

Report to Planning and Environment Committee

To: Chair and Members
Community Advisory Committee on Planning

From: Scott Mathers, MPA, P. Eng.,
Deputy City Manager, Planning and Economic Development

Subject: Request to Remove Properties from the Register of Cultural Heritage Resources by 2698746 Ontario Inc. for the Property at 185 Wellington Street, and by 2700875 Ontario Inc. for the property at 189 Wellington Street

Date: October 3, 2022

Recommendation

That, on the recommendation of the Director, Planning and Development, with the advice of the Heritage Planner, that:

- a) The Chief Building Official **BE ADVISED** that Municipal Council consents to the demolition of the built resource on the property at 185 Wellington Street;
- b) The Chief Building Official **BE ADVISED** that Municipal Council consents to the demolition of the built resource on the property at 189 Wellington Street;
- c) The property at 185 Wellington Street **BE REMOVED** from the *Register of Cultural Heritage Resources*, and;
- d) The property at 189 Wellington Street **BE REMOVED** from the *Register of Cultural Heritage Resources*.

Executive Summary

A written request to remove the properties at 185 Wellington Street and 189 Wellington Street from the *Register of Cultural Heritage Resources* was received by the City. Pursuant to the requirements of the *Ontario Heritage Act*, when considering a request to remove a property from the *Register of Cultural Heritage Resources*, Municipal Council must decide as to whether the property should continue to be included on the *Register* or whether it should be removed and provide notice of decision to the owner(s) of the property within 90 days after the decision. A Cultural Heritage Impact Statement report was submitted with this request and determined that the properties do not meet the criteria of *Ontario Regulation 9/06* and do not merit designation pursuant to the *Ontario Heritage Act*. Staff agree with the findings and conclusions of the Cultural Heritage Impact Statement report.

Analysis

1.0 Background Information

1.1 Property Location

The properties located at 185 Wellington Street and 189 Wellington Street are situated on the west side of Wellington Street, between Simcoe Street and Grey Street (Appendix A).

185 Wellington Street and 189 Wellington Street are located within the SoHo neighbourhood, which has been identified as an area for future study as a potential heritage conservation district (*Heritage Places 2.0*, 2019). Both properties are part of a historic commercial streetscape, including purpose-built commercial buildings, institutional buildings, and residential-form buildings including some that have been adapted to commercial uses. Nearby heritage landmarks include the former Wellington Street Methodist Church (156 Wellington Street, heritage listed property), former Christ Anglican Church (138 Wellington Street, heritage designated property), and the Red

Antiquities Building (129-131 Wellington Street). There are numerous adjacent and nearby heritage listed properties.

1.2 Cultural Heritage Status

The properties at 185 Wellington Street and 189 Wellington Street are heritage listed properties. The properties were added to the *Register of Cultural Heritage Resources* by resolution of Municipal Council on March 27, 2018.

1.3 Description

1.3.1 185 Wellington Street¹

The built resource on the property at 185 Wellington Street is circa 1859, and consists of a 1-storey, vernacular frame building, clad with contemporary siding. The front section is on a brick foundation that has been parged. The primary footprint of the building consists of a front square portion (measuring approximately 10m x 10m) and a wing extending 4m to the rear. Most of the front and rear yard is paved. In its massing, roof shape and the centre gable, the building exhibits elements of an Ontario Cottage style, but with few other representative details.

Much of the building has been altered or replaced including the exterior cladding, doors, and windows. The Cultural Heritage Impact Statement report notes the following alterations to the exterior:

- *replacement of all window sash with modern slider or double hung sash;*
- *the enlargement of window openings on the principal elevation;*
- *replacement and relocation of the front door;*
- *removal of any other window and door openings of the [b]uilding;*
- *addition of modern siding; it is not known whether any original siding remains under the modern siding;*
- *cladding of fascia and soffits with modern synthetic material;*
- *addition to the [rear] wing;*
- *addition of front and rear wooden decks and staircases; and*
- *removal of all chimneys. (Morgan, p27)*

1.3.2 189 Wellington Street²

The built resource on the property at 189 Wellington Street is circa 1856, and consists of a 1-storey, vernacular frame building, clad with yellow brick on the front façade and asbestos shingle siding on the other elevations. The building sits on a concrete block foundation. The footprint of the building is rectangular, measuring approximately 10m x 14.8m which includes a wing extending to the rear. The front section is capped by a low pitched, asphalt gabled roof (side facing). A brick façade was added to the primary façade which obscures what is thought to be a centre gable (like what is at 185 Wellington Street). The rear wing is capped by a low-pitched hip roof.

Alterations to the exterior are extensive and the Cultural Heritage Impact Statement report notes the following alterations:

- *addition of a full front elevation and extension in a different architectural style and building material from the rest of the [b]uilding;*
- *change in siding to the rest of the [b]uilding; it is unlikely the original siding remains under the shingle siding;*
- *replacing all of the original foundation with concrete blocks;*
- *change in size and sash of all window openings except one;*
- *replacement of all doors;*
- *alterations to the rear [...] wing; and*
- *replacement of all original chimneys with one 1950s chimney. (Morgan, p31)*

¹ This section is excerpted from Morgan, 2021 (p25-29).

² This section is excerpted from Morgan, 2021 (p29-31).

1.4 History

The Euro-Canadian history of the properties at 185 Wellington Street and 189 Wellington Street originates with the original survey of the town plot of London, completed by Colonel Mahlon Burwell in 1826 under the direction of Surveyor-General Thomas Ridout. The original town site was bounded by North Street (later Queens Avenue), Wellington Street, and the Thames River. The subject site is identified relative to this town survey as Lot, Part 1, Plan 30 – NW Grey Street (185 Wellington Street) and Lot Part 1, Plan 30 – SW Simcoe Street (189 Wellington Street).

1.4.1 185 Wellington Street³

The Crown retained ownership of Lot, Part 1, Plan 30 – NW Grey Street (185 Wellington Street) until 1850 when all of Lot 1 on the north side of west Grey Street was sold to John Wood. Wood acquired the property as an investment and sold the north half of the lot to William Winslow within four months of acquiring the patent. The property, specifically at the address now 185 Wellington Street, remained vacant until circa 1859 when Winslow mortgaged the property to build a rental dwelling. The property was sold to Laura Newell in 1863 (a previous tenant) and then to John Price in 1877 who also owned and resided at the adjacent property at 189 Wellington Street. John Price and his descendants continued to own the property until 1957. The building was a rental property that was used as a residence for a variety of people and, in the mid-twentieth century, it was a beauty salon for roughly 30 years. The property has been held by the current owner since 2019 and is not currently occupied.

1.4.2 189 Wellington Street⁴

The Crown retained ownership of Lot Part 1, Plan 30 – SW Simcoe Street until 1848 when a half-area lot containing 189 Wellington Street was sold to Henry McCabe. The lot was subsequently sold and subdivided. The property specifically at the address now 189 Wellington Street remained vacant until 1854 when Robert Leathorn then owner, built the dwelling on the property circa 1855. This building was built as a rental property for Robert Leathorn. John Price, who later bought the property may have rented it prior to purchasing it in 1863. John Price and his descendants continued to own the property until 1949 and it appears that the building was still being used for residential purposes at that time, and up until the early 1960s when a barber shop was established in the front of the house. The property has been held by the current owner since 2019 and is not currently occupied.

2.0 Discussion and Considerations

2.1 Legislative and Policy Framework

Cultural heritage resources are to be conserved and impacts assessed as per the fundamental policies of the *Provincial Policy Statement* (2020), the *Ontario Heritage Act*, and *The London Plan*.

2.1.1 Provincial Policy Statement

Heritage Conservation is a matter of provincial interest (Section 2.d, *Planning Act*). The *Provincial Policy Statement* (2020) promotes the wise use and management of cultural heritage resources and directs that “significant built heritage resources and significant cultural heritage landscapes shall be conserved” (Policy 2.6.1, *Provincial Policy Statement* 2020).

“Significant” is defined in the *Provincial Policy Statement* (2020) as, “resources that have been determined to have cultural heritage value or interest.” Further, “processes and criteria for determining cultural heritage value or interest are established by the province under the authority of the *Ontario Heritage Act*.”

³ This section is excerpted from Morgan, 2021 (p18, pp23-24; pp35-36; Appendix I).

⁴ This section is excerpted from Morgan, 2021 (pp18-23, pp38-39, Appendix I).

Additionally, “conserved” means, “the identification, protection, management and use of built heritage resources, cultural heritage landscapes and archaeological resources in a manner that ensures their cultural heritage value or interest is retained.”

2.1.2 Ontario Heritage Act

Section 27, *Ontario Heritage Act* requires that a register kept by the clerk shall list all properties that have been designated under the *Ontario Heritage Act*. Section 27(1.2), *Ontario Heritage Act* also enables Municipal Council to add properties that have not been designated, but that Municipal Council “believes to be of cultural heritage value or interest” on the *Register*.

The only cultural heritage protection afforded to heritage listed properties is a 60-day delay in the issuance of a demolition permit. During this time, Council Policy directs that the Community Advisory Committee on Planning (CACP) is consulted, and a public participation meeting is held at the Planning & Environment Committee.

Section 27(8), *Ontario Heritage Act*, requires that when an objection to a property’s inclusion on the Register is received, Municipal Council must decide as to whether the property should continue to be included on the *Register* or whether it should be removed, and provide notice of Municipal Council’s decision to the owner of the property within 90-day after decision.

Section 29, *Ontario Heritage Act* enables municipalities to designate properties to be of cultural heritage value or interest. Section 29, *Ontario Heritage Act* also establishes consultation, notification, and process requirements, as well as a process to appeal the designation of a property. Objections to a Notice of Intention to Designate are referred back to Municipal Council. Appeals to the passing of a by-law to designate a property pursuant to the *Ontario Heritage Act* are referred to the Ontario Land Tribunal (OLT).

2.1.2.1 Criteria for Determining Cultural Heritage Value or Interest

Ontario Heritage Act Regulation 9/06 establishes criteria for determining the cultural heritage value or interest of individual properties. These criteria are:

1. Physical or design value:
 - 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.
2. Historical or associative value:
 - 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.
3. Contextual value:
 - i. Is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an area;
 - ii. Is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings; or,
 - iii. Is a landmark.

A property is required to meet one or more of the abovementioned criteria to merit protection under Section 29 of the *Ontario Heritage Act*. Should the property not meet the criteria for designation, the demolition request should be granted. These same criteria are in Policy 573_ of *The London Plan*.

2.1.3 The London Plan

The Cultural Heritage chapter of *The London Plan* recognizes that our cultural heritage resources define our city’s unique identity and contribute to its continuing prosperity. It notes, “The quality and diversity of these resources are important in distinguishing London from other cities and make London a place that is more attractive for people to visit, live or invest in.” Policies 572_ and 573_ of *The London Plan* enable the designation of individual properties under Part IV of the *Ontario Heritage Act*, as well as the criteria by which individual properties will be evaluated.

Policies 575_ and 576_ of *The London Plan* also enable City Council to designate areas of the City under Part V of the *Ontario Heritage Act* as Heritage Conservation Districts. These policies include a set of criteria in the evaluation of an area. *Heritage Places 2.0* is a guideline document as a part of the Cultural Heritage Guidelines. The document describes potential heritage conservation districts and assigns a priority to these districts for consideration as heritage conservation districts.

2.1.4 Register of Cultural Heritage Resources

Municipal Council may include properties on the *Register of Cultural Heritage Resources* that it “believes to be of cultural heritage value or interest.” These properties are not designated but are considered to have potential cultural heritage value or interest.

The *Register of Cultural Heritage Resources* states that further research is required to determine the cultural heritage value or interest of heritage listed properties. If a property is evaluated and found to not meet the criteria for designation, it should be removed from the *Register of Cultural Heritage Resources*.

The properties at 185 Wellington Street and 189 Wellington Street are included on the *Register of Cultural Heritage Resources* as a heritage listed properties.

3.0 Financial Impact/Considerations

None

4.0 Key Issues and Considerations

4.1. Request to Remove Properties from the Register of Cultural Heritage Resources

A complete written request to remove the properties at 185 Wellington Street and 189 Wellington Street from the Register of Cultural Heritage resources was received by the City on August 29, 2022.

Pursuant to Section 27(8) of the *Ontario Heritage Act*, when considering a request to remove a property from the *Register of Cultural Heritage Resources*, Municipal Council must decide as to whether the property should continue to be included on the *Register* or whether it should be removed and provide notice of decision to the owner of the property within 90-days after the decision.

4.2 Cultural Heritage Impact Statement (CHIS)

A Cultural Heritage Impact Statement report by Wayne Morgan – heritage planner (dated January 2021) was submitted as a part of the request to remove the properties from the *Register of Cultural Heritage Resources*. As required, the Cultural Heritage Impact Statement report included an evaluation of the properties according to the criteria of *Ontario Regulation 9/0, Criteria for Determining Cultural Heritage Value or Interest*. Through the evaluation, Morgan (2021) determined that both properties –185 Wellington Street and 189 Wellington Street – do not meet the criteria of *Ontario Regulation 9/06* and therefore do not merit designation pursuant to the *Ontario Heritage Act*. Staff agree with the conclusions of the Cultural Heritage Impact Statement report.

4.3 Consultation

Pursuant to the Council Policy Manual, notification of the request to remove the subject properties from the *Register of Cultural Heritage Resources* will be sent to property owners within 120m of the subject property, as well as community groups including the Architectural Conservancy Ontario – London Region Branch, the London & Middlesex Historical Society, and the Urban League of London. Notice will be published in *The Londoner* on September 15, 2022. This item will be heard at the October 3, 2022, PPM of the Planning and Environment Committee (PEC).

At its meeting on August 31, 2022, the Stewardship Sub-Committee of the Community and Advisory Committee on Planning (CACP), received and reviewed the Cultural Heritage Impact Statement report (Morgan, 2021) for the properties at 185 Wellington

Street and 189 Wellington Street, and did not object to removing both properties from the *Register of Cultural Heritage Resources*.⁵

Heritage planning staff accessed the subject properties on August 30, 2022, for the purposes of photo-documenting the building exteriors and surrounding context.

Conclusion

A written request to remove the properties at 185 Wellington Street and 189 Wellington Street was received by the City. A Cultural Heritage Impact Statement report was submitted with the written request and included an evaluation of the properties according to the criteria of *Ontario Regulation 9/06, Criteria for Determining Cultural Heritage Value or Interest*. The evaluation determined that the properties did not meet the criteria, and therefore do not warrant designation pursuant to the *Ontario Heritage Act*. Staff agree with the findings and conclusions of the Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report. The properties should be removed from the *Register of Cultural Heritage Resources*.

Prepared by: Laura E. Dent, M.Arch, PhD, MCIP, RPP
Heritage Planner

Reviewed by: Jana Kelemen, M.Sc.Arch., MUDS, RPP, MCIP
Manager, Urban Design and Heritage

Recommended by: Gregg Barrett, AICP
Director, Planning and Development

Submitted by: Scott Mathers, MPA, P. Eng.
Deputy City Manager, Planning and Economic
Development

Appendices

| | |
|------------|------------------------------------|
| Appendix A | Location of Properties |
| Appendix B | Images |
| Appendix C | Cultural Heritage Impact Statement |

Sources

City of London and Letourneau Heritage Consulting Inc. (2019). *Heritage places 2.0: Potential heritage conservation districts in the City of London*. London, ON: Corporation of the City of London.

Corporation of the City of London. (n.d.) 2019-2023 Strategic plan for the City of London. London, ON: Author.

Corporation of the City of London. (2020, Dec 8). *City of London register of cultural heritage resources*. London, ON: Author.

Corporation of the City of London. (2016, consolidated 2021, May 28). *The London plan*. London, ON: Author.

Corporation of the City of London. n.d. Property files: 185 Wellington Street.

Corporation of the City of London. n.d. Property files: 189 Wellington Street.

Cspace Architecture. (2020, April 9). *Proposal summary report: 185-189 Wellington Street, London – Pre-application consultation*. Bolton, ON: Author. [including attached drawings A.101, A.102 and survey].

Ministry of Culture. (2006). *Ontario heritage toolkit: Heritage property evaluation*. Ontario: Queen's Printer for Ontario.

⁵ The Stewardship Sub-Committee noted the thoroughness of the Cultural Heritage Impact Statement report, including land registry research, review of historical mapping, interior and exterior photographs, as well as floorplans.

Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing. (2020). *Provincial policy statement, 2020*. Ontario: Queen's Printer for Ontario.

Morgan, Wayne. (2021, January). Cultural heritage impact statement – 185 & 189 Wellington Street, City of London, Ontario. Sutton West, ON: Author.

Ontario Heritage Act, (last amendment 2021, c. 4, Sched. 6, s.74). Retrieved from e-Laws website <https://www.ontario.ca/laws/statute/90o18>

Ontario Ministry of Culture. (2006). *Heritage resources in the land use planning process information sheet series*. "InfoSheet #5, Heritage impact assessments and conservation plans." Ontario: Queen's Printer for Ontario.

