

## Report to Community Advisory Committee on Planning

**To:** Chair and Members  
Community Advisory Committee on Planning

**From:** Kyle Gonyou, RPP, MCIP, CAHP  
Manager, Heritage and Urban Design

**Subject:** Request to Remove from the Register of Cultural Heritage Resources for the Properties at 2 Kennon Place and 3 Kennon Place

**Date:** Wednesday, July 12, 2023

### Summary of Recommendation

Removal of the properties located at 2 and 3 Kennon Place from the Register of Cultural Heritage Resources is being recommended, in response to a request received by the City.

### Executive Summary

The properties at 2 Kennon Place and 3 Kennon Place were identified as a potential cultural heritage resource during the preliminary work completed for the Rapid Transit project back in 2018 and were added to the Register of Cultural Heritage Resources by Municipal Council.

A Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report (CHER) was prepared. The CHER evaluated the properties against the mandated criteria of Ontario Regulation 9/06, criteria for determining cultural heritage value or interest. The CHER determined that the properties at 2 Kennon Place and 3 Kennon Place do not meet the criteria for designation under the *Ontario Heritage Act*. Staff agree with the findings and conclusions of the CHER and recommend the property be removed from the Register of Cultural Heritage Resources.

### Analysis

#### 1.0 Background Information

##### 1.1 Property Location

The subject properties at 2 Kennon Place and 3 Kennon Place are located on Lots 10 (2 Kennon Place) and 11 (3 Kennon Place) of Registered Plan 449. The properties are located on the south side of Kennon Place, east of Wellington Road, just north of Grand Avenue (Appendix A).

##### 1.2 Cultural Heritage Status

The properties at 2 and 3 Kennon Place are heritage listed properties. The properties were added to the Register of Cultural Heritage Resources by resolution of Municipal Council on March 27, 2018.

##### 1.3 Description

###### 1.3.1 2 Kennon Place

The house located at 2 Kennon Place is a one-storey vernacular style frame house (Image 2). It is clad in pink horizontal vinyl siding. The house is situated on the south side of Kennon Place, with the main façade of the house facing north onto Kennon Place. The ground floor north façade includes a main entrance offset to the west enclosed in a small vestibule with a single entrance door and a shallow gable roof. The north façade also features two differently shaped vinyl windows in the center and on the east side of the façade. The window to the east is a small hung or sash-type window. The window to the west is larger and appears to be a single fixed pane of glass with a small horizontal casement pane below. The most distinguishing feature on the house is

the jerkinhead gable roof on the front façade (Image 1). Jerkinhead gable roofs are also referred to as clipped gable roofs.

### **1.3.2 3 Kennon Place**

The house at 3 Kennon Place is very similar in massing and design to the house at 2 Kennon Place, however it appears to maintain more original features (Image 4). The house is situated immediately east of the house at 2 Kennon Place, facing north onto Kennon Place. The house features a similar jerkinhead gable roof. The façade is clad in a grey vertical vinyl siding. The upper part of the gable is clad in black painted shingles. The gable also features three wood framed windows with a frosted texture. These windows are separated by small wooden bracket details blending into the black painted shingles. Similar wooden bracket details are located at the bottom corners of the gable. These brackets and upper gable detailing distinguish the house at 3 Kennon Place from its neighbour at 2 Kennon Place (Image 3).

## **1.4 History**

Prior to European settlement, the area later known as Westminster Township was occupied by First Nations groups as far back as 11,000 years ago. Westminster Township was first surveyed in 1809-10 by Deputy Provincial Surveyor Simon T. Z. Watson, and later further surveyed in 1820 by Colonel Mahlon Burwell and Colonel Bostwick. Settled in the 1810s, and originally part of Westminster Township, South London became part of the City of London on May 1, 1890.

The subject properties at 2 Kennon Place and 3 Kennon Place are located on part of Lot 25, Broken Front Concession, in the former Westminster Township. In February of 1811, Lot 25, Broken Front Concession was assigned to Jon Odell. The Odell family was one of the earliest families to settle in the Westminster Township. In 1840, part of the north portion of Lot 25 was purchased from Odell by Rev. William Clarke, who later constructed a cottage overlooking Wellington Road. Rev. William Clarke gathered funds from the nearby community to build Clarke's Bridge, dated 1840, on Wellington Road over the Thames River.

In 1912, Lots 10, 11, and 12 of RP 11 on the east side of Wellington Road were purchased by Violet A. Johnson and subsequently subdivided into smaller lots. The new plan was surveyed by F. W. Farncomb in 1912 and registered as RP 449. Lots 10 and 11 of RP 449 are occupied by the subject properties, 2 and 3 Kennon Place. Kennon Place was laid out to access these new lots between 1912 and 1915. The street is first listed in the 1915 Vernon's London City Directory, showing the properties at 2 and 3 Kennon Place listed as the only existing properties at the time, addressed as 1 and 3 Kennon Place.

