

9TH REPORT OF THE
LONDON ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON HERITAGE

Meeting held on July 6, 2016, commencing at 5:30 PM, in Committee Room #5, Second Floor, London City Hall.

PRESENT: D. Dudek (Chair), S. Adamsson, D. Brock, H. Garrett, T. Jenkins, J. Manness, B. Vazquez, K. Waud and M. Whalley and B. Westlake-Power (Acting Secretary).

ABSENT: J. Cushing, H. Elmslie, S. Gibson and J. Manness.

ALSO PRESENT: R. Armistead, G. Bailey, J. Dent, L. Dent, K. Gonyou, T. Macbeth, C. McIntosh, M. Tomazincic, A. Watson and J. Yanchula.

I. CALL TO ORDER

1. Disclosures of Pecuniary Interest

That it BE NOTED that H. Garrett disclosed a pecuniary interest in clause 2 of this Report, having to do with the application of Rygar Properties Inc. related to 100 Fullarton Street, 475 – 501 Talbot Street and 93 – 95 Dufferin Avenue, by indicating that her employer is the agent on file.

II. SCHEDULED ITEMS

2. Notice of Application - Rygar Properties Inc. - 100 Fullarton Street, 475-501 Talbot Street and 93-95 Dufferin Avenue

That the Civic Administration BE ADVISED that the London Advisory Committee on Heritage (LACH) continues to support, and reiterates, its previous recommendation related to the properties located at 100 Fullarton Street, 475 – 501 Talbot Street and 93 – 95 Dufferin, as follows, which was adopted by Municipal Council at its meeting held on September 29, 2015:

“That the following actions be taken with respect to the 11th Report of the London Advisory Committee on Heritage from its meeting held on September 9, 2015:

a) the following actions be taken with respect to part a) and b) of clause 6 of the 11th Report of the London Advisory Committee on Heritage, having to do with the proposed designation of the properties located at 79, 481, 483, 485, 487 and 489 Talbot Street (Camden Terrace) and 93 – 95 Dufferin Avenue:

i) the owner BE REQUESTED to stabilize the above-noted structures during the winter season;

ii) parts a) and b) of clause 6 of the 11th Report of the London Advisory Committee on Heritage BE REFERRED to the Civic Administration to consider in conjunction with the evaluation of future planning applications regarding these properties; it being noted that part a) and b) of clause 6 of the 11th Report of the London Advisory Committee on Heritage reads as follows:

“a) a Notice under the provisions 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 properties located at 479, 481, 483, 485, 487 and 489 Talbot Street (Camden Terrace) to be of cultural heritage value and interest BE GIVEN, for the attached reasons;

- b) a Notice under the provisions 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 properties located at 93 – 95 Dufferin Avenue to be of cultural heritage value and interest BE GIVEN, for the attached reasons;"
- iii) the Civic Administration BE REQUESTED to work with the developer to evaluate opportunities to integrate heritage elements into the design;

it being noted that the Planning and Environment Committee heard verbal presentations from W. Kinghorn, Chair, LACH and J. Rodgers, Rygar Properties Inc. and reviewed and received a communication dated September 15, 2015, from J. Rodgers, Rygar Properties Inc., with respect to these matters."

it being noted that the LACH noted the following additional information:

- the LACH approves of most of the aspects of the project, particularly with respect to the heritage façades proposed to be incorporated in the project;
- the LACH supports the requirement that the designated elements may require alteration to permit the removal of parts of structure(s); and,
- the LACH understands that potential difficulties with structures and site conditions exist, and if it proves necessary, the LACH would support the rebuilding of structures/facades, using original materials, in situ, within the project;

it being further noted that the LACH received delegations from M. Rivard, Stantec Consulting (see attached presentation) on behalf of the applicant, M. Tomazincic, Manager, Current Planning and J. Hunten and M. Tovey.

3. Heritage Alteration Permit Application - Steven Cooper, Matter Architecture Inc. - 531 Ridout Street North - Harris Park Pavilion - Downtown 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 alter the pavilion located at 531 Ridout Street North (Harris Park) BE PERMITTED as appended to the staff report dated July 6, 2016 as Appendix C, subject the following terms and conditions being met:

- a) photographic documentation of the pavilion (before renovation, during renovation, and after completion) be submitted to the Heritage Planner; and,
- b) the final drawings to alter be provided to the Heritage Planner for approval prior to issuance of the Building Permit.

4. City's comprehensive review of Community Improvement Plans (CIPs) and Incentive Programs

That the attached presentation from G. Bailey, Planner II, A. Watson, Planner II and T. Macbeth, Planner II, with respect to the City of London's comprehensive review of Community Improvement Plans and Incentive Programs BE REFERRED to the Planning and Policy Sub-committee for further review and comment.