Appendix A – Location of Properties



Figure 1: Location of the subject properties at 185 Wellington Street and 189 Wellington Street

Appendix B – Images



Image 1. 185 Wellington Street, façade-facing southwest – W. Morgan (CHIS, Jan 2021)



Image 2. 185 Wellington Street, rear-facing northeast – W. Morgan (CHIS, Jan 2021)



Image 3. 189 Wellington Street, facade-facing northeast – W. Morgan (CHIS, Jan 2021)



Image 4. 189 Wellington Street, rear-facing northeast – W. Morgan (CHIS, Jan 2021)



Image 5. 189 Wellington Street, façade detail-facing northeast – W. Morgan (CHIS, Jan 2021)


Appendix C – Cultural Heritage Impact Statement

Cultural Heritage Impact Statement (Wayne Morgan, dated January 2021) – *attached separately*

CULTURAL HERITAGE IMPACT STATEMENT



185 - East and North Elevations



189 - South and East Elevations



**185 & 189 WELLINGTON STREET
CITY OF LONDON, ONTARIO**

January 2021

Prepared for:

2698748 Ontario Inc.

Prepared by:

**WAYNE MORGAN
HERITAGE PLANNER**

CULTURAL HERITAGE IMPACT STATEMENT

**185 & 189 WELLINGTON STREET
CITY OF LONDON, ONTARIO**

January 2021

Prepared for:

2698748 Ontario Inc.

**Prepared by:
Wayne Morgan
Heritage Planner
21 Land's End
Sutton West, Ontario, L0E 1R0
Tel: 905-722-5398
e-mail: wayne.morgan@sympatico.ca**

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The owners of a site, 185 and 189 Wellington Street, on the west side of the Street between Simcoe and Grey Streets, propose to redevelop the site for a three storey 'Main Street' type building. They have prepared a Concept Plan for the proposal and will submit more detailed plans in conjunction with applications for Site Plan Approval and Zoning By-law variances. The subject properties are listed in the City's Register of Heritage Properties but are not designated under the *Ontario Heritage Act*.

City Official Plan (OP) policy 565 requires a heritage impact assessment for the proposal. Also, an assessment of the heritage values of the subject and adjacent properties is required. This Cultural Heritage Impact Statement (CHIS) meets both requirements by identifying and evaluating heritage values on and near the site, assessing impacts from the proposed development and recommending measures to mitigate any adverse heritage impacts consistent with provincial and municipal policies.

The historical development of the site and nearby properties, within the City context, was examined. The site's building exteriors and interiors and landscapes were examined and documented. Both buildings were built in the 1850s but have been considerably altered. The site and nearby properties were evaluated using municipal and provincial criteria supplemented by consideration of heritage integrity and building condition. It was determined that the site's buildings and landscapes do not have sufficient cultural heritage value to warrant conservation but adjacent and some nearby properties have potential heritage value that may warrant their conservation.

The owners' Concept Plan is a phased development involving the demolition of the site's existing structures, constructing a three storey building with ground floor commercial and upper floor residential uses and parking in the rear. Access to the rear parking is from a north end driveway. The proposed building abuts the street right-of-way; no front yard is proposed.

Since the subject site does not warrant heritage conservation, the proposal will not have an adverse on-site heritage impact. Similarly the proposal will not adversely impact the attributes of adjacent heritage resources. However there is a potential for adverse visual impact on the adjacent properties. It is proposed to mitigate such impacts through modification of the proposed development in terms of the Wellington Street setback, the exterior material palette and landscaping on the north side.

This CHIS recommends that the City:

1. accept this CHIS as fulfilling the requirements of OP policy 565;
2. approve demolition of the site's structures and landscapes once the proposed building replacement plans has been approved;
3. approve replacement building plans as shown in the Concept Plan with setback, an exterior material palette and landscaping modifications as described in this CHIS;
4. accept this CHIS as sufficient archival documentation of the site;
5. not require salvage of material from demolition of the buildings on the site;
6. not require a commemorative interpretation program for the site; and

the owner, in respect of the replacement building plans:

7. not apply for demolition permits until those plans have been approved; and
8. work with City staff to develop an appropriate exterior material palette.


Wayne Morgan, Heritage Planner

PROJECT PERSONNEL

Wayne Morgan
Heritage Planner

Member, Canadian Association of Heritage Professionals
Member, Canadian Institute of Planners
Member, Ontario Professional Planners Institute
President, Community Heritage Ontario

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | Page |
|---|------|
| 1.0 INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| 2.0 DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPERTY AND ITS CONTEXT | 2 |
| 2.1 Location | 2 |
| 2.2 Ownership and Legal Description | 3 |
| 2.3 Area Character and Physiography | 3 |
| 2.4 Context – General Character | 4 |
| 2.5 Context – Adjacent and Nearby Heritage Properties | 5 |
| 3.0 HERITAGE POLICIES | 7 |
| 3.1 The Planning Act and Provincial Policy Statement (2020) | 7 |
| 3.2 Ontario Heritage Act (OHA) | 8 |
| 3.3 City of London Official Plan and Zoning By-law | 9 |
| 3.4 Standards and Guidelines - Conservation of Historic Places in Canada | 12 |
| 3.5 Municipal Heritage Status - Subject and Adjacent/Nearby Heritage Properties | 12 |
| 4.0 HISTORICAL SUMMARY | 13 |
| 4.1 Development of the Area – Town / City of London | 14 |
| 4.2 The Subject Site | 18 |
| 5.0 BUILT AND LANDSCAPE RESOURCE DESCRIPTIONS | 25 |
| 5.1 185 Wellington Street – Building & Landscape | 25 |
| 5.2 189 Wellington Street – Building & Landscape | 29 |
| 5.3 Adjacent/Nearby Heritage Properties | 31 |
| 6.0 HERITAGE EVALUATION | 35 |
| 6.1 Introduction | 35 |
| 6.2 Application of Provincial Criteria | 35 |
| 6.2.1 185 Wellington Street – Cultural Heritage Value | 35 |
| 6.2.2 189 Wellington Street – Cultural Heritage Value | 38 |
| 6.3 Summary of Cultural Heritage Values | 40 |
| 6.4 Statement of Cultural Heritage Values and Attributes | 40 |
| 6.5 Adjacent/Nearby Heritage Properties – Cultural Heritage Values | 40 |
| 7.0 DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL | 42 |
| 7.1 Description of the Development Proposal | 42 |
| 8.0 DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL IMPACT ON HERITAGE RESOURCES | 44 |
| 8.1 Impact of the Development on the Subject Site | 44 |
| 8.2 Impact of the Development on Adjacent/Nearby Heritage Resources | 44 |

TABLE OF CONTENTS

(continued)

| | Page | |
|---------|---|----|
| 9.0 | OPTIONS, CONSERVATION AND MITIGATION | 47 |
| 9.1 | Options for Managing the Heritage Resource | 47 |
| 9.2 | Mitigation / Conservation Measures | 47 |
| 9.2.1 | Documentation of Resources to be Demolished | 47 |
| 9.2.2 | Salvage of Features and Commemoration of Site | 47 |
| 9.2.3 | Addressing Visual Impacts on Adjacent / Nearby Heritage Resources | 48 |
| 9.2.3.1 | Setbacks from Wellington Street | 48 |
| 9.2.3.2 | Exterior Material Palette | 48 |
| 9.2.3.3 | Landscaping next to 191 – 193 Wellington Street | 49 |
| 9.2.3.4 | Upper Floor Stepbacks | 49 |
| 10.0 | CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS | 51 |
| 10.1 | Conclusions | 51 |
| 10.2 | Recommendations | 51 |
| | SOURCES CONSULTED | 53 |
| | APPENDICIES | |
| A | Property Survey | |
| B | Photographs – Context | |
| C | Maps | |
| D | Aerial Photographs | |
| E | Exterior Photographs | |
| F | Floor Plan Sketches | |
| G | Interior Photographs | |
| H | Landscape Photographs | |
| I | Property Ownership History | |
| J | Adjacent/Nearby Heritage Properties | |
| K | Development Proposal | |
| L | City of London Planning Document Maps | |
| M | Curriculum Vitae – Wayne Morgan | |

LIST OF FIGURES

| | | |
|------------|---|---|
| Figure 2.1 | General Location Map [Source: London City Maps, 2020]. | 2 |
| Figure 2.2 | Subject Site in Context [Source: London City Maps, image 2020]. | 2 |

LIST OF FIGURES (continued)

| | page | |
|-------------|---|----|
| Figure 2.3 | The Area in 1942. [Source: Ontario Dept. of Lands & Forests, Line 17, Photo 9]. | 4 |
| Figure 4.1 | London District, later Middlesex County Courthouse & Goal built 1828-31, pictured c1870 [Source: Ontario Archives, Acc3629, s12569] | 15 |
| Figure 4.2 | A brewery, established 1828, acquired by Labatt in 1847, pictured c1875 [Source: London Public Library] | 15 |
| Figure 4.3 | The GWR Station (left) and rail yard and associated industries. No date. [Source: https://labattheritage.lib.uwo.ca/closer-look/labatt-the-legacy-of-a-legend] | 16 |
| Figure 4.4 | University of Western Ontario c1891 [Source: University of Western Ontario Archives] | 17 |
| Figure 4.5 | Aerial Photograph of an Industrial Area in London, c1948 [Source: https://www.facebook.com/vintagelondon/photos/an-aerial-view-of-the44606915665611] | 17 |
| Figure 4.6 | George Jervis Goodhue [Source: London Public Library, Ivey Room] | 19 |
| Figure 4.7 | London Directories showing Resident on the West Side of Wellington Street between Simcoe and Grey Streets | 21 |
| Figure 4.8 | 189 Wellington Street in 2009 [Source: Google Street View] | 23 |
| Figure 4.9 | John Wood [Source: London Public Library, Ivey Room] | 23 |
| Figure 4.10 | 185 Wellington Street in 2009 [Source: Google Street View] | 24 |
| Figure 5.1 | 185 Wellington Street, East and North Elevations, 2020. | 25 |
| Figure 5.2 | 108 Albion Street, Brantford. [Source: Google Street View, 2011]. | 28 |
| Figure 5.3 | Other London one Storey Gothic Revival Styled House-Form Heritage Buildings | 28 |
| Figure 5.4 | 189 Wellington Street, South and East Elevations, 2020. | 29 |
| Figure 5.5 | West Block Face of Wellington Street between Grey and Simcoe Streets showing the Subject Properties. | 33 |
| Figure 5.6 | Heritage Properties Adjacent to the Subject Site | 34 |
| Figure 7.1 | Proposed East (Wellington Street) Elevation in Context, Phase One | 42 |
| Figure 7.2 | Proposed East (Wellington Street) Elevation in Context, Phase Two | 43 |
| Figure 8.1 | 189 – 197 Wellington Street, Building Alignments, 2020 | 44 |
| Figure 8.2 | 181– 85 Wellington Street, Shared Side Yard Conditions 2020 | 45 |
| Figure 8.3 | 181 – 185 Wellington Street, Building setback and alignments with Wellington Street, 2020 | 46 |
| Figure 9.1 | Recommended Building Setback from Wellington Street | 49 |

LIST OF TABLES

| | | |
|-----------|--|----|
| Table 4.1 | London Population | 18 |
| Table 4.2 | Historical Timelines – 185 & 189 Wellington Street, London | 18 |
| Table 4.3 | 1851 – 1921 Census of Canada -185 & 189 Wellington Street by Household Head | 20 |
| Table 4.4 | Vernon’s Directory, London, 185 & 189 Wellington Street, 1939 - 200 | 22 |
| Table 6.1 | Application of Heritage Criteria to the Resources of 185 and 189 Wellington Street, London | 36 |
| Table 6.2 | Potential Cultural Heritage Values – Properties Adjacent to or Near 185 & 189 Wellington Street, London | 41 |
| Table 7.1 | Development Proposal Statistics – 185 & 189 Wellington St | 45 |
| Table 9.1 | Heritage Policy Compliance | 46 |

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The owners of an approximately 879 square metre (9,460 square feet) site on the west side of Wellington Street between Simcoe and Grey Streets in the City of London propose to develop the site for a three storey ‘Main Street’ type building with a mix of commercial and residential uses. A Concept Plan has been submitted for the proposed development. The owners will be submitting more detailed plans in conjunction with applications for Site Plan Approval and variances to the Zoning By-law for the proposed development. The proposal encompasses two properties – 185 and 189 Wellington Street. Both properties are listed in the City’s Register of Heritage Properties in accordance with the *Ontario Heritage Act*, but are not designated under that *Act*.

Policy 565 of the London Official Plan requires a heritage impact statement when redevelopment or new development is proposed on a listed property. Since the subject properties are listed and not designated, a cultural heritage assessment is required to determine the heritage values and attributes of the subject and nearby properties. This Cultural Heritage Impact Statement (CHIS) has been prepared to meet both of those requirements. Wayne Morgan, Heritage Planner, was retained by the property owners to prepare this CHIS in accordance with provincial and municipal heritage policies and to recommend any mitigation measures with respect to the heritage resources and values of the subject and adjacent / nearby heritage properties. A curriculum vitae for Wayne Morgan is contained in *Appendix M*.

2.0 DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPERTIES AND THEIR CONTEXT

2.1 Location

The two properties are located in the City of London in the County of Middlesex on the west side of Wellington Street south of Simcoe Street and north of Grey Street, south of the downtown area of London (**Figures 2.1 and 2.2**). The two properties are bounded on the east by Wellington Street, on the north by a property line dividing 189 Wellington Street from 193 Wellington Street, on the west by the lot line that forms the east boundary of 257 Simcoe and 258 Grey Streets and on the south by a property line dividing 185 Wellington Street from 181 Wellington Street.

*Subject
Properties*



Figure No. 2.1
General Location Map
[Source: London City Maps,
2020]

*Subject
Properties*



Figure No. 2.2
Subject Site in Context
[Source: London City Maps
Image 2020].

2.2 Ownership and Legal Description

Currently the properties are owned by:

2698748 Ontario Inc. (185 Wellington Street) and
2700875 Ontario Inc. (189 Wellington Street)
6751 Professional Court, Suite 203
Mississauga, Ontario L4V 1Y3

The short legal description of each property is:

185 Wellington Street - *Part Lot 1, North of West Grey Street, Crown Plan 30 as in 765429 in the City of London;* and

189 Wellington Street - *Part Lot 1, South of West Simcoe Street, Crown Plan 30 and Part Lot 1 North of West Grey Street being the northerly 1 foot as in W42629 in the City of London.*

Appendix A contains a survey of the properties. Together, the properties are approximately 878.7 square metres (9,460 square feet) in size.

The municipality has addressed the properties as 185 and 189 Wellington Street. These municipal addresses have been applied to the properties since at least 1881.

2.3 Area Character and Physiography

As shown on the topographic map (**Appendix C**), the subject site is relatively flat, with a very gentle slope to the southwest to the Thames River which drains west into Lake St. Clair. The river valley, which is the only noteworthy topographic feature in the area, is in a relatively wide valley with low valley walls. The subject site is within an urban area that has been developed for urban purposes for more than a century.

The area character identified in the topographic map is also illustrated in a 1942 aerial photograph (Figure 2.3) which shows that the subject property located in an extensive urban area. Downtown London is to the north of the subject site, with railway tracks and a rail yard between the subject site and downtown London.

Since 1942, there has been some change in the area land uses when Figure 2.3 is compared to Figure 2.2. A number of sites have been redeveloped for more intensive use, while others have had buildings demolished and the property paved for parking lots.

Detailed aerial photographs of the subject site from 1922 to 2020 are found in **Appendix D**.




Figure No. 2.3
The Area in 1942

[Source: Ontario Department of Lands and Forests, Line 17, Photo 9].

The property is in the Caradoc Sand Plains and London Annex physiographic region¹ which is described as:

Immediately surrounding the city and extending several miles eastward there is a basin lying between 850 and 900 feet above sea level. Into this basin the earliest glacial spillways discharged muddy water, laying down beds of silt and fine sand. Later, when standing water had retired westward to lower levels, gravely alluvium was spread over the lower parts of the basin.

2.4 Context - General Character

The subject site is within an immediate area that is urban in character (Figures 2.2 and 2.3).

¹ Chapman and Putnam, pp 236-238.

As shown by the context photographs in *Appendix B*, the properties to the north, south, east and west of the subject property have been developed for a variety of low rise residential, mixed commercial / residential and institutional uses. On one property to the west, there is a high rise residential building.

Wellington Street is a heavily traveled four lane arterial road with a special urban character – sidewalks on both sides, enclosed storm drains, curbs, a lane of metered parking on the west side and a landscaped centre median containing street lights. Between the sidewalk and the curb, there is a planting area paved with coloured concrete pavers with a street tree in it in front of 189 Wellington Street. On Wellington Street, the nearest signalized intersections are at Horton Street to the north and Grey Street to the south. Further south on Wellington Street, a bridge provides a crossing over the south branch of the Thames River.

2.5 Context - Adjacent and Nearby Heritage Properties

Two heritage properties are adjacent to or abut the subject site. There are:

- *181 Wellington Street* – west side of the street – semi-detached House – circa 1855 –
A two storey yellow, solid brick, hip roofed, house-form building with a symmetrical arrangement openings on the front façade.
- *193-195 Wellington Street*² – west side of street – semi-detached House – circa 1860
A 1½ storey frame, gable roofed, house-form building with a centre gable and a symmetrical arrangement of openings on the front façade.

