Tuesday, January 19, 2016
7:00 PM. – Regular Meeting

Council Committee Room
4th Floor, City Hall

Members:

Peter Dymond, Co-Chair
Paul Willoughby, Co-Chair
Michael Avis
Chris Bejnar
Harry Blackburn
Jeff Chalmers
Steve Collie
Herman Custodio
Kathryn Fowlston
Gugni Gill
Mandeep Kundan
Doug McLeod
Anthony Simone
Debbi Visser (See Item 10.6)
David Whyte
Ken Wilde
City Councillor Doug Whillans – Wards 2 and 6

For inquiries about this Agenda, or to make arrangements for accessibility accommodations for persons attending (some advance notice may be required), please contact:

Terri Brenton, Legislative Coordinator
Phone (905) 874-2106, TTY (905) 874-2130, cityclerksoffice@brampton.ca

Note: Some meeting information may also be available in alternate formats, upon request.
Please ensure all cell phones, personal digital assistants (PDAs) and other electronic devices are turned off or placed on non-audible mode during the meeting.

1. **Approval of Agenda**

2. **Declarations of Interest under the Municipal Conflict of Interest Act**

3. **Previous Minutes**

3.1. **Minutes – Brampton Heritage Board – November 17, 2015**

The minutes were considered by Planning and Infrastructure Services Committee on December 7, 2015, and the recommendations were approved by Council on December 9, 2015.

The minutes are provided for the Board's information.

4. **Consent**

* The following item(s) listed with an asterisk (*) are considered to be routine and non-controversial by the Committee and will be approved at one time. There will be no separate discussion of these items unless a Committee Member requests it, in which case the item will not be consented to and will be considered in the normal sequence of the agenda.

(12.1, 12.2)

5. **Delegations/Presentations**

5.1. Presentation by Rebecca Sciarra, Cultural Heritage Specialist Manager, ASI, re: City of Brampton Cultural Heritage Policy Review (File H.Ex. OP Review).

6. **Sub-Committees**

6.1. **Minutes – Outreach and Marketing Sub-Committee – November 26, 2015**

*To be received*
7. **Designation Program**

7.1. Proposed Designations List

8. **Heritage Impact Assessments (HIA)**

9. **Correspondence**

10. **Other/New Business**


   **Recommendation**

10.2. Discussion at the request of Michael Avis, Board Member, re: Highlight on Heritage – Saturday, February 13, 2016 – Bramalea City Centre

10.3. Discussion at the request of Paul Willoughby, Co-Chair, re: Delegation to Heritage Milton – Brampton’s Heritage Program

10.4. Verbal Update from Antonietta Minichillo, Heritage Coordinator, Planning and Infrastructure Services, re: Churchville Public Art for 200th Anniversary – Ward 6

10.5. Verbal Update from Antonietta Minichillo, Heritage Coordinator, Planning and Infrastructure Services, re: Community Mailbox Upgrade in Churchville – Ward 6

10.6. Verbal advisory from the City Clerk's Office, re: Resignation from Membership on the Brampton Heritage Board – Debbi Visser

11. **Referred/Deferred Items**
12. Information Items

12.1. * 2016 Brampton City Council and Committee Meeting Schedule


13. Question Period

14. Public Question Period

15 Minute Limit (regarding any decision made at this meeting)

15. Adjournment

Next Meeting: Tuesday, February 16, 2016
Subject: Minutes – Brampton Heritage Board – November 17, 2015

The minutes were considered by Planning and Infrastructure Services Committee on December 7, 2015, and the recommendations were approved by Council on December 9, 2015.

The minutes are provided for the Board's information.
November 17, 2015

Members Present:  
Peter Dymond, Co-Chair  
Paul Willoughby, Co-Chair  
Michael Avis  
Chris Bejnar  
Harry Blackburn  
Steve Collie  
Herman Custodio  
Kathryn Fowlston  
Doug McLeod  
Anthony Simone  
David Whyte  
Ken Wilde  
City Councillor Doug Whillans – Wards 2 and 6

Members Absent:  
Jeff Chalmers (regrets)  
Gugni Gill  
Debbi Visser  
Mandeep Kundan (regrets)

Staff Present:  
Planning and Infrastructure Services Department:  
Heather MacDonald, Director, Planning Policy and Growth Management, Planning and Infrastructure Services  
Stavroula Kassaris, Heritage Coordinator  
Antonietta Minichillo, Heritage Coordinator  
Corporate Services Department:  
Terri Brenton, Legislative Coordinator
The meeting was called to order at 7:03 p.m. and adjourned at 8:44 p.m.

### A. Approval of Agenda

The following motion was considered.

HB077-2015 That the agenda for the Brampton Heritage Board Meeting of November 17, 2015 be approved as amended as follows:

To add:

F 1-2. Minutes – Heritage Resources Sub-Committee – October 8, 2015

Carried

### B. Declarations of Interest under the Municipal Conflict of Interest Act – nil

### C. Previous Minutes

C 1. Minutes – Brampton Heritage Board – October 20, 2015

The minutes were considered by Planning and Infrastructure Services Committee on November 2, 2015, and the recommendations were approved by Council on November 10, 2015.

The minutes were provided for the Board’s information.

During consideration of the minutes, staff drew attention to new wording for recommendations on heritage designation reports, as outlined in Recommendation HB075-2015.

### D. Consent

* The following item(s) listed with an asterisk (*) are considered to be routine and non-controversial by the Board and will be approved at one time. There will be no separate discussion of these items unless a Board Member requests it, in which case the item will not be consented to and will be considered in the normal sequence of the agenda.

(L 1, L 2, L 3)
E. Delegations/Presentations


Item K 1 was brought forward and dealt with at this time.

Don Arthur, agent for the owners, outlined his position that the Application, as presented, complies with the requirements for new construction in the Churchville Heritage Conservation District, and cited documents in support of his position.

Mr. Arthur confirmed that the property owners will not be providing revised plans for the Board’s consideration, as requested by the Board at its meeting of October 20, 2015 (Recommendation HB069-2015), and that any changes would have to be done through conditional approval of the application.

Board consideration of this matter included:
- review of the following:
  - Board’s consideration of the subject Heritage Permit Application at its meeting of October 20, 2015
  - consideration of the delegation made by Mr. Arthur at the Planning and Infrastructure Services Committee on November 2, 2015 regarding the Heritage Permit Application
- discussion on each of the proposed conditions in the staff comments and those put forward at the October Board meeting
- requirement for staff to evaluate Heritage Permit Applications for properties in Churchville in accordance with the Village of Churchville District Plan
- concern about the property owners not being in attendance at the meeting
- reiteration of the deadline for Council’s decision on the Application pursuant to the Ontario Heritage Act

The Board and Mr. Arthur discussed various opportunities for revisions to the plans with respect to stone cladding, enclosure of the verandah, dormers, sash windows, window surrounds, vegetation, and the front and rear doors.

The following motion was considered.

HB078-2015 1. That the delegation of Don Arthur, agent for the owners, to the Brampton Heritage Board Meeting of November 17, 2015, re: Heritage Permit Application – 58 Church Street – Ward 6 (File BH.c), be received; and,
2. That the Heritage Permit Application from Don Arthur, to the Brampton Heritage Board Meeting of November 17, 2015, re: 58 Church Street – Ward 6 (File BH.c), be received; and,

3. That the subject Heritage Permit Application, which includes demolition of the existing residential dwelling and construction of a new dwelling, be approved, subject to the following conditions:
i. That the stone cladding be installed such that it is not higher than the minimum guard (railing) height of the porch as required under the Ontario Building Code;
ii. That the verandah not be enclosed in part or in whole in the future;
iii. That all windows be sash windows;
iv. That the design of all window surrounds be consistent;
v. That all vegetation along the western portion of the lot be maintained and enhanced;
vii. That the proposed front and rear doors be replaced with an alternative design that is more in keeping with the character of the Village of Churchville and plans for the doors be submitted to Heritage staff for approval;
ix. That the wraparound verandah be reduced to two sides (facing Church Street and Victoria Street);
ixi. That the proposed balcony on the principal façade (Victoria Street) be removed and replaced with windows;

and the conditions below, which are required for all Heritage Permits:
i. That prior to the issuance of the Heritage Permit, the proposal be cleared by Zoning Services;
ii. That any changes to the approved Heritage Permit may require an application for a Heritage Permit amendment;
iii. That the applicant submit revised drawings to Heritage staff that reflect the above-noted conditions in order for the City to issue the Heritage Permit; and,

4. That the Board acknowledges agreement reached on November 17, 2015 between the agent for the property owners (Don Arthur) and the Board on conditions 3. i, ii, iii, iv, v, and vi above, and also that the dormers cannot be symmetrical.

Carried
F. Sub-Committees

F 1. Heritage Resources Sub-Committee (Designations, Cultural Landscapes, Heritage Inventory, Development Applications)

F 1-1. Minutes – Heritage Resources Sub-Committee – November 12, 2015

The minutes were distributed at the meeting.

Paul Willoughby, Sub-Committee Chair, provided an overview of the subject minutes and matters considered at the meeting.

Mr. Willoughby requested assistance from all Board Members with research work on the properties listed in the minutes. He indicated that the January 2016 Sub-Committee meeting will be held at the Peel Art Gallery, Museum and Archives (PAMA), at which time guidance will be provided on researching properties.

