CULTURAL HERITAGE ASSESSMENT

759 Elizabeth Street

London, Ontario, Canada

20 October 2015

prepared by



architecture + planning + urban design

heritage conservation + real estate development

11 Christie Street, Suite 304 Toronto, ON M6G 4C3 CANADA

> 416 920 8105 mark@mwhallcorp.com www.mwhallcorp.com

759 Elizabeth Street, London, Ontario 20 October 2015

Prepared by: MW HALL CORPORATION

SUMMARY

Based upon our on-site investigation and research for this Preliminary Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment, it is concluded that the cultural heritage value of the property known as 759 Elizabeth Street, London, Ontario does not merit Designation as a historic property under the Ontario Heritage Act.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

759 Elizabeth Street is located northeast of the central core of London, Ontario on the west side of Elizabeth Street, south of Oxford Street East at Plan 435, Lot 17, Part of Lot 18. The property contains an existing one storey single family dwelling within an existing single family dwelling neighbourhood that was likely developed in the early 20th century. A Canadian Forces Base, London is located on the east side of Elizabeth Street, east of the property. CFB London contains the Wolseley Barracks, which was established in the 1880's and is presently a museum. 759 Elizabeth Street was added to City of London Inventory of Heritage Resources as a Priority 1 property by Municipal Council in 2010. Owners of the property are in the process of redeveloping the site to create two 2 storey residential buildings and filed for a demolition permit to clear the land on September 9, 2015.

Owners of the property received a notice dated 14 October 2015 that was sent from John M. Fleming, Managing Director, Planning and City Planner to Chair and Members, London Advisory Committee on Heritage Meeting on October 14, 2015. The Purpose and Effect of Recommended Action notes that 'the recommended action would designate the property pursuant to Section 29 of the Ontario Heritage Act [designation by Municipal By-Law]. Background information on the Notice states that "... the

759 Elizabeth Street, London, Ontario 20 October 2015

Prepared by: MW HALL CORPORATION

property might date to the 1820's which, if proven, would make it the oldest residence in London."

The owners of the property contacted MW HALL CORPORATION, heritage consultant, to conduct an initial review of the property, and to review research completed by the owners to date. Part of this review requested was to determine the likely age of the existing one storey building on the property.

Research conducted by MW HALL CORPORATION during 16-20 October 2015 indicates that 759 Elizabeth Street was constructed on the present site as a relatively modest farm building, likely in the latter part of the 19th century. The building has had a number of renovations/additions. Today the building is 9.0m wide by 9.8m deep, with a relatively recent 1.8m verandah added along the west side of the building. The original building may have been 9.0m wide by approximately 7.0m in an east-west direction, and possibly with no verandah. The building today is rectangular, with low pitched hip roof with various slope angles. The overall impression is of a Regency style cottage, but detailed investigation shows that this image may have been simulated/created by previous owners with the more recent provision of various additions to a simpler and smaller original rectangular structure that likely dates from the late 19th century.

The foundation of the older portions of the building is interlocked 3-brick wythes, with interspersed soldier courses, bearing directly on soil. It appears that the original building, which has a two wythe interlocked brick wall structure, with two additions to the east. The first of the additions was two wythe brick, approximately 7.0m wide by 3.0m deep at the north east corner of the original structure. The second addition was wood frame, bearing upon slab-on-grade, approximately 2.0m wide by 2.8m.

There are two chimneys on the structure. The north chimney appears to be original as it is exposed brick construction engaged with the brick walls of the original building and continues below grade in line with the foundation. The south chimney has a brick, or brick veneer cap, and has stucco finish. But it does not have a foundation and extends only to the main floor framing. Further it penetrates the roof eave, unlike the north chimney. The south chimney services what appears to be a wood-burning fireplace that appears to be newer than this portion of the building itself. The north chimney services a warm air furnace in the basement.