The following heritage properties are near to the subject site:

- *169-171 Wellington Street* – west side of street – House – circa 1885 -
A 2 storey, solid yellow brick, gable and hip roofed house-form structure with an ‘L’ shaped floor plan; upper floor retains original openings, ground floor commercial facades – 31.6 metres from the subject site.
- *184 Wellington Street* – east side of street – House – 1881 -
A 1 storey, solid brick, hip roofed, structure with a symmetrical arrangement of front openings – 40.3 metres from the subject site.
- *190 Wellington Street* – east side of street – House – circa 1890 -
A 2 storey, solid yellow brick, cross gable roofed house-form structure with an ‘L’ shaped floor plan; retains original front openings– 41.3 metres from the subject site.

² 193 – 195 and 197-199 Wellington Street are two separate structures on one property. In this CHIS, they are discussed as two separate properties.

- *197-199 Wellington Street* – west side of street – commercial structure – circa 1870 -
A 2 storey, solid yellow brick, flat roofed, structure with ground floor retail and upper floor residential uses – 11.9 metres from the subject site.
- *201-203 Wellington Street* – west side of street – commercial structure – circa 1870 -
A 2 storey, solid brick, gable roofed, structure with the gable facing the street, ground floor retail and a symmetrical arrangement of front openings – 25 metres from the subject site.
- *205-209 Wellington Street* – west side of street – commercial structure – circa 1885 -
A 3 storey, solid brick, flat roofed, structure, ground floor retail and a symmetrical arrangement of upper floor rectangular window openings – 34.4 metres from the subject site.

No other potential heritage properties were identified adjacent to or near the subject site using the London Heritage Register and walking the area.

3.0 HERITAGE POLICIES

This chapter identifies federal, provincial, and municipal heritage policies relevant to the proposed development of the subject site.

3.1 The Planning Act and Provincial Policy Statement (2020)

Section 2 of the *Planning Act* identifies “matters of provincial interest, which includes the conservation of significant features of architectural, cultural, historical, archaeological or scientific interest.”³ This applies as a planning application will be required for the proposal.

Section 3 of the *Planning Act* enables the Province to issue Policy Statements on matters of Provincial Interest. The Provincial Policy Statement (2020) (PPS) issued under the *Act* applies. Section 2.6 of the PPS addresses Cultural Heritage. Policy 2.6.1 states:

Significant built heritage resources and significant cultural heritage landscapes shall be conserved.

The PPS provides the following definitions to the italicized terms.

Significant means in regard to cultural heritage and archaeology, “resources that have been determined to have cultural heritage value or interest. Processes and criteria for determining cultural heritage value or interest are established by the Province under the authority of the *Ontario Heritage Act*.”

Built heritage resources “means a building, structure, monument, installations or any manufactured remnant that contributes to a property’s cultural heritage value or interest as identified by a community, including indigenous community. Built heritage resources are located on property that has been designated under Parts IV or V of the *Ontario Heritage Act*, or that may be included on local, provincial, federal and/or international registers.”

Cultural heritage landscape means a defined geographical area that may have been modified by human activities and is identified as having cultural heritage value or interest by a community including an indigenous community. The area may include features such as structures, spaces, archaeological sites or natural elements that are valued together for their interrelationship, meaning or association. ...

conserved means “the identification, protection, management and use of built *heritage resources, cultural heritage landscapes and archaeological resources* in a manner that ensures their cultural heritage value or interest is retained. This may be achieved by the implementation of recommendations set out in a conservation plan, archaeological assessment and/or heritage impact assessment that has been

³Ontario Ministry of Culture. *Heritage Resources in the Land Use Planning Process*, p 1.

approved, accepted or adopted by the relevant planning authority and/or decision-maker. Mitigative measures and/or alternative development approaches can be included in these plans and assessments.”

Policy 2.6.3 of the PPS deals with development adjacent to a protected heritage property,

Planning authorities shall not permit *development* and *site alteration* on *adjacent lands* to *protected heritage property* except where the proposed *development* and *site alteration* has been evaluated and it has been demonstrated that the *heritage attributes* of the *protected heritage property* will be *conserved*.

In addition to the above definitions, each of the italicized terms has the following definitions:

Development means “the creation of a new lot, a change in land use, or the construction of buildings and structures, requiring approval under the *Planning Act*”;

Site alteration means activities, such as grading, excavation and the placement of fill that would change the landform and natural vegetative characteristics of a site; *Adjacent lands* means “for the purposes of policy 2.6.3, those lands contiguous to a *protected heritage property* or as otherwise defined in the municipal official plan”;

Protected heritage property means “property designated under Part IV, V or VI of the *Ontario Heritage Act*; property subject to a heritage conservation easement under Parts II or IV of the *Ontario Heritage Act*; property identified by the Province and prescribed public bodies as provincial heritage property under the Standards and Guidelines for Conservation of Provincial Heritage Properties; property protected under federal legislation, and UNESCO World Heritage Sites”.

Heritage attributes means “the principal features or elements that contribute to a *protected heritage property’s* cultural heritage value or interest, and may include the property’s built or manufactured elements, as well as natural landforms, vegetation, water features, and its visual setting (including significant views or vistas to or from a *protected heritage property*)”.

Other PPS policies that do not deal with cultural heritage may apply to the subject site. In such situations, the PPS states that “when more than one policy is relevant, a decision-maker should consider all of the relevant policies to understand how they work together.” This CHIS has not considered other PPS policies in evaluating the proposed development.

3.2 Ontario Heritage Act (OHA)

Amendments to the *OHA* were proclaimed on January 1, 2021. This section addresses those amendments and the sections of the *OHA* relevant to the proposed development.

Designation & the Register - Part IV of the *OHA* enables a municipality to list and designate properties of cultural value or interest after consultation with its heritage advisory committee, if one is appointed. Section 27 of the *Act* requires the municipal clerk to keep a Register of properties of cultural heritage value or interest. *OHA* amendments have changed the process for securing designation, including the opportunity for the owner to appeal the municipality's intent to designate to the Local Planning Appeals Tribunal (LPAT).

Listing - Subsection 27.1 of the *Act* allows municipal councils to include properties that may be of cultural heritage value that have not been designated (listed properties) on its Heritage Register after the council has consulted with its heritage advisory committee. Amendments to the *OHA* specify the scope of information to be provided for new listed properties and changes to the procedure for listing a property, including notification of the owner.

Criteria - The Provincial Government has established criteria for determining the cultural heritage value or interest of properties through Regulation 9/06. The criteria are unchanged by the new regulations and are identical to policy 573 of the London OP (see below).

Effect of Designation & Listing - Once a property is designated, demolition or alterations that may affect the heritage attributes require municipal council approval. An owner may appeal Council's decision on an application to alter or demolish to the LPAT. Once a property is listed in the municipal register under the *Act*, any application to demolish a building on a listed property may be delayed 60 days from the date when Council is notified of the intent to demolish, during which Council may pursue designation of the property.

3.3 City of London Official Plan and Zoning By-law

The office consolidation of the London Official Plan (OP) dated November 13, 2019 was reviewed for this report. Cultural heritage objectives and policies are found in the Cultural Heritage Section, pages 137 – 148.

The relevant cultural heritage objectives of the OP are:

554. *In all of the planning and development we do, and the initiatives we take as a municipality we will:*
2. *Conserve London's cultural heritage resources so they can be passed on to our future generations.*
 3. *Ensure that new development and public works are undertaken to enhance and be sensitive to our cultural heritage resources.*

Relevant cultural heritage conservation policies of the OP are:

565. *New development, redevelopment ... on and adjacent to properties listed on the Register will be designed to protect the heritage attributes and character of those resources, to minimize visual and physical impact on these resources. A heritage impact assessment will be required for new*

development on and adjacent to ... properties listed on the Register to assess potential impacts, and explore alternative development approaches and mitigation measures to address any impact to the cultural heritage resource and its heritage attributes.⁴

- 566 *Relocation of cultural heritage resources is discouraged. All options for on-site retention must be exhausted before relocation may be considered.*
- 567 *In the event that demolition, salvage, dismantling, relocation or irrevocable damage to a cultural heritage resources is found necessary as determined by City Council, archival documentation may be required to be undertaken by the proponent and made available for archival purposes.*
- 568 *Conservation of whole buildings on properties identified on the Register is encouraged and the retention of facades alone is discouraged. The portion of a cultural heritage resource to be conserved should reflect its significant attributes including its mass and volume.*
- 569 *Where, ... it is determined that a building may be removed, the retention of architectural or landscape features and the use of other interpretive techniques will be encouraged where appropriate.*
- 573 *City Council will consider one or more of the following criteria in the identification and designation of individual properties of cultural heritage value or interest:*
1. *The property has design or physical value because it:*
 - a. *Is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, expression, material, or construction method.*
 - b. *Displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit.*
 - c. *Demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement.*
 2. *The property has historic value or associative value because it:*
 - a. *Has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization, or institution that is significant to a community.*
 - b. *Yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of a community or culture.*
 - c. *Demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer, or theorist who is significant to a community.*
 3. *The property has contextual value because it:*
 - a. *Is important in defining, maintaining, or supporting the character of an area.*
 - b. *Is physically, functionally, visually, or historically linked to its surroundings.*
 - c. *Is a landmark.*

⁴ This policy is currently under appeal to the LPAT.

- 584 *Building height and densities may be increased, in conformity with the Bonus Zoning policies in the Our Tools part of this Plan, in support of heritage designation of a property that is of cultural heritage value or interest.*
- 586 *The City shall not permit development and site alteration on adjacent lands to heritage designated properties or properties listed on the Register except where the proposed development and site alteration has been evaluated and it has been demonstrated that the heritage attributes of the heritage designated properties or properties listed on the Register will be conserved.*
- 590 *Where a property has been identified on the Register and an application is submitted for its demolition or removal, the Heritage Planner and the Clerks Department will be notified in writing immediately. A demolition permit will not be issued until such time as City Council has indicated its approval, approval with conditions, or denial of the application pursuant to the Ontario Heritage Act. Council may also request such information that it needs for its consideration of a request for demolition or removal.*
- 591 *Where a heritage designated property or a property listed on the Register is to be demolished or removed, the City will ensure the owner undertakes mitigation measures including a detailed documentation of the cultural heritage features to be lost, and may require the salvage of materials exhibiting cultural heritage value for the purpose of re-use or incorporation into the proposed development.*

The OP designates the subject site ‘Rapid Transit Corridors’ (**Appendix L**) with the objective of permitting “a mix of residential and a range of other uses along corridors to establish demand for rapid transit services”. The uses are residential, retail, service, office, cultural, recreation and institutional uses a minimum 8 metre (2 storeys) and maximum 12 metre (4 storeys) height. Within the corridor, the subject site is part of the Main Street Soho Community Improvement Area where buildings are to be close to the street with parking to the rear or underground. There are design and signage requirements for new buildings in this segment. In addition paragraph 548, policy 1 specifies that “*Cultural heritage resources shall be conserved in conformity with the Cultural Heritage policies of this Plan and the OHA.*”

Although these policies show the intent of City Council for this area, OP Map 1 and many of the Place Type policies are under appeal, so the 1989 City OP remains in effect.

The subject site is in zone ‘BDC(4)’ Business District Commercial (4) (**Appendix L**) which permits a range of commercial, institutional and residential uses with residences on the upper floors or rear of the ground floors and no additional requirements for heritage conservation.

3.4 Standards and Guidelines - Conservation of Historic Places in Canada

In 2005, Parks Canada produced a set of standards and guidelines for the conservation of historic places in Canada. These standards and guidelines are intended to identify best practices in the management of heritage resources which include buildings, landscapes and

archaeological sites. The approach taken in developing the standards and guidelines has been informed by international charters for the conservation of heritage resources developed under the auspices of ICOMOS, the international council on historic sites and monuments, a body of heritage professionals which advises the United Nations Educational and Scientific Committee. Some municipalities in Canada have adopted Parks Canada's Standards and Guidelines in the management of their heritage resources.

In 2010, Parks Canada updated and expanded the Standards and Guidelines in a second edition of the document.

In general the Standard and Guidelines seek to:

- preserve the heritage attributes of the historic places;
- ensure that restoration work is consistent with documentary evidence;
- ensure that alterations are reversible and do not create a false sense of history; and
- ensure that additions to a heritage place are distinguishable from the heritage character of the place, yet sympathetic to that character.

Although it does not appear that the City of London has adopted the Standards and Guidelines, other municipalities and heritage professionals use the Standards and Guidelines as 'best practice' in the conservation of heritage resources.

3.5 Municipal Heritage Status - Subject and Adjacent/Nearby Heritage Sites

The subject site at 185 and 189 Wellington Street are listed in the City of London Heritage Register approved by City Council as per the *Ontario Heritage Act* but is not designated under Part IV or V of the *Act*.

All adjacent or nearby heritage properties where heritage resources continue to exist on the properties – 169-171, 184, 190, 193 – 195, 197-199, 201-203 and 205-209 Wellington Street are identified on City Maps as 'listed' heritage properties but are not designated under either Parts IV or V of the *Act*. All of the previous properties, except 193-199 Wellington Street, are included in the July 2019 edition of the Register.

4.0 HISTORICAL SUMMARY

With the gradual retreat of the glaciers from southern Ontario during the last glacial period some 12,000 to 10,000 years ago, the land was occupied by early indigenous (Paleo-Indian) peoples. Initially a nomadic people, later generations engaged in agricultural pursuits, along with hunting and fishing, and established temporary settlements throughout the area. The Thames River was a principal transportation route, with settlements located near the River.

In May 1790 the colonial government based in Quebec City negotiated Treaty number 2, the McKee Purchase⁵, with the chiefs of indigenous peoples of the area, securing for the Crown ownership of a tract of land in southwestern Ontario, including part of the City of London. In 1796, Treaty number 6, the London Township Treaty⁶, was signed with the Crown by the Chippewa of the Thames surrendering land that became London Township including the subject site. These land surrenders were part of the government's response to the need for land to settle Loyalists from the American Revolution and British immigrants.

In 1791, the government split the colony of Canada into Upper and Lower Canada and appointed John Graves Simcoe as governor of Upper Canada. In 1793 Simcoe traveled along the Thames confirming that the site for the colony's new capital should be just west of the forks of the Thames as shown in a 1795 map (*Appendix C*). He named the site after London, England. However, later settlement of London would occur mostly east of the forks of the Thames. Also in 1793, Augustus Jones initiated surveys of the Thames River⁷ and Dundas Road⁸, the latter connecting London with Dundas to the east and then Toronto (York).

In 1788, the colonial government divided southern Ontario into four administrative regions, with the subject site in Hesse District. In 1792 new administrative regions were created, with this site in the Western District. In 1798, the regions were reorganized again, with this site in the London District. By 1826, further reorganizations placed this subject site in London Township in the London District. At that time, the village of London became the seat for the District, housing District legal and administrative services. In 1847, London, including this site, was elevated as a 'Town' separate from the Township. In 1850 municipal and county governments were created in Ontario with the Town of London in Middlesex County. In 1855 London became a City separate from the County⁹, its current status.

The City of London is bounded by the Municipalities of Middlesex Centre (north and west), Thames Centre (east) and in Elgin County, Central Elgin and Southwold (south).

The survey of London Township was initiated by Colonel Mahlon Burwell in 1810. A line roughly parallel to the Thames River near the forks of the River was the east-west survey

⁵ <https://www.rcaanc-cirnac.gc.ca/eng/1370372152585/1581293792285#ucls4>

⁶ <https://www.rcaanc-cirnac.gc.ca/eng/1370372152585/1581293792285#ucls9>

⁷ Gentilcore (1973), 92.

⁸ Ibid, 97.

⁹ Dean, plates 98 and 100.

base, with concessions numbered north and south of this base and lots numbered from the east Township limit to the west limit. Concessions south of the base line were lettered (A, B and C) while concessions to the north were numbered. After every five lots, north-south roads were surveyed. The Township was laid out in the ‘Double Front System’ resulting in 200 acre rectangular lots with frontages on two concession roads¹⁰. These 200 acre lots were usually divided in two, one hundred acre lots and referenced as the north and south halves.

The Crown retained ownership of the site for the capital and in, 1824, directed Burwell to lay out a town survey superimposed on the Township survey. This was registered as Crown Plan 30, part of which is shown in **Appendix C** (1824). Wellington Street was the base line for this survey, with lots numbered east and west of the base. The town survey imposed a settlement grid that persists to this day.

The subject site is identified relative to this town survey as part of Lots 1 northwest of Grey Street (189 Wellington) and southwest of Simcoe Street (185 Wellington). **Appendix I** contains selected listings from the Abstract Index to Deeds and Mortgages for the properties.

4.1 Development of the Larger Area - Town / City of London

To understand the development of the subject site, it is essential to place it within the larger context of development of the area.

The site for London has several physical advantages that facilitated its early development. “*It was originally located at the forks of the Thames because the river was the early route of travel, and because the high alluvial terrace offered a good site on which to build. The underlying sands also offered a good water supply*”¹¹.

With the Township survey establishing lots available for settlement, Thomas Talbot brought a group of Irish settlers to the area in 1817 and 1818.¹² Initially, London would have developed slowly as a market centre for the surrounding agricultural settlement.