Board consideration of this matter included a request that the minutes be amended to add “East” to the address for 47 Queen Street (former Primitive Methodist Church).

The following motion was considered.

HB079-2015 That the Minutes of the Heritage Resources Sub-Committee Meeting of November 12, 2015, to the Brampton Heritage Board Meeting of November 17, 2015, be received.

Carried

F 1-2. Minutes – Heritage Resources Sub-Committee – October 8, 2015

Paul Willoughby, Sub-Committee Chair, provided an overview of the subject minutes and matters considered at the meeting.

The Board acknowledged the request for an amendment to the minutes to add “East” to the address for 47 Queen Street (former Primitive Methodist Church).

The following motion was considered.
That the Minutes of the Heritage Resources Sub-Committee Meeting of October 8, 2015, to the Brampton Heritage Board Meeting of November 17, 2015, be received.

Carried

F 2. Outreach and Marketing Sub-Committee (Historic Plaque Program, Newsletter, Projects, Events, Awards) – nil

G. Designation Program

G 1. Proposed Designations

A list of properties proposed for heritage designation was included with the agenda for this meeting.

In response to questions from the Board, staff provided details on the status of the proposed Main Street South Heritage Conservation District.

In response to questions from the Board, City Councillor Whillans and staff confirmed that the Heritage Theatre is not under threat and outlined potential future uses for the building.

G 2. Recent Designations – nil

H. Heritage Impact Assessments (HIA) – nil

I. Correspondence – nil

J. Other/New Business

J 1. Heritage Permit Application – 7742 Churchville Road – Ward 6 (File BH.c):

- Staff Comments
- Application

Antonietta Minichillo, Heritage Coordinator, Planning and Infrastructure Services, provided an overview of the subject Staff Comments and Heritage Permit Application.
A clerical correction was noted to the Staff Comments to amend the reference to “wooden stop” to read “wooden stoop”.

The following motion was considered.

HB081-2015 1. That the Staff Comments from Antonietta Minichillo, Heritage Coordinator, Planning and Infrastructure Services, dated November 3, 2015, to the Brampton Heritage Board Meeting of November 17, 2015, re: Heritage Permit Application – 7742 Churchville Road – Ward 6 (File BH.c), be received; and,

2. That the Heritage Permit Application from Robert Crouch, to the Brampton Heritage Board Meeting of November 17, 2015, re: 7742 Churchville Road – Ward 6 (File BH.c), be received; and,

3. That the subject Heritage Permit Application for 7742 Churchville Road, which includes a new front stoop, stairs and railing, and a new walkway, as outlined in Appendix A to the Staff Comments, be approved.

Carried


Stavroula Kassaris, Heritage Coordinator, Planning and Infrastructure Services, provided an overview of the subject Heritage Report.

The following motion was considered.

HB082-2015 1. That the Heritage Report: Reasons for Heritage Designation – 51 Chapel Street – Ward 3 (File BH.c), dated November 2015, to the Brampton Heritage Board Meeting of November 17, 2015, be received; and,

2. That designation of 51 Chapel Street under the Ontario Heritage Act as a property of cultural heritage significance, be approved; and,

3. That staff be authorized to publish and serve the Notice of Intention to Designate in accordance with the requirements under the Ontario Heritage Act; and,
4. That, if there are no objections to the designation in accordance with the provisions of the *Ontario Heritage Act*, a by-law be passed to designate the subject property; and,

5. That, if there are any objections in accordance with the provisions of the *Ontario Heritage Act*, staff be directed to refer the proposed designation to the Ontario Conservation Review Board; and,

6. That staff be authorized to attend the Conservation Review Board hearing process in support of Council’s decision to designate the subject property.

Carried

K. Referred/Deferred Items

K 1. Heritage Permit Application – 58 Church Street – Ward 6 (File BH.c):
   - Staff Comments
   - Application

Dealt with under Delegation E 1 – Recommendation HB078-2015

K 2. Presentation by Antonietta Minichillo and Stavroula Kassaris, Heritage Coordinators, Planning and Infrastructure Services, re: Heritage Permit Process (File BH.c).

Antonietta Minichillo and Stavroula Kassaris, Heritage Coordinators, Planning and Infrastructure Services, provided a presentation entitled “Heritage Permit Process”.

Ms. Minichillo and Ms. Kassaris responded to questions from the Board with respect to elements that are/are not restricted under the City’s Heritage Permit Process, role of the Conservation Review Board, requirements for Building Permits in addition to a Heritage Permit, and exceptions from the Process for Federal and Provincial Government agencies.

L. Information Items

*  L 1. The following report was considered at the Planning and Infrastructure Services Committee Meeting of October 19, 2015:
Report from A. Minichillo, Heritage Coordinator, Planning and Infrastructure Services, dated September 23, 2015, re: Receipt of Notices of Objections under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act – Wards 1, 2, 3, and 10 (File P60 / HE.x).

The report (Item F 4) is available for viewing on the City’s web portal.

This material was provided for the Board’s information.

*  L 2. The following by-law was passed at the Council Meeting of November 10, 2015:

269-2015 To partially repeal By-law 10-2014, being a by-law to designate the property at 8678 Chinguacousy Road as being of cultural heritage value or interest – Ward 4

A copy of the by-law is available on request from the City Clerk’s Office.

This material was provided for the Board’s information.


This material was provided for the Board’s information.

M. Question Period – nil

N. Public Question Period – nil

O. Adjournment

Discussion took place with respect to a requirement for a meeting in December 2015.

The following motion was considered.

HB083-2015 1. That the Brampton Heritage Board Meeting of December 15, 2015 be cancelled; and,
2. That the Brampton Heritage Board do now adjourn to meet again on Tuesday, January 19, 2016 at 7:00 p.m. or at the call of the Chair.

Carried

Co-Chair – Peter Dymond
Co-Chair – Paul Willoughby
Subject: Presentation by Rebecca Sciarra, Cultural Heritage Specialist Manager, ASI, re: City of Brampton Cultural Heritage Policy Review (File H.Ex. OP Review)
City of Brampton Cultural Heritage Policy Review

Presentation to Brampton Heritage Board

January 19th 2016

Agenda

• Introduction and Thank You
• Reasons for the Review
• Process and Scope of the Review
• Work to Date
• Roundtable Questions
Reasons for the Review

- Cultural Heritage Policy Review identified as a component of the 2006 Official Plan Review
- Part of regular and required 5 year review of the City's Official Plan
- Comprehensive review of the City’s Official Plan last completed as part of reviewing the 1993 Official Plan

Reasons for the Review (cont’d)

- Brampton’s planning horizon poses exciting and complex possibilities. Canada’s 9th largest city and one of the fastest growing municipalities
- Conservation of cultural heritage resources is a priority for the City:

  Brampton will “strive to lead and educate on the preservation and conservation of our natural and built environments to ensure Brampton’s heritage, identity, pride, vitality, and economic prosperity is balanced.”
Reasons for the Review (cont’d)

- Identify strengths and weaknesses in the City’s current policies and practices and to develop policies that will strengthen conservation in Brampton moving forward.

- New policies will also align with requirements of provincial and municipal policy, legislation and regulation and reflect best practices in cultural heritage conservation.

- Create a policy framework that is focused, strategic, responsive, and defensible.

Process and Scope of the Review

- End of 2015 project start-up.

- Comprehensive review of existing Brampton policy documents and guidelines impacting cultural heritage resources.

- Rigorous analysis of provincial legislation and policy provisions.

- Systematic review of practices used in other jurisdictions. Understand what is working well elsewhere and if it is appropriate for use in Brampton.
Process and Scope of the Review

- Understand what is working well and where we can improve
- Regular reporting, meetings, and updates with Brampton Staff: Antonietta Minichillo, Stavroula Kassaris, and Pam Cooper
- Recommend key policy directions and develop new policies
- Wrap up in 2016
Work to Date

• Development and initiation of public engagement plan (website content, social media content, input into other City-led engagement techniques)

• Identification of organizations and individuals to participate in stakeholder interviews held during last two weeks of January 2016 and into February/March 2016

Work to Date

• Review and analysis of City of Brampton policies, guidelines, and plans relevant to cultural heritage resource conservation:
  • City of Brampton Official Plan (November 2013 Office Consolidation);
  • Brampton By-Law 240-2004; Village of Churchville Heritage Conservation District: District Plan, 1990;
  • City of Brampton Minimum Maintenance By-Law 104-96;
  • City of Brampton Strategic Plan, 2013;
  • Downtown Brampton Heritage Conservation District Feasibility Study, 2009;
  • City of Brampton Criteria for Determining Cultural Heritage Value or Interest;
  • City of Brampton Heritage Building Protection Plan Terms of Reference;
  • City of Brampton Recommendation Report: Vacant Heritage Building Strategy;
  • Brampton Municipal Register of Cultural Heritage Resources Designated under the Ontario Heritage Act, 2015;
  • Municipal Register of Cultural Heritage Resources, 2015;
  • Cultural Heritage Map;
  • City of Brampton By-Law 155-2012 To establish a by-law regulating vacant buildings;
  • Various Secondary Plans in the City of Brampton
Work to Date