Roof of the house is low pitched, hip shaped, with approximately 1.0 ft overhang on all sides with contemporary gutters and downspouts, including the additions. Interior framing is with rough sawn joists and an asphalt shingle roof. Roof shape with overhands is similar to some other structures in the vicinity.

759 Elizabeth Street, London, Ontario 20 October 2015

Prepared by: MW HALL CORPORATION

Floor construction, with the exception of the southeast corner, generally is 2-12 rough sawn joists, with a single east-west span bearing on a sill plate on the brick foundation ledge. Existing flooring is solid 2" plank laid at right angles to the floor joists. The floor is approximately 24" above adjacent grade. There are basement windows on north, west and east sides of the building. The west side basement windows appear to be older than the north and south side windows, but are presently covered by the added verandah.

Walls of the house, for all except the southeast corner addition, are white painted exposed brick in relatively sound condition. Mortar joints have concave tooling. Interior of some of the walls are lath and plaster. There is no insulation in the perimeter walls.

Heating for the building is presently a wood or coal fired furnace that may date from the early 20th century with warm-air ducted to floor and wall ducts in the building. Ducting for the furnace is presently at the basement level, into the north chimney. There is an approximately 8" diameter cutout of the wood plank flooring adjacent to the north chimney, indicating that there may have been an earlier heating system for the building in this area. There is no indication of a traditional fireplace utilizing the north chimney.

Mounted on the floor joists, there are some existing ceramic insulators for original knob and tube electricity, which is no longer existing. Presently there is a new electrical panel on the north basement wall with relatively new wiring.

Adjacent residences on Elizabeth Street blocks appear to be constructed in first part of 20th century, which would make sense given the development survey dated 1904, showing a multiple residential lot subdivision plan prepared for Sir John Carling, likely the land developer of these blocks.

For dating references in Ontario, the following may also be considered:

- Brick foundations were used as late as the 1930's
- 2 wythes of brick for exterior walls were used as late as the 1960's
- Knob and tube wiring was used as late as the 1940's

759 Elizabeth Street, London, Ontario 20 October 2015

Prepared by: MW HALL CORPORATION

PRESENT OWNER CONTACT INFORMATION

Mr. Danny Partalas and Mr. Tom Partalas 305 Castlegrove Boulevard London, Ontario N6G 3Z4

and

Mr. Chris Tsiropoulos 987 Lawson Road London, Ontario N6G 3V5

2.0 BACKGROUND RESEARCH AND ANALYSIS

Research conducted by the owners of the property includes:

- London, Ontario historical maps: 1880, 1893, 1904 [first indication of building on the property]
- Land Registry Office Archives: [documents show, <u>for first time</u> <u>with mention of house</u>, that James Price owned the lot/house 1907-1928
- London Directory research: property listed for years 1881-1908 in the directories. 1908-1909 shows 759 Elizabeth under name'Chas Bailey'
- Strik Baldinelli Moniz, structural engineers, report 25 September 2015, Structural Evaluation of Rear Porch Framing. Summary, "The existing rear canopy and porch...an addition...found to be inadequate..."

759 Elizabeth Street, London, Ontario 20 October 2015

Prepared by: MW HALL CORPORATION

- May 1880 Plan of Parts of the North Half of Lot No.12 First Concession. Showing block of land between bounded by Oxford Street, Brattle Street, Elizabeth Street, Adelaide Street to be undivided, except for approximately ¼ of parcel in southwest corner as a separate parcel. Blocks south of Brattle are subdivided into house-sized lots. No structures shown on any of the lands of this map.
- 1893 Plan of Part of North Half of Lot No. 12. Showing "as Re-Subdivided for Sir John Carling" -a block south of Picadilly Street, east of Adelaide Street, West of Elizabeth Street, North of Pall Mall Street. No subdivision of Block D [location of 759 Elizabeth Street, and no structure shown on Plan. Carling was apparently engaged in real estate development of these lands into a multiple house lot subdivision as part of the expansion of City of London in early part of 20th century.
- 1904 Plan of Part of North Half of Lot No.12. Showing entire block bounded by Oxford Street, Elizabeth Street, Picadilly Street, Adelaide Street to be subdivided into individual house lots with service lanes further subdividing the block. For the first time, the building at 729 Elizabeth Street is shown on a survey plan as being a rectangular structure 30' x 32' [9.14m x 9.75m] straddling lots 17 and 18.
- An analysis of the planned development compared against the criteria for designation of heritage properties was created and is attached to this report.