With the naming of London as the District seat in 1826, London’s growth accelerated when such District services as the Court house, goal and registry office (Figure 4.1) were established in London. Industries were developed to process agricultural produce and to serve the local market (Figure 4.2). Labatt’s brewery is a couple of blocks west of the subject site. By 1834 London had a population over 1,100. In 1838 a British garrison was stationed in London¹³. As shown on the 1839 map (**Appendix C**), most of the development in London was focused on the west end of Dundas Street, near the Thames, with a scattering of buildings throughout the rest of the area surveyed for the Town.

¹⁰ Gentilcore (1973), 9.

¹¹ Chapman and Putnam, pp 237-238.

¹² Arnold, 2.

¹³ The Founding of London, heritage plaque.

Figure 4.1
*London District, later
Middlesex County
Courthouse & Goal, built
1828-31, pictured c1870*
[Source: Ontario Archives
Acc.3629 s12569]




Figure 4.2
A brewery, established 1828, acquired by Labatt in 1847, pictured c1875 [Source: London Public Library]

In 1846 the settlement of London was described as:

The District Town of the London District, situated in the township of London, ..., [is] eighty-five miles from Hamilton, twenty-six from Port Stanley, and seventeen from St. Thomas. ... It is finely situated, being in the midst of a beautiful country, and at the ... junction of the two branches of the River Thames.

London possesses a handsome jail and court house, built of brick in the form of a castle; ... Large barracks, capable of accommodating a regiment, and Artillery barracks in addition, both of which are occupied. A fire company with one engine, a theatre, and two market buildings. Within the last two years London has been twice nearly destroyed by fire. The Episcopal Church was burnt down ...; ... [rebuilt] and London can now boast of possessing the handsomest gothic church in Canada West. ... A fire took place on the 8th October, 1844, when a large portion of the town was burnt; a second fire occurred on the 12th April, 1845,

when about 150 buildings were consumed. Building, however, has been proceeded with rapidly; and in place of the old frame buildings, handsome streets have been erected, composed of brick buildings three and four stories high.

Excellent roads stretch away in every direction. A plank road ... to Port Stanley, and a plank and macadamized road to Brantford [Dundas Street]. New roads have also been completed to Chatham and Port Sarnia. Stages leave London daily for Hamilton, Chatham, and Detroit, and all intermediate places; three times a-week for Port Sarnia and Port Stanley; and twice a-week for Goderich.

A weekly newspaper, the "Times," is published here.

Churches and chapels, 10;

Post Office, post every day.

Population about 3500.¹⁴

Initially the main modes of transportation were by road, described above, and by river. Wellington Street provided access from the City to the area to the south. However, in 1854, the first of several railways, the Great Western Railway (GWR), provided a more reliable mode of transportation and the basis for industrial development in the City, both directly through employment on the railway, in the rail yards and shops; and indirectly by facilitating the growth and relocation of businesses to the City. The 1855 map (*Appendix C*) shows the location of this railway in the City, with the line and station located several blocks north of the subject site while Figure 4.3 shows the line, rail yard and station north of the subject site.



Figure 4.3

The GWR Station (left) and rail yard and associated industries. No date. [Source: <https://labattheritage.lib.uwo.ca/closer-look/labatt-the-legacy-of-a-legend>]

¹⁴ Smith, 100.

The GWR merged with the Grand Trunk Railway (1882) and became part of Canadian National Railways (1921). Other railways to service the City were the London and Port Stanley Railway (1856) and the West Ontario Pacific railway (1887) which in 1888 became part of the Ontario and Quebec Railway a subsidiary of the Canadian Pacific Railway.

In 1881, the University of Western Ontario, which would become a major institution in the City, received its first students.



Figure 4.4
University of Western Ontario c1881 [Source: University of Western Ontario Archives]

The federal government, through high tariff barriers, promoted the growth of branch plants of foreign owned companies in the country. London was well placed to take advantage of this economic policy and, with its program of bonusing new industries, became the site of numerous American branch plants (Figure 4.5), including Kellogg's, Kelvinator and General Motors. The growth of Canadian owned industries was also promoted. London became the site of a number of companies in the service sector, such as insurance company head offices, providing services to the province and nation.

In the early 1950s, road access from London to the rest of Ontario was promoted with the construction of Highway 401, a limited access, multi-lane expressway.



Figure 4.5
Aerial Photo of an Industrial Area in London, circa 1948.
[Source:

<https://www.facebook.com/vintagelondon/photos/an-aerial-view-of-the44606915665611/>

Table 4.1 shows the growth in population in the City of London from 1861 to 2016 as reported by the Census.

| Year | Population |
|------|------------|
| 1861 | 11,555 |
| 1891 | 22,281 |
| 1911 | 46,300 |
| 1961 | 168,569 |
| 2016 | 383,822 |

The subject site is within an area that has been urbanized for more than 140 years in a City that has grown steadily from the mid nineteenth through to the twenty-first century.

4.2 The Subject Site

| Key Date | Historical Event |
|-------------|---|
| 1810 | London Township surveyed into lots and concessions |
| 1826 | Town of London surveyed into building lots; subject properties each part of half acre lots; Crown retains ownership of lots |
| 1839 | Lots remain vacant despite development elsewhere in Town |
| 1848 | Half acre Lot containing 189 Wellington sold to McCabe who sells part to Goodhue |
| 1850 | Half acre Lot containing 185 Wellington sold to Wood who sells to Winslow |
| 1851 - 1854 | 189 Wellington – four sales of lot ending with Leathorn in 1854. |
| 1855 | Both 185 & 189 Wellington remain vacant. |
| 1856 (est.) | House Built 189 Wellington – house built by Leathorn & leased to employee |
| 1859 (est.) | House Built 185 Wellington – Winslow mortgages property |
| 1862 | 189 Wellington – property sold to John Price |
| 1863 | 185 Wellington – property sold to Laura Newell (later Milne) |
| 1877 | 185 Wellington – property sold to John Price who now owns both 185 & 189 |
| 1949 | 189 Wellington – sold out of Price/Stephens family to Goldsworthy & Cripps |
| 1957 | 185 Wellington – sold out of Price/Stephens family to Lea Ayers |

As stated in section 4.1, London Township survey was initiated in 1810. Despite land being made available for sale to settlers, the Crown retained ownership of an area at the forks of the Thames for its vision of the area being the site for the capital of Upper Canada.

In 1826, the Crown registered a further subdivision of the land with Crown Plan 30, creating approximately half acre lots on the north and south sides of Grey and Simcoe Streets. The Crown continued to retain ownership of the newly created lots.

An 1839 map of London (*Appendix C* – 1839) shows development in the Town to that year. Buildings are identified on the map with a red square. No buildings are shown on the subject properties despite scattered development to the north, west and south.

189 Wellington Street - In 1848, the Crown sold all of lot 1 on the south side of west Simcoe Street to Henry McCabe¹⁵. Nothing could be found about McCabe; he is not listed in the City in the 1861 Census or in later directories. In 1851, McCabe sold the vacant lot to the Honourable George Jervis Goodhue¹⁶ (1799 – 1870), a wealthy London merchant, land speculator and member of the provincial legislature for the London District.¹⁷ In 1863 Goodhue was living on Bathurst Street between Talbot and Ridout Street, so he probably purchased the land for speculative purposes.



Figure 4.6
George Jervis Goodhue
[Source: London Public
Library, Ivey Room]

Shortly after acquiring the land, Goodhue sold parts of the lot. In 1851 he sold the north 40 feet (of the original 120 foot lot), which is the lot for 189 Wellington Street, to Phillip Davis¹⁸. Nothing could be found about Davis. In 1853 Davis sold the lot to George Brett¹⁹. Similarly nothing could be found about Brett. However, the lot was still vacant as shown on the 1855 map (*Appendix C*).

In 1854, Brett sold the vacant building lot to Robert Leathorn²⁰ (c1826 –?), a butcher. In 1861 Leathorn was listed living in Ward 6 in London in a brick two storey house with his wife, three children and servant²¹. The subject site is in Ward 3²². However, Leathorn is also shown in the 1861 Census (Table 4.3) owning a vacant, frame one storey house on a 40 x 100 foot lot (the lot for 189 Wellington is 40 x 110). Around 1856 he appears to have built the house at 189 Wellington Street either for his own use or as a rental property. If it was built for his own use, later in the 1850s he moved to the brick house referenced in the 1861 Census.

In 1862 Leathorn sold the property at 189 Wellington Street to John Price²³. Although Price moved into the house, it is not clear whether he rented the house prior to the 1862 purchase. The 1861 Census (Table 4.3) shows Price living in a frame, one storey on a quarter acre lot (twice the size of the lot at 189 Wellington Street) in Ward 6, not Ward 3, the Ward in which

¹⁵ Land Records, Middlesex County, Lot 1, SW Simcoe Street, London Township, Patent.

¹⁶ Ibid, Instrument No. 218.

¹⁷ http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/goodhue_george_jervis_9E.html

¹⁸ Land Records, Middlesex County, Lot 1, SW Simcoe Street, London Township, Instrument No. 1229.

¹⁹ Ibid, Instrument No. 3044.

²⁰ Ibid, Instrument No. 3887.

²¹ 1861 Census of Canada, (Population), London City, p. 308.


²² The 1861 Census for London City does not show any entries for Ward 3. Either the forms for Ward 3 have not survived, or some forms have been incorrectly assigned to Ward 6.

²³ Land Records, Middlesex County, Lot 1, SW Simcoe Street, London Township, Instrument No. 1229.

| Table 4.3 1851 – 1921 Census, London City – 185 & 189 Wellington Street, by Household Head | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|------------------|---|-----------------|-----|-----------|--------|----------|---------|-------|----------|--------|
| Year | 185 Or 189 | Name | Profession | Age | Land | Houses | | | | | |
| | | | | | | # | Material | Storeys | Rooms | Families | Vacant |
| 1851 | | No individual forms have survived for the City of London from the 1851 Census | | | | | | | | | |
| 1861 | ? | Robert Leathorn | Butcher | 35 | 30 x 120' | 1 | brick | 2 | nc | 2 | - |
| | 189? | | | | 40 x 100' | | frame | 1 | nc | - | 1 |
| | 189? | John Price | GWR Fireman | 26 | 1/4 ac | 1 | frame | 1 | nc | 1 | - |
| | 185? | Laura Newell | Milliner | 29 | 1/4 ac | 1 | frame | 1 | nc | 1 | - |
| 1871 | 189? | John Price | GWR Fireman | 35 | 1/4 ac | 1 | nc | nc | nc | nc | 0 |
| | 185 | ? | | | | | | | | | |
| 1881 | 189 | ? | | | nc | | nc | nc | nc | nc | 0 |
| | 185 | ? | | | | | | | | | |
| 1891 | 189 | John Price | Engineer | 57 | nc | 1 | wood | 1 | 5 | 1 | 0 |
| | 185? | James Wardell | Dry Goods Clerk | 41 | nc | 1 | wood | 1 | 6 | 1 | 0 |
| 1901 | 189 | Alexander Burnett | Builder | 66 | tenant | 1 | wood | nc | 7 | 1 | nc |
| | 185 | John Cowie | Moulder? | 52 | tenant | 1 | wood | nc | 6 | 1 | nc |
| 1911 | 189 | Walter Logan | Civil servant | 41 | nc | nc | nc | nc | nc | nc | nc |
| | 185 | George Cowie | Cigar maker | 29 | nc | nc | nc | nc | nc | nc | nc |
| 1921 | 189 | James Anderson | ? | 62 | nc | 1 | wood | nc | 6 | nc | nc |
| | 185 | George Cowie | Cigar maker | 40 | tenant | 1 | wood | nc | 6 | nc | nc |

Notes: nc- not collected,

Figure 4.7 London Directories showing Residents on the West Side of Wellington Street between Simcoe and Grey Streets



| Year | 185 Wellington Street | 189 Wellington Street |
|------|------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| 1939 | Bernard McGibbon | C. J. Planz |
| 1946 | H. W. Ayers | Robert Findlater |
| 1950 | H. W. Ayers | Robert Findlater |
| 1955 | Mrs. L. Ayers / Lea's Beauty Salon | H. G. Goldsworthy |
| 1960 | Mrs. L. Ayers / Lea's Beauty Salon | Florence Goldsworthy |
| 1965 | Mrs. L. Ayers / Lea's Beauty Salon | Mrs. Goldsworthy / Adrian Barber Shop |
| 1970 | Mrs. L. Ayers / Lea's Beauty Salon | Mrs. R. Goldsworthy |
| 1974 | Mrs. L. Ayers / Lea's Beauty Salon | R. Goldsworthy / Fred the Barber |
| 1979 | Mrs. L. Ayers / Lea's Beauty Salon | R. Goldsworthy / Fred the Barber |
| 2000 | Pushin Inc. Tattoo Emporium | vacant |

189 Wellington Street is located²⁴. John Price and his descendants continued to own the property until 1949, although he only lived in the house until about 1894 when he rented it to others. John Weyman Price:

*was born in 1836 in Basingstoke, England to George Price and his wife Elizabeth Weyman. In Canada he married the former Elizabeth Harvey with whom he had a son and a daughter, William and Mary Elizabeth Price. He worked more than thirty years for the Great West Railway, initially as a fireman and later as an engineer.*²⁵

Residents of 189 Wellington Street were Henry Rogers in 1895 and Alexander Burnett in 1901. (Figure 4.7 and Table 4.3). Burnett, a builder, lived with his wife and adult son in this six room, one storey house. By 1911, Walter Logan, a civil servant, his wife and three children were the tenants in 189 Wellington Street.

In 1920, John Price's daughter, Mary, inherited the property. Mary had married Emerson Stephens and, in 1921, lived at 190 Wellington Street. As of 1921, her tenants at 189 were James Anderson and his wife. The Fire Insurance Plans (*Appendix C*) shows only a minor alteration to the rear of the building from the time John Price lived in it until 1922. In that year, a small rear extension and garage was added to the property. The 1922 aerial photo (*Appendix D*) shows that the existing brick addition had not been constructed on the front of the building. In 1939 her tenant was C. J. Planz and in 1946 Robert Findlater. It appears that the building was still being used for residential purposes when she died in 1949 and her estate sold it to Florence Goldsworthy and Ella Cripps.²⁶

²⁴ 1861 Census of Canada, (Population), London City, p. 54.

²⁵ Arnold, pp.4-5.

²⁶ Land Records, Middlesex County, Lot 1, SW Simcoe Street, London Township, Instrument No. 42629.

Florence Goldsworthy and her husband moved into the house around 1950. It continued to be used as a house until the early 1960s, when a barber shop was established in the front of the house. The 1965 aerial photo (*Appendix C*) appears to show that the existing brick addition had been constructed on the front of the house; the addition is clearly visible in the 1974 aerial photo. Mrs. Goldsworthy continued to live in the house, while there was a barbershop in the front of the building (Table 4.4).

In 1998 the property was sold to Marko Boskovic²⁷ who, with other members of his family bought the property to the south as an investment. In 2010 Boskovic sold the property to Marilyn and Mark Benns, who sold it to the current owner in 2019.²⁸

No builder or designer or early photographs of the building could be found. The oldest photos are the aerial photos (*Appendix D*) and Google Street Views in 2009 (Figure 4.8) when it housed an antique and fine arts store.



Figure 4.8
189 Wellington Street in 2009
[Source: Google Street View]

185 Wellington Street - In 1850, the Crown sold all of lot 1 on the north side of west Grey Street to John Wood²⁹. Wood was a plasterer who lived at the northwest corner of Wellington and Simcoe Streets. He acquired the property as an investment and sold the north half of the lot to William Winslow, a mason, within four months of acquiring the patent.³⁰ “Winslow was born in England in 1809 and travelled to London about 1845 where he married his Irish-born wife, Mary Jane. They had a family of three sons being William Jr., Richard and Robert.”³¹ It is likely that Winslow constructed the brick house on the north half of the lot as shown in the 1855 map (*Appendix C*), now 181 Wellington Street, but left the north quarter, which would constitute the building lot for 185 Wellington Street, vacant.

In 1859, Winslow mortgaged the property and possibly used the funds to construct the



Figure 4.9
John Wood
[Source: London Public Library, Ivey Room]

²⁷ Ibid, Instrument No. LT508948.

²⁸ Ibid, Instrument No. ER1241972.

²⁹ Land Records, Middlesex County, Lot 1, NW Grey Street, London Township, Patent.

³⁰ Ibid, Instrument No. 867.

³¹ Arnold, p. 4.

house at 185 Wellington Street³². It is not clear to whom he rented the house, although it may have been Laura Newell, a widow and milliner. In 1861 Newell was living with her two children in a frame, one storey house³³ (Table 4.3). The Census shows her living in Ward 6, although the property is in Ward 3. However, there are no entries for Ward 3 in the 1861 Census suggesting either the original enumeration forms for Ward 3 have been lost or misclassified as Ward 6. In any event, Winslow sold the property to Mrs. Newell in 1863.³⁴ Newell continued to live in the house until she married John Milne in 1866. She eventually moved to Detroit but continued to rent the house. In 1872, William Hardin, a barber, lived in it (Figure 4.7). In 1875, William Coombs, a GWR baggage master, lived at 185.

