BRT TPAP process, which has been received by the London Advisory Committee on Heritage and the MTCS (Appendix A).

2.3 CONSULTATION

Consultation for the London BRT project has been conducted with the London Advisory Committee on Heritage (LACH). A draft CHSR report (dated February 6, 2018) was provided for their review and comment. The LACH Stewardship Sub-Committee recommended that 104 properties identified by the draft CHSR to have potential cultural heritage value or interest did not require further examination for consideration as having cultural heritage value or interest. The LACH also recommended 30 properties not identified by the CHSR be evaluated for their potential cultural heritage value. Further, the remaining properties flagged by the draft CHSR requiring further cultural heritage work were added to the Register (Inventory of Heritage Resources) pursuant to Section 27 of the *Ontario Heritage Act* (2006) by resolution of Municipal Council on March 27, 2018.

The CHSR report was also provided to the MTCS for review and comments were received in July 2018. In response to MTCS comments, the CHSR was expanded to a CHAR that includes additional information on impacted properties, and a preliminary impact assessment. Ongoing communications with MTCS have continued as a part of the TPAP process.

The CHSR report was updated to a CHAR (Dated October 8th, 2018) and was provided to the LACH on October 10th, 2018. The Draft Terms of Reference for CHERs was also received and referred to the LACH Stewardship Sub-Committee for review. This report

will be submitted and reviewed by the LACH Stewardship Sub-Committee at their meeting on November 5, 2018.

3 HISTORICAL CONTEXT

3.1 LOCAL CONTEXT AND SETTLEMENT HISTORY

City of London

For a detailed local history of the City of London, please refer to the City of London Cultural Heritage Screening Report: London Bus Rapid Transit System (WSP, 2018).

Richmond Street

Richmond Street was named after Charles Lennox, 4th Duke of Richmond, the Governor-in-Chief of the Canadas from 1818 to 1819 (Neary & Baker, 2003: 80). In 1824, Colonel Burwell began to survey Proof Line Road to connect Concession 1 of Westminster Township and Concession 3 of London Township (presently Huron Street), travelling through the City of London Town Plot (Brock, 2011: 9). At the time, many roads were simply dirt trails, which prompted the early settlers to request road improvements. In 1849, provincial legislation was passed to allow the construction of toll roads by private companies (London Public Library, 2018). The Proof Line Road Joint Stock Company was formed to grade and macadamize the Proof Line Road which runs along Richmond Street (Brock, 2011:38-39; London Public Library, 2018). Three toll gates were placed along the road. As use of the road increased, many hotels and taverns opened along the right-of-way. By 1882, tolls were removed from all publicly owned roads, which did not include the privately-owned Proof Line Road. The people of London Township began to travel by routes which avoided Proof Line Road. The City of London council and province purchased the road for \$11 000 in 1907. The tolls were abolished and the gates removed and burned as a celebration (London Public Library, 2018; London Public Library, n.d.).

Broughdale

The village of Broughdale developed within former London Township, north of Huron Street which was the northern boundary of the City of London. In 1854, Reverend Charles C. Brough settled north of the Thames River on the east side of Proof Line Road (Grainger, 2002: 283). In 1842, a bridge had been constructed along the Proof Line Road over the north branch of the Thames River, which later became known as Brough's Bridge, named after Reverend Brough (Brock & McEwen, 2011: 26; Grainger, 2002: 283). In 1867, Brough and his family constructed a house on the property known as 1132 Richmond Street which is designated under Part IV of the *Ontario Heritage Act* (Grainger, 2002: 283). William Turville rented 20 acres of glebe land and established Hartley Mills on in the modern-day intersection of Parkdale Crescent and Parkdale Ave (Grainger, 2002: 283; Brock & McEwen, 2011: 55). Dedicated from Clergy Reserves laid out in the Constitutional Act of 1791, glebe land was reserved support any parsonage or rectory that may have been established by the Church of England. In 1869, the Church Society of the Anglican Diocese of Huron sold portions of the glebe land to small farms (Brock & McEwen, 2011: 189).

Also in 1869, the Hellmuth Ladies College opened north of the Thames River in Reverend Brough's old residence. The school closed 30 years later, after being purchased by the Sisters of St. Joseph to be transformed into the Mount St. Joseph Orphanage (Grainger, 2002: 285).

The London Street Railway was extended into the area in 1901, leading to an increase in population and residential development (Grainger, 2002: 285). The Brough post office opened in 1904 with Charles Walter as its first postmaster. It was located in a frame house belonging to Walter at 1110 Richmond St (Shawyer, 1981: 98; Brock & McEwen, 2011: 189). The post office was only open until 1916 but had a total of seven different postmasters and was located in different houses along Richmond street during its lifespan (Shawyer, 1981: 98).

In 1906, St. Luke's Church was opened on the east side of Richmond Street, with Archdeacon James Richardson serving as the first rector (Grainger, 2002: 286). During the same year, Archdeacon Richardson felt that the name Brough was "too harsh" and successfully petitioned for the name of the post office, and subsequently the community, to be changed to Broughdale (Shawyer, 1981: 98).

Designated under Part IV of the *Ontario Heritage Act*, Broughdale School (247 Epworth Avenue), was the first in the community and opened in 1920. The population expanded further after the opening of Western University in 1924. Many employees and students of the university lived in the Broughdale area (Grainger, 2002: 286). Broughdale incorporated as a Village in 1930 and by the end of World War II the population growth necessitated the need for an expansion of St. Luke's Church. In 1961, Broughdale was annexed by the City of London (Grainger, 2002: 287).

3.2 EURO-CANADIAN LAND USE HISTORY

The land use history for 1110 Richmond Street was produced using census returns, land registry records, assessment and/or collector rolls, historical mapping, and other primary and secondary sources where available. This section has generally been divided into periods of property ownership, separated by significant changes in tenure. The subject property is located on former Lot 15, Concession 3 in London Township.

3.2.1 1860 – 1889

Tremaine's 1862 Middlesex County Map depicts Lot 15, Concession 3, as associated with Reverend Charles Brough, part of ecclesiastical lands to support the incumbent parishoner and known as glebe land. Richmond Street travels diagonally across the lot from the edge of the City of London and crosses over the north branch of the Thames River. Two structures are present on the western side of Richmond Street, with one labelled a grist mill (Figure 2). A mill race is also pictured running east-west through the lot, diverting water from the Thames River to power the grist mill. No buildings are recorded within the study area.

In the 1860s, Charles Brough and his family constructed a house on the northeastern corner of Richmond Street and Broughdale Avenue (Grainger, 2002: 283). The 1871

Census Returns for London Township (Division 5, Page 2) describe Charles Brough as a 76 year old Clergyman of the Church of England.

H.R. Page & Co's 1878 County Atlas of Middlesex County indicates the grist mill and mill race still existed on Lot 15 at that time. The map also reveals that the lot was subdivided into irregular parcels, most stretching east and west from Richmond St (Figure 3). In addition, the Broughdale Road right-of-way is visible north of Huron Street, only extending partially into the lot. On October 21, 1873, Plan 321 was registered to subdivide the southern portion of Lot 15 as reflected in the 1878 historical map.

In 1875, the Church Society of the Diocese of Huron transferred Lot 1 within Plan 321 to James Snow, an officer of Western Commercial Traveller's Association (Unknown Author, 1889: 367;MCLRO 5234). The 1881 Census Returns for the City of London (Sub-District G, No Page) records James Snow as a 23-year-old dry goods clerk who resided on the property with his wife Mary Maude, aged 21.

3.2.2 1889-1923

James Snow transferred the land to Sophia S. Healey in 1889 (MCLRO 13889). The Census Returns for Middlesex County were reviewed and reveal no entry for Sophia Healey, Sofia Healy, or S. Healey. It is likely that the property was rented to another occupant at this time.

By 1904, the property at 1110 Richmond Street was the location of the first Post office in Brough (changed to Broughdale in 1906). A frame house was located on the property and was occupied by Charles Walter, who likely rented the property from Sophia Healey (Shawyer, 1981: 98). The 1911 Census Returns for the London Township (Sub-district 5, Page 1) record Charles Walter as a 56-year old watchmaker who resided with his wife, Theresa (aged 50), and his five children: Ethel (aged 19), Charles (aged 13), Mildred (aged 10), John (aged 7), and Mary (aged 6).

Lot 1 was transferred from Sophia S. Healey to May Huckley Nelles in 1913 (MCLRO 29517). The 1921 Census Data for the City of London was reviewed and, while May Nelles was recorded as living at 270 Huron Street in Broughdale, she was identified as a lodger in the Smith household and not the owner of the property.

3.2.3 1923-PRESENT

Lot 1 was transferred from May Huckley Nelles to John Harvey in 1923 (MCLRO 35594). According to the Municipal Property Assessment Corporation (MPAC), the one-and-a-half storey brick building constructed at 1110 Richmond Street was constructed in 1925. However, the Geodetic Survey, surveyed in 1926 and printed in 1928, indicates the subject residence was not constructed at this time and rather the subject property was still part of 270 Huron Street (Figure 4). The subject property is not identified on the City directories until 1937, when it is identified as a barbershop, and as such, the building was likely built in 1937.

The property parcel containing 1110 Richmond St was transferred from John Harvey to Ernest Taylor in 1936 (MCLRO 41851). According to the sign on the property, Taylor's Barber Shop was established in the building in 1937 (Image 8). Geodetic Mapping produced in 1957 records the one-and-a-half storey brick structure located on the subject property as well as the single-storey garage to the north of the house (Figure 5). Aerial photography produced in 1967 reveals that the properties along Richmond Street in Broughdale had largely been developed (Image 6). The property was transferred from Ernest and Kathleen Taylor to Dorothy Jean Taylor in 2002 (MCLRO ER150445). It was then transferred to Sean Douglas Taylor in 2003 (MCLRO ER251520), who continues to operate Taylor's Barber Shop (Image 8).

4 EXISTING CONDITIONS

4.1 DESCRIPTION OF STUDY AREA AND LANDSCAPE CONTEXT

The study area consists of the property known municipally as 1110 Richmond Street. The property is located on the east side of Richmond Street, a main thoroughfare that crosses north-south through the City of London, and just north of Huron Street. It is located within the former Village of Broughdale, which was located north of Huron Street.

Immediately north of the subject property is the Chabad House (1114 Richmond Street), a Jewish Student Synagogue which was formerly Holy Trinity Greek Orthodox Church built in 1952-1954. Residential areas are located further north, south, east and west of the property. The residential area in the immediate block along Richmond Street consist of single detached, predominantly one-and-a-half and two storey dwellings likely constructed around the same time as the building located on the subject property. A small strip of commercial buildings is located on the west side of Richmond Street just north of Broughdale Avenue. The residential areas beyond Richmond Street along Brough Street, Broughdale Avenue, Audrey Avenue, and Huron Street demonstrate similar one-and-a-half to two storey dwellings, on narrow streets with grassed verges and manicured front lawns with mature trees. To the immediate southeast, the subject property abuts a three-storey apartment building, known as the Norbert Apartments (242 Huron Street) constructed in 1935. Further north along Richmond Street lies a row of commercial buildings.

Richmond Street consists of four lanes, two northbound, two southbound, adjacent to the subject property. Sidewalks are located on either side of the road, grass verges on the west side, grassed front lawns with mature trees predominantly located in the rear yards.

4.2 ARCHITECTURAL DESCRIPTION

The property located at 1110 Richmond Street includes a one-and-a-half storey dwelling, with a barbershop in the lower level, constructed in the Tudor Revival style and a one-storey accessory structure of no discernable architectural style.

The building features a beveled stone-like concrete foundation and smooth, varied red-brown brick laid in running bond except for a band of soldier course brick. The roof is a hipped gable shape with a half-timbered and stucco feature in the gable end.

4.2.1 WEST ELEVATION

The west elevation of the building features the gable end with half timbering and is oriented towards Richmond Street (Image 4). A sunken entrance protected by a decorative wrought iron fence which includes a barber's pole light (candy striped) leads to the basement through a rectangular door, one third of which is divided light glass, including what appears to be an original mail slot (Image 5). To the south of the basement door lies a grouping of three six-paned wood windows with storm windows attached with butterfly clips (Image 5).

The main storey features a main recessed entrance in a small porch on the north side of the front façade, accessed by a set of concrete steps with wrought iron railings, abutted by brick piers with concrete caps (Image 6 and Image 7). The entrance to the small porch features a semi-circular opening with a wooden gable awning (Image 7). Inside the front porch, the front door lies on the south wall perpendicular to the front façade. On the west wall inside the porch is a small semi-circular arched wood window with a brick lintel and concrete or stone sill. The north wall of the porch features a semi-circular arched opening with a concrete or stone sill (Image 7). To the south of the front porch is another small semi-circular arched wood window with a brick lintel and keystone, and a concrete or stone sill (Image 9). A diamond shaped leaded glass pattern was observed in this window. To the south of the leaded glass window is a grouping of three six-over-one wood windows with a brick lintel, shaded by a metal awning (Image 9).

A blue plaque erected by the London Public Library Board in 1994 titled 'Toll Gates on the Proof Line Road' is adhered to the brick on the south end of the front elevation (Image 10). It identifies that Richmond Road was originally a Toll road maintained by the Proof Line Road Joint Stock Company between 1849 and 1907.

The second storey is a half storey, as it sits in the gable end. The gable end features half timbering with a centrally located grouping of three six-paned wood windows (Image 9). The roof features asphalt shingles and wooden soffit purlins.

4.2.2 EAST ELEVATION

The east elevation could not be observed from the municipal right of way.

4.2.3 NORTH ELEVATION

The north elevation is also asymmetrically arranged, with a centrally located chimney on the north elevation (Image 11). The main floor also includes three six-over-one paned wooden windows covered by storm windows. The basement level is largely obscured by a fence with dense vines, however a similar group of two six-paned wooden windows with storm windows is visible beside the chimney. In addition, a small single-pane window is located on the west end of the south elevation and may have been used as a milk delivery door given its location.

4.2.4 SOUTH ELEVATION

The south elevation continues the asymmetrical layout, with a protruding chimney featuring a curved detail (Image 12). Small six-pane windows are located on either side of the chimney on the main floor and two six-paned windows on the basement floors, all with storm windows. East of these is a small cantilevered vinyl or aluminum clad addition with a grouping of three six paned wooden windows. Further to the rear of the north elevation is a three-over-one-paned wooden window with storm window. Another window in the basement may be present to the rear of the north elevation, but views were obscured by a parked vehicle at the time of field review.

4.2.5 DETACHED ACCESSORY STRUCTURE

Located at the end of the concrete driveway behind Taylor's Barbershop is a one-storey, hipped roof accessory structure (Image 13). The accessory structure is clad in horizontal aluminium or vinyl siding. It is likely used for storage as it appears to be too small to fit a vehicle.

5 HERITAGE EVALUATION

5.1 ONTARIO REGULATION 9/06 EVALUATION

Table 1: Ontario Regulation 9/06 Evaluation

CATEGORY	CRITERIA	Y/N	COMMENTS
Design/ Physical Value	Is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, expression, material or construction method	Y	The comparative analysis has demonstrated that the dwelling is neither a rare, unique or early example of Tudor Revival style of architecture. It is, however, a representative example of a one-and-a-half storey dwelling designed in the Tudor Revival style. Specifically, this dwelling demonstrates typical features found on Tudor Revival dwellings in London including varied shades of red-brown brick, half timbering and stucco, arched entrances, multi-paned wood windows and a leaded glass window. As such, this criterion is met.
	Displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit	N	The subject building demonstrates skills and techniques typical of the era in which it was built, as such, it does not display a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit. Therefore, the property does not meet this criterion.
	Demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement	N	The subject building demonstrates skills and techniques typical of the era in which it was built, it is not known to demonstrate a high degree of technical or scientific achievement. Therefore, the property does not meet this criterion.
Historical/ Associative Value	Has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization or institution that is significant to a community	N	The subject building has been the location of Taylor's Barbershop since 1937 and it continues to this day, making it a long-standing business in the community. However, there is no evidence to suggest that the barbershop is significant to the community. There is also a plaque from the London Public Library identifying Richmond Street as a former Toll Road, however, this does not suggest that the property itself has an association with the toll road.

			Therefore, the property does not meet this criterion.
	Yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of a community or culture,	N	This property is not associated with a particular community or culture and as such, it is unlikely that it will contribute to an understanding of a community or culture. As such, this criterion is not met. Therefore, the property does not meet this criterion.
	Demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer or theorist who is significant to a community	N	The architect and building of this building is unknown. Therefore, the property does not meet this criterion.
Contextual Value	Is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an area	Y	The subject building supports the character of the immediate area that consists of predominantly one-and-a-half to two storey dwellings from the first half of the twentieth century and the evolved commercial character of Richmond Street in the former Village of Broughdale. Therefore, the property does meet this criterion.
	Is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings	Y	The subject building is historically linked to its surroundings given their similar construction dates and that little change has disrupted this portion of Richmond Street. Therefore, the property does meet this criterion.
	Is a landmark	N	The subject building has not been identified as a significant landmark. It does not stand out from its context visually, nor is it known to a landmark for the longstanding association with Taylor's Barbershop. Therefore, the property does not meet this criterion.

5.2 COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS

A comparative analysis was undertaken to establish a baseline understanding of similar heritage designated properties in the City of London, and to determine if the property “*is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, expression, material or construction method*” as described in O. Reg. 9/06.

Comparative examples were drawn from Part IV and Part V properties within the City of London. Residential and mixed-use buildings were selected from this data set, with a preference for buildings of similar age, style, typology and material.






Seven comparable properties with cultural heritage status were identified. This does not represent all available properties but are intended to be a representative sample of similar building typologies (Table 1). Of these examples:


- Seven are Tudor Revival style, built between 1910 and 1949
- Three (3) are two-and-a-half storey, Two (2) are two storey, and Two (2) are one-and-a-half storey.
- Five (5) have some element of half timbering, Two (2) do not.
- One has a hipped gable roof, Six (6) do not.
- One is primarily stone, Seven (7) are primarily brick.
- Six (6) use stucco, one does not.
- Four (4) have side gable roofs, Two (2) have hipped roofs, and one is a complex roof.

The comparative analysis suggests that this building is not an early example of the Tudor Revival style in London. It is typical in its size and massing, and its hipped gable roof is consistent with other Tudor Revival homes in London. Varied shades of red-brown brick, stucco and half timbering are common materials in Tudor Revival homes in London.

Table 2. Comparative analysis of Part IV or Part V Buildings of a similar age, style and/or typology.

Address	Recognition	Picture	Age	Material	Style
1576 Richmond Street, City of London, Ontario, Canada	Part IV Designation		1926	Stone, stucco.	Tudor Revival, two-and-a-half storey, with one front gable, one side gable, and one hipped gable roof. Arched stone doorway. Windows arranged singly and in groups of two and three.

<p>803 Waterloo Street, City of London, Ontario, Canada</p>	<p>Part V Bishop Hellmuth HCD</p>		<p>1910</p>	<p>Red-brown brick, wood timbering and stucco.</p>	<p>Tudor Revival, two-and-a-half storey, side gable roof and two front gable dormers, half-timbering and six-over-one windows arranged singly and in groups of three.</p>
<p>791 Wellington Street, City of London, Ontario, Canada</p>	<p>Part V Bishop Hellmuth HCD</p>		<p>1935</p>	<p>Varied shades of red-brown brick, wood timbering and stucco.</p>	<p>Tudor Revival, two-and-a-half storey, hipped roof and one front gable, and half-timbering. Windows arranged in groups of two.</p>
<p>325 Victoria Street, City of London, Ontario, Canada</p>	<p>Part IV Designation</p>		<p>1930</p>	<p>Varied shades of red-brown brick, wood timbering and stucco.</p>	<p>Tudor Revival, two-and-a-half storey, hipped roof and two front gables, half-timbering and six-over-one windows arranged singly, and in groups of two and three.</p>
<p>253 James Street, City of London, Ontario, Canada</p>	<p>Part V Bishop Hellmuth HCD</p>		<p>1931</p>	<p>Varied shades of red-brown brick, wood timbering and stucco.</p>	<p>Tudor Revival, one-and-a-half storey, side gable roof and half-timbered front gable and arched stone doorway.</p>
<p>154 Elmwood Avenue East, City of London, Ontario, Canada</p>	<p>Part V Wortley Village-Old South HCD</p>		<p>1949</p>	<p>Varied red-brown brick and stone.</p>	<p>Tudor Revival, one-and-a-half storey, side gable roof, two front gables and stone transom doorway.</p>

553 Dufferin Avenue, City of London, Ontario, Canada	Part V East Woodfield HCD		1917	Red-brown brick, wood timbering and stucco.	Tudor Revival two-and-a-half storey, complex roof, one side gable, one front gable, half-timbering.
---	---------------------------------	---	------	---	---

5.3 DISCUSSION OF INTEGRITY

According to the Ontario Heritage Toolkit, Heritage Property Evaluation (MTCS 2006), *“Integrity is a question of whether the surviving physical features (heritage attributes) continue to represent or support the cultural heritage value or interest of the property.”* The following discussion of integrity was prepared to consider the ability of the property to represent and retain its value over time. It does not consider the structural integrity of the building, or the overall condition of the building.

Access to the interior of the building was not available, and observations have been made from the public right-of-way. Structural integrity, should it be identified as a concern, should be determined by a qualified heritage engineer, building scientist, or architect.

The subject building is a one-and-a-half storey residential building with varied shades of red-brown brick influenced by the Tudor Revival and retaining a barber shop in the lower level. The building does not appear to have been significantly altered since its construction in 1937 and no additions have altered the footprint of the building. Original features, such as the half-timbering, hipped gable roofline, wooden gable awning, wood windows, leaded glass window, and wooden soffits, remain intact. Accordingly, the building has a high degree of integrity as a Tudor Revival building.

6 CONCLUSIONS

Based on the evaluation of background historical research, site investigation and application of criteria from *Ontario Regulation 9/06*, the subject property at 1110 Richmond Street was determined to have significant cultural heritage value or interest. Accordingly, the following Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest and list of Attributes has been prepared.

6.1 STATEMENT OF CULTURAL HERITAGE VALUE OR INTEREST

6.1.1 DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY

The property located at 1110 Richmond Street in the City of London, consists of a one-and-a-half storey, hipped gable dwelling of varied shades of red-brown brick situated on a small lot on the east side of Richmond Street north of Huron Street.

6.1.2 CULTURAL HERITAGE VALUE

Likely constructed in 1937 and designed in the Tudor Revival style, the dwelling has cultural heritage value because of its physical/design values and its contextual values.

The City of London's Tudor Revival dwellings are characterised by their use of red-brown brick - often in varying shades, half-timbering, arched features such as door and window surrounds, stone or concrete meant to resemble stone, tall chimneys, multi-paned wood windows often arranged in groupings of two and three, and leaded glass windows. The dwelling located at 1110 Richmond Street displays these Tudor Revival characteristics common in the City of London.

The Tudor Revival style dwelling located at 1110 Richmond Street also supports the character of the immediate area along Richmond Street which consists of an eclectic mix of residential architectural styles from the early to mid 20th century. In addition to its architectural style, its massing, setback and slightly angled orientation are consistent with and support the character of this residential section of the immediate block along Richmond Street. It also supports the evolved commercial character of the broader Richmond Street in the former Village of Broughdale.

6.2 DESCRIPTION OF HERITAGE ATTRIBUTES

The heritage attributes that reflect the cultural heritage value of the subject property include:

- One-and-a-half storey massing;
- Hipped gable roof;
- Varied shades of red-brown brick and concrete foundation;
- Brick chimneys;
- Basement door on the front elevation with original hardware;
- Arched brick window surrounds with wooden windows and leaded glass and sills;
- Singular and grouped rectangular multi-paned windows including lintels and sills;
- Recessed porch including arched openings;
- Timbered wooden awning over entrance;
- Timber and stucco feature in gable end;
- Wooden soffit purlins; and,
- Angled orientation of the building toward Richmond Street.

7 RECOMMENDATIONS

WSP Canada Inc. (WSP) was retained by the City of London to complete a Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report (CHER) of the property located at 1110 Richmond Street as part of the Transit Project Assessment Process for the proposed London Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) system. The purpose of this report is to identify the cultural heritage value or interest of the property, which has been identified in the City of London Cultural Heritage Screening Report (October 2018) as being directly impacted and as a heritage property listed on the City of London's Inventory of Heritage Resources.

The subject property includes a one-and-a-half storey varied red-brown brick dwelling with half-timbering likely built in 1937. Based on the evaluation of the background historical research, site investigation, and application of criteria from *Ontario Regulation 9/06*, the subject property was determined to demonstrate significant cultural heritage value or interest.

The completion of the study has resulted in the following recommendation:

- 1 The property located at 1110 Richmond Street was determined to demonstrate cultural heritage value or interest. As such, a Heritage Impact Assessment is required for this property to identify appropriate mitigation measures.

8 IMAGES



Image 1: View of Chabad House on Richmond Street (1114 Richmond Street), looking east



Image 2: View of Richmond Street, looking west



Image 3: View of intersection at Richmond and Huron Streets, looking west



Image 4: View of front elevation of the building located at 1110 Richmond Street, looking east



Image 5: View toward basement entrance on front elevation of the building located 1110 Richmond Street




Image 6: View of stairs to front porch on front elevation of the building located at 1110 Richmond Street



Image 7: View of front porch and gable awning on front elevation of the building located at 1110 Richmond Street



Image 8: Detail of Taylor's Barbershop sign, Est. 1937 on front elevation of the building located at 1110 Richmond Street



Image 9: View of half timbering in the gable end and the grouping of three windows on front elevation of the building located at 1110 Richmond Street



Image 10: Detail of plaque erected by the London Public Library Board on front elevation of the building located at 1110 Richmond Street



Image 11: View of north elevation and front elevation of the building located at 1110 Richmond Street



Image 12: View of south elevation including the curved detail of the chimney of the building located at 1110 Richmond Street




Image 13: View of the one-storey detached accessory structure located at 1110 Richmond Street

9 HISTORICAL PHOTOS AND MAPPING



Figure 1: Location and Context of 1110 Richmond Road, City of London, Ontario



Figure 2: 1110 Richmond Street, City of London, Ontario, 1862 Tremaine's Map of the County of Middlesex, Canada West




Figure 3: 1110 Richmond Street, City of London, Ontario 1878 Illustrated Historical Atlas of the County of Middlesex




Figure 5: 1110 Richmond Street, City of London, Ontario, 1957 Topographic Map



Figure 6: 1110 Richmond Street, City of London, Ontario, 1967 Aerial Imager

10 BIBLIOGRAPHY AND SOURCES

- Armstrong, Frederick H. (1986). *The Forest City: An Illustrated History of London, Canada*. Windsor Publications, London, Ontario.
- Baker, M. & Neary, H. B. (2003). *London Street Names: An Illustrated Guide*. Toronto: J. Lorimer & Company Ltd.
- Bothwell, Robert. (1986). *A Short History of Ontario*. Hurtig Publishers, Edmonton, Alberta.
- Brock, Daniel (1972). *History of the County of Middlesex, Canada*. Mika Studio, Belleville, Ontario.
- Brock, D. J., & McEwen, C. B. (2011). *Fragments from the Forks: London, Ontario's legacy*. London, Ont.: London & Middlesex Historical Society.
- City of London (2016). *Founding of the Forest City*. Retrieved From <http://www.london.ca/about-london/london-history/pages/overview.aspx>
- Craig, Gerald M. (1963). *Upper Canada: The Formative Years*. McClelland and Stewart, Toronto, Ontario.
- Errington, Jane (1987). *The Lion, the Eagle, and Upper Canada: A Developing Ideology*. McGill-Queen's University Press, Kingston and Montreal.
- Firth, Edith G. ed. (1962). *The Town of York 1793-1918, A Collection of Documents of Early Toronto*. The Champlain Society, Toronto, Ontario.
- Goodden, Herman. (2012). *London*. The Canadian Encyclopedia. <http://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/london/>
- Grainger, Jennifer (2002). *Vanished Village of Middlesex*. Dundurn Publishers, Toronto, Ontario.
- London Public Library (2018). Gates on the Proof Line Road. Retrieved from: <http://www.londonpubliclibrary.ca/research/local-history/historic-sites-committee/gates-proof-line-road>
- London Public Library (n.d.). Paying the Last Toll on the Proof Line Road, London Township, London Ontario. Retrieved from: <http://images.ourontario.ca/london/2369866/data>
- Lutman, John (1977). *The Historic Heart of London*. Corporation of the City of London, London, Ontario.

Meligrana, John F. (2000). *The Politics of Municipal Annexation: The Case of the City of London's Territorial Ambitions during the 1950s and 1960s*. *Urban History Review* 29, no. 1, pp. 3-20.

Middlesex County (33) Land Registry Office (MCLRO). Book 54. Plan 321.

Sancton, Andrew. (1994). *Governing Canada's City-Regions: Adapting Form to Function*. The Institute for Research on Public Policy, Montreal, Quebec.

Sancton, Andrew and Montgomery Byron. (1994). *Municipal Government and Residential Land Development: A Comparative Study of London, Ontario, in the 1920s and 1980s*. In *The Changing Canadian Metropolis*. Ed Frances Frisken, The Institute of Intergovernmental Studies Press, University of California, Berkeley and Toronto.

Schull, Joseph. (1978). *Ontario Since 1867*. McClelland and Stewart, Toronto, Ontario.

Shawyer, A.J. (1981). *Broughdale – Looking for its Past: A History of a Residential Neighbourhood Within the City of London, Ontario*. Broughdale Community Association: London, Ontario.

Surtees, Robert J. (1994). *Land Cessions, 1763-1830*. In *Aboriginal Ontario: Historical Perspectives on the First Nations*, Ed Edward S. Rogers and Donald B. Smith, pp. 92-121. Dundurn Press for the Government of Ontario, Toronto, Ontario.

St-Denis, Guy (1992). *Simcoe's Choice, Celebrating London's Bicentennial 1793-1993*. Dundurn Press, Toronto, Ontario.

Unknown Author (1889). *History of the County of Middlesex*. W.A. and C.L. Goodspeed Publishers, Toronto.

Worrall, Reid Alan. (1980). *The evolution of the boundaries of the City of London, Ontario*. Undergraduate thesis, Department of Geography, University of Western Ontario.

Provincial Standards and Resources

Ontario Heritage Tool Kit

<http://www.culture.gov.on.ca/english/heritage/Toolkit/toolkit.ht>

Ontario Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport: Heritage Conservation Principle's for Land Use Planning

http://www.culture.gov.on.ca/english/heritage/info_sheets/info_sheet_landuse_planning.htm

Ontario Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport: Eight Guiding Principles in the Conservation of Historic Properties

http://www.culture.gov.on.ca/english/heritage/info_sheets/info_sheet_8principles.htm

Ontario Ministry of Culture, Tourism and Sport: Archaeological Assessments
http://www.mtc.gov.on.ca/en/archaeology/archaeology_assessments.shtml

Municipal Heritage Bridges Cultural, Heritage and Archaeological Resources
Assessment Checklist (Revised April 11, 2014)

Ontario Heritage Act (2006)

Ontario Heritage Bridge Guidelines (2008)

Reference Guide on Physical and Cultural Heritage Resources (1996)

Guidelines for Preparing the Cultural Heritage Resource Component of Environmental
Assessments (1992)

Guidelines on the Man-Made Heritage Component of Environmental Assessments
(1981)

Environmental Guide for Built Heritage and Cultural Heritage Landscapes (2007)

National and International Standards and Resources

Canadian Register of Historic Places
http://www.historicplaces.ca/visit-visite/rep-reg_e.aspx

Parks Canada Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in
Canada
http://www.pc.gc.ca/docs/pc/guide/nldclpc-sgchpc/index_E.asp

Parks Canada National Historic Sites of Canada
http://www.pc.gc.ca/progs/lhn-nhs/index_e.asp

International Council of Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS): Appleton Charter
<http://www.international.icomos.org/charters/appleton.pdf>

A DRAFT TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR CULTURAL HERITAGE EVALUATIONS

DRAFT Terms of Reference:

Individual Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report

A stand-alone Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report will be prepared by a qualified heritage consultant as required by the recommendations of the Cultural Heritage Screening Report.

The Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report will include:

- an executive summary, describing a summary of the outcome of the heritage evaluation;
- an introduction providing context for the report and providing a brief overview of how and why the research was undertaken;
- a general description of the history of the immediate context, considering the unique setting of the property, which may consist of a village, neighborhood, commercial district, and/or street the property is located within;
- a land use history of the property parcel describing key transfers of land and milestones, informed by Land Registry records to the Crown and additional archival research into prominent owners or tenants, including but not limited to the use of tax assessments or City Directories, if identified;
- a description of the heritage character of the immediate landscape context, including significant views and/or vistas;
- a description of the exterior of a built heritage resource visible from the public right-of-way for a building, and if an engineering work, a description of its structural design and materials;
- representative photographs of the exterior of a building or structure, character-defining architectural details taken during a site visit from the public right-of-way, or, of a structure, representative photographs of the elevations and structural details of a bridge or engineering work;
- a comparative analysis, using buildings of a similar age, style, typology, context and/or history, informed by a search of the City of London Heritage Register;
- a qualified statement about integrity, including observations from the public right-of-way, description of limitations, and recommendations for future work by a qualified heritage engineer, building scientist, or architect;
- a cultural heritage resource evaluation under O. Reg. 9/06, guided by the Ontario Heritage Toolkit (2006) and the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport's Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Provincial Heritage Properties (2014);
- a statement of cultural heritage value or interest;
- a description of the heritage attributes;
- historical mapping, photographs of the building if available;
- a location plan;
- a description of consultation undertaken;
- recommendations for future work; and
- sources cited.

Group Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report

A group Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report will be prepared by a qualified heritage consultant as required by the recommendations of the Cultural Heritage Screening Report for contiguous properties which share a geography, style, age, use and typology.

A Grouped Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report will include:

- an executive summary, describing a summary of the outcome of the heritage evaluation(s);
- an introduction providing context for the report and providing a brief overview of how and why the research was undertaken;
- a shared general description of the history of the of the immediate context, considering the unique setting of the property, which may consist of the village, neighborhood, commercial district, and/or street the properties are located within;
- a shared description of the heritage character of the immediate landscape context, including significant views and/or vistas;
- a land use history of the property parcel describing key transfers of land and milestones, informed by Land Registry records to the Crown and additional archival research into prominent owners or tenants, including but not limited to the use of tax assessments or City Directories, if identified;
- a description of the exterior of each built heritage resource visible from the public right-of-way for a building, and if an engineering work, a description of its structural design and materials;
- representative photographs of the exterior of each built heritage resource, including architectural details, taken during a site visit from the public right-of-way, or, of a structure, representative photographs of the elevations and structural details of a bridge or engineering work;
- a comparative analysis for each built heritage resource, using buildings or structures of a similar age, style, typology, context and/or history, informed by a search of the City of London Heritage Register;
- a qualified statement about integrity for each built heritage resource, including observations from the public right-of-way, description of limitations, and recommendations for future work by a qualified heritage engineer, building scientist, or architect;
- a cultural heritage resource evaluation under O. Reg. 9/06 for each property, guided by the Ontario Heritage Toolkit (2006) and the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport's Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Provincial Heritage Properties (2014);
- a statement of cultural heritage value or interest for each property that meets O. Reg. 9/06;
- a description of the heritage attributes for each property that meets O. Reg. 9/06;
- historical mapping, photographs of the building if available;
- a location plan;
- a description of consultation undertaken; and
- recommendations for future work; and
- sources cited.

DRAFT REPORT – NOVEMBER 5, 2018

CULTURAL HERITAGE EVALUATION REPORT

TRANSIT PROJECT ASSESSMENT PROCESS
LONDON BUS RAPID TRANSIT

44 WHARNCLIFFE ROAD NORTH
CITY OF LONDON
PROVINCE OF ONTARIO





CULTURAL HERITAGE EVALUATION REPORT

44 WHARNCLIFFE ROAD NORTH

CITY OF LONDON
PROVINCE OF ONTARIO

REPORT

PROJECT NO.: 141-21085-00
DATE: OCTOBER 2018

WSP

WSP.COM

SIGNATURES

PREPARED BY

DRAFT

Lauren Walker, B.A. (Hons)
Cultural Heritage Specialist

REVIEWED BY

DRAFT

Joel Konrad, PhD.
Cultural Heritage Lead - Ontario

This report was prepared by WSP Canada Inc. for the account of the City of London, in accordance with the professional services agreement. The disclosure of any information contained in this report is the sole responsibility of the intended recipient. The material in it reflects WSP's best judgement in light of the information available to it at the time of preparation. Any use which a third party makes of this report, or any reliance on or decisions to be made based on it, are the responsibility of such third parties. WSP accepts no responsibility for damages, if any, suffered by any third party as a result of decisions made or actions based on this report. This limitations statement is considered part of this report.

The original of the technology-based document sent herewith has been authenticated and will be retained by WSP for a minimum of ten years. Since the file transmitted is now out of WSP's control and its integrity can no longer be ensured, no guarantee may be given with regards to any modifications made to this document.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

WSP Canada Inc. (WSP) was retained by the City of London to complete a Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report (CHER) as part of the Transit Project Assessment Process for the proposed London Bus Rapid Transit system to determine the potential cultural heritage significance of the property at 44 Wharncliffe Road North, which has been identified in the City of London Cultural Heritage Screening Report (October 2018) as being a directly impacted and as a potential cultural heritage property listed on the City of London's Inventory of Heritage Resources.

The subject property contains a one-and-a-half storey red-orange rug brick, post-war bungalow built in 1951 (MPAC). Based on the results of background historical research, site investigation, and application of the criteria from *Ontario Regulation 9/06*, the subject property has been determined not to meet *Ontario Regulation 9/06*, and therefore not retain cultural heritage value or interest.

The completion of the study has resulted in the following recommendation:

- 1 The property at 44 Wharncliffe Road North was determined not to have significant cultural heritage value or interest. The property may be removed from the heritage register. Subsequently, no additional cultural heritage work is recommended for this property.**



TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION	1
1.1	Development Context	1
2	LEGISLATION AND POLICY CONTEXT.....	2
2.1	Provincial and Municipal Context and Policies	2
2.1.1	Provincial Policy Context.....	2
2.1.2	Ontario Regulation 9/06.....	3
2.1.3	Municipal Policies.....	3
2.2	Methodology	4
2.3	Consultation.....	4
3	HISTORICAL CONTEXT.....	6
3.1	Local Context and Settlement History	6
3.2	Land Use History.....	7
3.2.1	1834-1871	7
3.2.2	1871-1879.....	7
3.2.3	1879-1921	8
3.2.4	1921-Present.....	9
4	EXISTING CONDITIONS	10
4.1	Description of Study Area and Landscape Context	10
4.2	Architectural Description	10
4.2.1	Front (East) Elevation	11
4.2.2	Rear (West) Elevation.....	11
4.2.3	North Side Elevation.....	12
4.2.4	South Side Elevation	12
5	CULTURAL HERITAGE EVALUATION.....	13
5.1	Ontario Regulation 9/06 Evaluation	13
5.2	Comparative Analysis	14
5.3	Discussion of Integrity	17

6	CONCLUSIONS.....	18
7	RECOMMENDATIONS.....	19
8	IMAGES.....	20
9	MAPPING.....	28
10	BIBLIOGRAPHY AND SOURCES	39
11	DRAFT TERMS OF REFERENCE	42

FIGURES

FIGURE 1	LOCATION AND CONTEXT OF 44 WHARNCLIFFE ROAD NORTH, CITY OF LONDON PARCEL DATA 2018, IMAGERY: ESRI 2017	28
FIGURE 2	44 WHARNCLIFFE ROAD NORTH, CITY OF LONDON, ONTARIO 1872 "SUBURB OF KENSINGTON" PLAN 308.	29
FIGURE 3	44 WHARNCLIFFE ROAD NORTH, CITY OF LONDON, ONTARIO 1878 ILLUSTRATED HISTORICAL ATLAS.	30
FIGURE 4	44 WHARNCLIFFE ROAD NORTH, CITY OF LONDON, ONTARIO, 1878 MAP OF THE SUBURBS OF THE CITY OF LONDON. ...	31
FIGURE 5	44 WHARNCLIFFE ROAD NORTH, CITY OF LONDON, ONTARIO 1892, REVISED 1907 FIRE INSURANCE MAP.	32
FIGURE 6	44 WHARNCLIFFE ROAD NORTH, CITY OF LONDON, ONTARIO 1912 REVISED 1915 FIRE INSURANCE MAP.	33
FIGURE 7	44 WHARNCLIFFE ROAD NORTH, CITY OF LONDON, ONTARIO 1912 REVISED 1922 FIRE INSURANCE MAP.	34
FIGURE 8	44 WHARNCLIFFE ROAD NORTH, CITY OF LONDON, ONTARIO 1967 AERIAL PHOTOGRAPH.	35
FIGURE 9	44 WHARNCLIFFE ROAD NORTH, CITY OF LONDON, ONTARIO 1969 AERIAL PHOTOGRAPH.	36
FIGURE 10	44 WHARNCLIFFE ROAD NORTH, CITY OF LONDON, ONTARIO 1976 AERIAL PHOTOGRAPH.	37
FIGURE 11	44 WHARNCLIFFE ROAD NORTH, CITY OF LONDON, ONTARIO 1998 AERIAL PHOTOGRAPH.	38

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 DEVELOPMENT CONTEXT

WSP Canada Inc. (WSP) was retained by the City of London to complete a Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report (CHER) as part of the Transit Project Assessment Process for the proposed London Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) system to determine the cultural heritage value of the property at 44 Wharncliffe Road North (Figure 1). The BRT system is comprised of four segments, combined into two operational routes: the north/east corridor and the south/ west corridor. The BRT network was approved by City of London Council through the Rapid Transit Master Plan in July 2017.

The property located at 44 Wharncliffe Road North was identified in the City of London Cultural Heritage Screening Report (CHSR) (October 2018) as being a directly impacted, listed cultural heritage property. The CHSR was completed as part of the Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP) for the London Bus Rapid Transit project. The TPAP is regulated by the Environmental Assessment Act (EAA) under Ontario Regulation 231/08: Transit Projects and Metrolinx Undertakings (O. Reg. 231/08). This CHER forms part of the Environmental Project Report (EPR) completed under the TPAP.

2 LEGISLATION AND POLICY CONTEXT

2.1 PROVINCIAL AND MUNICIPAL CONTEXT AND POLICIES

2.1.1 PROVINCIAL POLICY CONTEXT

The Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport is charged under Section 2 of the *Ontario Heritage Act* with the responsibility to determine policies, priorities and programs for the conservation, protection and preservation of the cultural heritage of Ontario and has published guidelines to assist in assessing cultural heritage resources as part of an environmental assessment. The following have informed the preparation of this CHER:

- Guideline for Preparing the Cultural Heritage Resource Component of Environmental Assessments (1992),
- Guidelines on the Man-Made Heritage Component of Environmental Assessments (1981),
- MTCS Standards & Guidelines for Conservation of Provincial Heritage Properties (2010)
- Environmental Guide for Built Heritage and Cultural Heritage Landscapes (2007), and
- The Ontario Heritage Toolkit (2006).

An Environmental Assessment is required for all large-scale projects that have potential impact on the environment. These projects require approval from the Government of Ontario. Certain projects, such as transit projects, have more predictable environmental impacts or effects, and can be readily managed. This streamlined approach protects the environment, but shortens the timeline to six months for commencement, review and approval. This Environmental Assessment process for transit projects is known as the Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP).

TPAP provides a framework for focused consultation and objection processes. Through TPAP, the Minister of the Environment may initiate a Time Out period if there is a potential for a negative impact on a matter of provincial importance that relates to the natural environment or has cultural heritage value or interest, or on a constitutionally protected Aboriginal or treaty right. (TPAP Guide to Environmental Assessment Requirements for Transit Projects, 2014)

Additionally, the Planning Act (1990) and related Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) (2014) provide guidance for the assessment and evaluation of potential cultural heritage resources. Subsection 2.6 of the Provincial Policy Statement, Cultural Heritage and Archaeological Resources, states that:

2.6.1 Significant built heritage resources and significant cultural heritage landscapes shall be conserved.

Criteria for determining significance for the resources are mandated by the Province in Ontario Regulation 9/06.

2.1.2 ONTARIO REGULATION 9/06

Ontario Regulation 9/06 provides the Criteria for Determining Cultural Heritage Value or Interest under the *Ontario Heritage Act*. This regulation was created to ensure a consistent approach to the designation of heritage properties under Ontario under the act. All designations under the *Ontario Heritage Act* after 2006 must meet the minimum criteria outlined in the regulation.

Criteria

A property may be designated under section 29 of the *Ontario Heritage Act* if it meets one or more of the following criteria for determining whether it is of cultural heritage value or interest:

1. The property has design value or physical value because it,
 - i. is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, expression, material or construction method,
 - ii. displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit, or
 - iii. demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement.
 2. The property has historical value or associative value because it,
 - i. has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization or institution that is significant to a community,
 - ii. yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of a community or culture, or
 - iii. demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer or theorist who is significant to a community.
 3. The property has contextual value because it,
 - i. is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an area,
 - ii. is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings, or
 - iii. is a landmark. O. Reg. 9/06, s. 1 (2).
-

2.1.3 MUNICIPAL POLICIES

In addition to provincial legislation, policies and guiding documents, municipal policies regarding cultural heritage have also been considered as a part of this CHER.