5. West London Dyke

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 alter the West London Dyke, located within the Blackfriars/Petersville Heritage Conservation District (HCD), BE PERMITTED as submitted, subject to the following terms and conditions being met:

- a) an arborist report be prepared and submitted identifying existing species of trees to be removed and provide recommendations for replacement species in accordance with the policies and guidelines of the Blackfriars/Petersville HCD Plan;

- b) any new vegetation added to the greenway conform to the policies and guidelines of the Blackfriars/Petersville HCD, particularly for native and non-invasive plant species;
- c) documentation of the West London Dyke be undertaken to contribute to the archival record of this important piece of civic infrastructure, with above-noted documentation to be submitted to the Heritage Planner to include the following information:
 - i) photographic documentation of the existing condition of the West London Dyke, (including railings, concrete sloped wall, and surrounding environment);
 - ii) measured drawings or 3D digital modelling to maintain a record of the historic structure; and,
 - iii) photographic documentation of the construction activities associated with the West London Dyke alteration to be taken at regular intervals;
- d) the existing, historic railings from the West London Dyke be salvaged and be made available to community members for installation as decorative features preferably within the Blackfriars/Petersville HCD; and,
- e) implementation of cultural heritage interpretive signage or public art that commemorates the history of the West London Dyke, historic flooding in London, flood control measures, and the Blackfriars/Petersville HCD along the West London Dyke be encouraged; it being noted that topics should not be duplicated between cultural heritage interpretive signage within Harris Park;

it being noted that the London Advisory Committee on Heritage heard a presentation from the K. Gonyou, Heritage Planner and C. McIntosh, Environmental Service Engineer and L. Jones, Stantec, with respect to this matter.

III. CONSENT ITEMS

6. 7th Report of the London Advisory Committee on Heritage

That it BE NOTED that the 7th Report of the Advisory Committee on Heritage from its meeting held on June 8, 2016 was received.

7. Municipal Council resolution adopted at its meeting held May 31, 2016 with respect to the 6th Report of the London Advisory Committee on Heritage

That it BE NOTED that the Municipal Council resolution adopted at its session held on May 31, 2016, with respect to the 6th Report of the London Advisory Committee on Heritage was received.

8. Municipal Council resolution adopted at its meeting held May 31, 2016 with respect to the Demolition of 4402 Colonel Talbot Road

That it BE NOTED that the Municipal Council resolution adopted at its session held on May 31, 2016, with respect to the request for demolition of the structure at 4402 Colonel Talbot Road was received.

9. Municipal Council resolution adopted at its meeting held May 31, 2016 with respect to the Demolition of 5067 Cook Road

That it BE NOTED that the Municipal Council resolution adopted at its session held on May 31, 2016, with respect to the demolition of the structure at 5067 Cook Road was received.

10. Municipal Council resolution adopted at its meeting held June 23, 2016 with respect to 142 Kent Street

That it BE NOTED that the Municipal Council resolution adopted at its session held on May 31, 2016, with respect to the proposed repeal of the designating By-law for the property located at 142 Kent Street was received.

11. Municipal Council resolution adopted at its meeting held June 23, 2016 with respect to 335 Thames Street

That it BE NOTED that the Municipal Council resolution adopted at its session held on June 23, 2016, with respect to the 6th Report of the London Advisory Committee on Heritage was received.

12. Municipal Council resolution adopted at its meeting held June 23, 2016 with respect to 864-872 Dundas Street

That it BE NOTED that the Municipal Council resolution adopted at its session held on June 23, 2016, with respect to the designation of the property located at 864-872 Dundas Street was received.

13. Municipal Council resolution adopted at its meeting held June 23, 2016 with respect to the 7th Report of the London Advisory Committee on Heritage

That it BE NOTED that the Municipal Council resolution adopted at its session held on June 23, 2016, with respect to the 7th Report of the London advisory Committee on Heritage from its meeting held on June 8, 2016, was received.

14. Municipal Council resolution adopted at its meeting held June 23, 2016 with respect to the Demolition of 5221 Cook Road

That it BE NOTED that the Municipal Council resolution adopted at its session held on June 23, 2016, with respect to the proposed demolition of the heritage listed property located at 5221 Cook Road, was received.

15. Municipal Council resolution adopted at its meeting held June 23, 2016 with respect to the Demolition of 175/179/181 King Street

That it BE NOTED that the Municipal Council resolution adopted at its session held on June 23, 2016, with respect to the demolition of the building located at 175/179/181 King Street, in the Downtown London Heritage Conservation District, was received.

16. Notice of Application - 2431602 Ontario Limited - 420 Fanshawe Park Road East

That it BE NOTED that the Notice dated June 1, 2016 from S. Wise, Planner II, with respect to the application submitted by 2431602 Ontario Limited, related to the property located at 420 Fanshawe Park Road East, was received.

IV. SUB-COMMITTEES & WORKING GROUPS

17. Stewardship

That it BE NOTED that the Stewardship Sub-committee report from its meeting held on April 27, 2016 was received.

V. ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

18. Heritage Alteration Application - R. Teves - 104 Wortley Road

That, on the recommendation of the Managing Director, Planning and City Planner, with the advice of the Heritage Planner, the Heritage Alteration Permit Application of R. Teves for the erection of a new residence on the property located at 104 Wortley Road **BE PERMITTED** as described in the drawing, attached to the staff report dated July 6, 2016 as Appendix 3.

19. Request for Demolition - 2497646 Ontario Inc. - 269 Thames Street

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 property located at 269 Thames Street:

- a) the Chief Building Official **BE ADVISED** that Municipal Council regrettably consents to the demolition of this property; it being noted that the London Advisory Committee on Heritage cautioned against the nearby archaeological significance being affected by the demolition;
- b) 269 Thames Street **BE REMOVED** from the *Inventory of Heritage Resources* (Register); and,
- c) the London Diversity and Race Relations Advisory Committee **BE CONSULTED** during the development of interpretive signage for the area.

20. Request for Demolition - G. Moore and P. Cane - 129 Langarth Street East

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 property located at 129 Langarth Street East,:

- a) the Chief Building Official **BE ADVISED** that Municipal Council consents to the demolition of this property; and,
- b) 129 Langarth Street East **BE REMOVED** from the *Inventory of Heritage Resources* (Register).

21. Heritage Alteration Permit Application - P. Dillon - 853 Waterloo Street - Bishop Hellmuth 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 alter the porch located at 853 Waterloo Street, within the Bishop Hellmuth Heritage Conservation District, **BE PERMITTED**, in accordance with the sketch appended to the staff report dated July 6, 2016, with the following terms and conditions being met:

- a) the Heritage Alteration Permit be displayed in a location visible from the street until the work is completed;
- b) photographic documentation of the work be submitted to the Heritage Planner upon completion;
- c) all exposed wood be painted; and,
- d) the handrails and spindles be installed 1&3/4" square and set 3&1/2" apart between centres, as shown on the above-noted sketch;

it being noted that consideration should be given for the substitution of the box piers with wood Ionic columns, as well as the application of a decorative relief pattern on the porch skirting.

22. Heritage Alteration Permit Application - G. Chellew - 216 Wharnccliffe Road North - Blackfriars/Petersville 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 alter the porch located at 216 Wharnccliffe Road North, within the Blackfriars/Petersville Heritage Conservation District, **BE PERMITTED** in accordance with the sketch appended to the staff report dated July 6, 2016, with the following terms and conditions being met:

- a) the final drawings, showing all details, be provided to the Heritage Planner for approval prior to issuance of the Building Permit;
- b) the Heritage Alteration Permit be displayed in a location visible from the street until the work is completed;
- c) photographic documentation of the work be submitted to the Heritage Planner

upon completion; and,

- d) all exposed wood be painted.

23. Request for Demolition - S. Randhawa - 102 Wharncliffe Road North - Blackfarris/Petersville Heritage Conservation District

That, on the recommendation of the Managing Director, Planning and City Planner, with the advice of the Heritage Planner, the application of S. Randhawa under section 42 of the *Ontario Heritage Act* to demolish the building located at 102 Wharncliffe Road North, within in the Blackfriars/Petersville Heritage Conservation District, **BE PERMITTED** with the following terms and conditions being met:

- a) the property owner obtain a Heritage Alteration Permit for an approved replacement structure that is compatible with the goals of the Blackfriars/Petersville Heritage Conservation District Plan prior to the initiation of the demolition permit;
- b) documentation, including as-built drawings, property history, and photographs, be completed by the property owner be submitted, prior to the initiation of demolition activities to the satisfaction of the Heritage Planner; and,
- c) the property owner be encouraged to salvage any reusable elements from the existing building.

24. Heritage Impact Statement - Z-8616 - 66 Byron Avenue East

That the Civic Administration **BE ADVISED** that the London Advisory Committee on Heritage (LACH) supports the Heritage Impact Assessment, dated March 2016, prepared by Pol Associates Inc., and the proposed Zoning By-law Amendment for the property located at 66 Byron Avenue East; it being noted that the LACH expressed concerns with the proposed elevations noted in the Heritage Impact Assessment as to the compatibility within the Wortley Village Heritage Conservation District.

25. Heritage Planners' Report

That it **BE NOTED** that the attached submission from K. Gonyou, Heritage Planner, with respect to various updates and events, was received.

VI. DEFERRED MATTERS/ADDITIONAL BUSINESS

None.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 9:07 PM.