In 1877 Laura Newell (now Milne), sold the property at 185 Wellington Street to John Price³⁵, who owned and lived in the property to the north at 189. Price continued to rent the property to others. In 1884 Peter West rented 185 Wellington Street. By 1891, James Wardell, a dry goods clerk, was living with wife and three children in the house, a one storey wood structure with six rooms.³⁶ (Table 4.3). Wardell continued to live at 185 until at least 1895. By 1901, John Crowie rented the house. His son, George Crowie, a cigar maker, continued to live in the house with his wife and six children in 1911 and 1921. Later tenants included Bernard McGibbon (1939) and H. W. Ayers (1946) (Table 4.4).

By 1955, Lea Ayers was living in the house and had established a Beauty Salon in the front section of house. In 1957 Lea bought the property from the estate of Mary Stephens, John Price's daughter. Lea continued to live in and operate a beauty salon at 185 until she sold the property in 1986 to Edith Fleming³⁷ who sold it to Ivan Milicevic the same year³⁸. The following year Milicevic sold it to the Boskovic brothers³⁹. It was sold two more times in 2003 and 2006 and purchased by the current owner in 2019.

No builder or designer or early photographs of the building could be found. The oldest photos are the aerial photos (*Appendix D*) and Google Street Views in 2009 (Figure 4.10) when it housed a print shop.



Figure 4.10
185 Wellington Street in 2009
[Source: Google Street View]

³² Land Records, Middlesex County, Lot 1, NW Grey Street, London Township, Instrument No. +125.

³³ 1861 Census of Canada, (Population), London City, p. 168.

³⁴ Land Records, Middlesex County, Lot 1, NW Grey Street, London Township, Instrument No. 2358.

³⁵ Ibid, Instrument No. 15063.

³⁶ 1891 Census of Canada, (Schedule 1), London City, enumeration area no. 6, p. 39.

³⁷ Land Records, Middlesex County, Lot 1, NW Grey Street, City of London, Instrument No. 736719.

³⁸ Ibid, Instrument No. 749933.

³⁹ Ibid, Instrument No. 765428.

5.0 BUILT AND LANDSCAPE RESOURCE DESCRIPTIONS

On October 25, 2020, an on-site survey of all built and landscape resources was conducted.

The following components of the site are documented in photographs in:

- **Appendix E** – 185 & 189 Wellington Street Building Exteriors,
- **Appendix F** – 185 & 189 Wellington Street – Floor Plan Sketches
- **Appendix G** – 185 & 189 Wellington Street Building Interiors; and
- **Appendix H** – Landscapes on the Site

The six foot measuring stick that appears in some of the photographs is divided in one foot lengths.

5.1. 185 Wellington Street – Building & Landscape

As discussed in Chapter 4, this Building was built as a rental structure around 1859 for William Winslow when he mortgaged the property. Census information, whether it is for Winslow, or his possible tenant, Laura Newell strongly suggest that the Building had been constructed by January 1861 when the census after its construction was undertaken⁴⁰.

*Figure 5.1
185 Wellington Street,
East and North Elevations,
2020*



Exterior - The Building, which is setback 7.3 feet (2.22 metres) from the Wellington Street right-of-way, is a single detached, one storey frame structure clad in white, modern synthetic siding imitating vertical boards on the front elevation and horizontal clapboards on the side and rear elevation. The front section of the Building rests on a brick foundation that has been parged with a thin surface of mortar painted.

This Building is rectangular in plan measuring approximately 28 feet 8 inches by 44 feet 10 inches, the latter including a 14-foot tail wing. Evidence of an earlier tail wing was not visible on the exterior.

⁴⁰ [Census of 1861 - Library and Archives Canada \(bac-lac.gc.ca\)](http://bac-lac.gc.ca)

The front section of the Building is capped by a low pitched, hip roof with a centre gable on the front side of the Building. The tail wing is capped by a gable roof on the south two-thirds of the wing, with the gable facing the rear or west, and a shed roof on the northwest one-third. The grey asphalt shingled roof has unadorned projecting eaves with soffits clad in modern synthetic materials and fascia clad with metal eaves trough. The centre gable on the front elevation has a moulded wood fascia and soffit. There was no evidence of chimneys or decorative brackets supporting the eaves. (*Appendix E*).

All window openings are rectangular with flat heads, synthetic material clad frames and modern sash – double sliders on the front windows and vertical one over one on the side windows. There are no sills on the window openings. The window openings were not measured as they are, at least on the front elevation, modern alterations to the original openings.

The one storey tail wing is a frame structure clad in the same siding and roofing as the front or main section of the Building. It rests partly on a concrete block foundation and partly on a brick foundation with modern parging on the exterior. A modern shed roof covered deck is attached to part of the rear of the tail wing. There is a separate metal clad, modern shed adjacent, but not attached, to the tail wing.

East Elevation – The east or principal elevation contains a roughly symmetrical three bay façade with a centre door (*Appendix E* and Figure 5.1) flanked by two modern window openings. The upper gable has a small modern metal vent and no window. The front door opening contains a modern, single leaf, door with an upper glazed panel. The door is slightly off centre, perhaps having been placed within part of a larger original door opening. There is a modern platform deck with side stair and wood balustrade constructed of unfinished lumber providing access to the front door.

There is no physical evidence nor evidence on the Fire Insurance plans (*Appendix C*) that there ever was a veranda on this elevation.

North Elevation – This elevation contains two rectangular window openings, one in the front section of the Building and one in the tail wing. Towards the east end of the front section a hydro pole and meter has been fixed to the side of the Building and nearby there is a metal vent which is assumed for the furnace. This elevation also contains the north elevation of the rear, shed roofed veranda or deck

West Elevation – This elevation contains the rear veranda or deck discussed above and a solid, double leafed metal door which opens onto the deck. The foundation wall has not been painted black on this elevation.

South Elevation - The south elevation of blank wall clad in the same siding as the north and rear elevations.

Alterations to the exterior of the Building include:

- replacement of all window sash with modern slider or double hung sash;
- the enlargement of window openings on the principal elevation;
- replacement and relocation of the front door;
- removal of any other window and door openings of the Building;
- addition of modern siding; it is not known whether any original siding remains under the modern siding;
- cladding of fascia and soffits with modern synthetic material;
- addition to the tail wing;
- addition of front and rear wooden decks and staircases; and
- removal of all chimneys.

No early photographs could be found of the Building and the builder and architect, if any, could not be identified.

Architectural Style - The architectural style of this house is a vernacular variation on the 'Gothic Revival' or 'Ontario Cottage'.

In Ontario, where the Gothic Revival had more influence than anywhere else in Canada, the 1830s witnessed the appearance of Neo-Gothic features in another version of the Neo-Classical house that was primarily built in small towns. This was dubbed the Ontario Cottage, although the same type of building is found in other British colonies, where it was apparently introduced by discharged British soldiers. It was usually a house with one-and-a-half stories, a square plan, three bays on the main façade and a pavilion roof. The influence of the Gothic Revival is seen in the appearance of a small central gable with a fretted fascia board highlighting a gothic window; sometimes the shape of the other windows and the door is also modified.⁴¹

Blumenson has also described Gothic Revival styled buildings.

The most common and often singular feature shared by many houses across the Province is the simple lancet or pointed window, located in the centre gable above the main door. Another common detail is the vergeboard or bargeboard, a roof trim ideally decorated with curvilinear patterns. Hood-moulds with carved label stops, numerous dormers and gables, finials, pinnacles and crockets are other features highlighting a formal brick villa or modest frame dwelling. Bay windows, verandas and a steep roof pierced by tall decorated chimney stacks also add to the ideal picturesque quality of the building.⁴²

⁴¹ Brosseau, p 11.


⁴² Blumenson, p. 37.

The Building at 185 Wellington Street exhibits few of the details of the architectural style discussed by Brousseau and Blumenson. Figure 5.2 is a representative example of the Gothic Revival style house with a similar massing and roof shape to 185 that meets the style requirements by the authors. All that the Building at 185 has in common is the massing, roof shape and the centre gable. It lacks all the details of this architectural style. Even the windows and the door location on the principal elevation of 185 are very poor and heavily altered examples of this style.



*Figure 5.2
108 Albion Street, Brantford.
[Source: Google Street view, 2012].*

Similar Gothic Revival style house-form buildings with a one storey massing and similar roof shape are found in London that more closely conform to the to the style requirements than the subject property. These properties, shown in Figure 5.3, are designated under the OHA and in a better state of conservation.



*Figure 5.3 Other London one Storey, Gothic Revival styled House-Form Heritage Buildings
39 Carfrae Street (left - 2007), 477 Waterloo Street (333 Dufferin Avenue) (right - 2019)
[Source: National Historic Places (left), Google Street View (right)].*

Interior – As shown in the record of photographs of the interior of taken during the site visit (**Appendix F**), most of the interior has been gutted with all plaster work, doors, many wall partitions and most trim (door and window casings and baseboard) removed. Only in Room 2 on the ground floor has a door casing and baseboard been retained. Most of the north wall of the original tail wing been removed following the north addition to the tail wing sometime between 1990 and 1999. The tail wing was underpinned, and a basement dug out under part of that section of the structure. There is only a crawl space under the rest of the Building. The concrete pads under the brick piers in the crawl space suggest that additional structural reinforcement of the Building occurred sometime after 1900.

Landscape – As shown in **Appendix H**, most of the rear yard is a paved parking surface with a few shrubs or young trees along the boundary. The front yard consists of concrete paving slabs and a gravel planting area with a few low shrubs. This landscape did not exist in 1922

(*Appendix D*). Wellington Street was widened in the 1950s or 1960s removing most of the original front yard.

5.2 189 Wellington Street – Building & Landscape

This Building was built as a rental property around 1856 for Robert Leathorn based on an 1855 map and the 1861 Census. John Price, who later bought the property may have rented it prior to purchasing it in 1863.

Exterior - The Building, which is setback between 1.1 and 2.2 feet (0.32 and 0.69 metres) from the Wellington Street right-of-way, is a single detached, one storey frame structure clad in yellow brick laid in a common bond on the principal elevation and grey asbestos⁴³ shingle siding on other elevations. The Building rests on a concrete, rock-faced block foundation. The use of concrete blocks suggest that the Building was raised sometime after 1910.




Figure 5.4
189 Wellington Street,
South and East Elevations,
2020

This Building is rectangular in plan measuring approximately 30 feet 9 inches by 47 feet ½ inches, the latter including a 22-foot 11 inch tail wing that is recessed by 4 feet 1 inch on the south elevation. Evidence of an earlier tail wing was not visible on the exterior.

The front section of the Building is capped by a low pitched, gable roof with the gable facing the Building sides. Originally it also had a centre gable on the front of the Building like 185 Wellington Street. However, with the addition of the brick façade on the principal elevation, the gable has been widened although hidden behind the brick parapet. The tail wing is capped by a low-pitched hip roof. The black asphalt shingled roof has unadorned projecting eaves with soffits clad in plain wooden boards and fascia clad with metal eaves trough except on the gable ends which have plain board fascia. There is no evidence of decorative brackets supporting the eaves. (*Appendix E*). There is a single flue, square brick chimney stack towards the northwest corner of the main section of the Building (*Appendix F*).

⁴³ The shingles appear to be asbestos, but this was not confirmed during the on-site visit.

Window openings are a variety of rectangular shapes with flat heads and no sills except for the south window on the front elevation, which has a brick sill. These openings, with the same exception, have modern sash clad in synthetic materials. The exception on the south side of the front elevation is divided in three, with a large fixed centre sash flank by smaller narrow units with one over one sash. The openings were not measured as they are all relatively modern alterations.

There are three door openings on the Building – one on the front and two on the south side. All have relatively modern wood doors with upper glazed panels.

The one storey tail wing is a frame structure clad in the same siding and roofing as the front section of the Building. The tail wing rests on a plain concrete block foundation.

East Elevation – The east or principal elevation contains a symmetrical three bay façade with a centre door (*Appendix E* and Figure 5.4) flanked by two modern window openings. The front door opening contains a concrete threshold and a modern, single leaf, solid, two paneled door with an upper glazed panel. The door may have been flanked by side lights and a transom, but those features are now covered with wood on both the exterior and interior. Concrete steps accessing the front door and a semi-circular vinyl sign band is over the door.

The brick façade and extension to the front of the Building was added around 1960. No front veranda is shown on in any of the Fire Insurance plans (*Appendix C*) or aerial photos.

South Elevation – This elevation contains three parts – the front brick section, the original gable end of the Building and the tail wing. The gable contains clapboard siding and a plain frieze board below the west soffit suggesting this section of the roof was raised on the west side. Based on the difference in siding around the openings, the two window appear to have been reduced in size. Where the tail wing has lost the shingle siding, the plain, horizontal board construction of the wing is visible. The two door openings on the south side have upper glazed panels and lower wood panels. Concrete steps access to the east door.

The foundation contains one in-filled basement window opening in the front section and one in the tail wing. The modern concrete block foundation of the rear of the tail wing suggests either the tail wing is a recent addition or an older section underpinned by a new foundation.

West Elevation – This elevation contains two altered, ground floor window openings and one in-filled basement window opening.

North Elevation - The south elevation has two altered window openings and is clad in the same siding as the south and rear elevations.

Alterations to the exterior of this Building include:

- addition of a full front elevation and extension in a different architectural style and building material from the rest of the Building;
- change in siding to the rest of the Building; it is unlikely the original siding remains under the shingle siding;
- replacing all of the original foundation with concrete blocks;
- change in size and sash of all window openings except one;
- replacement of all doors;
- alterations to the rear of the tail wing; and
- Replacement of all original chimneys with one 1950s chimney.

No early photographs could be found of the Building and the builder and architect, if any, could not be identified.

Architectural Style - The Building exhibits no particular architectural style with a 1960s retail brick façade replacing a 1850s residential elevation.

Interior – The interior photographs of 189 Wellington Street taken during the site visit (**Appendix F**) show that the interior has been gutted and reconfigured with new internal partitions. All early doors and trim (door and window casings and baseboards) have been removed and, in the front section of the Building, new floor levels. The original front of the Building has been completely removed by the addition of the front extension and façade. Further, the original foundation of the Building has been replaced with concrete block, a material not available when the Building was constructed. Some original brick foundation remains in isolated locations in the basement. The roof has been altered with the construction of the tail wing and front section of the Building.

Landscape – As shown in **Appendix H**, most of the rear yard is lawn with a few young trees or shrubs along the rear boundary and in the side yard with the property to the north. The front yard is all concrete slabs. This landscape did not exist in 1922 (**Appendix D**) which, in the front yard prior to the widening of Wellington Street, was a grassed with a centre walkway to the front door, and, in the rear yard, a garage, trees, grass and walkways.

5.3 Adjacent/Nearby Heritage Properties

The adjacent / nearby heritage properties are shown in **Appendix J**. The heritage features of those properties are briefly described in section 2.5 of this CHIS. All heritage features relate to the structures and not the landscapes. The properties on the Wellington Street block face between Grey and Simcoe Streets are shown in Figure 5.5, while the adjacent properties are also shown in context with the subject site in Figure 5.6.

On all properties on the west side of Wellington Street, the heritage structures are close to and, in most cases, adjacent to the Street right-of-way. On the two properties on the east side of the Street, the structures are set back from the right-of-way providing room for a narrow, landscaped front yard. In terms of the front yards of properties abutting the subject site, 191-193 Wellington is adjacent to the right-of-way, while 181 has a narrow front yard, part of which is paved.

The building heights on the west side of Wellington (Figure 5.5) range from 3 stories at the north end to 1 ½ abutting the north side of the subject site. On the east side of the Street, the two late nineteenth century, yellow brick, house-form structures are 1 and 2 ½ storeys. The mid to late nineteenth century west side properties consist of three house-form structures, both in yellow brick, and three mixed commercial - residential structures, two with flat roofs and of brick construction. The abutting property south of the subject site is 2 storeys.

As shown in Figure 5.5, the west side block face is characterized by its variety of built forms, heights, roof shapes, building materials and fenestration.

Figure 5.5 West Block Face of Wellington Street between Grey and Simcoe Streets showing the Subject Properties




Figure 5.6 Heritage Properties Adjacent to the Subject Site

2020



1881



1922



6.0 HERITAGE RESOURCE EVALUATION

6.1 Introduction

Criteria for determining the cultural heritage value or interest of a property are specified in Ontario Regulation 9/06 and repeated in the London OP (Section 3.3, policy 573). The criteria assist in evaluating properties for designation. They are grouped into three categories – design or physical value, historical or associative value and contextual value. A property must meet only one of the criteria to warrant designation.

The criteria are insufficient to determine the merits of heritage resource conservation. Other factors that should be considered include resource condition – the extent of deterioration in the attributes and fabric of a resource – and heritage integrity – the extent to which heritage attributes (character defining features) remain in place.

6.2 Application of Provincial Criteria

In this report, the application of the criteria, in addition to condition and heritage integrity, are based on a thorough examination of the site. They have been applied to the Buildings and landscape on both properties. Table 6.1 summarizes the evaluation.

6.2.1 185 Wellington Street - Cultural Heritage Value

Design or Physical Value:

- i. Example of a style, type, expression, material or construction method

The Building, on the exterior, is not a rare, unique or representative example of a vernacular interpretation of the ‘Gothic Revival’ or ‘Ontario Cottage’ architectural style. As discussed in section 5.1, the Building, except for its massing and roof shape, lacks the details of this style. With no documentary evidence of its early appearance, it cannot be restored to its original character; any such work would be speculative. Since there is little heritage fabric left, except for the frame and foundation, any ‘restoration’ would incorporate little visible heritage fabric.