The London Plan is the City of London's new Official Plan which was consolidated August 27, 2018. *The London Plan* focuses on three areas of cultural heritage planning, including: general policies for the protection and enhancement of cultural heritage resources; specific policies related to the identification of cultural heritage resources including individual cultural heritage resources, heritage conservation districts, cultural heritage landscapes, and archaeological resources; and specific policies related to the protection and conservation of these cultural heritage resources. The criteria outlined in *The London Plan* for the identification and designation of individual properties of cultural heritage value or interest reflect the criteria defined in O.Reg 9/06.

2.2 METHODOLOGY

A Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report examines a property as a whole, its relationship to its surroundings, as well as its individual elements – engineering works, landscape etc. The recommendations of the CHER are based on an understanding of the physical values of the property, a documentation of its history through research, and an analysis of its social context, comparisons with similar properties and mapping.

This CHER is guided and informed by key documents listed in 2.1.1. The following report has been prepared utilizing the Terms of Reference prepared for the London BRT TPAP process, which has been received by the London Advisory Committee on Heritage. (See Section 11)

2.3 CONSULTATION

Consultation for the London BRT project has been conducted with the London Advisory Committee on Heritage (LACH). A draft CHSR report (dated February 6, 2018) was provided for their review and comment. The LACH Stewardship Sub-Committee recommended that 104 properties which were identified by the draft CHSR to have potential cultural heritage value or interest, do not require further examination for consideration as having Cultural Heritage Value or Interest (CHVI). The LACH also recommended an additional 30 properties be evaluated for their potential cultural heritage value which were not identified by the draft CHSR. Further, the remaining properties flagged by the draft CHSR requiring further cultural heritage work were added to the Register (Inventory of Heritage Resources) pursuant to Section 27 of the *Ontario Heritage Act* by resolution of Municipal Council on March 27, 2018.

The draft CHSR report was also provided to the Ministry of Tourism Culture and Sport (MTCS) for review and comments were received in July 2018. In response to MTCS comments, the CHSR was revised to include additional information on impacted properties, and a preliminary impact assessment. The CHSR identified properties with direct impacts that cannot be mitigated through design, and that recommended these properties be addressed through CHERs prior to the completion of TPAP, including the property at 44 Wharnccliffe Road North. Ongoing communications with MTCS have continued as a part of the TPAP process.

The revised CHSR (Dated October 8th, 2018) was provided to the LACH on October 10, 2018. The Draft Terms of Reference for CHERs was also received and referred to the LACH Stewardship Sub-Committee for review. This CHER will be submitted and reviewed by the LACH Stewardship Sub-Committee at their November 14th, 2018 meeting.

3 HISTORICAL CONTEXT

3.1 LOCAL CONTEXT AND SETTLEMENT HISTORY

City of London

For a detailed local history of the City of London, please refer to the City of London Cultural Heritage Screening Report (CHSR): London Bus Rapid Transit System (WSP, 2018).

London West

London West began as two small communities on the west side of the Thames River. After initial settlement, Kensington developed on the west side of the Wharncliffe Highway while Petersville developed on the east side.

In 1807, Joshua Applegarth was granted 1000 acres of land to the west of the Thames River with the intention to cultivate hemp. The attempt at cultivation was unsuccessful, and after a short departure from the area, he returned and later served as the town clerk in 1819. Part of Applegarth's lands were later occupied by William Montague who offered a service to transport settlers across the Thames River by canoe (City of London, 2014).

In 1823, John Kent purchased Lots 1 and 2 on the east side of the Wharncliffe Highway (City of London, 2014). In 1834, Walter Nixon purchased Lot 1 on the west side of the Wharncliffe Highway, later purchasing Lot 2. After Nixon's death in 1871, his son, Joseph Nixon, sold Lot 1 to John Walker. Walker submitted plans for the Suburb of Kensington (Figure 2) to be completed on the west side of the Wharncliffe Highway (City of London, 2014). The suburb contained 115 new lots and was expected to flourish into a wealthy neighbourhood (City of London, 2014). However, in 1874, Kensington was severely flooded from the Thames River, with many residents having to be rescued by boat. The flood caused the Kensington neighbourhood to grow slower than originally anticipated (City of London, 2014; Brock & McEwen, 2011: 92).

Concurrently with the development of Kensington, Peterville was developing on the east side of the Wharncliffe Highway. The area was initially referred to as Bridgetown, but was renamed Petersville after Samuel Peters, a major land owner. His nephew, also named Samuel Peters, surveyed the area in 1854 (City of London, 2014). In 1872, the Petersville post office opened with William Lowgrey as postmaster (Grainger, 2002: 320; Brock & McEwen, 2011: 87). Petersville soon merged with Kensington, incorporating as the Village Of Petersville in 1875 (Grainger, 2002: 320; City of London, 2014). After previous designs of the Blackfriars Bridge had been severely compromised by flooding, the City of London's first iron bridge was constructed in 1875. This bridge served as an important east-west link between the Village of Petersville and the City of London (City of London, 2014; Brock & McEwen, 2011: 97).

In 1881, the Village of Petersville voted to change its name to London West (City of London, 2014; Brock & McEwen, 2011: 116). In 1897, London West was annexed by the City of London, which eventually allowed for more amenities, like street cars, paved streets and sidewalks, to be implemented into the London West area (City of London, 2014; Brock & McEwen, 2011: 151).

Wharncliffe Road

In 1824, Colonel Thomas Talbot commissioned Mahlon Burwell to survey the Wharncliffe Highway (later Wharncliffe Road) through the London Town Plot, extending along the western side of the North Branch of the Thames River to connect with Concession 4 within London Township (Brock & McEwen, 2001: 9; Baker & Neary, 2003: 104). Colonel Talbot named the road after James Archibald Stuart-Wortley, Baron Wharncliffe of Wortley (Baker & Neary, 2003: 104). Wharncliffe Road has served as a primary north-south route in the City of London since 1824.

3.2 LAND USE HISTORY

The Euro-canadian land use history for 44 Wharncliffe Road was produced using census returns, land registry records, city directories, assessment and/or collector rolls, historical mapping, and other primary and secondary sources where available. This section has generally been divided into periods of property ownership, separated by significant changes in tenure. The subject property is located on former Lot 17, Concession 1 in London Township.

3.2.1 1834-1871

According to the Abstract Index for the property, Walter Nixon purchased Lot 17, Concession 1 from the John Kent in 1834. The 1861 Census returns for the County of Middlesex (No Enumeration District identified, page 75) indicate that Walter Nixon was a 66 year-old farmer who resided in a two storey brick building on the Lot with his wife Hannah, aged 61, and his four children: Joseph Nixon (aged 29), Jane Nixon (aged 24), George Nixon (aged 23), and Hannah Nixon (aged 20). Thomas Hines, a farm labourer residing on the property, was also enumerated.

Tremaine's 1862 Middlesex County Map (Figure 3) confirms that Walter Nixon occupied Lot 17, Concession 1 at that time. The property retains a generally rectangular shape and the Wharncliffe Highway is indicated, transecting Nixon's property.

3.2.2 1871-1879

The property passed to Joseph Nixon, Walter's eldest son, in 1871 upon Walter's death. John Walker purchased the property that same year with ambitions to create a new suburb for the growing City of London. Popularly known as Kensignton, Walker's Suburb was located to the west of Petersville and was bounded by Wharncliffe Road

North to the east, the Thames River to the south, and agricultural properties to the north and west. The current boundaries of the subject property fall completely within Lot 7 of Walker's Plan (Plan 308). The 1872 *Plan of the Suburb of Kensington Belonging to John Walker, Esq.* (Figure 2) indicates that Lot 7 was oriented toward the Wharncliffe Highway, located on the west side of that right-of-way, with the property's northern boundary demarcated by the newly surveyed Walnut Street. The 1878 *Map of the City of London and Suburbs* confirms Walker's Plan was surveyed faithfully (Figure 4) and identifies the area as a distinct suburb.

The subject property was transferred in relatively quick succession during the 1870s. The Abstract Index for Lot 7 (Plan 308) indicates that Henry Johnston, a board member of the Huron & Middlesex Mutual Fire Insurance Company (Annon, 1889: 406), sold the property to Annie Hutchinson in 1876 (MCLRO 145). Annie Hutchinson was married to Charles Hutchinson who was the County Crown Attorney and Clerk of the Peace for the County of Middlesex (Annon., 1889). Later in 1876, Annie and Charles Hutchinson transferred the land to Thomas Barham (MCLRO 211). Barham then deeded Lot 7 to John S. Stanton in 1879 (MCLRO 631).

3.2.3 1879-1921

According to the 1881 Census Returns for London West Village (Schedule 1, Page 21), John Stanton was a 34 year-old harness maker who lived on the property with his wife Susan, aged 25, and his child Florence Mable, aged 2. The census also records Julia Alicia Stanton as an occupant of the household, though it appears that she was not a member of the immediate family.

The 1891 Census Returns for London West Village (Schedule 1, Page 57) reveal that the family lived in a single-storey, frame house on the subject property. The returns also indicate that the family had grown to include four more children: Lena (aged 11), Ethal (aged 6), Olive (aged 4), and William (aged 1).

Charles E. Goad and the Underwriter's Survey Bureau's (Goad's) *Fire Insurance Plans of the City of London* provide detail of the configuration and nature of the subdivided study area parcel. In the 1907 fire insurance plan, a frame structure is identified on the parcel with an extension at its rear (Figure 5). The plan records the rear extension as approximately two feet shorter than the rest of the structure. The residence is set back from Wharncliffe Road, though it appears that the setback along Walnut Street to the north was minimal. An outbuilding is identified at the parcel's western boundary, crossing into the neighbouring 42 Wharncliffe Parcel to the south. As this structure is not coloured on the plan its material composition is unknown. The structure was assigned an address of 12 Walnut Street, suggesting it was not associated with the properties on Wharncliffe Road.

The Goad's *Fire Insurance Plan for the City of London* published in 1915 identifies the structure at 44 Wharncliffe Road to be a one and a half storey frame dwelling (Figure 5). The rear extension appears to be omitted from the plan, and the building at 12 Walnut Street is no longer present on the parcel.

3.2.4 1921-PRESENT

In 1921, John Stanton transferred the land to Norman F. Schram (MCLRO 22540). Goad's 1922 revision of the 1915 fire insurance plan includes the rear extension, again indicating the rear portion is approximately two feet shorter than the rest of the structure (Figure 7). This structure was likely demolished following 1930, when the address is removed from the City Directory.

In 1946, Norman F. Schram transferred the property to William R. Fraser (MCLRO 38810). William R. Fraser transferred the land to James O. McCutcheon and Margaret M. McCutcheon in 1951 (MCLRO 44226). According to the Municipal Property Assessment Corporation, the subject residence was constructed in 1951, likely for James and Margaret McCutcheon. According to the 1951 City Directory, a J. McCutcheon, dentist, lives at this address. Previous to 1951 the address does not appear in the City Directories. Aerial photography from 1967 (Figure 8) captures the subject structure located on the corner of Wharncliffe Road and Walnut Street, which had been renamed Kensington Place.

During the 1970s a decision was made to extend Dundas Street West, now Riverside Drive, west to meet Mount Pleasant Avenue. This 3 million dollar project significantly altered the landscape, requiring the demolition of a number of houses to the south and west of the subject property. The extension altered traffic flow in and out of the downtown, with Riverside Drive becoming a major thoroughfare following its completion in late 1977. While the residence was not demolished as part of the extension, the property boundaries were altered resulting in a general reduction in size. In addition, Kensington Place was dead-ended just beyond the western boundary of the subject property. (Figures 9 to 11)

James and Margaret McCutcheon transferred the land to Robert P. McCutcheon in 1966 (MCLRO 125982). According to the City Directories, the property remains a dentist office throughout this period. The property was then transferred to a numbered company in 2005 (MCLRO ER388634).

4 EXISTING CONDITIONS

4.1 DESCRIPTION OF STUDY AREA AND LANDSCAPE CONTEXT

The property at 44 Wharnccliffe Road North is located at the intersection of Wharnccliffe Road North and Riverside Drive, on a triangle of land intersected by Kensington Place, a short, dead end road which was formerly a part of Walnut Street before Riverside Drive was surveyed and built. It is within the London West neighborhood of London, historically the Petersville neighborhood, located west and north of the Thames River, and west of downtown London. The property is located nearby the Blackfriars/Petersville Heritage Conservation District (HCD), which consists of the residential areas to the west of Wharnccliffe Road North, and along Wharnccliffe Road, north of the subject property.

These residential areas consist of a mix of small and medium-sized homes, with narrow streets, short blocks and frequent dead ends where the roads meet the river. The neighbourhood includes the Blackfriars Bridge, a nineteenth-century bridge made of wrought iron and the Labatt Memorial Park a Part IV designated cultural heritage ballpark.

Wharnccliffe Road North consists of four lanes, two northbound and two southbound, with sidewalks on either side of the road and very few street trees north of Riverside Drive. Riverside Park is located on the southeast corner of the intersection, and consists of an open green area, with mature trees. Riverside Drive consists of four lanes, two eastbound, two westbound with sidewalks on either side of the road and very few trees. There are traffic lights at the intersection, and streetlights and above ground utility poles line both streets (Images 11 to 16).

The intersection at Wharnccliffe Road North and Riverside Drive is predominantly commercial, with some residential buildings which have been converted to use as commercial buildings. Commercial buildings are generally 1 story, flat roofed buildings including gas stations, restaurants, and auto repair facilities.

4.2 ARCHITECTURAL DESCRIPTION

The subject property contains a one-and-a-half storey red-orange rug brick post-war bungalow built in 1951 (MPAC). Bungalows are generally one or one-and-a-half storey homes with broad, roofs that seem to blanket the building. Large porches, overhangs, and verandahs link the bungalow to the exterior spaces surrounding the building. Bungalows are typically residential and are often made of rustic materials such as stone and rug brick.

4.2.1 FRONT (EAST) ELEVATION

The front elevation (Images 1, 2, 8, 10) consists of one storey, red-orange rug brick façade, a steep side gable asphalt roof with a large dormer in the roofline, and a covered entranceway with two access doors. There is a single window opening containing two aluminum windows, with a concrete window sill, and a vertical rug brick lintel above it. A wooden sign appears on the front of the building; however it is largely illegible, the word “Dental” visible at the base, and has been painted over in black.

A large front dormer is located within the roofline and is clad in brown aluminum horizontal siding. It consists of a front gabled roof, and contains a single 1/1 aluminum sash window. An aluminum eavestrough has been installed along the front end of the gable roof.

A covered porch and entranceway is located at the northern side of the front elevation, under the main roof, and contains two wooden entrance doors. The door located towards the front of the house contains a 3-pane window, and was likely used as the entrance to a former dental office. This suggests that the building was built as mixed-use structure, both a dentist office and a residence.

The porch consists of one plain wooden post, and simple wooden railing. The porch is constructed of poured concrete with concrete stairs off Wharncliffe Road North. The entranceway is decorated with a mailbox and porch light that are both consistent with the age and character of the building. Vines from the north side elevation have grown to cover the roofline of the covered porch.

The poured concrete foundation is also visible from the front elevation, with decorative solder course rug brick above the base of the foundation. At the base of the foundation there is a raised garden, which is overgrown, and located approximately 1.5 feet above the grade of the sidewalk along Wharncliffe Road North.

4.2.2 REAR (WEST) ELEVATION

The rear elevation is obscured by an overgrowth of trees and bushes located at the rear of the property (Image 5) and is not visible from Riverside Drive, however, the rear elevation is visible from Kensington Place, as seen from under the tree canopy.

The rear elevation (Image 6) consists of a one storey red-orange rug brick façade, a steep side gable asphalt roof with a large dormer in the roofline, and a red-orange rug brick chimney. A single window opening is located at the south side of the elevation, containing an aluminum window and contains an air conditioning unit. A large dormer is located within the roofline and is clad in brown aluminum horizontal siding. It consists of a front gabled roof, and contains a single 1/1 aluminum sash window.

The poured concrete foundation is also visible from the front elevation, with a decorative vertical rug brick above the base of the foundation. Vines from the north side elevation have grown to cover the north side of the elevation. An asphalt driveway with access off Kensington Place is also present.

4.2.3 NORTH SIDE ELEVATION

The north side elevation (Image 3, 9) consists of a one-and-a-half storey red-orange rug brick façade, with two aluminum windows in the side gable, one near the top of the building, one halfway between the first and second storey with an air conditioning unit. The windows both have a concrete window sill, and a vertical rug brick lintel. An additional side door provides access off Kensington Place, but is covered with vines and shrubs. Evergreen hedge plants have been planted along the foundation along with a number of species of vine that have grown up and over the majority of the north side elevation, and around to the front and rear elevations. The covered porch and entranceway is located at the eastern end of the side elevation.

4.2.4 SOUTH SIDE ELEVATION

The south side elevation is obscured by trees and bushes located beside the property (Image 4) and is not visible from Riverside Drive, however, the side gable is visible above the treeline, and consists of red-orange rug brick and a rectangular wooden vent.

5 CULTURAL HERITAGE EVALUATION

5.1 ONTARIO REGULATION 9/06 EVALUATION

Table 1: Ontario Regulation 9/06 Evaluation

CATEGORY	CRITERIA	Y/N	COMMENTS
Design/ Physical Value	Is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, expression, material or construction method	N	The subject property retains a residential building constructed in 1951 to reflect a post-war bungalow style. The structure is a late example of a bungalow, and a consistent age for a post-war style. Its material and architectural detailing is typical for its age. Therefore, the property does not meet this criterion.
	Displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit	N	The building is of a post-war bungalow style architectural style, built utilizing skills and techniques typical of the era and therefore the property does not meet this criterion.
	Demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement	N	The building does not reflect a high degree of technical or scientific achievement. Therefore, the property does not meet this criterion.
Historical/ Associative Value	Has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization or institution that is significant to a community	N	While the lot was surveyed as a part of Lot 7 Plan 308 in 1872, the building itself was built in 1951 (MPAC, City Directory). No notable individuals, associations, institutions or themes are associated with the building. Therefore, the property does not meet this criterion.
	Yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of a community or culture,	N	The building has not been associated with any notable communities or cultures, and is not known to potentially yield information regarding its neighborhood community context. Therefore, the property does not meet this criterion.
	Demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder,	N	The building is not associated with a known architect, artist, builder, designer or theorist, and therefore the property does not meet this criterion.

	designer or theorist who is significant to a community		
Contextual Value	Is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an area	N	While the building reflects mixed uses along Wharncliffe Road North, its relative isolation following the extension of Riverside Drive in the 1970s prevents it from defining or contributing to the character of the area. Therefore, the property does not meet this criterion.
	Is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings	N	The subject building has been isolated from its physical and historical context by the extension of Riverside Drive in the 1970s, which resulted in the demolition of its neighbouring properties, and in its resulting isolation on a triangular island of land between Wharncliffe Road North, Riverside Drive, and Kensington Place. Therefore, the property does not meet this criterion.
	Is a landmark	N	The building has not been identified as a landmark. No significant views into the property distinguish the building as a notable or distinct property. While the property does have distinct placement surrounded by municipal rights-of-way, this is not a particularly significant placement or position. Therefore, the property does not meet this criterion.

5.2 COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS

A comparative analysis was undertaken to establish a baseline understanding of similar cultural heritage designated properties in the city, and to determine if the property “is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, expression, material or construction method” as described in O. Reg. 9/06.

Comparative examples were drawn from Part IV designated properties within the City of London, and Part V designated properties from within the Blackfriars/Petersville HCD, from properties on Wharncliffe Road, and from residential developments on Empress Avenue, Rathnally Street and Rathowen Street. Residential and mixed-use buildings were selected from this data set, with a preference for buildings of similar age, style, typology and material.

Five comparable properties with cultural heritage status were identified. However, this sample does not represent all available properties, and is rather intended to be representative (Table 1). Of these examples:

- Two (2) are of a bungalow style, built between 1922 and 1925

- Two (2) are of a Post-war style, built between 1947 and 1955
- One (1) is of a period revival style, built in 1936
- Two (2) are wood frame construction, three (3) are rug brick and one (1) is smooth brick.
- Four (4) have a covered porch or entranceway, two (2) do not.
- Three (3) have a side gabled roof, three (3) do not.
- All are residential buildings, none are mixed-use.

In addition, one comparable property with no cultural heritage status was identified on Wharncliffe Road North. This residence does not represent all available properties but is intended to be an example of a mixed-use typology along Wharncliffe Road North. This example is:






- A Bungalow style.
- Built around 1930.
- Is brick.
- Has covered porch or entranceway.
- Has a hipped roof.
- Is a mixed-use building which has been altered for use along Wharncliffe Road.

Additionally, three clusters of comparable properties with no cultural heritage status were identified on Empress Avenue, Rathnally Street and Rathowen Street. Of these examples:

- All are of a Post-war style.
- All are built between 1945 and 1955
- All are rug brick.
- Some have a covered porch or entranceway, but none are built into the footprint of the house or are under the main roofline.
- All have a side gabled roof.
- All are residential buildings, none are mixed-use.

The comparative analysis suggests that the building located at 44 Wharncliffe Road is a late example of a bungalow style, likely influenced by post-war design. The property was built for use as both a residence and a dental office, and this is reflected in its architecture, however, mixed use buildings along Wharncliffe Road North are not unusual or rare. The general design, architectural features, and utilization of brick and concrete is typical for buildings constructed in the mid-twentieth century and therefore the structure is not considered to be a rare, unique, representative, or early example of its type when compared to similar structures.

Table 1. Comparative analysis of Part IV or Part V properties of a similar age, style and/or typology.

Address	Recognition	Picture	Age	Material	Style
10 Moir Street	Part V Blackfriars/ Petersville HCD		1922	Wood frame- Horizontal siding	Bungalow, one- and-a-half storey with side gabled roof, a shed dormer within roofline and covered porch.
53 Empress Ave	Part V Blackfriars/ Petersville HCD		1955	Brick – Red- Brown Rug Brick	Post-war Victory housing. one-and- a-half storey, side gable roof, with tripled rows of 1/1 sash windows.
65 Riverside Drive	Part V Blackfriars/ Petersville HCD		1936	Brick – Red- Orange Rug Brick	Period revival – English cottage. one-and-a-half storey, side gable roof, with arched entranceway.
3 Cummings Ave	Part V Blackfriars/ Petersville HCD		1925	Brick – Red Brick	Bungalow with Edwardian influences. one- and-a-half storey, hipped roof with two dormers in the roofline.
18 Cummings Ave	Part V Blackfriars/ Petersville HCD		1947	Brick – Yellow Rug Brick	Post-war Victory style. 1 storey, covered porch area, L-shaped gable roof.

69 Wharncliffe Road North	None		1920	Brick – Red Brick	Bungalow with Edwardian influences. One-and-a-half storey, hipped roof with dormer in the roofline. Adapted for mixed use.
Rathowen Street Cluster	None		1945 to 1955	Brick – Red-Orange Rug Brick	Post-war Victory style. One-and-a-half storey, side gable roof.
Empress Avenue Cluster	None		1950	Brick – Red-Orange Rug Brick	Post-war Victory style. One-and-a-half storey, side gable roof.
Rathnally Street Cluster	None		1945 to 1955	Brick – Red-Orange Rug Brick	Post-war Victory style. One-and-a-half storey, side gable roof.

5.3 DISCUSSION OF INTEGRITY

According to the Ontario Heritage Toolkit, Heritage Property Evaluation (MTCS 2006), *“Integrity is a question of whether the surviving physical features (heritage attributes) continue to represent or support the cultural heritage value or interest of the property.”* The following discussion of integrity was prepared to consider the ability of the property to represent and retain its cultural heritage value over time. It does not consider the structural integrity of the building, or the overall condition of the building. Access to the interior of the building was not available, and observations have been made from the public right-of-way. Structural integrity, should it be identified as a concern, should be determined by a qualified heritage engineer, building scientist, or architect.

The subject property retains a one-and-a-half storey red-orange rug brick post-war bungalow. The building does not appear to have been significantly altered since its construction in 1951 and no additions have altered the footprint of the building. The two large dormers may be original and are consistent with the age, style and character of the building. The three wooden doors appear to be early or original and the covered porch entranceway also includes original or early features such as the wooden posts, railings and spindles. The original wood windows appear to have been replaced by aluminum windows. Accordingly, the property generally retains the integrity of its original built character.

6 CONCLUSIONS

The property is not considered to be a rare, unique, representative, or early example of its type when compared to similar structures, which was determined through a comparative analysis. A consideration of the integrity of the building indicates that it retains its original built character. However, based on the results of background historical research, site investigation, and application of the criteria from Ontario Regulation 9/06, the subject property at 44 Wharncliffe Road North was determined not to be of significant cultural heritage value or interest. Accordingly, no Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest or Description of Heritage Attributes has been prepared.

7 RECOMMENDATIONS

The subject building is a one-and-a-half storey red-orange rug brick post-war bungalow built in 1951 (MPAC). Based on the background historical research, site investigation, comparative analysis, description of integrity, and application of *Ontario Regulation 9/06* criteria, the subject property was not determined to have no significant cultural heritage value or interest.

The completion of the CHER has resulted in the following recommendation:

- 1 The property at 44 Wharncliffe Road North was determined not to have significant cultural heritage value or interest. The property may be removed from the heritage register. Subsequently, no additional cultural heritage work is recommended for this property.**

8 IMAGES



Image 1: View of the front (east) elevation of 44 Wharncliffe Road North, looking southwest.



Image 2: View of the front (east) elevation of 44 Wharncliffe Road North, looking west.



Image 3: View of the north side elevation of 44 Wharncliffe Road North, looking south.



Image 4: View of the south side elevation of 44 Wharncliffe Road North, looking north.



Image 5: View of the rear (west) elevation of 44 Wharncliffe Road North, looking east.



Image 6: View of the rear (west) elevation of 44 Wharncliffe Road North, looking southeast.



Image 7: View from 44 Wharncliffe Road North, looking west along Kensington Place.



Image 8: View of the porch detail 44 Wharncliffe Road North.



Image 9: View of the side entrance detail 44 Wharncliffe Road North.



Image 10: View of the foundation and garden detail 44 Wharncliffe Road North.



Image 11: View of Wharncliffe Road North looking northeast.



Image 12: View of Wharncliffe Road North looking northeast.



Image 13: View of Wharncliffe Road North and Riverside Drive looking east towards Riverside Drive.



Image 14: View of Wharncliffe Road North looking northwest, towards the property at 44 Wharncliffe Road North.



Image 15: View of Riverside Drive looking east from Wharncliffe Road North.



Image 16: View of Wharncliffe Road North looking south.

9 MAPPING



Figure 1 Location and context of 44 Wharncliffe Road North, City of London Parcel Data 2018, Imagery: ESRI 2017




Figure 2 44 Wharncliffe Road North, City of London, Ontario 1872 "Suburb of Kensington" Plan 308.




Figure 3 44 Wharncliffe Road North, City of London, Ontario 1878 Illustrated Historical Atlas.






Figure 4 44 Wharnclyffe Road North, City of London, Ontario, 1878 Map of the Suburbs of the City of London.



 <p>4 HUGHSON STREET SOUTH, SUITE 302 HAMILTON, ONTARIO CANADA L8N 3Z1 TEL: 306-528-4414 WWW.WSP.COM</p>	<p>LEGEND</p> <p> PROJECT LOCATION</p> <p>SOURCE: LONDON FIRE INSURANCE PLANS 1892 (REVISED 1907) PLATE 40</p> <p>0 10 20 40 m</p>	<p>CLIENT: CITY OF LONDON</p> <p>PROJECT: CULTURAL HERITAGE SCREENING REPORT LONDON RAPID TRANSIT CORRIDOR 44 WHARNCLIFFE ROAD NORTH</p>	<p>PROJECT NO: 141-21085-00</p>	<p>DATE: OCTOBER 2018</p>	<p>TITLE: LONDON FIRE INSURANCE PLAN 1907</p>
			<p>DESIGNED BY: -</p> <p>DRAWN BY: A.T.</p> <p>CHECKED BY: -</p> <p>FIGURE NO: S-4</p>	<p>SCALE: 1:500</p>	<p>DISCIPLINE: ENVIRONMENT</p> <p>REV: -</p>

Document Path: C:\Users\A-streus\Documents\Projects\141-21085-00 - London BR\Ardur\2018\CHSR\44 Wharncliffe Road North\MapDocs\141-21085-00 Figure S-4 1007.FRP.mxd

Figure 5 44 Wharncliffe Road North, City of London, Ontario 1892, revised 1907 Fire Insurance Map.




Figure 6 44 Wharncliffe Road North, City of London, Ontario 1912 revised 1915 Fire Insurance Map.




Figure 7 44 Wharnclyffe Road North, City of London, Ontario 1912 revised 1922 Fire Insurance Map.



Figure 8 44 Wharncliffe Road North, City of London, Ontario 1967 Aerial Photograph.






Figure 9 44 Wharncliffe Road North, City of London, Ontario 1969 Aerial Photograph.



Figure 10 44 Wharncliffe Road North, City of London, Ontario 1976 Aerial Photograph.



 <p>4 HAMILTON STREET SOUTH, SUITE 300 HAMILTON, ONTARIO CANADA L8N 3Z1 TEL: 905-529-4414 WWW.WSP.CCA</p>	<p>LEGEND</p> <p> PROJECT LOCATION</p>		CLIENT:	PROJECT NO:	DATE:	TITLE:
			CITY OF LONDON	141-21085-00	OCTOBER 2018	AERIAL IMAGERY - 1998
			PROJECT:	DESIGNED BY:	DISCIPLINE:	
			CULTURAL HERITAGE SCREENING REPORT LONDON RAPID TRANSIT CORRIDOR 44 WHARNCLIFFE ROAD NORTH	A.T.	ENVIRONMENT	
				CHECKED BY:	FIGURE NO:	SCALE:
					9-10	1:2,000
						REV:

Document Path: C:\Users\Andrew.S.Turner\Projects\141-21085-00 - London BR\Turner\Jan2018\CHSR\44 Wharncliffe Road North\Map\300x141-21085-00 Figure 9-10 1998 Aerial.mxd

Figure 11 44 Wharncliffe Road North, City of London, Ontario 1998 Aerial Photograph.

10 BIBLIOGRAPHY AND SOURCES

- Armstrong, Frederick H. (1986). *The Forest City: An Illustrated History of London, Canada*. Windsor Publications, London, Ontario.
- Baker, M. (2000). *Downtown London: Layers of time*. London, ON: London Regional Art & Historical Museums.
- Baker, M. & Neary, H. B. (2003). *London Street Names: An Illustrated Guide*. Toronto: J. Lorimer & Company Ltd.
- Bothwell, Robert. (1986). *A Short History of Ontario*. Hurtig Publishers, Edmonton, Alberta.
- Brock, Daniel (1972). *History of the County of Middlesex, Canada*. Mika Studio, Belleville, Ontario.
- Brock, D. J., & McEwen, C. B. (2011). *Fragments from the Forks: London, Ontario's legacy*. London, Ont.: London & Middlesex Historical Society.
- City of London (2016). *Founding of the Forest City*. Retrieved From <http://www.london.ca/about-london/london-history/pages/overview.aspx>
- Craig, Gerald M. (1963). *Upper Canada: The Formative Years*. McClelland and Stewart, Toronto, Ontario.
- Errington, Jane (1987). *The Lion, the Eagle, and Upper Canada: A Developing Ideology*. McGill-Queen's University Press, Kingston and Montreal.
- Firth, Edith G. ed. (1962). *The Town of York 1793-1918, A Collection of Documents of Early Toronto*. The Champlain Society, Toronto, Ontario.
- Goodden, Herman. (2012). *London*. The Canadian Encyclopedia. <http://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/london/>
- London Public Library (2018). Gates on the Proof Line Road. Retrieved from: <http://www.londonpubliclibrary.ca/research/local-history/historic-sites-committee/gates-proof-line-road>
- London Public Library (n.d.). Paying the Last Toll on the Proof Line Road, London Township, London Ontario. Retrieved from: <http://images.ourontario.ca/london/2369866/data>

Lutman, John (1977). *The Historic Heart of London*. Corporation of the City of London, London, Ontario.

Meligrana, John F. (2000). *The Politics of Municipal Annexation: The Case of the City of London's Territorial Ambitions during the 1950s and 1960s*. *Urban History Review* 29, no. 1, pp. 3-20.

Middlesex County (33) Land Registry Office (MCLRO). Book 6. Plan 308.

Middlesex County (33) Land Registry Office (MCLRO). Book 10. Plan 308.

Sancton, Andrew. (1994). *Governing Canada's City-Regions: Adapting Form to Function*. The Institute for Research on Public Policy, Montreal, Quebec.

Sancton, Andrew and Montgomery Byron. (1994). *Municipal Government and Residential Land Development: A Comparative Study of London, Ontario, in the 1920s and 1980s*. In *The Changing Canadian Metropolis*. Ed Frances Frisken, The Institute of Intergovernmental Studies Press, University of California, Berkeley and Toronto.

Schull, Joseph. (1978). *Ontario Since 1867*. McClelland and Stewart, Toronto, Ontario.

Surtees, Robert J. (1994). *Land Cessions, 1763-1830*. In *Aboriginal Ontario: Historical Perspectives on the First Nations*, Ed Edward S. Rogers and Donald B. Smith, pp. 92-121. Dundurn Press for the Government of Ontario, Toronto, Ontario.

St-Denis, Guy (1992). *Simcoe's Choice, Celebrating London's Bicentennial 1793-1993*. Dundurn Press, Toronto, Ontario.

Unknown Author (1889). *History of the County of Middlesex*. W.A. and C.L. Goodspeed Publishers, Toronto.

Worrall, Reid Alan. (1980). *The evolution of the boundaries of the City of London, Ontario*. Undergraduate thesis, Department of Geography, University of Western Ontario.

Provincial Standards and Resources

Ontario Heritage Tool Kit

<http://www.culture.gov.on.ca/english/heritage/Toolkit/toolkit.ht>

Ontario Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport: Heritage Conservation Principle's for Land Use Planning

http://www.culture.gov.on.ca/english/heritage/info_sheets/info_sheet_landuse_planning.htm

Ontario Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport: Eight Guiding Principles in the Conservation of Historic Properties

http://www.culture.gov.on.ca/english/heritage/info_sheets/info_sheet_8principles.htm

Ontario Ministry of Culture, Tourism and Sport: Archaeological Assessments

http://www.mtc.gov.on.ca/en/archaeology/archaeology_assessments.shtml

Municipal Heritage Bridges Cultural, Heritage and Archaeological Resources Assessment Checklist (Revised April 11, 2014)

Ontario Heritage Act (2005)

Ontario Heritage Bridge Guidelines (2008)

Reference Guide on Physical and Cultural Heritage Resources (1996)

Guidelines for Preparing the Cultural Heritage Resource Component of Environmental Assessments (1992).

National and International Standards and Resources

Canadian Register of Historic Places

http://www.historicplaces.ca/visit-visite/rep-reg_e.aspx

Parks Canada Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada

http://www.pc.gc.ca/docs/pc/guide/nldclpc-sgchpc/index_E.asp

Parks Canada National Historic Sites of Canada

http://www.pc.gc.ca/progs/lhn-nhs/index_e.asp

International Council of Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS): Appleton Charter

<http://www.international.icomos.org/charters/appleton.pdf>

11 DRAFT TERMS OF REFERENCE

DRAFT Terms of Reference (As provided to the LACH, October 2018):

Individual Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report

A stand-alone Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report will be prepared by a qualified heritage consultant as required by the recommendations of the Cultural Heritage Screening Report. The Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report will include:

- an executive summary, describing a summary of the outcome of the heritage evaluation;
- an introduction providing context for the report and providing a brief overview of how and why the research was undertaken;
- a general description of the history of the immediate context, considering the unique setting of the property, which may consist of a village, neighborhood, commercial district, and/or street the property is located within;
- a land use history of the property parcel describing key transfers of land and milestones, informed by Land Registry records to the Crown and additional archival research into prominent owners or tenants, including but not limited to the use of tax assessments or City Directories, if identified;
- a description of the heritage character of the immediate landscape context, including significant views and/or vistas;
- a description of the exterior of a built heritage resource visible from the public right-of-way for a building, and if an engineering work, a description of its structural design and materials;
- representative photographs of the exterior of a building or structure, character-defining architectural details taken during a site visit from the public right-of-way, or, of a structure, representative photographs of the elevations and structural details of a bridge or engineering work;
- a comparative analysis, using buildings of a similar age, style, typology, context and/or history, informed by a search of the City of London Heritage Register;
- a qualified statement about integrity, including observations from the public right-of-way, description of limitations, and recommendations for future work by a qualified heritage engineer, building scientist, or architect;
- a cultural heritage resource evaluation under O. Reg. 9/06, guided by the Ontario Heritage Toolkit (2006) and the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport's Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Provincial Heritage Properties (2014);
- a statement of cultural heritage value or interest;
- a description of the heritage attributes;
- historical mapping, photographs of the building if available;
- a location plan;
- a description of consultation undertaken;
- recommendations for future work; and
- sources cited.

City of London

Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report 16 Wellington Road, London, Ontario

Prepared by:

AECOM

410 – 250 York Street, Citi Plaza
London, ON, Canada N6A 6K2
www.aecom.com

519 673 0510 tel
519 673 5975 fax

Statement of Qualifications and Limitations

The attached Report (the “Report”) has been prepared by AECOM Canada Ltd. (“AECOM”) for the benefit of the Client (“Client”) in accordance with the agreement between AECOM and Client, including the scope of work detailed therein (the “Agreement”).

The information, data, recommendations and conclusions contained in the Report (collectively, the “Information”):

- is subject to the scope, schedule, and other constraints and limitations in the Agreement and the qualifications contained in the Report (the “Limitations”);
- represents AECOM's professional judgement in light of the Limitations and industry standards for the preparation of similar reports;
- may be based on information provided to AECOM which has not been independently verified;
- has not been updated since the date of issuance of the Report and its accuracy is limited to the time period and circumstances in which it was collected, processed, made or issued;
- must be read as a whole and sections thereof should not be read out of such context;
- was prepared for the specific purposes described in the Report and the Agreement; and
- in the case of subsurface, environmental or geotechnical conditions, may be based on limited testing and on the assumption that such conditions are uniform and not variable either geographically or over time.

AECOM shall be entitled to rely upon the accuracy and completeness of information that was provided to it and has no obligation to update such information. AECOM accepts no responsibility for any events or circumstances that may have occurred since the date on which the Report was prepared and, in the case of subsurface, environmental or geotechnical conditions, is not responsible for any variability in such conditions, geographically or over time.

AECOM agrees that the Report represents its professional judgement as described above and that the Information has been prepared for the specific purpose and use described in the Report and the Agreement, but AECOM makes no other representations, or any guarantees or warranties whatsoever, whether express or implied, with respect to the Report, the Information or any part thereof.

Without in any way limiting the generality of the foregoing, any estimates or opinions regarding probable construction costs or construction schedule provided by AECOM represent AECOM's professional judgement in light of its experience and the knowledge and information available to it at the time of preparation. Since AECOM has no control over market or economic conditions, prices for construction labour, equipment or materials or bidding procedures, AECOM, its directors, officers and employees are not able to, nor do they, make any representations, warranties or guarantees whatsoever, whether express or implied, with respect to such estimates or opinions, or their variance from actual construction costs or schedules, and accept no responsibility for any loss or damage arising therefrom or in any way related thereto. Persons relying on such estimates or opinions do so at their own risk.

Except (1) as agreed to in writing by AECOM and Client; (2) as required by-law; or (3) to the extent used by governmental reviewing agencies for the purpose of obtaining permits or approvals, the Report and the Information may be used and relied upon only by Client.

AECOM accepts no responsibility, and denies any liability whatsoever, to parties other than Client who may obtain access to the Report or the Information for any injury, loss or damage suffered by such parties arising from their use of, reliance upon, or decisions or actions based on the Report or any of the Information (“improper use of the Report”), except to the extent those parties have obtained the prior written consent of AECOM to use and rely upon the Report and the Information. Any injury, loss or damages arising from improper use of the Report shall be borne by the party making such use.

This Statement of Qualifications and Limitations is attached to and forms part of the Report and any use of the Report is subject to the terms hereof.

AECOM: 2015-04-13
© 2009-2015 AECOM Canada Ltd. All Rights Reserved.

Signatures

Report Prepared By:

DRAFT

Michael Greguol, M.A.
Cultural Heritage Specialist

DRAFT

Liam Smythe, B.URPI
Heritage Researcher

Report Reviewed By:

DRAFT

Tatum Taylor, M.Sc., CAHP
Cultural Heritage Specialist

Distribution List

# Hard Copies	PDF Required	Association / Company Name

Revision History

Revision #	Date	Revised By:	Revision Description
0	Nov. 16, 2018	M. Greguol, L. Smythe	Draft Report to City of London
1	Nov 21, 2018	M. Greguol, L. Smythe	Revised Draft Report to City of London for LACH Stewardship Sub-Committee

Executive Summary

AECOM Canada Ltd. (AECOM) was retained by the City of London to complete a Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report (CHER) as part of the Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP) for the proposed London Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) system to determine the cultural heritage value of the property at 16 Wellington Road (**Image 1**). The BRT system is comprised of four segments, combined into two operation routes: the north/east corridor and the south/west corridor. The BRT network was approved by City of London Council through the Rapid Transit Master Plan in July 2017.

The property located at 16 Wellington Road was identified in the City of London Cultural Heritage Screening Report (CHSR) (October 2018) as being a directly impacted, heritage listed property. The CHSR was completed as part of the TPAP for the London Bus Rapid Transit project. The TPAP is regulated by the Environmental Assessment Act (EAA) under Ontario Regulation 231/08: Transit Projects and Metrolinx Undertakings (O.Reg. 231/08). This CHER forms part of the Environmental Project Report (EPR) completed under the TPAP.

The property at 16 Wellington Road is a single-storey commercial building, constructed in the Art Moderne style and completed in 1946. Based on the evaluation of the background historical research, field review, and application of criteria from *Ontario Regulation 9/06*, the subject property was determined to have significant cultural heritage value or interest.

The completion of this Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report recommends that a Heritage Impact Assessment is required for this property to identify appropriate mitigation measures with respect to any proposed interventions.

Should the City of London wish to pursue designation of the property under Part IV of the *Ontario Heritage Act*, further research, and an interior assessment of the property is recommended in order to inform a comprehensive designating by-law for the property.

Table of Contents

1.	Introduction	1
1.1	Development Context	1
2.	Legislation and Policy Context	2
2.1	Provincial and Municipal Context and Policies	2
2.1.1	Provincial Policy Context	2
2.1.2	Ontario Regulation 9/06.....	2
2.1.3	Municipal Policies	3
2.2	Methodology	3
2.3	Consultation.....	3
3.	Historical Context	5
3.1	Local Context and Settlement History	5
3.1.1	Westminster Township	5
3.1.2	London South.....	5
3.1.3	Wellington Road.....	5
3.2	Land Use History	6
3.2.1	1810-1850.....	6
3.2.2	1880-1945.....	6
3.2.3	1945-Present.....	7
4.	Existing Conditions	8
4.1	Landscape Context.....	8
4.2	Architectural Description	8
4.2.1	South (Front) Elevation	8
4.2.2	North (Rear) Elevation.....	9
4.2.3	East Elevation	9
4.2.4	West Elevation	9
4.3	Comparative Analysis	9
4.4	Discussion of Integrity.....	12
5.	Heritage Evaluation	13
5.1	Ontario Regulation 9/06	13
6.	Conclusions	15
6.1	Statement of Cultural Heritage Value.....	15
6.1.1	Description of Property.....	15
6.1.2	Cultural Heritage Value	15
6.2	Heritage Attributes	16
7.	Recommendations	17

8. Images 18

9. Historic Photos and Mapping 21

10. Bibliography and Sources..... 32

List of Figures

Figure 1: Project Location 22

Figure 2: Project Location in Detail 23

Figure 3: Project Location, 1862 24

Figure 4: Project Location, 1878 25

Figure 5: Project Location, 1913 26

Figure 6: Project Location, 1929 27

Figure 7: Project Location, 1948 28

Figure 8: Project Location, 1922 29

Figure 9: Project Location, 1951 30

Figure 10: Project Location, 1972 31

List of Tables

Table 1: Comparative analysis of properties with cultural heritage value with buildings or structures of a similar age, style and/or typology 11

1. Introduction

1.1 Development Context

AECOM Canada Ltd. (AECOM) was retained by the City of London to complete a Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report (CHER) as part of the Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP) for the proposed London Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) system to determine the cultural heritage value of the property at 16 Wellington Road (**Image 1**). The BRT system is comprised of four segments, combined into two operation routes: the north/east corridor and the south/west corridor. The BRT network was approved by City of London Council through the Rapid Transit Master Plan in July 2017.

The property located at 16 Wellington Road was identified in the City of London Cultural Heritage Screening Report (CHSR) (October 2018) as being a directly impacted, listed cultural heritage property. The CHSR was completed as part of the TPAP for the London Bus Rapid Transit project. The TPAP is regulated by the Environmental Assessment Act (EAA) under Ontario Regulation 231/08: Transit Projects and Metrolinx Undertakings (O.Reg. 231/08). This CHER forms part of the Environmental Project Report (EPR) completed under the TPAP.

2. Legislation and Policy Context

2.1 Provincial and Municipal Context and Policies

2.1.1 Provincial Policy Context

The Ministry of Tourism, Culture, and Sport (MTCS) is charged under Section 2 of the *Ontario Heritage Act* with the responsibility to determine policies, priorities and programs for the conservation, protection and preservation of the cultural heritage of Ontario and has published guidelines to assist in assessing cultural heritage resources as part of environmental assessment. The following have informed the preparation of this CHER:

- Guidelines for Preparing the Cultural Heritage Resource Component of Environmental Assessments (1992);
- Guidelines on the Man-Made Heritage Component of Environmental Assessments (1981);
- MTCS Standards and Guidelines for Conservation of Provincial Heritage Properties (2010);
- Environmental Guide for Built Heritage and Cultural Heritage Landscapes (2007); and
- The Ontario Heritage Toolkit (2006).