The author of this assessment report, Mark Hall, conducted a field review of the building at 759 Elizabeth Street on Monday, 19 October 2015. Discussions were conducted with the present owners of the building. Review was made of research completed by the present owners, as noted above. In addition to exterior review, interior review included a ceiling access, opening in an interior wall, the structure of the floor as viewed from the basement, windows, doors and existing trims and finishes in the building. Purpose of this review was to determine whether this building may have been constructed as 'Regency Style' as noted in the report submitted by the Director of Planning.

759 Elizabeth Street, London, Ontario 20 October 2015

Prepared by: MW HALL CORPORATION

Findings of this review are that the original portions of the building do not seem to be of the Regency Style because:

- a) Regency style typically had a symmetrical floor plan, usually with a central hall. The main portion of this building has an irregular interior floor plan, with no central hall.
- b) Regency style buildings typically had high ceilings. The ceilings in this building are approximately 8 feet in height. Not grand, but adequate for a modest residence.
- c) Regency buildings typically had a verandah across the front. This building has what appear to be original windows in the basement which are located facing under the recently added verandah. Given these basement windows and the recent materials found in the present more contemporary verandah, it is unlikely that this building previously had a verandah prior to the recent addition.
- d) Regency style buildings had symmetrically place chimneys serving fireplaces. The chimney on the north side of the building likely served some sort of heating furnace/stove. The chimney on the south side of the building has no foundation for the existing fireplace, and is suspected of not being original to the house.
- e) The first indication of a building on the land is found in 1904, despite surveyor records as Plans of Record being prepared as early as 1880.

3.0 Assessment of Existing Condition

The basic existing building is in relatively sound structural condition and in sound repair, except for some broken windows and some of the interior finishes. A number of changes have been made to the existing structure to make it <u>appear</u> to be an historic Regency Style cottage, but as noted above, a number of these changes are not contemporary to what is the original structure, and therefore are likely faux.

5.0 Description of the Proposed Development or Site Alteration

The existing building is proposed to be demolished and two new 2-storey structures developed on the property for residential apartments.

759 Elizabeth Street, London, Ontario 20 October 2015

Prepared by: MW HALL CORPORATION

(6) Impact of Development or Site Alteration

The planned structures will generally be in scale with the existing residential neighbourhood building, although of contemporary design, with the front elevations of the planned buildings brought in line with the existing structures on either side of the lot in accord with existing zoning bylaws. This neighbourhood would remain a low scaled residential neighbourhood west of the museum and the designated Wolseley Barracks building on the east side of Elizabeth Street. None of the adjacent existing residential structures are considered historic or of heritage value.

(7) Considered Alternatives and Mitigation Strategies

There are some existing older wood storm windows and a small number of pieces of building hardware that may be of interest.

(8) Conservation Strategy

It may be of value to document the existing building, with measured drawings and photographs as a record of earlier real estate development in this area. It is unlikely that Carling developed this building, but did subdivide larger property, and this may be of interest.