- ii. Display a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit

The Building does not display a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit on either the exterior or interior.

- iii. High technical or scientific achievement

This construction and design of the Building does not demonstrate high technical or scientific achievement.

| Table 6.1 Application of Heritage Criteria to the Resources of 185 & 189 Wellington Street, London | | | | |
|---|------------------------------|------------------|------------------------------|------------------|
| Criteria | Resource | | | |
| | 185 Wellington Street | | 189 Wellington Street | |
| | Building | Landscape | Building | Landscape |
| Design or Physical Value | | | | |
| i. Rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, expression, material or construction method. | No | No | No | No |
| ii. Displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit. | No | No | No | No |
| iii. Demonstrates a high technical or scientific achievement | No | No | No | No |
| Historical or Associative Value | | | | |
| i. Has direct association with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization or institution of community significance | No | No | * | No |
| ii. Yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of a community or culture | No | No | No | No |
| iii. Demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer or theorist significant to a community | No | No | No | No |
| Contextual Value | | | | |
| i. Is important in defining, maintaining, or supporting the area character. | No | No | No | No |
| ii. Is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings. | Yes | No | * | No |
| iii. Is a landmark | No | No | No | No |
| Condition / Heritage Integrity | | | | |
| i. Significant condition problems - | Minor | N/A | Minor | N/A |
| ii. Integrity – retains much of its original built heritage character - | Low – exterior only | N/A | No | N/A |

N/A – Not Applicable; * - Marginal

Historical or associative value:

- i. The Building, in either its owners or residents, is not directly associated with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization or institution of community significance.

Although it was constructed during the early years of the railway boom in London, it was not directly associated with the railway. For a brief time in the 1870s, a railway employee rented the house.

- ii. The Building does not yield or have the potential to yield information that contributes to an understanding of London or its culture.

The Building was a rental property that was used as a residence for a variety of people and, in the mid-twentieth century, it was a beauty salon for roughly 30 years.

- iii. Even if the Building's designer and or builder could be determined, which they have not, the Building has limited value demonstrating the body of work or ideas of such a person.

Contextual Value:

- i. The Building is not important in defining, maintaining or supporting the area character.

As shown in Figure 5.4, the character of the Wellington Street block between Grey and Simcoe Streets is diverse, with no architectural style or building material dominating the area character. The Building does not define the character of the area; it is not essential to its maintenance nor does it support that character.

- ii. The Building is physically, visually and historically linked to its site and the street on which it has been located for more than 160 years.
- iii. The Building is not a landmark.

It is not an important point of reference in the landscape; it does not terminate a view or vista; it is not a building of such note that general public have regard for it.

Condition and Heritage Integrity:

- i. The Building does not appear to have any significant condition issues.

The Building appears to be structurally sound – there are only minor cracks in the foundation brickwork but no evidence of bowing or distortion of the ground floor walls. The roof appears to be water-tight. The basement was dry.

- ii. The Building has only limited heritage integrity.

On the interior, only a few pieces of trim remain; the rest of the interior has been gutted. On the exterior, the Building maintains its original massing and roof shape. Both the size and sash of windows have been altered, as has the front door. Modern synthetic cladding has replaced original siding. All decorative details and chimneys have been removed from the Building. Any attempt to replicate lots features of this Building would be speculative as no early photographs of it could be found.

Landscape

The current landscape, a paved parking area and front yard planting bed, has no cultural heritage value. None of it is associated with the early use of the Building nor is it a designed landscape of note.

6.2.2 189 Wellington Street – Cultural Heritage Value

Design or Physical Value:

- i. Example of a style, type, expression, material or construction method

The Building, on the exterior, is not a rare, unique or representative example of any architectural style. As discussed in section 5.2, the Building, because of alterations, does not represent any architectural style. With no documentary evidence of its early appearance, it cannot be restored to its original character; any such work would be speculative and incorporate little, if any, heritage fabric.

- ii. Display a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit

The Building does not display a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit on either its exterior or interior.

- iii. High technical or scientific achievement

This Building, in its construction or design, does not demonstrate high technical or scientific achievement.

Historical or associative value:

- i. The Building, based on its owners or residents, is not directly associated with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization or institution of community significance.

Although the Building was constructed during the early years of the railway boom in London, it has a marginal association with the railway. For approximately fifty years, John Price, a railway employee, owned the property, although he and his family only lived in it for about twenty years. The Building was not constructed specifically for him but was built by Robert Leathorn as a rental property. For these reasons, it is noted as having a marginal connection with the City's railway development.

- ii. The Building does not yield or have the potential to yield information that contributes to an understanding of London or its culture.

The Building was a rental property that was used as a residence for a variety of people and in the mid-twentieth century it served as a barber shop for roughly 20 years and later was used as a retail outlet and residence.

- iii. Even if the designer and or builder of this Building could be determined, which it has not, the Building would have little to no value in demonstrating the body of work or ideas of such a person because of later alterations.

Contextual Value:

- iv. The Building is not important in defining, maintaining or supporting the area character.

As shown in Figure 5.4, the character of the Wellington Street block between Grey and Simcoe Streets is diverse, with no architectural style or building material dominating its character. The Building does not define the character of the area; it is not essential to its maintenance nor does it support that character.

- v. The Building is physically and historically linked to its site and the street on which it has been located for more than 160 years. However, the visual linkage of the Building to the site is tenuous with the severe front alterations made in the later part of the 20th century. For this reason it is noted as having a marginal value for this criteria.
- vi. The Building is not a landmark.

It is not an important point of reference in the landscape; it does not terminate a view or vista; it is not a building of such note that general public have regard for it.

Condition and Heritage Integrity:

- i. The Building has some condition issues.

The Building appears to be structurally sound – there is no evidence of bowing or distortion of the ground floor walls or the foundation. However, the shingle siding has been lost from parts of the Building. The siding, if it is asbestos shingles, is an environmental hazard as they deteriorate over time. The roof appears to be mostly water-tight, although the loss of some downspouts has discoloured brickwork and there is some water damage in Room 8. The basement has a number of damp areas. There has been some vandalism to interior walls and ceilings.

- ii. The Building has minimal heritage integrity.

The interior has been gutted; no heritage fabric remains. The floor levels in the front of the Building have been altered. The original massing, roof shape and front façade have not been maintained. On the sides and rear of the structure, the size and sash of windows have been altered; the siding has been changed as have exterior doors. There is no original siding under the existing shingle siding. All decorative details, if there were any, and original chimneys have been removed. Any attempt to replicate lost features would be speculative as no early photographs could be found; even the framing for the east elevation frame would have to be entirely replaced.

Landscape

The current landscape, a greased rear yard has no cultural heritage value. None of it is associated with the early use of the Building nor is it a designed landscape of note.

6.3 Summary of Cultural Heritage Values of the Subject Site

Even though the building 185 Wellington Street has long been associated with the site, it meets no other criteria making it worthy of designation. Indeed the extent of alteration to the Building compromises its heritage value. The structure, in its current state, lacks most of the architectural details of the ‘Gothic Revival’ style. Any ‘restoration’ work on those lost features would be speculative due to the lack of documentary evidence. The building is not important in defining or maintaining the character of the immediate streetscape. For these reasons the building at 185 Wellington Street does not warrant conservation.

Similarly, the building at 189 Wellington Street does not have sufficient cultural value or interest as defined by provincial regulation or London OP policy 573 to warrant heritage conservation under the *Act*. Most heritage values of this building have been lost as a result of later alterations, especially to the front façade. Lack of documentary evidence, especially old photographs, prohibits reconstruction of those features, a requisite for appropriate restoration under the federal Standards and Guidelines (see section 3.4).

6.4 Statement of Cultural Heritage Value and Heritage Attributes –

Since this report has determined that the properties do not have sufficient cultural heritage value to warrant conservation under the *Act* or London OP policy 573, a statement of the cultural heritage value and attributes of each of the properties was not prepared.

6.5 Adjacent/Nearby Heritage Properties Cultural Heritage Values

The potential cultural heritage values of the adjacent / nearby heritage properties are described in sections 2.5 and 5.4 of this CHIS. Such values relative to the criteria of *OHA* Regulation 9/06 and London OP policy 573 are summarized in Table 6.2. They were determined based on ownership information in the case of 181 Wellington Street and a combination of maps (1855), fire insurance plans, aerial photographs, recent photographs, site inspections from the street and the experience of the author. Any proposals to designate these properties under the *Act* should be accompanied by a more thorough analysis – both historical and architectural.

Notwithstanding this qualification, all properties except 197 – 199 Wellington Street, have potential cultural heritage values that indicate that they warrant consideration for designation under the *Act*. Alterations to the front façade of 197 – 199 Wellington Street suggest that it may not warrant conservation.

| Table 6.2 Potential Cultural Heritage Values – Properties Adjacent to or Near 185 & 189 Wellington Street, London | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|-----|-----|-----|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Criteria | Resource – Property – Wellington Street | | | | | | | |
| | 161-171 | 181 | 184 | 190 | 193-5 | 197-9 | 201-3 | 205-9 |
| Design or Physical Value | | | | | | | | |
| i. 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. | | | | | | | | |
| iii. Demonstrates a high technical or scientific achievement | U | U | U | U | U | U | U | U |
| Historical or Associative Value | | | | | | | | |
| i. Has direct association with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization or institution of community significance | | √ | U | U | U | U | U | U |
| ii. Yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of a community or culture | U | U | U | U | U | U | U | U |
| iii. Demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer or theorist significant to a community | U | √ | U | U | U | U | U | U |
| Contextual Value | | | | | | | | |
| i. Is important in defining, maintaining, or supporting the area character. | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | | √ | √ |
| ii. Is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings. | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | | √ | √ |
| iii. Is a landmark | | | | | | | | √ |
| Condition / Heritage Integrity | | | | | | | | |
| i. Significant condition problems - | U | U | U | U | U | U | U | U |
| ii. Integrity – retains much of its original built heritage character - | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | | √ | √ |

√ - potentially meets criteria; U - Unknown

7.0 DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL

7.1 Description of the Development Proposal

The owner, as shown in Concept Plans (*Appendix K*), is proposing to develop the site in two phases.

Phase One involves removing the existing building at 189 Wellington Street and constructing a three storey (14 metre) building with one ground floor commercial unit and six upper floor residential units, three per floor. Eight surface parking spaces would be provided to the rear of the site (some of the parking spaces would be in the rear of the property at 185 Wellington Street) with access to the parking provided on the north side of the building at the ground floor level. The building would be constructed abutting the east or Wellington Street property line. The east elevation would be finished in two different materials as shown in Figure 7.1, with the materials still to be determined.



Figure 7.1 *Proposed East (Wellington Street) Elevation in Context, Phase One*
[Source: CSPACE Architecture, December 2, 2020, with photo inserts].

Phase Two involves removing the existing building at 185 Wellington Street and constructing a three storey (14 metre) addition to the building at 189 Wellington Street. The addition would have two ground floor commercial units and eight upper floor residential units, four per floor. Four additional surface parking spaces would be provided to the rear of the site with access to the parking provided on the north side of the building at 189 Wellington Street at the ground floor level. The building would be constructed abutting the east or Wellington Street property line. The east elevation would be finished in two different materials as shown in Figure 7.2, with the materials still to be determined.

Statistics for the completed building on the site (185 and 189 Wellington Street) are shown in Table 7.1. Once completed, the building would have fourteen upper floor residential units, three ground floor commercial units and twelve parking spaces accessed through a ground floor, two way driveway at the north end of the site.



Figure 7.2 Proposed East (Wellington Street) Elevation in Context, Phases One and Two
 [Source: CSPACE Architecture, December 2, 2020, with photo inserts].

| | Phase One | Phase Two | Completed Structure |
|-----------------|-----------|-----------|---------------------|
| Commercial | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Residential | 6 | 8 | 14 |
| Parking Spaces | 8 | 4 | 12 |
| Front Yard | 0.0 m | 0.0 m | 0.0 m |
| North Side yard | 0.0 m | 0.0 m | 0.0 m |
| South Side yard | NA | 0.0 m | 0.0 m |
| Height | 14 m | 14 m | 14 m |

The development proposal generally complies with the Official Plan but requires variances to the Zoning By-law in respect to height and number of parking spaces.

8.0 DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL IMPACT ON HERITAGE RESOURCES

8.1 Impact of the Proposed Development on the Subject Site

As discussed in Chapter 7 and shown in *Appendix K*, the proposed development, when phase two is complete, will have resulted in the demolition and removal of existing structures and landscapes on 185 and 189 Wellington Street. Since it was determined, after an evaluation using provincial and municipal criteria, that the built and landscape resources of both properties do not warrant heritage conservation, no heritage resources on the subject site will be altered or lost by completion of the proposed development.

8.2 Impact of the Proposed Development on Adjacent/Nearby Heritage Resources


Adjacent heritage properties -

193 – 195 Wellington Street –

This property abuts the subject site's north boundary as shown in Figures 7.1 and 7.2 and *Appendix K*.

The existing heritage structure at 193 – 195 Wellington Street has been constructed between 0.21 and 0.25 metres from the common property boundary. The proposed piers for the parking garage will be constructed 0.2 metres from the common boundary as shown in the Site/Ground Floor Plan in *Appendix K*. The existing house at 193 – 195 Wellington Street is setback from boundary with the Wellington Street right-of-way approximately 0.5 metres. The existing building at 189 Wellington Street is setback 0.32 metres from the right-of-way. The existing setback relationship between the two buildings is shown in Figure 8.1. The proposed pier and building at 189 Wellington Street will be setback 0.0 metres from the Wellington Street boundary.

*Figure 8.1
189 – 197 Wellington Street,
Building alignments with Wellington Street,
2020*



The proposed development will not have a direct impact on the heritage attributes of the heritage structure at 193 – 195 Wellington Street. All existing attributes – the height, massing, roof shape, fenestration and cladding will remain. Should the

owner of 193 – 195 wish to restore the original siding of the structure, it could still be done after construction of the proposed development at 189 Wellington Street.

However, the proposed development will have visual impacts on 193 – 195 Wellington Street. The proposed building will be set closer to the street than the existing building, limiting views of the heritage structure at 193 - 195 as one walks along the sidewalk. The height of the proposed building will be slightly more than one storey higher than the building at 193 - 195. Lastly, the soft landscaping between the two existing buildings will be replaced by a hard landscape - driveway, building piers and, above the ground floor, the new building.

181 Wellington Street –

This property abuts the subject site’s south boundary of the site as shown in Figure 7.2 and **Appendix K** and will be most affected by Phase two of the development.

The existing heritage structure at 181 Wellington Street has been built between 2.54 and 2.49 metres from the common property boundary as shown in Figure 8.2. This setback on 181 provides for a driveway to the rear of the property at 181. The existing house at 185 Wellington Street is setback between 0.69 and 0.7 metres from the common property boundary. The setback area on 185 has been largely paved and forms part of the driveway for 181.



*Figure 8.2
181 – 185 Wellington Street,
Shared Side Yard Conditions,
2020*

The proposed building at 185 – 189 Wellington Street will be constructed 0.0 metres from the common boundary.

In terms of Wellington Street setback (often referred to as the front yard setback), the existing houses at 181 and 185 are both setback approximately 2.2 metres from the Street right-of-way as shown In Figure 8.3. The proposed building at 185 - 189 Wellington Street will be setback 0.0 metres from the Wellington Street right-of-way.

Figure 8.3
181 – 185 Wellington Street,
Building setbacks and alignments with
Wellington Street, 2020



The proposed development will not have a direct impact on the heritage attributes of the heritage structure at 181 Wellington Street. All existing attributes – the height, massing, roof shape, fenestration and cladding will remain.

However, the proposed development will have visual impacts on 181 Wellington Street. The proposed building will be set closer to the street than the existing building, limiting views of the heritage structure at 181 as one walks along the sidewalk. The height of the proposed building will be one storey higher than the building at 181. The side yard condition between the two buildings will not be severely affected as there will still be a 2.5 metre separation between the existing building at 181 and the proposed building at 185 - 189.

Nearby heritage properties – Excluding adjacent heritage properties, the heritage attributes of and visual setting for the nearby heritage properties will not be adversely affected by the proposed development given the three storey or 14 metre height of the proposed development and the distance between the subject site and the nearby heritage properties. However, for all heritage resources along the west side of Wellington Street between Grey and Simcoe Streets (Figure 5.5), the proposed development, when both phases are complete, will present a longer front facade on the block face than currently exists for any other building on the west side.

9.0 OPTIONS, CONSERVATION, MITIGATION AND POLICY COMPLIANCE

9.1 Options for Managing Resource on the Subject Site

Since the heritage resources of 185 and 189 Wellington Street (the subject site) were evaluated using provincial and municipal criteria to determine whether a property warrants heritage conservation and it was determined that neither warranted such conservation, no options were considered for their conservation.

As these properties are listed by the Council of the City of London under subsection 27.1 of the *OHA*, approval of the Council is required for the demolition of any structures on these properties. Accordingly, this report recommends that the City of London grant approval for the demolition of the structures on the subject site when the owner has obtained approval for the new structures to be built on the site. This report also recommends that the owner not apply for demolition of the structures until Council grants approval of plans for the new structures on the site.