An Environmental Assessment is required for all large-scale projects that have potential impacts on the environment. These projects require approval from the Government of Ontario. Certain projects, such as transit projects, have more predictable environmental impacts or effects, and can be readily managed. This streamlined approach protects the environment, but shortens the timeline to six month for commencement, review and approval. This Environmental Assessment process for transit projects is known as the Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP).

TPAP provides a framework for focused consultation and objection processes. Through TPAP, the Minister of the Environment may initiate a Time Out period if there is a potential for a negative impact on a matter of provincial importance that relates to the natural environment or has cultural heritage value or interest, or on a constitutionally protected Aboriginal or treaty right (TPAP Guide to Environmental Assessment Requirements for Transit Projects, 2014).

Additionally, the *Planning Act* (1990) and related *Provincial Policy Statement* (PPS) (2014) provide guidance for the assessment and evaluation of potential cultural heritage resources. Subsection 2.6 of the PPS, Cultural Heritage and Archaeological Resources, states that:

2.6.1 Significant built heritage resources and significant cultural heritage landscapes shall be conserved.

Criteria for determining significance for the resources are mandated by the Province in Ontario Regulation 9/06.

2.1.2 Ontario Regulation 9/06

Ontario Regulation 9/06 provides the Criteria for Determining Cultural Heritage Value or Interest under the *Ontario Heritage Act*. This regulation was created to ensure a consistent approach to the designation of heritage properties under the *Ontario Heritage Act*. All designations under the *Ontario Heritage Act* after 2006 must meet at least one of the criteria outlined in the regulation.

A property may be designated under Section 29 of the *Ontario Heritage Act* if it meets one or more of the following criteria for determining whether the property is of cultural heritage value or interest:

1. The property has design value or physical value because it,
 - i. is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, expression, material or construction method;
 - ii. displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit;
 - iii. demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement.
2. The property has historical value or associative value because it,
 - i. has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization, or institution that is significant to a community,
 - ii. yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of a community or culture;
 - iii. demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer or theorist who is significant to a community.
3. The property has contextual value because it,
 - i. is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an area;
 - ii. is physically, functionally, visually, or historically linked to its surroundings;
 - iii. is a landmark.

2.1.3 Municipal Policies

The London Plan is the City of London's new Official Plan which was consolidated on August 27, 2018. *The London Plan* focuses on three areas of cultural heritage planning, including: general policies for the protection and enhancement of cultural heritage resources; specific policies related to the identification of cultural heritage resources, including individual cultural heritage resources, heritage conservation districts, cultural heritage landscapes, and archaeological resources; and specific policies related to the protection and conservation of these cultural heritage resources. The criteria outlined in *The London Plan* for the identification and designation of individual properties of cultural heritage value or interest reflect the criteria defined in O.Reg. 9/06.

2.2 Methodology

A CHER examines a property as a whole, its relationship to its surroundings, as well as its individual elements—engineering works, landscape, etc. The recommendations of the CHER are based on an understanding of the physical values of the property, a documentation of its history through research, and an analysis of its social context, comparisons with similar properties, and mapping. A field review was undertaken by Liam Smythe, Heritage Researcher at AECOM in November 2018. Access was limited only to the public right-of-way.

This CHER is guided and informed by the key documents listed in 2.1.1. The following report has been prepared utilizing the Terms of Reference prepared for the London BRT TPAP process, which have been received by the London Advisory Committee on Heritage (LACH) (See Section 11).

2.3 Consultation

Consultation for the London BRT project has been conducted with the LACH. A draft CHSR (dated February 6, 2018) was provided for their review and comment. The LACH Stewardship Sub-Committee recommended that 104 properties which were identified by the draft CHSR to have potential cultural heritage value or interest, do not require further examination for consideration as having cultural heritage value or interest (CHVI). The LACH also recommended that an additional 30 properties, not identified by the draft CHSR, be evaluated for their potential

cultural heritage value. Further, the remaining properties flagged by the draft CHSR requiring further cultural heritage work were added to the Register (*Inventory of Heritage Resources*) pursuant to Section 27 of the *Ontario Heritage Act* by resolution of Municipal Council on March 27, 2018.

The draft CHSR was also provided to the MTCS for review, and comments were received in July 2018. In response to MTCS comments, the CHSR was revised to include additional information on impacted properties, and a preliminary impact assessment. The CHSR identified properties with direct impacts that cannot be mitigated through design, and recommended that these properties be addressed through completion of CHERs prior to completion of the TPAP, including the property at 16 Wellington Road. Ongoing communications with MTCS have continued as part of the TPAP.

The revised CHSR (October 8, 2018) was provided to the LACH on October 10, 2018. The Draft Terms of Reference for CHERs was also received and referred to the LACH Stewardship Sub-Committee for review. This CHER will be submitted and reviewed by the LACH Stewardship Sub-Committee for their November 28, 2018 meeting.

3. Historical Context

3.1 Local Context and Settlement History

3.1.1 Westminster Township

Prior to European settlement the area that would eventually become Westminster Township was settled by members of the Chippewa First Nation. One of the largest townships in Middlesex County, the first survey of Westminster Township was completed in 1809-10 by Deputy Provincial Surveyor Simon T. Z. Watson. The remainder of the township was surveyed in 1820 by Colonel Mahlon Burwell and Colonel Bostwick. Unlike other townships in Upper Canada, lots were not parceled out to government “favorites” or speculators before 1817; the earliest settlers were farmers, many of whom arrived by way of the United States. By 1817, the township was home to 428 people and the price of land had quadrupled since tracts were first made available. By 1850, the township had a population of 4,525.¹

3.1.2 London South

Originally part of Westminster Township, South London was originally settled in the 1810s. For most of the nineteenth century, the area was home to a number of wealthy Londoners, who constructed large country mansions away from the increasingly congested city. South London remained predominantly rural until the 1880s, but was connected to the City of London by a series of bridges over the Thames. By the 1890s, the population of the area had increased to the point where annexation was considered. Eager to reap the benefits of electric street lighting, safe drinking water, sidewalks and the city’s education system, this section of the township became part of the City of London on May 1st, 1890. Bounded by Wellington Road, Wharnccliffe Road, Emery Street and the Thames River, the new suburb was designated as Ward 6. The building boom of the 1880s and 1890s was concentrated largely to the western side of the ward; parcels of land along Wellington Road were still held by wealthy families such as the McClary and Mackenzie families until the end of the century. Grand Avenue is so named for the large estates that once fronted on it.²

3.1.3 Wellington Road

Running north to south from Huron Street to the City of St. Thomas with brief interruptions by the Grand Trunk Railway (now Canadian Pacific Railway) line, Wellington Road was named for Arthur Wellesley, 1st Duke of Wellington. A major figure in British military history, Wellington was famous for his victory over Napoleon at the Battle of Waterloo in 1815. From 1818 to 1827, he served Master General of the Ordnance, commanding military officers and artillery in Upper Canada.³ The road was cut through Westminster Township by W. L. Odell, who also assisted in the construction of an iron bridge to carry Wellington Road across the Thames River.⁴

Within London, Wellington Road is identified by various official names, at varying points within the City. Between Huron Street and the Thames River, the road runs relatively parallel with Richmond Street and is identified in this

¹ *A History of the County of Middlesex, Canada*. Toronto: W. A. & C. L. Goodspeed, 1889. p. 566-568

² The Architectural Conservancy of Ontario. *Tecumseh Trek; ACO’s 38th Annual Geranium Heritage House Tour*. London, Ontario: ACO, June 5, 2011.

³ *Michael Baker & Hilary Bates Neary. London Street Names*. Toronto: James Lormier & Company Ltd., 2003. p. 100

⁴ *A History of the County of Middlesex, Op Cit*. p.570

section as Wellington Street. South of the Thames River, the road changes names to Wellington Road, and is identified as such between the River and the road's intersection with Exeter Road, just north of Highway 401. Lastly, the road is identified as Wellington Road South southwards from Exeter Road to south of the municipal city limits.

3.2 Land Use History

3.2.1 1810-1850

The subject property is located on a portion of Lot 25, Broken Front Concession, or Concession "B" in the former Westminster Township. Located on the west side of Wellington Road, Lot 25 was vacant for many years following its original survey. In 1839, Albert Scriver Odell received 69 ½ acres in the north part of the lot from the Crown. The southern part of the lot was deeded to Edward Matthews in 1850. Odell already owned Lot 24 immediately to the east, having purchased it from James Lester in 1822. The Odell family was one of the earliest families to settle in Westminster Township. Albert was the first of his family to arrive in the Township in 1810, settling on Lot 24 Concession I, along commissioner's road near the present Victoria Hospital⁵ One of ten children, Albert was born in 1787 to John Odell and Enor Schriver. The Odell family had originally settled in Dutchess County, New York and were of Dutch origin. John left New York following the American Revolution, and relocated near Montreal. All of John and Enor's children would eventually settle in Westminster Township, with the exception of their son Loop, who died in Lower Canada. The first records of the Westminster Council, dated March 4th 1817 identify Albert S. Odell and Robert Frank as "overseers of highways".⁶ Albert Odell did not reside on this property however; the 1854 assessment roll lists him as living on Lot 26, Concession I, former Westminster Township.⁷ Albert and his wife, Charlotte Percival, did not have children. Charlotte predeceased Albert sometime prior to 1852; Albert himself passed away in 1856.⁸

3.2.2 1880-1945

In 1851, a section of the original Lot 25 west of Wellington Road and immediately south of the Thames River was subdivided into smaller residential lots and registered as Plan 11 (4th). The property at 16 Wellington Road comprises a portion of Lot 13 from this plan. Land registry records indicate that Lot 13 was sold in its entirety from the estate of William McIllich; the original subdivision plan from 1851 identifies "Messers McIllich and Russell" as the proprietors. Also indicated on the plan are Clarke Street and Bridge Street. The former was redesignated as an extension of Grand Avenue in the 1940s, the latter was renamed Front Street and is now primarily a parking area and recreational trail. Kennon Place was constructed at a later date.

Charles E. Goad's *Fire Insurance Plans of the City of London* shows that the surrounding area was well developed by the turn of the twentieth century. A number of brick and frame houses were present along Kennon Place and Clarke Street (Grand Avenue); Front Street also had a number of houses fronting onto it at one point, all of which have been demolished. Lot 13 remained undivided until 1939 when it was subdivided by the London and Western Trust Company. The corner portion of the Lot was purchased by the City of London in 1941, and in 1945 Robert Dobbyn purchased the property from the City for \$275.⁹

3.2.3 1945-Present

In 1946, Robert Dobbyn designed and constructed the existing building at 16 Wellington Road to serve as a new office and printing plant for The Art Novelty Company.¹⁰ The Art Novelty Company specialised in the production of advertising “novelties” (which would today be known as promotional products) such as calendars, flyers, and postcards. The company was originally founded in Strathroy, Ontario; it was purchased in 1922 by Robert’s father Alfred B. Dobbyn, and Hedley Smith, who moved the company to London and set up shop in the garage of Dobbyn’s house on 385 Wortley Road. Robert joined the business after finishing high school, eventually taking it over. The first mention of the Art Novelty Company on Wellington Road is made in the 1947 city directory, with Robert Dobbyn also listed as a resident on the property. The Art Novelty Company continued to operate at this location for twenty-three years, before being renamed Dobbyn Creative Printing in 1969. A 1999 article in the *London Free Press* notes that Dobbyn Creative Printing had passed through five owners by that time, but was continuing to operate under the Dobbyn name.¹¹ As recently as 2010, the building continued to be used as a printing facility by Murray Prepress Limited. In 2015 the property was sold to a company identified as 16 Wellington Holdings Limited, and currently houses a fitness centre called The Training Station, and a naturopathic clinic called Rebalance London.¹²

¹⁰ Christine Dirks. “A London Printer Leaves His Mark”. *London Free Press*, 14 February 1999. p. B6

¹¹ Dirks. *Op Cit.* p. B6

¹² Middlesex County (33) Land Registry Office (MCRLO). Parcel Register, PT LT 13, PL 11 (4th)

4. Existing Conditions

4.1 Landscape Context

The property at 16 Wellington Road is located on the northeast corner of the Wellington Road and Grand Avenue intersection. Wellington Road is a major four-lane traffic artery which passes through the area from southeast to northwest. Grand Avenue is a two-lane residential street following an east-west orientation. A set of traffic signals controls the intersection. The property is located in the South London neighbourhood of the City of London. While the neighbourhood is primarily a residential area, a number of one- and two-storey commercial establishments are located along Wellington Road, particularly north of Weston Street. Here there is a mixture of single-storey detached houses, interspersed with stores and restaurants along both sides of the road. Sidewalks are present along both sides of Wellington Road, with street lighting mounted on wooden utility poles. Few trees are present along the roadway, aside from those located on private properties. Residential streets in the area are straight, following a loose grid pattern with short rectangular blocks. Grand Avenue, Watson Street, and Kennon Place are all dead-end streets that terminate a short block east of Wellington Road. Residential units are typically small one- or one-and-a-half-storey detached houses, constructed in the early- to mid-twentieth century. Most of these houses are located on large rectangular lots with mature trees. Topographically, the property is situated on a relatively level grade along this portion of Wellington Road.

Consistent with residential properties along Grand Avenue, the building at 16 Wellington Road is set back from the property line. Its frontage on Grand Avenue consists mainly of hardscape used for automobile parking. The corner entrance and Wellington Road frontage are landscaped with a small lawn, several mature trees and a pair of hedgerows along the entrance footpath.

4.2 Architectural Description

4.2.1 South (Front) Elevation

The south elevation (**Image 4**) is a single story wall clad in smooth, white parged concrete. The architectural composition and detailing, particularly on this façade and the west façade are designed in the Art Moderne style (see Section 4.3). The westernmost end of the elevation forms a rounded corner with the west façade and is the location of the main entrance (**Image 6**). The rounded corner creates a frontispiece, projected slightly forward from the rest of the façade, with a raised step in the otherwise straight cornice. The entranceway consists of a single door flanked by two slender round posts, and sidelights of glass block. The door is made of wood. A flat concrete awning extends out from the façade above the doorway, following the curve of the façade. Like the cornice, it is finished with black painted metal flashing. To the immediate right of the entrance is a small vertically oriented, 4-over-4 vinyl casement-style window with a fabric covered awning and concrete sill. The remainder of the façade has three large, equally spaced, horizontally arranged windows with concrete sills. The westernmost of these has a large picture window flanked by two 4-over-4 casement-style windows. The other two are of frosted glass blocks (**Image 5**). A pair of double doors is present at the eastern end of the façade. Signage for “The Training Station” is present above the easternmost glass block window, and a round red sign is affixed to the building just above the double doors. The windows on the structure are not original to the construction of the building.

4.2.2 North (Rear) Elevation

The north elevation is obscured by a neighbouring fence. It appears to be a single-storey concrete block wall, painted white. Like other elevations, it has black painted metal flashing on the cornice, with a small step towards the western end. Two small horizontal sliding windows are present towards the western end of the façade.

4.2.3 East Elevation

The east elevation is somewhat obscured by the neighbouring structure. It consists of a single storey façade of white painted concrete blocks. There are two small window openings with horizontally arranged 6-over-6 sash windows with concrete sills. A small storage box with a hinged lid is attached to the building's east façade.

4.2.4 West Elevation

The western elevation (**Image 3**) is a single-storey wall clad in smooth, white parged concrete with black metal flashing along the cornice. The southern end forms a rounded corner frontispiece with the southern façade as described in section 4.2.1. Approximately halfway along the elevation, there is a setback suggesting where an extension has been added. The northern half of the façade has no window or door openings, whereas the southern half has two horizontally arranged cast glass block windows of a similar design to those on the south façade.

4.3 Comparative Analysis

A comparative analysis was undertaken to establish a baseline understanding of similar cultural heritage designated properties in the City of London, and to determine if the property “is a rare, unique, representative, or early examples of a style, type, expression, material or construction method” as described in O.Reg. 9/06.

Comparative examples were drawn from Part V designated properties and listed properties within the City of London, as well as similar examples of architecture identified as Art Moderne within the City. Residential and commercial properties were selected from this data set.

The Art Moderne style is an architectural style which was most popular in North America during the 1930s and 1940s. Also known as Style Moderne or Streamline Moderne, the style originated in Europe and is an evolution of the Art Deco style. Art Modern buildings are typified by their horizontal massing, generally having flat roofs, rounded corners and smooth wall finishes. Windows made of translucent glass block are common and are often arranged in long horizontal bands, creating a smooth, streamlined effect. Polished metals such as stainless steel were often used for accent trim. Unlike Art Deco, ornamentation was very simple, generally limited to raised concrete panels and banding with low relief. The style was commonly used for storefronts, theatres, commercial buildings and low-rise apartment houses.¹³

Five comparable properties with cultural heritage value were identified. However, this sample does not represent all available properties, and is rather intended to be a representative selection (**Table 1**). Other similar or comparable properties are located throughout the City, however, these five were identified in order to provide similar examples for the purposes of this report. The following observations were noted in analyzing the comparable properties. Of these examples:





- Five include buildings or structures that can be considered Art Moderne;
- Five include building or structures that were constructed between 1940 and 1950;

¹³ John Blumenson. *Ontario Architecture: A Guide to Styles and Building Terms 1784 to the present*. Fitzhenry & Whiteside, 1990.

- Two have three storeys, two have two storeys, and one has one storey;
- Five have flat roofs;
- Four are constructed with or clad with exterior brick;
- Three include rounded corners or rounded bays, key design elements associated with Art Moderne.

The comparative analysis suggests that this property is a representative example of the Art Moderne style within the City of London. It is relatively typical in size and includes key design elements associated with the Art Moderne style/form including rounded corners, a flat roof, and an emphasis on horizontal form. The style is relatively uncommon in London, making the subject property a rare and representative example of the style.

Table 1: Comparative analysis of properties with cultural heritage value with buildings or structures of a similar age, style and/or typology

Address	Recognition	Picture	Age	Material	Style
350 Dufferin Avenue	Part V West Woodfield Heritage Conservation District		1950	Brick – buff brick, concrete rounded corners	“The Berkley” Apartments, three storey apartment building, Art Moderne, also described as Eclectic, flat roof, rounded corners and rounded bays
300 Wellington Street	Listed Priority 1		1949	Brick – buff brick, stucco, at ground floor	Art Moderne, three storey, commercial/office building, flat roof, streamlined rounded corners, rounded bays
155 York Street	Part V Downtown Heritage Conservation District		1942	Brick, painted brick	Art Moderne, one storey commercial building, tower, projected awning, horizontal appearance
109 Dundas Street	Part V Downtown Heritage Conservation District		1951	Limestone veneer façade with black granite	Art Moderne, historically Toronto Dominion Bank, two storey commercial building, flat roof, flagpole attached at top of building

<p>10 Parkdale Crescent</p>	<p>Listed Priority 1</p>		<p>c.1940</p>	<p>Brick – red orange rug brick, concrete foundation</p>	<p>Art Moderne, two storey residential building, flat roof, rounded bays</p>
------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	---	---------------	--	--

4.4 Discussion of Integrity

According to the Ontario Heritage Toolkit, Heritage Property Evaluation (MTCS 2006), “*Integrity is a question of whether the surviving physical features (heritage attributes) continue to represent or support the cultural heritage value or interest of the property.*” The following discussion of integrity was prepared to consider the ability of the property to represent and retain its cultural heritage value over time. It does not consider the structural integrity of the building. Access to the interior of the building was not available, and observations have been made from the public right-of-way. Structural integrity, should it be identified as a concern, should be determined by way of a qualified heritage engineer, building scientist, or architect.

The subject property contains a single-storey commercial building constructed in the Art Moderne style in 1946. Examination of archival photographs and maps indicates that a small single-storey addition was added to the north side of the building sometime at a later date. However it was designed in a similar style to the original building with the same flat roof and white stucco cladding. The front entrance door and glass block windows appear to be original to the building. The windows on the south façade and their associated awnings appear to have been recently replaced with modern vinyl windows, although they are similar in design to the originals. As such, the property generally retains the integrity of its original built character.

5. Heritage Evaluation

5.1 Ontario Regulation 9/06

Criteria	Meets Criteria (Yes/No)	Rationale
1) The property has <i>design or physical value</i> because it:		
i) Is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, or expression, material, or construction method.	Yes	The property at 16 Wellington contains a rare, representative example of an Art Moderne style commercial building in the City of London; Its flat roof, rounded corner entrance, glass block windows and horizontal form are characteristic of this style and era. It appears that the property has been largely unaltered since its construction and it is therefore a representative example of the style. Therefore, it meets this criterion.
ii) Displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit.	No	While the property’s design details make it a representative example of Art Moderne, its artistic merit and craftsmanship are consistent with a modest commercial property of the period. Therefore, it does not meet this criterion.
iii) Demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement.	No	No evidence was found to suggest that the property demonstrates a high degree of technical merit or scientific achievement. Its construction appears to be typical of other small commercial buildings of its era. Therefore it does not meet this criterion.
2) The property has <i>historic or associative value</i> because it:		
i) Has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organisation, or institution that is significant to a community.	No	No information was found suggesting that Robert Dobbyn, The Art Novelty Company, Dobbyn Creative Printing, or printing businesses in general were major industries in the area. Further significant associations were not determined. Therefore it

<p>ii) Yields, or has the potential to yield information that contributes to the understanding of a community or culture.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>does not meet this criterion. The property does not yield any information towards understanding the community or its culture. While the building has been visually linked to the community for decades, it is unlikely that the building provides any information about the community. Therefore it does not meet this criterion.</p>
<p>iii) Demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer or theorist who is significant to the community.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>No evidenced was found to suggest that Robert Dobbyn or any previous landowners were of noteworthy significance to the community. Further associations were not determined. Therefore it does not meet this criterion.</p>
<p>3) The property has contextual value because it:</p>		
<p>i) Is important in defining, maintaining, or supporting the character of an area</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>While the property's scale does not detract from the commercial and residential fabric of Wellington Road and Grand Avenue, the property does not play an important role in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of the area. Therefore, it does not meet this criterion.</p>
<p>ii) Is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The building at 16 Wellington Road functionally and physically defining the intersection of Wellington Road and Grand Avenue. The building maintains frontage along both Wellington Road and Grand Avenue and is built in a style that utilizes rounded corners as an aesthetic component of its form. As a result, the building and its style play a functional and physical role in defining one of the corners of this intersection.</p>
<p>iii) Is a landmark</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>While the property is unusual in the area in terms of its style and siting, it is not considered to be a landmark in the area. Therefore, it meets this criterion.</p>

6. Conclusions

6.1 Statement of Cultural Heritage Value

6.1.1 Description of Property

Situated on the northeast corner of the intersection of Wellington Road and Grand Avenue in the City of London, Ontario, the property at 16 Wellington Road is a relatively squared corner property that maintains significant frontage along both roads. The property includes a small grassed area, and parking lot along Grand Avenue, however, the vast majority of the property consists of the single-storey commercial building that defines the property. Constructed of concrete block, the south and west façades of the building are clad in smooth, white parged concrete and the building is designed in the Art Moderne architectural style. In addition, the building utilizes its location as a corner building with its main entrance situated at the corner of the property.

6.1.2 Cultural Heritage Value

Originally constructed in 1946, the building located at 16 Wellington Road is a rare, representative example of Art Moderne style commercial architecture within the City of London. The building was initially designed and constructed by Robert Dobbyn to serve as a new office and printing plant for his company, the Art Novelty Company, which specialized in the production of advertising novelties, or promotional materials. Dobbyn's company moved operations from Strathroy, Ontario, where the company was founded to take up residence in the purpose-built structure at 16 Wellington Road in 1947. The Art Novelty Company continued to operate from this location for 23 years before being re-named to the Art Dobbyn Company in 1969. The company passed through various ownerships in the late-20th century; however, the Dobbyn name maintained its association with the building and the property. More recently, the building was home to the Murray Press Limited, another printing facility, and today the building houses a fitness centre and naturopathic clinic.

As an example of Art Moderne commercial architecture, the building includes various design elements that are considered key features of the style. As an evolution of the Art Deco style, the building's horizontal massing, flat roof, rounded corner, glass block windows, and horizontal, streamlined appearance are all key elements associated with the style. The smooth white concrete parging, flat roof, low, horizontal form, and the rounded corner and centre frontispiece contribute to this building's design value as a rare and representative example of the Art Moderne style. Further, the style is relatively under-represented within the City of London, and the building at 16 Wellington Road is a good example of this style within the City.

The building at 16 Wellington Road is also functionally and physically important in defining the intersection of Wellington Road and Grand Avenue. The building maintains frontage along both Wellington Road and Grand Avenue and is built in a style that utilizes rounded corners as an aesthetic component. As a result, the style functions in manner that assists in the contextual value of the property, as the building and its rounded corners plays a role in defining one of the corners of this intersection. The building's style and form lends itself to the landscape, and its setting at this intersection.

6.2 Heritage Attributes

The heritage attributes that reflect the cultural heritage value of the property include:

- Single-story building with horizontal massing;
- Flat roof
- Rounded corner entrance, consisting of its walkway, awning, glass block sidelights, front door, and projected awning;
- Glass block windows used throughout the building and sidelights, utilized in the centre door to the building;
- Original/early wood front door, with three windows, original hardware and metal letter slot;
- Smooth concrete cladding; and,
- Orientation of building, with main entrance addressing the corner of the intersection.

7. Recommendations

AECOM Canada Ltd. (AECOM) was retained by the City of London to complete a Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report (CHER) as part of the Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP) for the proposed London Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) system to determine the cultural heritage value of the property at 16 Wellington Road.

The subject property includes a single-storey concrete block commercial building, designed in the Art Moderne style and constructed in 1946. Based on the evaluation of the background research, historical research, site investigation, and application of the criteria from *Ontario Regulation 9/06*, the subject property was determined to demonstrate significant cultural heritage value.

The completion of this CHER recommends that a Heritage Impact Assessment is required for this property to identify appropriate mitigation measures, with respect to any proposed interventions.

Should the City of London wish to pursue designation of the property under Part IV of the *Ontario Heritage Act*, further research, and an interior assessment of the property is recommended in order to inform a comprehensive designating by-law for the property.

8. Images



Image 1: 16 Wellington Road, looking northeast from intersection of Grand Avenue and Wellington Road



Image 2: 16 Wellington Road, showing west façade and landscaping. (AECOM, 2018)



Image 3: West façade of building, facing Wellington Road. The blank wall to the left denotes the extension that was added to the north side of the building sometime after the 1950s (AECOM, 2018)



Image 4: Section of south façade showing window treatments and stepped cornice. (AECOM, 2018)



Image 5: Detail of glass block window and concrete window sill, south façade. (AECOM, 2018)




Image 6: Rounded entrance on southwest corner of building. Note early/original front door with glass block sidelights and curved awning. (AECOM, 2018)

9. Historic Photos and Mapping



Image 7: 16 Wellington Road circa 1948, showing the building occupied by the Art Novelty Company, shortly after its completion. The existing extension on the north (left) side of the building was added at a later date. (Western Archives, Western University via Historypin.net)



Legend

 Project Location




Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report
 16 Wellington Road
 London, Ontario

Project Location in Detail


November 2018	1:400	Datum: NAD 83 UTM17 Source: LIO 2017, City of London 2017
P#: 60590467	V#:	

AECOM

Figure 2





This drawing has been prepared for the use of AECOM's client and may not be used, reproduced or relied upon by third parties, except as agreed by AECOM and its client, as required by law or for use by governmental reviewing agencies. AECOM accepts no responsibility, and denies any liability whatsoever, to any party that modifies this drawing without AECOM's express written consent.



Legend

 Project Location



Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report 16 Wellington Road London, Ontario		
Project Location, 1862		
November 2018	1:15,000	Datum: NAD 83 UTM17 Source: Tremaine's Map 1862
P#: 60590467	V#:	Figure 3
		
		
This drawing has been prepared for the use of AECOM's client and may not be used, reproduced or relied upon by third parties, except as agreed by AECOM and its client, as required by law or for use by governmental reviewing agencies. AECOM accepts no responsibility, and denies any liability whatsoever, to any party that modifies this drawing without AECOM's express written consent.		


Map Source: "Map of the City of London, Ontario, 1862" by A. Tremaine, 1862. Digitized by the University of Toronto.




Legend

 Project Location




Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report		
16 Wellington Road London, Ontario		
Project Location, 1878		
November 2018	1:20,000	Datum: NAD 83 UTM17 Source: Illustrated Historic Atlas of Middlesex County, Toronto: H.R. Page & Co.
P#: 60590467	V#:	
AECOM		Figure 4
		
<small>This drawing has been prepared for the use of AECOM's client and may not be used, reproduced or relied upon by third parties, except as agreed by AECOM and its client, as required by law or for use by governmental reviewing agencies. AECOM accepts no responsibility, and denies any liability whatsoever, to any party that modifies this drawing without AECOM's express written consent.</small>		

Map Source: "Illustrated Historic Atlas of Middlesex County" by H.R. Page & Co., Toronto, 1878. Digitized by the University of Toronto. Project: 1878 Atlas of Middlesex County. File: 1878 Atlas of Middlesex County.tif. Date: 2018-11-08.



Legend

 Project Location



Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report
16 Wellington Road
London, Ontario

Project Location, 1913

November 2018

1:10,000


Datum: NAD 83 UTM17
Source: LIO 2017, Department of Militia and Defence, 1913

P#: 60590467

V#:


AECOM

Figure 5



This drawing has been prepared for the use of AECOM's client and may not be used, reproduced or relied upon by third parties, except as agreed by AECOM and its client, as required by law or for use by governmental reviewing agencies. AECOM accepts no responsibility, and denies any liability whatsoever, to any party that modifies this drawing without AECOM's express written consent.

Map Source: "Map of the City of London, Ontario, 1913" (L1017017) by the Department of Militia and Defence, 1913. Digitized by the University of Toronto Libraries. Project Location: 16 Wellington Road, London, Ontario.




Legend

 Project Location



Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report 16 Wellington Road London, Ontario	
Project Location, 1929	
November 2018	1:10,000
P#: 60590467	V#:
Datum: NAD 83 UTM17 Source: LIO 2017, Department of Militia and Defence, 1929	
AECOM	
Figure 6	
0 100 200 400 Metres	
<p>This drawing has been prepared for the use of AECOM's client and may not be used, reproduced or relied upon by third parties, except as agreed by AECOM and its client, as required by law or for use by governmental reviewing agencies. AECOM accepts no responsibility, and denies any liability whatsoever, to any party that modifies this drawing without AECOM's express written consent.</p>	

Map Source: "Map of London, Ontario and Surrounding Area" (Scale 1:10,000) prepared by the Department of Militia and Defence, 1929. Project Location: 16 Wellington Road, London, Ontario.



Legend

 Project Location



Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report
16 Wellington Road
London, Ontario

Project Location, 1948

November
2018


1:10,000
V#:

Datum: NAD 83 UTM17
Source: LIO 2017, Department
of National Defence, 1948

P#: 60590467

AECOM

Figure 7



This drawing has been prepared for the use of AECOM's client and may not be used, reproduced or relied upon by third parties, except as agreed by AECOM and its client, as required by law or for use by governmental reviewing agencies. AECOM accepts no responsibility, and denies any liability whatsoever, to any party that modifies this drawing without AECOM's express written consent.

Map Source: "LIONEL TRIVETT'S AERIAL PHOTOGRAPHS OF LONDON, ONTARIO, 1948" (http://www.london.on.ca/heritage/heritage_images/1948_aerial_photos.html) Project Location: 16 Wellington Road



Legend

 Project Location



Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report
16 Wellington Road
London, Ontario

Project Location, 1922

November 2018

1:2,000


Datum: NAD 83 UTM17
Source: LIO 2017, Department of Lands and Forests, 1922

PH#: 60590467

V#:

AECOM

Figure 8



This drawing has been prepared for the use of AECOM's client and may not be used, reproduced or relied upon by third parties, except as agreed by AECOM and its client, as required by law or for use by governmental reviewing agencies. AECOM accepts no responsibility, and denies any liability whatsoever, to any party that modifies this drawing without AECOM's express written consent.

10. Bibliography and Sources

A History of the County of Middlesex, Canada. Toronto: W. A. & C. L. Goodspeed, 1889.

Index to the 1854 Assessment Roll, Westminster Township, Middlesex County, Canada West, 1854.
<https://londonmiddlesex.ogs.on.ca/docs/membpubs/assessment/1854-Westminster-Twp.pdf>.

Vernon, Henry. *Vernon's City of London (Ontario) Directory.* Hamilton, Ontario: Henry Vernon & Son. (Issues 1922, 1939-78).

The Architectural Conservancy of Ontario. *Tecumseh Trek: ACO's 38th Annual Geranium Heritage House Tour.* London, Ontario: ACO, 5 June 2011.

Baker, Michael & Hilary Bates Neary. *London Street Names.* Toronto: James Lormier & Company Ltd., 2003

Blumenson, John. *Ontario Architecture: A Guide to Styles and Building Terms 1784 to the present.* Fitzhenry & Whiteside, 1990.

Brock, Dan. "All in the Family: An Account of Some Members of the Odell Family". *London & Middlesex County Historical Society Newsletter*, Fall, 2018.

Dirks, Christine. "A London Printer Leaves His Mark". *London Free Press*, 14 February 1999. p. B6

Foster, J. G. & Co. *Foster's London and Middlesex County Directory 1896-97.* Toronto: J. G. Foster & Co., 1896

Goad, Charles E. *Fire Insurance Plan for the City of London Ontario.* Montreal: Charles E. Goad, 1881 (Revised ed. 1888, 1907, 1915, 1922)

Middlesex County (33) Land Registry Office (MCLRO). *Book 2. Abstract Index Up 2 1866; LOT 23 Concession 4 to Concession 9; Concession A and B*

Middlesex County (33) Land Registry Office (MCLRO). *Book 170. Chester Street; Plan 11, 400*

Middlesex County (33) Land Registry Office (MCLRO). *Parcel Register, PT LT 13, PL 11 (4th)*

Page, H. R. & Co. *Illustrated Historical Atlas of the County of Middlesex, Ont.* Toronto: H. R. Page & Co., 1878

Tremaine, Geo. R. & G. M. *Tremaine's Map of the County of Middlesex, Canada West.* Toronto: Geo. R. & G. M. Tremaine, 1862

Photographs:

Art Novelty Company Wellington Road London. 25 October 1948. London Free Press Collection, Western Archives, Western University via Historypin.net. <https://photos-cdn.historypin.org/services/thumb/phid/1011671/dim/1000x1000/c/1455826139>.

Provincial Standards and Resources:

Ontario Heritage Tool Kit

[http:// www.culture.gov.on.ca/english/heritage/Toolkit/toolkit.ht](http://www.culture.gov.on.ca/english/heritage/Toolkit/toolkit.ht)

Ontario Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport: Heritage Conservation Principle's for Land Use Planning

http://www.culture.gov.on.ca/english/heritage/info_sheets/info_sheet_landuse_planning.htm

Ontario Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport: Eight Guiding Principles in the Conservation of Historic Properties

http://www.culture.gov.on.ca/english/heritage/info_sheets/info_sheet_8principles.htm

Ontario Ministry of Culture, Tourism and Sport: Archaeological Assessments

http://www.mtc.gov.on.ca/en/archaeology/archaeology_assessments.shtml

Municipal Heritage Bridges Cultural, Heritage and Archaeological Resources Assessment Checklist (Revised April 11, 2014)

Ontario Heritage Act (2006)

Ontario Heritage Bridge Guidelines (2008)

Reference Guide on Physical and Cultural Heritage Resources (1996)

Guidelines for Preparing the Cultural Heritage Resource Component of Environmental Assessments (1992)

Guidelines on the Man-Made Heritage Component of Environmental Assessments (1981)

Environmental Guide for Built Heritage and Cultural Heritage Landscapes (2007)

National and International Standards and Resources:

Canadian Register of Historic Places

http://www.historicplaces.ca/visit-visite/rep-reg_e.aspx

Parks Canada Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada

http://www.pc.gc.ca/docs/pc/guide/nldclpc-sgchpc/index_E.asp

Parks Canada National Historic Sites of Canada

http://www.pc.gc.ca/progs/lhn-nhs/index_e.asp

City of London

Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report 122 Wellington Road, London, Ontario

Prepared by:

AECOM

410 – 250 York Street, Citi Plaza
London, ON, Canada N6A 6K2
www.aecom.com

519 673 0510 tel
519 673 5975 fax

Statement of Qualifications and Limitations

The attached Report (the “Report”) has been prepared by AECOM Canada Ltd. (“AECOM”) for the benefit of the Client (“Client”) in accordance with the agreement between AECOM and Client, including the scope of work detailed therein (the “Agreement”).

The information, data, recommendations and conclusions contained in the Report (collectively, the “Information”):

- is subject to the scope, schedule, and other constraints and limitations in the Agreement and the qualifications contained in the Report (the “Limitations”);
- represents AECOM's professional judgement in light of the Limitations and industry standards for the preparation of similar reports;
- may be based on information provided to AECOM which has not been independently verified;
- has not been updated since the date of issuance of the Report and its accuracy is limited to the time period and circumstances in which it was collected, processed, made or issued;
- must be read as a whole and sections thereof should not be read out of such context;
- was prepared for the specific purposes described in the Report and the Agreement; and
- in the case of subsurface, environmental or geotechnical conditions, may be based on limited testing and on the assumption that such conditions are uniform and not variable either geographically or over time.

AECOM shall be entitled to rely upon the accuracy and completeness of information that was provided to it and has no obligation to update such information. AECOM accepts no responsibility for any events or circumstances that may have occurred since the date on which the Report was prepared and, in the case of subsurface, environmental or geotechnical conditions, is not responsible for any variability in such conditions, geographically or over time.

AECOM agrees that the Report represents its professional judgement as described above and that the Information has been prepared for the specific purpose and use described in the Report and the Agreement, but AECOM makes no other representations, or any guarantees or warranties whatsoever, whether express or implied, with respect to the Report, the Information or any part thereof.

Without in any way limiting the generality of the foregoing, any estimates or opinions regarding probable construction costs or construction schedule provided by AECOM represent AECOM's professional judgement in light of its experience and the knowledge and information available to it at the time of preparation. Since AECOM has no control over market or economic conditions, prices for construction labour, equipment or materials or bidding procedures, AECOM, its directors, officers and employees are not able to, nor do they, make any representations, warranties or guarantees whatsoever, whether express or implied, with respect to such estimates or opinions, or their variance from actual construction costs or schedules, and accept no responsibility for any loss or damage arising therefrom or in any way related thereto. Persons relying on such estimates or opinions do so at their own risk.

Except (1) as agreed to in writing by AECOM and Client; (2) as required by-law; or (3) to the extent used by governmental reviewing agencies for the purpose of obtaining permits or approvals, the Report and the Information may be used and relied upon only by Client.

AECOM accepts no responsibility, and denies any liability whatsoever, to parties other than Client who may obtain access to the Report or the Information for any injury, loss or damage suffered by such parties arising from their use of, reliance upon, or decisions or actions based on the Report or any of the Information (“improper use of the Report”), except to the extent those parties have obtained the prior written consent of AECOM to use and rely upon the Report and the Information. Any injury, loss or damages arising from improper use of the Report shall be borne by the party making such use.

This Statement of Qualifications and Limitations is attached to and forms part of the Report and any use of the Report is subject to the terms hereof.

AECOM: 2015-04-13
© 2009-2015 AECOM Canada Ltd. All Rights Reserved.

Signatures

Report Prepared By:

DRAFT

Michael Greguol, M.A.
Cultural Heritage Specialist

DRAFT

Liam Smythe, B.URPI
Heritage Researcher

Report Reviewed By:

DRAFT

Tatum Taylor, M.Sc., CAHP
Cultural Heritage Specialist

Distribution List

# Hard Copies	PDF Required	Association / Company Name

Revision History

Revision #	Date	Revised By:	Revision Description
0	Nov. 16, 2018	M. Greguol, L. Smythe	Draft Report to City of London
1	Nov. 21, 2018	M. Greguol, L. Smythe	Revised Draft Report to City of London for LACH Stewardship Sub-Committee

Executive Summary

AECOM Canada Ltd. (AECOM) was retained by the City of London to complete a Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report (CHER) as part of the Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP) for the proposed London Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) system to determine the cultural heritage value of the property at 122 Wellington Road. The BRT system is comprised of four segments, combined into two operation routes: the north/east corridor and the south/west corridor. The BRT network was approved by City of London Council through the Rapid Transit Master Plan in July 2017.

The property located at 122 Wellington Road was identified in the City of London Cultural Heritage Screening Report (CHSR) (October 2018) as being a directly impacted heritage listed property. The CHSR was completed as part of the TPAP for the London Bus Rapid Transit project. The TPAP is regulated by the Environmental Assessment Act (EAA) under Ontario Regulation 231/08: Transit Projects and Metrolinx Undertakings (O.Reg. 231/08). This CHER forms part of the Environmental Project Report (EPR) completed under the TPAP.

The subject building is a two-storey brick/concrete block commercial building constructed circa 1963. Based on the background historical research, field review, comparative analysis, description of integrity, and application of Ontario Regulation 9/06 criteria, the property was not determined to have significant cultural heritage value or interest.

The completion of the CHER has resulted in the following recommendation:

- The property at 122 Wellington Road was determined not to have significant cultural heritage value or interest. Subsequently, no additional cultural heritage work is recommended for the property.

Table of Contents

1.	Introduction	1
1.1	Development Context	1
2.	Legislation and Policy Context	2
2.1	Provincial and Municipal Context and Policies	2
2.1.1	Provincial Policy Context	2
2.1.2	Ontario Regulation 9/06.....	2
2.1.3	Municipal Policies	3
2.2	Methodology	3
2.3	Consultation.....	3
3.	Historical Context	5
3.1	Local Context and Settlement History	5
3.1.1	Westminster Township	5
3.1.2	London South.....	5
3.1.3	Wellington Road.....	5
3.2	Land Use History	6
3.2.1	1810-1850.....	6
3.2.2	1850-1948.....	6
3.2.3	1948-Present.....	7
4.	Existing Conditions	8
4.1	Landscape Context.....	8
4.2	Architectural Description	8
4.2.1	West (Front) Elevation.....	8
4.2.2	North Elevation.....	8
4.2.3	East (Rear) Elevation	8
4.2.4	South Elevation	9
4.3	Comparative Analysis	9
4.4	Discussion of Integrity.....	12
5.	Heritage Evaluation	13
5.1	Ontario Regulation 9/06.....	13
6.	Conclusions	16
7.	Recommendations.....	17
8.	Images	18
9.	Historic Photos and Mapping	20
10.	Bibliography and Sources.....	31

List of Figures

Figure 1: Project Location	21
Figure 2: Project Location in Detail	22
Figure 3: Project Location, 1862	23
Figure 4: Project Location, 1878	24
Figure 5: Project Location, 1913	25
Figure 6: Project Location, 1929	26
Figure 7: Project Location, 1948	27
Figure 8: Project Location, 1922	28
Figure 9: Project Location, 1965	29
Figure 10: Project Location, 1972	30

List of Tables

Table 1: Comparative analysis of properties with building/structures of similar age, style, and/or typology	10
---	----

1. Introduction

1.1 Development Context

AECOM Canada Ltd. (AECOM) was retained by the City of London to complete a Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report (CHER) as part of the Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP) for the proposed London Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) system to determine the cultural heritage value of the property at 122 Wellington Road. The BRT system is comprised of four segments, combined into two operation routes: the north/east corridor and the south/west corridor. The BRT network was approved by City of London Council through the Rapid Transit Master Plan in July 2017.

The property located at 122 Wellington Road was identified in the City of London Cultural Heritage Screening Report (CHSR) (October 2018) as being a directly impacted, heritage listed property. The CHSR was completed as part of the TPAP for the London Bus Rapid Transit project. The TPAP is regulated by the Environmental Assessment Act (EAA) under Ontario Regulation 231/08: Transit Projects and Metrolinx Undertakings (O.Reg. 231/08). This CHER forms part of the Environmental Project Report (EPR) completed under the TPAP.

2. Legislation and Policy Context

2.1 Provincial and Municipal Context and Policies

2.1.1 Provincial Policy Context

The Ministry of Tourism, Culture, and Sport (MTCS) is charged under Section 2 of the *Ontario Heritage Act* with the responsibility to determine policies, priorities and programs for the conservation, protection and preservation of the cultural heritage of Ontario and has published guidelines to assist in assessing cultural heritage resources as part of environmental assessment. The following have informed the preparation of this CHER:

Guidelines for Preparing the Cultural Heritage Resource Component of Environmental Assessments (1992);
Guidelines on the Man-Made Heritage Component of Environmental Assessments (1981);
MTCS Standards and Guidelines for Conservation of Provincial Heritage Properties (2010);
Environmental Guide for Built Heritage and Cultural Heritage Landscapes (2007); and
The Ontario Heritage Toolkit (2006).

An Environmental Assessment is required for all large-scale projects that have potential impacts on the environment. These projects require approval from the Government of Ontario. Certain projects, such as transit projects, have more predictable environmental impacts or effects, and can be readily managed. This streamlined approach protects the environment, but shortens the timeline to six month for commencement, review and approval. This Environmental Assessment process for transit projects is known as the Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP).

