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Executive Summary

The City of London (the City) retained Stantec Consulting Ltd. (Stantec) to prepare a Cultural Heritage Assessment Report (CHAR) for the Clarke Road Improvements (the Project), between the Veterans Memorial Parkway Extension and Fanshawe Park Road East in London, Ontario. The CHAR forms part of the planning and design process for a Schedule C Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (Class EA).

As part of the Class EA this CHAR has been completed to identify cultural heritage resources, including built heritage and cultural heritage landscapes present within the study area (Figure 1). Potential cultural heritage resources were identified through consultation with City Heritage Planning Staff and a pedestrian survey. Known and potential cultural heritage resources were inventoried and evaluated according to O. Reg. 9/06, the criteria for cultural heritage value or interest (CHVI). A land use history was completed to provide a cultural context for the study area and to provide a background upon which to base evaluations. Where CHVI was identified, the resource was mapped. Based on the presence of known protected heritage properties, a CHAR is necessary to identify anticipated impacts to cultural heritage resources and identify mitigation measures.

Consultation with Kyle Gonyou, City Heritage Planner, identified three properties listed on the City of London Inventory of Heritage Resources (City of London 2006) within the study area as well as the Thames River as a Canadian Heritage River. One additional potential cultural heritage resource was identified during the site visit: the J.W. Carson Bridge over the Thames River.

There are potential for indirect or direct impacts to the J.W. Carson Bridge (HR-1) as a result of potential alteration of the structure depending on the widening alternative selected. However, the cultural heritage value of the J.W. Carson Bridge is associated with the plaque affixed to the structure. The structure itself was not found to have CHVI. Direct impacts may also occur on 1424 Clarke Road (HR-5) if mature trees at the end of the driveway are removed as a result of widening or construction. There is potential for indirect impacts to 1511 Clarke Road (HR-3), as the resource is located within 50 metres of where construction activities are expected to occur.

Based on the potential for adverse impacts identified to the cultural heritage resource, it is recommended that the following mitigation measures be implemented:

- Salvage the plaque from the existing J.W. Carson Bridge such that it can be reinstalled at the replacement bridge, following construction.
- Restore to existing or similar conditions Thames River banks altered by construction of replacement bridge abutments and piers, preferably using native riparian vegetation species.
- Where possible, avoid removal of mature maple trees at the end of the driveway at 1424 Clarke Road. If removal is required, replant following construction with the same species.
Where possible, establish a 50 metre buffer zone around the cultural heritage resource at 1511 Clarke Road where all construction activities should be avoided, including but not limited to ground disturbance and the movement of equipment and people to and from the site.

If a 50 metre buffer area around the cultural heritage resource at 1511 Clarke Road is not feasible given the construction requirements and site constraints, prepare vibration studies by a qualified engineer to determine the maximum acceptable vibration levels, or peak particle velocity (PPV) levels and the appropriate buffer distance between Project activities and the cultural heritage resource.

Monitor construction within the defined area at appropriate points at 1511 Clarke Road to confirm that acceptable PPV levels are not exceeded. All construction activities should cease if levels are exceeded until an acceptable solution can be identified.
1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 STUDY PURPOSE

The City of London (the City) retained Stantec Consulting Ltd. (Stantec) to prepare a Cultural Heritage Assessment Report (CHAR) for the Clarke Road Improvements (the Project), between the Veterans Memorial Parkway Extension and Fanshawe Park Road East in London, Ontario. The CHAR forms part of the planning and design process for a Schedule C Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (Class EA).

As part of the Class EA this CHAR has been completed to identify cultural heritage resources, including built heritage and cultural heritage landscapes present within the study area (Figure 1). Potential cultural heritage resources were identified through consultation with City Heritage Planning Staff and a pedestrian survey. Known and potential cultural heritage resources were inventoried and evaluated according to Ontario Regulation (O. Reg.) 9/06, the criteria for determining cultural heritage value or interest (CHVI).

A land use history was completed to provide a cultural context for the study area and to provide a background upon which to base evaluations. Where CHVI was identified, the resource was mapped. Based on the presence of known protected heritage properties, a CHAR is necessary to identify anticipated impacts to cultural heritage resources and identify mitigation measures.

To meet these objectives, the CHAR:

- summarizes the historical context of the area surrounding the Project
- identifies properties protected under the Ontario Heritage Act through consultation with the local heritage planners and regulatory bodies
- identifies and describes potential cultural heritage resources situated on properties within the study area based on a windshield survey of the study area
- evaluates the CHVI of potential cultural heritage resources at the study area according to O. Reg. 9/06 to determine the cultural heritage resources within the study area
- identifies areas of potential impacts according to the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport’s (MTCS) InfoSheet #5 in Heritage Resources in the Land Use Planning Process, Cultural Heritage and Archaeology Policies of the Ontario Provincial Policy Statement (PPS), 2005 (Government of Ontario 2006b), and establishes measures to mitigate negative direct or indirect impacts to cultural heritage resources associated with the Project.
2.0 METHODOLOGY

2.1 REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS

The requirement to consider cultural heritage in Class EAs is discussed in the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment document and the revised 2014 Provincial Policy Statement (PPS). The MCEA document considers the cultural environment, including built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes, as well as archaeological resources, as one in a series of environmental factors to be considered when undertaking a Class EA, particularly when describing existing and future conditions, development alternatives, and determination of the preferred alternative.