9.2 Mitigation / Conservation Measures

In order to meet the heritage requirements of applicable legislation and to conserve the heritage values of properties adjacent and nearby resources the subject site, the following measures are recommended.

9.2.1 Documentation of Resources to be Demolished

London Official Plan Policy 567 specifies that archival documentation of a cultural heritage resource may be required in the event of demolition of a resource.

This CHIS includes a comprehensive set of photographs of the exteriors, interiors and landscapes of the subject site. It also provides floor plan sketches of each Building. This documentation provides an archival record of the subject site. It is recommended that this CHIS be considered as fulfilling the archival requirements of policy 567.

9.2.2 Salvage of Features and Commemoration of the Site

London Official Plan Policy 569 specifies that, in the event of approved demolition, retention of architectural or landscape features and use of interpretive techniques may be required.

This CHIS examined the exteriors and interiors of both buildings and determined there was little left other than a few baseboards and door casings in 185 Wellington Street. It is not recommended that any architectural features be salvaged from the site.

This CHIS examined the history of the site and its context in some detail and attempted to find historical photographs to illustrate the evolution of the properties. No such photographs could be found and the historical development of the site was not noteworthy for its historical or associative values, other than being an indirect product of the early railway development of the City. As a result, no interpretive techniques, such as heritage plaques, are recommended as a condition of approval of this development.

9.2.3 Addressing Visual Impacts on Adjacent / Nearby Heritage Resources

London Official Plan Policy 565 specifies that new development adjacent to listed properties be designed to protect their heritage attributes and minimize visual and physical impacts.

This CHIS examined the cultural heritage values and attributes of adjacent and nearby heritage resources. It determined that there will be no adverse impact on the heritage attributes of adjacent and nearby properties from the proposed development. However, it did determine that there will be some visual impacts. Such impacts arise from the zero front yard setback and the overall length of the frontage of the proposed development relative to other buildings on the west side of Wellington Street.

9.2.3.1 Setbacks from Wellington Street

It is currently proposed that both phases of the proposed building have a setback of 0.0 metres from the Wellington Street right-of-way. As discussed in section 8.2 of this CHIS, this setback will affect views of the adjacent heritage buildings at 181 and 191-193 Wellington Street, both of which are setback varying distances from the right-of-way.

To address this visual impact, it is recommended that sections of the front façade of the east elevation be setback one (1) metre as shown in Figure 9.1. This would provide for greater visibility of the adjacent heritage buildings and better reflect the varying setback conditions that currently exist among the heritage resources on this west side of Wellington Street.

9.2.3.2 Exterior Material Palette

Although materials to be used in cladding the exterior of the proposed building have not been determined, the Concept Plan (Figure 9.1 and *Appendix K*) shows different materials on the ground floor and the upper floors and in one of the central bays. While this helps to visually mitigate the length and height of the proposed building, such materials, including their colour, should be appropriate to the area's heritage character. In addition, use of different materials on the ground floor of one or several bays should be explored to mitigate visual impacts. It is recommended that the owner's consultants and City heritage staff work together to determine an appropriate exterior material palette for the proposed building.




Figure 9.1
Recommended Building Setbacks from Wellington Street

9.2.3.3 Landscaping next to 191-193 Wellington Street

As discussed in section 8.2 of this CHIS, the existing soft landscaping between 189 and 191-193 Wellington Street will be lost with the construction of the proposed building. The open ground floor north wall presents an opportunity to reintroduce a landscaping feature, albeit a narrow one, to mitigate the loss of this landscaping feature. It is recommended that landscaping beds be included along the ground floor north wall between the pillars of the parking garage.

9.2.3.4 Upper Floor Stepbacks

To further address the visual impact on the adjacent heritage resources, stepback of the upper floors by an additional one to two metres, providing balcony areas using clear glass guard balustrades was considered. Such a stepback would be permitted by the area Zoning By-law. However, given that the adjacent heritage structures are between one and one-half and two storeys and the proposed building is only three storeys in height, such a modification to the proposed development was not considered necessary.

9.3 Policy Compliance

Table 9.1 shows compliance of the proposed development, as modified by recommendations of this report, with applicable heritage policies. As the Table shows, the development proposal complies with the applicable heritage policies.

| No. | Policy | Policy Summary | Discussion | Complies? |
|-----|--------------------------|--|--|--|
| 1 | PPS Policy 2.6.1 | Conserve significant cultural heritage resources | No Significant cultural heritage resources will be demolished by this development | Yes |
| 2 | PPS Policy 2.6.3 | Development adjacent to protected heritage properties | There are no 'protected' heritage properties | Yes |
| 3 | OHA – 27.1 | No demolition on listed properties except with Council approval | Owner will apply to the Council for heritage permit to demolish | Yes – owner will comply - approval process |
| 4 | London OP Policy 554 - 2 | Conserve cultural heritage resources | Cultural heritage resources have been evaluated & significant resources will be conserved | Yes |
| 5 | London OP Policy 554 - 3 | New development sensitive to cultural heritage resources | Proposed development through mitigation measures is sensitive | Yes |
| 6 | London OP Policy 565 | New development protect heritage attributes & minimize visual & physical impact; conduct impact assessment | Proposed development does not affect heritage attributes of adjacent heritage properties and minimizes visual impact; this CHIS is the impact assessment | Yes |
| 7 | London OP Policy 567 | Demolition – archival documentation | This CHIS provides archival documentation | Yes |
| 8 | London OP Policy 569 | Demolition – salvage & interpretation | No heritage fabric worth salvaging; no heritage storey worth plaquing | Yes |
| 9 | London OP Policy 573 | Criteria for evaluation properties for cultural heritage value | Subject site and adjacent / nearby properties evaluation using criteria; results in Tables 6.1 & 6.2 | Yes |
| 10 | London OP Policy 586 | No development adjacent to listed properties unless heritage attributes conserved | The proposed development will not result in the loss of heritage attributes on adjacent listed heritage properties | Yes |
| 11 | London OP Policy 590 | No demolition on listed properties except with Council's approval | Demolition will not be sought until such time as Council has approved the replacement building | Yes |
| 12 | London OP Policy 591 | No demolition without implementation of mitigation measures & salvage of heritage materials | Mitigation measures are part of the approval of the new development; no heritage fabric on subject site worth salvaging | Yes |

The proposal also complies with the City's Official Plan land use policies and Zoning By-law except with respect to height, where the proposal is for 14 metres and the zoning permits a maximum of 12 metres, and the number of parking spaces.

10.0 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The owners of an approximately 879 square metre (9,460 square feet) site on the west side of Wellington Street between Simcoe and Grey Streets in the City of London propose to construct a three storey, ‘Main Street’ type building with residential and commercial uses. A Concept Plan (*Appendix K*) has been prepared. The owners will be submitting applications for Site Plan Approval and Zoning By-law variances. The site contains two properties, 185 and 189 Wellington Street, which are listed in the City’s Register of Heritage Properties under the *Ontario Heritage Act*. The properties are not designated under that *Act*.

10.1 Conclusions

After a detailed examination of the history and evaluation of the resources on the site, this Cultural Heritage Impact Statement (CHIS) found that neither of the two properties warrant designation under the *Act*. Although the structures were built in the 1850s during the early railway boom in the City, later unsympathetic alterations have resulted in the structures and associated landscapes not having significant cultural heritage values, whether those values are design, historical or contextual. This CHIS also found that adjacent and nearby properties have potential cultural heritage value and may warrant protection under the *Act*.

Based on those findings, this CHIS evaluated the impact of the construction of the proposed development on the adjacent / nearby heritage properties. It found that the proposed building will not have an adverse effect of the heritage attributes of those adjacent / nearby properties and, with mitigating measures specified in chapter 9 of this CHIS, will not have an adverse visual impact on those properties.

10.2 Recommendations

Based on the analysis and evaluation of this CHIS, it is recommended that:

the City:

1. in regard to the proposed development at 185 and 189 Wellington Street, accept this CHIS as fulfilling the impact assessment requirements of Official Plan policy 565;
2. approve the demolition of the structures and alteration of the landscapes on the listed properties at 185 and 185 Wellington Street once plans for the replacement building for those properties described in recommendation 3 has been approved;
3. approve the plans for the replacement building generally in accord with the Concept Plan contained in *Appendix K* of this CHIS with modifications for the

Wellington Street setback, the exterior material palette and landscaping contained in sections 9.2.3.1, 9.2.3.2 and 9.2.3.3 of this CHIS;

4. accept this CHIS as sufficient archival documentation of the existing buildings and landscapes at 185 and 189 Wellington Street and that no further archival documentation be required of the owner;
5. not require the salvage of any materials from the demolition of the buildings at 185 and 189 Wellington Street as there is little heritage fabric worth salvaging; and
6. not require any commemorative interpretation program for this site; and

the owner:

7. not apply for demolition permits for the structures at 185 and 189 Wellington Street until plans for the replacement building for the site have been approved; and
8. work with City staff to develop an appropriate exterior material palette for the proposed building.

SOURCES CONSULTED

Publications

Arnold, Thomas G. & Associates. *Stage 1 and Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment of 185 – 189 Wellington Street ... Formerly Part of Lot 15, Concession C, London Township, Middlesex County. Draft.* London. 29 November 2020.

Beck, Julia; Spicer, Elizabeth. *Brackets & Bargeboards, Walks in London.* Architectural Conservancy of Ontario Inc., London Region Branch. London, Ontario: 1989.

Blumenson, John. *Ontario Architecture A guide to Styles and Building Terms 1784 to the Present.* Fitzhenry & Whiteside. Toronto. 1990.

Brosseau, Mathilde. *Gothic Revival in Canadian Architecture.* Canadian Historic Sites, Occasional Papers in Archaeology and History. Ottawa: Parks Canada. 1980.

Byers, Mary; McBurney, Margaret. *The Governor's Road.* University of Toronto Press. Toronto. 1982.

Census of Canada. London City, Ontario (Canada West). 1851, 1861, 1871, 1881, 1891, 1901, 1911 and 1921.

Chapman, L. J.; Putnam, D. F. *The Physiography of Southern Ontario.* 2nd Edition. University of Toronto Press. Toronto. 1966.

City of London. *Official Plan.* Office Consolidation, November 2019.

City of London. *Register of Cultural Heritage Resources.* July 2, 2019.

City of London. *Zoning By-law.* Office Consolidation, November 2019.

Dean, W. G., editor. *Economic Atlas of Ontario.* University of Toronto Press. Toronto. 1969.

Gentilcore, Louis; Donkin, Kate. Land Surveys of Southern Ontario, Supplement No. 2 to the *Canadian Cartographer*, Vol. 10, 1973.

Gentilcore, R. Louis; Head, C. Grant. *Ontario's History in Maps.* University of Toronto Press. Toronto. 1984.

McIlwraith, Thomas. F. *Looking for Old Ontario.* University of Toronto Press. Toronto. 1997.

Ontario Heritage Act, R.S.O. Chapter 0.18.

Ontario Ministry of Culture. *Heritage Resources in the Land Use Planning Process*. Queen's Printer for Ontario, Toronto, 2006.

Ontario Ministry of Public Infrastructure Renewal. *Places to Grow, Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe*. Queen's Printer for Ontario. Toronto. 2006.

Ontario Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing, *Provincial Policy Statement 2020*, Queen's Printer for Ontario, Toronto, 2020.

Ontario Regulation 9/06 made under the *Ontario Heritage Act, Criteria for Determining Cultural Heritage Value or Interest*, January 25, 2006.

Parks Canada. *Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada*. Second Edition. Ottawa. 2010.

Smith, Wm. H. *Smith's Canadian Gazetteer... Canada West*. H. & W. Rowsell. Toronto. 1846.

Tausky, Nancy; DiStefano, Lynne. *Victorian Architecture in London and Southwestern Ontario*. University of Toronto Press. Toronto: 1986.

City Directories

Cherrier & Kirwin's London Directory for 1872-73. Cherrier & Kirwin Publishers. Montreal.

Foster's London City and Middlesex County Directory, 1901. J. G. Foster & Co. Toronto.

McAlpine's London City and County of Middlesex Directory, 1875. McAlpine, Everett & Co.

Might's London City and County of Middlesex Directory, 1891, 1895. Might's Directory Co. Toronto. 1891.

Polk's London City and Middlesex County Directory, 1884. R. L. Polk & Co. Toronto. 1884.

Vernon's Directory. *London 1939, 1948, 1950, 1955, 1960, 1965, 1970, 1974, 1979, 2000*. Vernon Directories Limited. Hamilton, Ontario.

Museums / Government Offices

City of London, Planning Department, Laura Dent, Heritage Planner

City of London, Public Library, Arthur McClelland, Archivist.

Library and Archives Canada. Ottawa.

Ontario Ministry of Government Services, Land Registry Office, Peel Region, 7765 Hurontario Street, Brampton, Ontario. <https://www.onland.ca/ui/>

National Airphoto Library, Ottawa.

Maps

Department of National Defence. Geographical Section, General Staff. National Topographic System. *Map 40P/9(16), Orangeville, Ontario*. Edition 1. Scale 1:63,360, Ottawa. 1937.

Illustrated Historical Atlas of County of Middlesex Ont. H. R. Page & Co. Toronto. 1878.

See websites for Historic Maps and Fire Insurance Plans.

Websites

London City Maps – Current and Aerial Photographs – [London City Map \(arcgis.com\)](#) & [Aerial Photos Selector \(arcgis.com\)](#)

London Public Library – Digitized Historic Photograph collection – [Historic London Photographs | London Public Library](#)


National Historic Places - [HistoricPlaces.ca - Welcome to / Bienvenue à HistoricPlaces.ca / LieuxPatrimoniaux.ca](#)

University of Western Ontario – Western Libraries – Historic Maps - [London Ontario Historical Maps | Digitized Special Collections | Western University \(uwo.ca\)](#)


University of Western Ontario – Western Libraries – Fire Insurance Plans - [Fire Insurance Plan Holdings - Western Libraries - Western University \(uwo.ca\)](#)

Appendix A: Property Survey

Property Fabric



Property Survey



Source: Callon Dietz Incorporated, Ontario Land Surveyors,
 November 15, 2018.

Appendix B: Photographs - Context



West side of Wellington Street, including subject site.

View north on Wellington Street from just north of the subject site.





East side of Wellington Street directly opposite the subject site.

View south on Wellington Street from just south of the subject site.





West of the rear yards of the subject site.

South of the rear yards of the subject site.




North of the rear yards of the subject site.



Appendix C: Maps


1795
Proposed location for
'New London'




*Approximate
location of Subject
Site*

*Source: Survey of the River La Tranche or Thames from
its entrance or confluence with Lake St Clair to the
Upper Forks by M^r McNiff & M^r Jones, D. W. Smith Act^s
Surveyor Gen^l Upper Canada.*

1824



Source: Part of A Plan for London
Crown Plan 30
Department of Crown Lands, July 15, 1824
Byron Russell, Commissioner




Buildings shown in red

*Approximate
location of Subject
Site*

*Source: Sketch of the Position of London
November 1839
By Major William Sykes, 73rd Regiment*


**1855
London City Map**



*Approximate
location of Subject
Site*

*Source: Part of the 'Map of the City of
London, Canada West 1855
By S. Peters, PLS & CE*


**1855
Detail of
London City Map**



*Approximate
location of Subject
Site*

*Source: Part of the 'Map of the City of
London, Canada West 1855
By S. Peters, PLS & CE*


1872 Bird's Eye View



*Approximate
location of Subject
Site*

*Source: Part of 'Bird's Eye View of London'
Ontario, Canada 1872
Published by Strobridge & Co. Lith.*


1875
Context



*Approximate
location of Subject
Site*

1881 - 1888
 Fire Insurance Plan

Context



Legend

KEY.

| | |
|-------------------|---|
| BUILDINGS COLORED | BLUE, ARE STONE |
| | RED, ARE BRICK |
| | YELLOW, WOODEN DWELLINGS. |
| | BLACK, WOODEN SHEDS & BARN. |
| | EDGED WITH RED, ARE VENEERED. |
| | MARKED R.C. ARE ROUGH CAST OR PLASTERED |
| | FIRE-WALL ONE FOOT ABOVE ROOF. |
| | TWO FEET |
| | FRAME PARTITION. |
| | OPENING IN BRICK WALL. |
| | IRON DOORS. |
| | WINDOWS—IRON SHUTTERS. |
| | WIDEN, 1st Story. |
| | 2d " |
| | 3d & 4th story. |
| | 5th & 6th " |
| | BRICK PARAPET WALL. |
| | STABLE. |
| | GALLERY OR VERANDAH |
| | METAL CORNICE |
| | WOODEN CORNICE |
| | SKYLIGHT—LINES UNDER DENOTE OPENINGS IN FLOORS. |
| | LUMBER PILED |
| | GREEN H—SPECIALLY HAZARDOUS |
| | FIRE-ALARM BOXES |
| | ON KEY PLANS |
| | HYDRANTS |
| | FIGURES IN CIRCLES show pressure of Water on Hydrants |
| | NUMBERS PARALLEL with direction of Streets are existing |
| | Street numbers. |
| | REFERENCE NUMBERS are arbitrary, each block numbered |
| | separately. |
| | WHEN OTHER NUMBERS in same block coincide, additional |
| | arbitrary numbers are placed in front, thus 121 46. |

FIGURES IN BRACKETS (57) denote relative heights of ground (40) being low water in harbor.