TPAP provides a framework for focused consultation and objection processes. Through TPAP, the Minister of the Environment may initiate a Time Out period if there is a potential for a negative impact on a matter of provincial importance that relates to the natural environment or has cultural heritage value or interest, or on a constitutionally protected Aboriginal or treaty right (TPAP Guide to Environmental Assessment Requirements for Transit Projects, 2014).

Additionally, the *Planning Act* (1990) and related *Provincial Policy Statement* (PPS) (2014) provide guidance for the assessment and evaluation of potential cultural heritage resources. Subsection 2.6 of the PPS, Cultural Heritage and Archaeological Resources, states that:

2.6.1 Significant built heritage resources and significant cultural heritage landscapes shall be conserved.

Criteria for determining significance for the resources are mandated by the Province in Ontario Regulation 9/06.

2.1.2 Ontario Regulation 9/06

Ontario Regulation 9/06 provides the Criteria for Determining Cultural Heritage Value or Interest under the *Ontario Heritage Act*. This regulation was created to ensure a consistent approach to the designation of heritage properties under the *Ontario Heritage Act*. All designations under the *Ontario Heritage Act* after 2006 must meet at least one of the criteria outlined in the regulation.

A property may be designated under Section 29 of the *Ontario Heritage Act* if it meets one or more of the following criteria for determining whether the property is of cultural heritage value or interest:

1. The property has design value or physical value because it,
 - i. is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, expression, material or construction method;
 - ii. displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit;
 - iii. demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement.
2. The property has historical value or associative value because it,
 - i. has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization, or institution that is significant to a community,
 - ii. yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of a community or culture;
 - iii. demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer or theorist who is significant to a community.
3. The property has contextual value because it,
 - i. is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an area;
 - ii. is physically, functionally, visually, or historically linked to its surroundings;
 - iii. is a landmark.

2.1.3 Municipal Policies

The London Plan is the City of London's new Official Plan which was consolidated on August 27, 2018. *The London Plan* focuses on three areas of cultural heritage planning, including: general policies for the protection and enhancement of cultural heritage resources; specific policies related to the identification of cultural heritage resources, including individual cultural heritage resources, heritage conservation districts, cultural heritage landscapes, and archaeological resources; and specific policies related to the protection and conservation of these cultural heritage resources. The criteria outlined in *The London Plan* for the identification and designation of individual properties of cultural heritage value or interest reflect the criteria defined in O.Reg. 9/06.

2.2 Methodology

A CHER examines a property as a whole, its relationship to its surroundings, as well as its individual elements—engineering works, landscape, etc. The recommendations of the CHER are based on an understanding of the physical values of the property, a documentation of its history through research, and an analysis of its social context, comparisons with similar properties and mapping. A field review was undertaken by Liam Smythe, Heritage Researcher at AECOM in November 2018. Access was limited to the public-right-of way.

This CHER is guided and informed by the key documents listed in 2.1.1. The following report has been prepared utilizing the Terms of Reference prepared for the London BRT TPAP process, which have been received by the London Advisory Committee on Heritage (LACH) (See Section 11).

2.3 Consultation

Consultation for the London BRT project has been conducted with the LACH. A draft CHSR (dated February 6, 2018) was provided for their review and comment. The LACH Stewardship Sub-Committee recommended that 104 properties which were identified by the draft CHSR to have potential cultural heritage value or interest, do not require further examination for consideration as having cultural heritage value or interest (CHVI). The LACH also recommended that an additional 30 properties, not identified by the draft CHSR, be evaluated for their potential

cultural heritage value. Further, the remaining properties flagged by the draft CHSR requiring further cultural heritage work were added to the Register (*Inventory of Heritage Resources*) pursuant to Section 27 of the *Ontario Heritage Act* by resolution of Municipal Council on March 27, 2018.

The draft CHSR was also provided to the MTCS for review, and comments were received in July 2018. In response to MTCS comments, the CHSR was revised to include additional information on impacted properties, and a preliminary impact assessment. The CHSR identified properties with direct impacts that cannot be mitigated through design, and recommended that these properties be addressed through completion of CHERs prior to completion of the TPAP, including the property at 122 Wellington Road. Ongoing communications with MTCS have continued as part of the TPAP.

The revised CHSR (October 8, 2018) was provided to the LACH on October 10, 2018. The Draft Terms of Reference for CHERs was also received and referred to the LACH Stewardship Sub-Committee for review. This CHER will be submitted and reviewed by the LACH Stewardship Sub-Committee for their November 28, 2018 meeting.

3. Historical Context

3.1 Local Context and Settlement History

3.1.1 Westminster Township

Prior to European settlement the area that would eventually become Westminster Township was settled by members of the Chippewa First Nation. One of the largest townships in Middlesex County, the first survey of Westminster Township was completed in 1809-10 by Deputy Provincial Surveyor Simon T. Z. Watson. The remainder of the township was surveyed in 1820 by Colonel Mahlon Burwell and Colonel Bostwick. Unlike other townships in Upper Canada, lots were not parceled out to government “favorites” or speculators before 1817; the earliest settlers were farmers, many of whom arrived by way of the United States. By 1817, the township was home to 428 people and the price of land had quadrupled since tracts were first made available. By 1850, the township had a population of 4,525.¹

3.1.2 London South

Originally part of Westminster Township, South London was originally settled in the 1810s. For most of the nineteenth century, the area was home to a number of wealthy Londoners, who constructed large country mansions away from the increasingly congested city. South London remained predominantly rural until the 1880s, but was connected to the City of London by a series of bridges over the Thames. By the 1890s, the population of the area had increased to the point where annexation was considered. Eager to reap the benefits of electric street lighting, safe drinking water, sidewalks and the city’s education system, this section of the township became part of the City of London on May 1st, 1890. Bounded by Wellington Road, Wharncliffe Road, Emery Street and the Thames River, the new suburb was designated as Ward 6. The building boom of the 1880s and 1890s was concentrated largely to the western side of the ward; parcels of land along Wellington Road were still held by wealthy families such as the McClary and Mackenzie families until the end of the century. Grand Avenue – formerly Hamilton Row prior to 1890 – is so named for the large estates that once fronted on it.²

3.1.3 Wellington Road

Running north to south from Huron Street to the City of St. Thomas with brief interruptions by the Grand Trunk Railway (now Canadian Pacific Railway) line, Wellington Road was named for Arthur Wellesley, 1st Duke of Wellington. A major figure in British military history, Wellington was famous for his victory over Napoleon at the Battle of Waterloo in 1815. From 1818 to 1827, he served Master General of the Ordnance, commanding military officers and artillery in Upper Canada.³ The road was cut through Westminster Township by W. L. Odell, who also assisted in the construction of an iron bridge to carry Wellington Road across the Thames River.⁴

Within London, Wellington Road is identified by various official names, at varying points within the City. Between Huron Street and the Thames River, the road runs relatively parallel with Richmond Street and is identified in this section as Wellington Street. South of the Thames River, the road changes names to Wellington Road, and is

¹ *A History of the County of Middlesex, Canada*. Toronto: W. A. & C. L. Goodspeed, 1889. p. 566-568

² The Architectural Conservancy of Ontario. *Tecumseh Trek; ACO’s 38th Annual Geranium Heritage House Tour*. London, Ontario: ACO, June 5, 2011.

³ *Michael Baker & Hilary Bates Neary. London Street Names*. Toronto: James Lormier & Company Ltd., 2003. p. 100

⁴ *A History of the County of Middlesex, Op Cit.* p.570

identified as such between the River and the road's intersection with Exeter Road, just north of Highway 401. Lastly, the road is identified as Wellington Road South southwards from Exeter Road to south of the municipal city limits.

3.2 Land Use History

3.2.1 1810-1850

The subject property is located on a portion of Lot 25, Broken Front Concession, or Concession "B" in the former Westminster Township. Located on the west side of Wellington Road, Lot 25 was vacant for many years following its original survey. In 1839, Albert Scriver Odell received 69 ½ acres in the north part of the lot from the Crown. The southern part of the lot was deeded to Edward Matthews in 1850. Odell already owned Lot 24 immediately to the east, having purchased it from James Lester in 1822. The Odell family was one of the earliest families to settle in Westminster Township. Albert was the first of his family to arrive in the Township in 1810, settling on Lot 24 Concession I, along Commissioner's Road near the present Victoria Hospital⁵ One of ten children, Albert was born in 1787 to John Odell and Enor Schriver. The Odell family had originally settled in Dutchess County, New York and were of Dutch origin. John left New York following the American Revolution, and relocated near Montreal. All of John and Enor's children would eventually settle in Westminster Township, with the exception of their son Loop, who died in Lower Canada. The first records of the Westminster Council, dated March 4th 1817 identify Albert S. Odell and Robert Frank as "overseers of highways".⁶ Albert Odell did not reside on this property however; the 1854 assessment roll lists him as living on Lot 26, Concession I, former Westminster Township.⁷ Albert and his wife, Charlotte Percival, did not have children. Charlotte predeceased Albert sometime prior to 1852; Albert himself passed away in 1856.⁸

3.2.2 1850-1948

All portions of the original Lot 25 were sold off and subdivided through the 1850s and 1860s. While the 1862 Tremaine map of the township does not provide details of the property, the 1878 atlas shows the property as being subdivided into as many as thirteen parcels. The portions of Lots 24 and 25 fronting on the Thames River are both listed to landowner G.B.R Frank. The northern portion of the Original Lot 25 was previously dominated by a large meander in the river. Aerial photography suggests that this section of the river was realigned and the meander filled in by 1922, although its former location is still evident today as a small oxbow in Watson Street Park.

In 1873, a plan of "Villa Lots" was prepared by Samuel Peters and registered as Plan 312 (4th) in June of that year. Prepared for Lieutenant Colonel John B. Taylor, the plan divided a portion of Taylor's property on the original Lot 25 into seven smaller lots for residential development. In the drawing submitted to the County, Wellington Road is identified as a "gravel road to Wellington Bridge", and Weston Street is also identified. Land registry records indicate that Colonel Taylor sold the lots to Daniel Torrance in August 1873. Lot 4, Plan 312 (4th) on the northeast corner of Wellington Road and Weston Street is where 122 Wellington Road currently sits.

Fire insurance plans indicate that the north portion of the original Lot 25 had been developed as a residential community by the turn of the twentieth century. A number of small brick and frame houses were present along Wellington Road and its side streets. The London City Directory of 1897 identifies thirty-eight people living along Wellington Road between the Thames River and what was then the city limits, just south of Maryboro Place (also

⁵ *A History of the County of Middlesex, Op Cit.* p.568

⁶ *A History of the County of Middlesex, Op Cit.* p.948

⁷ *Index to the 1854 Assessment Roll, Westminster Township, Middlesex County, Canada West.*
<https://londonmiddlesex.ogs.on.ca/docs/membpubs/assessment/1854-Westminster-Twp.pdf>. (Accessed November 2018).

⁸ Dan Brock "All in the Family: An Account of Some Members of the Odell Family". *London & Middlesex County Historical Society Newsletter*, Fall, 2018.

identified as Marybora place on fire insurance plans, and the presently McClary Avenue). Many of these small residential streets extending off of Wellington Road have since been renamed. For example on the 1922 Fire Insurance plan, Grand Avenue is identified as Clarke Street east of Wellington Road. It was not determined why these streets were renamed; however a review of later city directories indicated that all of the respective streets had assumed their present names by 1948.

3.2.3 1948-Present

Although Lot 4, Plan 312 (4th) had been subdivided as early as 1873, the portion of the lot at 122 Wellington Road was one of the last to be developed, remaining vacant into the 1960s.⁹ In 1949, Hugh Cheung purchased the southwest portion of Lot 4, and by 1952 the neighbouring commercial buildings had been constructed at 120 and 124-26 Wellington Road. City directories indicate that Cheung resided at 126 Wellington Road and operated a restaurant at that location under the name of “Huey’s Coffee Bar”. City directories make no mention of 122 Wellington Road until 1963, when the address is identified as a new building. By 1964, Huey’s Coffee Bar moved into the building at 122 Wellington Road. It is likely that Cheung had the building constructed in order to expand his restaurant. Huey’s Coffee Bar continued to occupy the building until 1978; the following year it was taken over by the current occupant, a Chinese restaurant called Tack Sun.

⁹ Middlesex County (33) Land Registry Office (MCLRO). *Book 38. Chester Street; Plan 259, 312, 313, 443, 456, 474*

4. Existing Conditions

4.1 Landscape Context

The property at 122 Wellington Road is located on the east side of Wellington Road between Weston Street and Watson Street. Through the area, Wellington Road follows a roughly north-south orientation and is a four-lane arterial road. Weston and Watson Streets are both two-lane residential streets that dead-end just east of Wellington Road. Sidewalks are present on both sides of all streets. No trees are present along Wellington Road; however residential properties on the side streets have large mature trees. The area is a mixture of commercial retail and residential uses, with mostly retail and restaurant uses fronting onto Wellington Road, some of which have been converted from residential buildings. A small commercial shopping plaza with a parking lot is located on the east side of Wellington, with a stand-alone Liquor Control Board of Ontario store on the west side.

Consistent with neighbouring properties, the building at 122 Wellington Road is set back slightly from the Wellington Road sidewalk. A flowerbed constructed of concrete blocks is located in front of the building, landscaped with small shrubs and flowers.

4.2 Architectural Description

122 Wellington Road is a modest two-storey, rectangular-plan commercial building with a flat roof, constructed of concrete blocks. The most defining characteristic of the building's exterior is its large awning, designed in the style of a Chinese pagoda with a tile roof (**Image 4**).

4.2.1 West (Front) Elevation

The west elevation of the building (**Images 1 and 2**) is the main façade fronting onto Wellington Road. It is a two-storey façade, generally symmetrical in design; the ground floor has two single glass and aluminium entrance doors at opposite ends of the façade, and three large picture windows. Two horizontally arranged windows are present on the second storey, each divided vertically into three panes. The second storey is almost entirely obscured by a large awning, which extends from over the entrances almost to the roofline. This awning is designed in the style of a Chinese pagoda, with a tile roof. It is supported by four red painted wooden columns. It is unclear if the awning was constructed as a part of the original design of the building, however, it is suspected that it was constructed when the building was converted to a Chinese restaurant in the 1970s. The façade is clad in artificial stone, and a backlit sign is located along the cornice, advertising the Tack Sun Dining Lounge.

4.2.2 North Elevation

The north elevation of the building (**Image 3**) is obscured by the neighbouring building. It is a two-storey façade of concrete blocks. Two small windows are present on the second storey.

4.2.3 East (Rear) Elevation

The east façade faces a parking area at the rear of the building. Two single entrance doors are located on the ground floor; the northernmost of the two is slightly raised and accessed by a steel porch with four steps.

Aluminium awnings cover both doorways. A picture window with two narrow sidelights is present on the second storey, and a metal ladder on the northeast corner provides access to the roof.

4.2.4 South Elevation

Like the north elevation, the south elevation is also obscured by the neighbouring building. It is a two-storey façade of concrete blocks. Four vinyl or aluminium windows are present on the second storey, with a horizontal sliding window on the first storey, towards the rear of the building. A portion of the façade is covered in artificial stone, which wraps from the west façade. The rear portion of the elevation, predominantly obstructed by the building at 126 Wellington Road consists of exterior wall, constructed of concrete block..

4.3 Comparative Analysis

A comparative analysis was undertaken to establish a baseline understanding of similar cultural heritage designated properties in the City of London, and to determine if the property “is a rare, unique, representative, or early examples of a style, type, expression, material or construction method” as described in O.Reg. 9/06.

Comparative examples were drawn from listed and non-listed properties within the City of London, as well as similar examples of architecture identified as two-storey commercial or mixed-use buildings within the City.

Nine comparable properties with and without identified cultural heritage value were identified. However, this sample does not represent all available properties, and is rather intended to be a representative selection (**Table 1**). Various similar or comparable properties are located throughout the City, however, these nine were identified to provide similar examples for the purposes of this report. The following observations were noted in analyzing the comparable properties.

Of these examples:

- Six include buildings that were originally designed to be two-storey commercial buildings;
- Five include various alterations to the exterior materials and appearance of the building;
- Five include large storefront windows at the ground level;
- Five appear to still function as commercial uses;
- Six have flat roofs;
- Six are clad with exterior brick;
- Three are clad with artificial stone;
- One is clad with exterior siding;
- Three were designed with applied architectural motifs that represent Asian-inspired roof-forms and design, to demonstrate similar motifs elsewhere in the City of London.

The comparative analysis suggests that this property is a relatively common example of the two-storey commercial buildings that are located along many major roads within the City of London. It is typical in size, scale, form, and materials and has been significantly altered over the last several decades. As a result, from a comparative perspective, the property does not appear to be a rare, unique, representative, or example of a style, type, expression, material, or construction method.

Table 1: Comparative analysis of properties with building/structures of similar age, style, and/or typology

Address	Recognition	Picture	Age	Material	Style
116 Wharncliffe Road South	None		TBD	Brick – brown/beige	Two-storey commercial building, storefront windows at ground level, and projected awnings over window and door entrances, flat roof.
120 Wellington Road	Listed		TBD	Brick - brown/yellow, Artificial stone	Two-storey commercial building, storefront windows at ground level, projected awnings over window and door entrances, flat roof.
193-199 Wellington Street	Listed		c.1880	Brick – yellow/beige	Two-storey commercial buildings with storefront windows at ground level, flat roof.
221 Wharncliffe Road South	None		TBD	Brick – white, Aluminum siding	Two-storey commercial buildings with, large storefront windows at ground level, and projected awnings, flat roof.
246 Wharncliffe Road South	None		TBD	Brick – grey/beige/red, Artificial stone	Two storey former commercial building, ground floor window has been altered to accommodate current residential use, flat roof.

<p>744 & 746 Richmond Street</p>	<p>Listed</p>		<p>TBD</p>	<p>Brick – red, Artificial stone</p>	<p>Two-storey commercial building with large storefront windows at ground floor, modern artificial stone exterior appears to be a recent alteration, flat roof.</p>
<p>608 Hamilton Road</p>	<p>None</p>		<p>2014</p>	<p>Brick – 21st century white, Roof – tile</p>	<p>Two-storey place of worship, designed for the Doc Huang Buddhist Centre. “Pagoda” style tile roof used for projected awning around the first storey</p>
<p>732 Lorne Avenue</p>	<p>Part V Old East Heritage Conservation District</p>		<p>TBD</p>	<p>Brick – red</p>	<p>One storey cottage, with various alterations designed to reflect Asian-inspired architectural motifs. Ridging on dormer roof is exaggerated to reflect a “pagoda”-like appearance</p>
<p>228 Clarence Street</p>	<p>None</p>		<p>TBD</p>	<p>Brick – red, Tile pagoda</p>	<p>Two storey institutional building with recent “pagoda” awning constructed over the front entrance to the building.</p>

4.4 Discussion of Integrity

According to the Ontario Heritage Toolkit, Heritage Property Evaluation (MTCS 2006), *“Integrity is a question of whether the surviving physical features (heritage attributes) continue to represent or support the cultural heritage value or interest of the property.”* The following discussion of integrity was prepared to consider the ability of the property to represent and retain its cultural heritage value over time. It does not consider the structural integrity of the building. Access to the interior of the building was not available, and observations have been made from the public right-of-way. Structural integrity, should it be identified as a concern, should be determined by way of a qualified heritage engineer, building scientist, or architect.

The subject property is a two-storey commercial building, constructed of brick and concrete blocks with a flat roof. It would appear that the building has been extensively modified since its construction. The main entrance doors are made of glass and aluminium, and appear to be early additions or possibly originals. The large picture windows on the ground level of the street façade also appear to be original or early. As the building was originally constructed to house a restaurant, it is possible that these features would have remained unchanged when the restaurant changed owners. Although no street-level historic photographs could be located, aerial photography indicates that the pagoda-style awning was not present at the time of the buildings original construction, and was likely added when the building was converted to a Chinese restaurant between the 1970s-1990s. The artificial stone cladding may also have been added at this time. Accordingly, the property appears to have retained little integrity of its original built character.

5. Heritage Evaluation

5.1 Ontario Regulation 9/06

Criteria	Meets Criteria (Yes/No)	Rationale
1) The property has <i>design or physical value</i> because it:		
i) Is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, or expression, material, or construction method.	No	The building at 122 Wellington Road is a modest two-storey commercial building, similar to many others of the period. It has undergone significant modifications, particularly with the later addition of an awning that, while exhibiting a distinctive Chinese pagoda style, does not hold design value. Although padoga-style roofs can be considered unusual in London, other examples can be found elsewhere in the City. The property is not a rare, unique, representative, or early example of a style, type, expression, and material or construction method. Therefore, it does not meet this criterion.
ii) Displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit.	No	The building is a simple commercial building similar to many others of the period. While the front façade is distinctive, it is a more recent addition and does not display a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit. Therefore it does not meet this criterion.
iii) Demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement.	No	The building does not demonstrate an unusual degree of technical or scientific achievement. It is very similar to many other storefront commercial buildings of the era, despite its more recent awning addition. Therefore, it does not meet this criterion.
2) The property has <i>historic or associative value</i> because it:		
i) Has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person,	No	There is no information that suggests Hugh Cheung, Huey's

<p>activity, organisation, or institution that is significant to a community.</p> <p>ii) Yields, or has the potential to yield information that contributes to the understanding of a community or culture.</p> <p>iii) Demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer or theorist who is significant to the community.</p>		<p>Coffee Bar, or any of the building's other tenants were of particular significance to the community.</p>
	<p>No</p>	<p>The building does not yield any information towards understanding the community or its culture. Therefore, it does not meet this criterion.</p>
	<p>No</p>	<p>Although the building and its neighbour was constructed under the ownership of Hugh Cheung, no evidence was found the he, or any previous landowners were of particular significance to the community. Further, it was determined if Cheung hired an artist, builder, designer or theorists, who is significant to the community.</p>
<p>3) The property has contextual value because it:</p>		
<p>i) Is important in defining, maintaining, or supporting the character of an area</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Although this commercial building is located in a mixed commercial/residential area, it has been highly altered and does not play a role in defining, maintaining, or supporting the character of the area. With regards to its form and massing, the building shares similar qualities to its neighbours at 126 and 120 Wellington Road. However, together the three properties are not significantly important in defining, maintaining, or supporting the character of the area.</p>
<p>ii) Is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The building has been used continuously as a restaurant since its construction, but this connection is not of importance to its surroundings. As noted, the building is one of three similar buildings, located in a row, constructed within a close timeframe. However, the three buildings are not physically, functionally, visually, or historically linked to their surroundings in manner that conveys cultural heritage value</p>

<p>iii) Is a landmark</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>or interest. The building is located in a row of commercial buildings of similar age and form. It does not appear to be a landmark within the community. Therefore it does not meet this criterion.</p>
----------------------------------	-----------	--

6. Conclusions

Based on the results of background historical research, field review, and application of the criteria from Ontario Regulation 9/06, the subject property at 122 Wellington Road was not determined to be of significant cultural heritage value or interest. Accordingly, no Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest, or Description of Heritage Attributes has been prepared.

7. Recommendations

The subject building is a two-storey brick/concrete block commercial building constructed circa 1963. Based on the background historical research, field review, comparative analysis, description of integrity, and application of Ontario Regulation 9/06 criteria, the property was not determined to have significant cultural heritage value or interest.

The completion of the CHER has resulted in the following recommendation:

- The property at 122 Wellington Road was determined not to have significant cultural heritage value or interest. Subsequently, no additional cultural heritage work is recommended for the property

8. Images



Image 1: Front (west) elevation of 122 Wellington Road. (AECOM, 2018)



Image 2: Front (west) elevation of 122 Wellington Road, showing relation to neighbouring properties. (AECOM, 2018)




Image 3: 122 Wellington Road, showing portion of north elevation. (AECOM, 2018)



Image 4: Detail of pagoda-style awning. (AECOM, 2018)


9. Historic Photos and Mapping

All mapping related to the subject property are included on the following pages.



Legend

Project Location



Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report
 122 Wellington Road
 London, Ontario

Project Location, 1862

November 2018

1:15,000


Datum: NAD 83 UTM17
 Source: Tremaine's Map 1862

PH: 60590467

V#:

AECOM

Figure 3




This drawing has been prepared for the use of AECOM's client and may not be used, reproduced or relied upon by third parties, except as agreed by AECOM and its client, as required by law or for use by governmental reviewing agencies. AECOM accepts no responsibility, and denies any liability whatsoever, to any party that modifies this drawing without AECOM's express written consent.



Legend

 Project Location



Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report
122 Wellington Road
London, Ontario

Project Location, 1878

November
2018

1:20,000


Datum: NAD 83 UTM17
Source: Illustrated Historic Atlas
of Middlesex County,
Toronto: H.R. Page & Co.

PH: 60590467

V#:

AECOM

Figure 4




This drawing has been prepared for the use of AECOM's client and may not be used, reproduced or relied upon by third parties, except as agreed by AECOM and its client, as required by law or for use by governmental reviewing agencies. AECOM accepts no responsibility, and denies any liability whatsoever, to any party that modifies this drawing without AECOM's express written consent.

Map Source: "Illustrated Historic Atlas of Middlesex County, Toronto: H.R. Page & Co." (1878). Digitized by University of Toronto. Project Location: 122 Wellington Road, London, Ontario.



Legend

 Project Location



Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report
122 Wellington Road
London, Ontario

Project Location, 1913

November 2018

1:10,000


Datum: NAD 83 UTM17
Source: LIO 2017, Department of Militia and Defence, 1913

P#: 60590467

V#:


AECOM

Figure 5




This drawing has been prepared for the use of AECOM's client and may not be used, reproduced or relied upon by third parties, except as agreed by AECOM and its client, as required by law or for use by governmental reviewing agencies. AECOM accepts no responsibility, and denies any liability whatsoever, to any party that modifies this drawing without AECOM's express written consent.

Map Source: "LIONEL TOWN AND SUBURBS OF LONDON, ONTARIO" by the Department of Militia and Defence, 1913. Digitized by the University of Toronto. Project Location: 1913.



Legend

 Project Location



Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report
122 Wellington Road
London, Ontario

Project Location, 1929

November 2018

1:10,000


Datum: NAD 83 UTM17
Source: LIO 2017, Department of Militia and Defence, 1929

P#: 60590467

V#:

AECOM

Figure 6




This drawing has been prepared for the use of AECOM's client and may not be used, reproduced or relied upon by third parties, except as agreed by AECOM and its client, as required by law or for use by governmental reviewing agencies. AECOM accepts no responsibility, and denies any liability whatsoever, to any party that modifies this drawing without AECOM's express written consent.

Map Source: "Map of the City of London, Ontario, 1929" (L101701) by the Department of Militia and Defence, 1929. Digitized by the University of Toronto. Project Location: 122 Wellington Road, London, Ontario. Date: November 2018.



Legend

 Project Location



Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report
122 Wellington Road
London, Ontario

Project Location, 1948

November
2018

1:10,000


Datum: NAD 83 UTM17
Source: LIO 2017, Department
of National Defence, 1948

PH#: 60590467

V#:

AECOM

Figure 7




This drawing has been prepared for the use of AECOM's client and may not be used, reproduced or relied upon by third parties, except as agreed by AECOM and its client, as required by law or for use by governmental reviewing agencies. AECOM accepts no responsibility, and denies any liability whatsoever, to any party that modifies this drawing without AECOM's express written consent.



Map Source: "Map of the City of London, Ontario" (2017) by the City of London, Ontario. Project Location: 122 Wellington Road, London, Ontario. Date: November 2018. Scale: 1:10,000. Datum: NAD 83 UTM17. Source: LIO 2017, Department of National Defence, 1948.



Legend

 Project Location



Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report 122 Wellington Road London, Ontario		
Project Location, 1972		
November 2018	1:2,000	Datum: NAD 83 UTM17 Source: LIO 2017, City of London - 1972 Line 6 Photo 130
P#: 60590467	V#:	Figure 10
		
		
<small>This drawing has been prepared for the use of AECOM's client and may not be used, reproduced or relied upon by third parties, except as agreed by AECOM and its client, as required by law or for use by governmental reviewing agencies. AECOM accepts no responsibility, and denies any liability whatsoever, to any party that modifies this drawing without AECOM's express written consent.</small>		

10. Bibliography and Sources

A History of the County of Middlesex, Canada. Toronto: W. A. & C. L. Goodspeed, 1889.

Index to the 1854 Assessment Roll, Westminster Township, Middlesex County, Canada West, 1854.
<https://londonmiddlesex.ogs.on.ca/docs/membpubs/assessment/1854-Westminster-Twp.pdf>.

Vernon, Henry. *Vernon's City of London (Ontario) Directory.* Hamilton, Ontario: Henry Vernon & Son. (Issues 1922, 1939-78).

The Architectural Conservancy of Ontario. *Tecumseh Trek: ACO's 38th Annual Geranium Heritage House Tour.* London, Ontario: ACO, 5 June 2011.

Baker, Michael & Hilary Bates Neary. *London Street Names.* Toronto: James Lormier & Company Ltd., 2003

Brock, Dan. "All in the Family: An Account of Some Members of the Odell Family". *London & Middlesex County Historical Society Newsletter*, Fall, 2018.

Foster, J. G. & Co. *Foster's London and Middlesex County Directory 1896-97.* Toronto: J. G. Foster & Co., 1896

Goad, Charles E. *Fire Insurance Plan for the City of London Ontario.* Montreal: Charles E. Goad, 1881 (Revised ed. 1888, 1907, 1915, 1922)

Middlesex County (33) Land Registry Office (MCLRO). *Book 2. Abstract Index Up 2 1866; LOT 23 Concession 4 to Concession 9; Concession A and B*

Middlesex County (33) Land Registry Office (MCLRO). *Book 38. Chester Street; Plan 259, 312, 313, 443, 456, 474*

Middlesex County (33) Land Registry Office (MCLRO). *PT LT 4, PL 312(4TH), as in 676510, London*

Page, H. R. & Co. *Illustrated Historical Atlas of the County of Middlesex, Ont.* Toronto: H. R. Page & Co., 1878

Tremaine, Geo. R. & G. M. *Tremaine's Map of the County of Middlesex, Canada West.* Toronto: Geo. R. & G. M. Tremaine, 1862

Provincial Standards and Resources:

Ontario Heritage Tool Kit

<http://www.culture.gov.on.ca/english/heritage/Toolkit/toolkit.ht>

Ontario Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport: Heritage Conservation Principle's for Land Use Planning

http://www.culture.gov.on.ca/english/heritage/info_sheets/info_sheet_landuse_planning.htm

Ontario Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport: Eight Guiding Principles in the Conservation of Historic Properties

http://www.culture.gov.on.ca/english/heritage/info_sheets/info_sheet_8principles.htm
Ontario Heritage Act (2006)

Reference Guide on Physical and Cultural Heritage Resources (1996)

Guidelines for Preparing the Cultural Heritage Resource Component of Environmental Assessments (1992)

Guidelines on the Man-Made Heritage Component of Environmental Assessments (1981)

Environmental Guide for Built Heritage and Cultural Heritage Landscapes (2007)

National and International Standards and Resources:

Canadian Register of Historic Places
http://www.historicplaces.ca/visit-visite/rep-reg_e.aspx

Parks Canada Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada
http://www.pc.gc.ca/docs/pc/guide/nldclpc-sgchpc/index_E.asp

Parks Canada National Historic Sites of Canada
http://www.pc.gc.ca/progs/lhn-nhs/index_e.asp

City of London

Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report 126 Wellington Road, London, Ontario

Prepared by:

AECOM

410 – 250 York Street, Citi Plaza
London, ON, Canada N6A 6K2
www.aecom.com

519 673 0510 tel
519 673 5975 fax

Statement of Qualifications and Limitations

The attached Report (the “Report”) has been prepared by AECOM Canada Ltd. (“AECOM”) for the benefit of the Client (“Client”) in accordance with the agreement between AECOM and Client, including the scope of work detailed therein (the “Agreement”).

The information, data, recommendations and conclusions contained in the Report (collectively, the “Information”):

- is subject to the scope, schedule, and other constraints and limitations in the Agreement and the qualifications contained in the Report (the “Limitations”);
- represents AECOM's professional judgement in light of the Limitations and industry standards for the preparation of similar reports;
- may be based on information provided to AECOM which has not been independently verified;
- has not been updated since the date of issuance of the Report and its accuracy is limited to the time period and circumstances in which it was collected, processed, made or issued;
- must be read as a whole and sections thereof should not be read out of such context;
- was prepared for the specific purposes described in the Report and the Agreement; and
- in the case of subsurface, environmental or geotechnical conditions, may be based on limited testing and on the assumption that such conditions are uniform and not variable either geographically or over time.

AECOM shall be entitled to rely upon the accuracy and completeness of information that was provided to it and has no obligation to update such information. AECOM accepts no responsibility for any events or circumstances that may have occurred since the date on which the Report was prepared and, in the case of subsurface, environmental or geotechnical conditions, is not responsible for any variability in such conditions, geographically or over time.

AECOM agrees that the Report represents its professional judgement as described above and that the Information has been prepared for the specific purpose and use described in the Report and the Agreement, but AECOM makes no other representations, or any guarantees or warranties whatsoever, whether express or implied, with respect to the Report, the Information or any part thereof.

Without in any way limiting the generality of the foregoing, any estimates or opinions regarding probable construction costs or construction schedule provided by AECOM represent AECOM's professional judgement in light of its experience and the knowledge and information available to it at the time of preparation. Since AECOM has no control over market or economic conditions, prices for construction labour, equipment or materials or bidding procedures, AECOM, its directors, officers and employees are not able to, nor do they, make any representations, warranties or guarantees whatsoever, whether express or implied, with respect to such estimates or opinions, or their variance from actual construction costs or schedules, and accept no responsibility for any loss or damage arising therefrom or in any way related thereto. Persons relying on such estimates or opinions do so at their own risk.

Except (1) as agreed to in writing by AECOM and Client; (2) as required by-law; or (3) to the extent used by governmental reviewing agencies for the purpose of obtaining permits or approvals, the Report and the Information may be used and relied upon only by Client.

AECOM accepts no responsibility, and denies any liability whatsoever, to parties other than Client who may obtain access to the Report or the Information for any injury, loss or damage suffered by such parties arising from their use of, reliance upon, or decisions or actions based on the Report or any of the Information (“improper use of the Report”), except to the extent those parties have obtained the prior written consent of AECOM to use and rely upon the Report and the Information. Any injury, loss or damages arising from improper use of the Report shall be borne by the party making such use.

This Statement of Qualifications and Limitations is attached to and forms part of the Report and any use of the Report is subject to the terms hereof.

AECOM: 2015-04-13
© 2009-2015 AECOM Canada Ltd. All Rights Reserved.

Signatures

Report Prepared By:

DRAFT

Michael Greguol, M.A.
Cultural Heritage Specialist

DRAFT

Liam Smythe, B.URPI
Heritage Researcher

Report Reviewed By:

DRAFT

Tatum Taylor, M.Sc., CAHP
Cultural Heritage Specialist

Distribution List

# Hard Copies	PDF Required	Association / Company Name

Revision History

Revision #	Date	Revised By:	Revision Description
0	Nov 16, 2018	M. Greguol, L. Smythe	Draft Report to the City of London
1	Nov. 21, 2018	M. Greguol, L. Smythe	Revised Draft Report to City of London and LACH Stewardship Sub-Committee

Executive Summary

AECOM Canada Ltd. (AECOM) was retained by the City of London to complete a Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report (CHER) as part of the Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP) for the proposed London Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) system to determine the cultural heritage value of the property at 126 Wellington Road. The BRT system is comprised of four segments, combined into two operation routes: the north/east corridor and the south/west corridor. The BRT network was approved by City of London Council through the Rapid Transit Master Plan in July 2017.

The property located at 126 Wellington Road was identified in the City of London Cultural Heritage Screening Report (CHSR) (October 2018) as being a directly impacted, heritage listed property. The CHSR was completed as part of the TPAP for the London Bus Rapid Transit project. The TPAP is regulated by the Environmental Assessment Act (EAA) under Ontario Regulation 231/08: Transit Projects and Metrolinx Undertakings (O.Reg. 231/08). This CHER forms part of the Environmental Project Report (EPR) completed under the TPAP.

The subject building is a two-storey brick/concrete block commercial building constructed circa 1952. Based on the background historical research, field review, comparative analysis, description of integrity, and application of Ontario Regulation 9/06 criteria, the property was not determined to have significant cultural heritage value or interest.

The completion of the CHER has resulted in the following recommendation:

The property at 126 Wellington Road was determined not to have significant cultural heritage value or interest. The completion of the CHER has resulted in the following recommendation:

- The property at 126 Wellington Road was determined not to have significant cultural heritage value or interest. Subsequently, no additional cultural heritage work is recommended for the property.

Table of Contents

	page
1. Introduction	1
1.1 Development Context	1
2. Legislation and Policy Context	2
2.1 Provincial and Municipal Context and Policies	2
2.1.1 Provincial Policy Context	2
2.1.2 Ontario Regulation 9/06.....	2
2.1.3 Municipal Policies	3
2.2 Methodology	3
2.3 Consultation.....	3
3. Historical Context	5
3.1 Local Context and Settlement History	5
3.1.1 Westminster Township	5
3.1.2 London South.....	5
3.1.3 Wellington Road.....	5
3.2 Land Use History	6
3.2.1 1810-1850.....	6
3.2.2 1850-1949.....	6
3.2.3 1949-Present.....	7
4. Existing Conditions	8
4.1 Landscape Context.....	8
4.2 Architectural Description	8
4.2.1 West (Front) Elevation.....	8
4.2.2 North Elevation.....	8
4.2.3 South Elevation	8
4.2.4 East (Rear) Elevation	9
4.3 Comparative Analysis	9
4.4 Discussion of Integrity.....	11
5. Heritage Evaluation	12
5.1 Ontario Regulation 9/06.....	12
6. Conclusions	14
7. Recommendations	15
8. Images	16
9. Historic Photos and Mapping	19
10. Bibliography and Sources.....	30

List of Figures

Figure 1: Project Location	20
Figure 2: Project Location in Detail	21
Figure 3: Project Location, 1862	22
Figure 4: Project Location, 1878	23
Figure 5: Project Location, 1913	24
Figure 6: Project Location, 1929	25
Figure 7: Project Location, 1948	26
Figure 8: Project Location, 1922	27
Figure 9: Project Location, 1951	28
Figure 10: Project Location, 1972	29

List of Tables

Table 1: Comparative analysis of properties with building/structures of similar age, style, and/or typology	10
---	----

1. Introduction

1.1 Development Context

AECOM Canada Ltd. (AECOM) was retained by the City of London to complete a Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report (CHER) as part of the Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP) for the proposed London Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) system to determine the cultural heritage value of the property at 126 Wellington Road. The BRT system is comprised of four segments, combined into two operation routes: the north/east corridor and the south/west corridor. The BRT network was approved by City of London Council through the Rapid Transit Master Plan in July 2017.

The property located at 126 Wellington Road was identified in the City of London Cultural Heritage Screening Report (CHSR) (October 2018) as being a directly impacted, heritage listed property. The CHSR was completed as part of the TPAP for the London Bus Rapid Transit project. The TPAP is regulated by the Environmental Assessment Act (EAA) under Ontario Regulation 231/08: Transit Projects and Metrolinx Undertakings (O.Reg. 231/08). This CHER forms part of the Environmental Project Report (EPR) completed under the TPAP.

2. Legislation and Policy Context

2.1 Provincial and Municipal Context and Policies

2.1.1 Provincial Policy Context

The Ministry of Tourism, Culture, and Sport (MTCS) is charged under Section 2 of the *Ontario Heritage Act* with the responsibility to determine policies, priorities and programs for the conservation, protection and preservation of the cultural heritage of Ontario and has published guidelines to assist in assessing cultural heritage resources as part of environmental assessment. The following have informed the preparation of this CHER:

- Guidelines for Preparing the Cultural Heritage Resource Component of Environmental Assessments (1992);
- Guidelines on the Man-Made Heritage Component of Environmental Assessments (1981);
- MTCS Standards and Guidelines for Conservation of Provincial Heritage Properties (2010);
- Environmental Guide for Built Heritage and Cultural Heritage Landscapes (2007); and
- The Ontario Heritage Toolkit (2006).

An Environmental Assessment is required for all large-scale projects that have potential impacts on the environment. These projects require approval from the Government of Ontario. Certain projects, such as transit projects, have more predictable environmental impacts or effects, and can be readily managed. This streamlined approach protects the environment, but shortens the timeline to six month for commencement, review and approval. This Environmental Assessment process for transit projects is known as the Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP).

TPAP provides a framework for focused consultation and objection processes. Through TPAP, the Minister of the Environment may initiate a Time Out period if there is a potential for a negative impact on a matter of provincial importance that relates to the natural environment or has cultural heritage value or interest, or on a constitutionally protected Aboriginal or treaty right (TPAP Guide to Environmental Assessment Requirements for Transit Projects, 2014).

Additionally, the *Planning Act* (1990) and related *Provincial Policy Statement* (PPS) (2014) provide guidance for the assessment and evaluation of potential cultural heritage resources. Subsection 2.6 of the PPS, Cultural Heritage and Archaeological Resources, states that:

2.6.1 Significant built heritage resources and significant cultural heritage landscapes shall be conserved.

Criteria for determining significance for the resources are mandated by the Province in Ontario Regulation 9/06.

2.1.2 Ontario Regulation 9/06

Ontario Regulation 9/06 provides the Criteria for Determining Cultural Heritage Value or Interest under the *Ontario Heritage Act*. This regulation was created to ensure a consistent approach to the designation of heritage properties under the *Ontario Heritage Act*. All designations under the *Ontario Heritage Act* after 2006 must meet at least one of the criteria outlined in the regulation.

A property may be designated under Section 29 of the *Ontario Heritage Act* if it meets one or more of the following criteria for determining whether the property is of cultural heritage value or interest:

1. The property has design value or physical value because it,
 - i. is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, expression, material or construction method;
 - ii. displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit;
 - iii. demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement.
2. The property has historical value or associative value because it,
 - i. has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization, or institution that is significant to a community,
 - ii. yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of a community or culture;
 - iii. demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer or theorist who is significant to a community.
3. The property has contextual value because it,
 - i. is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an area;
 - ii. is physically, functionally, visually, or historically linked to its surroundings;
 - iii. is a landmark.

2.1.3 Municipal Policies

The London Plan is the City of London's new Official Plan which was consolidated on August 27, 2018. *The London Plan* focuses on three areas of cultural heritage planning, including: general policies for the protection and enhancement of cultural heritage resources; specific policies related to the identification of cultural heritage resources, including individual cultural heritage resources, heritage conservation districts, cultural heritage landscapes, and archaeological resources; and specific policies related to the protection and conservation of these cultural heritage resources. The criteria outlined in *The London Plan* for the identification and designation of individual properties of cultural heritage value or interest reflect the criteria defined in O.Reg. 9/06.

2.2 Methodology

A CHER examines a property as a whole, its relationship to its surroundings, as well as its individual elements—engineering works, landscape, etc. The recommendations of the CHER are based on an understanding of the physical values of the property, a documentation of its history through research, and an analysis of its social context, comparisons with similar properties, and mapping.

This CHER is guided and informed by the key documents listed in 2.1.1. The following report has been prepared utilizing the Terms of Reference prepared for the London BRT TPAP process, which have been received by the London Advisory Committee on Heritage (LACH) (See Section 11).

2.3 Consultation

Consultation for the London BRT project has been conducted with the LACH. A draft CHSR (dated February 6, 2018) was provided for their review and comment. The LACH Stewardship Sub-Committee recommended that 104 properties which were identified by the draft CHSR to have potential cultural heritage value or interest, do not require further examination for consideration as having cultural heritage value or interest (CHVI). The LACH also recommended that an additional 30 properties, not identified by the draft CHSR, be evaluated for their potential cultural heritage value. Further, the remaining properties flagged by the draft CHSR requiring further cultural

heritage work were added to the Register (*Inventory of Heritage Resources*) pursuant to Section 27 of the *Ontario Heritage Act* by resolution of Municipal Council on March 27, 2018.

The draft CHSR was also provided to the MTCS for review, and comments were received in July 2018. In response to MTCS comments, the CHSR was revised to include additional information on impacted properties, and a preliminary impact assessment. The CHSR identified properties with direct impacts that cannot be mitigated through design, and recommended that these properties be addressed through completion of CHERs prior to completion of the TPAP, including the property at 126 Wellington Road. Ongoing communications with MTCS have continued as part of the TPAP.

The revised CHSR (October 8, 2018) was provided to the LACH on October 10, 2018. The Draft Terms of Reference for CHERs was also received and referred to the LACH Stewardship Sub-Committee for review. This CHER will be submitted and reviewed by the LACH Stewardship Sub-Committee for their November 28, 2018 meeting.