NEXT MEETING DATE: August 10, 2016

Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest for 479, 481, 483, 485, 487, 489 Talbot Street

Legal Description of Property

479-485 Talbot Street: PLAN 61 PT LOT 4 PT LOT 5 S/S MAPLE RP 33R5367 PT PART 1

487 Talbot Street: PLAN 61 PT LOT 4 PT LOT 5 S/S MAPLE

489 Talbot Street: PLAN 61 PT LOT 4 PT LOT 5 S/S MAPLE RP 33R2843 PART 1 REG

Roll Number

479-485 Talbot Street: 010030064000000

487 Talbot Street: 010030063000000

489 Talbot Street: 010030062000000

Property Description

479-489 Talbot Street is located on the west side of Talbot Street, between Fullarton Street and Dufferin Avenue (formerly Maple Street/Hitchcock Street). The building located on the properties is a six-unit terrace, or townhouse/row house, locally known as Camden Terrace. It is believed to have been designed by Samuel Peters Junior in two phases: the northerly four units were built in 1876 and the southerly two units shortly after in 1877. The terrace units are two and a half storeys in height and are built of London (buff) brick. Units in Camden Terrace are paired, with entry doors adjacent and sharing a common stoop.

Physical/Design Values

This property is of physical and design value as a rare example of a late nineteenth century terrace, composed of six attached units. Camden Terrace reflects the refined Italianate detailing expected of a later nineteenth century housing development that appealed to well-to-do Londoners. Camden Terrace demonstrates a high degree of craftsmanship, believed to be the design of Samuel Peters Junior, as demonstrated in the use of characteristic buff brick for the structure and details including brick brackets, dentils and cornice frieze, drip course, roof fire walls, and chimneys. Other architectural details which contribute to the refined qualities of Camden Terrace include unusual carved flat-based half-elliptical lintels over the windows on the ground storey and rounded-bottom half-elliptical lintels on the upper storey, narrow dormers on the shallow roof, and stone corbels at the eaves.

Each of the paired terrace units features tall, narrow windows equally spaced across the terrace, also accenting the Italianate verticality of Camden Terrace. The similarly tall, narrow single leaf front entry doors are paired and accented by a (now blind) transom. Each terrace unit has an identical front three-bay window with a solid sill running across

the base and a flat roof articulated by denticulate brickwork. This lends a harmonious rhythm to the whole construction.

The difference between the northerly four units and southerly two units of Camden Terrace are minute. The southerly two units are accessed by an elevated stoop. The height difference is pronounced at the basement level (the northerly four units of Camden Terrace do not have basement windows) however this diminishes to a minor height difference at the roofline. The southerly two units of Camden Terrace are also accented by a pilaster, which is not present on the northerly four units.

Historical/Associative Values

This property and several surrounding properties were owned by Samuel Peters Junior (1822-1882). Samuel Peters Junior was a Surveyor, Architect, and Engineer. He was appointed as Town Engineer in 1852, and became the first City Engineer in 1855. Samuel Peter Junior is responsible for surveying the first City of London map in 1855. He is a noted architect in London having designed several prominent buildings, including Grosvenor Lodge (1853), first Covent Garden Market building (1853-1854, now demolished), and the Edge Block (1875, southeast corner of Richmond Street and Dundas Street). He oversaw the construction of the city sewer system, surveyed and designed the Mount Pleasant Cemetery, and other undertakings in the rapidly growing City of London. Samuel Peters Junior is believed to be responsible for the design of Camden Terrace. After moving to No. 2 Camden Terrace (481 Talbot Street) in 1881, Samuel Peters Junior died there in 1882. His wife and daughter continued living there after his death.

In addition to historical associations with Samuel Peters Junior and his family, Camden Terrace became a fashionable address for affluent Londoners. Some notable residents included D.S. Perrin of Perrin Biscuit Company, Colonel John Walker of Imperial Oil, Mrs. S. L. Carfrae, Mrs. Louisa Ridout, Richard Shaw-Wood, and Ethelwolfe Scatchard.

Following the construction of the new Federal Courthouse (80 Dundas Street) in 1974, lawyers' offices became common in Camden Terrace, lending the name "Lawyer's Row." 485 Talbot Street was the home of Julius Siskind in 1923-1966, a noted London pawnbroker who became a successful merchant. His son, Abe, founded what would become Siskinds LLP, a prominent Canadian law firm.

Contextual Value

Camden Terrace is historically linked to the mid-nineteenth century development north of the original Mahlon Burwell's survey of the town site of London. Originally part of the Kent Farm, several large commercial and industrial establishments were the first non-agricultural uses in the area. These included the North American Wagon Factory, R. M. McPherson Machine Shop, Fanning Mill Manufacturing, and Joseph D. Saunby's Blackfriars Mill. As residential uses began to develop the Talbot North area as London's

first suburban area in the 1860s-1880s, these businesses relocated to other areas of London.

Business owners and workers wanted to live in close proximity to, but outside of, the Downtown. Terrace housing became a practical and elegant solution, signaling the transition of the built form from the Downtown to more residential uses in the Talbot North area. Camden Terrace represents this historic transition and is important in defining the character of the Talbot North area. While the terrace form of the building was once common, Camden Terrace is one of the last remaining nineteenth century terraces in London.