The MCEA document further suggests that cultural heritage resources which retain heritage attributes should be identified early in the EA process and avoided where possible. Where avoidance is not possible, potential effects to these attributes should be identified and minimized. Adverse impacts should be mitigated according to provincial and municipal guidelines.

In addition to requirements outlined in the MCEA document, provisions made under the PPS were also considered in the preparation of the study. Section 2.6 of the PPS addresses cultural heritage in the land use planning process and as such was considered. The applicable provisions include:

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

2.6.3 - 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.

(PPS 2014: 29)

In accordance with PPS requirements, the presence of a protected heritage property situated within or adjacent to lands where change is proposed requires consideration of the effects of the Project to the heritage property and, where necessary, demonstration that the heritage attributes of that protected heritage property will be conserved. Where a property was identified as protected through inclusion on a municipal list, registry, or inventory, an evaluation of CHVI is required to determine whether it meets the criteria of significance as described within the PPS. Properties which are designated under the Ontario Heritage Act are considered significant.
2.2 MUNICIPAL AND AGENCY INFORMATION REQUESTS

Listings of provincially and locally designated properties, districts, and easements were collected from the City, the Ontario Heritage Trust (OHT), and the MTCS. Consultation with agencies and the City of London within which the Project is proposed was undertaken to determine the presence of designated, listed, or registered heritage properties within the study area. A property can be designated or listed under the Ontario Heritage Act as well as registered municipally. These properties are considered to be protected heritage properties.

Recognition of protected heritage properties varies greatly and is dependent on the level of CHVI identified or, in some cases, the level of investigation undertaken. For the purpose of this study, any property previously identified by municipal staff or provincial agencies as containing, or having the potential to contain, CHVI was determined to be a protected heritage property or potential heritage property.

2.3 FIELD PROGRAM

A pedestrian and vehicular windshield survey was conducted by Lashia Jones, Cultural Heritage Specialist, and Frank Smith, Cultural Heritage Specialist Assistant, both with Stantec, on August 18, 2017. Stantec staff conducted the windshield and pedestrian survey from publicly accessible roadways, unless specified otherwise. During the field program, the study area was surveyed for potential cultural heritage resources, including both potential built heritage resources and components of cultural heritage landscapes. Where identified, these were photographed, and their locations recorded. Characteristics of each potential cultural heritage resource were noted while in the field.

In general, buildings and structures of more than 40 years of age were evaluated during the survey for their potential to satisfy O. Reg. 9/06 criteria. The use of the 40-year threshold is generally accepted by both the federal and provincial authorities as a preliminary screening measure for CHVI. This practice does not imply that all buildings and structures more than 40 years of age are inherently of significant heritage value, nor does it exclude exceptional examples constructed within the past 40 years of being of significant CHVI.

The metric system was adopted in Canada between 1971 and 1984. Given the mid-20th century construction date of the bridge, measurements and inspections prior to the 1970s would have been prepared according to Imperial standards. Converting measurements that are often standardized into metric may obscure patterns and relationships between features. Therefore, when discussing dimensions of historic structures imperial units are used. In all other areas, measuring distance for example, metric units are applied.

2.4 EVALUATION OF CULTURAL HERITAGE VALUE OR INTEREST

The criteria for determining CHVI is defined by O. Reg. 9/06 and the City’s Guidelines for the Identification of Cultural Heritage Landscapes in London as referenced in the London Plan. Each potential
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cultural heritage resource was considered both as an individual structure and as cultural landscape. Where CHVI was identified, a structure was assigned a built heritage resource (BHR) number and a landscape was assigned a cultural heritage landscape (CHL) number and the property was determined to contain a cultural heritage resource. Evaluations for each property are contained within Appendix A.

The City’s Official Plan, the London Plan, contains discussion of the evaluation of cultural heritage landscapes as per specific requirements that predate the use of O. Reg 9/06. Specifically referenced is the Guidelines for the Identification of Cultural Heritage Landscapes in London, a council adopted document for identifying, evaluating, and managing the City’s cultural heritage landscapes. These criteria use a similar approach in determining CHVI as O. Reg. 9/06 by identifying broad categories of historical significance and cultural significance where features contribute to an area’s heritage character by virtue of their physical elements. Following discussion with City staff, it was determined that both O. Reg. 9/06 and the City’s criteria would be used when evaluating the study area in its entirety as a potential cultural heritage landscape. O. Reg. 9/06 is provided below, and the City’s guidelines are provided in Appendix B.

### 2.4.1 Ontario Regulation 9/06

In order to identify CHVI at least one of the following criteria must be met:

1. The property has design value or physical value because it:
   - is a rare, unique, representative, or early example of a style, type, expression, material or construction method;
   - displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit; or
   - demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement.

2. The property has historical value or associative value because it:
   - has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization, or institution that is significant to a community;
   - yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of a community or culture; or
   - 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:
   - is important in defining, maintaining, or supporting the character of an area;
   - is physically, functionally, visually, or historically linked to its surroundings; or
   - is a landmark.