END OF REPORT

DNTARIO REGULATION 9/06, ONTARIO HERITAGE ACT Image: construction of the construction method Image: construction of the construction method 20-Oct-15 Image: construction of the construction method Image: construction method Image: construction method 20-Oct-16 Image: construction method Image: construction method Image: construction method Image: construction method 20-Oct-15 Image: construction method Image: construction method Image: construction method Image: construction method 20-Oct-16 Image: construction method Image: construction construction method <th>759 Elizabeth Street, London, Ontario</th> <th></th> <th></th>	759 Elizabeth Street, London, Ontario		
Drepared by: MW HALL CORPORATION, Heritage Consultant Image: Construction and the construction and the construction and the construction and the construction method. Image: Construction and the construction method. CRITERIA for determining cultural heritage value, and for determining whether or not a property is worthy of Designation under the Ontario Heritage Act ASSESSEMENT of whether planned development conforms with designated heritage buildings Assesses and the construction method Image: Construction method Image: Construction method. If the property has design value or physical value because It, is a rare, unique or any example of a style, type or construction method. Image: Construction method. If the property has design value or physical value because It, dephys high regree of raftsmanship or artistic ment. Image: Construction method. Image: Construction method. If the property has design value or physical value because It, dephys high regree of raftsmanship or artistic ment. Image: Construction method. Image: Construction method. If the property has historical value because It, demonstrates a ligh degree of technical or scientific achievement. Image: Construction method. Im	CULTURAL HERITAGE IMPACT SUMMARY CHART		
CRITERIA for determining cultural heritage value, and for determining whether or not a property is worthy of Designation under the Ontario Heritage Act ASSESSEMENT of whether planned development conforms with designated heritage buildings ASSESSEMENT of whether planned development conforms with designated heritage buildings ASSESSEMENT of whether planned development conforms with designated heritage buildings ASSESSEMENT of whether planned development conforms with designated heritage buildings ASSESSEMENT of whether planned development conforms with designated heritage buildings ASSESSEMENT of whether planned development conforms with designated heritage buildings ASSESSEMENT of whether planned development conforms with designated heritage buildings ASSESSEMENT of whether planned development conforms with designated heritage buildings ASSESSEMENT of whether planned development conforms with designated heritage buildings ASSESSEMENT of whether planned development conforms with designated heritage buildings ASSESSEMENT of whether planned development conforms with designated heritage buildings ASSESSEMENT of whether planned development conforms with designated heritage buildings ASSESSEMENT of whether planned development conforms with designated heritage buildings ASSESSEMENT of whether planned development conforms with designated heritage buildings ASSESSEMENT of whether planned development conforms with designated heritage buildings ASSESSEMENT of whether planned development conforms with designated heritage buildings ASSESSEMENT of whether planned development conforms with designated heritage buildings ASSESSEMENT of whether planned development conforms with designated heritage buildings ASSESSEMENT of whether planned development conforms with designated heritage buildings ASSESSEMENT of whether planned development conforms with designated heritage buildings ASSESSEMENT of whether planned development conforms with designated heritage buildings ASSESSEMENT of whether planned development c	ONTARIO REGULATION 9/06, ONTARIO HERITAGE A	T	
CRITERIA for determining cultural heritage value, and for determining whether or not a property is worthy of Designation under the Ontario Heritage Act ASSESSEMENT of whether planned development conforms with designated heritage buildings ASSESSEMENT of whether planned development conforms with designated heritage buildings ASSESSEMENT of whether planned development conforms with designated heritage buildings ASSESSEMENT of whether planned development conforms with designated heritage buildings ASSESSEMENT of whether planned development conforms with designated heritage buildings ASSESSEMENT of whether planned development conforms with designated heritage buildings ASSESSEMENT of whether planned development conforms with designated heritage buildings ASSESSEMENT of whether planned development conforms with designated heritage buildings ASSESSEMENT of whether planned development conforms with designated heritage buildings ASSESSEMENT of whether planned development conforms with designated heritage buildings ASSESSEMENT of whether planned development conforms with designated heritage buildings ASSESSEMENT of whether planned development conforms with designated heritage buildings ASSESSEMENT of whether planned development conforms with designated heritage buildings ASSESSEMENT of whether planned development conforms with designated heritage buildings ASSESSEMENT of whether planned development conforms with designated heritage buildings ASSESSEMENT of whether planned development conforms with designated heritage buildings ASSESSEMENT of whether planned development conforms with designated heritage buildings ASSESSEMENT of whether planned development conforms with designated heritage buildings ASSESSEMENT of whether planned development conforms with designated heritage buildings ASSESSEMENT of whether planned development conforms with designated heritage buildings ASSESSEMENT of whether planned development conforms with designated heritage buildings ASSESSEMENT of whether planned development con	prepared by: MW HALL CORPORATION, Heritage Co	nsultant	