Heritage Attributes

Heritage attributes which support and contribute to the cultural heritage value or interest of Camden Terrace include:

- Rare example of a late nineteenth century terrace development in the Italianate style;
- Form, scale, and massing of a six-unit terrace development, divided into three sets of pairs;
- Elevated stoops and basement windows of the southerly two units (479 and 481 Talbot Street);
- Use of buff brick in the structure of the terrace as well as details including pilasters, drip course, dentils, brackets, and cornice frieze;
- Ground floor bay windows with a continuous plain rectangular lugsill, brickwork detailing, and a flat roof;
- High transoms (now blind) above the front entry doors;
- Plain rectangular lugsills;
- Unusual carved flat-based half-elliptical lintels over the windows on the ground storey and rounded-bottom half-elliptical lintels on the upper storey;
- Roof fire walls with integrated chimneys;
- Narrow dormers with a pair of sash windows separated by a mullion (one per terrace unit) on the shallow sloping roof;
- “Camden Terrace” plaque affixed to the building;
- Prominent location on Talbot Street;
- Historical associations with Samuel Peters Junior as the architect and original property owner of Camden Terrace; and,
- Historical associations with other notable occupants.

Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest for 93-95 Dufferin Avenue

Legal Description of Property

93-95 Dufferin Avenue: PLAN 61 PT LOT 3 PT LOT 4 RP 33R3977 PART 1 & RP 33R7012 PT PART 1 69.91X129.33X189.31XIRR 11217.00SF 69.91FR

Roll Number

93-95 Dufferin Avenue: 010030049000000

Property Description

93-95 Dufferin Avenue is located on the south side of Dufferin Avenue (formerly Maple Street/Hitchcock Street) between Talbot Street and Ridout Street in London, Ontario. The double house located on the property was primarily constructed in two phase, but maintains cohesion across its two parts. The first, 93 Dufferin Avenue, was constructed circa 1864 or 1868, as the home of Samuel Peters Junior. 95 Dufferin Avenue was added in 1894.

Physical/Design Values

The physical or design value of 93-95 Dufferin Avenue is derived from the particular stylistic evolution seen across its façade.

Believed to have been designed by Samuel Peters Junior in circa 1864 or 1868, 93 Dufferin Avenue demonstrates the Italianate style in its shallow hipped roof, paired brackets, and balanced horizontal proportions, as well as robust lugsills and lintels with a gentle peak. Brickwork detailing, including quoining, the plain frieze, and stringcourse, complement the appearance. The wide, single leaf entry door in the east bay of the lower storey features a rounded arch fan light articulated by wooden fluted pilasters and trim detail. A flat roof porch supported by square columns on plinths covers the doorway. A double-storey bay window is located between 93 and 95 Dufferin Avenue, acting as a bridge between the two units.

Added in 1894, 95 Dufferin Avenue replicates many of the architectural details of 93 Dufferin Avenue however it takes a stronger Classical Revival influence, particularly in its temple front form. Additional Classical Revival elements include the oval window with a robust architrave, keystone and blocks located above the entry doorway, as well as the round window set in the pediment that is surrounded by a laurel wreath. Brickwork detailing, window sills and lintels with a gentle peak, as well as paired brackets are maintained from 93 Dufferin Avenue.

Historical/Associative Values

93-95 Dufferin Avenue has several significant historical associations. Firstly, it is believed to have been designed by London architect/surveyor/engineer Samuel Peters Junior (1822-1882). Samuel Peters Junior was a Surveyor, Architect, and Engineer. He was appointed as Town Engineer in 1852, and became the first City Engineer in 1855. Samuel Peter Junior is responsible for surveying the first City of London map in 1855. He is a noted architect in London having designed several prominent buildings, including Grosvenor Lodge (1853), first Covent Garden Market building (1853-1854, now demolished), and the Edge Block (1875, southeast corner of Richmond Street and Dundas Street). He oversaw the construction of the city sewer system, surveyed and designed the Mount Pleasant Cemetery, and other undertakings in the rapidly growing City of London. Samuel Peters Junior and his family lived at 93 Dufferin Avenue from its construction in 1868 until immediately prior to his death in 1882. Samuel Peters Junior's decision to settle in Talbot North reflects the status he had achieved in London.

Secondly, Lieutenant Colonel John Walker (1832-1889) lived at 93 Dufferin Avenue, then known as "Shirra." Colonel Walker was a Scottish-born industrialist and London's Liberal Member of Parliament in the Canadian House of Commons in 1874. He was also a Vice-President of Canadian Pacific Railway, a director of the Mutual Oil Refining Company, and the Middlesex County Registrar.

Contextual Values

The historical and contextual values of 93-95 Dufferin Avenue are rooted in its location in London and the Londoners who chose to live there. 93-95 Dufferin Avenue contributes to the history of the Talbot North area. Residential and industrial uses were mixed throughout the area north of the City of London proper until the mid-1860s when the area began to transition to a primarily residential area. It quickly became London's first suburb. Talbot North developed with an exclusive character of London's early elite. Many of the buildings that date from this period of early suburban development are constructed of the characteristic London buff brick, including 93-95 Dufferin Avenue. The form and style of 93-95 Dufferin Avenue reflect the social status afforded to individuals who chose to settle in this area in the later-half of the nineteenth century.