2.5 ASSESSMENT OF PROJECT IMPACTS

The assessment of impacts on cultural heritage resources is based on the impacts defined in the MTCS InfoSheet #5: Heritage Impact Assessments and Conservation Plans from the Heritage Resources in the Land Use Planning Process Cultural Heritage and Archaeology Policies of the Ontario Provincial Policy Statement, 2005 (Government of Ontario 2006b). Impacts to cultural heritage resources may be direct or indirect. Direct impacts include:

- **destruction** of any, or part of any, significant heritage attributes or features
- **alteration** that is not sympathetic, or is incompatible, with the historic fabric and appearance

Indirect impacts to cultural heritage resources do not result in the direct destruction or alteration of the feature or its heritage attributes, but may indirectly affect the CHVI of a property by causing:

- **shadows** created that alter the appearance of a heritage attribute or change the viability of a natural feature or plantings, such as a garden
- **isolation** of a heritage attribute from its surrounding environment, context, or a significant relationship
- **direct or indirect obstruction** of significant views or vistas within, from, or of built and natural features
- **a change in land use** such as rezoning a battlefield from open space to residential use, allowing new development or site alteration to fill in the formerly open spaces
- **land disturbances** such as a change in grade that alters soil, and drainage patterns that adversely affect an archaeological resource

(Government of Ontario 2006b)

Indirect impacts resulting from land disturbances apply to archaeological resources, which are beyond the scope of this assessment. An Archaeological Assessment has been prepared under a separate cover, which addresses the archaeological potential of the study area and includes recommendations for further work. No further consideration to archaeological resources is provided in this report and the recommendations of the Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment should be followed to mitigate impacts related to land disturbance (Stantec 2018).

In addition to direct impacts related to destruction, this report also evaluates the potential for indirect impacts resulting from construction vibrations and the transportation of Project components and personnel. Ground movements induced by construction vibration are found to dissipate with distance from the source. The severity of soil movements depends primarily on type and compactness/consistency of the surrounding soils particularly between the source, receiver, and groundwater levels. The source, duration, frequency of occurrences of vibration, and the foundation-footing interaction also contribute to the strains induced in structures. In the absence of in situ soil data and considering the typical vibration
levels induced by anticipated construction equipment associated with the proposed pipeline construction, a 50 metre buffer is recommended as an appropriate distance from road widening construction activities. Vibration monitoring is recommended where CHRs are located within 50 metres of the proposed work.

2.6 MITIGATION STRATEGIES

Mitigation strategies were prepared based on guidelines provided by the MTCS. The MTCS suggest methods of minimizing or avoiding negative direct or indirect impacts including, but not limited to:

- alternative development approaches
- isolating development and site alteration from significant built and natural features and vistas
- design guidelines that harmonize mass, setback, setting, and materials
- limiting height and density
- allowing only compatible infill and additions
- reversible alterations
- buffer zones, site plan control, and other planning mechanisms

(Government of Ontario 2006b)

In the case of road widening projects buffer zones and site plan controls are often the most appropriate method of mitigation when used in combination with alternative development approaches.
3.0 HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT

3.1 INTRODUCTION

The study area is located within London, Ontario in the former Township of London, Middlesex County. The study area spans the hamlet known as “The Grove” north along Clarke Road and over the Thames River north to Fanshawe Park Road East. The following sections outline the historical development of the study area from the time of Euro-Canadian settlement to the 21st century.

3.2 PHYSIOGRAPHY

The study area is located in the Caradoc Sand Plains and London Annex physiographic regions. The Caradoc Sand Plains and London Annex region is a flat sand plain extending from east London to the Strathroy area in the southwest. It is surrounded by the Stratford Till Plain to the north, the Mount Elgin Ridges to the east and the Ekfrid clay plain to the south and west. In its entirety, the region comprises approximately 482 square kilometres in southwestern Ontario. The land is generally flat with a few rolling hills. The soil in the area consists of three types: Fox fine sandy loam that appears on the finer soils which are deep and well drained, Berrien sandy loam which is a shallow layer of sand over clay with wet subsoil, and Oshtemo sand, which appears in sand hills and dunes.

The study area is part of the London Basin, an area predominantly characterized as a dairy region, although orchards and market gardens were present. Suburban development is increasingly encroaching upon this area. The deposits of sand and gravel in this area are excavated for use in building roads and concrete (Chapman and Putnam 1984: 146).

3.3 HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT

3.3.1 Survey and Settlement

The Province of Upper Canada was created in 1791 to separate Canada’s new Loyalist settlers from the established French settlements in Quebec. John Graves Simcoe was selected as Lieutenant Governor of the newly created province. Simcoe served in the British Army during the American Revolutionary War from 1775 to 1781. Upon his appointment as Lieutenant Governor in 1791, he eagerly planned to build a model British society in Upper Canada (Armstrong 1986: 18).

While studying maps of Upper Canada, he decided the provincial capital should be in the southwest. This strategic location would be too far inland for the Americans to easily attack. Simcoe and a party of men set out from Niagara in February 1793 to explore the area (Armstrong 1986: 17). Joining him on this expedition was Thomas Talbot, who later became a major colonizer and land owner in Southwestern Ontario. Simcoe was impressed when he arrived at the forks of The Thames and named the area London since he wished it to become the capital of the Province (London Township History Book Committee
2001a: 11). Despite Simcoe’s wishes, London was still too remote a location to be a capital city. Instead, the capital was moved to York (present day Toronto) (Armstrong 1986: 21).

The first surveyor in the region, Abraham Iredell, reported the agricultural conditions in Southwestern Ontario to be among the finest in North America. In 1800, the London District and Middlesex County was created (London Township History Book Committee 2001a:13). Middlesex County was further divided into townships, London Township being the largest at 12 square miles. The first settler in London Township was Joshua Applegarth, who arrived in 1807 and attempted to cultivate hemp before switching to other crops (Page 1878: 5).