- Review and analysis of provincial and federal policies, guidelines, standards, and plans relevant to ensure that Brampton's cultural heritage policies are compliant with existing legislation, policy, and reflective of best practices:
  - Municipal Act
  - Planning Act
  - Greenbelt Plan (2005)
  - Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (2013)
  - Ontario Heritage Act (2006)
  - Provincial Policy Statement (2014)
  - Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport (MTCS), Standards and Guidelines for Conservation of Provincial Heritage Properties (2010)
  - MTCS, Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists (2011)
  - MTCS, Check Sheet for Environmental Assessments (2010)
  - Municipal Engineers Association Bridge Checklist
  - Ontario Heritage Trust Easement Provisions
  - Ontario Building Code
  - Region of Peel Official Plan (2014 Office Consolidation);
  - Historic Sites and Monuments Act (1985)
  - Federal Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada

City of Brampton Cultural Heritage Policy Review

Work to Date

- Review and analysis of other municipal Official Plan cultural heritage policies to identify best practices, OMB-approved policy tools, and a range of policy options to consider for adoption in Brampton:
  - City of Toronto
  - City of Mississauga
  - City of London
  - City of Ottawa
  - City of Kingston
  - City of Markham
  - City of Hamilton
  - Brant County
Roundtable Questions for Tonight

- What do you consider as 'heritage' in Brampton?
- How do these heritage assets contribute to quality of life in Brampton?
- How is heritage affected by what’s going on now?
  o Built Heritage: What built heritage sites (institutional, residential, commercial, religious, bridges etc.) are we most worried about NOW? Where are the key locations of concern? What are the greatest threats?
  o What are the City's most significant cultural heritage landscapes (parks, trails, streetscapes, roads) that would be priorities for protection?
- Looking to the future, what resources or areas do you think should be protected?
- What do you see as major development trends that may impact heritage up to 2031?

Thank You

- Results of stakeholder interviews will inform development of policy recommendations
- Please send any further comments or responses to questions to:
  rsciarra@asiheritage.ca
  jkonrad@asiheritage.ca
Subject: Minutes – Outreach and Marketing Sub-Committee – November 26, 2015
Outreach and Marketing Sub-Committee
November 26, 2015
City Hall, Brampton
MINUTES

Present: Michael Avis, Antonietta Minichillo, Jeff Chalmers, Doug McLeod

Regrets: Herman Custodio, Steve Collie, Kathryn Fowlston, Paul Willoughby

Heritage Plaque Reception Review: Disappointed by the low turnout of plaque recipients at the recent Alderlea reception. The sub-committee discussed how we might address the challenge. It was suggested that personal contact [phone call] two days before the reception may help. Antonietta Minichillo’s students will do an analysis as to which recipients have mounted their plaques.

New Outreach Photographs: Jeff Chalmers will approach Herman Custodio about taking new photos for the Outreach and Marketing display. Focus will be on properties that will be located within the upcoming new ‘Heritage Districts’ initiative.

Alderlea: Flowertown Probus Club December 13: The Probus Club requested one or two Brampton Heritage Board (BHB) volunteers be on hand to welcome guests and answer any questions prior to the Club’s meeting/social. Time commitment approximately an hour and a half.

‘Highlight on Heritage’: February 13, 2016 at Bramalea City Centre. This year the public will be asked to fill out questionnaires on IPADS. Steve Collie has the space confirmed.

‘Bike the Creek’ June 18, 2106: Outreach and Marketing will again support this event [3rd year]. BHB will staff a table in Gage Park.

Brampton Heritage Times (BHT): Jeff Chalmers will write an article about the history of CHIC Radio in Brampton.

Brampton Heritage Times mailing list:
1. It was decided to distribute BHT to all residents of Churchville. In addition a one-page insert will be included that relates specifically to the Village.
2. BHT will also be distributed to all Main Street South residents.
3. All residents of the proposed downtown area Heritage Districts.
4. All members of the Brampton Historical Society.
Subject: Proposed Designations
Proposed Heritage Designations

- Downtown Heritage Conservation Districts
- All Heritage Cemeteries in the City of Brampton
- 3864 Countryside Drive – Pendergast Log House – Ward 10
- 86 Main Street North – Heritage Theatre – Ward 1
- 7715 Kennedy Road South – Graham-Rutledge Property – Ward 3 (cultural heritage landscape designation)
- 70 Main Street North – Robson Block – Ward 1
- 23 Centre Street South – Kilpatrick-Young House – Ward 3
- 4585 Mayfield Road – Peter Archdekin Farmhouse – Ward 9
- 1985 Bovaird Drive West – McCandless Plank House – Ward 6
- 19 John Street – formerly St. Mary’s Church – Ward 3
- 12061 Hurontario Street (former Snelgrove Baptist Church) – Ward 2
- 10955 Clarkway Drive – Pinebrook Farm – Ward 10
- 7 English Street – Ward 5
- 11285 Creditview Road – Drinkwater Farmhouse – Ward 6
- 22 William Street – Ward 1
- 73 Main Street South – Ward 4
- 51 Chapel Street – Ward 3
- 3448 Castlemore Road (Squire Thomas Burrell Grist Mill Site/Burrell’s Hollow) – Ward 10
Date: 2016-01-06

Subject: Recommendation Report: Designation under Part IV, Section 29 of the Ontario Heritage Act - 27 Wellington Street East (George W. Packham House) - Ward 3 (HE.x 27 Wellington St E)

Contact: Stavroula Kassaris, Heritage Coordinator, Planning and Infrastructure Services, 905-874-3825, stavroula.kassaris@brampton.ca

Recommendations:

1. That the report from Stavroula Kassaris, Heritage Coordinator, Planning and Infrastructure Services, dated January 6, 2016, to the Brampton Heritage Board Meeting of January 19, 2016, re: Heritage Designation under Part IV, Section 29 of the Ontario Heritage Act – 27 Wellington Street East – Ward 3 (HE.x 27 Wellington St E), be received; and

2. That designation of 27 Wellington Street East under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act as a property of cultural heritage significance, be approved; and,

3. That staff be authorized to publish and serve the Notice of Intention to Designate in accordance with the requirements under the Ontario Heritage Act; and,

4. That, if there are no objections to the designation in accordance with the provisions of the Ontario Heritage Act, a by-law be passed to designation the subject property; and,

5. That, if there are any objections in accordance with the provisions of the Ontario Heritage Act, staff be directed to refer the proposed designation to the Ontario Conservation Review Board; and,

6. That staff be authorized to attend the Conservation Review Board hearing process in support of Council’s decision to designate the subject property.
Overview:

- This report recommends that Council designate the property at 27 Wellington Street East under Part IV, Section 29 of the *Ontario Heritage Act* for its cultural heritage value.
- Following research and evaluation by the City, it has been determined that the property at 27 Wellington Street East satisfies Ontario Regulation 9/06, the provincial criteria prescribed for municipal designation under the *Ontario Heritage Act*.
- Upon Council approval, staff will proceed with the designation process as required under the *Ontario Heritage Act*.

Background:

The property at 27 Wellington Street East, known as the George W. Packham House, is located on the south side of Wellington Street East, east of Chapel Street. It contains a two-and-a-half storey single detached dwelling, a long driveway on the east side, and mature trees. The property is currently listed on the City of Brampton’s Municipal Register of Cultural Heritage Register.

The *Ontario Heritage Act* enables municipalities to pass by-laws to designate properties of cultural heritage value or interest. Designation under Part IV of the *Act* is a way of publicly acknowledging a property’s value to a community, and ensures the conservation of important places for the benefit and enjoyment of present and future generations. It also allows municipalities to conserve and manage properties through the Heritage Permit process enabled under Sections 33 (alterations) and 34 (demolition or removal) of the *Act*.

The property at 27 Wellington Street East meets the criteria for designation prescribed by the Province of Ontario under the *Ontario Heritage Act*, Regulation 9/06 for the categories of design/physical value, historical/associative value, and contextual value.

Current Situation:

The property at 27 Wellington Street East has been evaluated using the Criteria for Determining Cultural Heritage Value or Interest, as defined in Regulation 9/06 of the *Ontario Heritage Act*. The property has design/physical value, historical/associative value, and contextual value, and should be designated under Part IV of the *Ontario Heritage Act*. 


The George W. Packham House has design or physical value because it is a representative example of a Queen Anne style residence, and displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit, particularly the brick and wood work. The historic or associative value relates to its connection to the Packham family and the Packham Brick Works (now Brampton Brick Ltd). The property has contextual value as it defines, maintains and supports the character of the area. The complete Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest, including a list of heritage attributes, is outlined in the designation report attached as Appendix A, and will form part of the designation by-law.

The property owners of 27 Wellington Street West support the designation. A copy of the Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest was provided to the owners for information and for an opportunity to provide comment.

Upon Council approval, staff will proceed with the designation process as required under the Ontario Heritage Act.

**Corporate Implications:**

**Financial Implications:**

Upon designation, the property will become eligible for the City of Brampton’s Designation Heritage Property Incentive Grant program, which offers funds to cover half of the cost of eligible conservation work up to a maximum of $5,000, subject to available funding, on the condition that the grant is matched by the property owner. A property owner can apply for the grant once every two years.

**Other Implications:**

N/A

**Strategic Plan:**

This report achieves the Strategic Plan priorities by preserving and protecting heritage environments with balanced, responsible planning.
Conclusion:

The property located at 27 Wellington Street West (George W. Packham House) is of cultural heritage value or interest, sufficient to warrant designation under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act. It is recommended that 27 Wellington Street West be designated under Part IV of the Act according to the Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest and Description of Heritage Attributes included in Appendix A. Staff will proceed with the designation process required under the Act.