Heritage Attributes

Heritage attributes which support and contribute to the cultural heritage value or interest of 93-95 Dufferin Avenue include:

- Form and scale of the double house;
- Buff brick;
- Demonstration of the Italianate style in 93 Dufferin Avenue: shallow hipped roof; paired wooden brackets; balanced proportions across its three bays in the upper and lower storey; robust lugsills and lintels with a gentle peak; wide, six panel

single leaf door with rounded arch fan light transom and wooden fluted pilasters and trim; brickwork detailing including quoining, a plain frieze, and stringcourse;

- Double storey bay window, acting as a bridge between 93 and 95 Dufferin Avenue;
- Demonstration of the Classical Revival style in 95 Dufferin Avenue: temple front form; oval window with robust architrave, keystone, and blocks located above the entry doorway; round window set in the pediment that is surrounded by a laurel wreath; dentils; brickwork detailing, window sills and lintels with a gentle peak, and paired brackets maintained from 93 Dufferin Avenue; and,
- Historical associations with Samuel Peters Junior and Lieutenant Colonel John Walker.



Agenda

- 1 Where we started
- 2 What we learned
- 3 Where we want to go

A vision for something different

- Early talks of use
- On the edge of the Downtown HCD
- High standard of design

1 Where we started

High hopes and endless possibilities began with property ownership

After closing...

- Vacancy of 479-485
- Visual inspection revealed:
 - Several fires
 - Structural concerns
 - Poor maintenance
 - Illegal drug operations
- Vandalism
- Copper
- Overall health and safety concerns



2 What we learned

We wanted to know what we *could* do and what we *had* to do... So Rygar asked the experts

How does feasibility factor in?

Retention
Partial retention
Relocation



Studies

- Environmental Site Assessments
 - December 2014
- Heritage Overview
 - Began May 2015
 - Draft completed January 2016
- Structural Report
 - June 2015
- Assessment of Fungal Spores, Moisture, and Indoor Air Testing
 - December 2015
- Ongoing planning studies
- Confirmed two units in 483 Talbot were used for illegal drug operations

3 Where we want to go

How do we find balance between what we *know* and what we *hope to do*?

The heritage context & study



Listed properties
Historical research
Site assessment
Evaluation
Impacts
Recommendations

Options considered to celebrate our history

- **Interpretive signage**
- **Public art project focused on history**
- **Incorporation into the development**
- **A written history**
- **Reuse of materials or exhibition**



Visual interest rooted in history – commemoration through the built form

What we are asking of you...

A commitment to work with us to refine a commemoration strategy prior to Phase 3 building permit approvals.

The strategy should acknowledge the heritage attributes, preferably in the built form as presented, which contribute to the heritage value of these properties. This should provide opportunities to interpret the past appropriate to the level of value identified.



Evaluation of Community Improvement Plan Incentives

London Advisory Committee on Heritage Meeting
July 6, 2016



DC Programs vs. Other Programs

Other Programs	Cost (2006 to 2015)	# of Approved Applications	DC Programs	Cost (2006 to 2015)	# of Approved Applications
Facade Improvement Loans (DT, OEV, SoHo)	\$1 million	51	Downtown	\$5.7 million	3
Upgrade to B.C. Loans (DT, OEV, SoHo)	\$3.2 million	92	Old East Village	\$6.3 million	2
Non-Street FI Loans (DT, OEV)	\$220,000	12	Industrial	\$813,000 (only 2015)	4
Rehab and Redevelop Tax Grant (DT, OEV)	\$6 million	19	Total	\$12.81 million	9
Other DT, OEV Grants	Approx. \$200,000	~40			
Brownfield CIP Grants	\$618,000	15			
Airport CIP Grants	\$330,000	2			
Heritage CIP Grants	\$0	0			
Industrial Lands CIP Grants (non DC)	\$0	0			
Total	\$11.5 million	231			



What Are We Here to Talk About?

PROJECT PHASE	FINANCIAL INCENTIVE PROGRAMS	COMPLETED
CLAUSE A	Undertake a review process to consider and evaluate the range of financial incentives offered	By End of 2016
CLAUSE B	Consider the potential for two program changes (Res, DC cap & targeted Ind. DC approach)	By End of 2016
CLAUSE C	Undertake public engagement program for the service review process identified in parts a) and b).	By End of 2016
CLAUSE D	Consider and evaluate incentive programs posed to Council in the past	By End of 2016
CLAUSE E	Provide a business case relating to Brownfield Contamination Assessment Study Grant Program Summary as part of the 2016-2019 Multi-year Budget process	YES
CLAUSE F	Investigate impacts of the vacancy tax rebate on the municipality for communication to the province	* YES
FINAL REPORT BACK	Staff report (and recommendations) on changes for 2017-2019 (and beyond)	End of 2016

