



London
CANADA

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

June 1, 2016

G. Kotsifas
Managing Director, Development and Compliance Services & Chief Building Official

J.M. Fleming
Managing Director, Planning and City Planner

I hereby certify that the Municipal Council, at its meeting held on May 31, 2016 resolved:

11. That, on the recommendation of the Managing Director, Planning and City Planner, with the advice of the Heritage Planner, the following actions be taken with respect to the request for the demolition of a heritage listed building located at 4402 Colonel Talbot Road:

- a) notice BE GIVEN under the provision of Section 29(3) of the Ontario Heritage Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. O. 18, of the Municipal Council's intention to designate the property at 4402 Colonel Talbot Road to be of cultural heritage value or interest for the reasons appended to the staff report dated May 30, 2016 as Appendix D; and,
- b) the Chief Building Official BE ADVISED of the Municipal Council's intention in this matter;

it being noted that the Planning and Environment Committee reviewed and received a communication dated May, 2016 from D.A. Smith, S3AEC + StudioS3AEC, with respect to this matter;

it being pointed out that at the public participation meeting associated with this matter, the individuals indicated on the attached public participation meeting record made oral submissions regarding this matter. (2016-P10D/R01) (11/10/PEC)

C. Saunders
City Clerk
/jb

cc: Dr. Chawla & D. Smith, S3AEC and Studio S3AEC, 221 Consortium Court, London, ON
N6E 2S8
J. Yanchula, Manager, Urban Regeneration
K. Gonyou, Heritage Planner
K. Butts, Executive Assistant, Planning
M. Hicks, Executive Assistant
H. Tomlinson, Documentation Services Representative
London Advisory Committee on Heritage

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

11. Property located at 4402 Colonel Talbot Road

- Derek Smith, S3AEC, on behalf of the applicant – directing the Committee to pages 130 through 147 of the Planning and Environment Committee Agenda; indicating that Mr. Gonyou, Heritage Planner, did a very good job identifying the heritage aspects of the original school built in 1925 and the additions made in 1953, 1963 and 1968; realizing that the recommendation from the London Advisory Committee on Heritage is to proceed with the demolition of the 1953, 1963 and 1968 additions leaving the 1925 building as is; requesting consent for an entire demolition as they have requested through their demolition permit; pointing out that there are some technical challenges with the 1925 building which are going to cause them the challenge of redeveloping that project and it is identified in his 5.0 conclusions and recommendations; pointing to page 146 of the Planning and Environment Committee, there is a sectional view of the existing building through 1925 because it is an elevated floor system they will have to provide some form of accessibility to reuse that particular part of the building; noting that that can either be done from an external ramp system; however, the ideal situation is to remove the floor system and bring it down to grade; advising that the challenge associated with that is that once we remove floor system which is acting as a diaphragm, the exterior façade begins to become distressed and its ability to maintain its structure; noting that it is an old wood frame structure with a face brick façade; indicating that they will have to do some pretty interesting engineering in order to maintain that facade on the west, north and south walls in order to maintain the existing building; reiterating that this leaves them with some challenges associated with being able to reuse that building for anything that is going to be functional; indicating that his report identifies some accessibility challenges and in terms of the historical value, Collegiate Goth, on page 147 of the Planning and Environment Committee Agenda, there is an error on the listing and they agree with that error; outlining that as far as the context goes, yes, they understand that the school plays an important role within the community; however, the development plans are to ensure that a health and wellness clinic does also serve an important role within the community and whether they use the existing architecture of the school or not is the debate on the table; indicating that the London Advisory Committee on Heritage recommendation includes keeping the 1925 original school and they disagree with that as a statement; pointing out that, in terms of the Bozart style, he disagrees with staff and they have included, on page 149 of the Planning and Environment Committee Agenda, some outside of Lambeth contextual images of Bozart style in which you will see Ionic columns; Doric columns, Corinthian columns with greater detail associated with more civic buildings; noting that limestone is used, is typical for a Bozart building not brick so the idea that M. B. McEachren is contextually a Bozart building, they believe is not quite accurate; indicating that they have provided some site plan options in the event that the Planning and Environment Committee and then ultimately Council does go ahead with the London Advisory Committee on Heritage recommendation, then what you will see is a development that begins with a smaller building to the northwest corner which is already in for site plan approval, a professional building; moving towards a development on the northeast of the larger clinic area leaving the school alone and then moving towards possibly a third building on the site leaving the remnant school alone for a period of time when it starts to economically make sense; reiterating that they have contemplated a site plan development leaving the school alone; however, it will take some time to get to that school economically; pointing out that the other option that you have on page 151 of the Planning and Environment Committee Agenda that they have looked at is the complete demolition of the school, the northwest building going ahead as planned and then replacing the school with a similar sized structure of similar scale, similar intent of a building using similar materials such as windows and brick as identified in the northwest building that is already being studied and planned in order to recreate a similar scale building on the site; advising that they have looked at two contextual options to see

