

D. Menard

TO:	CHAIR AND MEMBERS PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING <del>MONDAY, MAY 28, 2012; NOT BEFORE 5:00 P. M.</del> RESUBMITTED - JUNE 11, 2012
FROM:	JOHN M. FLEMING DIRECTOR, LAND USE PLANNING AND CITY PLANNER
SUBJECT:	REQUEST FOR HERITAGE DESIGNATION 1576 RICHMOND STREET

RECOMMENDATION
----------------

That, on the recommendation of the Director, Land Use Planning and City Planner with the advice of the Heritage Planner, that Notice of Intent to designate the property at 1576 Richmond Street under Section 29 of *the Ontario Heritage Act* as a property of cultural heritage value or interest **BE GIVEN** for the attached reasons under the provisions of subsection 29(3) of the *Ontario Heritage Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. O.18; it being noted that the owner has not concurred in the above recommendation; it being further noted that the Chief Building Officer **BE ADVISED** of Council's intention in this regard.

PREVIOUS REPORTS PERTINENT TO THIS MATTER
---

April 10, 2012 – Report to Special Planning Committee Meeting – Request for Designation for 1576 Richmond Street

BACKGROUND
------------

The property at 1576 Richmond Street is located on the east side of Richmond Street north of the intersection of Western Road and Richmond Street.(Appendix 1). It is a two storey stone clad structure built c. 1926 in the Tudor Revival style.

It had been identified on previous Inventories of Heritage Resources including those published in 1991 and 1997 as a Priority 1 structure. Priority 1 structures are deemed to be London's most important structures and merit designation under Part IV (Section 29) of the *Ontario Heritage Act*. However, this listing had disappeared in the 2006 version of the Inventory which Council attached to the Municipal (Heritage) Register in 2007 pursuant to Section 26 of *the Ontario Heritage Act*. The attachment of the Inventory to the Register allows for a minimum 60 day period for Council to determine whether a request for a demolition of a listed property can be granted or alternatively be denied by issuing a notice of its intent to designate the property under the *Act*.

Why the property was removed in the 2006 version of the *Act* remains unclear. This omission became more critical, when, recently, an enquiry was made to the Heritage Planner as to the status of the property. In checking the written copy of the current Inventory, the caller was informed by the planner that the property was not on the list. It was only later that questions arising from the possible redevelopment of the site made clear the previous listing as a Priority 1 property. It should also be noted that the heritage City Map continued to show the Priority 1

listing notwithstanding its omission in the current Inventory.

When the error was recognized, the Heritage Planner consulted with the LACH at its meeting on March 14, 2012. The LACH recommended that Council be requested to reinstate the priority 1 listing at its scheduled April 10, 2012 meeting. When this recommendation came forward to the Planning and Environment Committee at its meeting on March 26, a request was made to Committee to recommend that Council not to do so as a buyer of the property had offered to purchase the property on the basis of the information obtained earlier from the heritage planner. On the 26<sup>th</sup>, Planning and Environment Committee recommended that Council, at its meeting on April 10, place the building on the Inventory as a Priority 1 structure.

On March 27, a request was submitted to the Heritage Planner's office requesting sign-off to go forward with the request for clearances for demolition for the property. Given the previous history with respect to being a listed property, and given the direction from PEC recommending that Council reinstitute the listing, staff determined that, should the building appear to merit designation in the opinion of the heritage planner under the criteria established by the Province in Regulation 9/06, it would be prudent to provide a forum for debate with respect to the potential loss of this heritage resource to request Council to issue a notice of its intent to designate the property to forestall any demolition order.

At its meeting on April 10, Council approved the recommendation to place the building on the Inventory as a Priority 1 structure. At the same meeting Council deferred the matter of designation that had come forward from a special meeting of the Planning and Environment Committee that day. (The Planning and Environment Committee had recommended against the designation of the property.) This deferral by Council has allowed the request for demolition to be considered as part of the normal process for a listed property.

As part of this process, at its meeting on May 09, the LACH discussed the proposed statement of significance created by staff and heard representations from one of the property owners and their planning consultant. The LACH has recommended that Council be advised that a notice of designation be provided by Council on the basis of the attached Statement of Significance.(Appendix 2)

#### Alternative to Demolition

Information had previously been received from an inquiry with respect to a proposed three storey residential building to be constructed on the site assuming the removal of the existing building. At this time, there has been little discussion as to whether an intensification of the site can occur with the retention of the heritage property. The City does have a Community Improvement Plan with respect to developments which may threaten the loss of a heritage resource. Whether this plan can come into play in this situation remains to be discussed.

#### Ontario Heritage Act and Designation under Section 29

Regarding the process of designation, the following provides a brief outline of the initial steps required. The Council of a municipality may, by by-law, designate a property within the municipality to be of cultural heritage value or interest if (a) where criteria for determining whether the property is of cultural heritage value or interest have been prescribed by regulation, the property meets the prescribed criteria; and, (b) the designation is made in accordance with the processes set out in the *Act*. If the Council intends to designate a property within the municipality to be of cultural heritage value or interest, it shall cause notice of intention to designate the property to be given by the clerk of the municipality in accordance with sub-section (3) of the *Act*. As part of the process, any person who objects to a proposed designation has the opportunity within 30 days of the notice of intention being served, must serve on the clerk of the municipality a notice of objection setting out the reason for the objection and all the relevant facts. Where such notice of objection has been received, the council shall refer the matter to the Conservation Review Board for a hearing and a report.

