

COMMENT AND RESPONSE TABLE

At the LACH meeting on October 10, the project team provided the expanded Cultural Heritage Screening Report (CHSR) and the draft terms of reference for the individual and group CHER. The draft table of contents and an example of a grouped CHER was provided to the Stewardship Sub-committee.

The following table summarizes the comments received from the LACH Stewardship Sub-Committee report dated October 24, 2018 and the project team's responses.

#	COMMENT	RESPONSE
1	The historical section of the CHER should be focused on the history of the property and how it fits into the London context, rather than a regurgitation of the history of London.	The historical context and settlement history section of the CHER will be focused on the immediate context where each property is located (e.g. the neighborhood and street). A detailed land use history will be included for each property. In the draft CHERs, we have referenced the CHSR for a more detailed history of London.
2	It may not be essential to take land registry research back to the Crown in all instances.	We have been able to complete land registry research back to the Crown for 44 Wharncliffe Road North, 1110 Richmond Street and the Richmond Street Group CHER. We understand that this may not always be possible or desirable, and will document as far back as we can.
3	A combined Terms of Reference for both group and individual CHERs should be considered as the essential/required content is identical.	The purpose of having a Terms of Reference for both individual and group CHERs is to clarify where background information, descriptions of context and historical research can be shared for properties in the Group CHER, and where property-specific details are required.
4	Only a brief summary of provincial and municipal context and policies should be included in the CHERs.	We agree. Only a summary will be included, specifically the Ontario Heritage Act, Planning Act, Provincial Policy Statement 2014, and Environmental Assessment Act.
5	Consideration should be given to combining all relevant information on an individual property (description, evaluation, conclusion, and recommendation) to be better suited for a reader's perspective for the group CHERs.	We have reorganized the group CHER Table of Contents so that all the property-specific information, including the land use history, architectural description, description of integrity, O. Reg. 9/06 evaluation and Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest (if applicable) is in one section. We will also include a picture of the relevant property at the beginning of each section.
6	It should be noted that the grouping or sum of properties together may be of cultural heritage value or interest, rather than just the individual properties on their own (e.g. collective value of the streetscape).	We do consider the contextual value of each property within its streetscape, and this will be considered in each CHER.
7	There are concerns with the potential volume of including all of the necessary information on thirty-five (35) properties in one CHER. Consideration should be given to break this down further, perhaps on a block-basis, for a more manageable CHER.	It is expected that the 35 Wellington Group CHER properties will be organized into sub-groupings based on our research and common elements. Block-by-block Group CHERs may make sense and will be considered and evaluated as an approach.