

**LACH Stewardship Sub-Committee
REPORT**

Wednesday November 28, 2018

Location: Planning Office, 206 Dundas Street

Time: 6:30pm – 8:30pm

Present: M. Whalley, J. Hunten, J. Cushing, M. Tovey, K. Waud, T. Regnier; K. Gowan, K. Gonyou (staff)

Agenda Items:

1. New Chairperson

The Stewardship Sub-Committee is looking for a new chairperson, as well as sub-committee member. Jim Cushing, Chairperson, is seeking to step down.

Rapid Transit – Cultural Heritage Evaluation Reports (CHERs)

2. General Comments on CHERs

- Some inconsistencies in the order of reports was noted.
- A photograph on the front cover of each of the CHERs would be appreciated.
- The information (e.g. date) included in the legends of the figures included in the CHERs prepared by WSP are too difficult to read.
- Further research and description of cultural heritage value and heritage attributes may be appropriate or needed to pursue designation under the *Ontario Heritage Act*.
- Some of the geo-references included on the historical maps are wrong, and must be corrected. For example, Figures 5-6 in the 16 Wellington Road CHER which do not map the correct location for the subject property; Figure 4 in the same report is sufficiently correct as the road alignment has changed.
- The use of blue in the tables included in the CHERs prepared by AECOM resulted in digital and print copies that were difficult to read.
- In the Wellington Road CHERs, please clarify the spelling of the historic landowners: Albert Scriver Odell, Enor Schriver. Is this difference correct?

3. CHER 1110 Richmond Street

- The Stewardship Sub-Committee reviewed the Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report prepared by WSP for the heritage listed property located at 1110 Richmond Street. The Stewardship Sub-Committee supports the conclusions of the evaluation (based on the criteria of Ontario Regulation 9/06) that the property demonstrates sufficient cultural heritage value or interest to warrant further cultural heritage assessment related to the Rapid Transit project, with the following comments:

- The property was noted on the ACO London Region’s Geranium Heritage House Tour, “Gateway to the North” (1996).
- The Historic Sites Committee of the London Public Library plaque affixed to the building is appropriately noted.
- The Stewardship Sub-Committee disagrees with the statement that the barbershop is not significant to the community; the Taylor Barbershop at 1110 Richmond Street is significant to the community. It is one of the longest continually operating businesses in Broughdale. The property has direct associations with an activity, the Taylor Barbershop, which is significant to the community.
- Regarding contextual value, while the building at 1110 Richmond Street may not visually stand out from its context, it does have longstanding association with the Taylor’s Barbershop and could be considered a community landmark with this respect.
- The concrete foundation, identified as a heritage attribute, should be noted as a concrete block foundation
- Is the barbershop pole a heritage attribute?

4. **CHER 44 Wharncliffe Road North**

The Stewardship Sub-Committee reviewed the Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report prepared by WSP for the heritage listed property located at 44 Wharncliffe Road North. The Stewardship Sub-Committee supports the conclusions of the evaluation (based on the criteria of Ontario Regulation 9/06) that the property does not demonstrate sufficient cultural heritage value or interest to warrant further cultural heritage assessment related to the Rapid Transit project, with the following comments:

- The information presented in the CHER suggests that the current building (construct c.1951, per the research presented in the CHER) replaced an earlier building, but this is not plainly stated in the CHER.

5. **CHER 16 Wellington Road**

The Stewardship Sub-Committee reviewed the Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report prepared by AECOM for the heritage listed property located at 16 Wellington Road. The Stewardship Sub-Committee supports the conclusions of the evaluation (based on the criteria of Ontario Regulation 9/06) that the property demonstrates sufficient cultural heritage value or interest to warrant further cultural heritage assessment related to the Rapid Transit project, with the following comments:

- The comparative analysis reinforces the rarity and representative nature of the cultural heritage resource at 16 Wellington Road as an example of the Art Moderne style.
- The Stewardship Sub-Committee disagrees with the evaluation of the contextual value for the property at 16 Wellington Road; the property is a landmark because of its site and relation to Wellington Road, its Art Moderne style which is tailored to its corner location, as well as its one-storey form which makes it stand out.

- The addition to the original building is well-designed; because it is setback, it preserves the character of the original building.
- The posts located at the rounded entrance should be noted as a heritage attribute.
- The use of large expanses of glass block should be clarified in the description of that heritage attribute. Within the Statement of Cultural Heritage Value, the use of expansive glass block windows can be explained as essential to the original function of the building as a printing press. Other examples of expansive windows related to the original function of a building include the former McCormick Factory (1156 Dundas Street, designated under *Part IV* of the *Ontario Heritage Act*).
- The term “awning” should be clarified in the description of the frontispiece – it is more clearly described as a “curved projection,” which is an integral part of the Art Moderne style of the building. The term “awning” could be confused with the canvas awnings located on the building.