3. Historical Context

3.1 Local Context and Settlement History

3.1.1 Westminster Township

Prior to European settlement, the area that would eventually become Westminster Township was settled by members of the Chippewa First Nation. One of the largest townships in Middlesex County, the first survey of Westminster Township was completed in 1809-10 by Deputy Provincial Surveyor Simon T. Z. Watson. The remainder of the township was surveyed by Colonel Mahlon Burwell and Colonel Bostwick in 1820. Unlike other townships in Upper Canada, lots were not parceled out to government “favorites” or speculators before 1817; the earliest settlers were farmers, many of whom arrived by way of the United States. By 1817, the township was home to 428 people and the price of land had quadrupled since tracts were first made available. By 1850, the township had a population of 4,525.¹

3.1.2 London South

Originally part of Westminster Township, South London was originally settled in the 1810s. For most of the nineteenth century, the area was home to a number of wealthy Londoners, who constructed large country mansions away from the increasingly congested city. South London remained predominantly rural until the 1880s, but was connected to the City of London by a series of bridges over the Thames. By the 1890s, the population of the area had increased to the point where annexation was considered. Eager to reap the benefits of electric street lighting, safe drinking water, sidewalks and the city’s education system, this section of the township became part of the City of London on May 1st, 1890. Bounded by Wellington Road, Wharnccliffe Road, Emery Street and the Thames River, the new suburb was designated as Ward 6. The building boom of the 1880s and 1890s was concentrated largely to the western side of the ward; parcels of land along Wellington Road were still held by wealthy families such as the McClary and Mackenzie families until the end of the century. Grand Avenue – formerly Hamilton Road prior to 1890 – is so named for the large estates that once fronted on it.²

3.1.3 Wellington Road

Running north to south from Huron Street to the City of St. Thomas with brief interruptions by the Grand Trunk Railway (now Canadian Pacific Railway) line, Wellington Road was named for Arthur Wellesley, 1st Duke of Wellington. A major figure in British military history, Wellington was famous for his victory over Napoleon at the Battle of Waterloo in 1815. From 1818 to 1827, he served Master General of the Ordnance, commanding military officers and artillery in Upper Canada.³ The road was cut through Westminster Township by W. L. Odell, who also assisted in the construction of an iron bridge to carry Wellington Road across the Thames River.⁴

Within London, Wellington Road is identified by various official names, at varying points within the City. Between Huron Street and the Thames River, the road runs relatively parallel with Richmond Street and is identified in this

¹ *A History of the County of Middlesex, Canada*. Toronto: W. A. & C. L. Goodspeed, 1889. p. 566-568

² The Architectural Conservancy of Ontario. *Tecumseh Trek; ACO’s 38th Annual Geranium Heritage House Tour*. London, Ontario: ACO, June 5, 2011.

³ *Michael Baker & Hilary Bates Neary. London Street Names*. Toronto: James Lormier & Company Ltd., 2003. p. 100

⁴ *A History of the County of Middlesex, Op Cit*. p.570

section as Wellington Street. South of the Thames River, the road changes names to Wellington Road, and is identified as such between the River and the road's intersection with Exeter Road, just north of Highway 401. Lastly, the road is identified as Wellington Road South southwards from Exeter Road to south of the municipal city limits.

3.2 Land Use History

3.2.1 1810-1850

The subject property is located on a portion of Lot 25, Broken Front Concession, or Concession "B" in the former Westminster Township. Located on the west side of Wellington Road, Lot 25 was vacant for many years following its original survey. In 1839, Albert Scriver Odell received 69 ½ acres in the north part of the lot from the Crown. The southern part of the lot was deeded to Edward Matthews in 1850. Odell already owned Lot 24 immediately to the east, having purchased it from James Lester in 1822. The Odell family was one of the earliest families to settle in Westminster Township. Albert was the first of his family to arrive in the Township in 1810, settling on Lot 24 Concession I, along Commissioner's Road near the present Victoria Hospital⁵ One of ten children, Albert was born in 1787 to John Odell and Enor Schriver. The Odell family had originally settled in Dutchess County, New York and were of Dutch origin. John left New York following the American Revolution, and relocated near Montreal. All of John and Enor's children would eventually settle in Westminster Township, with the exception of their son Loop, who died in Lower Canada. The first records of the Westminster Council, dated March 4th 1817 identify Albert S. Odell and Robert Frank as "overseers of highways".⁶ Albert Odell did not reside on this property however; the 1854 assessment roll lists him as living on Lot 26, Concession I, former Westminster Township.⁷ Albert and his wife, Charlotte Percival, did not have children. Charlotte predeceased Albert sometime prior to 1852; Albert himself passed away in 1856.⁸

3.2.2 1850-1949

All portions of the original Lot 25 were sold off and subdivided through the 1850s and 1860s. While the 1862 Tremaine map of the township does not provide details of the property, the 1878 atlas shows the property as being subdivided into as many as thirteen parcels. The portions of Lots 24 and 25 fronting on the Thames River are both listed to landowner G.B.R Frank. The northern portion of the lot was originally dominated by a large meander in the river. Aerial photography suggests that this section of the river was realigned and the meander filled in by 1922, although its former location is still evident today as a small oxbow in Watson Street Park.

In 1873, a plan of "Villa Lots" was prepared by Samuel Peters and registered as Plan 312 (4th) in June of that year. Prepared for Lieutenant Colonel John B. Taylor, the plan divided a portion of Taylor's property on the original Lot 25 into seven smaller lots for residential development. In the drawing submitted to the County, Wellington Road is identified as a "gravel road to Wellington Bridge", and Weston Street is also identified. Land registry records indicate that Colonel Taylor sold the lots to Daniel Torrance in August 1873. Lot 4, Plan 312 (4th) on the northeast corner of Wellington Road and Weston Street is where 122 Wellington Road currently sits.

The abstract index for the Lot 4 (Plan 312) indicates that the lot on which 126 Wellington Road sits was first subdivided and sold by John H. Taylor to David Torrance in 1873. The lot quickly passed through several owners

⁵ *A History of the County of Middlesex, Op Cit.* p.568

⁶ *A History of the County of Middlesex, Op Cit.* p.948

⁷ *Index to the 1854 Assessment Roll, Westminster Township, Middlesex County, Canada West.*
<https://londonmiddlesex.ogs.on.ca/docs/membpubs/assessment/1854-Westminster-Twp.pdf>. (Accessed November 2018).

⁸ Dan Brock "All in the Family: An Account of Some Members of the Odell Family". *London & Middlesex County Historical Society Newsletter*, Fall, 2018.

before the majority of it was purchased by the City of London for the “construction of a public highway” in 1913, presumably a widening of Wellington Road.⁹

Fire insurance plans indicate that the north portion of the original Lot 25 had been developed as a residential community by the turn of the twentieth century. A number of small brick and frame houses were present along Wellington Road and its side streets. The London City Directory of 1897 identifies thirty-eight people living along Wellington Road between the Thames River and what was then the city limits, just south of Marybora Place (presently McClary Avenue). Many of these small residential streets extending off of Wellington Road have since been renamed. For example on the 1922 Fire Insurance plan, Grand Avenue is identified as Clarke Street east of Wellington Road. It was not determined why these streets were renamed; however a review of later city directories indicated that all of the respective streets had assumed their present names by 1948.

3.2.3 1949-Present

Although subdivided as early as 1873, City Directories and aerial photography indicate that Lot 4, Plan 13 remained vacant until after the Second World War. In 1949 Hugh Cheung purchased the property from the City of London¹⁰ and by 1952, constructed the existing building at 124-126 Wellington Road. The original tenants of the building were “Huey” Cheung and his restaurant named Huey’s Coffee Bar at 126, as well as Kirby Distributors, a manufacturer of vacuum cleaners at 124. By 1955, Kirby Distributors had been replaced by Alfred’s House of Beauty, and a tenant named Mrs. E. Davidson was also identified. As with many two-storey commercial buildings, the ground floor would typically have been leased to retail tenants with residential units above. A barber shop operated in the building from 1956 through the 1970s. In 1963, Cheung and his restaurant moved next door to a new building at 122 Wellington Road. The building at 126 Wellington was later home to a number of commercial tenants, and is currently occupied by a+LiNK Architecture (formerly SJMA Architects), who extensively modified the building’s exterior facades in 2015.

⁹ Middlesex County (33) Land Registry Office (MCLRO). *Book 38. Chester Street; Plan 259, 312, 313, 443, 456, 474*

¹⁰ MCLRO *Book 38*. Op Cit.

4. Existing Conditions

4.1 Landscape Context

The property at 126 Wellington Road is located on the east side of Wellington Road between Weston Street and Watson Street. Through the area, Wellington Road follows a roughly north-south orientation and is a four-lane arterial road. Weston and Watson Streets are both two-lane residential streets that dead-end just east of Wellington Road. Sidewalks are present on both sides of all streets. No trees are present along Wellington Road; however residential properties on the side streets have large mature trees. The area is a mixture of commercial retail and residential uses, with mostly retail and restaurant uses fronting onto Wellington Road; some of which have been converted from residential buildings. A small commercial shopping plaza with a parking lot is located on the east side of Wellington Road, with a stand-alone Liquor Control Board of Ontario store on the west side of the street.

4.2 Architectural Description

The building located at 126 Wellington Road is a two-storey, rectangular plan commercial building with a flat roof. The ground floor was divided into two commercial units, with large display windows and doors trimmed with aluminium. Prior to its renovation, the building had a second story awning, supported by steel columns and finished with shingles (**Image 7**). This was likely a later addition and not original to the building. In 2015, a+LiNK architects extensively renovated the building's façade.

4.2.1 West (Front) Elevation

The west elevation of the building (**Image 2**) faces onto Wellington Road. Four windows are present on the second storey. Symmetrically arranged, the outermost are single-pane casement windows with fixed sidelights; centre windows are smaller and appear to be a single fixed pane of glass, respectively. A flat awning of wood and unpainted metal extends from ground level, along the top of the ground floor windows, and wraps around to the south side. Windows on the ground floor are large and are situated towards the southern end of the façade (**Image 3**). A spandrel glass panel on the southern corner has the address number below the awning. The most defining feature of the building's exterior is the bright yellow and green exterior cladding panels (**Image 4**) that was added to the building in 2015. The cladding appears to be a composite material that is organized or applied in panels to form rectangular segments with a block building-like appearance. The cladding has dramatically altered the overall appearance of this elevation and creates a design that stands out along this portion of Wellington Road.

4.2.2 North Elevation

The north elevation of the building is obscured by the neighbouring building at 126 Wellington Road. It is a two-storey façade clad in horizontal vinyl corrugated metal siding. Two windows are present on the second storey.

4.2.3 South Elevation

The south elevation of the building (**Image 5**) faces onto Weston Street and includes the main entrance. It is a two-storey façade, clad in green and yellow composite panels in a rectangular pattern. Three windows are present on the second storey; each is a single-pane casement-style window with a fixed sidelight framed with what appears to be grey aluminium. On the west half of this façade, there is a single glass entrance door with large sidelights and

an awning of wood and unpainted metal that wraps around to the west façade. This is the main entrance door to the ground floor unit. A second single door is present on the eastern half of the façade, with a smaller awning similar to that of the main entrance. Both doors are accessed by sets of three stairs with metal handrails. At ground level is a landscaped flower bed constructed of stone blocks.

4.2.4 East (Rear) Elevation

The east elevation (**Image 6**) is a two-storey façade facing onto a paved parking area at the rear of the building. The façade is clad in panels, with the exception of the southern corner, where the green and yellow cladding wraps around from the south façade. Four windows are present on the second storey; all are two-pane sash-type windows with brightly painted sills and surrounds. There is a single window on the first storey as well as a small basement window in the exposed concrete foundation. A covered entranceway with a single panel door extends out from the east façade, serving as an entrance to the second storey units.

4.3 Comparative Analysis

A comparative analysis was undertaken to establish a baseline understanding of similar cultural heritage designated properties in the City of London, and to determine if the property “is a rare, unique, representative, or early examples of a style, type, expression, material or construction method” as described in O.Reg. 9/06.

Comparative examples were drawn from listed properties within the City of London, as well as similar examples of architecture identified as two-storey commercial or mixed-use buildings within the City, not all of which are listed.





Six comparable properties with and without identified cultural heritage value were identified. However, this sample does not represent all available properties, and is rather intended to be a representative selection (**Table 1**). Various similar or comparable properties are located throughout the City, however, these six were identified to provide similar examples for the purposes of this report. The following observations were noted in analyzing the comparable properties.

Of these examples:

- Six include buildings that were originally designed to be two-storey commercial buildings;
- Five include various alterations to the exterior materials and appearance of the building;
- Five include large picture windows at the ground level;
- Five appear to still function as commercial uses;
- Six have flat roofs;
- Six are clad with exterior brick;
- Three are clad with artificial stone;
- One is clad with exterior siding.

The comparative analysis suggests that the subject property is a relatively common example of the two-storey commercial buildings that are located along many major roads within the City of London. It is typical in size, scale, form, and materials and has been significantly altered over the last several decades. As a result, from a comparative perspective, the property does not appear to be a rare, unique, representative, or example of a style, type, expression, material, or construction method. The existing exterior of the building located at 126 Wellington Road is certainly a dramatic, and unusual exterior application applied in 2015. The exterior of the building is unique in its appearance, however, it is not a rare or unique in a manner that expresses cultural heritage value.

Table 1: Comparative analysis of properties with building/structures of similar age, style, and/or typology

Address	Recognition	Picture	Age	Material	Style
116 Wharncliffe Road South	None		TBD	Brick – brown/beige	Two-storey commercial building, storefront windows at ground level, and projected awnings over window and door entrances, flat roof.
120 Wellington Road	Listed		TBD	Brick - brown/yellow, Artificial stone	Two-storey commercial building, storefront windows at ground level, projected awnings over window and door entrances, flat roof.
193-199 Wellington Street	Listed		c.1880	Brick – yellow/beige	Two-storey commercial buildings with storefront windows at ground level, flat roof.
221 Wharncliffe Road South	None		TBD	Brick – white, Aluminum siding	Two-storey commercial buildings with, large storefront windows at ground level, and projected awnings, flat

					roof.
246 Wharncliffe Road South	None		TBD	Brick – grey/beige/red, Artificial stone	Two storey former commercial building, ground floor window has been altered to accommodate current residential use, flat roof.
744 & 746 Richmond Street	Listed		TBD	Brick – red, Artificial stone	Two-storey commercial building with large picture windows at ground floor, modern artificial stone exterior appears to be a recent alteration, flat roof.

4.4 Discussion of Integrity

According to the Ontario Heritage Toolkit, Heritage Property Evaluation (MTCS 2006), “Integrity is a question of whether the surviving physical features (heritage attributes) continue to represent or support the cultural heritage value or interest of the property.” The following discussion of integrity was prepared to consider the ability of the property to represent and retain its cultural heritage value over time. It does not consider the structural integrity of the building. Access to the interior of the building was not available, and observations have been made from the public right-of-way. Structural integrity, should it be identified as a concern, should be determined by way of a qualified heritage engineer, building scientist, or architect.

The subject property contains a two-storey commercial building constructed of concrete blocks, with a flat asphalt roof. The building has been extensively modified since its construction in the 1950s. As constructed, the street façade was clad with yellow brick, and the remaining facades of exposed concrete block. Original second-storey windows were likely double hung with aluminium frames similar to other commercial buildings of the period. Based on information in City Directories, the ground floor would have been divided into at least two storefronts; each would have had a large display window and single entrance door. In 2015, the building was heavily modified. An awning of wood and unpainted metal was added over the southwest corner of the building, and over a small entrance door on the south side. The second storey window arrangement appears to remain original, although all windows have been replaced with modern vinyl frames. The south and west facades of the building were clad with a composite material in a bright green and yellow brick pattern. The east façade has been clad in brown vinyl siding with brightly painted window surrounds. As such, the building retains little integrity of its original character.

5. Heritage Evaluation

5.1 Ontario Regulation 9/06

Criteria	Meets Criteria (Yes/No)	Rationale
1) The property has <i>design or physical value</i> because it:		
i) Is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, or expression, material, or construction method.	No	The building at 126 Wellington Road is a simple two-storey commercial building similar to many others of the period. It has been extensively renovated and subsequently retains little of its original built character. Therefore, it does not meet this criterion.
ii) Displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit.	No	The building is a simple commercial building similar to many others. The cladding on the south and west facades is distinctive and consideration has been given to the overall appearance and aesthetics of the exterior elevations. However, this application is a recent addition and does not display a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit that exhibits cultural heritage value.
iii) Demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement.	No	The building does not demonstrate an unusual degree of technical or scientific achievement. It is very similar to many other storefront commercial buildings of the era.
2) The property has <i>historic or associative value</i> because it:		
i) Has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organisation, or institution that is significant to a community.	No	There is no information that suggests Hugh Cheung, Huey's Coffee Bar, or any of the building's other tenants were of particular significance to the community.
ii) Yields, or has the potential to yield information that contributes to the understanding of a community or culture.	No	The building does not yield any information towards understanding the community or its culture.
iii) Demonstrates or reflects	No	Although the building and its

<p>the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer or theorist who is significant to the community.</p>	<p>neighbour was constructed under the ownership of Hugh Cheung, no evidence was found the he, or any previous landowners were of particular significance to the community. Further, it was determined if Cheung hired an artist, builder, designer or theorists, who is significant to the community.</p>
<p>3) The property has contextual value because it:</p>	
<p>i) Is important in defining, maintaining, or supporting the character of an area</p>	<p>No Although this commercial building is located in a mixed commercial/residential area, it has been highly altered to a contemporary aesthetic and does not play a role in defining, maintaining, or supporting the character of the area. With regards to its form and massing, the building shares similar qualities to its neighbours at 122 and 120 Wellington Road. However, together the three properties are not significantly important in defining, maintaining, or supporting the character of the area.</p>
<p>ii) Is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings</p>	<p>No As a highly modified commercial building, the property is not physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings. As noted, the building is one of three similar buildings, located in a row, constructed within a close timeframe. However, the three buildings are not physically, functionally, visually, or historically linked to their surroundings in manner that conveys cultural heritage value or interest.</p>
<p>iii) Is a landmark</p>	<p>No Although the recent cladding makes the building distinctive among its neighbours, as well as along Wellington Road, it is not considered to be a landmark.</p>

6. Conclusions

Based on the results of background historical research, field review, and application of the criteria from Ontario Regulation 9/06, the subject property at 126 Wellington Road was not determined to be of significant cultural heritage value or interest. Accordingly, no Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest, or Description of Heritage Attributes has been prepared.

7. Recommendations

The subject building is a two-storey brick/concrete block commercial building constructed circa 1952. Based on the background historical research, field review, comparative analysis, description of integrity, and application of Ontario Regulation 9/06 criteria, the property was not determined to have significant cultural heritage value or interest.

The completion of the CHER has resulted in the following recommendation:

- The property at 126 Wellington Road was determined not to have significant cultural heritage value or interest. Subsequently, no additional cultural heritage work is recommended for the property.

8. Images



Image 1: Looking north on Wellington Road from west side of the road, showing properties at 118-126. The building at 126 Wellington Road is the green and yellow clad building on the northeast corner of Wellington Road and Weston Street. (AECOM, 2018)



Image 2: 126 Wellington Road showing west and south elevations. (AECOM, 2018)



Image 3: Detail of ground floor glazing. (AECOM, 2018)



Image 4: Detail of green and yellow cladding added in 2015. (AECOM, 2018)




Image 5: South elevation. (AECOM, 2018)




Image 6: South and east (rear) elevations of 126 Wellington Road, showing parking area and rear of 122 Wellington Road at right (AECOM, 2018).

9. Historic Photos and Mapping




Image 7: View of building located at 126 Wellington Road, as shown from online street imagery showing exterior elevations and details prior to 2015 exterior alterations (2011)




Legend

Project Location




Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report 126 Wellington Road London, Ontario			
Location of Project Location			
November 2018	1:25,000	Datum: NAD 83 UTM17 Source: http://wms.ess-ws.nrcan.gc.ca/wms/toporama_en	
PH: 60590467	V#:		
AECOM		Figure 1	
This drawing has been prepared for the use of AECOM's client and may not be used, reproduced or relied upon by third parties, except as agreed by AECOM and its client, as required by law or for use by governmental reviewing agencies. AECOM accepts no responsibility, and denies any liability whatsoever, to any party that modifies this drawing without AECOM's express written consent.			


Map Source: http://wms.ess-ws.nrcan.gc.ca/wms/toporama_en (1:25,000 scale). Date: 11/2018



Legend

 Project Location



Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report		
126 Wellington Road London, Ontario		
Project Location, 1862		
November 2018	1:15,000	Datum: NAD 83 UTM17 Source: Tremaine's Map 1862
P#: 60590467	V#:	
AECOM		Figure 3
 <p>0 175 350 700 Metres</p>		
<p><small>This drawing has been prepared for the use of AECOM's client and may not be used, reproduced or relied upon by third parties, except as agreed by AECOM and its client, as required by law or for use by governmental reviewing agencies. AECOM accepts no responsibility, and denies any liability whatsoever, to any party that modifies this drawing without AECOM's express written consent.</small></p>		


Map Source: "London (Ontario) 1862" from the "London and Middlesex County Archives" (https://www.london.ca/heritage/heritage-research/heritage-research-projects/heritage-research-projects/1862-map)



Legend

 Project Location



Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report		126 Wellington Road London, Ontario	
Project Location, 1878			
November 2018	1:20,000	Datum: NAD 83 UTM17 Source: Illustrated Historic Atlas of Middlesex County, Toronto: H.R. Page & Co.	
P#: 60590467	V#:		
AECOM		Figure 4	
			
<small>This drawing has been prepared for the use of AECOM's client and may not be used, reproduced or relied upon by third parties, except as agreed by AECOM and its client, as required by law or for use by governmental reviewing agencies. AECOM accepts no responsibility, and denies any liability whatsoever, to any party that modifies this drawing without AECOM's express written consent.</small>			

Map Source: "Illustrated Historic Atlas of Middlesex County, Toronto: H.R. Page & Co." (1878). Digitized by the University of Toronto. Project Location: 126 Wellington Road, London, Ontario. Date: 2018.



Legend

 Project Location



Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report
126 Wellington Road
London, Ontario

Project Location, 1951

November
2018

1:2,000


Datum: NAD 83 UTM17
Source: LIO 2017, City of
London - 1951-04-27 Line 9,
Photo 81

PH: 60590467

V#:

AECOM

Figure 9



This drawing has been prepared for the use of AECOM's client and may not be used, reproduced or relied upon by third parties, except as agreed by AECOM and its client, as required by law or for use by governmental reviewing agencies. AECOM accepts no responsibility, and denies any liability whatsoever, to any party that modifies this drawing without AECOM's express written consent.

Map Source: "LIONEL" (1951-04-27 Line 9, Photo 81) - 1951-04-27 Line 9, Photo 81. Source: LIO 2017, City of London - 1951-04-27 Line 9, Photo 81. Source: LIO 2017, City of London - 1951-04-27 Line 9, Photo 81. Source: LIO 2017, City of London - 1951-04-27 Line 9, Photo 81.



Legend

Project Location



Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report 126 Wellington Road London, Ontario		
Project Location, 1972		
November 2018 P#: 60590467	1:2,000 V#:	Datum: NAD 83 UTM17 Source: LIO 2017, City of London -1972 Line 6 Photo 130
		Figure 10
<small>This drawing has been prepared for the use of AECOM's client and may not be used, reproduced or relied upon by third parties, except as agreed by AECOM and its client, as required by law or for use by governmental reviewing agencies. AECOM accepts no responsibility, and denies any liability whatsoever, to any party that modifies this drawing without AECOM's express written consent.</small>		

Map Source: 'LION 2017' LIO 2017, City of London -1972 Line 6 Photo 130. Aerial Photo: 'LION 2017' LIO 2017, City of London -1972 Line 6 Photo 130. Photo: 'LION 2017' LIO 2017, City of London -1972 Line 6 Photo 130.

10. Bibliography and Sources

A History of the County of Middlesex, Canada. Toronto: W. A. & C. L. Goodspeed, 1889.

Index to the 1854 Assessment Roll, Westminster Township, Middlesex County, Canada West, 1854.
<https://londonmiddlesex.ogs.on.ca/docs/membpubs/assessment/1854-Westminster-Twp.pdf>.

Vernon, Henry. *Vernon's City of London (Ontario) Directory.* Hamilton, Ontario: Henry Vernon & Son. (Issues 1922, 1939-78).

The Architectural Conservancy of Ontario. *Tecumseh Trek: ACO's 38th Annual Geranium Heritage House Tour.* London, Ontario: ACO, 5 June 2011.

Baker, Michael & Hilary Bates Neary. *London Street Names.* Toronto: James Lormier & Company Ltd., 2003

Dan Brock "All in the Family: An Account of Some Members of the Odell Family". *London & Middlesex County Historical Society Newsletter*, Fall, 2018.

Foster, J. G. & Co. *Foster's London and Middlesex County Directory 1896-97.* Toronto: J. G. Foster & Co., 1896

Goad, Charles E. *Fire Insurance Plan for the City of London Ontario.* Montreal: Charles E. Goad, 1881 (Revised ed. 1888, 1907, 1915, 1922)

Middlesex County (33) Land Registry Office (MCLRO). *Book 2. Abstract Index Up 2 1866; LOT 23 Concession 4 to Concession 9; Concession A and B*

Middlesex County (33) Land Registry Office (MCLRO). *Book 38. Chester Street; Plan 259, 312, 313, 443, 456, 474*

Middlesex County (33) Land Registry Office (MCLRO). *Parcel Register PT LT 4, PL 312(4TH), as in 676511, London*

Page, H. R. & Co. *Illustrated Historical Atlas of the County of Middlesex, Ont.* Toronto: H. R. Page & Co., 1878

Tremaine, Geo. R. & G. M. *Tremaine's Map of the County of Middlesex, Canada West.* Toronto: Geo. R. & G. M. Tremaine, 1862

Provincial Standards and Resources:

Ontario Heritage Tool Kit

<http://www.culture.gov.on.ca/english/heritage/Toolkit/toolkit.ht>

Ontario Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport: Heritage Conservation Principle's for Land Use Planning

http://www.culture.gov.on.ca/english/heritage/info_sheets/info_sheet_landuse_planning.htm

Ontario Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport: Eight Guiding Principles in the Conservation of Historic Properties

http://www.culture.gov.on.ca/english/heritage/info_sheets/info_sheet_8principles.htm
Ontario Heritage Act (2006)

Reference Guide on Physical and Cultural Heritage Resources (1996)

Guidelines for Preparing the Cultural Heritage Resource Component of Environmental Assessments (1992)

Guidelines on the Man-Made Heritage Component of Environmental Assessments (1981)

Environmental Guide for Built Heritage and Cultural Heritage Landscapes (2007)

National and International Standards and Resources:

Canadian Register of Historic Places
http://www.historicplaces.ca/visit-visite/rep-reg_e.aspx

Parks Canada Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada
http://www.pc.gc.ca/docs/pc/guide/nldclpc-sgchpc/index_E.asp

Parks Canada National Historic Sites of Canada
http://www.pc.gc.ca/progs/lhn-nhs/index_e.asp

City of London

Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report 220 Wellington Road, London, Ontario

Prepared by:

AECOM

410 – 250 York Street, Citi Plaza
London, ON, Canada N6A 6K2
www.aecom.com

519 673 0510 tel
519 673 5975 fax

Statement of Qualifications and Limitations

The attached Report (the “Report”) has been prepared by AECOM Canada Ltd. (“AECOM”) for the benefit of the Client (“Client”) in accordance with the agreement between AECOM and Client, including the scope of work detailed therein (the “Agreement”).

The information, data, recommendations and conclusions contained in the Report (collectively, the “Information”):

- is subject to the scope, schedule, and other constraints and limitations in the Agreement and the qualifications contained in the Report (the “Limitations”);
- represents AECOM's professional judgement in light of the Limitations and industry standards for the preparation of similar reports;
- may be based on information provided to AECOM which has not been independently verified;
- has not been updated since the date of issuance of the Report and its accuracy is limited to the time period and circumstances in which it was collected, processed, made or issued;
- must be read as a whole and sections thereof should not be read out of such context;
- was prepared for the specific purposes described in the Report and the Agreement; and
- in the case of subsurface, environmental or geotechnical conditions, may be based on limited testing and on the assumption that such conditions are uniform and not variable either geographically or over time.

AECOM shall be entitled to rely upon the accuracy and completeness of information that was provided to it and has no obligation to update such information. AECOM accepts no responsibility for any events or circumstances that may have occurred since the date on which the Report was prepared and, in the case of subsurface, environmental or geotechnical conditions, is not responsible for any variability in such conditions, geographically or over time.

AECOM agrees that the Report represents its professional judgement as described above and that the Information has been prepared for the specific purpose and use described in the Report and the Agreement, but AECOM makes no other representations, or any guarantees or warranties whatsoever, whether express or implied, with respect to the Report, the Information or any part thereof.

Without in any way limiting the generality of the foregoing, any estimates or opinions regarding probable construction costs or construction schedule provided by AECOM represent AECOM's professional judgement in light of its experience and the knowledge and information available to it at the time of preparation. Since AECOM has no control over market or economic conditions, prices for construction labour, equipment or materials or bidding procedures, AECOM, its directors, officers and employees are not able to, nor do they, make any representations, warranties or guarantees whatsoever, whether express or implied, with respect to such estimates or opinions, or their variance from actual construction costs or schedules, and accept no responsibility for any loss or damage arising therefrom or in any way related thereto. Persons relying on such estimates or opinions do so at their own risk.

Except (1) as agreed to in writing by AECOM and Client; (2) as required by-law; or (3) to the extent used by governmental reviewing agencies for the purpose of obtaining permits or approvals, the Report and the Information may be used and relied upon only by Client.

AECOM accepts no responsibility, and denies any liability whatsoever, to parties other than Client who may obtain access to the Report or the Information for any injury, loss or damage suffered by such parties arising from their use of, reliance upon, or decisions or actions based on the Report or any of the Information (“improper use of the Report”), except to the extent those parties have obtained the prior written consent of AECOM to use and rely upon the Report and the Information. Any injury, loss or damages arising from improper use of the Report shall be borne by the party making such use.

This Statement of Qualifications and Limitations is attached to and forms part of the Report and any use of the Report is subject to the terms hereof.

AECOM: 2015-04-13
© 2009-2015 AECOM Canada Ltd. All Rights Reserved.

Signatures

Report Prepared By:

DRAFT

Michael Greguol, M.A.
Cultural Heritage Specialist

DRAFT

Liam Smythe, B.URPI
Heritage Researcher

Report Reviewed By:

DRAFT

Tatum Taylor, M.Sc., CAHP
Cultural Heritage Specialist

Distribution List

# Hard Copies	PDF Required	Association / Company Name

Revision History

Revision #	Date	Revised By:	Revision Description
0	Nov 16, 2018	M. Greguol, L. Smythe	Draft Report to City of London
1	Nov 21, 2018	M. Greguol, L. Smythe	Revised Draft Report to City of London for LACH Stewardship Sub-Committee

Executive Summary

AECOM Canada Ltd. (AECOM) was retained by the City of London to complete a Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report (CHER) as part of the Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP) for the proposed London Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) system to determine the cultural heritage value of the property at 220 Wellington Road. The BRT system is comprised of four segments, combined into two operation routes: the north/east corridor and the south/west corridor. The BRT network was approved by City of London Council through the Rapid Transit Master Plan in July 2017.

The property located at 220 Wellington Road was identified in the City of London Cultural Heritage Screening Report (CHSR) (October 2018) as being a directly impacted, heritage listed property. The CHSR was completed as part of the TPAP for the London Bus Rapid Transit project. The TPAP is regulated by the Environmental Assessment Act (EAA) under Ontario Regulation 231/08: Transit Projects and Metrolinx Undertakings (O.Reg. 231/08). This CHER forms part of the Environmental Project Report (EPR) completed under the TPAP.

The subject property at 220 Wellington Road contains a two-storey frame residential/commercial structure in a vernacular style, constructed circa 1941. Based on the results of background historical research, field review, and application of criteria from Ontario Regulation 9/06, the subject property at 220 Wellington Road was not determined to be of significant cultural heritage value or interest.

The completion of the CHER has resulted in the following recommendation:

- The property at 220 Wellington Road was determined not to have significant cultural heritage value or interest. Subsequently, no additional heritage work is recommended for the property.

Table of Contents

	page
1. Introduction	1
1.1 Development Context	1
2. Legislation and Policy Context	2
2.1 Provincial and Municipal Context and Policies	2
2.1.1 Provincial Policy Context	2
2.1.2 Ontario Regulation 9/06.....	2
2.1.3 Municipal Policies	3
2.2 Methodology	3
2.3 Consultation.....	3
3. Historical Context	5
3.1 Local Context and Settlement History	5
3.1.1 Westminster Township	5
3.1.2 London South.....	5
3.1.3 Wellington Road.....	5
3.2 Land Use History	6
3.2.1 1810-1850.....	6
3.2.2 1850-1930.....	6
3.2.3 1930-Present.....	7
4. Existing Conditions	8
4.1 Landscape Context.....	8
4.2 Architectural Description	8
4.2.1 Northeast Elevation	8
4.2.2 Northwest Elevation	8
4.2.3 Southwest Elevation.....	9
4.2.4 Southeast Elevation	9
4.3 Comparative Analysis	9
4.4 Discussion of Integrity.....	10
5. Heritage Evaluation	12
5.1 Ontario Regulation 9/06.....	12
6. Conclusions	14
7. Recommendations.....	15
8. Images	16
9. Historic Photos and Mapping	19
10. Bibliography and Sources.....	30

List of Figures

Figure 1: Project Location	20
Figure 2: Project Location in Detail	21
Figure 3: Project Location, 1862	22
Figure 4: Project Location, 1878	23
Figure 5: Project Location, 1913	24
Figure 6: Project Location, 1929	25
Figure 7: Project Location, 1948	26
Figure 8: Project Location, 1922	27
Figure 9: Project Location, 1945	28
Figure 10: Project Location, 1972	29

List of Tables

Table 1: Comparative analysis of properties with building/structures of similar age, style, and/or typology	10
---	----

1. Introduction

1.1 Development Context

AECOM Canada Ltd. (AECOM) was retained by the City of London to complete a Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report (CHER) as part of the Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP) for the proposed London Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) system to determine the cultural heritage value of the property at 220 Wellington Road. The BRT system is comprised of four segments, combined into two operation routes: the north/east corridor and the south/west corridor. The BRT network was approved by City of London Council through the Rapid Transit Master Plan in July 2017.

The property located at 220 Wellington Road was identified in the City of London Cultural Heritage Screening Report (CHSR) (October 2018) as being a directly impacted, heritage listed property. The CHSR was completed as part of the TPAP for the London Bus Rapid Transit project. The TPAP is regulated by the Environmental Assessment Act (EAA) under Ontario Regulation 231/08: Transit Projects and Metrolinx Undertakings (O.Reg. 231/08). This CHER forms part of the Environmental Project Report (EPR) completed under the TPAP.

2. Legislation and Policy Context

2.1 Provincial and Municipal Context and Policies

2.1.1 Provincial Policy Context

The Ministry of Tourism, Culture, and Sport (MTCS) is charged under Section 2 of the *Ontario Heritage Act* with the responsibility to determine policies, priorities and programs for the conservation, protection and preservation of the cultural heritage of Ontario and has published guidelines to assist in assessing cultural heritage resources as part of environmental assessment. The following have informed the preparation of this CHER:

- Guidelines for Preparing the Cultural Heritage Resource Component of Environmental Assessments (1992);
- Guidelines on the Man-Made Heritage Component of Environmental Assessments (1981);
- MTCS Standards and Guidelines for Conservation of Provincial Heritage Properties (2010);
- Environmental Guide for Built Heritage and Cultural Heritage Landscapes (2007); and
- The Ontario Heritage Toolkit (2006).

An Environmental Assessment is required for all large-scale projects that have potential impacts on the environment. These projects require approval from the Government of Ontario. Certain projects, such as transit projects, have more predictable environmental impacts or effects, and can be readily managed. This streamlined approach protects the environment, but shortens the timeline to six month for commencement, review and approval. This Environmental Assessment process for transit projects is known as the Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP).

TPAP provides a framework for focused consultation and objection processes. Through TPAP, the Minister of the Environment may initiate a Time Out period if there is a potential for a negative impact on a matter of provincial importance that relates to the natural environment or has cultural heritage value or interest, or on a constitutionally protected Aboriginal or treaty right (TPAP Guide to Environmental Assessment Requirements for Transit Projects, 2014).

Additionally, the *Planning Act* (1990) and related *Provincial Policy Statement* (PPS) (2014) provide guidance for the assessment and evaluation of potential cultural heritage resources. Subsection 2.6 of the PPS, Cultural Heritage and Archaeological Resources, states that:

2.6.1 Significant built heritage resources and significant cultural heritage landscapes shall be conserved.

Criteria for determining significance for the resources are mandated by the Province in Ontario Regulation 9/06.

2.1.2 Ontario Regulation 9/06

Ontario Regulation 9/06 provides the Criteria for Determining Cultural Heritage Value or Interest under the *Ontario Heritage Act*. This regulation was created to ensure a consistent approach to the designation of heritage properties under the *Ontario Heritage Act*. All designations under the *Ontario Heritage Act* after 2006 must meet at least one of the criteria outlined in the regulation.

A property may be designated under Section 29 of the *Ontario Heritage Act* if it meets one or more of the following criteria for determining whether the property is of cultural heritage value or interest:

1. The property has design value or physical value because it,
 - i. is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, expression, material or construction method;
 - ii. displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit;
 - iii. demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement.
2. The property has historical value or associative value because it,
 - i. has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization, or institution that is significant to a community,
 - ii. yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of a community or culture;
 - iii. demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer or theorist who is significant to a community.
3. The property has contextual value because it,
 - i. is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an area;
 - ii. is physically, functionally, visually, or historically linked to its surroundings;
 - iii. is a landmark.

2.1.3 Municipal Policies

The London Plan is the City of London's new Official Plan which was consolidated on August 27, 2018. *The London Plan* focuses on three areas of cultural heritage planning, including: general policies for the protection and enhancement of cultural heritage resources; specific policies related to the identification of cultural heritage resources, including individual cultural heritage resources, heritage conservation districts, cultural heritage landscapes, and archaeological resources; and specific policies related to the protection and conservation of these cultural heritage resources. The criteria outlined in *The London Plan* for the identification and designation of individual properties of cultural heritage value or interest reflect the criteria defined in O.Reg. 9/06.

2.2 Methodology

A CHER examines a property as a whole, its relationship to its surroundings, as well as its individual elements—engineering works, landscape, etc. The recommendations of the CHER are based on an understanding of the physical values of the property, a documentation of its history through research, and an analysis of its social context, comparisons with similar properties and mapping. A field review was completed by Liam Smythe, Heritage Researcher at AECOM in November 2018. Access was limited only to the public right of way.

This CHER is guided and informed by the key documents listed in 2.1.1. The following report has been prepared utilizing the Terms of Reference prepared for the London BRT TPAP process, which has been received by the London Advisory Committee on Heritage (LACH) (See Section 11).

2.3 Consultation

Consultation for the London BRT project has been conducted with the LACH. A draft CHSR (dated February 6, 2018) was provided for their review and comment. The LACH Stewardship Sub-Committee recommended that 104 properties which were identified by the draft CHSR to have potential cultural heritage value or interest, do not require further examination for consideration as having cultural heritage value or interest (CHVI). The LACH also recommended that an additional 30 properties, not identified by the draft CHSR, be evaluated for their potential

cultural heritage value. Further, the remaining properties flagged by the draft CHSR requiring further cultural heritage work were added to the Register (*Inventory of Heritage Resources*) pursuant to Section 27 of the *Ontario Heritage Act* by resolution of Municipal Council on March 27, 2018.

The draft CHSR was also provided to the MTCS for review, and comments were received in July 2018. In response to MTCS comments, the CHSR was revised to include additional information on impacted properties, and a preliminary impact assessment. The CHSR identified properties with direct impacts that cannot be mitigated through design, and recommended that these properties be addressed through completion of CHERs prior to completion of the TPAP, including the property at 220 Wellington Road. Ongoing communications with MTCS have continued as part of the TPAP.

The revised CHSR (October 8, 2018) was provided to the LACH on October 10, 2018. The Draft Terms of Reference for CHERs was also received and referred to the LACH Stewardship Sub-Committee for review. This CHER will be submitted and reviewed by the LACH Stewardship Sub-Committee for their November 28, 2018 meeting.

3. Historical Context

3.1 Local Context and Settlement History

3.1.1 Westminster Township

Prior to European settlement the area that would eventually become Westminster Township was settled by members of the Chippewa First Nation. One of the largest townships in Middlesex County, the first survey of Westminster Township was completed in 1809-10 by Deputy Provincial Surveyor Simon T. Z. Watson. The remainder of the township was surveyed in 1820 by Colonel Mahlon Burwell and Colonel Bostwick. Unlike other townships in Upper Canada, lots were not parceled out to government “favorites” or speculators before 1817; the earliest settlers were farmers, many of whom arrived by way of the United States. By 1817, the township was home to 428 people and the price of land had quadrupled since tracts were first made available. By 1850, the township had a population of 4,525.¹

3.1.2 London South

Originally part of Westminster Township, South London was originally settled in the 1810s. For most of the nineteenth century, the area was home to a number of wealthy Londoners, who constructed large country mansions away from the increasingly congested city. South London remained predominantly rural until the 1880s, but was connected to the City of London by a series of bridges over the Thames. By the 1890s, the population of the area had increased to the point where annexation was considered. Eager to reap the benefits of electric street lighting, safe drinking water, sidewalks and the city’s education system, this section of the township became part of the City of London on May 1st, 1890. Bounded by Wellington Road, Wharnccliffe Road, Emery Street and the Thames River, the new suburb was designated as Ward 6. The building boom of the 1880s and 1890s was concentrated largely to the western side of the ward; parcels of land along Wellington Road were still held by wealthy families such as the McClary and Mackenzie families until the end of the century. Grand Avenue – formerly Hamilton Row prior to 1890 – is so named for the large estates that once fronted on it.²

3.1.3 Wellington Road

Running north to south from Huron Street to the City of St. Thomas with brief interruptions by the Grand Trunk Railway (now Canadian Pacific Railway) line, Wellington Road was named for Arthur Wellesley, 1st Duke of Wellington. A major figure in British military history, Wellington was famous for his victory over Napoleon at the Battle of Waterloo in 1815. From 1818 to 1827, he served Master General of the Ordnance, commanding military officers and artillery in Upper Canada.^[1] The road was cut through Westminster Township by W. L. Odell, who also assisted in the construction of an iron bridge to carry Wellington Road across the Thames River.^[2]

Within London, Wellington Road is identified by various official names, at varying points within the City. Between Huron Street and the Thames River, the road runs relatively parallel with Richmond Street and is identified in this

¹ *A History of the County of Middlesex, Canada*. Toronto: W. A. & C. L. Goodspeed, 1889. p. 566-568

² The Architectural Conservancy of Ontario. *Tecumseh Trek; ACO’s 38th Annual Geranium Heritage House Tour*. London, Ontario: ACO, June 5, 2011.

^[1] *Michael Baker & Hilary Bates Neary. London Street Names*. Toronto: James Lormier & Company Ltd., 2003. p. 100

^[2] *A History of the County of Middlesex, Op Cit*. p.570

section as Wellington Street. South of the Thames River, the road changes names to Wellington Road, and is identified as such between the River and the road's intersection with Exeter Road, just north of Highway 401. Lastly, the road is identified as Wellington Road South southwards from Exeter Road to south of the municipal city limits.

3.2 Land Use History

3.2.1 1810-1850

The subject property is located on a portion of Lot 25, Broken Front Concession, or Concession "B" in the former Westminster Township. Located on the west side of Wellington Road, Lot 25 was vacant for many years following its original survey. In 1839, Albert Scriver Odell received 69 ½ acres in the north part of the lot from the Crown. The southern part of the lot was deeded to Edward Matthews in 1850. Odell already owned Lot 24 immediately to the east, having purchased it from James Lester in 1822. The Odell family was one of the earliest families to settle in Westminster Township. Albert was the first of his family to arrive in the Township in 1810, settling on Lot 24 Concession I, along commissioner's road near the present Victoria Hospital³ One of ten children, Albert was born in 1787 to John Odell and Enor Schriver. The Odell family had originally settled in Dutchess County, New York and were of Dutch origin. John left New York following the American Revolution, and relocated near Montreal. All of John and Enor's children would eventually settle in Westminster Township, with the exception of their son Loop, who died in Lower Canada. The first records of the Westminster Council, dated March 4th 1817 identify Albert S. Odell and Robert Frank as "overseers of highways".⁴ Albert Odell did not reside on this property however; the 1854 assessment roll lists him as living on Lot 26, Concession I, former Westminster Township.⁵ Albert and his wife, Charlotte Percival, did not have children. Charlotte predeceased Albert sometime prior to 1852; Albert himself passed away in 1856.⁶

3.2.2 1850-1930

All portions of the original Lot 25 were sold off and subdivided through the 1850s and 1860s. While the 1862 Tremaine map of the township does not provide details of the property, the 1878 atlas shows the property as being subdivided into as many as thirteen parcels. The portions of Lots 24 and 25 fronting on the Thames River are both listed to landowner G.B.R Frank. The northern portion of the lot was originally dominated by a large meander in the river. Aerial photography suggests that this section of the river was realigned and the meander filled in by 1922, although its former location is still evident today as a small oxbow in Watson Street Park. Historic maps and fire insurance plans indicate that the subject property remained vacant well into the twentieth century. The 1926 Geodetic Survey of the City of London indicates that Beverly Street had been constructed by that time, although the block bounded by Beverley Street, Raywood Avenue and Wellington Road was vacant. 220 Wellington Road is located on Lot 39, Plan 467 (4th). Land registry records indicate that the property was originally granted to the Service Truck Company Limited in 1924, although city directories make no mention any address on Beverley Street south of Raywood drive until much later.

³ *A History of the County of Middlesex, Op Cit.* p.568

⁴ *A History of the County of Middlesex, Op Cit.* p.948

⁵ *Index to the 1854 Assessment Roll, Westminster Township, Middlesex County, Canada West.*
<https://londonmiddlesex.ogs.on.ca/docs/membpubs/assessment/1854-Westminster-Twp.pdf>. (Accessed November 2018).