Regulation 9/06 and the Property at 1576 Richmond Street

Regulation 9/06 of the *Ontario Heritage Act* applies to both listed properties and to newly identified properties that may be candidates for heritage conservation and protection under Section 29 of the Act. The evaluation criteria set out in Regulation 9/06 essentially form a test against which properties must be assessed. The regulation requires that, to be designated, a property must meet "one or more" of the criteria grouped into categories of Design/Physical Value, Historical/Associative Value, and Contextual Value. Council must be satisfied that the property meets at least one of the criteria set out in Regulation 9/06 before it can be designated under Section 29.

1. *A property has design or physical value because it, i) is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, expression, material or construction method. ii) displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit, or iii) demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement.*

As can be seen in Appendix 2, the Tudor Revival style structure is an excellent example of this style, perhaps one of the finest of this style in the Inventory which lists 14 Priority 1 properties within this category. (Appendix 4) As well, it displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit.

2. *The property has historical value or associative value because it, i) has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization or institution that is significant to a community. ii) yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of a community or culture or iii) demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer or theorist who is significant to a community.*

At this time a complete understanding of those associated with this property is not available. However, on the basis of information in the City Directories and in the history of the University of Western Ontario, it is known that the house was occupied for much of its lifespan by the Gillespie Family. It may have been modelled after a family home in the U.K. as it is known as Wivelsfield Manor, perhaps similar to a family home in the U.K. Kate Gillespie presumably lived there for many years as she was an assistant librarian at UWO from 1922 - 1961. One of the four houses at Delaware Hall is named after her. Mary Gillespie was associated with the University from as early as 1935.




3. *The property has contextual value because it i) is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an area, ii) it is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings, or iii) is a landmark.*

Given the contextual changes around the area resulting from greater intensification, the contextual argument for designation is not as strong as the argument related to its design values.

Recommendations

It is recommended that the Planning and Environment Committee advise municipal Council to instruct the City Clerk to issue a notification of its intent to designate the property at 1576 Richmond Street as a property of cultural heritage value or interest under Section 29 of the Ontario Heritage Act for the reasons identified in the draft statement of significance in Appendix 2 and to notify the Chief Building Officer of this intent to designate the property.



PREPARED BY:	SUBMITTED BY:
	
D. MENARD HERITAGE PLANNER CITY PLANNING AND RESEARCH	G. BARRETT, AICP MANAGER – CITY PLANNING AND RESEARCH
RECOMMENDED BY:	
	
J. M. FLEMING, MCIP, RPP DIRECTOR OF LAND USE PLANNING AND CITY PLANNER	


May 10 , 2012

DM/

Attach: Appendix 1- Location Map, Appendix 2- Draft Statement of Significance

Y:\Shared\policy\HERITAGE\PEC reports\1576 Richmond Street May 28 2012.docx

#### Appendix 1: Location Map – 1576 Richmond Street



**Appendix 2: Draft Statement of Significance -1576 Richmond Street proposed for designation under Section 29 of the Ontario Heritage Act.**

**Description of the Property**

The structure is a two storey building, clad with stone and stucco,, located on an irregular shaped lot at the municipal address 1576 Richmond Street, east side, Part Lot 28, Plan 533.

**Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest**

The cultural heritage value of this structure is primarily related to its design and physical values as an excellent example of a Tudor Revival style of building, somewhat uncommon in London in terms of its size and setting. Architecturally, this structure exhibits many of the key features typical of this style, in particular, what has been called the “story book house” and may have been modeled after a similar building in the United Kingdom. The property has been named Wivelsfield Manor. This style of building became popular in suburban settings from the 1920s to the 1940s. The building also has historical importance for its associations with the Gillespie family in particular and its relationship to the University of Western Ontario through both Kate and Mary Gillespie members of the Faculty.





**Description of Heritage Attributes**

Key exterior attributes that embody the heritage value of the residence as an example of the Tudor Revival Style include its:

- Its composition with its various elements - front projecting gable, north wing and conservatory - reinforcing the sense of a picturesquely segmental building suggesting random additions at various times.
- Steeply pitched slate roofs
- Prominent gable ends on the front, side and rear facades
- Half timbering on the west and south façades set in stucco
- Stone cladding on the front façade both on the projecting front gable and on corner pilasters
- Brick cladding on the north wing and the conservatory walls
- Stone clad chimneys of different heights on the north and south facades
- The recessed front entrance set within a beveled and moulded stone arch.
- A single wood front door featuring a diamond paned window and two side panels with similar panes set in segmental frames following the curve of the stone arch.
- Three -light bay dormers on the front and rear facades
- Small paned windows in the dormers on the front façade, larger windows both singly and in groups featuring similar small panes on the front and side facades
- Windows feature stone lintels and metal muntins
- Copper downspouts with decorative floral elements in metal
- The siting of the building creating a park-like vista as viewed from the street



Appendix 3 –Photos – 1576 Richmond Street





**Appendix 4: Other Priority 1 Tudor Revival Style Properties Listed/Designated**



369 St. George



381 St. George



290 Huron



1011 Wellington



1071 Waterloo (IV)



993 Waterloo



568 Wellington (V)




550 Dufferin (V)



553 Dufferin (V)



119 Commissioners Rd. E.



236 Langley Street

**IV- Designated Individually    V- Designated as part of a District**