NUMBERS IN STREETS, thus—57—, are street widths.

NUMBERS ON BUILDINGS 1, 1, 2, are Stories, 2/3 are heights.

HOUSES ARE UNDERSTOOD to have windows at front and back, unless otherwise noted.

WOODEN ROOFS, if not otherwise marked, have shingled roofs.

S. STORES—Occupation is stated if hazardous

W.H. S.— Wholesale Store. S.A.L. Saloon.


O.R.O. Grocer—D. D.W.O. Dwelling—St. Heat.

T. TEN. TEN. Tenement Dwellings.

DOTTED LINES in Streets show position of water pipes.


SEES are written thus 10" pipe.

Site



1907
 Fire Insurance Plan

Context



Site



Legend

| - KEY - | |
|---|--------------------------------------|
| BUILDINGS | RED ARE BRICK |
| | COLORED BLUE STONE |
| | YELLOW ARE WOODEN BUILDINGS |
| | BLACK SHEDS BARN & C. |
| | EDGED WITH RED ARE VENEERED |
| | IF MARKED R.C. ROUGH CAST OR PLASTER |
| | PROBABLE FIRE CUT OFF |
| SLATE ROOF | FIRE WALL ONE FOOT ABOVE ROOF |
| TYPED ROOF | TWO FEET |
| COMPOSITE ROOF | OPENING IN BRICK WALL |
| SHEDS OR WOODEN | OPENING WITH IRON DOORS |
| SCHEDULES IN MURALS | WOODEN PARTITION |
| MANHOLE | |
| WELL | |
| OUTRIGGER | |
| PARAPET UNDER | |
| | WINDOWS READ FROM LEFT TO RIGHT |
| | FACING BUILDING |
| | 1ST 2ND 3RD 4TH IRON SHUTTERS |
| | BRICK PARAPET WALL |
| | STABLE |
| | GALLERY OR VERANDAH |
| | METAL CORNICE (SOLID LINE) |
| | WOODEN CORNICE (BROKEN LINE) |
| SKYLIGHT | LUMBER PILED |
| | HYDRANTS ON KEY PLAN |
| | TANKS ON KEY PLAN |
| FIGURES IN BRACKETS (W) & (D) | RELATIVE HEIGHTS OF GROUND |
| N IN STREETS THUS (N) ARE STREET WIDTHS | N DENOTES STONE |
| DD DETACHED DWELLINGS | SD SCATTERED DW. |

**1973
Topographic Maps
1:25,000 series**




*Approximate
location of Subject
Site*

*Source: National Topographic Series,
1:25,000
1973*

Appendix D: Aerial Photographs

1922
Context and Site

Context




Site



Source – National
Airphoto Library
Roll No. R3-081

1945 - 1965
Block Face –
West side of Wellington
Between Simcoe & Grey Streets



Site

Sources – National Airphoto Library Roll No. A9344-44 (1945);
Dept. of Planning & Development 1413-17, Photo 21 (1950);
Hunting Survey Line 5, Photo 207 (1965).

1974
Context and Site

Context




Site



Source – National
Airphoto Library
Roll No. A23667-171

1990
Context and Site

Context



Site



Source – National
Airphoto Library
Roll No. A27597-169

1999
Context and Site

Context



Site



Source – London City
Maps, Archives air
photos

2020
Context and Site

Context



Site



Source – London City
Maps

Appendix E: Exterior Photographs

185 Wellington Street



East Elevation

East and North Elevations



185 Wellington Street



North Elevation

North and West Elevations



185 Wellington Street



West Elevation

South and East Elevations



189 Wellington Street




East and North Elevations

East Elevation



189 Wellington Street



South and East Elevations

South and East Elevations



189 Wellington Street



South Elevation

West and South Elevations



189 Wellington Street




West Elevation

North and West Elevations




Appendix F: Floor Plan Sketches


185 Wellington Street - Roof




London Maps, 2020
aerial photograph.



185 Wellington Street - Ground Floor



185 Wellington Street – Basement




189 Wellington Street - Roof




Source: London City Maps, 2020 aerial photograph


189 Wellington Street – Foot Print



189 Wellington Street – Ground Floor




189 Wellington Street – Basement




Appendix G: Interior Photographs

185 Wellington Street – Ground Floor



Ground Floor –
Photograph locations



1. Entrance vestibule –
East wall.



2. Room 1 – North, East and South Walls.



*185 Wellington Street
– Ground Floor*

3. Room 1 – South Wall.

4. Room 1 – North Wall.



185 Wellington Street – Ground Floor




5. Room 1 – Window, North Wall, Detail -
new mouldings.

6. Room 1 – South, West and North Walls.




185 Wellington Street – Ground Floor



7. Room 2 –North Wall.

8. Room 2 – North, East and South Walls.



9. Room 2 – Door Casing & Baseboard Detail.



185 Wellington Street – Ground Floor



10. Room 2 – South Wall.



11. Room 2 – West Wall.

185 Wellington Street – Ground Floor



12. Room 3 – North, East and South Walls.



13. Room 2 – South, West and North Walls.

185 Wellington Street – Ground Floor



14. Room 4 –North Wall.

15. Room 4 – North and East Walls.



185 Wellington Street – Ground Floor




16. Room 4 – East, South and West Walls.

17. Room 4 – South and West Walls.



185 Wellington Street – Basement



Basement –
Photograph locations



1. Room 1 – East and South Walls.



2. Room 1 – West and North Walls.

185 Wellington Street – Basement



3. Room 1 – North Wall.



4. Room 1 – East Wall and
access to Crawl Space.

185 Wellington Street – Basement




5. Room 1 – Ceiling joists and floorboards.

6. Crawl Space – View East and South from Room 1 access.




189 Wellington Street – Ground Floor



Ground Floor –
Photograph
locations



1. Room 1 – North, East and South Walls.



2. Room 1 – Part of North and East
Walls at the front of the Building.

189 Wellington Street – Ground Floor



3. Room 1 – South Wall and Entrance to Room 2.



4. Room 1 – West and North Wall and Entrance to Room 8.

189 Wellington Street – Ground Floor

5. Room 2 – East and South Walla.



6. Room 2 – West and North Walla and
Entrance to Rooms 3 and 1.



189 Wellington Street – Ground Floor



7. Room 3 –North and East Walla and Entrance to Room 2.



8. Room 3 – South and West Walla and Door to Outside.

189 Wellington Street – Ground Floor



9. Room 4 – North and East Wall and opening to Room 3.




10. Room 4 – South and West Wall and Door to Basement Stairs.

189 Wellington Street – Ground Floor


11. Room 4 – Stairs down to
Basement and Door to Outside.




12. Room 5 – South and West Walla and
Opening to Closet.



189 Wellington Street – Ground Floor



13. Room 5 – North and East Walla
and Door to Hall.



14. Hall – View East to Room 8.

189 Wellington Street – Ground Floor




15. Hall – View West to Room 6.

189 Wellington Street – Ground Floor



17. Room 6 – West and North Walla.




18. Room 7 – View from Hall
to North Wall.

189 Wellington Street – Ground Floor


19. Room 8 – South and West
Walls and Door to Hall.



20. Room 8 – North and East
Walls and Door to Room 1.



189 Wellington Street – Basement



Basement –
Photograph
locations



1. Room 1 – South Wall and Staircase up.



2. Room 1 – West Wall.

189 Wellington Street – Basement



3. Room 1 – North Wall and remnant wall (right).




4. Room 1 – East Wall and access to Crawl Space..



5. Crawl Space – View to East and South Walls.

189 Wellington Street –Attic



Attic –
Photograph
locations



2. Attic – Front Section –
View East and South.



1. Attic – Front Section –
View North and East.

189 Wellington Street –Attic



3. Attic – Tail Wing – View
East to Front Section.



4. Attic – Tail Wing –
View West.

Appendix H: Landscape Photographs

185 Wellington Street



Front Yard – View southwest from the northeast corner.


Rear Yard – View northeast from the southwest corner.



Rear Yard – View west from the rear of the Building.



189 Wellington Street



Front Yard – View north from the south end.

Rear Yard – View southeast from the northwest corner.



Rear Yard – View west from the rear of the Building.

Appendix I: Property Ownership History

Page 1 Municipality London (City) Lot Part 1 Plan 30 – NW Grey Street Address: 185 Wellington Street

| No. of Instrument | Instrument | Date of Instrument | Date of Registration | Grantor | Grantee | Consideration | Remarks |
|-------------------|-------------|--------------------|----------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|---------------|---------------------------------|
| | Patent | 28.03.1850 | | The Crown | John Wood | | All 1/2 ac |
| 867 | B & S | 17.07.1850 | 19.07.1850 | John Wood & wife | William Winslow | | N 1/2 |
| +126 | Mortgage | 24.02.1859 | 26.02.1859 | Wm Winslow | Charles Crutchley | | N 1/2 |
| 2357 | Dis of Mort | 08.08.1863 | 08.08.1863 | Wm Winslow | Charles Crutchley | | N 1/2 |
| 2358 | B & S | 04.08.1863 | 08.08.1863 | Wm Winslow & wife | Laura Newell | | N 1/2 |
| 15793 | Quit Claim | 05.02.1863 | 22.04.1869 | Robert Moore | Louisa I Milne | | N 1/2 1/4 ac |
| 15063 | Grant | 17.09.1877 | 27.09.1877 | Laura Milne et al | John Price | | N 1/2 |
| 3237 | Probate | 20.12.1919 | 02.01.1920 | John Price | John H Stephens | | S23 ft of N 1/2 |
| 77106 | Grant | 29.12.1956 | 12.02.1957 | Estate of Mary Stephens | Lea Ayers | \$1 | G – S 45' of N 46' of W 110' |
| 736719 | Grant | | 17.08.1986 | Lea Ayers | Edith Fleming | | |
| 749933 | Grant | | 14.11.1986 | Edith Fleming | Ivan Milicevic | \$60,000 | As in 736719 |
| 765428 | Grant | | 05.07.1987 | Ivan Milicevic | Eli, Peter, Stephen Boskovic | \$65,300 | As in 749933 |
| LT393960 | Transfer | | 24.08.1995 | Eli, Peter, Stephen Boskovic | Eli, Stephen Boskovic | | |
| ER25965 | Transfer | | 28.11.2003 | Eli, Stephen Boskovic | Robert Edward Pugh | | |
| ER466424 | Transfer | | 31.10.2006 | Robert Edward Pugh | Mark Emerson Bennis | | |
| ER1241979 | Transfer | | 28.06.2019 | Mark Emerson Bennis | 2698746 Ontario Inc. | | |

Page 1 Municipality London (City) Lot Part 1 Plan 30 – SW Simcoe Street Address: 189 Wellington Street

| No. of Instrument | Instrument | Date of Instrument | Date of Registration | Grantor | Grantee | Consideration | Remarks |
|-------------------|------------|--------------------|----------------------|---|------------------------------------|---------------|-----------------------------|
| | Patent | 26.05.1848 | | The Crown | Henry McCabe | | All 1/2 ac |
| 218 | B & S | 26.05.1848 | 26.05.1848 | Henry McCabe & wife | G. J. Goodhue | | S pt 120 x 110 |
| 1299 | B & S | 30.07.1851 | 31.07.1851 | G. J Goodhue & wife | Philip Davis | | S pt 40 x 110 |
| 3044 | B & S | 24.06.1853 | 25.06.1853 | Philip Davis | George Brett | | S pt 40 x 110 |
| 3887 | B & S | 02.03.1854 | 24.03.1854 | George Brett | Robert Leathorn | | 40 x 110 |
| 1716 | B & S | 21.05.1862 | 22.05.1862 | Robert Leathorn | John Price | | 40 x 110 |
| 3237 | Probate | | 02.01.1920 | | Mary E. Stephens | | |
| 40678 | Grant | 22.12.1947 | 08.01.1948 | Ethel M. Stephens | Charles L S Stephens | | Probate of Mary E. Stephens |
| 42629 | Grant | 30.09.1949 | 08.11.1949 | Ethel Stephens, exec Mary E Stephens | Florence Goldsworthy & Ella Cripps | \$3650 | S 40 feet |
| 43598 | | | 10.05.1950 | | Florence Goldsworthy & Ella Cripps | | |
| LT508948 | Transfer | | 10.02.1998 | Ella Cripps | Marko Boskovic | | |
| ER550742 | Transfer | | 28.12.2007 | Marko Boskovic | <u>Ilija</u> Boskovic | | |
| ER702448 | Transfer | | 03.05.2010 | <u>Ilija</u> Boskovic | Marilyn & Mark Bennis | | |
| ER1241972 | Transfer | | 28.06.2019 | Marilyn & Mark Bennis | 2700875 Ontario Inc. | \$135,000 | |

Appendix J: Adjacent/Nearby Heritage Properties



201 - 203 Wellington Street



205 - 209 Wellington Street



190 Wellington Street



197 - 199 Wellington Street



193 - 195 Wellington Street



181 Wellington Street




169 - 171 Wellington Street




184 Wellington Street

***Adjacent / Nearby Heritage
Properties – 1881 - 1922***


1881 - 1888



1907



1922



Source: Fire Insurance Plans, University
of Western Ontario Archives

Appendix K: Development Proposal

Concept Plan – Phase One


East (Wellington Street) Elevation in Context




*Source: CSPACE Architecture
December 2, 2020*

Concept Plan – Phase One

Site/Ground Floor Plan



Upper Floor Plans



Source: CSPACE Architecture
 December 2, 2020

Concept Plan – Phase Two


East (Wellington Street) Elevation in Context




*Source: CSPACE Architecture
December 2, 2020*

Concept Plan – Phase Two

Site/Ground Floor Plan



Upper Floor Plans



*Source: CSPACE Architecture
 December 2, 2020*

**Appendix L: City of London
Planning Document Maps**


City of London
 Official Plan
 Part of Map 1, November 2019
 Place Types



Subject site

| LEGEND | | | | | | |
|--------|------------------------|--|---|-------------------|-----------------------|---|
| | Green Space | | Heavy Industrial | BASE MAP FEATURES | | Streets (See Map 3) |
| | Environmental Review | | Light Industrial | | | Railways |
| | Downtown | | Commercial Industrial | | Water Courses / Ponds | Note: At the time of the printing of this map, the Rapid Transit EA is in progress. It is expected that a rapid transit alignment will be known before <i>The London Plan</i> is approved. This map shows the Rapid Transit Corridors and Urban Corridors to recognize potential alignments. These Place Types will be modified to align with the results of the EA process for final version of <i>The London Plan</i> . |
| | Transit Village | | Future Community Growth | | | |
| | Rapid Transit Corridor | | Future Industrial Growth | | | |
| | Urban Corridor | | Farmland | | | |
| | Shopping Area | | Rural Neighbourhoods | | | |
| | Main Street | | Waste Management Resource Recovery Area | | | |
| | Neighbourhoods | | Urban Growth Boundary | | | |
| | Institutional | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

City of London
Zoning By-law as amended
London Maps



Subject Site

BDC(4) Zone

Appendix M: Curriculum Vitae: Wayne Morgan

Wayne Morgan – Curriculum Vitae

| | | |
|----------------------------------|--|---|
| Work Experience | 2006 – | Consultant |
| | Principal, Wayne Morgan Heritage Planner | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Heritage character statements and impact assessments• Heritage Conservation Districts• Heritage planning policies | |
| | 2000–2006 | City of Toronto, City Planning |
| | Senior Co-ordinator, Heritage Preservation Services | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Managed review and approval of proposals involving heritage properties in the City – under the following Acts – Planning, Heritage and Building Code.• Secured and administered heritage easement agreements (more than 200) and letters of credit to the City (in excess of \$10 million annually).• Established 4 Heritage Conservation Districts involving in excess of 1500 properties – Yorkville and the Cabbagetowns -Metcalfe, North and South.• Managed the listing and designation of individual heritage properties.• Provided technical advice to City Council and its advisory committees and represented the City in negotiations and before Provincial tribunals. | |
| | 1998 - 2000 | City of Toronto, Urban Development Services |
| Related Experience | Senior Community Planner | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Managed approval process of planning proposals and preparation of community plans, involving liaison with City staff and the public; provided professional advice to City Council and Provincial tribunals. | |
| | 1989–1997 | Metropolitan Toronto, Planning Department |
| | Manager, Research Division | |
| | 1976–1989 | Region of York, Planning Department |
| Education | Senior Planner, long range planning | |
| | 1974–1976 | Region of Hamilton Wentworth, Planning Department |
| | Planner, Official Plan team | |
| | 1973–1974 | Acres Engineering |
| Professional Associations | Planner/Economist | |
| | 1980 - 2000 | Town of Newmarket |
| | Chair, Local Architectural Conservation Advisory Committee | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Appointed as a volunteer by Town Council to the municipal heritage advisory committee established under the Ontario Heritage Act | |
| | 1968–1972 - University of Toronto - B.A., Geography | |
| | 1972–1973 - Queen’s University - M.A., Geography – Urban and Regional | |
| | Registered Professional Planner – member - Canadian Institute of Planner and the Ontario Professional Planners Institute. | |
| | Member – Canadian Association of Heritage Professionals | |