⁶ Dan Brock "All in the Family: An Account of Some Members of the Odell Family". *London & Middlesex County Historical Society Newsletter*, Fall, 2018.

3.2.3 1930-Present

The property came under ownership of the City of London in 1936, who in turn sold it to Anne and Mary Johnson in 1940. 57 Beverley Street first appears in the 1942 city directory, with A. Johnson, Grocer listed as resident. The Johnsons operated a grocery business at this location until they sold the property in May of 1956 to Henry Mullins. Later the same year, the property was sold to Howard Turner. In the 1958 City Directory the property is identified as vacant; however in 1959, Turner is listed as owner with Alec Ross as a tenant; the grocery store appears to have reopened as Bert and John's Variety. The following year, the store was renamed as V. Variety, a name it would hold for the next two decades. In 1964, the property was purchased by Ivan Doupe who retained ownership of the property through the 1970s.⁷

Beverley Street originally extended directly north from Wellington Road. During the early 1960s, the intersection was realigned so that Beverley Street now curved northward from Alexandra Street. The official address of the property is now listed as 220 Wellington Road, despite the fact that the property continues to front onto Beverley Street. It was not determined when the address was changed.

⁷ Middlesex County (33) Land Registry Office (MCLRO). *Book 155. Plan 439, 449, 467.*

4. Existing Conditions

4.1 Landscape Context

The subject property is located at 220 Wellington Road in the City of London. The property is on the east side of Wellington Road, on a triangular piece of land bounded by Wellington Road, Beverley Street, and the adjacent property to the north. Wellington Road is a four-lane arterial road following a diagonal orientation through the area from northwest to southeast. Beverley Street is a two-lane residential street running north from Alexandra Street, just east of its intersection with Wellington Road.

East of Wellington Road, the area is largely residential. Houses are typically small, single-storey detached houses on large narrow lots with mature trees. Residential streets follow a grid pattern of small rectangular blocks, typical of early residential subdivisions. Sidewalks and curbs are present on all streets, and streets are lit with lamps on wooden utility poles. A length of steel guardrail separates sidewalk on the east side of Wellington Road from the roadway itself. Houses fronting onto Wellington Road are similar to those on the side streets, although some have been converted into stores or other commercial offices. On the west side of Wellington Road is the St. Andrew Memorial Anglican Church and Gartshore Park, an open park with large mature trees.

4.2 Architectural Description

The property at 220 Wellington Road includes a two-storey building, originally constructed circa 1941 as a combined residence and retail storefront, but now being used as commercial office space. The building is of a vernacular style, with a low pitched hipped roof, and is clad primarily in dark grey vertical aluminium siding. The roof is covered with asphalt shingles. The building is oriented parallel with Wellington Road, roughly 45 degrees skewed to Beverley Street. The orientation of the building is unusual in comparison to other properties along Wellington Road as a result of the curvature and trajectory of Wellington Road.

4.2.1 Northeast Elevation

The northeast elevation fronts onto Beverley Street (**Image 2**). It is a two-storey façade with two small sash-type windows on the second storey. A single entrance door with one sidelight is located on the right side of the façade. This door is accessed by means of a low, stepped wooden porch with no railing. A single-storey extension extends from the northern corner of the building. This extension has a flat roof and is clad in what appears to be smooth, grey painted concrete. On this elevation, the extension has two sash type windows made of vinyl or aluminium.

4.2.2 Northwest Elevation

The northwestern elevation (**Image 5**) is a two-storey façade with an aforementioned single-storey, flat-roofed extension at the first storey. A brick chimney extends up the main façade of the building. The portion of the chimney below the roofline has been painted grey to match the siding; the portion above the roofline remains unpainted red brick. Large single-pane fixed windows are present on the northwest corner of the first and second storeys. Two smaller sash windows are also present on the second storey. The first-storey extension has no windows on this side, and has red painted metal flashing. It has a single panel door with cast concrete step below. A free-standing backlit advertising sign is located on this corner of the property.

4.2.3 Southwest Elevation

The southeast elevation of the building (**Image 3**) faces Wellington Road. Its features are symmetrically arranged, with the first and second storeys each having three windows. Windows are large with no sills, and all appear to be a fixed single pane of glass. The central window on the first storey is narrower and was originally a doorway; a low concrete stoop with three steps is located directly below the window. A band of red-painted aluminum trim runs horizontally around the floor level of the second storey. A single-storey extension juts out from the northwestern front of the structure; this is clad in grey painted concrete or stucco and contains a single-pane horizontal window. A single storey brick extension with a low hipped roof extends out from the southeastern face of the building. This extension is of grey painted brick and is embellished with a large red letter “A” on this façade.

4.2.4 Southeast Elevation

The southeast elevation (**Image 1**) is a two-storey façade, clad mainly in vertical aluminium siding. A single storey brick storefront extends out at ground level. This storefront is symmetrical in design, offset to the left (south) of the façade with a low hipped roof covered in grey asphalt shingles. A cast concrete stoop with three stairs on either side leads up to what was formerly a doorway. This has been filled in with a large picture window and section of aluminium siding. The former doorway is flanked on either side by two large picture windows with concrete sills. No other windows are present on this side of the building. A backlit advertising sign is affixed to the second storey just below the eaves.

4.3 Comparative Analysis

A comparative analysis was undertaken to establish a baseline understanding of similar cultural heritage designated properties in the City of London, and to determine if the property “is a rare, unique, representative, or early examples of a style, type, expression, material or construction method” as described in O.Reg. 9/06.

Comparative examples were drawn from listed and non-listed properties within the City of London, as well as similar examples of architecture identified as two-storey commercial or mixed-use buildings within the City.

Three comparable properties with and without identified cultural heritage value were identified. However, this sample does not represent all available properties, and is rather intended to be a representative selection (**Table 1**). Various similar or comparable properties are located throughout the City, however, these six were identified to provide similar examples for the purposes of this report. The following observations were noted in analyzing the comparable properties.




Of these examples:

- Three include buildings that appear to be originally designed as two-storey commercial buildings with an apparent residential use on the second storey;
- One includes extensive alterations and modifications to the exterior materials that has drastically altered the appearance of the building;
- Two include large picture windows at the ground level;
- Three appear to still function as commercial uses;
- Two have hipped roofs, one has a gambrel roof; and
- Three are clad with exterior brick, one is clad with horizontal vinyl siding.

The comparative analysis suggests that this property is a relatively common example of the two-storey commercial buildings with a second storey apartment or residential use. Buildings of this type are located along many major roads within the City of London. The subject property is typical in size, scale, form, and materials, and has been

significantly altered over the last several decades. As a result, from a comparative perspective, the property does not appear to be a rare, unique, representative, or example of a style, type, expression, material, or construction method.

Table 1: Comparative analysis of properties with building/structures of similar age, style, and/or typology

Address	Recognition	Picture	Age	Material	Style
2525 Main Street (Lambeth)	None		TBD	Brick – red	Two storey vernacular commercial building built with gambrel roof. Large storefront windows at ground level, and set of second storey windows. Side entrance suggests mixed use with commercial at ground level and residential unit above
247 Wellington Street	Listed		TBD	Frame or brick, horizontal vinyl cladding	Two storey vernacular building, with hipped roof. Commercial use at ground level and residential unit on second storey.
750 Lorne Avenue	Listed		1891	Brick – buff brick	Two storey vernacular commercial store, hipped roof, store front windows at ground level

4.4 Discussion of Integrity

According to the Ontario Heritage Toolkit, Heritage Property Evaluation (MTCS 2006), “Integrity is a question of whether the surviving physical features (heritage attributes) continue to represent or support the cultural heritage value or interest of the property.” The following discussion of integrity was prepared to consider the ability of the

property to represent and retain its cultural heritage value over time. It does not consider the structural integrity of the building. Access to the interior of the building was not available, and observations have been made from the public right-of-way. Structural integrity, should it be identified as a concern, should be determined by way of a qualified heritage engineer, building scientist, or architect.

The subject property contains a two-storey frame residential/commercial structure with a low-pitched hipped roof. The building and property appears to have been heavily modified since its construction. Although difficult to discern, aerial photographs suggest that the single-storey extension on the northern corner of the building is a later addition and was not present in the 1940s. The 1957 Geodetic Survey of the City of London shows this extension was present by that time, as was a detached single car garage and driveway facing onto Beverley Street. The garage and driveway have since been replaced with an asphalt parking pad. A single-storey brick storefront with a low hipped-roof and cast concrete stoop extends out from the southeast façade. As the building originally housed a grocery store, this likely dates to the building's construction, although the vinyl windows are a recent addition and the entrance door has been filled in. As constructed, the building's other windows would likely have been sash-type windows constructed of wood; all of these have been replaced with fixed single-pane windows or vinyl framed sash windows. Most of the building is clad in vinyl or aluminium siding, and at some point after 2017 the entire building was painted a dark grey. The backlit signage affixed to the building is a recent addition as well. As a result of these modifications, the building retains little integrity of its original character.

5. Heritage Evaluation

5.1 Ontario Regulation 9/06

Criteria	Meets Criteria (Yes/No)	Rationale
1) The property has <i>design or physical value</i> because it:		
i) Is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, or expression, material, or construction method.	No	The building at 220 Wellington Road is a two storey residential/commercial building constructed in a vernacular style. The building is similar in design and function to many other structures in the area. Additionally, it has been heavily modified since its construction, and is not a representative example of its type. Therefore, it does not meet this criterion.
ii) Displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit.	No	The building does not show any evidence of artistic merit above the base standards for a mixed use residential / commercial building of the period. Therefore it does not meet this criterion.
iii) Demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement.	No	The building is a typical two-storey frame building of the period. It does not reflect a high degree of technical or scientific achievement.
2) The property has <i>historic or associative value</i> because it:		
i) Has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organisation, or institution that is significant to a community.	No	No information was found to indicate that any of the identified property owners or residents are significant to the community, and no other significant associations were determined. Therefore, the property does not meet this criterion.
ii) Yields, or has the potential to yield information that contributes to the understanding of a community or culture.	No	The building does not yield any information towards understanding the community or its culture and development. Therefore, it does not meet this criterion.
iii) Demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an	No	No information was found regarding the building's designer

<p>architect, artist, builder, designer or theorist who is significant to the community.</p>		<p>or builder, or indicating that the building is in any way related to a significant figure in the community. Therefore, it does not meet this criterion.</p>
<p>3) The property has contextual value because it:</p>		
<p>i) Is important in defining, maintaining, or supporting the character of an area</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>While the building reflects mixed commercial/residential uses along Wellington Road, such uses are common in this area. This building does not play an important role in defining, maintaining, or supporting this character. Therefore, it does not meet this criterion.</p>
<p>ii) Is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The building has been extensively renovated and no longer serves its original use as a residence and grocery store. While a prominent building along Wellington Road, it is not linked in any way to its surroundings. Therefore, it does not meet this criterion.</p>
<p>iii) Is a landmark</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>While the building is prominently located along a curve in the east side of Wellington Road, there is no evidence to suggest that it is a landmark in the community. Therefore, it does not meet this criterion.</p>

6. Conclusions

Based on the results of background historical research, field review, and application of criteria from Ontario Regulation 9/06, the subject property at 220 Wellington Road was not determined to be of significant cultural heritage value or interest. As such, no Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest, or Description of Heritage Attributes has been prepared.

7. Recommendations

The subject property at 220 Wellington Road contains a two-storey frame residential/commercial structure in a vernacular style, constructed circa 1941. Based on the results of background historical research, field review, and application of criteria from Ontario Regulation 9/06, the subject property at 220 Wellington Road was not determined to be of significant cultural heritage value or interest.

The completion of the CHER has resulted in the following recommendation:

- The property at 220 Wellington Road was determined not to have significant cultural heritage value or interest. Subsequently, no additional heritage work is recommended for the property.

8. Images



Image 1: Southeast façade, 220 Wellington Road, showing former storefront. (AECOM, 2018)



Image 2: 220 Wellington Road, looking west from Beverley Street. Storefront extends out from southeastern elevation (left), with single-storey extension on north corner of building (right). (AECOM, 2018)




Image 3: Southwest elevation of 220 Wellington Road showing extension and storefront. Middle window on ground floor is a former doorway. (AECOM, 2018)




Image 4: Looking east towards property from Wellington Road, showing northwest and southwest elevations. (AECOM, 2018)




Image 5: Northwest elevation of 220 Wellington Road, showing extension, chimney and modern signage. (AECOM, 2018)


9. Historic Photos and Mapping

All mapping related to the subject property is included on the following pages.



Legend
 Project Location




Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report 220 Wellington Road London, Ontario	
Location of Project Location	
November 2018	Datum: NAD 83 UTM17 Source: http://wms.ess-ws.nrcan.gc.ca/wms/toporama_en
PH#: 60590467	V#:
AECOM	
Figure 1	
 0 250 500 1,000 Metres	
<small>This drawing has been prepared for the use of AECOM's client and may not be used, reproduced or relied upon by third parties, except as agreed by AECOM and its client, as required by law or for use by governmental reviewing agencies. AECOM accepts no responsibility, and denies any liability whatsoever, to any party that modifies this drawing without AECOM's express written consent.</small>	

Map Source: "http://wms.ess-ws.nrcan.gc.ca/wms/toporama_en" (1:25,000 scale) - Date: 11/20/18



Legend

 Project Location



Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report
220 Wellington Road
London, Ontario

Project Location, 1878

November 2018

1:20,000


Datum: NAD 83 UTM17
Source: Illustrated Historic Atlas of Middlesex County, Toronto: H.R. Page & Co.

PH: 60590467

V#:

AECOM

Figure 4




This drawing has been prepared for the use of AECOM's client and may not be used, reproduced or relied upon by third parties, except as agreed by AECOM and its client, as required by law or for use by governmental reviewing agencies. AECOM accepts no responsibility, and denies any liability whatsoever, to any party that modifies this drawing without AECOM's express written consent.

Map Source: "Illustrated Historic Atlas of Middlesex County" (1878) by H.R. Page & Co. Digitized by Google. Project Location: 1878.mxd



Legend

 Project Location



Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report
220 Wellington Road
London, Ontario

Project Location, 1945

November 2018

1:2,000


Datum: NAD 83 UTM17
Source: LIO 2017, Department of Planning and Development, Roll 1025, Line 42, 1945

P#: 60590467

V#:

AECOM

Figure 9



This drawing has been prepared for the use of AECOM's client and may not be used, reproduced or relied upon by third parties, except as agreed by AECOM and its client, as required by law or for use by governmental reviewing agencies. AECOM accepts no responsibility, and denies any liability whatsoever, to any party that modifies this drawing without AECOM's express written consent.

Map Source: "Map of London, Ontario" (2017) by AECOM, Inc. (2017) and its client, as required by law or for use by governmental reviewing agencies. AECOM accepts no responsibility, and denies any liability whatsoever, to any party that modifies this drawing without AECOM's express written consent.



Legend

 Project Location



Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report
220 Wellington Road
London, Ontario

Project Location, 1972

November
2018

1:2,000


Datum: NAD 83 UTM17
Source: LIO 2017, City of
London - 1972 Line 6 Photo
130

PH: 60590467

V#:

AECOM

Figure 10



This drawing has been prepared for the use of AECOM's client and may not be used, reproduced or relied upon by third parties, except as agreed by AECOM and its client, as required by law or for use by governmental reviewing agencies. AECOM accepts no responsibility, and denies any liability whatsoever, to any party that modifies this drawing without AECOM's express written consent.

Map Source: "Map of London, Ontario" (2017) by AECOM and its client, as required by law or for use by governmental reviewing agencies. AECOM accepts no responsibility, and denies any liability whatsoever, to any party that modifies this drawing without AECOM's express written consent.

10. Bibliography and Sources

A History of the County of Middlesex, Canada. Toronto: W. A. & C. L. Goodspeed, 1889.

Index to the 1854 Assessment Roll, Westminster Township, Middlesex County, Canada West, 1854.
<https://londonmiddlesex.ogs.on.ca/docs/membpubs/assessment/1854-Westminster-Twp.pdf>.

Vernon, Henry. *Vernon's City of London (Ontario) Directory.* Hamilton, Ontario: Henry Vernon & Son. (Issues 1922, 1939-78).

The Architectural Conservancy of Ontario. *Tecumseh Trek: ACO's 38th Annual Geranium Heritage House Tour.* London, Ontario: ACO, 5 June 2011.

Baker, Michael & Hilary Bates Neary. *London Street Names.* Toronto: James Lormier & Company Ltd., 2003

Brock, Dan. "All in the Family: An Account of Some Members of the Odell Family". *London & Middlesex County Historical Society Newsletter*, Fall, 2018.

Foster, J. G. & Co. *Foster's London and Middlesex County Directory 1896-97.* Toronto: J. G. Foster & Co., 1896

Goad, Charles E. *Fire Insurance Plan for the City of London Ontario.* Montreal: Charles E. Goad, 1881 (Revised ed. 1888, 1907, 1915, 1922)

Middlesex County (33) Land Registry Office (MCLRO). *Book 2. Abstract Index Up 2 1866; LOT 23 Concession 4 to Concession 9; Concession A and B*

Middlesex County (33) Land Registry Office (MCLRO). *Book 155. Plan 439, 449, 467.*

Middlesex County (33) Land Registry Office (MCLRO). *Parcel Register LT 39, PL 467 (4th); London*

Page, H. R. & Co. *Illustrated Historical Atlas of the County of Middlesex, Ont.* Toronto: H. R. Page & Co., 1878

Tremaine, Geo. R. & G. M. *Tremaine's Map of the County of Middlesex, Canada West.* Toronto: Geo. R. & G. M. Tremaine, 1862

Provincial Standards and Resources:

Ontario Heritage Tool Kit

<http://www.culture.gov.on.ca/english/heritage/Toolkit/toolkit.ht>

Ontario Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport: Heritage Conservation Principle's for Land Use Planning

http://www.culture.gov.on.ca/english/heritage/info_sheets/info_sheet_landuse_planning.htm

Ontario Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport: Eight Guiding Principles in the Conservation of Historic Properties

http://www.culture.gov.on.ca/english/heritage/info_sheets/info_sheet_8principles.htm

Ontario Heritage Act (2006)

Reference Guide on Physical and Cultural Heritage Resources (1996)

Guidelines for Preparing the Cultural Heritage Resource Component of Environmental Assessments (1992)

Guidelines on the Man-Made Heritage Component of Environmental Assessments (1981)

Environmental Guide for Built Heritage and Cultural Heritage Landscapes (2007)

National and International Standards and Resources:

Canadian Register of Historic Places
http://www.historicplaces.ca/visit-visite/rep-reg_e.aspx

Parks Canada Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada
http://www.pc.gc.ca/docs/pc/guide/nldclpc-sgchpc/index_E.asp

Parks Canada National Historic Sites of Canada
http://www.pc.gc.ca/progs/lhn-nhs/index_e.asp

City of London

**Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report
243 Wellington Road, 55 Foxbar Road,
49 Foxbar Road,
London, Ontario**

Prepared by:

AECOM

410 – 250 York Street, Citi Plaza
London, ON, Canada N6A 6K2
www.aecom.com

519 673 0510 tel
519 673 5975 fax

Statement of Qualifications and Limitations

The attached Report (the “Report”) has been prepared by AECOM Canada Ltd. (“AECOM”) for the benefit of the Client (“Client”) in accordance with the agreement between AECOM and Client, including the scope of work detailed therein (the “Agreement”).

The information, data, recommendations and conclusions contained in the Report (collectively, the “Information”):

- is subject to the scope, schedule, and other constraints and limitations in the Agreement and the qualifications contained in the Report (the “Limitations”);
- represents AECOM's professional judgement in light of the Limitations and industry standards for the preparation of similar reports;
- may be based on information provided to AECOM which has not been independently verified;
- has not been updated since the date of issuance of the Report and its accuracy is limited to the time period and circumstances in which it was collected, processed, made or issued;
- must be read as a whole and sections thereof should not be read out of such context;
- was prepared for the specific purposes described in the Report and the Agreement; and
- in the case of subsurface, environmental or geotechnical conditions, may be based on limited testing and on the assumption that such conditions are uniform and not variable either geographically or over time.

AECOM shall be entitled to rely upon the accuracy and completeness of information that was provided to it and has no obligation to update such information. AECOM accepts no responsibility for any events or circumstances that may have occurred since the date on which the Report was prepared and, in the case of subsurface, environmental or geotechnical conditions, is not responsible for any variability in such conditions, geographically or over time.

AECOM agrees that the Report represents its professional judgement as described above and that the Information has been prepared for the specific purpose and use described in the Report and the Agreement, but AECOM makes no other representations, or any guarantees or warranties whatsoever, whether express or implied, with respect to the Report, the Information or any part thereof.

Without in any way limiting the generality of the foregoing, any estimates or opinions regarding probable construction costs or construction schedule provided by AECOM represent AECOM's professional judgement in light of its experience and the knowledge and information available to it at the time of preparation. Since AECOM has no control over market or economic conditions, prices for construction labour, equipment or materials or bidding procedures, AECOM, its directors, officers and employees are not able to, nor do they, make any representations, warranties or guarantees whatsoever, whether express or implied, with respect to such estimates or opinions, or their variance from actual construction costs or schedules, and accept no responsibility for any loss or damage arising therefrom or in any way related thereto. Persons relying on such estimates or opinions do so at their own risk.

Except (1) as agreed to in writing by AECOM and Client; (2) as required by-law; or (3) to the extent used by governmental reviewing agencies for the purpose of obtaining permits or approvals, the Report and the Information may be used and relied upon only by Client.

AECOM accepts no responsibility, and denies any liability whatsoever, to parties other than Client who may obtain access to the Report or the Information for any injury, loss or damage suffered by such parties arising from their use of, reliance upon, or decisions or actions based on the Report or any of the Information (“improper use of the Report”), except to the extent those parties have obtained the prior written consent of AECOM to use and rely upon the Report and the Information. Any injury, loss or damages arising from improper use of the Report shall be borne by the party making such use.

This Statement of Qualifications and Limitations is attached to and forms part of the Report and any use of the Report is subject to the terms hereof.

AECOM: 2015-04-13

© 2009-2015 AECOM Canada Ltd. All Rights Reserved.

Signatures

Report Prepared By: DRAFT

Michael Greguol, M.A.
Cultural Heritage Specialist

DRAFT

Liam Smythe, B.URPI
Heritage Researcher

Report Reviewed By: DRAFT

Tatum Taylor, M.Sc., CAHP
Cultural Heritage Specialist

Distribution List

# Hard Copies	PDF Required	Association / Company Name

Revision History

Revision #	Date	Revised By:	Revision Description
0	Nov 16, 2018	M. Greguol, L. Smythe	Draft Report to City of London
1	Nov 21, 2018	M. Greguol, L. Smythe	Revised Draft Report to City of London for LACH Stewardship Sub-Committee

Executive Summary

AECOM Canada Ltd. (AECOM) was retained by the City of London to complete a Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report (CHER) as part of the Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP) for the proposed London Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) system to determine the cultural heritage value of the property at 243 Wellington Road, including 55 and 49 Foxbar Road. The BRT system is comprised of four segments, combined into two operation routes: the north/east corridor and the south/west corridor. The BRT network was approved by City of London Council through the Rapid Transit Master Plan in July 2017.

The property located at 243 Wellington Road, including 55 and 49 Foxbar Road was identified in the City of London Cultural Heritage Screening Report (CHSR) (October 2018) as being a directly impacted, listed cultural heritage property. The CHSR was completed as part of the TPAP for the London Bus Rapid Transit project. The TPAP is regulated by the Environmental Assessment Act (EAA) under Ontario Regulation 231/08: Transit Projects and Metrolinx Undertakings (O.Reg. 231/08). This CHER forms part of the Environmental Project Report (EPR) completed under the TPAP.

The subject property includes two mid-20th century churches, a modest 1941 church building and the other a distinctive Mid-Century Modern church, constructed in 1957. Based on the evaluation of the background research, historical research, site investigation, and application of the criteria from *Ontario Regulation 9/06*, the subject property was determined to demonstrate significant cultural heritage value.

The completion of this CHER recommends that a Heritage Impact Assessment is required for this property to identify appropriate mitigation measures with respect to any proposed interventions.

Should the City of London wish to pursue designation of the property under Part IV of the *Ontario Heritage Act*, further research, and an interior assessment of the property is recommended in order to inform a comprehensive designating by-law for the property.

Table of Contents

	page
1. Introduction	1
1.1 Development Context	1
2. Legislation and Policy Context	2
2.1 Provincial and Municipal Context and Policies	2
2.1.1 Provincial Policy Context	2
2.1.2 Ontario Regulation 9/06.....	2
2.1.3 Municipal Policies	3
2.2 Methodology	3
2.3 Consultation.....	3
3. Historical Context	5
3.1 Local Context and Settlement History	5
3.1.1 Westminster Township	5
3.1.2 London South.....	5
3.1.3 Wellington Road.....	5
3.2 Land Use History	6
3.2.1 1810-1850.....	6
3.2.2 1850-1940.....	6
3.2.3 1940-Present.....	7
4. Existing Conditions	8
4.1 Landscape Context.....	8
4.2 Architectural Description – 1941	8
4.2.1 East (Front) Elevation.....	8
4.2.2 North Elevation.....	8
4.2.3 South Elevation	9
4.3 Architectural Description – 1957	9
4.3.1 East (Front) Elevation.....	9
4.3.2 North Elevation.....	9
4.3.3 South Elevation	9
4.4 Architectural Description – 49 Foxbar Road.....	9
4.4.1 Front (North) Elevation	9
4.4.2 South (Rear) Elevation	10
4.4.3 East Elevation	10
4.4.4 West Elevation	10
4.5 Comparative Analysis	10
4.6 Discussion of Integrity.....	12
5. Heritage Evaluation	14
5.1 Ontario Regulation 9/06.....	14

6. Conclusions17

6.1 Statement of Cultural Heritage Value17

6.1.1 Description of Property17

6.1.2 Cultural Heritage Value17

6.2 Heritage Attributes18

7. Recommendations19

8. Images20

9. Historic Photos and Mapping27

10. Bibliography and Sources.....38

List of Figures

Figure 1: Project Location28

Figure 2: Project Location in Detail29

Figure 3: Project Location, 186230

Figure 4: Project Location, 187831

Figure 5: Project Location, 191332

Figure 6: Project Location, 192933

Figure 7: Project Location, 194834

Figure 8: Project Location, 192235

Figure 9: Project Location, 1945 and 196536

Figure 10: Project Location, 197237

List of Tables

Table 1: Comparative analysis of properties with cultural heritage value with buildings/structures of similar age, style, and/or typology 11

1. Introduction

1.1 Development Context

AECOM Canada Ltd. (AECOM) was retained by the City of London to complete a Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report (CHER) as part of the Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP) for the proposed London Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) system to determine the cultural heritage value of the property at 243 Wellington Road, including 55 and 49 Foxbar Road. The BRT system is comprised of four segments, combined into two operation routes: the north/east corridor and the south/west corridor. The BRT network was approved by City of London Council through the Rapid Transit Master Plan in July 2017.

The property located at 243 Wellington Road, including 49 and 55 Foxbar Road was identified in the City of London Cultural Heritage Screening Report (CHSR) (October 2018) as being a directly impacted, listed cultural heritage property. The CHSR was completed as part of the TPAP for the London Bus Rapid Transit project. The TPAP is regulated by the Environmental Assessment Act (EAA) under Ontario Regulation 231/08: Transit Projects and Metrolinx Undertakings (O.Reg. 231/08). This CHER forms part of the Environmental Project Report (EPR) completed under the TPAP.

2. Legislation and Policy Context

2.1 Provincial and Municipal Context and Policies

2.1.1 Provincial Policy Context

The Ministry of Tourism, Culture, and Sport (MTCS) is charged under Section 2 of the *Ontario Heritage Act* with the responsibility to determine policies, priorities and programs for the conservation, protection and preservation of the cultural heritage of Ontario and has published guidelines to assist in assessing cultural heritage resources as part of environmental assessment. The following have informed the preparation of this CHER:

- Guidelines for Preparing the Cultural Heritage Resource Component of Environmental Assessments (1992);
- Guidelines on the Man-Made Heritage Component of Environmental Assessments (1981);
- MTCS Standard and Guidelines for Conservation of Provincial Heritage Properties (2010);
- Environmental Guide for Built Heritage and Cultural Heritage Landscapes (2007); and
- The Ontario Heritage Toolkit (2006).

An Environmental Assessment is required for all large-scale projects that have potential impact on the environment. These projects require approval from the Government of Ontario. Certain projects, such as transit projects, have more predictable environmental impacts or effects, and can be readily managed. This streamlined approach protects the environment, but shortens the timeline to six month for commencement, review and approval. This Environmental Assessment process for transit projects is known as the Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP).

TPAP provides a framework for focused consultation and objection processes. Through TPAP, the Minister of the Environment may initiate a Time Out period if there is a potential for a negative impact on a matter of provincial importance that relates to the natural environment or has cultural heritage value or interest, or on a constitutionally protected Aboriginal or treaty right (TPAP Guide to Environmental Assessment Requirements for Transit Projects, 2014).

Additionally, the *Planning Act* (1990) and related *Provincial Policy Statement (PPS)* (2014) provide guidance for the assessment and evaluation of potential cultural heritage resources. Subsection 2.6 of the PPS, Cultural Heritage and Archaeological Resources, states that:

2.6.1 Significant built heritage resources and significant cultural heritage landscapes shall be conserved.

Criteria for determining significance for the resources are mandated by the Province in Ontario Regulation 9/06.

2.1.2 Ontario Regulation 9/06

Ontario Regulation 9/06 provides the Criteria for Determining Cultural Heritage Value or Interest under the *Ontario Heritage Act*. This regulation was created to ensure a consistent approach to the designation of heritage properties under the *Ontario Heritage Act*. All designations under the *Ontario Heritage Act* after 2006 must meet at least one of the criteria outlined in the regulation.

A property may be designated under Section 29 of the *Ontario Heritage Act* if it meets one or more of the following criteria for determining whether the property is of cultural heritage value or interest:

1. The property has design value or physical value because it,
 - i. is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, expression, material or construction method;
 - ii. displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit;
 - iii. demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement.
2. The property has historical value or associative value because it,
 - i. has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization, or institution that is significant to a community,
 - ii. yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of a community or culture;
 - iii. demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer or theorist who is significant to a community.
3. The property has contextual value because it,
 - i. is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an area;
 - ii. is physically, functionally, visually, or historically linked to its surroundings;
 - iii. is a landmark.

2.1.3 Municipal Policies

The London Plan is the City of London's new Official Plan which was consolidated on August 27, 2018. *The London Plan* focuses on three areas of cultural heritage planning, including: general policies for the protection and enhancement of cultural heritage resources; specific policies related to the identification of cultural heritage resources, including individual cultural heritage resources, heritage conservation districts, cultural heritage landscapes, and archaeological resources; and specific policies related to the protection and conservation of these cultural heritage resources. The criteria outlined in *The London Plan* for the identification and designation of individual properties of cultural heritage value or interest reflect the criteria defined in O.Reg. 9/06.

2.2 Methodology

A CHER examines a property as a whole, its relationship to its surroundings, as well as its individual elements—engineering works, landscape, etc. The recommendations of the CHER are based on an understanding of the physical values of the property, a documentation of its history through research, and an analysis of its social context, comparisons with similar properties and mapping. A field review was undertaken by Liam Smythe, Heritage Researcher at AECOM, and Michael Greguol, Cultural Heritage Researcher at AECOM in November 2018. Access was limited only to the public right-of-way.

This CHER is guided and informed by the key documents listed in 2.1.1. The following report has been prepared utilizing the Terms of Reference prepared for the London BRT TPAP process, which have been received by the London Advisory Committee on Heritage (LACH) (See Section 11).

2.3 Consultation

Consultation for the London BRT project has been conducted with the LACH. A draft CHSR (dated February 6, 2018) was provided for their review and comment. The LACH Stewardship Sub-Committee recommended that 104 properties which were identified by the draft CHSR to have potential cultural heritage value or interest, do not require further examination for consideration as having cultural heritage value or interest (CHVI). The LACH also

recommended that an additional 30 properties, not identified by the draft CHSR, be evaluated for their potential cultural heritage value. Further, the remaining properties flagged by the draft CHSR requiring further cultural heritage work were added to the Register (*Inventory of Heritage Resources*) pursuant to Section 27 of the *Ontario Heritage Act* by resolution of Municipal Council on March 27, 2018.

The draft CHSR was also provided to the MTCS for review, and comments were received in July 2018. In response to MTCS comments, the CHSR was revised to include additional information on impacted properties, and a preliminary impact assessment. The CHSR identified properties with direct impacts that cannot be mitigated through design, and recommended that these properties be addressed through completion of CHERs prior to completion of the TPAP, including the property at 243 Wellington Road. Ongoing communications with MTCS have continued as part of the TPAP.

The revised CHSR (October 8, 2018) was provided to the LACH on October 10, 2018. The Draft Terms of Reference for CHERs was also received and referred to the LACH Stewardship Sub-Committee for review. This CHER will be submitted and reviewed by the LACH Stewardship Sub-Committee for their November 28, 2018 meeting.

3. Historical Context

3.1 Local Context and Settlement History

3.1.1 Westminster Township

Prior to European settlement the area that would eventually become Westminster Township was settled by members of the Chippewa First Nation. One of the largest townships in Middlesex County, the first survey of Westminster Township was completed in 1809-10 by Deputy Provincial Surveyor Simon T. Z. Watson. The remainder of the township was surveyed in 1820 by Colonel Mahlon Burwell and Colonel Bostwick. Unlike other townships in Upper Canada, lots were not parceled out to government “favorites” or speculators before 1817; the earliest settlers were farmers, many of whom arrived by way of the United States. By 1817, the township was home to 428 people and the price of land had quadrupled since tracts were first made available. By 1850, the township had a population of 4,525.¹

3.1.2 London South

Originally part of Westminster Township, South London was originally settled in the 1810s. For most of the nineteenth century, the area was home to a number of wealthy Londoners, who constructed large country mansions away from the increasingly congested city. South London remained predominantly rural until the 1880s, but was connected to the City of London by a series of bridges over the Thames. By the 1890s, the population of the area had increased to the point where annexation was considered. Eager to reap the benefits of electric street lighting, safe drinking water, sidewalks and the city’s education system, this section of the township became part of the City of London on May 1st, 1890. Bounded by Wellington Road, Wharncliffe Road, Emery Street and the river, the new suburb was designated as Ward 6. The building boom of the 1880s and 1890s was concentrated largely to the western side of the ward; parcels of land along Wellington Road were still held by wealthy families such as the McClary and Mackenzie families until the end of the century. Grand Avenue – known as Hamilton Row prior to 1890 - is so named for the large estates that once fronted on it.²

3.1.3 Wellington Road

Running north to south from Huron Street to the City of St. Thomas with brief interruptions by the Grand Trunk Railway (now Canadian Pacific Railway) line, Wellington Road was named for Arthur Wellesley, 1st Duke of Wellington. A major figure in British military history, Wellington was famous for his victory over Napoleon at the Battle of Waterloo in 1815. From 1818 to 1827, he served Master General of the Ordnance, commanding military officers and artillery in Upper Canada.³ The road was cut through Westminster Township by W. L. Odell, who also assisted in the construction of an iron bridge to carry Wellington Road across the Thames River.⁴

Within London, Wellington Road is identified by various official names, at varying points within the City. Between Huron Street and the Thames River, the road runs relatively parallel with Richmond Street and is identified in this section as Wellington Street. South of the Thames River, the road changes names to Wellington Road, and is

¹ *A History of the County of Middlesex, Canada*. Toronto: W. A. & C. L. Goodspeed, 1889. p. 566-568

² The Architectural Conservancy of Ontario. *Tecumseh Trek; ACO's 38th Annual Geranium Heritage House Tour*. London, Ontario: ACO, June 5, 2011.

³ *Michael Baker & Hilary Bates Neary. London Street Names*. Toronto: James Lormier & Company Ltd., 2003. p. 100

⁴ *A History of the County of Middlesex, Op Cit*. p.570

identified as such between the River and the road's intersection with Exeter Road, just north of Highway 401. Lastly, the road is identified as Wellington Road South southwards from Exeter Road to south of the municipal city limits.

3.2 Land Use History

3.2.1 1810-1850

The subject property is located on a portion of Lot 25, Broken Front Concession, or Concession "B" in historic Westminster Township. Located on the west side of Wellington Road, Lot 25 was vacant for many years following its original survey. In 1839, Albert S. Odell received 69 ½ acres in the north part of the lot from the Crown. The southern part of the lot was deeded to Edward Matthews in 1850. Odell already owned Lot 24 immediately to the east, having purchased it from James Lester in 1822. The Odell family was one of the earliest families to settle in Westminster Township; Albert was the first of his family to arrive in the Township in 1810.⁵ One of ten children, Albert was born in 1787 to John Odell and Enor Schriver. The Odell family had originally settled in Dutchess County, New York and were of Dutch origin. John left New York following the American Revolution, and relocated near Montreal. All of John and Enor's children would eventually settle in Westminster Township, with the exception of their son Loop, who died in Lower Canada. The first records of the Westminster Council, dated March 4th 1817 identify Albert S. Odell and Robert Frank as "overseers of highways".⁶ Albert Odell did not reside on this property however; the 1854 assessment roll lists him as living on Lot 26, Concession I.⁷

3.2.2 1850-1940

All portions of the original Lot 25 were sold off and subdivided through the 1850s and 1860s. While the 1861 Tremaine map of the township does not provide details of the property, the 1878 atlas shows the property as being subdivided into as many as thirteen parcels. The portions of Lots 24 and 25 fronting on the Thames River are both listed to landowner G.B.R Frank. The northern portion of the lot was originally dominated by a large meander in the river. Aerial photography suggests that this section of the river was realigned and the meander filled in by 1922, although its former location is still evident today as a small oxbow in Watson Street Park.

Between 1882 and 1889, portions of the north half of the original Lot 25 was purchased by the Ontario Investment Association. In August of 1889, these lands were deeded to Lieutenant Colonel William Moir Gartshore, Born in Dundas, Ontario in 1853, Col. Gartshore arrived in London in 1873 to accept a superintendent position with the London Car Wheel Company. He would quickly become a major figure in the London business world, serving as director of The Mutual Fire Insurance Company, Ontario Loan and Debenture Company, and the Canada Trust Company. A distinguished military man, Col. Gartshore joined the Queen's Own Rifles in Toronto in 1871, transferring to the 7th Fusiliers upon arriving in London. He would go on to serve in the Northwest Rebellion in 1885. Col. Gartshore would later serve as a City Alderman, and ran for Mayor in 1916. In 1876 he married Catherine McClary, daughter of stove manufacturer John McClary. The couple had one daughter, and resided at 90 Ridout Street in South London.⁸

⁵ *A History of the County of Middlesex, Op Cit.* p.568

⁶ *A History of the County of Middlesex, Op Cit.* p.948

⁷ *Index to the 1854 Assessment Roll, Westminster Township, Middlesex County, Canada West.*
<https://londonmiddlesex.ogs.on.ca/docs/membpubs/assessment/1854-Westminster-Twp.pdf>. (Accessed November 2018).

⁸ *London and its Men of Affairs.* London, Ontario: Advertiser Job Printing Co. n.d. p. 34

3.2.3 1940-Present

In 1921 Col. Gartshore subdivided much of his property in the original Lot 25 into residential lots. Registered Plan 457 (4th) was completed by Ontario Land Surveyor F. W. Farncom and registered in June of that year. The new subdivision marked a departure from the usual grid pattern – it was the first subdivision in London to be designed with curved streets.⁹ The property on which the St. Andrew Memorial Church sits comprises lots 83 to 92 of plan 457. Records indicate that the property was first purchased from William Gartshore in 1925 and that the Diocese of Huron purchased the property in 1940. The St. Andrew Memorial Church was completed the following year, and officially opened by Reverend C. A. Seager, bishop of the Diocese of Huron, on November 28, 1941; its first pastor was Reverend Alford Abraham. Construction of the St. Andrew Memorial Church was funded by Jessie Jameson, who willed an undisclosed sum of money in trust to the Diocese in order to fund the construction of as many churches as possible, wherever the authorities thought necessary. The St. Andrew Memorial Church was the fourth to be constructed using the funds; two others had been constructed on the Munsee Delaware First Nation Reserve near St. Thomas, another in Windsor. The only stipulation of the trust fund was that the churches be named for her father, the Reverend Andrew Jameson, who was the first missionary to the Chippewa First Nation on Walpole Island. A congregation that had previously met in a church at Adelaide Street and Edna Street in Chelsea Green voted to vacate their building and join the new congregation.¹⁰ The Adelaide Street church building was taken over by the United Church of Canada, and is presently occupied by the Holy Cross Romanian Orthodox Church.

From the beginning, the 1941 church building at 243 Wellington Road was intended to be the parish hall of a much larger facility, to be constructed once the congregation had grown to sufficient size.¹¹ The Diocese set aside the majority of the property for this purpose. Despite its temporary status, the 1941 church was outfitted with the finest furnishings; an elaborate memorial altar was constructed, also with the intention of being moved to the new building.¹² A statue from the altar the Church of St. Andrew Undershaft in London, England, was brought to the church in 1941. One of the oldest churches in England, St. Andrew Undershaft had survived the Great Fire of London and was at the time under threat of destruction by German bombing. The statue of St. Andrew was removed as a precautionary measure, and gifted to the Diocese of Huron to be displayed in the new church.¹³ By the 1950s, the congregation had grown sufficiently to warrant the construction of a larger church. The congregation announced its plans in September of 1955, and sod was turned the following May. The new \$140,000 Mid-Century Modern building was dedicated in February of 1957.¹⁴ A new rectory at 49 Foxbar Road was also constructed at this time, its yellow brick and Mid-Century Modern design echoing that of the new church. The land on which the building sits remains under the ownership of the Diocese of Huron. The 1957 church building continues to be used as the St. Andrew Memorial Church; the original 1941 building is currently occupied by the Church of God of Prophecy. The building is also used by two masonic orders operating youth education programs and the London Consistory Club.¹⁵ The rectory at 49 Foxbar Road continues to be used for its original purpose.

⁹ Baker & Bates, *Op Cit.* p. 44

¹⁰ "Dedicate New London Church". *London Free Press*. 15 November 1941.

¹¹ "Cornerstone of New St. Andrew Memorial Anglican Church Laid". *London Free Press*, 11 September 1941.

¹² "Church of St. Andrew Memorial to Observe Anniversary Sunday". *London Free Press*. 29 November 1947.

¹³ *London Free Press*, 28 November 1941.

¹⁴ *London Free Press*, 2 March 1957.

¹⁵ St. Andrew Memorial Church, "Our History"; <http://standrewmemorial.org/about/history/>.

4. Existing Conditions

4.1 Landscape Context

The properties at 243 Wellington Road, 55 Foxbar Road, and 49 Foxbar Road are located on the west side of Wellington Road, at the corner of Wellington Road and Foxbar Road. Wellington Road follows a north-south orientation through the area before curving to the northwest at its intersection with Alexandra Street/Bevelery Street. Wellington Road is a four-lane road, serving as a major connection between Downtown London and Highway 401. The property is located in the South London neighbourhood of the City of London. The area is primarily residential. Almost all residential units are one- or one-and-a-half-storey single-family detached homes located on large lots with mature trees. Some houses fronting onto Wellington Road have been converted to small stores or offices. Most houses appear to have been constructed in the early- to mid-twentieth century. Residential streets generally follow a grid pattern with small rectangular blocks, typical of older residential subdivisions. The exception is the block in which the property is located. Here the streets follow a winding pattern of crescents. There are no sidewalks on streets within this block, although all other residential streets as well as Wellington Road have them on both sides. Streets are lit with lamps affixed to wooden utility poles.

The 1941 building at 243 Wellington is located adjacent to 1957 building at 55 Foxbar Road and is connected to it by a concrete footpath. The property is landscaped with grass, flowerbeds, and mature trees. A large open park is located in the triangle bounded by Foxbar Road and Wellington Crescent to the north of the Church. Together, the two churches represent a “campus” landscape where the 1941 church and 1957 church building are retained on the same property. The church rectory is located at 49 Foxbar Road, on the south side just west of the 1957 church, with the St. Andrew Memorial Community Garden to its west.

4.2 Architectural Description – 1941, 243 Wellington Road

4.2.1 East (Front) Elevation

The east (front) elevation of the 1941 church building (**Images 1-4**) on the property is a symmetrical front façade framed by the steep gable of the church roof. A small gabled narthex, or enclosed entryway, projects from the centre, echoing the form and materials of the façade behind it. This entrance is flanked by two Gothic pointed arch windows (**Image 5**). The exterior cladding consists of brown-red rug brick, and the peaks of both gables are clad with white horizontal aluminum cladding. A single concrete step raises the walkway to the entryway of the church. Based on the arrangement of the fenestration, it is assumed that more stairs are located on the interior of the narthex. On the north side of this elevation is a cornerstone that notes the opening of the church, and includes the following text: “ST. ANDREW MEMORIAL SEPTEMBER 10, 1941” (**Image 6**). White vertical downspouts extending from the eaves troughs on the north and south sides of the building continue down the front elevation of the church.

4.2.2 North Elevation

The north elevation (**Image 1**) consists of the side gable portion of the church building and is organized into five bays, divided by the buttresses of the exterior church wall. The first, second, third, and fifth bays all include Gothic pointed arch windows, and each bay also includes a simple basement window. A set of metal stairs is attached at this elevation, leading to a side door on the church. The brown-red brick walls of the church extend from the ground to the roofline, and a tall brick chimney also extends through the roof on the west end of this elevation.