Attachments:

Appendix A - Heritage Report: Reasons for Heritage Designation - 27 Wellington Street East (George W. Packham House)

Report authored by: Stavroula Kassaris
Heritage Report:
Reasons for Heritage Designation

27 Wellington Street East
George W. Packham House

January 2016
## Profile of Subject Property

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Municipal Address</strong></th>
<th>27 Wellington Street East</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PIN Number</strong></td>
<td>140370039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Roll Number</strong></td>
<td>10-02-0-008-15800-0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Property Description</strong></td>
<td>PLAN BR 36 BLK 1 PT LOTS 2,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ward Number</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Property Name</strong></td>
<td>George W. Packham House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Owner</strong></td>
<td>Trevor and Josephine Nicholas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Owner Concurrence</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Zoning</strong></td>
<td>Residential (R1B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Use(s)</strong></td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Construction Date</strong></td>
<td>1892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Notable Owners or Occupants</strong></td>
<td>George W. Packham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Heritage Resources on Subject Property</strong></td>
<td>Built heritage resource</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relevant Council Resolutions</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional Information</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Current Situation:

The property at 27 Wellington Street East (George W. Packham House) is worthy of designation under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act for its cultural heritage value or interest. The property meets the criteria for designation prescribed by the Province of Ontario under the Ontario Heritage Act, Regulation 9/06 for the categories of design/physical value, historical/associative value, and contextual value.

2. Description of Property

The property at 27 Wellington Street East is located on the south side of Wellington Street East, east of Chapel Street. It contains a two-and-a-half storey single detached dwelling, a long driveway on the east side, and mature trees.

3. Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest

Design/Physical Value:

The cultural heritage value of the 27 Wellington Street East (George W. Packham House) is related to its design or physical value, as a representative example of a Queen Anne style residence. The Queen Anne Revival is from the late Victorian era, and was most popular between 1890 and 1914. The style drew its inspiration from different eras and incorporated many elements into its designs. The style is filled with exuberance, variation and asymmetry, and was one of the most eclectic and popular architectural styles of the Victorian period. Its success is related to a number of factors, including advances in building technology that allowed for more freedom and flexibility in floor planning, as well as the rise of industrialism and the growth of railroads that made quantity production methods available and affordable. Industrialization and the resulting economic growth and prosperity also made home ownership possible for both working and middle class. There was an increasing interest and demand for improved housing and extravagant homes with ample ornamentation to reflect their new wealth.

The George W. Packham House contains a number of the hallmarks of this style including a steeply pitched irregular roofline, decorative brick work, single-paned double hung windows, a multi-paned stained glass staircase window, broad decorative gables, and a round corner turret containing small decorated dormers, fish scale and plain shingles, cornice with small brackets and topped by a weather vane. The interior of the home also reflects the Queen Anne Style with its generous entry hall, prominent wooden staircase, detailed wood trim, large pocket doors, and fireplace with glazed decorative tiles. The residence also displays a high degree of craftsmanship and artistic
merit, which is evident in the design, material and finishes of the building, particularly the brick and wood work.

**Historical/Associative Value:**

The property is also valued for its association with the Packham family and the Packham Brick Works. The Chapel Street area was originally part of John Elliott’s estate, and from 1865 to 1884, a local fair grounds. Auctioneer John Smith and cattle dealer George Armstrong bought the old fair grounds at auction, and had the area subdivided by Joseph A. Carbert, P.L.S. and registered in November 1884. In 1892, Smith and Armstrong sold BR 36 Block 1, Part lots 2, 3 to George W. Packham, who was noted as unmarried and a brickmaker, for $550.00. The Assessment Roll (1893) notes brickmaker George Packham as the owner of Lots 2 and 3, South Wellington valued at $2000 with a building believed to be the present residence at 27 Wellington Street East.

George Packham, born in 1860, was the eldest son of Brampton Brick founder, James Packham, and Sarah Walterhouse. George, along with his brothers, helped run Brampton Brick after his father’s retirement in 1904. As noted in the *Brampton Conservator*, George married Mary Jane Mackay at Christ Church on November 1, 1892, with the reception held at their newly constructed home:

> A uniquely attractive wedding took place at Christ Church, Brampton, at 7:30 p.m., on Tuesday, Nov. 1\(^{st}\), the contracting parties being Mr. George W. Packham, eldest son of Mr. James Packham, of this town, and Miss Mary Mackay, only daughter of Dr. J. A. Mackay of Virginia, and granddaughter of Mrs. G.T. Clark, Brampton, ... Immediately after the ceremony, (while there rang out the wedding peals on the familiar church bell, evidently with more than usual vigor, and thus expressive of the church’s greetings) the happy couple with their attendants drove to their new and attractive home on South Wellington street, which was illuminated for their reception, and a number of friends from Toronto and other places, in addition to those of the town, joined them in partaking of a sumptuous repast. (3 November 1892, p.5)

The Packham family had considerable real estate holdings in Brampton at the turn of the last century. Countless homes in Brampton, including 27 Wellington Street West, were constructed using the brick manufactured by the Packham Brick Works, and the high degree of craftsmanship observed in the masonry of residence can be attributed to the connection to the Packham family.
Packham sold the property to Norman J. Altman in 1914 for $5,000. He and his wife, Helen T. Altman, and family lived at 27 Wellington Street East until the early 1960s. The Altman family operated a jewellery store in downtown Brampton. The executors of Norman J. Altman sold to the present owner Trevor A. Nicholson in 1971. Mr. Nicholson, a civil engineer, moved his family to Brampton because of his involvement with the construction of roads and services in the newly burgeoning community of Bramalea.

Packham Brick Works /Brampton Brick

James Packham started the business as Packham Brick Works on the flats at the end of John Street in 1871. By the 1890s, it was a very prosperous company providing high quality pressed red brick for many of Brampton and the area’s buildings.

In 1905, the company was incorporated as Brampton Pressed Brick Company Ltd. It relocated to Main Street North to take advantage of the local raw materials. By the early twentieth century, the company achieved an impressive output of 2 million bricks a year.

In 1949, the Packhams sold their business, and it was renamed Brampton Brick Ltd. In 1960, the company replaced the pressed brick equipment with extrusion technology, which allowed it to increase production to 26 million brick per year. Brampton Brick evolved into one of the most advanced brick making facilities in the world, and by 2001 their facility on Wanless Drive and Hurontario Street was North America’s single largest brick manufacturing plant under one roof.

Contextual Value:

The property has contextual value as it defines, maintains and supports the character of the area. In addition, 27 Wellington Street East is located within an area identified as a potential Heritage Conservation District (HCD) in the 2009 HCD feasibility study prepared for the City by a team of consultants led by George Robb Architect. The Neighbourhood Near the Courthouse contains substantial nineteenth and early twentieth century single detailed residences that characterize the neighbourhood.

4. Description of Heritage Attributes
The heritage attributes comprise all façades, architectural detailing, construction materials and associated building techniques, as well as significant landscape elements and important vistas. The detailed heritage attributes include, but are not limited to:

- Queen Anne architecture
- 2 ½ storey height
- brick construction
- steeply pitched irregular roofline
- decorative masonry, such as brick bands and ornamental pressed brick
- brick water table
- broad decorative gables
- round corner turret with conical roof, small decorated dormers, fish scale and plain cedar shingles, cornice with small brackets and topped by a weather vane
- wood soffit
- wood fascia
- one-over-one sash wood windows
- wood storm windows
- window hoods
- window sills
- a multi-paned stained glass window
- brick with etching that says “Alice loves Bob McCarthy” on east facade
- prominent interior wooden staircase
- wood trim in interior
- large pocket doors in interior
- first floor fireplace with glazed decorative tiles
- association with Packham family
- association with Packham Brick Works/Brampton Pressed Brick Company Ltd./Brampton Brick Ltd.
- short setback from street
- contribution to the neighbourhood character

5. Alteration History and Heritage Integrity

The following are the known alterations to the subject property:

- Addition of enclosed porch
- Removal of corbelled chimney stacks
- Removal of shutter(s) on select windows
• Removal of storms on select windows
• Addition of aluminum stores of select windows

6. Archaeological Potential

The subject property has archaeological potential due to its proximity to a primary water source (Etobicoke Creek) and the early Euro-Canadian settlement of the area.

7. Policy Framework

In the context of land use planning, the Province of Ontario has declared that the wise use and management of Ontario’s cultural heritage resources is a key provincial interest.

A set of Provincial Policy Statements (PPS) provides planning policy direction on matters of provincial interest in Ontario. These statements set the policy framework for regulating the development and use of land. The relevant heritage policy statement is PPS 2.6.1, which states that “significant built heritage resources and significant cultural heritage landscapes shall be conserved”. PPS 2.6.1 is tied to Section 3 of the Ontario Planning Act, which stipulates that land use planning decisions by municipalities “shall be consistent with” the Provincial Policy Statements.

The policy is also integrated with the Ontario Heritage Act. This piece of legislation grants municipalities powers to preserve locally significant cultural heritage resources through heritage designation. Decisions as to whether a property should be designated heritage or not is based solely on its inherent cultural heritage value or interest.

City Council prefers to designate heritage properties with the support of property owners. However, Council will designate a property proactively, without the concurrence of a property owner as required. These principles are reflected in Brampton’s Official Plan. The relevant policies are as follows:

Section 4.9.1.3: All significant heritage resources shall be designated as being of cultural heritage value or interest in accordance with the Ontario Heritage Act to help ensure effective protection and their continuing maintenance, conservation and restoration.