The subject properties located at 2 Kennon Place and 3 Kennon Place were both built in 1915. The 1912, Revised 1915 FIP shows the dwellings on the properties at 2, 3, and 8 Kennon Place as extant at the time, with the properties at 2 and 3 Kennon Place labelled as 1 and 3 Kennon Place, corrected in later FIPs. The two subject properties are shown as 1 storey wood frame dwellings with 1 storey rear additions.

The properties at 2 and 3 Kennon Place have been sold various times since the 1920s, with minimal changes to the dwellings themselves. The properties continue to be used as residences today. The property at 2 Kennon Place appears to have undergone exterior renovations between 2009 and 2014.

## **2.0 Discussion and Considerations**

### **2.1 Legislative and Policy Framework**

Cultural heritage resources are to be conserved and impacts assessed as per the fundamental policies of the *Provincial Policy Statement (2020)*, the *Ontario Heritage Act*, and *The London Plan*.

### **2.1.1 Provincial Policy Statement**

Heritage Conservation is a matter of provincial interest (Section 2.d, *Planning Act*). The *Provincial Policy Statement (2020)* promotes the wise use and management of cultural heritage resources and directs that “significant built heritage resources and significant cultural heritage landscapes shall be conserved” (Policy 2.6.1, *Provincial Policy Statement 2020*).

“Significant” is defined in the *Provincial Policy Statement (2020)* as, “resources that have been determined to have cultural heritage value or interest.” Further, “processes and criteria for determining cultural heritage value or interest are established by the Province under the authority of the *Ontario Heritage Act*.”

Additionally, “conserved” means, “the identification, protection, management and use of built heritage resources, cultural heritage landscapes and archaeological resources in a manner that ensures their cultural heritage value or interest is retained.”

### **2.1.2 Ontario Heritage Act**

Section 27, *Ontario Heritage Act* requires that a register kept by the clerk shall list all properties that have been designated under the *Ontario Heritage Act*. Section 27(1.2), *Ontario Heritage Act* also enables Municipal Council to add properties that have not been designated, but that Municipal Council “believes to be of cultural heritage value or interest” on the Register.

The only cultural heritage protection afforded to heritage listed properties is a 60-day delay in the issuance of a demolition permit. During this time, Council Policy directs that the Community Advisory Committee on Planning (CACP) is consulted, and a public participation meeting is held at the Planning & Environment Committee. A Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report (CHER) is required for a demolition request for a building or structure on a heritage listed property.

Section 29, *Ontario Heritage Act* enables municipalities to designate properties to be of cultural heritage value or interest. Section 29, *Ontario Heritage Act* also establishes consultation, notification, and process requirements, as well as a process to appeal the designation of a property. Objections to a Notice of Intention to Designate are referred back to Municipal Council. Appeals to the passing of a by-law to designate a property pursuant to the *Ontario Heritage Act* are referred to the Ontario Land Tribunal (OLT).

#### **2.1.2.1 Criteria for Determining Cultural Heritage Value or Interest**

Ontario Regulation 9/06, as amended by Ontario Regulation 569/22, establishes criteria for determining the cultural heritage value or interest of individual properties. These criteria are consistent with Policy 573\_ of *The London Plan*. These criteria are:

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

9. The property has contextual value because it is a landmark.

A property is required to meet two or more of the abovementioned criteria to merit protection under Section 29 of the *Ontario Heritage Act*.

### 2.1.3 *The London Plan*

The Cultural Heritage chapter of *The London Plan* recognizes that our cultural heritage resources define our City’s unique identity and contribute to its continuing prosperity. It notes, “The quality and diversity of these resources are important in distinguishing London from other cities and make London a place that is more attractive for people to visit, live or invest in.” Policies 572\_ and 573\_ of *The London Plan* enable the designation of individual properties under Part IV of the *Ontario Heritage Act*, as well as the criteria by which individual properties will be evaluated.

### 2.1.4 Register of Cultural Heritage Resources

Municipal Council may include properties on the Register of Cultural Heritage Resources that it “believes to be of cultural heritage value or interest.” These properties are not designated but are considered to have potential cultural heritage value or interest.

The Register of Cultural Heritage Resources states that further research is required to determine the cultural heritage value or interest of heritage listed properties. If a property is evaluated and found to not meet the criteria for designation, it should be removed from the Register of Cultural Heritage Resources.

The properties at 2 and 3 Kennon Place are included on the Register of Cultural Heritage Resources as a heritage listed properties.

## 3.0 Financial Impact/Considerations

None

## 4.0 Key Issues and Considerations

### 4.1. Request to Remove Properties from the Register of Cultural Heritage Resources

The properties at 2 Kennon Place and 3 Kennon Place were identified as potential cultural heritage resources during the preliminary work completed for the Wellington Gateway project back in 2018 and were added to the Register of Cultural Heritage Resources by Municipal Council. Since then, the City has completed a Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report (CHER). The CHER evaluated the properties against the mandated criteria of Ontario Regulation 9/06, criteria for determining cultural heritage value or interest.