London Township remained almost entirely unsettled until Thomas Talbot returned along with surveyor Mahlon Burwell to develop the township in 1810. Talbot would eventually be instrumental in the settlement of 29 townships in Southwestern Ontario. Before the outbreak of the War of 1812, Burwell surveyed Concessions 1 to 6 of the township, which includes the land in the study area (London Township History Book Committee 2001a: 12). After the war ended, the rest of the township was surveyed (Page 1878: 5).

The first land grant in the Township was patented to John Hale in 1812. The next year Burwell received several lots as part payment for his survey work. The first permanent settlers to the newly surveyed Township arrived in 1818. More than 100 settlers were brought to the township by Richard S. Talbot, a relative of Thomas. Thomas Talbot recommended Richard Talbot locate the settlement in the London Township.

Richard Talbot was born in Ireland and served as an officer in the British army from 1783 to 1790. Uncertain of his family’s future in Ireland, he decided to organize and sponsor a group of immigrants to Upper Canada. The sponsor had to deposit £10 per settler and find at least 10 prospective settlers over 17 years of age. Settlers would receive 100 acres and free transport to Quebec. As organizer, Talbot would receive a large land grant (London Township History Book Committee 2011b:491).

Richard Talbot chose lots in the study area for his grant and was the first settler in the study area. Richard Talbot was granted Lots 3 to 4 in Concession 5 and Lots 1, 2, and 4 in Concession 6 (London Township History Book Committee 2001a: 14).

In 1819, an additional 98 immigrants were assigned lots in the township by Thomas Talbot. The first township meeting was called in January 1819 at Joshua Applegarth’s home. At the meeting a town clerk, assessors, road masters, pound keepers, and wardens were selected (London Township 2001b: 5). The first religious services in the township were also conducted in 1819 by a Methodist circuit rider and in 1822 the first Anglican service was held (Armstrong 1986: 29).

3.3.2 19th Century Development

Development of the Township of London and the study area in the 19th century was focused on agriculture. Before farming could begin, the land had to be cleared. Settlers burned the logs and stumps on their property into “black salt”, made by boiling lye extracted from stump ashes. The ash was then
packed and exported to Britain for sale (London Township History Book Committee 2001a: 45). Within 10 years, the average settler usually built a log cabin, stable, smoke house, granary, and barn on his property. Wheat was the preferred crop and was shipped abroad from Port Stanley (London Township History Book Committee 2001a: 46).

Settlers were also tasked with improving the local roads. The road allowances in the study area were Concession 3 (now Huron Street), Concession 4 (now Kilally Road), and Concession 5 (now Fanshawe Park Road). The allowance between Lots 4 and 5 is now Clarke Road. Settlers struggled to make clear roadways. Progress was delayed when road allowances bordering unpatented lots remained uncleared (London Township History Book Committee 2001a: 83). Until the arrival of the railroad in London in 1853, it remained easier to travel in the township and region during winter by sled (London Township History Book Committee 2001a: 87).

By the early 1860s, half of the Township had been settled, including all the lots within the study area (Figure 2). In 1864 there were 92,489 acres of land settled in the township: 35,684 acres for crops, 11,983 acres for pasture, 1,162 acres for gardens and orchards and the remainder were still classified as woods. Other crops grown in the township included barley, peas, oats, Indian corn, potatoes, and turnips (London and Middlesex City Directory 1864). Since most farmers failed to rotate their crops, wheat output declined after the 1860s. The start of the American Civil War in 1861 also increased demand for barley, oats and livestock, leading farmers to transition away from wheat as their main crop (London Township History Book Committee 2001a: 49).

The southern portion of the study area became known as “The Grove” and was centred on the corner of Concession 3 (now Huron Street) and Side Road 5 (now Clarke Road). Most original setters in The Grove were from New York State and of Irish background. The Grove had a church, post office, and school. It also benefited from being only 6.5 kilometres from downtown London. Women in the area often walked to London for work in a tailor’s shop where they could earn 25 cents a day (Grainger 2002: 147).

To the southwest of the study area, and in the southeast portion of London Township, the Village of London East was incorporated in 1874. London East was home to many industries as well as a residential housing for many factory and railway workers. In 1885, London East was annexed by the City of London. A major contributing factor to annexation was the lack of fire protection in the township. A major fire in 1883 burned down buildings owned by Imperial Oil and the Great Western Railway (Armstrong 1986: 128). When London East joined the City, residents and businesses gained access to improved municipal services such as water, fire protection, and street car service (London Township History Book Committee 2001a: 33). Before annexation, the population of London Township exceeded 10,000 (Pope 1878).

### 20th Century Development

During the initial decades of the 20th century, London Township remained largely agricultural. However, the township benefitted from its adjacency to the City of London, and technological advances reached the
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township more quickly compared to other rural townships in Southwestern Ontario. Telephone service was introduced to London Township in 1908 and electrification occurred in phases starting in the 1910s (London Township History Book Committee 2001a: 120 and London Township History Book Committee 2001a: 130).

Like most of Canada, the township was impacted by the First World War. The amount of available labour decreased as working age men enlisted. Export opportunities for the township’s agricultural output were curtailed, as the ability to ship produce to Europe became curtailed in 1914 (London Township History Book Committee 2001a: 51). London Township celebrated its 100th anniversary in 1919. Over 5,000 people attended the celebration, which included honouring those who served in the recently ended war. During the war, 350 men and women from the township participated in the conflict, and 31 are buried in cemeteries in France and Belgium (London History Book Committee 2001a: 345-348).