- **Clauses A – D:** Review Existing and Proposed New CIPs (and related financial programs) as well as any money savings changes that could be made
- **Clauses E:** Completed in 2015 as part of Multi-Year Budget Process
- **Clauses F:** Being undertaken as a separate policy review process by Finance and Corporate Services



Existing CIPs & Financial Incentives

Presently the City of London has 7 Community Improvement Programs through which a variety of Financial Incentives have been funded:

CIPs	Financial Incentive Programs Offered					Discontinued CIP Programs							Approved but not funded CIP Programs	
	Last Mile Grant	Facade Improvement Loan	Upgrade to Building Code Loan	Tax Grant Program	DC Grant	Forgivable Facade Improvement Loan	Forgivable Upgrade to Building Code Loan	Non-street Facade Improvement Loan	Awning, Signage & Decorative Lighting Grant	Tax Holiday Grant	Heritage Assessment Grant	Heritage Improvement Grant		
Downtown													-	-
Old East Village													-	-
SoHo						-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Tax Grant Program	DC Grant
Heritage						-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Airport Area						-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Brownfield						-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Industrial Lands						-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Industrial Corridor Enhancement Grant	-



Types of Financial Incentives through CIPs

Programs	Examples	Description
Loans	- Upgrade to Building Code - Facade Improvement - Non-street Facade Improvement Loan	No interest, 10 year pay back to the City, Capped (percentage of cost of improvements set to a max.), Low cost
Tax Grant	- Brownfield Tax Increment Equivalent Grant - Rehabilitation & Redevelopment Grant - Heritage Tax Increment Grant - Airport Tax Increment Grant	Tied to increase Tax (related to improvement), New taxes paid, grant provided for a set proportion of the tax increase, city received no less than prior to improvement, Low cost
Other Grants	- Forgivable Upgrade to Building Code - Forgivable Facade Improvement - Awning, Signage & Decorative Lighting Grant - Tax Holiday Grant - Industrial Corridor Enhancement Grant	Typically tied to Small Scale property improvement Projects or studies, Capped, Moderate cost
DC Grants	- Industrial - Residential - Brownfield - Heritage Development Charge Equivalent Grant	Widely used for a variety Projects, Not capped for IND/RES/AIR, Capped for HER/BRO based on costs of site improvement/remediation – value of grants determined at Building Permit Stage, High cost



Evaluation of CIPs & Financial Incentives

- **Review Criteria (staff have undertaken this exercise internally & seeking comments)**
 - Proportion of CIP Funding?
 - Application Volume?
 - Sustainability based on funding source?
 - Link to Strategic Plans (Strategic Alignment)?
 - Are the CIP objectives being achieved?
 - Impact of reduced CIP funding?
- **Indicators of Success**
 - Will reflect the specific Community Improvement Plan
 - Heritage
 - Airport
 - Brownfield
 - Downtown/SoHo/Old East Village CIPs are similar



Evaluation of Community Improvement Plans

Community Improvement Plan	AIRPORT	BROWNFIELD			SoHo / D / OEV		D / OEV		INDUSTRIAL		HERITAGE	
Program	Tax Increment Grant	Property Tax Assistance	DC Rebate	Tax Increment Equivalent Grant	Facade Improvement	Upgrade to Building Code	Tax Grant	DC Grant	DC Grant	Corridor Enhancement Grant	Tax Grant	DC Equivalent Grant
Review Criteria												
Proportion of CIP Funding												
Application Volume												
Sustainability based on funding source												
Link to Strategic Plan												
Are the CIP objectives being achieved?												
Impact of reduced CIP funding?												

Potential Indicators of Success

Heritage and Proposed Community Improvement Plans

Potential Indicator of Success	Potential Measure	Area to Use Indicator	Applicable Incentive
Retention of heritage structures plays an important within the context of employment for the entire City			
Long term stability and identity of our City			
City wide heritage retention is strong for a protracted period			
High levels of retention and rehabilitation of heritage resources			
Encourages the coordination of municipal expenditure and planning and development activity			
Vacancies are low and lands within the Heritage Conservation Districts and properties are well occupied			
Encourage the designation of significant heritage resources			
Create a sense of place and ensure that our history is retained			
Quality structures and facades			

Evaluation of CIPs & Financial Incentives

- Review Criteria
 - Proportion of CIP Funding?
 - Application Volume?
 - Sustainability based on funding source?
 - Link to Strategic Plans?
 - Are the CIP objectives being achieved?
 - Impact of reduced CIP funding?
- Indicators of Success (Comments on Indicators are being sought)
 - Will reflect the specific Community Improvement Plan
 - Industrial
 - Heritage
 - Airport
 - Brownfield
 - Downtown/SoHo/Old East Village CIPs are similar