### 4.2 Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report (CHER)

A Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report (CHER; AECOM Canada Ltd., dated March 2023) was submitted as part of the work being completed for the Wellington Gateway segment of the proposed London Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) system (Appendix D). As required, the CHER included an evaluation of the properties according to the criteria of *Ontario Regulation 9/06, Criteria for Determining Cultural Heritage Value or Interest*.

Table 1: Summary of Evaluation of the property at 2 Kennon Place

Criteria	Evaluation
1. The property has design value or physical value because it is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, expression, material or construction method.	No
2. The property has design value or physical value because it displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit.	No

3. The property has historical value because it demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement.	No
4. The property has historical value or associative value because it has direct association with a theme, event, believe, person, activity, organization or institution that is significant to a community.	No
5. The property has historical value or associative value because it yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of a community or culture.	No
6. The property has historical value or associative value because it demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer, or theorist who is significant to a community.	No
7. The property has contextual value because it is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an area.	No
8. The property has contextual value because it is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings.	No
9. The property has contextual value because it is a landmark.	No

Table 2: Summary of Evaluation of the property at 3 Kennon Place

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation</b>
1. The property has design value or physical value because it is a rare, unique, representative or early example o a style, type, expression, material or construction method.	No
2. The property has design value or physical value because it displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit.	No
3. The property has historical value because it demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement.	No
4. The property has historical value or associative value because it has direct association with a theme, event, believe, person, activity, organization or institution that is significant to a community.	No
5. The property has historical value or associative value because it yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of a community or culture.	No
6. The property has historical value or associative value because it demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer, or theorist who is significant to a community.	No
7. The property has contextual value because it is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an area.	No
8. The property has contextual value because it is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings.	No
9. The property has contextual value because it is a landmark.	No

See Appendix D for the full evaluation of the properties at 2 Kennon Place and 3 Kennon Place.

Through the evaluations, it was determined that the properties at 2 Kennon Place and 3 Kennon Place do not meet the criteria of *Ontario Regulation 9/06* and therefore do not merit designation pursuant to the *Ontario Heritage Act*. Staff have reviewed the CHER and agree with its conclusions and recommendations.

### 4.3 Consultation

Pursuant to the Council Policy Manual, notification of the request to remove the subject properties from the Register of Cultural Heritage Resources has been sent to property owners within 120m of the subject property on June 29, 2023, as well as community groups including the Architectural Conservancy Ontario – London Region Branch, the London & Middlesex Historical Society, and the Urban League of London. Notice was published in *The Londoner* on June 29, 2023.

A Public Participation Meeting (PPM) will be held at the Planning and Environment Committee (PEC) at their meeting to be held on July 17, 2023.

## Conclusion

A request to remove the properties located at 2 and 3 Kennon Place was received by the City. As a part of the work being completed for the Wellington Gateway segment of the proposed Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) system, a CHER was prepared, including an evaluation of the properties at 2 Kennon Place and 3 Kennon Place according to the criteria of *Ontario Regulation 9/06*, Criteria for Determining Cultural Heritage Value or Interest.

The CHER determined that the properties at 2 Kennon Place and 3 Kennon Place did not meet the criteria and therefore do not warrant designation pursuant to the *Ontario Heritage Act*. Staff agree with the conclusions and recommendations of the CHER. The properties should be removed from the Register of Cultural Heritage Resources.

**Prepared by:** Konner Mitchener, M.Arch, Intern CAHP  
Heritage Planner

**Submitted by:** Kyle Gonyou, RPP, MCIP, CAHP  
Manager, Heritage and Urban Design

### Appendices

Appendix A	Properties Location
Appendix B	Images
Appendix C	Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report (attached separately)

### Selected Sources

Corporation of the City of London. *2023-2027 Strategic Plan*.  
Corporation of the City of London. Property file.  
Corporation of the City of London. *Register of Cultural Heritage Resources*. 2022.  
Corporation of the City of London. *The London Plan*. 2022 (consolidated).  
Land Registry Records.  
Ministry of Culture. *Ontario Heritage Toolkit: Heritage Property Evaluation*. 2006.  
*Ontario Heritage Act*. 2023, c. 21. Sched. 6.  
AECOM Canada Ltd. Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report: 2 and 3 Kennon Place, London, Ontario. March 2023.  
AECOM Canada Ltd. Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report: 35 Properties, Wellington Road, London, Ontario Bus Rapid Transit – Transit Project Assessment Process. February 2019.



# Appendix A – Property Location



Figure 1: Location of the subject properties at 2 Kennon Place and 3 Kennon Place.



**Appendix B – Images**



*Image 1: Photograph of the dwelling located on the subject property at 2 Kennon Place, May 30, 2023.*



*Image 2: Photograph of the dwelling located on the subject property at 2 Kennon Place, May 30, 2023.*



*Image 3: Photograph of the dwelling located on the subject property at 3 Kennon Place, May 30, 2023.*



*Image 4: Photograph of the dwelling located on the subject property at 3 Kennon Place, May 30, 2023.*

## **Appendix C – Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report**

Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report (AECOM Canada Ltd., dated March 2023) –  
*attached separately*