The Second World War and the post-war period marked the beginning of significant changes in the township and lands adjacent to the study area. In 1939 construction on the Crumlin Airport (now London International Airport) began about two kilometres east of the study area. The airport was used by the Royal Canadian Air Force during the war (London Township History Book Committee 2001a: 349). About 500 men and women from London Township served during the Second World War (London Township History Book Committee 2001a: 350).

In 1947, the Township of London formed its own Police Department. The Township decided it was more financially prudent to operate their own police force in the growing suburbs in the township than to pay the City of London for services (London Township History Book Committee 2001a: 37).

A major development about one kilometre east of the study area was the construction of the Fanshawe Dam. In 1947, London suffered its third major flood since the 1880s. The Upper Thames River Conservation Authority was established to mitigate flooding. In 1950, the Authority began construction of a $4.89 million dollar dam at Fanshawe Park (Armstrong 1986: 200). When it was completed in 1953 it also carried traffic over the Thames River until the Clarke Road Bridge was built in the study area in 1967. The land surrounding the new dam and reservoir became the 3,000 acre Fanshawe Conservation Area, a park that includes boating facilities, nature trails, and Fanshawe Pioneer Village (Fanshawe Conservation Area 2017).

By the 1950s, the City of London was almost fully developed and needed new land to continue growth. In 1958, the City began the process of annexing 57,000 acres of land in London, West Nissouri, Westminster, and North Dorchester Townships. Some township residents opposed annexation and believed their taxes would increase with little in return from the City. Township officials claimed businesses chose to locate themselves in the township and should not be forced into the City. In May 1960, the Ontario Municipal Board ruled in favour of annexation and awarded 30,000 acres of land in London Township to the City. The annexation, which became effective in 1961, included the southern part of the study area (Globe and Mail 1960: 10).
During the 1960s the portion of the study area north of the Thames River transitioned to industrial use. This area of London has large sand and gravel deposits ideal for road and concrete construction (Chapman and Putnam 1984: 146). In the late 1950s Riverside Construction opened a pit and asphalt plant on the east side Clarke Road. In the early 1970s a pit and asphalt plant opened on the west side. This pit is presently owned by Coco Paving, Inc. and Lafarge Paving and Construction. The proliferation of gravel extraction in and adjacent to the study area increased the amount of traffic, particularly truck traffic, on the roadway over Fanshawe Dam.

The Upper Thames River Conservation Authority appealed to the Suburban Roads Commission to create a new link over the Thames that would reduce traffic over the dam and through the conservation area (London Free Press 1967a). The Suburban Roads Commission was founded in 1917. The commission’s task was to maintain and administer roadways in areas outside of the City that were often used by City residents. The commission consisted of five members: two appointed by Middlesex County and two appointed by the City of London, the fifth being a mutual appointment. The commission’s budget was funded by Middlesex County, the City of London, and provincial subsidies. By the 1960s, the commission was responsible for approximately 150 kilometres of roads outside of London (London Free Press 1969).

In 1967, construction began on a new bridge that would link both ends of Clarke Road over the Thames River. The bridge would be named the J.W. Carson Bridge in honour of Joseph William Carson (1890-1980), the retiring chairman of the Suburban Roads Commission (Plate 1). Carson joined the commission in 1932 and became chair in 1942. He was responsible for signing all contracts approved by the Commission and once joked “If I had a dollar for all the contracts, agreements and minutes which I’ve signed in the past 30 years, I think I’d have a pretty fair pension” (London Free Press 1967c). Carson oversaw the Commission during a period of rapid growth in the City and Middlesex County and naming the bridge for him was a way to highlight the significance of the time and effort he put into chairing the commission for over 20 years. The new 128 metre span would cost $640,000 and reduce the travel distance between the intersections of Kilally and Clarke and Fanshawe and Clark by approximately four kilometres (London Free Press 1967a).

The four-span I-beam bridge was constructed by Graham and Graham and McKay Construction and Cocker Construction. Engineering consulting work was completed by M.M. Dillon and Company and construction was completed by Graham and Graham and McKay, and Cocker Construction. (Plate 2). The J.W. Carson bridge cost $348,000 and another $300,000 was budgeted for bridge approaches. The bridge, also known as the Clarke Road Bridge, was opened on October 12, 1967. The ribbon cutting was presided upon by Gordon Stronach, Mayor of London, and Harry Ward, Middlesex County Warden. Carson unveiled the plaque affixed to the bridge named in his honour. Carson’s 13 grandchildren each received a clipping of the ribbon used in the ceremony (London Free Press 1967b).

The City and county lauded the bridge as a symbol of cooperation and expected Clarke Road to develop into an important link between the City of London and Township of London. Mayor Stronach predicted “in 15 years or so the area surrounding the bridge, I’m sure, will be the location for many beautiful homes. I just hope the builders will retain the rustic beauty of this spot as they develop the area as part of London.” After the dedication ceremony, a reception was held at the Fanshawe Park Pavilion. Carson remained
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modest throughout the day and used his speaking time to extend his best wishes to his successor on the Suburban Roads Commission (London Free Press 1967b).