determining whether or not a property is worthy of ASSESSEMENT of whether planned development conforms with designated heritage buildings ASSESSEMENT of whether planned development conforms with designated heritage buildings Image: Control of the control o	20-Oct-15		
determining whether or not a property is worthy of ASSESSEMENT of whether planned development conforms with designated heritage buildings ASSESSEMENT of whether planned development conforms with designated heritage buildings Image: Control of the control o			
determining whether or not a property is worthy of ASSESSEMENT of whether planned development conforms with designated heritage buildings ASSESSEMENT of whether planned development conforms with designated heritage buildings Image: Control of the control o			
determining whether or not a property is worthy of ASSESSEMENT of whether planned development conforms with designated heritage buildings ASSESSEMENT of whether planned development conforms with designated heritage buildings Image: Control of the control o	CRITERIA for determining cultural heritage value, and for		
Designation under the Ontario Heritage Act ASSESSEMENT of whether planned development conforms with designated heritage buildings Assessed and the planned development conforms with designated heritage buildings Image: content of the planned development conforms with designated heritage buildings Assessed and the planned development conforms with designated heritage buildings Image: content of the planned development conforms with designated heritage buildings If he property has design value or physical value because it, displays a high gree of craftsmanship or artistic merit. Image: content of the property has design value or physical value because it, displays a high the gree of craftsmanship or artistic merit. Image: content of the property has design value or physical value because it, displays a high the gree of craftsmanship or artistic merit. Image: content of the property has design value or physical value because it, has direct social value because it, demonstrates a ligh degree of technical or scientific achievement. Image: content of the property has historical value or associative value because it, has direct social value because it, demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement. Image: content of the property has historical value or associative value because it, demonstrates and the science of the art and the contributes to an understanding of a community. Image: content of the property does not free on the origin of the science of the area. Image: content of the property does not heve context or idea of a architect, artist, builder, designer or theorist who is significant to use or associative value because it, is montani as dinding and the property does not need the work or ideas of			
arity example of a style, type, expression, material or construction method It does not appear that this building is rare or actually an early example of a style, type or construction method. Image: Construction method Image: Constructin method Image: Construction method <td>Designation under the Ontario Heritage Act</td> <td>ASSESSEMENT of whether planned development conforms with designated heritage buildings</td> <td></td>	Designation under the Ontario Heritage Act	ASSESSEMENT of whether planned development conforms with designated heritage buildings	
arity example of a style, type, expression, material or construction method It does not appear that this building is rare or actually an early example of a style, type or construction method. Image: Construction method Image: Constructin method Image: Construction method <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>			
arity example of a style, type, expression, material or construction method It does not appear that this building is rare or actually an early example of a style, type or construction method. Image: Construction method Image: Constructin method Image: Construction method <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>			
arity example of a style, type, expression, material or construction method It does not appear that this building is rare or actually an early example of a style, type or construction method. Image: Construction method Image: Constructin method Image: Construction method <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>			
legree of craftsmanship or artistic merit The building does not seem to be an example of a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit Image: Craf	early example of a style, type, expression, material or construction method	It does not appear that this building is rare or actually an early example of a style, type or construction method.	
legree of craftsmanship or artistic merit The building does not seem to be an example of a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit Image: Craf	1ii The property has design value or physical value because it displays a high		
ligh degree of technical or scientific achievement. Building does not demonstrate a high degree of technical or scientific achievement. Image: State of technical or scientific achievement. State of technical or scientity state of technical or scientific achievem	degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit	The building does not seem to be an example of a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit	