whether or not they can go ahead with the development that way in either scenario; and, reiterating that their request is for the entire demolition of the school.

- Dr. Challah, Owner Lambeth Health Organization – summarizing the slides submitted; raising the question what is the history here, what is her story; indicating that the Lambeth Health Organization will bring her story back to Lambeth; advising it is more than just a building, advising due to minimal maintenance mould has developed and is spreading, stating that this is a health risk for anyone in the building; indicating it is in the ventilation system, advising that he has experienced health issues including shortness of breath, cough, nose and eye flare ups when in the building without a mask and goggles which lasts several days; stating he does not normally have any environmental allergies; indicating that the mould is small spores that are difficult to contain and despite any efforts to do so will not catch all the spores which will result in the mould multiplying again; advising that there is mould and water damage to the ceiling, walls and floors in the 1925 section due to the compromised roof; advising of structural damage to the pillars and bricks and mortar and vandalism; asking what is her story and what are we trying to preserve; indicating that this building represents an education system; indicating that there have been significant alterations to the building from the 1925 postcard that has been presented and it no longer meets the mark of a historic building and attempts to return to original structure would result in the collapse of sidewalls; and, ending by thanking the Committee for their time; *(Councillor Turner confirms the recommendation from the London Advisory Committee on Heritage to preserve the west, north and south aspects of the building. Asking what can be done, is that a façade preservation and anything on the interior could be gutted just as long as those three aspects were maintained.)*; Mr. Gonyou, Heritage Planner, responds that the intent is to preserve the volume of the 1925 continuation school with the London Advisory Committee on Heritage noting that the primary heritage attributes can be found on the exterior of the north, west and south façade so that does allow for the opportunity for interior interventions, renovation as necessary; noting that the rear or east façade which would be routed towards the rest of the development for the site could be an appropriate location to facilitate accessibility and interventions for example; *(Councillor Turner enquires about when this came before them June 15, 2015, why this had not been applied for, why, in the site plan had that not been contemplated; this seems reverse in the process.)*; Dr. Challah responds that his intention was to keep the school as it was as he liked the characteristics of the school and he had no intention at that time to do that; noting that he had only been in the school twice in that time frame and after purchasing and he was able to explore the area in the school he realized that this is more of a health risk and more of a structurally risk to the environment and to the people in Lambeth; indicating that his intention is to maintain those stories and maintain the heritage in that school by gathering the stories that exist in Lambeth and he has had a lot of community engagement; *(Councillor Park enquires about the Heritage Community Improvement Plan, the two grants that are offered throughout it and asking for an idea of what the ceiling would be on the two grants that could be utilized for this project if they went forward with the recommendation.)*; Mr. J. Yanchula, Manger, Urban Regeneration, responds that without knowing the costs he could not give you a ceiling because it is proportionate to the cost of the investment made in the building but the principle behind the heritage community improvement plan is to reach a threshold which makes the saving of the building not a factor in its reuse and redevelopment on the site; *(Councillor Park further enquires about there is no up to a certain amount in the Community Improvement Plan.)*; Mr. J. Yanchula, Manger, Urban Regeneration, responds that the up to is the threshold for which it takes to retain the heritage attributes that are there in the first place; and, noting that there is no dollar up to.