The rest of the study area south of the Thames River was annexed in 1989 and the entire study area became part of the City of London in 1993. On December 31, 1997, the Township of London was amalgamated with Lobo and Delaware Townships to form the new municipality of Middlesex Centre.
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3.3.4 Property History

The study area spans the following historical lots and concessions of the former Township of London, County of Middlesex, Ontario (see Table 1):

- Lots 4 to 5, Concession 3
- Lots 4 to 5, Concession 4
- Lots 4 to 5, Concession 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Municipal Addresses Evaluated in Study Area within each lot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot 4, Concession 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 5, Concession 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 4, Concession 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 5, Concession 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 4, Concession 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 5, Concession 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Thomas Ridout’s map of London Township, which shows some of the area’s earliest settlers, Lot 4, Concession 3 is only shown as granted. The property was owned first by Edward Hale. In 1848, he sold the lot to John Tackabury.

John Tackabury (1804-1877) and his wife Elizabeth Belton (1807-1875) were born in County Wicklow, Ireland. As children, they followed their parents to Madison County, New York. They arrived with other members of the Belton family in London Township in 1829. John and Elizabeth settled with their daughter, Sarah Ann, on the north half of Lot 1, Concession 3, which they purchased from James Dickinson. In 1848, they purchased the north half of Lot 4 Concession 3 in the study area. John and Elizabeth had 12 children and the family expanded their holdings in London Township to encompass 600 acres.

The 1861 Census of Canada shows John and Elizabeth living with eight of their children. Their type of residence is listed as log (1861 Census of Canada). The 1863 map of London by Samuel Peters shows a structure on the Tackabury fam that matches the present location of the residence on the lot (Peters 1863). It is possible the current residence on the lot was constructed between 1862 and 1863. This residence is an Ontario farmhouse constructed of brick, and is similar to the residence on Lot 5, Concession 3 (Archaeologix, Inc. 2001:47). John and Elizabeth Tackabury are buried at the nearby Grove Cemetery.

John and Elizabeth were trained musicians and taught their children how to read music and sing gospel songs. The Tackabury family were active members of the community and participated in music programs.
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around Western Ontario. The Tackabury family offered their land for the site of both a church and a school. Many family members served as choir members and organists of the church. Many descendants of John Tackabury remained in London Township, including at their farm on Lot 4, Concession 3, which they named Riverview (London Township History Book Committee 2001b: 486-487). At Grove Cemetery, 17 descendants of John Tackabury are buried (Canada’s Genweb Cemetery Project).

Lot 4 Concession 3 was the location of The Grove United Church (Plate 3). John and Elizabeth Tackabury gave land in 1862 for the church, which was constructed on the northeast corner of Clarke Road and Huron Street to the south of the study area (Figure 3). The first church was a brick structure that proved too small for the congregation by 1883. A new brick church was constructed by parishioner William Wakeling for $4,000. A pipe organ was installed in 1898 and the church was electrified in 1930. In 1964, the church merged with Emmanuel United Church and the congregations built a new church at 1461 Huron Street. The Grove United Church was demolished in 1981 (London Township History Book Committee 2001a: 190).

Plate 3: The Grove United Church, built 1883 (London Township History Book Committee 2001a: 190)

Lot 4 Concession 3 was also home to the S.S. #27 Grove School, just south of the study area. The school was opened in 1865 on land offered by John Tackabury. The new white brick school was constructed for $625 mostly by local farmers. The first head master received no salary and was instead paid in fresh produce. In 1925, a new red brick school was constructed on the site that operated until 1960 (London Township History Book Committee 2001a: 254).

At the start of the post-war period, the study area and adjacent lands had changed little (Figure 4). The first major change started in 1950, when construction of the Fanshawe Dam began in the adjacent Lot 3, Concession 3. A new road that allowed access to the dam was constructed through Lot 4, Concession 3.
Upon completion of the dam in 1953, vehicles used the road on the dam to travel across the Thames River until the Clarke Road Bridge was opened in 1967.

Lot 5 Concession 3 was originally set aside as a Crown Reserve. In 1826, Crown Reserves were put up for sale by the newly created Canada Lands Company. In 1862, the northern half of the Lot was occupied by the brothers Joseph and Benjamin Pemberton. The 1861 Census of Canada lists Benjamin Pemberton as a 38-year-old farmer who was born in England. He lived with his wife Ellen, aged 28; daughter Martha, aged 2; and daughter Mary, aged 1. Benjamin Pemberton’s lived in a one storey log house (1861 Census of Canada b). In the 1861 Census, Joseph Pemberton is listed as a 37-year-old farmer born in England. He lived with his wife Matilda, aged 34; daughter Susan, aged 15; son George, aged 11; son John, aged 9; and daughter Mary, aged 5. They lived in a one storey log house (1861 Census of Canada c). The southern half was owned by James Legg and Thomas Gibbons. The Legg family was of English descent and farmed the land (1891 Census of Canada).

Daniel Bacon (1807-1895) purchased land in the southeast quarter of Lot 5, Concession 3 in 1854. Bacon was born in Norfolk, England. Together with his wife, Ann (1806-1854), and his four children they immigrated to Canada. Daniel and many other members of the Bacon family are buried at the nearby Grove Cemetery. The Bacon family farmhouse was demolished in the late 20th century (London Township History Book Committee 2001b: 16).