Li The property has historical value or associative value because it, has direct ssociation with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization or institution hat is significant to a community. If The property has historical value or associative value because it, yields, or has he potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of a ommunity or culture 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 if The property does not reflect any work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer or theorist if The property does not neted with Sir John Carling as purported, other than that Carling had purchased the and and had it surveyed for a method is significant to a community or culture other than it was part of the expansion of the City of London. The property does not reflect any work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer or theorist if The property does not reflect any work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer or theorist significant to the community. The property does not have contextual value which would be important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an area. If The property has contextual value because it, is physically, functionally, visually if The property has contextual value because it, is physically, functionally, visually if The property has contextual value because it, is physically, functionally, visually if The property has contextual value because it, is physically, functionally, visually if The property has contextual value because it, is physically, functionally, visually if The property has contextual value because it, is physically, functionally, visually if The property has contextual value because it, is physically, functionally, visually if The property has contextual value because it, is physically, functionally, visually if the property has contextual value because it,	1.iii The property has design value or physical value because it, demonstrates a		
ssociation with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization or institution The building is likely not connected with Sir John Carling as purported, other than that Carling had purchased the and and had it surveyed for a iii The property has historical value or associative value because it, yields, or has The property does have the potential to yield information that would contribute to an understanding of a community or culture other than it was ommunity or culture The property does have the potential to yield information that would contribute to an understanding of a community or culture other than it was iiii 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 significant to a community The property does not reflect any work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer or theorist significant to the community. iii The property has contextual value because it, is important in defining, naintaining or supporting the character of an area. The property is so physically, functionally visually or historically linked to its surroundings. It is actually quite separated from them in terms of development timing, and does not appear to have been related to the undeveloped lands as a farm property, other than perhaps as an incidental	high degree of technical or scientific achievement.	Building does not demonstrate a high degree of technical or scientific achievement.	
hat is significant to a community. residential subdivision in the early 20th century. residential subdivision in the expansion of the City of London. residential subdivision in the expansion of the City of Lond			
III The property has historical value or associative value because it, yields, or has he potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of a ommunity or culture of the property does have the potential to yield information that would contribute to an understanding of a community or culture other than it was part of the expansion of the City of London. IIII 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 violes of an architect, artist, builder, designer or theorist significant to a community. The property does not reflect any work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer or theorist significant to the community. III The property has contextual value because it, is important in defining, naintaining or supporting the character of an area. The property is not physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings. It is actually quite separated from them in terms of development timing, and does not appear to have been related to the undeveloped lands as a farm property, other than perhaps as an incidental			
he potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of a ommunity or culture other than it was part of the expansion of the City of London. 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 significant to a community. The property does not reflect any work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer or theorist significant to the community. The property does not reflect any work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer or theorist significant to the community. The property does not needed to the designate Wolesley Barrackes, but is separated and and fenced from the Barracks property and likely had no relationship to the Barracks property and likely had no relationship to the Barracks property and likely had no relationship to the Barracks property and likely had no relationship to the Barracks property and likely had no relationship to the Barracks property and likely had no relationship to the Barracks property and likely had no relationship to the Barracks property and likely had no relationship to the Barracks property and likely had no relationship to the Barracks property and likely had no relationship to the Barracks property and likely had no relationship to the Barracks property and likely had no relationship to the Barracks and and fenced from the Barracks property and likely had no relationship to the Barracks but is separated from them in terms of development timing, and does not appear to have been related to the undeveloped lands as a farm property, other than perhaps as an incidental		residential subdivision in the early zon century.	