4.2.3 South Elevation

The south elevation is mostly obscured from view as a result of the adjacent property fence-line as well as vegetation and tree cover. However, based on visibility, it appears that the south elevation is almost identical to the north elevation in that this side of the structure consists primarily of a series of bays defined by the visible buttresses of the exterior church wall. Much like the north elevation, pointed arch windows appear to be located along the south wall of the church.

4.3 Architectural Description – 1957, 55 Foxbar Road

4.3.1 East (Front) Elevation

The east (front) elevation of the 1957 church on the property (**Images 7, 8 and 12**) consists of the gable front of the church, its large windows, and the steep gable roof. The building's exterior consists of a beige/yellow brick. In comparison to the adjacent 1941 church, the 1957 structure is much larger, and has a much more modern appearance to its exterior. The east elevation includes a set of wooden double doors centered on the elevation, surrounded by large windows that extend from the ground to the roof line in the gable. These large banks project from the windows and the corners are accented with quoin-inspired detailing. To the right of the front entrance is a projected vestibule or entryway with a gable roof that provides an alternate entrance to the church. On the north side of this elevation is a cornerstone that notes the opening of the church, and includes the following text: "CHURCH OF ST. ANDREW MEMORIAL 1956 WE PREACH CHRIST CRUCIFIED". A large spire rises above the roof ridge.

4.3.2 North Elevation

The north elevation (**Image 10**) consists of the winged gable end of the church, defined by the building's steep roof and long depth. It comprises a long brick wall punctuated by a series of narrow, vertical window bays in a regular rhythm. Each bay includes a blue-green panel beneath what appears to be painted glass. A rear wing has been constructed towards the back of the structure on this elevation, and includes an intersecting gable roof with a set of centrally located windows.

4.3.3 South Elevation

The south elevation (**Image 11**) faces the 1941 church, and is almost identical in composition to the north elevation. Like the north side of the structure, the south elevation includes a long wall defined primarily by its fenestration, consisting of blue-green panels beneath vertical windows that extend from the roofline to the ground. Given the form of the steep gable roof, the north and south sides of the building are defined primarily by the long depth of the building and its steep gable roof form.

4.4 Architectural Description – 1957, 49 Foxbar Road

4.4.1 Front (North) Elevation

The north elevation faces Foxbar Road. The building is set far back from the road with a large lawn and single-width driveway in front. The north elevation is a two-storey façade with a low pitched side gable roof covered in brown asphalt shingles. Attached to the building is a single car garage with low hipped roof, connected to the building with a covered breezeway that extends over the main entrance. This façade and the garage are clad in yellow brick, similar to that of the 1957 church next door. A recessed bay is located slightly to the right of centre. On

the ground floor, this contains a large window and single entrance door offset to the right. The second storey of this bay is clad in vertical aluminum siding and has two horizontally sliding windows offset to the left. The only other window on this façade is a small horizontally sliding window on the ground floor, just to the left of the main entrance.

4.4.2 South (Rear) Elevation

The south elevation is obscured by high trees and neighbouring properties. It appears to be a two storey façade, clad in yellow brick. An awning with a sloping roof supported by square wooden posts extends out just below the eaves covering the rear entrance.

4.4.3 East Elevation

The east elevation is obscured by large trees. It appears to be a two-storey end-gable façade with large windows on the first and second storeys.

4.4.4 West Elevation

The west elevation faces onto the St. Andrew Memorial Community Garden. It is partially obscured by a large hedge and tree. It is a two storey, end gable façade with two symmetrically arranged windows on the first and second storeys. All windows consist of a large pane of fixed glass with small sliding horizontally windows below. The garage is clad in yellow brick, with a single horizontally oriented window just below the eaves.

4.5 Comparative Analysis

A comparative analysis was undertaken to establish a baseline understanding of cultural heritage resources in the City of London, and to determine if the property “is a rare, unique, representative, or early examples of a style, type, expression, material or construction method” as described in O.Reg. 9/06.

Comparative examples were drawn from identified properties within the City of London, as well as similar examples of architecture identified as Mid-Century Modern architectural style and places of worship. Eight comparable properties with cultural heritage value were identified. However, this sample does not represent all available properties, and is rather intended to be a representative selection (**Table 1**). Various similar or comparable properties are located throughout the City, however, these eight were identified to provide similar examples for the purposes of this report. The following observations were noted in analyzing the comparable properties.

Of these examples:





- Eight were originally built as places of worship;
- Six still function as places of worship
- Seven contain buildings that can be considered examples of Mid-Century Modern places of worship
- Two contain more than one building (a historic building and a newer building) forming a “campus”
- Two have steep A-Frame gables/form
- Five are constructed or clad with exterior brick

The Mid-Century Modern architectural style evolved out of the larger modernist and Art Moderne movements from the earlier 20th century. Like the Art Moderne movement, the Mid-Century Modern style was a self-conscious effort

to put former architectural styles and traditions behind and separate into new streamlined and experimental forms. In architecture, traditional architectural elements like columns and capitals were replaced with inverted wing roofs, and reinforced concrete forms. In civic or institutional architecture, Mid-Century Modern buildings often took on the form of tented structures, which was often most noticeable in church architecture where traditional gable roof forms became much more exaggerated in form, sometimes built in an A-Frame style.¹⁶

The comparative analysis suggests that the subject property is an early example of a Mid-Century Modern place of worship within the City of London. It is typical in its size and massing, as well as its gable form. However, the exaggerated A-Frame included as a part of the subject property is a much more distinctive element of the building's form. Various shades of brick have been used for comparative styles of architecture in London.

Table 1: Comparative analysis of properties with cultural heritage value with buildings/structures of similar age, style, and/or typology

Address	Recognition	Picture	Age	Material	Style
534 Huron Street Or Shalom Congregation	Listed Priority 1		1960	Brick – brown, rug brick, and concrete	Mid-Century Modern place of worship, temple, circular form, flat roof
33 Bromleigh Avenue Church of the Transfiguration	Listed Priority 1		1962	Frame, metal exterior cladding, Stone/concrete	Mid-Century Modern, place of worship, shallow gable roof, projected awning
471 Ridgewood Crescent Mount Zion United Church	Listed Priority 1		1963	Frame, exterior faux stone/silica cladding, brick, and concrete	Mid-Century Modern, place of worship, steep folding plate, and tall spire
511 Cheapside Street St. Michael's Roman Catholic Church	Listed Priority 1		1971	Brick, yellow/orange brick	Mid-Century Modern, place of worship, medium-pitched gable roof

¹⁶ Hal Kalman, A History of Canadian Architecture. Oxford Printing Press, 1994.

<p>29 Victoria Street</p> <p>Gibbons Park Montessori School (former Unitarian Fellowship Hall)</p>	<p>Listed</p> <p>Priority 1</p>		<p>1961</p>	<p>Brick, dark brown rug brick</p>	<p>Mid-Century Modern, former place of worship, one storey, flat roof</p>
<p>1246 Oxford Street West</p> <p>St. Aidan's Anglican Church</p>	<p>None</p>		<p>TBD</p>	<p>Stone</p>	<p>Mid-Century Modern, place of worship, steep A-Frame/gable roof</p>
<p>1344 Commissioners Road West</p> <p>St. Anne's Anglican Church</p>	<p>Listed,</p> <p>Priority 1</p>		<p>1853 (old church), 1950 (new hall)</p>	<p>Field stone (old church), buff brick (new hall)</p>	<p>Old church – Gothic Revival, single storey with shallow-pitched gable roof. New hall – Mid-Century Modern, hall associated with place of worship, shallow-pitched gable roof</p>

4.6 Discussion of Integrity

According to the Ontario Heritage Toolkit, Heritage Property Evaluation (MTCS 2006), “Integrity is a question of whether the surviving physical features (heritage attributes) continue to represent or support the cultural heritage value or interest of the property.” The following discussion of integrity was prepared to consider the ability of the property to represent and retain its cultural heritage value over time. It does not consider the structural integrity of the building. Access to the interior of the building was not available, and observations have been made from the public right-of-way. Structural integrity, should it be identified as a concern, should be determined by way of a qualified heritage engineer, building scientist, or architect.

The subject property contains a one-and-a-half storey church (1941) and a larger Mid-Century Modern church (1957). The 1941 church is constructed of red brick with a steep end-gable roof. Review of historic aerial photos and maps indicated that the church’s footprint remains identical to its original construction, with no additions. The blank steel door on the main entrance is believed to be a recent modification, as is the steel stairs and landing on

north side. The aluminium siding on the gables would also be of more recent vintage, likely covering or replacing older wood siding. All windows appear to have been replaced with modern aluminum frames. It is not known if any stained glass windows were present at the time of the church's construction, although these are not mentioned in any contemporary articles. Given the modest nature of the building it is likely that the church was constructed with little ornamentation. The cornerstone remains present on the northeastern corner of the building.

The 1957 church is constructed of a yellow brick with a steep end-gable roof, and a review of available mapping and aerial photography indicates that the church's footprint remains similar, with the rear wing of the church evidently a part of the original construction. The church appears to remain relatively unaltered and the exterior doors, and windows also appear to be of their original design and materials.

As such, the buildings can be considered to retain much of its historic integrity and original built character.

<p>iii) Demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Assessment of the interior of both churches was outside of the scope of this assessment, and would be encouraged to more fully understand the application of this criteria for the purposes of designation, if pursued. While visually interesting, no evidence was found to suggest that either building demonstrates a high degree of technical merit or scientific achievement. Their construction is typical of other small places of worship of the era.</p>
<p>2) The property has historic or associative value because it:</p>		
<p>i) Has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organisation, or institution that is significant to a community.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>While the property is associated with a longstanding organisation and reflects the twentieth century growth of the organisation, the church organisation is not of particular local significance. The property does not appear to have direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization, or institution that is significant to a community.</p>
<p>ii) Yields, or has the potential to yield information that contributes to the understanding of a community or culture.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The building does not yield information towards understanding the community or its culture. It is unlikely that the buildings provide any information about the community.</p>
<p>iii) Demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer or theorist who is significant to the community.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>No evidence was found to suggest that either building was the work of a major architect, artist, builder, designer or theorist who was significant to the community.</p>
<p>3) The property has contextual value because it:</p>		
<p>i) Is important in defining, maintaining, or supporting the character of an area</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Although the two church buildings on the property are one of a few places of worship located in a primarily residential area along Wellington Road. The area also includes Gartshore Park, located just north of the church property. The Redeemer Evangelical Lutheran Church is located north of the park, another example of Mid-Century Modern architecture.</p>

		<p>However, the two church buildings on the subject property do defining or maintain or support a particular character in the area and as a result, the property does not appear to be an important element in defining or maintaining the character of this portion of Wellington Road.</p>
<p>ii) Is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The property represents an unusual example of a church property where the original building was retained rather than being replaced. The property illustrates the evolution of the church and the growth of the area during the mid-twentieth century and the buildings form a “campus”. Further, as a result of the irregular curvature of Wellington Road, the orientation of the 1957 church is unusual. Together, the two churches are physically, and historically linked, and in particular, the 1957 church is physically, and functionally linked to its surroundings.</p>
<p>iii) Is a landmark</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Although the property contains two small to mid-scale churches, located at an unusual orientation on the property and along Wellington Road, the property does not appear to be considered a landmark.</p>

6. Conclusions

Based on the evaluation of background historical research, site investigation, and application of the criteria outlined in *Ontario Regulation 9/06*, the subject property at 243 Wellington Road was determined to have significant cultural heritage value or interest. Accordingly, the following Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest and list of Heritage Attributes have been prepared.

6.1 Statement of Cultural Heritage Value

6.1.1 Description of Property

The property at 243 Wellington Road, 55 Foxbar Road, 49 Foxbar Road, in the City of London consists of two mid-20th century churches, and rectory built in 1941 and 1957. The 1941 church building consists of a brown and red rug brick and gable roof. The 1957 church building consists of a beige/yellow brick and is much larger in scale than the 1941 structure, also including a gable roof. The rectory building is also constructed of yellow brick, similar to the 1957 church and is situated with its frontage entirely on Foxbar Road. Both church structures maintain frontage on the west side of Wellington Road, however, the orientation of the 1957 church building is much more unusual given the unusual curvature of Wellington Road.

6.1.2 Cultural Heritage Value

Originally developed in 1941, the property at 243 Wellington Road, 55 Foxbar Road, 49 Foxbar Road, in the City of London includes two church buildings, and a rectory built by and for the St. Andrew Memorial Church. The first of the church structures built in 1941, consists of a modest brown and red rug brick church building built with a gable roof, and includes horizontal white cladding in the gable peak of the structure. Pointed arch windows punctuate the north, east, and west façades of the structures. As a result of its growing congregation in the mid-20th century, the congregation was in need of a larger church and by 1957, a newer, and much larger second church building was constructed on the property in the Mid-Century Modern style of architecture, and a rectory building was also constructed, adjacent to the church, and fronting onto Foxbar Road.

The 1957 church structure was designed with a steeply-pitched gable roof form, and tall, narrow windows and panelling in a manner representative of Mid-Century Modern architectural style, applied in the design and construction of a place of worship. As an example of Mid-Century Modern architecture, the building includes a number of design elements that represent the style including its steep-pitched roof, designed in a steep A-Frame form, as well as its uses of narrow windows and panelling.

As a campus-like property, the retention of the 1941 church building, the 1957 church building, and 1957 rectory, all retained on a single property represents a functional, historical, and physical link to its surroundings. The 1941 and 1957 church buildings are historically and functionally linked in that they represent the growing congregation of the St. Andrew Memorial Church in the mid-20th century and the requirement for the construction of a larger place of worship. The two church buildings are physically connected by a walkway and represent a campus of sorts that typically not found elsewhere within the City of London. Lastly, the orientation of the 1957 church structure is unusual as a result of the curvature of Wellington Road and the church's placement on the property adjacent to the 1941 church. As a result, the property demonstrates a contextual value that is represented by its orientation and surroundings.

Individually, the 1957 church building is a representative example of mid-20th century Mid-Century Modern architectural utilized in the design and construction of a place of worship. Together, with the retention of the 1941 church structure and the presence of the 1957 rectory on the same property, the property at 243 Wellington Road, 55 Foxbar Road, and 49 Foxbar Road form a campus that represents the growth, contextual relationship, and value of all three structures.

6.2 Heritage Attributes

The heritage attributes that reflect the cultural heritage value of the subject property include:

- 1941 church building including:
 - Small, modest scale and form;
 - Gable—pitched roof;
 - Pointed-arch windows;
 - Cornerstone
 - Contextual and spatial relationship with the 1957 church building and rectory constructed on the same property.

- 1957 Mid-Century Modern church including:
 - Steeply-pitched gable roof;
 - Yellow brick;
 - Distinctive greenish-blue panels, and narrow window units;
 - Leaded glass windows;
 - Centrally-located spire;
 - Cornerstone; and
 - Contextual and functional, and spatial relationship with the 1941 church building and 1957 rectory constructed on the same property.

7. Recommendations

AECOM was retained by the City of London to complete a Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report as part of the Transit Project Assessment Process for the proposed London Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) system to determine the cultural heritage value of the property at 243 Wellington Road.

The subject property includes two mid-20th century churches, a modest 1941 church building and the other a distinctive Mid-Century Modern church, constructed in 1957. Based on the evaluation of the background research, historical research, site investigation, and application of the criteria from *Ontario Regulation 9/06*, the subject property was determined to demonstrate significant cultural heritage value.

The completion of this CHER recommends that a Heritage Impact Assessment is required for this property to identify appropriate mitigation measures with respect to any proposed interventions.

Should the City of London wish to pursue designation of the property under Part IV of the *Ontario Heritage Act*, further research, and an interior assessment of the property is recommended in order to inform a comprehensive designating by-law for the property.

8. Images



Image 1: 1941 St. Andrew Memorial Church, looking south from Wellington Road. (AECOM, 2018)



Image 2: St. Andrew Memorial Church, showing original 1941 church at left, with 1957 structure at right. (AECOM, 2018)



Image 3: East façade of 1941 church, showing vestibule. (AECOM, 2018)



Image 4: 1941 church, showing relationship to 1957 church and surrounding residential neighbourhood. (AECOM, 2018).




Image 5: Detail of pointed arch window on east façade of 1941 church. (AECOM, 2018)



Image 6: Cornerstone on the northeast corner of the 1941 church. (AECOM, 2018)



Image 7: East elevation of 1957 church showing design with steep gable roof. (AECOM, 2018)



Image 8: 1957 church looking southwest from Wellington Road. (AECOM, 2018)



Image 9: 1957 church, showing parking area and surrounding landscape. (AECOM, 2018)



Image 10: North elevation of 1957 church, showing narrow vertical windows and intersecting side gable roof. (AECOM, 2018)



Image 11: St Andrew Memorial Church property with 1941 church at left, south elevation of 1957 at right. (AECOM, 2018)



Image 12: Detail of windows and brickwork on east elevation of 1957 church. (AECOM, 2018)




Image 13: View of the rectory at 49 Foxbar Road, located adjacent to the 1957 church building (AECOM, 2018)



Image 14: View looking south, showing the 1957 church structure and the 1957 rectory along Foxbar Road (AECOM, 2018)

9. Historic Photos and Mapping

All mapping related to the subject property are included on the following pages.



**243 Wellington
Road/55 Foxbar Road,
49 Foxbar Road**


Legend

Project Location



<p>Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report 243 Wellington Road/55 Foxbar Road, 49 Foxbar Road London, Ontario</p>		
<p>Location of Project Location</p>		
<p>November 2018</p>	<p>1:25,000</p>	<p>Datum: NAD 83 UTM17 Source: http://wms.ess-ws.nrcan.gc.ca/wms/toporama_en</p>
<p>PH: 60590467</p>	<p>V#:</p>	<p>Figure 1</p>
<p>AECOM</p>		
<p>0 250 500 1,000 Metres</p>		
<p><small>This drawing has been prepared for the use of AECOM's client and may not be used, reproduced or relied upon by third parties, except as agreed by AECOM and its client, as required by law or for use by governmental reviewing agencies. AECOM accepts no responsibility, and denies any liability whatsoever, to any party that modifies this drawing without AECOM's express written consent.</small></p>		



Map Source: "http://wms.ess-ws.nrcan.gc.ca/wms/toporama_en" (1/17/2018 10:05:15 AM) - User: "AECOM" Project Location: "243 Wellington Road/55 Foxbar Road, 49 Foxbar Road"




Legend

 Project Location




Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report 243 Wellington Road/55 Foxbar Road, 49 Foxbar Road London, Ontario		
Project Location in Detail		
November 2018	1:900	Datum: NAD 83 UTM17 Source: LIO 2017, City of London 2017
P#: 60590467	V#:	Figure 2
		
<small>This drawing has been prepared for the use of AECOM's client and may not be used, reproduced or relied upon by third parties, except as agreed by AECOM and its client, as required by law or for use by governmental reviewing agencies. AECOM accepts no responsibility, and denies any liability whatsoever, to any party that modifies this drawing without AECOM's express written consent.</small>		


Map Source: "Map of London, Ontario" (2017) by AECOM and its client, as required by law or for use by governmental reviewing agencies. AECOM accepts no responsibility, and denies any liability whatsoever, to any party that modifies this drawing without AECOM's express written consent.



Legend

 Project Location



Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report		
243 Wellington Road/55 Foxbar Road, 49 Foxbar Road London, Ontario		
Project Location, 1862		
November 2018	1:15,000	Datum: NAD 83 UTM17 Source: Tremaine's Map 1862
P#: 60590467	V#:	
AECOM		Figure 3
		
<small>This drawing has been prepared for the use of AECOM's client and may not be used, reproduced or relied upon by third parties, except as agreed by AECOM and its client, as required by law or for use by governmental reviewing agencies. AECOM accepts no responsibility, and denies any liability whatsoever, to any party that modifies this drawing without AECOM's express written consent.</small>		


Map Source: "London (1862).tif" (2018-08-08 10:00:00 AM) - 100% Zoom



Legend

 Project Location



Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report		
243 Wellington Road/55 Foxbar Road, 49 Foxbar Road London, Ontario		
Project Location, 1878		
November 2018	1:20,000	Datum: NAD 83 UTM17 Source: Illustrated Historic Atlas of Middlesex County, Toronto: H.R. Page & Co.
PH#: 60590467	V#:	
AECOM		Figure 4
		
<small>This drawing has been prepared for the use of AECOM's client and may not be used, reproduced or relied upon by third parties, except as agreed by AECOM and its client, as required by law or for use by governmental reviewing agencies. AECOM accepts no responsibility, and denies any liability whatsoever, to any party that modifies this drawing without AECOM's express written consent.</small>		

Map Source: "Illustrated Historic Atlas of Middlesex County" (1878) by H.R. Page & Co. Digitized by Google. Project Location: 43.651111, -81.233333. Date: 2018-11-08.



Legend

 Project Location




Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report
 243 Wellington Road/55 Foxbar Road, 49 Foxbar Road
 London, Ontario

Project Location, 1929


November 2018	1:10,000	Datum: NAD 83 UTM17 Source: LIO 2017, Department of Militia and Defence, 1929
P#: 60590467	V#:	

AECOM **Figure 6**



This drawing has been prepared for the use of AECOM's client and may not be used, reproduced or relied upon by third parties, except as agreed by AECOM and its client, as required by law or for use by governmental reviewing agencies. AECOM accepts no responsibility, and denies any liability whatsoever, to any party that modifies this drawing without AECOM's express written consent.

Map Source: "Map of the City of London, Ontario, 1929" (L1010001) and "Map of the City of London, Ontario, 1929" (L1010002) from the Department of Militia and Defence, 1929. Digitized by the University of Toronto Libraries. Project Location: 243 Wellington Road/55 Foxbar Road, 49 Foxbar Road, London, Ontario.



1945





1965

Legend

 Project Location



Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report 243 Wellington Road/55 Foxbar Road, 49 Foxbar Road London, Ontario	
Project Location, 1945 & 1965	
November 2018	1:2,000
P#: 60590467	V#:
	
Figure 9	
	
<small>This drawing has been prepared for the use of AECOM's client and may not be used, reproduced or relied upon by third parties, except as agreed by AECOM and its client, as required by law or for use by governmental reviewing agencies. AECOM accepts no responsibility, and denies any liability whatsoever, to any party that modifies this drawing without AECOM's express written consent.</small>	

Map Source: "LONDON (1945 AND 1965) AERIAL PHOTOGRAPHS" (1945 AND 1965) - 1000.mxd
 Date: 2018-11-15 10:02:58 AM
 User: jason.gardner

10. Bibliography and Sources

“Cornerstone of New St. Andrew Memorial Anglican Church Laid”. *London Free Press*, 11 September 1941.

“Church of St. Andrew Memorial to Observe Anniversary Sunday”. *London Free Press*. 29 November 1947.

“Dedicate New London Church”. *London Free Press*. 15 November 1941.

A History of the County of Middlesex, Canada. Toronto: W. A. & C. L. Goodspeed, 1889.

London Free Press, 28 November 1941.

London Free Press, 2 March 1957.

Index to the 1854 Assessment Roll, Westminster Township, Middlesex County, Canada West, 1854.

<https://londonmiddlesex.ogs.on.ca/docs/membpubs/assessment/1854-Westminster-Twp.pdf>.

Vernon, Henry. *Vernon's City of London (Ontario) Directory*. Hamilton, Ontario: Henry Vernon & Son. (Issues 1922, 1939-78).

The Architectural Conservancy of Ontario. *Tecumseh Trek: ACO's 38th Annual Geranium Heritage House Tour*. London, Ontario: ACO, 5 June 2011.

Baker, Michael & Hilary Bates Neary. *London Street Names*. Toronto: James Lormier & Company Ltd., 2003

Brock, Dan. “All in the Family: An Account of Some Members of the Odell Family”. *London & Middlesex County Historical Society Newsletter*, Fall, 2018.

Foster, J. G. & Co. *Foster's London and Middlesex County Directory 1896-97*. Toronto: J. G. Foster & Co., 1896

Goad, Charles E. *Fire Insurance Plan for the City of London Ontario*. Montreal: Charles E. Goad, 1881 (Revised ed. 1888, 1907, 1915, 1922)

London and its Men of Affairs. London, Ontario: Advertiser Job Printing Co. n.d.

Middlesex County (33) Land Registry Office (MCLRO). *Book 2. Abstract Index Up 2 1866; LOT 23 Concession 4 to Concession 9; Concession A and B*.

Middlesex County (33) Land Registry Office (MCLRO). *Book 50. Plan 457*.

Middlesex County (33) Land Registry Office (MCLRO). *Parcel Register LTS 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, & 93, PL 457 (4TH), Except LC94225; S/T Debts in 592076, London*.

Page, H. R. & Co. *Illustrated Historical Atlas of the County of Middlesex, Ont*. Toronto: H. R. Page & Co., 1878

Tremaine, Geo. R. & G. M. *Tremaine's Map of the County of Middlesex, Canada West*. Toronto: Geo. R. & G. M. Tremaine, 1862

Provincial Standards and Resources:

Ontario Heritage Tool Kit

<http://www.culture.gov.on.ca/english/heritage/Toolkit/toolkit.ht>

Ontario Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport: Heritage Conservation Principle's for Land Use Planning

http://www.culture.gov.on.ca/english/heritage/info_sheets/info_sheet_landuse_planning.htm

Ontario Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport: Eight Guiding Principles in the Conservation of Historic Properties

http://www.culture.gov.on.ca/english/heritage/info_sheets/info_sheet_8principles.htm

Ontario Heritage Act (2006)

Reference Guide on Physical and Cultural Heritage Resources (1996)

Guidelines for Preparing the Cultural Heritage Resource Component of Environmental Assessments (1992)

Guidelines on the Man-Made Heritage Component of Environmental Assessments (1981)

Environmental Guide for Built Heritage and Cultural Heritage Landscapes (2007)

National and International Standards and Resources:

Canadian Register of Historic Places

http://www.historicplaces.ca/visit-visite/rep-reg_e.aspx

Parks Canada Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada

http://www.pc.gc.ca/docs/pc/guide/nldclpc-sgchpc/index_E.asp

Parks Canada National Historic Sites of Canada

http://www.pc.gc.ca/progs/lhn-nhs/index_e.asp

About AECOM

AECOM (NYSE: ACM) is built to deliver a better world. We design, build, finance and operate infrastructure assets for governments, businesses and organizations in more than 150 countries.

As a fully integrated firm, we connect knowledge and experience across our global network of experts to help clients solve their most complex challenges.

From high-performance buildings and infrastructure, to resilient communities and environments, to stable and secure nations, our work is transformative, differentiated and vital. A Fortune 500 firm, AECOM companies had revenue of approximately US \$19 billion during the 12 months ended June 30, 2015.

See how we deliver what others can only imagine at aecom.com and [@AECOM](https://twitter.com/AECOM).

Contact

First name Surname

Job Role

T +xx (x)xx xxxx xxxx

E firstname.surname@aecom.com

First name Surname

Job Role

T +xx (x)xx xxxx xxxx

E firstname.surname@aecom.com

City of London

Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report 253-255 Wellington Road, London, Ontario

Prepared by:

AECOM

410 – 250 York Street, Citi Plaza
London, ON, Canada N6A 6K2
www.aecom.com

519 673 0510 tel
519 673 5975 fax

Statement of Qualifications and Limitations

The attached Report (the “Report”) has been prepared by AECOM Canada Ltd. (“AECOM”) for the benefit of the Client (“Client”) in accordance with the agreement between AECOM and Client, including the scope of work detailed therein (the “Agreement”).

The information, data, recommendations and conclusions contained in the Report (collectively, the “Information”):

- is subject to the scope, schedule, and other constraints and limitations in the Agreement and the qualifications contained in the Report (the “Limitations”);
- represents AECOM’s professional judgement in light of the Limitations and industry standards for the preparation of similar reports;
- may be based on information provided to AECOM which has not been independently verified;
- has not been updated since the date of issuance of the Report and its accuracy is limited to the time period and circumstances in which it was collected, processed, made or issued;
- must be read as a whole and sections thereof should not be read out of such context;
- was prepared for the specific purposes described in the Report and the Agreement; and
- in the case of subsurface, environmental or geotechnical conditions, may be based on limited testing and on the assumption that such conditions are uniform and not variable either geographically or over time.

AECOM shall be entitled to rely upon the accuracy and completeness of information that was provided to it and has no obligation to update such information. AECOM accepts no responsibility for any events or circumstances that may have occurred since the date on which the Report was prepared and, in the case of subsurface, environmental or geotechnical conditions, is not responsible for any variability in such conditions, geographically or over time.

AECOM agrees that the Report represents its professional judgement as described above and that the Information has been prepared for the specific purpose and use described in the Report and the Agreement, but AECOM makes no other representations, or any guarantees or warranties whatsoever, whether express or implied, with respect to the Report, the Information or any part thereof.

Without in any way limiting the generality of the foregoing, any estimates or opinions regarding probable construction costs or construction schedule provided by AECOM represent AECOM’s professional judgement in light of its experience and the knowledge and information available to it at the time of preparation. Since AECOM has no control over market or economic conditions, prices for construction labour, equipment or materials or bidding procedures, AECOM, its directors, officers and employees are not able to, nor do they, make any representations, warranties or guarantees whatsoever, whether express or implied, with respect to such estimates or opinions, or their variance from actual construction costs or schedules, and accept no responsibility for any loss or damage arising therefrom or in any way related thereto. Persons relying on such estimates or opinions do so at their own risk.

Except (1) as agreed to in writing by AECOM and Client; (2) as required by-law; or (3) to the extent used by governmental reviewing agencies for the purpose of obtaining permits or approvals, the Report and the Information may be used and relied upon only by Client.

AECOM accepts no responsibility, and denies any liability whatsoever, to parties other than Client who may obtain access to the Report or the Information for any injury, loss or damage suffered by such parties arising from their use of, reliance upon, or decisions or actions based on the Report or any of the Information (“improper use of the Report”), except to the extent those parties have obtained the prior written consent of AECOM to use and rely upon the Report and the Information. Any injury, loss or damages arising from improper use of the Report shall be borne by the party making such use.

This Statement of Qualifications and Limitations is attached to and forms part of the Report and any use of the Report is subject to the terms hereof.

AECOM: 2015-04-13
© 2009-2015 AECOM Canada Ltd. All Rights Reserved.

Signatures

Report Prepared By: DRAFT

Michael Greguol, M.A.
Cultural Heritage Specialist

DRAFT

Liam Smythe, B.URPI
Heritage Researcher

Report Reviewed By: DRAFT

Tatum Taylor, M.Sc., CAHP
Cultural Heritage Specialist

Distribution List

# Hard Copies	PDF Required	Association / Company Name

Revision History

Revision #	Date	Revised By:	Revision Description
0	Nov 16 2018	M. Greguol, L. Smythe	Draft Report to City of London
1	Nov 21 2018	M. Greguol, L. Smythe	Revised Draft Report to City of London for LACH Stewardship Sub-Committee

Executive Summary

AECOM Canada Ltd. (AECOM) was retained by the City of London to complete a Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report (CHER) as part of the Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP) for the proposed London Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) system to determine the cultural heritage value of the property at 253-255 Wellington Road. The BRT system is comprised of four segments, combined into two operation routes: the north/east corridor and the south/west corridor. The BRT network was approved by City of London Council through the Rapid Transit Master Plan in July 2017.

The property located at 253-255 Wellington Road was identified in the City of London Cultural Heritage Screening Report (CHSR) (October 2018) as being a directly impacted, heritage listed property. The CHSR was completed as part of the TPAP for the London Bus Rapid Transit project. The TPAP is regulated by the Environmental Assessment Act (EAA) under Ontario Regulation 231/08: Transit Projects and Metrolinx Undertakings (O.Reg. 231/08). This CHER forms part of the Environmental Project Report (EPR) completed under the TPAP.

The subject property contains a one-and-a-half storey frame commercial/residential building constructed circa 1941-42. Based on the background historical research, field review, comparative analysis, description of integrity, and application of Ontario Regulation 9/06 criteria, the property was not determined to have significant cultural heritage value or interest. Subsequently, no additional cultural heritage work is recommended for the property.

Table of Contents

	page
1. Introduction	1
1.1 Development Context	1
2. Legislation and Policy Context	2
2.1 Provincial and Municipal Context and Policies	2
2.1.1 Provincial Policy Context	2
2.1.2 Ontario Regulation 9/06.....	2
2.1.3 Municipal Policies	3
2.2 Methodology	3
2.3 Consultation.....	3
3. Historical Context	5
3.1 Local Context and Settlement History	5
3.1.1 Westminster Township	5
3.1.2 London South.....	5
3.1.3 Wellington Road.....	5
3.2 Land Use History	6
3.2.1 1810-1850.....	6
3.2.2 1850-1910.....	6
3.2.3 1910-Present.....	7
4. Existing Conditions	8
4.1 Landscape Context.....	8
4.2 Architectural Description	8
4.2.1 East (Front) Elevation.....	8
4.2.2 West (Rear) Elevation	9
4.2.3 North Elevation.....	9
4.2.4 South Elevation	9
4.3 Comparative Analysis	9
4.4 Discussion of Integrity.....	11
5. Heritage Evaluation	13
5.1 Ontario Regulation 9/06.....	13
6. Conclusions	15
7. Recommendations	16
8. Images	17
9. Historic Photos and Mapping	20
10. Bibliography and Sources.....	31

List of Figures

Figure 1: Location of Project Location	21
Figure 2: Project Location in Detail	22
Figure 3: Project Location, 1862	23
Figure 4: Project Location, 1878	24
Figure 5: Project Location, 1913	25
Figure 6: Project Location, 1929	26
Figure 7: Project Location, 1948	27
Figure 8: Project Location, 1922	28
Figure 9: Project Location, 1945	29
Figure 10: Project Location, 1972	30

List of Tables

Table 1: Comparative analysis of properties with building/structures of similar age, style, and/or typology	10
---	----

1. Introduction

1.1 Development Context

AECOM Canada Ltd. (AECOM) was retained by the City of London to complete a Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report (CHER) as part of the Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP) for the proposed London Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) system to determine the cultural heritage value of the property at 253-255 Wellington Road. The BRT system is comprised of four segments, combined into two operation routes: the north/east corridor and the south/west corridor. The BRT network was approved by City of London Council through the Rapid Transit Master Plan in July 2017.

The property located at 253-255 Wellington Road was identified in the City of London Cultural Heritage Screening Report (CHSR) (October 2018) as being a directly impacted, heritage listed property. The CHSR was completed as part of the TPAP for the London Bus Rapid Transit project. The TPAP is regulated by the Environmental Assessment Act (EAA) under Ontario Regulation 231/08: Transit Projects and Metrolinx Undertakings (O.Reg. 231/08). This CHER forms part of the Environmental Project Report (EPR) completed under the TPAP.

2. Legislation and Policy Context

2.1 Provincial and Municipal Context and Policies

2.1.1 Provincial Policy Context

The Ministry of Tourism, Culture, and Sport (MTCS) is charged under Section 2 of the *Ontario Heritage Act* with the responsibility to determine policies, priorities and programs for the conservation, protection and preservation of the cultural heritage of Ontario and has published guidelines to assist in assessing cultural heritage resources as part of environmental assessment. The following have informed the preparation of this CHER:

- Guidelines for Preparing the Cultural Heritage Resource Component of Environmental Assessments (1992);
- Guidelines on the Man-Made Heritage Component of Environmental Assessments (1981);
- MTCS Standards and Guidelines for Conservation of Provincial Heritage Properties (2010);
- Environmental Guide for Built Heritage and Cultural Heritage Landscapes (2007); and
- The Ontario Heritage Toolkit (2006).

An Environmental Assessment is required for all large-scale projects that have potential impacts on the environment. These projects require approval from the Government of Ontario. Certain projects, such as transit projects, have more predictable environmental impacts or effects, and can be readily managed. This streamlined approach protects the environment, but shortens the timeline to six months for commencement, review, and approval. This Environmental Assessment process for transit projects is known as the Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP).

TPAP provides a framework for focused consultation and objection processes. Through TPAP, the Minister of the Environment may initiate a Time Out period if there is a potential for a negative impact on a matter of provincial importance that relates to the natural environment or has cultural heritage value or interest, or on a constitutionally protected Aboriginal or treaty right (TPAP Guide to Environmental Assessment Requirements for Transit Projects, 2014).

Additionally, the *Planning Act* (1990) and related *Provincial Policy Statement (PPS)* (2014) provide guidance for the assessment and evaluation of potential cultural heritage resources. Subsection 2.6 of the PPS, Cultural Heritage and Archaeological Resources, states that:

2.6.1 Significant built heritage resources and significant cultural heritage landscapes shall be conserved.

Criteria for determining significance for the resources are mandated by the Province in Ontario Regulation 9/06.

2.1.2 Ontario Regulation 9/06

Ontario Regulation 9/06 provides the Criteria for Determining Cultural Heritage Value or Interest under the *Ontario Heritage Act*. This regulation was created to ensure a consistent approach to the designation of heritage properties under the *Ontario Heritage Act*. All designations under the *Ontario Heritage Act* after 2006 must meet at least one of the criteria outlined in the regulation.

A property may be designated under Section 29 of the *Ontario Heritage Act* if it meets one or more of the following criteria for determining whether the property is of cultural heritage value or interest:

1. The property has design value or physical value because it,
 - i. is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, expression, material or construction method;
 - ii. displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit;
 - iii. demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement.
2. The property has historical value or associative value because it,
 - i. has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization, or institution that is significant to a community,
 - ii. yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of a community or culture;
 - iii. demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer or theorist who is significant to a community.
3. The property has contextual value because it,
 - i. is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an area;
 - ii. is physically, functionally, visually, or historically linked to its surroundings;
 - iii. is a landmark.

2.1.3 Municipal Policies

The London Plan is the City of London's new Official Plan which was consolidated on August 27, 2018. *The London Plan* focuses on three areas of cultural heritage planning, including: general policies for the protection and enhancement of cultural heritage resources; specific policies related to the identification of cultural heritage resources, including individual cultural heritage resources, heritage conservation districts, cultural heritage landscapes, and archaeological resources; and specific policies related to the protection and conservation of these cultural heritage resources. The criteria outlined in *The London Plan* for the identification and designation of individual properties of cultural heritage value or interest reflect the criteria defined in O.Reg. 9/06.

2.2 Methodology

A CHER examines a property as a whole, its relationship to its surroundings, as well as its individual elements - engineering works, landscape etc. The recommendations of the CHER are based on an understanding of the physical values of the property, a documentation of its history through research, and an analysis of its social context, comparisons with similar properties and mapping. A field review was carried out by Liam Smythe, Heritage Researcher at AECOM in November 2018. Access was limited to the public right-of-way.

This CHER is guided and informed by the key documents listed in 2.1.1. The following report has been prepared utilizing the Terms of Reference prepared for the London BRT TPAP process, which has been received by the London Advisory Committee on Heritage (LACH) (See Section 11).

2.3 Consultation

Consultation for the London BRT project has been conducted with the LACH. A draft CHSR (dated February 6, 2018) was provided for their review and comment. The LACH Stewardship Sub-Committee recommended that 104 properties which were identified by the draft CHSR to have potential cultural heritage value or interest, do not require further examination for consideration as having cultural heritage value or interest (CHVI). The LACH also recommended an additional 30 properties be evaluated for their potential cultural heritage value which were not

identified by the draft CHSR. Further, the remaining properties flagged by the draft CHSR requiring further cultural heritage work were added to the Register (*Inventory of Heritage Resources*) pursuant to Section 27 of the *Ontario Heritage Act* by resolution of Municipal Council on March 27, 2018.

The draft CHSR was also provided to the MTCS for review and comments were received in July 2018. In response to MTCS comments, the CHSR was revised to include additional information on impacted properties, and a preliminary impact assessment. The CHSR identified properties with direct impacts that cannot be mitigated through design, and recommended that these properties be addressed through completion of CHERs prior to completion of the TPAP, including the property at 255 Wellington Road. Ongoing communications with MTCS have continued as part of the TPAP process.

The revised CHSR (October 8, 2018) was provided to the LACH on October 10, 2018. The Draft Terms of Reference for CHERs was also received and referred to the LACH Stewardship Sub-Committee for review. This CHER will be submitted and reviewed by the LACH Stewardship Sub-Committee and their November 28, 2018 meeting.

3. Historical Context

3.1 Local Context and Settlement History

3.1.1 Westminster Township

Prior to European settlement the area that would eventually become Westminster Township was settled by members of the Chippewa First Nation. One of the largest townships in Middlesex County, the first survey of Westminster Township was completed in 1809-10 by Deputy Provincial Surveyor Simon T. Z. Watson. The remainder of the township was surveyed in 1820 by Colonel Mahlon Burwell and Colonel Bostwick. Unlike other townships in Upper Canada, lots were not parceled out to government “favorites” or speculators before 1817; the earliest settlers were farmers, many of whom arrived by way of the United States. By 1817, the township was home to 428 people and the price of land had quadrupled since tracts were first made available. By 1850, the township had a population of 4,525.¹

3.1.2 London South

Originally part of Westminster Township, South London was originally settled in the 1810s. For most of the nineteenth century, the area was home to a number of wealthy Londoners, who constructed large country mansions away from the increasingly congested city. South London remained predominantly rural until the 1880s, but was connected to the City of London by a series of bridges over the Thames. By the 1890s, the population of the area had increased to the point where annexation was considered. Eager to reap the benefits of electric street lighting, safe drinking water, sidewalks and the city’s education system, this section of the township became part of the City of London on May 1st, 1890. Bounded by Wellington Road, Wharnccliffe Road, Emery Street and the Thames River, the new suburb was designated as Ward 6. The building boom of the 1880s and 1890s was concentrated largely to the western side of the ward; parcels of land along Wellington Road were still held by wealthy families such as the McClary and Mackenzie families until the end of the century. Grand Avenue is so named for the large estates that once fronted on it.²

3.1.3 Wellington Road

Running north to south from Huron Street to the City of St. Thomas with brief interruptions by the Grand Trunk Railway (now Canadian Pacific Railway) line, Wellington Road was named for Arthur Wellesley, 1st Duke of Wellington. A major figure in British military history, Wellington was famous for his victory over Napoleon at the Battle of Waterloo in 1815. From 1818 to 1827, he served Master General of the Ordnance, commanding military officers and artillery in Upper Canada.³ The road was cut through Westminster Township by W. L. Odell, who also assisted in the construction of an iron bridge to carry Wellington Road across the Thames River.⁴

Within London, Wellington Road is identified by various official names, at varying points within the City. Between Huron Street and the Thames River, the road runs relatively parallel with Richmond Street and is identified in this section as Wellington Street. South of the Thames River, the road changes names to Wellington Road, and is

¹ *A History of the County of Middlesex, Canada*. Toronto: W. A. & C. L. Goodspeed, 1889. p. 566-568

² The Architectural Conservancy of Ontario. *Tecumseh Trek; ACO’s 38th Annual Geranium Heritage House Tour*. London, Ontario: ACO, June 5, 2011.

³ *Michael Baker & Hilary Bates Neary. London Street Names*. Toronto: James Lormier & Company Ltd., 2003. p. 100

⁴ *A History of the County of Middlesex, Op Cit*. p.570

identified as such between the River and the road's intersection with Exeter Road, just north of Highway 401. Lastly, the road is identified as Wellington Road South southwards from Exeter Road to south of the municipal city limits.

3.2 Land Use History

3.2.1 1810-1850

The subject property is located on a portion of Lot 25, Broken Front Concession, or Concession "B" in the former Westminster Township. Located on the west side of Wellington Road, Lot 25 was vacant for many years following its original survey. In 1839, Albert Scriver Odell received 69 ½ acres in the north part of the lot from the Crown. The southern part of the lot was deeded to Edward Matthews in 1850. Odell already owned Lot 24 immediately to the east, having purchased it from James Lester in 1822. The Odell family was one of the earliest families to settle in Westminster Township. Albert was the first of his family to arrive in the Township in 1810, settling on Lot 24 Concession I, along Commissioner's Road near the present Victoria Hospital⁵ One of ten children, Albert was born in 1787 to John Odell and Enor Schriver. The Odell family had originally settled in Dutchess County, New York and were of Dutch origin. John left New York following the American Revolution, and relocated near Montreal. All of John and Enor's children would eventually settle in Westminster Township, with the exception of their son Loop, who died in Lower Canada. The first records of the Westminster Council, dated March 4th 1817 identify Albert S. Odell and Robert Frank as "overseers of highways".⁶ Albert Odell did not reside on this property however; the 1854 assessment roll lists him as living on Lot 26, Concession I, former Westminster Township.⁷ Albert and his wife, Charlotte Percival, did not have children. Charlotte predeceased Albert sometime prior to 1852; Albert himself passed away in 1856.⁸

3.2.2 1850-1910

All portions of the original Lot 25 were sold off and subdivided through the 1850s and 1860s. While the 1861 Tremaine map of the township does not provide details of the property, the 1878 atlas shows the property as being subdivided into as many as thirteen parcels. The portions of Lots 24 and 25 fronting on the Thames River are both listed to landowner G.B.R Frank. The northern portion of the lot was originally dominated by a large meander in the river. Aerial photography suggests that this section of the river was realigned and the meander filled in by 1922, although its former location is still evident today as a small oxbow in Watson Street Park.