Lot 4 Concession 4 is shown in the 1862 Middlesex County Map as being divided between Alexander Noble and Richard Hale. Richard Hale was a farmer from Ireland who was 40 years old in the 1851 census (1851 Census of Canada East, Canada West, New Brunswick, and Nova Scotia). Source information has not determined if Richard Hale is related to one of the first settlers of London Township, John Hale.

Riverside Construction opened an asphalt plant in this lot in the late 1950s (Figure 5). The paving and construction company was founded in the 1920s by London Township resident T.J. Branton (Moauro 1973). In the early 1970s, Riverside Construction owned the rights to 750 acres of sand and gravel pits in the London area and employed 150 workers. Riverside Construction was sold to TCG Materials in 1973 and today is part of Dufferin Construction.

Lot 5 Concession 4 was split three ways by 1862. The northern half was farmed by Eli Barter (1823-1888) (Plate 4). Eli’s parents, James and Mary immigrated from England. James’s oldest son Joseph inherited the family lot in Concession 5, Lot 4. Eli purchased Lot 5, Concession 4 directly southwest of the original family farm. Barter purchased the lot from William and Frances Hornby, the original patent holders (London Township History Book Committee 2001b: 21). The lot remained agricultural until the early 1970s when it became the site of an asphalt plant (Department of Energy Mines and Resources 1974). Today, the plant is still in operation and is owned by Coco Paving, Inc. and Lafarge Paving and Construction.
Lot 4 in Concession 5 was originally settled by Richard Talbot (1772-1853). Richard was born in Ireland and was an officer in the British Army from 1783 to 1790, from 1787 to 1790 he was a captain in the 5th Regiment of the Foot. In 1795, he married Lydia Baird. Together they had eight children. In 1818, he wrote to Lord Bathurst, colonial secretary, about organizing a group of immigrants for Upper Canada. Talbot would receive a large land grant and a return of his deposit if he successfully settled ten settlers over 17 years of age. After accounting for deaths at sea and several families who decided to settle in Quebec or Ottawa about half the original group arrived in London Township. Talbot received 1,200 acres for himself on Lots 3 and 4, Concession 5; Lots 1, 2, and 4, Concession 6 Lot 6, Concession 13. By 1825, Talbot had sold his land in the study area to pay off debts (London Township History Book Committee 2001b:490).

In 1862, Charles Jones owned the northern half of Lot 4, Concession 5 and Joseph Barter (1818-1921) owned the southern half. Joseph Barter was the son of James Barter and Mary Ann Noble, both from England. Joseph's brother, Eli, owned the lot to the southwest. In 1880, Thomas Hill and J. Avery owned the parts of Lot 4, Concession 5 in the study area. In 1940, the land was owned by the Johnson, Carpenter, and Burnett families. In 1958, the Fanshawe Golf Course opened in Lot 4, Concession 5 as part of the Fanshawe Conservation Area. Today, the golf course offers two 18-hole layouts. The part of the golf course in the study area was part of a 1990s addition called “The Quarry”. (City of London 2017).

Lot 5 in Concession 5 was originally set aside as Crown Reserve According to the 1878 map of London Township, the southern half of Lot 5, Concession 5 was owned by James Fitzgerald. James was part of a large family in the Township that immigrated to New York from Ireland in 1818. James, his wife, and their seven children settled in London Township sometime before 1862 (Peters 1863).
Table 2: History of Ownership in Study Area Lots

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot and Concession</th>
<th>1820s-1830s</th>
<th>1862</th>
<th>1880</th>
<th>1940</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot 4, Concession 3</td>
<td>Granted</td>
<td>John Tackabury, Thomas Dickenson (southeast corner)</td>
<td>J. Tackabury (southwest quarter)</td>
<td>Tackabury (west half)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Samuel Tackabury (northwest quarter)</td>
<td>Robert Tackabury (northeast quarter)</td>
<td>Marshall (southeast quarter)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 5, Concession 3</td>
<td>Crown Reserve</td>
<td>Benjamin Pemberton (northeast quarter)</td>
<td>Daniel Bacon (southeast quarter)</td>
<td>J. Legg (northwest quarter)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Joseph Pemberton (northwest quarter)</td>
<td>James Legg (southwest quarter)</td>
<td>A.E. Johns (northeast quarter)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thomas Gibbons (southeast quarter)</td>
<td>J. Gilbert (northwest quarter)</td>
<td>J. Bacon (southeast quarter)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>James Legg (southwest quarter)</td>
<td>B. Pemberton (northwest quarter)</td>
<td>A.E. Johns (southwest quarter)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 4, Concession 4</td>
<td>No Patent</td>
<td>Alex Noble (east half)</td>
<td>George Mitchell (west half)</td>
<td>J.W. Older</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Richard Hale (west half)</td>
<td>J. Resner (east half)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 5, Concession 4</td>
<td>W. Hornby (north half)</td>
<td>Eli Barter (north half)</td>
<td>J. Plaxton (south of Thames River)</td>
<td>I.R. Springett (north half)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H. Scafield (south half)</td>
<td>James Bradshaw (south half)</td>
<td>N. McNaughton (south of Thames River)</td>
<td>E.C. Poole (southeast quarter)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>George White (north bank of Thames River)</td>
<td>George White (north bank of Thames River)</td>
<td>L. Gorlick (southwest quarter)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eli Barter (north half)</td>
<td>Eli Barter (north half)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 4, Concession 5</td>
<td>Talbot</td>
<td>Joseph Barter (south half)</td>
<td>Thomas Hill (southwest quarter)</td>
<td>G. Burnett (north half)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Charles Jones (north half)</td>
<td>J. Avery (southeast quarter)</td>
<td>J.A. Johnson (southwest quarter)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>James Stevens (north half)</td>
<td>James Stevens (north half)</td>
<td>William Carpenter (southeast quarter)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot and Concession</th>
<th>1820s-1830s</th>
<th>1862</th>
<th>1880</th>
<th>1940</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot 5, Concession 5</td>
<td>Crown Reserve</td>
<td>William Stevens (north half) John Thomas (south half)</td>
<td>William Stevens (north half) James Fitzgerald (south half)</td>
<td>A. Talbot (north half) Sarah Cooper (south half)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:**
- London Township History Book Committee 2001b: ix
- Tremaine, 1862
- Randall, J.S. 1878 in Page, 1878.
- London Township History Book Committee 2001b: xvii
**Title:** Map of London Township, 1863