ommunity or culture part of the expansion of the City of London.	the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of a	The property does have the potential to yield information that would contribute to an understanding of a community or culture other than it was	
or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer or theorist The property does not reflect any work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer or theorist significant to the community. Image: Community of the property does not reflect any work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer or theorist significant to the community. Image: Community of the property does not reflect any work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer or theorist significant to the community. Image: Community of the property does not reflect any work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer or theorist significant to the community. Image: Community of the property does not have contextual value which would be important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of the area. It is adjacent to the designate Wolesley Barrackes, but is separated and and fenced from the Barracks property and likely had no relationship to the Barracks. Image: Community of the property is not physically, functionally visually or historically linked to its surroundings. It is actually quite separated from them in terms of development timing, and does not appear to have been related to the undeveloped lands as a farm property, other than perhaps as an incidental	community or culture		
who is significant to a community The property does not reflect any work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer or theorist significant to the community. Image: Comparison of the property does not reflect any work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer or theorist significant to the community. Image: Comparison of the property does not reflect any work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer or theorist significant to the community. Image: Comparison of the property does not have contextual value which would be important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of the area. It is adjacent to the designate Wolesley Barrackes, but is separated and and fenced from the Barracks property and likely had no relationship to the Barracks. Image: Comparison of the property is not physically, functionally visually or historically linked to its surroundings. It is actually quite separated from them in terms of development timing, and does not appear to have been related to the undeveloped lands as a farm property, other than perhaps as an incidental	2iii The property has historical value or associative value because it, demonstrates		
The property has contextual value because it, is important in defining, anintaining or supporting the character of the area. It is adjacent to the designate Wolesley Barrackes, but is separated and and fenced from the Barracks property and likely had no relationship to the Barracks. The property is not physically, functionally visually or historically linked to its surroundings. It is actually quite separated from them in terms of development timing, and does not appear to have been related to the undeveloped lands as a farm property, other than perhaps as an incidental	or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer or theorist		
ii The property has contextual value because it, is important in defining, adjacent to the designate Wolesley Barrackes, but is separated and and fenced from the Barracks property and likely had no relationship to the naintaining or supporting the character of an area. Barracks. The property has contextual value because it, is physically, functionally, visually The property is not physically, functionally visually or historically linked to its surroundings. It is actually quite separated from them in terms of iii The property has contextual value because it, is physically, functionally, visually development timing, and does not appear to have been related to the undeveloped lands as a farm property, other than perhaps as an incidental	who is significant to a community		
naintaining or supporting the character of an area. Barracks. The property is not physically, functionally visually or historically linked to its surroundings. It is actually quite separated from them in terms of development timing, and does not appear to have been related to the undeveloped lands as a farm property, other than perhaps as an incidental			
The property is not physically, functionally visually or historically linked to its surroundings. It is actually quite separated from them in terms of development timing, and does not appear to have been related to the undeveloped lands as a farm property, other than perhaps as an incidental			
iii The property has contextual value because it, is physically, functionally, visually development timing, and does not appear to have been related to the undeveloped lands as a farm property, other than perhaps as an incidental	maintaining or supporting the character of an area.		
	20 The property has contextual value because it is physically functionally visually		
iiii The property has contextual value because it, is a landmark The property is not a landmark, given its modest character.	3iii The property has contextual value because it, is a landmark	The property is not a landmark, given its modest character.	