6. **CHER 122 Wellington Road**

The Stewardship Sub-Committee reviewed the Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report prepared by AECOM for the heritage listed property located at 122 Wellington Road. The Stewardship Sub-Committee supports the conclusions of the evaluation (based on the criteria of Ontario Regulation 9/06) that the property does not demonstrate sufficient cultural heritage value or interest to warrant further cultural heritage assessment related to the Rapid Transit project, with the following comments:

- The name of the restaurant is Tak Sun.
- The pagoda is a decorative addition to the building, to make it look as though it is a Chinese building.
- Reference to the 744 Richmond Street and 746 Richmond Street (comparative analysis): the building at 746 Richmond Street was completed in 1950; 744 Richmond Street was built as a single storey building in 1949 and had its second storey constructed in 1955. The angelstone is original to the construction of the buildings.
- The effort put into the comparative analysis was commendable.

7. **CHER 126 Wellington Road**

The Stewardship Sub-Committee reviewed the Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report prepared by AECOM for the heritage listed property located at 126 Wellington Road. The Stewardship Sub-Committee supports the conclusions of the evaluation (based on the criteria of Ontario Regulation 9/06) that the property does not demonstrate sufficient cultural heritage value or interest to warrant further cultural heritage assessment related to the Rapid Transit project, with the following comments:

- The building located at 126 Wellington Road, since its new cladding applied in 2015, has become very striking and distinctive.
- Reference to the 744 Richmond Street and 746 Richmond Street (comparative analysis): the building at 746 Richmond Street was completed in 1950; 744

Richmond Street was built as a single storey building in 1949 and had its second storey constructed in 1955. The angelstone is original to the construction of the buildings.

8. CHER 220 Wellington Road

The Stewardship Sub-Committee reviewed the Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report prepared by AECOM for the heritage listed property located at 220 Wellington Road. The Stewardship Sub-Committee supports the conclusions of the evaluation (based on the criteria of Ontario Regulation 9/06) that the property does not demonstrate sufficient cultural heritage value or interest to warrant further cultural heritage assessment related to the Rapid Transit project, with the following comments:

- A vacuum cleaner dealer was formerly located at 220 Wellington Road.

9. CHER 243 Wellington Road/49-55 Foxbar Road

The Stewardship Sub-Committee reviewed the Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report prepared by AECOM for the heritage listed property located at 243 Wellington Road/49-55 Foxbar Road. The Stewardship Sub-Committee supports the conclusions of the evaluation (based on the criteria of Ontario Regulation 9/06) that the property demonstrates sufficient cultural heritage value or interest to warrant further cultural heritage assessment related to the Rapid Transit project, with the following comments:

- The evaluation of the property was unclear with respect to the Rectory; the Rectory needs to be included in the evaluation as well as the Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest and heritage attributes identified.
- Double check the headings in Sections 3.2.2 and 3.2.3.
- Is the sculpture from St. Andrew Undershaft still located at St. Andrew Memorial Anglican Church?
- The campus landscape of the property is unusual, and worthy of conservation. The 1941 church building, 1957 church building, and 1957 rectory have contextual value together. The collection represents an evolution.
- Further research and evaluation may be necessary for this property in particular, including the windows and interior, as recommended by this CHER.
- The St. Andrew the Apostle Roman Catholic Church (built c.1964), located at 1 Fallons Lane, could be a potential comparison to the property as it also has a Mid-Century Modern place of worship with a Rectory.

10. CHER 253-255 Wellington Road

The Stewardship Sub-Committee reviewed the Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report prepared by AECOM for the heritage listed property located at 253-255 Wellington Road. The Stewardship Sub-Committee supports the conclusions of the evaluation (based on the criteria of Ontario Regulation 9/06) that the property does not demonstrate sufficient cultural heritage value or interest to warrant further cultural heritage assessment related to the Rapid Transit project, with the following comments:

- The house with the commercial addition are distinct, and reflects a period of business-operations.
- None of the comparisons are specific to the subject property, particularly the asymmetrical gable of the residential buildings. Potential comparisons: 1 Franklin Avenue, 15 Ingleside Place, and others.

11. Richmond 5 Group CHER

It was noted that the Stewardship Sub-Committee was anticipating the receipt of the Richmond 5 Group CHER (736 Richmond Street, 740 Richmond Street, 742 Richmond Street, 744 Richmond Street, and 746 Richmond Street) at its meeting on November 28, 2018. However, further time to complete comprehensive research and evaluation was required, and the Richmond 5 Group CHER was delayed until the January meeting of the Stewardship Sub-Committee. The Stewardship Sub-Committee expressed concerns with the number of CHERs scheduled for its review and comment at its January meeting.