Section 4.9.1.5: Priority will be given to designating all heritage cemeteries and all Class A heritage resources in the Cultural Heritage Resources Register under the Ontario Heritage Act.
Section 4.9.1.6: The City will give immediate consideration to the designation of any heritage resource under the Ontario Heritage Act if that resource is threatened with demolition, significant alterations or other potentially adverse impacts.

In 2013, the City of Brampton adopted a new Strategic Plan to guide the evolution, growth and development of the city over the next two decades. Heritage preservation is one of the strategic priorities of this new Strategic Plan.

These principles are also guided by recognized best practices in the field of heritage conservation.

8. Resources


Peel Art Gallery, Museum + Archives (PAMA)

“Wedding Bells”. Brampton Conservator 3 November 1892: 5.
9. Appendix

Figure 1: Map of 27 Wellington Street East (Source: City of Brampton)
Figure 2: Aerial view of 27 Wellington Street East (Source: City of Brampton)
Figure 3: Archival images of 27 Wellington Street East and adjacent property, 23 Wellington Street East, in 1948 (Source: Peel Art Gallery, Museum and Archives, 2013.001.017 Album 7, Page 76)
Figure 4: Front (north) façade, June 2015 (Source: City of Brampton)

Figure 5: Side (east façade), June 2015 (Source: City of Brampton)
Figure 6: Rear (south) façade, June 2015 (Source: City of Brampton)

Figure 7: Side (west) façade, June 2015 (Source: City of Brampton)
Figure 8: Small decorated dormer on round corner turret, surrounded by fish scale and plain cedar shingles, and cornice with small brackets, June 2015 (Source: City of Brampton)
Figure 9: Upper portion of round corner turret, including decorative brick belt course in Greek Key motif and window hood with corbelling, June 2015 (Source: City of Brampton)

Figure 10: Base of round corner turret, with windows with shutters, decorative brick belt course, dichromatic brick, and brick water table topped with quarter round brick containing egg and dart motif, June 2015 (Source: City of Brampton)
Figure 11: Top of round corner turret with conical root, and side (east) projecting gable, June 2015 (Source: City of Brampton)

Figure 12: Wood soffit, June 2015 (Source: City of Brampton)
Figure 13: Projecting side (west) bay with chimney, June 2015 (Source: City of Brampton)

Figure 14: One-over-one wood sash wood window with wood storm and shutters, June 2015 (Source: City of Brampton)
Figure 15: Multi-paned stained glass window on side (west) façade surrounded by decorative brick, June 2015 (Source: City of Brampton)

Figure 16: Brick with etching that says “Alice loves Bob McCarthy” on side (east) façade, June 2015 (Source: City of Brampton)
Figure 17: Small porch on side (west) façade, June 2015 (Source: City of Brampton)
Figure 18: Various decorative brick (Source: City of Brampton)
Figure 19: Enclosed front porch, June 2015 (Source: City of Brampton)
Figure 20: Front entrance door with bullseye rosettes, June 2015 (Source: City of Brampton)

Figure 21: Prominent Eastlake-inspired interior staircase, June 2015 (City of Brampton)
Figure 22: Interior staircase, June 2015 (City of Brampton)

Figure 23: Multi-paned stained glass window, June 2015 (City of Brampton)
Figure 24: Pocket doors, June 2015 (Source: City of Brampton)

Figure 25: Pocket doors, June 2016 (Source: City of Brampton)
Figure 26: Door trim, June 2015 (Source: City of Brampton)

Figure 27: First floor fireplace with glazed decorative tiles, June 2015 (Source: City of Brampton)
Figure 28: Window trim, June 2015 (Source: City of Brampton)
Subject: * 2016 Brampton City Council and Committee Meeting Schedule
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2016 Brampton City Council and Committee Meeting Schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>JANUARY</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun Mon Tue Wed Thu Fri Sat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 11 12 13 14 15 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FEBRUARY</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun Mon Tue Wed Thu Fri Sat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 8 9 10 CAO C of A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 15 Family Day ENH HB CYCL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 22 23 24 25 26 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MARCH</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun Mon Tue Wed Thu Fri Sat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 11 12 13 14 15 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>APRIL</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun Mon Tue Wed Thu Fri Sat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 11 12 13 14 15 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MAY</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun Mon Tue Wed Thu Fri Sat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 11 12 13 14 15 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JUNE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun Mon Tue Wed Thu Fri Sat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 11 12 13 14 15 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JULY</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun Mon Tue Wed Thu Fri Sat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 11 12 13 14 15 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AUGUST</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun Mon Tue Wed Thu Fri Sat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 11 12 13 14 15 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SEPTEMBER</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun Mon Tue Wed Thu Fri Sat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 11 12 13 14 15 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OCTOBER</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun Mon Tue Wed Thu Fri Sat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 11 12 13 14 15 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NOVEMBER</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun Mon Tue Wed Thu Fri Sat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 11 12 13 14 15 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DECEMBER</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun Mon Tue Wed Thu Fri Sat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 11 12 13 14 15 16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend**
- **C-1**: City Council
- **CPSC**: Community & Public Services Committee
- **CivH**: Civil Health
- **Cyc**: Cycling Advisory Committee
- **CSC**: Corporate Services Committee
- **Cyl**: Council of Adjustment
- **EA**: Emergency Advisory Committee
- **EC**: Economic Development Committee
- **FT**: Finance Committee
- **HC**: Health Committee
- **MF**: Management Committee
- **MB**: Member Services Committee
- **NAT**: Natural Resources Committee
- **P&IS**: Planning & Infrastructure Services Committee
- **PAM**: Property and Asset Management Committee
- **P&IS**: Planning & Infrastructure Services Committee
- **RC**: Regional Council
- **ShF**: Sports Hall of Fame Committee
- **SMP**: Social & Member Services Committee
- **T**: Temporary
- **U**: Unspecified
- **V**: Victoria Day
- **VAC**: Vacancy
- **W**: Weekly
- **WED**: Wednesday
- **Y**: Yearly

**Note**: Tentative dates are marked with **T**.
Grimbsy Wins the 2015 Prince of Wales Prize

Michael Seaman

The Town of Grimsby has earned national honours as the 2015 recipient of the Prince of Wales Prize for Municipal Heritage Leadership. This award was established in 1999 by the Heritage Canada Foundation, now the National Trust for Canada, under the patronage of his Royal Highness the Prince of Wales. It honours a municipal government for demonstrating exemplary commitment to the preservation of its built heritage through such means as regulation, policies, funding, community engagement and education, and stewardship.

The selection of Grimsby, a community of only 26,000, is a testament to the enthusiasm of volunteers and willingness of heritage property owners to preserve and celebrate local heritage. This is a movement that began in 1913 when the first Grimsby Historical Society was founded in the wake of the War of 1812 Centennial Celebration. Through the efforts, awareness, and foresight of multi generations of Grimsby residents and political leaders, a culture of conservation has become entrenched in the Town to make heritage preservation a key component of municipal policies and practice. The Trust explains why Grimsby is the 2015 recipient:

Though faced with developmental pressures, Grimsby has recognized the importance of heritage conservation in improving quality of life and enhancing a sense of place and community. Thanks to this longstanding commitment, today more than 95 percent of the town’s pre-1939 building stock still stands.

Beginning with the conversion of a former blacksmith shop (c.1800) into the first Grimsby Museum in 1963, the Town has demonstrated a firm commitment to investing in its heritage assets. In 1986, the Heritage Inventory was created which today lists 142 properties. A Cultural Heritage Landscape Inventory established this year includes 26 sites to date.

In Grimsby, heritage planning is integrated into the Official Plan. Its vision states that “Grimsby’s future will build on its small town scenic character” and that “Grimsby’s natural
It was a winning night for the Town of Grimsby. A Grimsby student attending Carleton University, Sara Nixon, created a smart phone App, "Grimsby Timescapes," that provides information about heritage buildings in Grimsby. She received the Herb Stovel Scholarship. A Grimsby heritage practitioner, Philip Hoad, was recognized by the Canadian Association of Heritage Professionals for his work, along with a team of heritage professionals, on the restoration of the Basilica of Our Lady in Guelph.

heritage, cultural heritage and arts will be celebrated and protected."

To demonstrate this commitment, Grimsby, in partnership with the Region of Niagara, has implemented a robust suite of policies and programs aimed at promoting heritage conservation. Financial measures include:

- Designated Property Grant Program: Provides grants up to $30,000 for heritage-designated commercial property and $10,000 for heritage-designated residential property for façade improvement projects.
- Downtown Grimsby Façade Improvement Grants up to $20,000 for façade improvements.
- Downtown Grimsby Property Rehabilitation and Redevelopment Tax Increment Rebate: Owners who complete property rehabilitation projects are eligible for reimbursement in the form of an annual grant equivalent to 70% of the resulting municipal tax increment for up to 10 years.

Michael Seaman is the Director of Planning for the Town of Grimsby.