ACADEMIC + PROFESSIONAL TRAINING

Harvard University, Master of City Planning in Urban Design US Navy Civil Engineer Corps Officer School, Certificate of Graduation Construction and Design Management Massachusetts Institute of Technology Graduate Studies in Planning and Economics Pratt Institute, Master Degree program studies in Planning and Economics University of Michigan, Bachelor of Architecture **DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION EXPERIENCE** Mariposa Land Development Company [1438224 Ontario Inc.]

Toronto / Orillia, President Orchard Point Development Company [1657923 Ontario Inc.] Orillia, Vice President MW HALL CORPORATION, Toronto, Toronto, President Teddington Limited, Toronto, Development advisor, Planner, Architect

DMJM, Los Angeles, Planner Gruen Associates, Los Angeles, Planner US NAVY, Civil Engineer Corps, Officer Apel, Beckert & Becker, Architects, Frankfurt Green & Savin, Architects, Detroit

CITY DEVELOPMENT / URBAN DESIGN / REAL ESTATE DEVELOPMENT

ARCHIPLAN, Los Angeles, Principal/President

Mark Hall has directed a number of city development and urban design projects, including waterfront revitalization, commercial, multiunit residential, industrial facilities and major mixed use projects in both public and private clients/employers. He has worked on staff for public agencies, including real estate development and property management services. He understands the dynamics of city development, the techniques required for successful implementation, and procedural, financial and political requirements. His experience and contributions range throughout Canada, the United States, Europe, Southeast Asia, the Middle East and the Arctic. As a result of his extensive experience in this area, he has been invited to participate in the Regional Urban Design Assistance Team [R/UDAT] programs of the American Institute of Architects, and a program of waterfront renewal in Toronto by the Ontario Professional Planners Institute. He is a Registered Professional Planner in Ontario, member of the Canadian Institute of Planners, and a founding member of the American Institute of Certified Planners. Recently, as president of Mariposa Land Development Company, he designed and built a 54 unit condominium apartment project designed to upgrade the waterfront of historic downtown Orillia, Ontario. The building has spurred a number of revitalization projects in Orillia. He has designed residential, commercial and industrial projects.

HISTORIC PRESERVATION / ADAPTIVE REUSE

Mr. Hall has developed special interest and expertise in historic preservation and adaptive reuse of historic structures and city districts. He has served as president of the Los Angeles Conservancy, and designed projects combining historic preservation and appropriate adaptive reuse of the properties. He is a member of the Canadian Association of Heritage Professionals. He served as preservation architect on renovations of the RC Harris Water Plan and Queens Park, designated cultural heritage buildings in Toronto. He has served as architect for restoration and additions to a number of historic buildings in the Annex, Beaches and other areas of central city Toronto, as well as Belleville, Orillia, Mississauga,Brampton, Richmond Hill, Aurora, Niagara-on-the-Lake and in Los Angeles, Florida and Mexico. He frequently works with property developers, municipalities and heritage property owners as consultant regarding historic properties of concern to municipalities in which they are working.

ARCHITECTURE

An architect for over 40 years, Mr. Hall is licensed to practice in Canada and the US. He has been responsible for design and construction of a number of significant projects: mixed use structures, corporate headquarters and industrial facilities, military facilities, multi-unit residential, civic and commercial centres, and seniors housing. He understands the design, construction and real estate development process, as well as management of multi-disciplinary and client concerns for cost effective, efficient, award-winning structures. Many of the structures he has built are the result of implementing more comprehensive master planned developments. For his work in historic preservation, education and community service he was awarded Fellowship in the American Institute of Architects.

COMMUNITY & EDUCATION SERVICE

In addition to professional practice, Mr. Hall has made major commitments to teaching and community service. He taught urban design and city planning at USC, UCLA, Southern California Institute of Architecture [SCI ARC] and Boston Architectural Center. While at Harvard he worked with the Harvard Urban Field Service in Boston's Chinatown. As an officer in the US NAVY he was awarded a special Commendation Medal for development of a master plan for the NAVY's Arctic Research Laboratory and the adjacent Inupiat community of Barrow, Alaska. His work has been published in professional journals and has received various awards and honors. He served on the board of directors and later as president of the Southern California chapter of the American Institute of Architects. He was co-chair for the Ontario Professional Planners Institute [OPPI] of a multi-disciplinary design Charette to determine the future of the Metropolitan Toronto waterfront, and later on a committee of the Ontario Association of Architects looking into solutions to urban sprawl. He has served as president of the non-profit Housing Development Resource Centre [HRDC] and as president of Toronto Brigantine, a non-profit organization providing sail training aboard two tall ships in the Great Lakes.