Potential NEW CIPs & Financial Incentive Programs

Indicator of Success	Measure	Area to Use Indicator	Applicable Incentive
a new incentive program stemming from the Hamilton Road Community Improvement Plan process;			
a new incentive program stemming from the Lambeth Community Improvement Plan process;			
the expansion of the Downtown Community Improvement Area to align with the new boundaries of the Downtown London Business Improvement Area;			
a new incentive program granting a development charge rebate for new buildings, or additions, to accommodate publicly accessible sports and recreation services;			
a new incentive program granting a development charge rebate for new buildings, or additions, to accommodate private, or not-for-profit educational facilities, including music schools;			
a new incentive program for environmentally sustainable buildings or communities;			
a new incentive program providing development charge rebates for new buildings, or additions, to accommodate small businesses;			
funding the existing Brownfield Contamination Assessment Study Grants incentive; and,			
fund the existing Industrial Corridor Enhancement Program to help industrial property owners improve their properties where such properties are visible from important corridors such as the Veterans Memorial Parkway or Highway 401;			

Potential Indicators of Success

Downtown, Old East Village, SoHo and Proposed Community Improvement Plans

Potential Indicator of Success	Potential Measure	Area to Use Indicator	Applicable Incentive
The residential neighbourhood plays an important within the context of the entire City	Minimum of 5% of London's population resides within the Downtown's boundaries.	• Downtown	• Bldg Code Loans • Tax Increment Grant • DC Grants
The neighbourhood can support a supermarket	Minimum population sufficient to support a community scale supermarket	• Downtown • Old East Village	• Bldg Code Loans • Tax Increment Grant • DC Grants
Residential growth is strong for a protracted period	Minimum of 750 residential units are constructed within a consecutive 5-year period	• Downtown	• Bldg Code Loans • Tax Increment Grant • DC Grants
The neighbourhood caters to a wide array of socio-economic groups	Minimum of 15% of the area's population fits within each of the City's four household income quartiles	• Downtown • Old East Village • SoHo	• Bldg Code Loans • Tax Increment Grant • DC Grants
The neighbourhood provides a significant stock of affordable housing	Minimum 25% of all rental housing is affordable to the 40 th percentile of city-wide incomes	• Downtown • Old East Village • SoHo	• Bldg Code Loans • Tax Increment Grant • DC Grants
Vacancies are low and storefronts are well occupied	Maximum 5% vacancy rate on ground level commercial spaces	• Downtown • Old East Village • SoHo	• Façade Loans • Bldg Code Loans • Tax Increment Grant • DC Grants
Quality uses on key storefronts	Minimum 75% of ground floor uses on key commercial streets are targeted uses	• Downtown • Old East Village • SoHo	• Façade Loans • Bldg Code Loans
Active streets	Minimum hourly pedestrian counts on key commercial streets on a selected Friday during the month of September for the following periods (1) 8-9AM; (2) Noon-1PM; (3) 5-6PM and (4) 8-9PM.	• Downtown • Old East Village • SoHo	• Façade Loans • Bldg Code Loans • Tax Increment Grant • DC Grants
Quality facades and storefronts	Minimum 80% façade and storefront graded A or B Condition (City rating)	• Downtown • Old East Village • SoHo	• Façade Loans

Heritage Planners' Report to LACH: July 6, 2016

1. Heritage Alteration Permits processed under Delegated Authority By-law:
 - a. 36 Grosvenor Street (Part IV): porch restoration
 - b. 259 Sydenham Street (Bishop Hellmuth HCD): new garage
 - c. 408 Simcoe Street (Part IV): new front door
 - d. 468 Wellington Street (Metropolitan UC) (West Woodfield HCD): steps
2. Heritage Conservation Districts
 - a. St. George-Grosvenor HCD Study
3. Cultural Heritage Interpretive Signs
 - a. London's Cycling History – Riverforks Park, Wonderland Gardens, Springbank Pump House
 - b. Richmond Row – Richmond Street at Angel Street
4. Archaeological Master Plan Review
 - a. Wilfrid Jury Day/International Archaeology Day, Museum of Ontario Archaeology – Saturday October 15, 2016
5. *Ontario Heritage Act* designations (update):
 - a. 68 Bruce Street
 - b. 1656 Hyde Park Road

Upcoming Heritage Events

- Shaken or Stirred? 007 Gala – Elsie Perrin Williams Estate, Thursday July 7, 6:00pm. \$70/per person. <http://heritagelondonfoundation.ca/events/>
- Museum London Walking Tours – Saturdays, 10:30am and 1:00pm. \$5/per person, registration required
 - July 16: River Walk Tour
 - July 23: From Castle to Cottage
 - August 6: Monuments and Memorials
 - August 20: Forest City Modern
 - August 27: Unsettling the Thames
- Smokestack District Walking Tour – Wednesday July 17 at 2:00pm and Sunday July 20 at 4:00pm. Meet at McCormick's (1156 Dundas Street). <https://www.facebook.com/events/1761962147377718/>
- Project Jericho – St. Paul's Cathedral (472 Richmond Street) <http://www.stpaulscathedral.on.ca/project-jericho#heritage>