In June 1874, a section of the south part of the original lot 25 owned by Colonel John B. Taylor was subdivided into residential lots under Registered Plan 328.⁹ It appears that development did not take hold immediately. Fire insurance plans indicate that the northern portion of the original lot 25 had been developed as a residential community by the turn of the twentieth century, but the southern half remained largely undeveloped. The London City Directory of 1897 identifies thirty-eight people living along Wellington Road between the river and what were then the city limits, just south of Maryboro Place (identified as Marybora Place on the 1892 revised 1907 Fire Insurance Plan, and presently McClary Avenue). Many of the small residential streets extending off of Wellington Road have since been renamed. For example on the 1912, revised 1922 Fire Insurance plan, Grand Avenue is identified as Clarke Street east of Wellington Road. It was not determined why these streets were renamed; however a review of later city directories indicated that all streets had assumed their present names by 1948.

⁵ *A History of the County of Middlesex, Op Cit.* p.568

⁶ *A History of the County of Middlesex, Op Cit.* p.948

⁷ *Index to the 1854 Assessment Roll, Westminster Township, Middlesex County, Canada West.*

<https://londonmiddlesex.ogs.on.ca/docs/membpubs/assessment/1854-Westminster-Twp.pdf>. (Accessed November 2018).

⁸ Dan Brock "All in the Family: An Account of Some Members of the Odell Family". *London & Middlesex County Historical Society Newsletter*, Fall, 2018.

⁹ Middlesex County (33) Land Registry Office (MCLRO), *Book 57, County Plan 328*

3.2.3 1910-Present

In September 1914, the north half of the southern half of Lot 25 was subdivided into residential lots as part of the Springwood Park subdivision, registered as Plan 452 (4th). The survey was carried out on behalf of the London and Western Trusts Company who had purchased much of Colonel Taylor's former property (RP 328) in 1910.¹⁰ The survey was carried out by J. M. Moore, who is likely the namesake of Moore Street. The 1914 drawings identify the street as "Windsor Avenue", which has been scratched out and replaced with "Moore Street" below.

The property at 253-55 Wellington Road comprises Lots 32 and 33, of Plan 452 (4th). Land registry records indicate that the London and Western Trusts Company originally granted Lots 32 and 33 to M. J. Smith in July of 1923, who sold them the following year to James Gilmour. Historic mapping and aerial photography indicate that the property was not developed at this time, although the surrounding neighbourhood was becoming established. In 1931, the property was requisitioned by the City of London for unpaid taxes, and both lots were sold to Frank L. Scriver in 1941.¹¹ The building was likely constructed in 1941 or 1942; 255 Wellington Road is first identified in the 1942 city directory, with F. L. Scriver listed as a resident and identified as a grocer. The property address changes during the 1940s; it is identified as either 253 or 255 Wellington Road, depending on the edition of the directory, although both addresses refer to the same property. It is likely that Scriver lived in the house at 253 Wellington Road and operated the attached store at 255 Wellington Road.

In 1948, Scriver sold the property to Robert Cunningham; the city directories identify Cunningham as a resident here until 1949. By 1950, the property was sold to Roy Fox, then to Elmer Morgan and John Horodyski as joint tenants in 1953. At this time the address is listed in City Directories as Morgan's Market.¹² Through the 1960s, John Horodyski is listed as a resident and the store continued to operate under the name of Morgan's Superior Market. The building continued to be used as a variety or grocery store through the 1970s. As recently as 2015, the building was renovated to be used as a hair salon and beauty parlour.

¹⁰ MCLRO, *Book 57, County Plan 328*

¹¹ Middlesex County (33) Land Registry Office (MCLRO). *Book 48. Lot 1 to 86, Plan 452 (4th)*

¹² MCLRO, *Book 48, Lot 1 to 86, Plan 452 (4th)*

4. Existing Conditions

4.1 Landscape Context

The property at 253-255 Wellington Road is located on the northeast corner of the Wellington Road and Moore Street intersection. Wellington Road is a four-lane arterial road that follows a north-south orientation through the area. Moore Street is a narrow two-lane residential road. A stop sign on Moore Street is the only traffic control at the intersection. Few trees are present along Wellington Road, although Moore Street is lined with large mature trees. Residential streets within the area follow a grid pattern of small rectangular blocks. Houses are typically small one or two-storey detached homes on large, deep lots. Sidewalks are present on both sides of all streets, and streets are lit by lamps on wooden utility poles.

Land use within the Study Area is primarily residential, although some properties fronting onto Wellington Road (Such as this one) are being used for commercial purposes. North of the Study Area, Wellington Road curves to the west, with the St. Andrews Memorial Anglican Church and Gartshore Park on the west side.

4.2 Architectural Description

The property at 253-255 Wellington Road contains a frame residential structure (253 Wellington Road) with an attached single storey commercial storefront (255 Wellington Road). Research indicates that the two structures were likely completed at the same time.

4.2.1 East (Front) Elevation

The east elevation of the building faces onto Wellington Road. It is divided into two sections; the storefront to the south and the residential unit to the north. The residential unit has a steeply pitched side gable roof and a steep asymmetrical centre gable over the central front vestibule. A small octagonal window is located within this front gable. The roof is covered with brown asphalt shingles. The single front door is slightly offset to the right of the vestibule, with a decorative porch light and mailbox to the left. On either side of the vestibule are large 6 x 3 light windows with aluminium frames. These appear to be fixed. Both windows have brown painted shutters, which appear to be decorative rather than functional. The front of the house is fenced by a low spear top iron fence with a gate. A central brick chimney extends above the top of the gable.

The storefront is generally symmetrical. It has a “boomtown” style front with a stepped cornice. Generally associated with rapidly developing frontier settlements in the nineteenth century, boomtown style fronts are decorative false fronts extending above the roofline on the front façade of a building. Designed to make a smaller building seem more substantial, these flat fronts provided large display windows with advertising space above.¹³

There is a central entrance door flanked by two large picture windows and ornamental light fixtures. A cast concrete stoop provides access to the front door, with three steps on the south side and a low ramp on the north, and a metal handrail.

¹³ Sara E. Quay. *Westward Expansion*. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 2002. p. 81-82

4.2.2 West (Rear) Elevation

The west elevation is obscured by a high wooden fence and large trees. It appears to be a two-storey façade with only one small horizontally sliding window on the second storey. It is clad in beige painted aluminium siding.

4.2.3 North Elevation

Details of the north elevation could not be determined from the public right-of-way, as it is obscured by a neighbouring building and a large tree. It has an end gable roof with a single-storey flat-roofed extension to the rear (west). Four windows are present on the ground floor with a single window on the second floor.

4.2.4 South Elevation

The south elevation faces onto Moore Street. On this side of the building there is a large paved parking area. The left section of this elevation is a two-storey façade with a roof that gently slopes to the rear (west) of the property. This section has a single entrance door with three cast concrete stairs and a painted aluminium awning. There is a single vinyl framed sash window on the second storey, with another window on the first storey obscured by a tree. The south side of the storefront extension has a stepped cornice, rising towards the front (east) of the building. There is a single entrance door with four cast concrete steps and an aluminium awning at the west end. Three small horizontally sliding basement windows are present in the exposed concrete foundation wall at ground level.

4.3 Comparative Analysis

A comparative analysis was undertaken to establish a baseline understanding of similar cultural heritage resources in the City of London, and to determine if the property “is a rare, unique, representative, or early example of a style, type, expression, material or construction method” as described in O.Reg. 9/06.




Comparative examples were drawn from listed and non-listed properties within the City of London, as well as similar examples of architecture identified as two-storey commercial or mixed-use buildings within the City.




Six comparable properties with and without identified cultural heritage value were identified. However, this sample does not represent all available properties, and is rather intended to be a representative selection (**Table 1**). Various similar or comparable properties are located throughout the City, however, these six were identified to provide similar examples for the purposes of this report. The following observations were noted in analyzing the comparable properties. Of these examples:

- Six include various alterations to the exterior materials and appearance of the building;
- Six include large picture windows at the ground level;
- Five include buildings that have a combined residential and commercial use
- Five appear to still function as commercial uses;
- Five have gable roofs
- Three appear to still function as residential uses;
- Six have flat roofs;
- Six are clad with exterior brick;
- Two have boomtown style fronts
- Two are clad with exterior siding.

The comparative analysis suggests that the subject property is a relatively common example of combined commercial and residential buildings that are located in many neighbourhoods within the City of London. It is typical in size, scale, form, and materials and has been altered over the last several decades. As a result, from a comparative perspective, the property does not appear to be a rare, unique, representative, or early example of a style, type, expression, material, or construction method.

Table 1: Comparative analysis of properties with building/structures of similar age, style, and/or typology

Address	Recognition	Picture	Age	Material	Style
244 Wellington Road	None		c. 1940s	Wood – grey Aluminium Siding / Insulbrick	Single-storey commercial building, intersecting gable roof, small retail store located in largely residential area
189 Wellington Street	Listed		TBD	Brick - beige/yellow Wood – Beige/White Aluminium Siding	Single-storey commercial building, with former residential structure at rear, boomtown style front, and storefront constructed of brick with frame structure at rear, gable roof on rear structure
219 Wellington Street	Listed		c.1880	Wood – white/ painted blue	Single-storey commercial buildings with picture windows at ground level, gable roof at rear, boomtown style front

<p>241 High Street</p>	<p>None</p>		<p>TBD</p>	<p>Brick – Yellow/ Beige</p>	<p>Two-storey residential building with attached commercial storefront, large picture windows at ground level, flat roof</p>
<p>980 Oxford Street East</p>	<p>None</p>		<p>TBD</p>	<p>Concrete Block / Brick – grey</p>	<p>Two storey combined commercial and residential building, steeply pitched, intersecting gable roof on house, flat roof on storefront</p>
<p>555 Emery Street West</p>	<p>Listed</p>		<p>TBD</p>	<p>Brick – painted green</p>	<p>Single-storey residential building with attached two-storey former commercial storefront, flat roof on storefront, picture windows</p>

4.4 Discussion of Integrity

According to the Ontario Heritage Toolkit, Heritage Property Evaluation (MTCS 2006), “*Integrity is a question of whether the surviving physical features (heritage attributes) continue to represent or support the cultural heritage value or interest of the property.*” The following discussion of integrity was prepared to consider the ability of the property to represent and retain its cultural heritage value over time. It does not consider the structural integrity of the building, or the overall condition of the building. Access to the interior of the building was not available, and observations have been made from the public right-of-way. Structural integrity, should it be identified as a concern, should be determined by a qualified heritage engineer, building scientist, or architect.

The subject property contains a one-and-a half storey residential structure with an attached single-storey commercial storefront on the south side. Although the City of London’s Heritage Register indicates that the residential portion of the building was likely constructed first with the store added later, historical background research indicates that both were likely constructed at the same time. It appears that a two-storey addition was constructed on the rear of the building at a later date. As such, the footprint of the building appears to have been altered somewhat from its original construction. The building is currently clad in horizontal vinyl siding, which would be a replacement for what would likely have been wood siding originally. It appears that all windows and doors have been replaced, with the possible exception of the octagonal window in the front gable. The storefront was remodelled a few years ago, with the addition of a boomtown style front with stepped cornice. The concrete ramp

and front stoop are also likely later additions to satisfy contemporary requirements. Despite these changes, the outward appearance of the building would be largely similar to its original construction. As such, the building retains little integrity of its original built character.

5. Heritage Evaluation

5.1 Ontario Regulation 9/06

Criteria	Meets Criteria (Yes/No)	Rationale
1) The property has <i>design or physical value</i> because it:		
i) Is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, or expression, material, or construction method.	No	The property at 253-255 Wellington is not considered to be a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style. Combined commercial and residential structures are not uncommon in the City of London, and the building has been modified since its original construction. Therefore, it does not meet this criterion.
ii) Displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit.	No	The building does not appear to display any artistic merit or degree of craftsmanship above the usual standards for the period. Therefore, it does not meet this criterion.
iii) Demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement.	No	No evidence was found to suggest that the building demonstrates a high degree of technical merit or scientific achievement. Its construction appears to be typical of other small commercial buildings of its era. Therefore it does not meet this criterion.
2) The property has <i>historic or associative value</i> because it:		
i) Has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organisation, or institution that is significant to a community.	No	No information was found to suggest that any previous tenants or landowners were significant in the area. Further significant associations were not determined. Therefore the property does not meet this criterion.
ii) Yields, or has the potential to yield information that contributes to the understanding of a community or culture.	No	The building does not yield any information that contributes to an understanding of the community or its culture.
iii) Demonstrates or reflects	No	No evidence was found related to

<p>the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer or theorist who is significant to the community.</p>		<p>the architect, builder, or designer of the building. As a result, no significant associations with an architect, artist, builder, designer, or theorist. Therefore the property does not meet this criterion.</p>
<p>3) The property has contextual value because it:</p>		
<p>i) Is important in defining, maintaining, or supporting the character of an area</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>While located in a mixed commercial and residential area, this property does not significantly contribute to the character of the area. Therefore, it does not meet this criterion.</p>
<p>ii) Is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The property does not appear to be physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings. Therefore this property does not meet this criterion.</p>
<p>iii) Is a landmark</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The building is not considered to be a landmark in the area. Therefore, it does not meet this criterion.</p>

6. Conclusions

Based on the results of background historical research, field review, and application of the criteria from Ontario Regulation 9/06, the subject property at 253-255 Wellington Road was not determined to be of significant cultural heritage value or interest. Accordingly, no Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest, or Description of Heritage Attributes has been prepared.

7. Recommendations

The subject building is a one-and-a-half store commercial/residential frame building constructed circa 1941-42. Based on the background historical research, field review, comparative analysis, description of integrity, and application of Ontario Regulation 9/06 criteria, the property was not determined to have significant cultural heritage value or interest.

The completion of the CHER has resulted in the following recommendation:

- The property at 253-255 Wellington Road was determined not to have significant cultural heritage value or interest. Subsequently, no additional cultural heritage work is recommended for the property.

8. Images



Image 1: 255 and 253 Wellington Road, showing commercial storefront at left with residential unit at right. (AECOM, 2018)



Image 2: Detail of storefront, 255 Wellington Road. (AECOM, 2018)



Image 3: Note the asymmetrical gable on the front of the house, and the wrought iron fence. The boomtown style front on the storefront is a recent addition. (AECOM, 2018)



Image 4: South elevation, 255 Wellington Road; the two-storey residential unit at left appears to be a later addition. (AECOM, 2018)




Image 5: Rear of storefront showing entrance door and boulevard parking. (AECOM, 2018)



Image 6: South elevation, showing stepped cornice and boomtown style front. (AECOM, 2018)

9. Historic Photos and Mapping

All mapping related to the subject property is included on the following pages.



Legend

 Project Location



Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report
253-255 Wellington Road
London, Ontario

Location of Project Location

November 2018

1:25,000


Datum: NAD 83 UTM17
Source: http://wms.ess-ws.nrcan.gc.ca/wms/toporama_en

PH: 60590467

V#:


AECOM

Figure 1



This drawing has been prepared for the use of AECOM's client and may not be used, reproduced or relied upon by third parties, except as agreed by AECOM and its client, as required by law or for use by governmental reviewing agencies. AECOM accepts no responsibility, and denies any liability whatsoever, to any party that modifies this drawing without AECOM's express written consent.

Map Source: "http://wms.ess-ws.nrcan.gc.ca/wms/toporama_en" (1/1/2018 10:55:15 AM) - User: "AECOM" - Project Location: "253-255 Wellington Road"



Legend

 Project Location



Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report
253-255 Wellington Road
London, Ontario

Project Location, 1862

November 2018

1:15,000


Datum: NAD 83 UTM17
Source: Tremaine's Map 1862

PH: 60590467


V#:

AECOM

Figure 3



This drawing has been prepared for the use of AECOM's client and may not be used, reproduced or relied upon by third parties, except as agreed by AECOM and its client, as required by law or for use by governmental reviewing agencies. AECOM accepts no responsibility, and denies any liability whatsoever, to any party that modifies this drawing without AECOM's express written consent.



Legend

 Project Location



Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report
253-255 Wellington Road
London, Ontario

Project Location, 1878

November
2018


1:20,000
V#:

Datum: NAD 83 UTM17
Source: Illustrated Historic Atlas
of Middlesex County,
Toronto: H.R. Page & Co.

P#: 60590467

AECOM

Figure 4



This drawing has been prepared for the use of AECOM's client and may not be used, reproduced or relied upon by third parties, except as agreed by AECOM and its client, as required by law or for use by governmental reviewing agencies. AECOM accepts no responsibility, and denies any liability whatsoever, to any party that modifies this drawing without AECOM's express written consent.

Map Source: "Illustrated Historic Atlas of Middlesex County, Toronto: H.R. Page & Co." (1878). Digitized by Google. Project Location: 1878.



Legend

 Project Location



Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report
253-255 Wellington Road
London, Ontario

Project Location, 1913

November 2018

1:10,000


Datum: NAD 83 UTM17
Source: LIO 2017, Department of Militia and Defence, 1913

P#: 60590467

V#:

AECOM

Figure 5




This drawing has been prepared for the use of AECOM's client and may not be used, reproduced or relied upon by third parties, except as agreed by AECOM and its client, as required by law or for use by governmental reviewing agencies. AECOM accepts no responsibility, and denies any liability whatsoever, to any party that modifies this drawing without AECOM's express written consent.

Map Source: "Map of the City of London, Ontario, 1913" (L1017). Source: LIO 2017, Department of Militia and Defence, 1913. Project Location: 253-255 Wellington Road, London, Ontario. Date: November 2018. Scale: 1:10,000. Datum: NAD 83 UTM17. Source: LIO 2017, Department of Militia and Defence, 1913.



Legend

 Project Location



Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report
253-255 Wellington Road
London, Ontario

Project Location, 1948

November 2018

1:10,000


Datum: NAD 83 UTM17
Source: LIO 2017, Department of National Defence, 1948

PH#: 60590467

V#:

AECOM

Figure 7



This drawing has been prepared for the use of AECOM's client and may not be used, reproduced or relied upon by third parties, except as agreed by AECOM and its client, as required by law or for use by governmental reviewing agencies. AECOM accepts no responsibility, and denies any liability whatsoever, to any party that modifies this drawing without AECOM's express written consent.


Map Source: "LION 2017" (https://www25.intelnet.com/arcgis/rest/services/LION2017/MapServer/info?layers=0,1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12,13,14,15,16,17,18,19,20,21,22,23,24,25,26,27,28,29,30,31,32,33,34,35,36,37,38,39,40,41,42,43,44,45,46,47,48,49,50,51,52,53,54,55,56,57,58,59,60,61,62,63,64,65,66,67,68,69,70,71,72,73,74,75,76,77,78,79,80,81,82,83,84,85,86,87,88,89,90,91,92,93,94,95,96,97,98,99,100,101,102,103,104,105,106,107,108,109,110,111,112,113,114,115,116,117,118,119,120,121,122,123,124,125,126,127,128,129,130,131,132,133,134,135,136,137,138,139,140,141,142,143,144,145,146,147,148,149,150,151,152,153,154,155,156,157,158,159,160,161,162,163,164,165,166,167,168,169,170,171,172,173,174,175,176,177,178,179,180,181,182,183,184,185,186,187,188,189,190,191,192,193,194,195,196,197,198,199,200,201,202,203,204,205,206,207,208,209,210,211,212,213,214,215,216,217,218,219,220,221,222,223,224,225,226,227,228,229,230,231,232,233,234,235,236,237,238,239,240,241,242,243,244,245,246,247,248,249,250,251,252,253,254,255,256,257,258,259,260,261,262,263,264,265,266,267,268,269,270,271,272,273,274,275,276,277,278,279,280,281,282,283,284,285,286,287,288,289,290,291,292,293,294,295,296,297,298,299,300,301,302,303,304,305,306,307,308,309,310,311,312,313,314,315,316,317,318,319,320,321,322,323,324,325,326,327,328,329,330,331,332,333,334,335,336,337,338,339,340,341,342,343,344,345,346,347,348,349,350,351,352,353,354,355,356,357,358,359,360,361,362,363,364,365,366,367,368,369,370,371,372,373,374,375,376,377,378,379,380,381,382,383,384,385,386,387,388,389,390,391,392,393,394,395,396,397,398,399,400,401,402,403,404,405,406,407,408,409,410,411,412,413,414,415,416,417,418,419,420,421,422,423,424,425,426,427,428,429,430,431,432,433,434,435,436,437,438,439,440,441,442,443,444,445,446,447,448,449,450,451,452,453,454,455,456,457,458,459,460,461,462,463,464,465,466,467,468,469,470,471,472,473,474,475,476,477,478,479,480,481,482,483,484,485,486,487,488,489,490,491,492,493,494,495,496,497,498,499,500,501,502,503,504,505,506,507,508,509,510,511,512,513,514,515,516,517,518,519,520,521,522,523,524,525,526,527,528,529,530,531,532,533,534,535,536,537,538,539,540,541,542,543,544,545,546,547,548,549,550,551,552,553,554,555,556,557,558,559,560,561,562,563,564,565,566,567,568,569,570,571,572,573,574,575,576,577,578,579,580,581,582,583,584,585,586,587,588,589,590,591,592,593,594,595,596,597,598,599,600,601,602,603,604,605,606,607,608,609,610,611,612,613,614,615,616,617,618,619,620,621,622,623,624,625,626,627,628,629,630,631,632,633,634,635,636,637,638,639,640,641,642,643,644,645,646,647,648,649,650,651,652,653,654,655,656,657,658,659,660,661,662,663,664,665,666,667,668,669,670,671,672,673,674,675,676,677,678,679,680,681,682,683,684,685,686,687,688,689,690,691,692,693,694,695,696,697,698,699,700,701,702,703,704,705,706,707,708,709,710,711,712,713,714,715,716,717,718,719,720,721,722,723,724,725,726,727,728,729,730,731,732,733,734,735,736,737,738,739,740,741,742,743,744,745,746,747,748,749,750,751,752,753,754,755,756,757,758,759,760,761,762,763,764,765,766,767,768,769,770,771,772,773,774,775,776,777,778,779,780,781,782,783,784,785,786,787,788,789,790,791,792,793,794,795,796,797,798,799,800,801,802,803,804,805,806,807,808,809,810,811,812,813,814,815,816,817,818,819,820,821,822,823,824,825,826,827,828,829,830,831,832,833,834,835,836,837,838,839,840,841,842,843,844,845,846,847,848,849,850,851,852,853,854,855,856,857,858,859,860,861,862,863,864,865,866,867,868,869,870,871,872,873,874,875,876,877,878,879,880,881,882,883,884,885,886,887,888,889,890,891,892,893,894,895,896,897,898,899,900,901,902,903,904,905,906,907,908,909,910,911,912,913,914,915,916,917,918,919,920,921,922,923,924,925,926,927,928,929,930,931,932,933,934,935,936,937,938,939,940,941,942,943,944,945,946,947,948,949,950,951,952,953,954,955,956,957,958,959,960,961,962,963,964,965,966,967,968,969,970,971,972,973,974,975,976,977,978,979,980,981,982,983,984,985,986,987,988,989,990,991,992,993,994,995,996,997,998,999,1000,1001,1002,1003,1004,1005,1006,1007,1008,1009,1010,1011,1012,1013,1014,1015,1016,1017,1018,1019,1020,1021,1022,1023,1024,1025,1026,1027,1028,1029,1030,1031,1032,1033,1034,1035,1036,1037,1038,1039,1040,1041,1042,1043,1044,1045,1046,1047,1048,1049,1050,1051,1052,1053,1054,1055,1056,1057,1058,1059,1060,1061,1062,1063,1064,1065,1066,1067,1068,1069,1070,1071,1072,1073,1074,1075,1076,1077,1078,1079,1080,1081,1082,1083,1084,1085,1086,1087,1088,1089,1090,1091,1092,1093,1094,1095,1096,1097,1098,1099,1100,1101,1102,1103,1104,1105,1106,1107,1108,1109,1110,1111,1112,1113,1114,1115,1116,1117,1118,1119,1120,1121,1122,1123,1124,1125,1126,1127,1128,1129,1130,1131,1132,1133,1134,1135,1136,1137,1138,1139,1140,1141,1142,1143,1144,1145,1146,1147,1148,1149,1150,1151,1152,1153,1154,1155,1156,1157,1158,1159,1160,1161,1162,1163,1164,1165,1166,1167,1168,1169,1170,1171,1172,1173,1174,1175,1176,1177,1178,1179,1180,1181,1182,1183,1184,1185,1186,1187,1188,1189,1190,1191,1192,1193,1194,1195,1196,1197,1198,1199,1200,1201,1202,1203,1204,1205,1206,1207,1208,1209,1210,1211,1212,1213,1214,1215,1216,1217,1218,1219,1220,1221,1222,1223,1224,1225,1226,1227,1228,1229,1230,1231,1232,1233,1234,1235,1236,1237,1238,1239,1240,1241,1242,1243,1244,1245,1246,1247,1248,1249,1250,1251,1252,1253,1254,1255,1256,1257,1258,1259,1260,1261,1262,1263,1264,1265,1266,1267,1268,1269,1270,1271,1272,1273,1274,1275,1276,1277,1278,1279,1280,1281,1282,1283,1284,1285,1286,1287,1288,1289,1290,1291,1292,1293,1294,1295,1296,1297,1298,1299,1300,1301,1302,1303,1304,1305,1306,1307,1308,1309,1310,1311,1312,1313,1314,1315,1316,1317,1318,1319,1320,1321,1322,1323,1324,1325,1326,1327,1328,1329,1330,1331,1332,1333,1334,1335,1336,1337,1338,1339,1340,1341,1342,1343,1344,1345,1346,1347,1348,1349,1350,1351,1352,1353,1354,1355,1356,1357,1358,1359,1360,1361,1362,1363,1364,1365,1366,1367,1368,1369,1370,1371,1372,1373,1374,1375,1376,1377,1378,1379,1380,1381,1382,1383,1384,1385,1386,1387,1388,1389,1390,1391,1392,1393,1394,1395,1396,1397,1398,1399,1400,1401,1402,1403,1404,1405,1406,1407,1408,1409,1410,1411,1412,1413,1414,1415,1416,1417,1418,1419,1420,1421,1422,1423,1424,1425,1426,1427,1428,1429,1430,1431,1432,1433,1434,1435,1436,1437,1438,1439,1440,1441,1442,1443,1444,1445,1446,1447,1448,1449,1450,1451,1452,1453,1454,1455,1456,1457,1458,1459,1460,1461,1462,1463,1464,1465,1466,1467,1468,1469,1470,1471,1472,1473,1474,1475,1476,1477,1478,1479,1480,1481,1482,1483,1484,1485,1486,1487,1488,1489,1490,1491,1492,1493,1494,1495,1496,1497,1498,1499,1500,1501,1502,1503,1504,1505,1506,1507,1508,1509,1510,1511,1512,1513,1514,1515,1516,1517,1518,1519,1520,1521,1522,1523,1524,1525,1526,1527,1528,1529,1530,1531,1532,1533,1534,1535,1536,1537,1538,1539,1540,1541,1542,1543,1544,1545,1546,1547,1548,1549,1550,1551,1552,1553,1554,1555,1556,1557,1558,1559,1560,1561,1562,1563,1564,1565,1566,1567,1568,1569,1570,1571,1572,1573,1574,1575,1576,1577,1578,1579,1580,1581,1582,1583,1584,1585,1586,1587,1588,1589,1590,1591,1592,1593,1594,1595,1596,1597,1598,1599,1600,1601,1602,1603,1604,1605,1606,1607,1608,1609,1610,1611,1612,1613,1614,1615,1616,1617,1618,1619,1620,1621,1622,1623,1624,1625,1626,1627,1628,1629,1630,1631,1632,1633,1634,1635,1636,1637,1638,1639,1640,1641,1642,1643,1644,1645,1646,1647,1648,1649,1650,1651,1652,1653,1654,1655,1656,1657,1658,1659,1660,1661,1662,1663,1664,1665,1666,1667,1668,1669,1670,1671,1672,1673,1674,1675,1676,1677,1678,1679,1680,1681,1682,1683,1684,1685,1686,1687,1688,1689,1690,1691,1692,1693,1694,1695,1696,1697,1698,1699,1700,1701,1702,1703,1704,1705,1706,1707,1708,1709,1710,1711,1712,1713,1714,1715,1716,1717,1718,1719,1720,1721,1722,1723,1724,1725,1726,1727,1728,1729,1730,1731,1732,1733,1734,1735,1736,1737,1738,1739,1740,1741,1742,1743,1744,1745,1746,1747,1748,1749,1750,1751,1752,1753,1754,1755,1756,1757,1758,1759,1760,1761,1762,1763,1764,1765,1766,1767,1768,1769,1770,1771,1772,1773,1774,1775,1776,1777,1778,1779,1780,1781,1782,1783,1784,1785,1786,1787,1788,1789,1790,1791,1792,1793,1794,1795,1796,1797,1798,1799,1800,1801,1802,1803,1804,1805,1806,1807,1808,1809,1810,1811,1812,1813,1814,1815,1816,1817,1818,1819,1820,1821,1822,1823,1824,1825,1826,1827,1828,1829,1830,1831,1832,1833,1834,1835,1836,1837,1838,1839,1840,1841,1842,1843,1844,1845,1846,1847,1848,1849,1850,1851,1852,1853,1854,1855,1856,1857,1858,1859,1860,1861,1862,1863,1864,1865,1866,1867,1868,1869,1870,1871,1872,1873,1874,1875,1876,1877,1878,1879,1880,1881,1882,1883,1884,1885,1886,1887,1888,1889,1890,1891,1892,1893,1894,1895,1896,1897,1898,1899,1900,1901,1902,1903,1904,1905,1906,1907,1908,1909,1910,1911,1912,1913,1914,1915,1916,1917,1918,1919,1920,1921,1922,1923,1924,1925,1926,1927,1928,1929,1930,1931,1932,1933,1934,1935,1936,1937,1938,1939,1940,1941,1942,1943,1944,1945,1946,1947,1948,1949,1950,1951,1952,1953,1954,1955,1956,1957,1958,1959,1960,1961,1962,1963,1964,1965,1966,1967,1968,1969,1970,1971,1972,1973,1974,1975,1976,1977,1978,1979,1980,1981,1982,1983,1984,1985,1986,1987,1988,1989,1990,1991,1992,1993,1994,1995,1996,1997,1998,1999,2000,2001,2002,2003,2004,2005,2006,2007,2008,2009,2010,2011,2012,2013,2014,2015,2016,2017,2018,2019,2020,2021,2022,2023,2024,2025,2026,2027,2028,2029,2030,2031,2032,2033,2034,2035,2036,2037,2038,2039,2040,2041,2042,2043,2044,2045,2046,2047,2048,2049,2050,2051,2052,2053,2054,2055,2056,2057,2058,2059,2060,2061,2062,2063,2064,2065,2066,2067,2068,2069,2070,2071,2072,2073,2074,2075,2076,2077,2078,2079,2080,2081,2082,2083,2084,2085,2086,2087,2088,2089,2090,2091,2092,2093,2094,2095,2096,2097,2098,2099,2100,2101,2102,2103,2104,2105,2106,2107,2108,2109,2110,2111,2112,2113,2114,2115,2116,2117,2118,2119,2120,2121,2122,2123,2124,2125,2126,2127,2128,2129,2130,2131,2132,2133,2134,2135,2136,2137,2138,2139,2140,2141,2142,2143,2144,2145,2146,2147,2148,2149,2150,2151,2152,2153,2154,2155,2156,2157,2158,2159,2160,2161,2162,2163,2164,2165,2166,2167,2168,2169,2170,2171,2172,2173,2174,2175,2176,2177,2178,2179,2180,2181,2182,2183,2184,2185,2186,2187,2188,2189,2190,2191,2192,2193,2194,2195,2196,2197,2198,2199,2200,2201,2202,2203,2204,2205,2206,2207,2208,2209,2210,2211,2212,2213,2214,2215,2216,2217,2218,2219,2220,2221,2222,2223,2224,2225,2226,2227,2228,2229,2230,2231,2232,2233,2234,2235,2236,2237,2238,2239,2240,2241,2242,2243,2244,2245,2246,2247,2248,2249,2250,2251,2252,2253,2254,2255,2256,2257,2258,2259,2260,2261,2262,2263,2264,2265,2266,2267,2268,2269,2270,2271,2272,2273,2274,2275,2276,2277,2278,2279,2280,2281,2282,2283,2284,2285,2286,2287,2288,2289,2290,2291,2292,2293,2294,2295,2296,2297,2298,2299,2300,2301,2302,2303,2304,2305,2306,2307,2308,2309,2310,2311,2312,2313,2314,2315,2316,2317,2318,2319,2320,2321,2322,2323,2324,2325,2326,2327,2328,2329,2330,2331,2332,2333,2334,2335,2336,2337,2338,2339,2340,2341,2342,2343,2344,2345,2346,2347,2348,2349,2350,2351,2352,2353,2354,2355,2356,2357,2358,2359,2360,2361,2362,2363,2364,2365,2366,2367,2368,2369,2370,2371,2372,2373,2374,2375,2376,2377,2378,2379,2380,2381,2382,2383,2384,2385,2386,2387,2388,2389,2390,2391,2392,2393,2394,2395,2396,2397,2398,2399,2400,2401,2402,2403,2404,2405,2406,2407,2408,2409,2410,2411,2412,2413,2414,2415,2416,2417,2418,2419,2420,2421,2422,2423,2424,2425,2426,2427,2428,2429,2430,2431,2432,2433,2434,2435,2436,2437,2438,2439,2440,2441,2442,2443,2444,2445,2446,2447,2448,2449,2450,2451,2452,2453,2454,2455,2456,2457,2458,2459,2460,2461,2462,2463,2464,2465,2466,2467,2468,2469,2470,2471,2472,2473,2474,2475,2476,2477,2478,2479,2480,2481,2482,2483,2484,24



Legend

 Project Location



Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report 253-255 Wellington Road London, Ontario	
Project Location, 1945	
November 2018	1:2,000
P#: 60590467	V#:
AECOM	
Figure 9	
 <p>0 20 40 80 Metres</p>	
<small>This drawing has been prepared for the use of AECOM's client and may not be used, reproduced or relied upon by third parties, except as agreed by AECOM and its client, as required by law or for use by governmental reviewing agencies. AECOM accepts no responsibility, and denies any liability whatsoever, to any party that modifies this drawing without AECOM's express written consent.</small>	

Map Source: "Map of London (Ontario) and Surrounding Areas" (2017) by Esri, Inc. All rights reserved. Source: LIO 2017, Department of Planning and Development, Roll 1025, Line 42, 1945. Photo Source: "Aerial Photo of London, Ontario" (2017) by Esri, Inc. All rights reserved.



Legend

 Project Location



Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report
253-255 Wellington Road
London, Ontario

Project Location, 1972

November
2018

1:2,000


Datum: NAD 83 UTM17
Source: LIO 2017, City of
London - 1972 Line 6 Photo
130

PH: 60590467

V#:

AECOM

Figure 10



This drawing has been prepared for the use of AECOM's client and may not be used, reproduced or relied upon by third parties, except as agreed by AECOM and its client, as required by law or for use by governmental reviewing agencies. AECOM accepts no responsibility, and denies any liability whatsoever, to any party that modifies this drawing without AECOM's express written consent.

Map Source: "Map of London, Ontario" (2017) by AECOM. Project Location: 253-255 Wellington Road, London, Ontario. Photo: "Aerial Photo of London, Ontario" (1972) by City of London. Scale: 1:2,000. Date: November 2018. Drawing Title: Figure 10. Drawing Number: PH: 60590467. V#: .

10. Bibliography and Sources

A History of the County of Middlesex, Canada. Toronto: W. A. & C. L. Goodspeed, 1889.

Index to the 1854 Assessment Roll, Westminster Township, Middlesex County, Canada West, 1854.
<https://londonmiddlesex.ogs.on.ca/docs/membpubs/assessment/1854-Westminster-Twp.pdf>.

Vernon, Henry. *Vernon's City of London (Ontario) Directory.* Hamilton, Ontario: Henry Vernon & Son. (Issues 1922, 1939-78).

The Architectural Conservancy of Ontario. *Tecumseh Trek: ACO's 38th Annual Geranium Heritage House Tour.* London, Ontario: ACO, 5 June 2011.

Baker, Michael & Hilary Bates Neary. *London Street Names.* Toronto: James Lormier & Company Ltd., 2003

Brock, Dan. "All in the Family: An Account of Some Members of the Odell Family". *London & Middlesex County Historical Society Newsletter*, Fall, 2018.

Foster, J. G. & Co. *Foster's London and Middlesex County Directory 1896-97.* Toronto: J. G. Foster & Co., 1896

Goad, Charles E. *Fire Insurance Plan for the City of London Ontario.* Montreal: Charles E. Goad, 1881 (Revised ed. 1888, 1907, 1915, 1922)

Middlesex County (33) Land Registry Office (MCLRO). *Book 2. Abstract Index Up to 1866; LOT 23 Concession 4 to Concession 9; Concession A and B*

Middlesex County (33) Land Registry Office (MCLRO), *Book 57, County Plan 328*

Middlesex County (33) Land Registry Office (MCLRO). *Book 48. Lot 1 to 86, Plan 452*

Middlesex County (33) Land Registry Office (MCLRO). *Parcel Register LTS 32 & 33, PL 452 (4th); London*

Page, H. R. & Co. *Illustrated Historical Atlas of the County of Middlesex, Ont.* Toronto: H. R. Page & Co., 1878

Quay, Sara E. *Westward Expansion.* Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 2002. p. 81-82

Tremaine, Geo. R. & G. M. *Tremaine's Map of the County of Middlesex, Canada West.* Toronto: Geo. R. & G. M. Tremaine, 1862

Provincial Standards and Resources:

Ontario Heritage Tool Kit

<http://www.culture.gov.on.ca/english/heritage/Toolkit/toolkit.ht>

Ontario Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport: Heritage Conservation Principle's for Land Use Planning

http://www.culture.gov.on.ca/english/heritage/info_sheets/info_sheet_landuse_planning.

htm

Ontario Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport: Eight Guiding Principles in the Conservation of Historic Properties

http://www.culture.gov.on.ca/english/heritage/info_sheets/info_sheet_8principles.htm

Ontario Heritage Act (2006)

Reference Guide on Physical and Cultural Heritage Resources (1996)

Guidelines for Preparing the Cultural Heritage Resource Component of Environmental Assessments (1992)

Guidelines on the Man-Made Heritage Component of Environmental Assessments (1981)

Environmental Guide for Built Heritage and Cultural Heritage Landscapes (2007)

National and International Standards and Resources:

Canadian Register of Historic Places

http://www.historicplaces.ca/visit-visite/rep-reg_e.aspx

Parks Canada Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada

http://www.pc.gc.ca/docs/pc/guide/nldclpc-sgchpc/index_E.asp

Parks Canada National Historic Sites of Canada

http://www.pc.gc.ca/progs/lhn-nhs/index_e.asp



Agenda

1. Update to work plan
2. Update on Wellington Road group CHER (35 properties)
3. Questions on
 - 1110 Richmond Street CHER
 - 44 Wharnccliffe Road North CHER
 - Wellington Road 6 individual CHERs




Work plan additions

- **University Drive Bridge**
- **Highbury Avenue Bridge**
- **Clark's Bridge**



Work plan: 2019



Timelines / Next Steps

- Submit revised CHSR to MTCS
- Revise grouped and individual CHERs based on LACH comments to include in Environmental Project Report
- Continue to bring reports to LACH and Stewardship Subcommittee
- Cultural heritage evaluations to be completed in time for LACH meeting in February 2019
- Transit Project Assessment Process with Environmental Project Report to be completed by end of March 2019



Wellington road Group CHER



Sub-Group 1:

- 1 Kennon Place
- 26 Wellington Road
- 28 Wellington Road
- 30 Wellington Road
- 32 Wellington Road
- 34 Wellington Road



SUB-Group 2:

- 74 Wellington Road
- 78 Wellington Road
- 88 Wellington Road
- 98 Wellington Road
- 118 Wellington Road



Sub-Group 3:

- 134 Wellington Road
- 136 Wellington Road
- 138 Wellington Road
- 140 Wellington Road
- 142 Wellington Road
- 166 Wellington Road
- 174 Wellington Road
- 19 Raywood Avenue



Sub-Group 4:

- 247 Wellington Road
- 249 Wellington Road
- 251 Wellington Road
- 261 Wellington Road
- 263 Wellington Road
- 265 Wellington Road
- 267 Wellington Road
- 269 Wellington Road
- 271 Wellington Road



Sub-Group 5:

- 273 Wellington Road
- 275 Wellington Road
- 285 Wellington Road
- 287 Wellington Road
- 289 Wellington Road
- 297 Wellington Road
- 301 Wellington Road



Questions?



2019 MEMBERSHIP RENEWAL FORM

Name of MHC _____
 or group or individual

Mailing Address _____

City/Town _____ **Postal Code** _____

MHC Chairperson _____ **Number of members** _____

Contact Person: Name _____
 (if different than Chair)

Position _____

Phone: () _____

E mail address: _____

(please print clearly)

Community Heritage Ontario is an incorporated, province-wide organization of Municipal Heritage Committees (MHCs). It serves its members as an "umbrella" organization, providing heritage preservation support, publications, workshops and an annual conference, CHO also welcomes individual members, other groups and corporations to join as well.

Please enclose:

MHC Membership Fee	\$ 75.
or: Individual membership:	\$ 35.
or: Corporate/Business:	\$ 100.
* _____ Extra copies CHOnews:	_____
** postage surcharge for 10 or more copies	\$ 15.

Cheque payable to:
Community Heritage Ontario

Forward form & cheque to:
Community Heritage Ontario
24 Conlins Road,
Scarborough, Ont., M1C 1C3

TOTAL _____

MHC membership includes six copies of CHOnews, mailed quarterly

* For additional copies, indicate the number of **extras** required and add \$ 4.00 each, per year
 (+ for 10 or more copies quarterly, add \$ 15. annually for additional postage/handling)

ie: for **total of 8 copies** of each issue add \$8.00 (2 extras x \$ 4.) for a total of **\$ 83.00**

*for total of 10 copies of each issue add \$ 16.00 (4 extras x \$4.)+ shipping surcharge ** (\$15.00) for a total of \$ 106.*
*for total of 12 copies of each issue add \$ 24.00 (6 extras x \$4.)+ shipping surcharge ** (\$15.00) for a total of \$ 114.*

To pay electronically, log onto our website and follow the directions.
However, we still need the form sent to us to keep our files up-to-date.

Heritage Planners' Report to LACH: December 12, 2018

1. Heritage Alteration Permits processed under Delegated Authority By-law:
 - a. 215 Dundas Street (Downtown HCD): Signage
 - b. 20 Oxford Street West (B/P HCD): Exterior Alterations
 - c. 325 Dundas Street (Downtown HCD): Signage
 - d. 23 Kensington Avenue (B/P HCD): Exterior alterations / Porch
2. Heritage Planner in Development & Compliance Services, Heritage Planners in City Planning
3. Print copies of Cultural Heritage Evaluation Reports (CHER) for Rapid Transit
 - a. Next Stewardship Sub-Committee meeting: Wednesday January 30, 2018 at 6:30pm
 - i. Richmond 5 Group CHER (before Christmas)
 - ii. Wellington 35 Group CHER (January 17, 2019)
 - iii. Highbury Avenue Overpass Bridge CHER (January 23, 2019)
 - iv. University Drive Bridge CHER (January 23, 2019)
 - v. Clark's Bridge (Wellington Street/Road) CHER (January 23, 2019)

Upcoming Heritage Events

- Victorian Christmas – Eldon House – December 1, 2018 - January 1, 2019. For more information: <http://www.eldonhouse.ca/events/>
- Meet Father Christmas – Eldon House – December 16, 2018. For more information: <http://www.eldonhouse.ca/events/>
- New Year's Levee – Eldon House – 1:00-4:00pm, January 1, 2019. Free. For more information: <http://www.eldonhouse.ca/events/>
- ACO London Region & Heritage London Foundation – 2019 Heritage Awards nominations – deadline to nominate: December 31, 2018. More information: <https://acolondon.ca/nominate>
- The London Heritage Scholarship – ACO London Region – deadline to apply: December 31, 2018. More information: <https://acolondon.ca/aco-london-and-region-heritage-scholarship-application>



London
CANADA

City of London Planning Services

COMMUNITY INFORMATION MEETING

Bruce Page

Tel: 519-661-2489 ext. 5355 | Fax: 519-661-5397

Email: bpage@london.ca | Website: www.london.ca

WHAT

This meeting is to introduce the **Byron Gravel Pits Secondary Plan** and the planning process to the community. The meeting will provide an opportunity for the City and their consultants to share project information, answer any questions, and to gather input from the community on a vision for the after use of the gravel pit and surrounding lands.

WHERE

The newly opened
Southwest Community Centre,
501 Southdale Road
Community Room #2

WHEN

Thursday, December 20, 2018
6:00pm to 9:00pm

WHO

Everyone is welcome to attend. Your opinion is important in preparing this plan. No RSVP is required, and you may drop in anytime between 6:00 p.m. and 9:00 p.m. to learn more. Consultants and City staff will be in attendance throughout the evening to receive your comments and answer questions.

HOW TO GIVE COMMENTS

Please call in, mail, e-mail, or fax your comments to:

City of London Planning Division
206 Dundas Street. London, ON
N6A 1G7
Attn: Bruce Page (bpage@london.ca)




(See over for area map)

There will be several opportunities for you to find out what is happening and to provide your input. We plan on hosting a second community meeting in the new year. As well, a website has been set up specifically for the Byron Gravel Pits Secondary Plan. If you would like further information, you can contact Bruce Page at bpage@london.ca.

Notice of future public meetings will be provided by mail to area property owners, a listing published in "Living in the City" in the Londoner and posted on the City's website at: www.london.ca/ByronGravel.



LEGEND

-  Parcel Boundary
-  Park Boundary
-  Study Area