**Ontario News from The National Trust for Canada**

**Awards Recipients**

The National Trust for Canada congratulates the recipients of its 2015 National Heritage Awards for outstanding contributions in their fields. Candidates for The Prince of Wales Prize, the Leadership Awards, and the Ecclesiastical Insurance Cornerstone Awards were formally nominated by Canadians from across the country. The Town of Grimsby is the recipient of the prestigious Prince of Wales Prize for Municipal Heritage Leadership. The following are the Ontario recipients of the Ecclesiastical Insurance Cornerstone Awards for Building Heritage:

- Market Street Development, Toronto, Taylor Smyth Architects and Woodcliffe Landmark Properties
- New Learning Centre, Building 94, Central Experimental Farm, Ottawa, GRC Architects Inc. and the Canada Agriculture and Food Museum
- The London Roundhouse, London, Creative Property Developments
- Trinity-St. Paul’s United Church Sanctuary, Toronto, ERA Architects Inc., Tafelmusik Baroque Orchestra and Chamber Choir and Trinity-St. Paul’s United Church

**New Crowdfunding Opportunity**

THIS PLACE MATTERS is an exciting tool that will help organizations embrace the power of social media, reach new audiences, and raise funds. It is designed with heritage places in mind and offers resources to help project teams plan and execute an effective crowdfunding campaign. Thanks to our Founding Partner, the RBC Foundation, the National Trust for Canada is offering a special opportunity to boost contributions made to the site and help project teams reach their crowdfunding goals. We will match 50 cents on the dollar, for the first $25,000 contributed through the site. To explore projects posted to the site, make a contribution, or submit a project, Canadians are invited to visit thisplacematters.ca.

**New Board of Governors Member for Ontario**

The National Trust for Canada is pleased to announce that Michael Seaman has joined its Board of Governors to represent Ontario. Michael is the Director of Planning for the Town of Grimsby, Ontario. With more than 25 years of experience in urban and heritage planning, he brings knowledge, insight, and enthusiasm for conserving and sensitively reusing heritage resources in ways that improve quality of life. He is currently heritage editor for Ontario Planning Journal and a faculty associate with Willowbank School of Restoration Arts.

For further information contact Carolyn Quinn, Director of Communications, The National Trust for Canada, cquinn@nationaltrustcanada.ca, 613 237 1066 ext. 229; mobile 613 797 7206.
On a warm and sunny afternoon in early October 2015, onlookers gathered to witness an official key transfer ceremony for a significant cultural heritage property in the Town of Ajax. In the presence of all members of Council, ownership of the former Quaker Meeting House, built in 1867, was symbolically transferred to the Town from the Freemasonry body that had been its capable steward for more than seventy years. The occasion marked an important event in the building’s nearly 150 year history and signified the Town’s ongoing commitment to the preservation of its heritage landmarks and landscapes.

The former Quaker Meeting House, located on the fringe of historic Pickering Village at the intersection of Kingston Road and Mill Street, has a long history connected to many of the area's earliest and most influential residents. The land was acquired in 1808 by Timothy Rogers, as part of an 800 acre parcel. Rogers was a faithful member of the Religious Society of Friends (commonly known as Quakers) and made it his life's mission to settle Quaker colonies across the United States and Canada. In 1814, he donated seven acres for use as a Quaker Meeting House and the creation of a community cemetery. The first Meeting House was built about 1819 but was replaced by a two storey, frame structure about 1833. The present red brick structure was completed in 1867 and opened on June 28, 1867, with the first Independent Yearly Meeting of Friends in Canada.

Pickering Village continued to grow through the latter half of the 19th century, with new Quaker residents settling in the community from other areas of Canada, the United States, and abroad. In 1878, the Quakers opened a new educational facility, Pickering College, in proximity to the Meeting House, further emphasizing the religious roots of the community.

On December 30, 1905, a catastrophic fire broke out in the College, the first of a series of unfortunate events that would eventually take a toll on the size and strength of the Quaker community in the area. Rather than rebuild the College on its existing site, a decision was made to open a new school in the village of Newmarket, where the school continues to operate today.

Less than three years after the fire, on a stormy summer's night, Pickering residents were awakened by the sound of the village fire alarm. Those who converged on the scene witnessed an illuminated night sky, as flames burst from the roof of the Quaker Meeting House. The fire reduced the building to its masonry walls, but unlike years earlier with the College, the community decided to rebuild within the damaged shell. Quakers used the Meeting House until their population declined and the building fell into disuse in the early 20th century. Following a decade of use by other religious denominations, in 1943 it was purchased by the local Freemasonry Lodge to accommodate its growing membership.

This building is architecturally significant for its simple American Classical Revival features, its symmetry, and its atypical design when compared to other Ontario Quaker Meeting Houses. Its design provides for a very tall volume of space, which differs from the traditional, single storey, frame construction of other Meeting Houses of the same period. This unique design reflects the stature and resourcefulness of the Pickering Quaker community. The large, central front door provides a focal point around which the building's symmetry revolves and suggests the building's importance as a centre of community life. The detailed but unadorned common bond brickwork of the exterior walls, the simple free laid stone foundation, and the symmetrically placed, round headed window openings, evoke the restraint, solidity, and dignity of the Quaker way of life. The building is one of a few Quaker Meeting Houses remaining in the province and provides a strong physical connection to the role played by the Quakers in the origins of Pickering Village.

The Town of Ajax will continue the tradition of community uses within this important structure. It will continue to operate as a Masonic Lodge and will offer rental space for meetings, as well as neighbourhood programming for local residents. Town Council has approved a restoration plan which anticipates all
work will be completed by the fall of 2017 to mark the 150th anniversary of its construction and of Canada’s Confederation. Following completion of this work, Ajax Heritage Advisory Committee will pursue designation of the property under the Ontario Heritage Act.

Mike Sewchuck is a Senior Planner at the Town of Ajax and staff liaison to the Ajax Heritage Advisory Committee.

The Case for 24 Sussex Drive
Leslie Mailand

 Barely had the dust settled from the October 19, 2015 federal election when the question of the Prime Minister’s residence, 24 Sussex Drive, came up. The ensuing discussion in the media from coast to coast raised interest in heritage conservation the way few topics ever have.

The residence at 24 Sussex is in rough shape. The house has not had a proper upgrade since it was purchased by the federal government in 1949 as a residence for the Prime Minister (until that date, Prime Ministers had lived in various accommodations around the city of Ottawa). The house was built in 1867-68 for wealthy and socially prominent Ottawa lumber baron J.M. Currier, and his third wife. The house was a great Victorian pile with a richly decorated façade and interior. This was hardly to the tastes of the 1950s, and so Public Works toned down the exterior and interior to its present appearance, a handsome and picturesque, stone house on an amazing site. Since then, 24 Sussex has housed every Prime Minister, giving it a long association with our nation’s history. Unfortunately, not much else has been done since 1950: there is no fire suppression system, there is asbestos, the wiring, heating, and plumbing all need to be updated.

How did it get this bad? The National Capital Commission, which is responsible for the maintenance of official residences in Ottawa, cannot be faulted. Over the years, the tenants just did not want to move out to get the work done and the NCC could not force the issue. Former Prime Minister Stephen Harper did not want to be seen spending federal money on something that was chiefly of benefit to himself. But, the Prime Minister and his family work hard and live in a public building. Our 24 Sussex is quite unlike the White House in Washington or 10 Downing Street in London. It was never intended for large public functions, nor was it intended to house the executive, as do the other two official residences. In Ottawa, large national events are held at Rideau Hall, the Governor General’s residence, and the executive is downtown in the Langevin Block. No. 24 Sussex is very much a family home, with some capacity for only small scale receptions.

The reasons to renovate are overwhelming. This is a Classified Federal Heritage Building with its importance based upon its historical associations, exterior design, and its breathtaking location on the cliffs overlooking the Ottawa River. It is part of a suite of closely sited buildings which speak to the foundations
of Canada's democracy: Rideau Hall is across the street; down the street is Elm-scliffe, the home of Sir John A. Macdonald while he was Prime Minister; and it is within sight of Parliament Buildings. No. 24 Sussex is already a showpiece of Canadian history.

This is also an excellent opportunity to showcase "green" heritage conservation. While upgrading all the systems, this is the time to install geothermal heating and cooling and other "green" technologies. Many heritage conservation projects are now winning LEED certification. Do we really want to send a designated heritage building to landfill? The greenest building is the one that is already there and left standing.

What a lot of expense for a building few Canadians will ever visit, you might ask. There are ways around that, too. Yes, the Prime Minister deserves a place of privacy and retreat. Perhaps the residence could be opened to the public once every year during Doors Open, as many ambassadorial residences and even the US Embassy are now. Perhaps its restoration could be a sesquicentennial project: open the doors for a few months during the 150th anniversary party, before closing the doors for private use again. For now, Prime Minister Trudeau and his young family are sensibly housed at Rideau Cottage, a former staff house on the grounds of Rideau Hall, recently renovated, secure, and close to the family's former neighbourhood.

Sad to say, but 24 Sussex is not the only neglected, federally owned heritage building in Ottawa. The former Embassy of the United States, across the street from the Parliament Buildings, has been standing derelict for years, ever since the Harper government canned the idea of installing the National Portrait Gallery in the building. The Harper Government also proposed to chop off a piece of the Central Experimental Farm National Historic Site to subsidize a new municipal hospital.

Canadians should know that there is no legislative protection for national historic sites or for federally owned heritage properties, so we would be naive to think our heritage properties are secure. We should do better.

Leslie Maitland is a member of Heritage Ottawa.

Tick, Tock, What About That Clock?

Paul R. King

The Superior Court of Justice recently released the decision by the Honourable Justice D.R. Aston in the case of Foley v. The Corporation of the Town of St. Marys, 2015 ONSC 6214 (CanLII) (ontariocourts.ca/search-canli/scj/scj-en.htm). This relates to the designation of the Andrews Jeweller property in St. Marys. There are two lessons to be learned about the Ontario Heritage Act from this decision, one dealing with notice requirements and the other dealing with the distinction between fixtures and chattels.

Notice Requirements

When notifying an owner that a property is about to be designated under s. 29 of the Ontario Heritage Act, it is important to check and double check the notice information. In the case of the Notice of Intention to Designate sent by the Town of St. Marys to the Foley's, one of the numbers in the postal code for the Foley's address in London was incorrect, an easy mistake. This error gave the Foley's a window of opportunity to argue that they did not receive notice of the impending designation. They argued that, due to the lack of notice, the designating bylaw (passed several years earlier) should, therefore, be declared void. This error was minor, and at the end of the day, Justice Ashton decided as follows:

The [Foley]s acknowledged . . . that they were aware from the notice published in the newspaper of the municipality's intent to pass the by-law designating the property prior to the adoption of that by-law. Moreover, the [Foley's] . . . had already advised the municipality in prior discussions that they were fully aware of the municipality's intention to pass a designating by-law and though they were not consenting to such a by-law, they would not be participating in the by-law process . . . . An owner who had actual notice of an intended designating by-law and its particulars (notwithstanding that notice was not strictly in accordance with [the requirements in the Ontario Heritage Act]) should not be able to rely on lack of notice to quash the by-law. Notice adequately given may nevertheless have been actually received. It follows that a technically defective notice is an irregularity rather than a

prerequisite to the power or jurisdiction of the municipality. I find that the failure to strictly comply with [the requirements in the Act] may render a designating by-law voidable but it does not render it void ab initio.
Nevertheless, this inadvertent error was part of the basis of a legal proceeding that was costly and time consuming for both parties.

**Fixtures vs. Chattels**

Under Part IV of the Act, it is possible to include interior features of a building (in addition to external features) in the designation statement. (This is not the same for Part V (Heritage Conservation Districts) designations which only deal with the exterior.) For the Andrews Jeweller building in St. Marys, all the original interior features from 1884, including a wall clock, walnut showcases, counters, and mirrors, were included in the designation statement. All of these items could be easily detached from the building and removed. The Foleys argued that the designation bylaw should either be quashed or, alternatively, amended to delete the wall clock, walnut showcases, counters, and mirrors. They reasoned that the designation included "chattels" in addition to "fixtures."

Object is integral to the real estate, even if it is not firmly attached, it may still be a fixture. For example, a hinged door is affixed, with the intention of improving the property. A "chattel" is an object attached only with the purpose of temporary use or ornament so as to be removable. For example, a painting hanging by a hook is a chattel.

There are, however, examples where the distinction between a fixture and a chattel is blurred. Justice Ashton accepted the submission of counsel for the Foleys that the jurisdiction and authority of a municipality under Part IV is limited to real property, including fixtures, and does not include chattels. In the case of the Andrews Jeweller building, he ruled:

(Though easily removed, the clock is in fact affixed to the wall. It loses its characterization as a chattel if there is evidence to show it was affixed with the purpose or intention of improving the premises as a whole. The evidence here establishes that the clock was designed for the jewellery store at the same time as the counters and cabinets, or shortly thereafter. I find that the ornate appearance and craftsmanship of the clock seem specifically designed to complement the rest of the décor, in particular the walnut and glass cabinets and counters. . . . On balance, I find the wall clock is a fixture in the context of the Ontario Heritage Act. . . . For similar reasons, the cabinets, counters, showcases and mirrors are also fixtures. . . . They were designed and installed for the express purpose of attracting customers and selling jewelry through an enhancement of the realty. . . . They were used for that purpose and never moved again in over 100 years.

The lesson here is to be careful about drafting designating bylaws so that they designate real estate and not chattels. There is, however, not always a clear distinction between fixtures and chattels, which explains the considerable volume of case law dealing with this subject. Details matter, so be very specific with the wording of designation statements.

Paul R. King is a member of the CHO/PCO Board of Directors.
After 120 years of continuous use as a classroom, Vineland's schoolhouse was demolished in thirty minutes on July 21, 2015, by the District School Board of Niagara. There is a dramatic video of the demolition posted online (vps.1895.ca). The schoolhouse more than satisfied every criterion for designation as a municipal and a provincial heritage property under the Ontario Heritage Act.

Over 1,800 paper petitioners, 1,400 Facebook supporters, 600 signatories at Change.org, and 50 passionate letter writers supported the efforts by Friends of Vineland Public School 1895 to save this key piece of Lincoln's built heritage.

The District School Board of Niagara refused to change its plans to replace the schoolhouse with three parking spots. Successive Lincoln mayors and Town Councils (2010 to 2014, 2015 to 2019) failed to exercise any leadership to save this landmark. The Town aided the DSBN in fighting legal efforts to prevent the schoolhouse's destruction. The Ontario Minister and Ministry of Tourism, Culture, and Sport stood aside and did nothing.

Ontario's heritage designation process is broken. Both the municipal and provincial designation processes and the Ontario Heritage Act (OHA), on which they are founded, require substantial overhauls. Based on our experience trying to save Vineland's last public heritage building, we submitted the following recommendations to Ontario's Culture Strategy, underway as talks toward strengthening Ontario's approach to protecting its built heritage.

1. The Ontario Ministry of Tourism, Culture, and Sport (MTCS) should undertake a public audit and stocktaking of heritage policies, strategies, processes, and registries in Ontario's 444 municipalities to assess the current state of Ontario's municipal heritage designation institutional infrastructure. Once a clear picture of deficiencies has been created, remedial action should be taken by the MTCS to ensure municipalities plug these holes.

2. Stronger expectations on municipalities for robust heritage designation systems should be written into an amended OHA. The OHA should compel municipalities to create, operate, and maintain these systems. The OHA should also compel municipalities to take proper account of the counsel provided by their municipal heritage committees and to justify in a transparent fashion any deviations from committee recommendations.

3. The Ontario government needs to create an appeal process for concerned parties when municipalities fail to designate valuable heritage properties. Leave to appeal to the Ontario Municipal Board in such cases, which was eliminated in the 2005 revision of the OHA, should be restored or an alternative appeal process should be created.

4. Provisions should be added to the OHA to ensure that any damage to designated heritage properties must be compensated for with appropriate remediation and restoration work. In short, the OHA should be given the same teeth as similar environmental legislation.

5. The OHA should be revised to mandate coordination amongst public bodies on the heritage status of all public buildings, with a particular emphasis on those older than 100 years. Ontario law and policy should mandate that all public buildings of potential heritage value should be subjected to a heritage review process prior to any decision to sell, alter, or demolish them. For instance, Accommodation Review processes run by local school boards should be required to participate in a municipal or provincial heritage review prior to a decision to close, renovate, or destroy a historic school building.

6. The Ontario Attorney General's office should provide clarifying guidance for the Minister of Tourism, Culture, and Sport and Ministry officials on the distinct application of the OHA for municipal and provincial heritage designation, which are separate processes under the Act. It should never again be the case that the Minister defers to municipalities on a provincial heritage designation application.

7. The Ontario government should create a process for review and appeal of Ministerial decisions on provincial heritage status. There is no appeal process when the Minister fails to act on a provincial heritage designation request. Clear criteria have been established for provincial heritage designation. Nevertheless, the process by which the Minister considers such requests is entirely opaque and subject to the arbitrary discretion of the Minister. Once a decision is rendered, there appears to be no review process in response to either a positive or negative decision.

We hope that these recommendations will feature in Ontario's new cultural strategy and in the government's work program for the year ahead. We know from Toronto's St Lawrence Market to Ottawa's Parliament Hill to Niagara's Historic Canal, that preservation of built heritage makes a significant contribution to Ontario's social and economic wellbeing. It is time to make Ontario's efforts and structures to protect its built heritage more strategic and effective, and less ad hoc and arbitrary.

Carla Mackie is with Friends of Vineland Public School 1895 and is Chair of the Town of Lincoln Municipal Heritage Committee.
Community Heritage Ontario Service Awards 2016

Community Heritage Ontario is pleased to present the 1st Annual Heritage Service Awards. The CHO/PCO Board of Directors invites nominations for 2 awards to be presented at the Ontario Heritage Conference in Stratford/St. Marys, May 12-15, 2016.

One award is given annually to an individual in each category

1. Service to CHO - members are encouraged to submit the names of CHO members who have provided a minimum of 5 years of service to CHO; have shown leadership in CHO; have furthered the cause of heritage in Ontario.

2. Service to Municipal Heritage Committees who are members of CHO - members are encouraged to submit the names of members of their Municipal Heritage Committee (MHC) who have provided a minimum of 5 years of service to their MHC; have shown leadership in the MHC; have furthered the cause of heritage in their local community. The MHC must be a member in good standing with CHO.

The nominator must submit the following:

Category of Nomination
Name and Contact Information of Nominee
Number of Years of Service
Contributions made in the nominating category
Name and Contact Information of the Nominating Member(s)
or Municipal Heritage Committee

Standing CHO/PCO Board Members are not eligible for an award.

Please send your nomination to:
Community Heritage Ontario
24 Conlins Road
Scarborough, ON M1C 1C3
or by email
rickschofield@communityheritageontario.ca

Deadline for Nominations is Thursday, March 24, 2016
Fire! How often have you sought to conserve a heritage resource only to see it literally go up in flames? It happens all too often, especially when buildings are left vacant. I know that I have worked for years to conserve heritage buildings only to see them destroyed by fire. These photographs show a property in Brampton where I was called in after the building had been destroyed. On others, I have worked for years documenting the resource, working with the owner to develop plans to conserve the resource, only to see it totally destroyed. Not only is there a sense of loss for the community, but such events are personally discouraging.

Leah Wallace of Niagara-on-the-Lake has a good article in the Jan/Feb 2015 edition of the Ontario Planning Journal (this issue of the Journal is posted at communityheritageontario.ca) about rebuilding after a fire. Do you recreate what was lost? Or do you build something new, of its time? Or is it some combination?

But how can we avoid getting to this decision point, where we are looking at a hole in the ground where an important resource once stood, and considering what should go in its place. Municipal heritage committees do have a role to play in preventing the destruction of heritage resources by fire. Review your municipal bylaws dealing with vacant buildings. Ensure that there are sufficient measures to prevent unauthorized entry. Boarding up of a vacant building is the first step, but it is not sufficient. I have been to buildings which appear to be boarded only to find an entry, out of site from the public, that has been opened and all woodwork has been stripped out of the house. Locked, tall fencing around the vacant building is another additional measure. Snow fences just don’t cut it when it comes to protection. Active alarm systems are another measure that can be required, even if electricity has been removed from the building, they can still be installed. Finally, frequent monitoring of the site can be required to ensure vacant buildings remain secure. Having reviewed your municipal bylaw, advise your Council on changes that should be made to tighten up the requirements.

Finally, develop a rapport with your fire chief. Sometimes a burned building can be salvaged or the ruins would be a good heritage resource if made safe for the public. But those options vanish if the chief orders the remains leveled immediately following the fire.

Perhaps you have additional ideas on this issue. Let us know so we can let other municipal heritage committees know.

Au feu ! Combien de fois avons-nous chercher à conserver une ressource patrimoniale juste pour la voir partir en feu ? Ceci arrive trop souvent, particulièrement lorsque les bâtiments sont laissés vacants. Je sais que j’ai travaillé pendant des années pour conserver des structures patrimoniales qui ont été détruites par le feu. Les photos ci-jointes montrent une propriété à Brampton pour laquelle j’ai été appelé après sa destruction. Pour d’autres, j’ai travaillé pendant des années pour documenter la propriété, travaillant avec le propriétaire pour développer des plans pour la conservation, juste pour la voir totalement détruite. Non seulement un sens de perte pour la communauté, mais de tels événements sont personnellement décourageants.

Leah Wallace de Niagara-on-the-Lake a un bon article dans l’édition de jan/fév 2015 du Ontario Planning Journal (cet édition se trouve sur notre site web communityheritageontario.ca) sur la reconstruction après un feu. Doit-on recréer ce qui a été perdu ? Ou bâtir quelque chose de neuf, en dehors de son temps ? Ou un mélange des deux ?

Mais comment pouvons-nous éviter ce point tournant où nous regardons un trou là où était une ressource important et devons prendre une décision sur ce qui devra la remplacer. Les comités municipaux sur le patrimoine ont un rôle à jouer dans la prévention de la destruction par le feu des ressources patrimoniales. Réviser vos règlements municipaux en matière de propriétés vacantes. Assurez-vous qu’il y
est suffisamment de mesure pour prévenir les entrées non autorisées. Barricader les édifices vacants est un premier pas, mais ce n'est pas suffisant. Je suis allé dans des édifices qui semblaient barricader simplement pour trouver une autre entrée, hors de vue du public, une ouverture et toutes les boiseries arrières de la maison. Une clôture haute et barrée, autour d'une propriété, est une mesure additionnelle. La clôture à neige ne suffit pas lorsqu'on parle de protection. Un système d'alarme actif est une autre mesure qui peut être nécessaire, même si l'électricité a été enlevé, il peut être installé. Finalement, la surveillance périodique du site peut être requise pour s'assurer que la propriété vacante demeure sûre. Après révision des règlements municipaux, avisez votre conseil municipal des changements qui pourraient être fait pour resserrer les exigences.

Finalement, développé un rapport pour votre chef pompier. Quelque fois un édifice incendié peut être récupéré ou les ruines pourraient être une ressource si mise disponible au public. Cependant ces options disparaissent si le chef ordonne le site nivelé après le feu.

Peut-être avez-vous des idées additionnelles sur le sujet. Laissez-nous savoir et nous partagerons avec les autres comités municipaux.
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News from the CHO/PCO Board of Directors

The CHO/PCO Board of Directors met on November 22, 2015, in Scarborough, to conduct its usual business. The Corporate Secretary reported that membership for 2015 stands at 121 Municipal Heritage Committees/Groups, with a total membership base of 922 individuals. CHO/PCO received the annual grant from the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport, and acknowledged this ongoing financial support. With reduced printing and postage expenditures as a result of sending an electronic version of CHOnews to those who have made that request, the Corporation will balance its budget for 2015.

The Board approved a letter outlining CHO/PCO’s concern about the future of the historic property at 24 Sussex Drive in Ottawa (the official residence of the Prime Minister), urging “the federal government to develop a program of restoration to conserve the character defining attributes, both exterior and interior, of this heritage resource.”

The Conference Committee reported that there is declining interest in holding the annual Ontario Heritage Conference in Toronto in 2017. Efforts have switched to attempting to hold the conference in Ottawa, which will be celebrating its Sesquicentennial that year.

For the benefit of major libraries and for CHO/PCO members who want a set, the Board again approved the binding of back issues of CHOnews into a hardcover book format. This was done for the years 1991-2000 and only two bound copies remain available for sale. The next bound set will cover the years 2001-2010 and will be available for purchase early in 2016. Cost will likely be around $25 to $30. Please contact the Corporate Secretary if you are interested in obtaining a bound set.

CHO/PCO is always looking for new members to serve on the Board of Directors and its committees. Although the next annual general meeting will not be until May 2016 in Stratford/St. Marys, now is the time to consider joining the Board or a committee and adding your knowledge and experience to this provincial heritage organization. The Board meets quarterly, usually on the fourth Sunday of September, November, March, and May/June in Scarborough. Travel expenses are paid, as well as accommodation for those coming to a Board meeting from a long distance. Various committees are formed (Communications, Conference, Education, etc.) and conduct their business by teleconference calls. Please drop us a note if you are interested.

Advertise in CHOnews!

Reach a province-wide readership composed of all Municipal Heritage Committee members, heritage societies, municipal officials, and heritage conscious individuals!

DISPLAY ADS must be supplied in camera-ready tiff or pdf format. Location of ads is at the discretion of the Editor. Cost is per issue:

Full Page $300
Half Page $150
Third Page $100
Quarter Page $75
One Sixth 5”x 2.6” $50
Business Card $25

CLASSIFIED ADS: $12.00 per column inch

To place an ad in CHOnews, please contact Rick Schofield at 416.282.2710
schofield@communityheritageontario.ca
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When it comes to effectively using conventional and social media to save historical buildings and sites, advocates would do well to focus on "something like monetizing heritage."

So says Christopher Hume, who will make that point as a member of the media panel at the Ontario Heritage Conference in Stratford and St. Marys, May 12-14, 2016. Hume is the architecture critic and urban issues columnist for the Toronto Star.

He will be urging the panelists and delegates to "talk to people like the developers who did the Distillery District and the Flatiron Building (both in Toronto), and to the dozens who have made heritage a huge economic asset." As well, he adds, they cannot ignore the tax incentives that could encourage preservation and re-use.

"Currently, there's Old City Hall in Toronto," says Hume, "which consultants suggested should be turned into a shopping mall. If that doesn't raise the hackles of the heritage movement what does?"

Also on the OHC panel next spring will be Romayne Smith-Fullerton, long-time professor in the Faculty of Information and Media Studies at Western University.

"Check any news story about preservation be it a building, a streetscape or a piece of natural landscape," she says, "and you'll also see feedback from those who say, 'out with the old and in with the new.' But if we don't commit to remembering our past, we are in real danger of forgetting from where we come. Why does it matter? Because buildings and streetscapes and landscapes offer us the actual space, a shared public space, where we can touch and feel and experience that past. It's an experiential thing that can't be duplicated, and needs to be valued.

"Communities today are about creating shared spaces where all of us can come together to think about where we live, how we live, and how best we can foster ties."

More than 300 delegates are expected to attend the conference, sponsored by the Architectural Conservancy of Ontario and Community Heritage Ontario. The local planning committee includes members from Community Heritage Ontario, the Stratford-Perth branch of the ACO, the St. Marys Heritage Committee, the Stratford Heritage Committee, the Stratford Tourism Alliance, the Town of St. Marys, the City of Stratford and others.

For more information, contact Dean Robinson, at deanrobinson@wightman.ca

Who is your Heritage Hero?

CHOnews wants you to share your personal heritage anecdotes or stories of your inspirational heritage heroes. Submit 500 to 1,000 words with photographs or illustrations (jpg file format, high resolution) and captions to tracygayda@communityheritageontario.ca

Disclaimer

The content of CHOnews does not contain nor reflect any opinion, position, or influence of the CHO/PCO Board of Directors or the Editor of CHOnews. Submissions received for publication in CHOnews are changed only for purposes of legibility and accuracy to the extent that can be readily determined.