**Notes:**
1. Historic mapping not to scale.

**References:**
- Peters, Samuel, Map of the Township of London, Canada West, 1863.
Historic mapping not to scale.
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4.0 SITE DESCRIPTION

4.1 GENERAL STUDY AREA

The study area is located at the northeast edge of the City of London. It contains a linear corridor along Clarke Road north of Huron Street to Fanshawe Park Road. Clarke Road is a two-lane asphalt road that runs generally in a north-south direction. The road has gravel shoulders within the study area and shallow ditches.

Alongside Clarke Road within the study area there is a mix of property types, including:

- rural agricultural lands with 19th century farm dwellings, barns and outbuildings, and cultivated fields
- the J.W. Carson bridge (a concrete and steel structure) crossing the Thames River
- gravel pits
- Fanshawe Conservation area (recreational and natural conservation area)
- a golf course (park of the Fanshawe Conservation Area)
- vacant lands

The Thames River bisects the study area, north of Kilally Road. At the study area, beneath the J.W. Carson Bridge, the river bed is wide but shallow, controlled by the Fanshawe Dam and reservoir. The riverbanks and embankments leading to the bridge contain a mix of riparian vegetation, shrubs, trees, and grass.

The broader landscape surrounding the study area contains mid-to-late 20th century suburban residential developments to the west, along with parkland and recreational fields, and commercial use along both sides of Clarke Road south of Huron Street. Light industrial use characterizes the stretch of Clarke Road between the study area and Huron Street.

4.2 J.W. CARSON BRIDGE

The J.W. Carson Bridge (Bridge 3-BR-02) is located at Clarke Road over the Thames River. The structure, built circa 1967, consists of a four-span bridge with span lengths of 102 feet (31.1 metres), 128 feet (39 metres), 128 feet (39 metres), and 102 feet (31.1 metres). The superstructure consists of a reinforced concrete deck on five structural steel plate girders. The bridge has a skew of approximately 10°. The overall deck width is approximately 39 feet (12 metres), and there is a 30 foot (9.1 metre) wide asphalt wearing surface between a 6 foot (1.9 metre) wide sidewalk on the east side and a three foot (one metre) wide curb on the west side. There is a concrete parapet wall with steel railing on each side of the bridge.
The bridge has an asphalt wearing surface above the concrete slab bridge deck. On the east side of the bridge is a raised concrete sidewalk. The west side of the bridge contains a concrete curb, rising the same height as the sidewalk on the opposite side. Expansion joints are located at both ends of the bridge.

The bridge contains concrete parapet wall barriers with a single steel tube railing. At the bridge approaches there are steel flex beam and wood post guardrails. At the end of the southeast railing, there is a metal plaque affixed to the concrete noting that the bridge is named in honour of the London Suburban Roads Commission chairman (served from 1932 to 1967) on his retirement.

The bridge has a cast-in-place solid slab bridge deck, with concrete soffit and fascia. The bridge deck is supported by five steel I-beam girders, connected to each other with steel cross bracing. The bridge has cast-in-place concrete abutments and concrete wing walls.

The bridge structure is supported by three cast-in-place concrete piers. The piers are Y-shaped, as wide as the bridge structure at the top, tapering in approximately to where the second and fourth I-beams are located, and gradually tapering out again to the ground level.
RESULTS

5.1 AGENCY AND MUNICIPAL CONSULTATION

In order to identify protected heritage properties, the MTCS, OHT, and City were contacted. Thomas Wicks of the OHT confirmed that there are no heritage easements within the study area. Karla Barboza of the MTCS confirmed there are no provincial heritage properties within or adjacent to the study area. Consultation with Kyle Gonyou, City Heritage Planner, identified three properties listed on the City of London Inventory of Heritage Resources (City of London 2006) within the study area (Table 1). Kyle Gonyou also identified that the Thames River is a Canadian Heritage River. The Canadian Heritage River designation is an honorary designation and does not have municipal, provincial, or federal regulations or protection. Kyle Gonyou identified additional listed properties in the vicinity of the study area, including 2080 Huron Street, 2056 Huron Street, and 2304 Kilally Road. These properties are located outside of the study area for this EA and are considered outside the scope of this report.

In discussion with City staff, it was determined that the 1424 Clarke Road was listed due to its historical association with a c 1860s residence situated on the property. Although in use today as a conservation area, the entire property parcel is listed on the City’s Inventory of Heritage Resources and therefore triggers an evaluation of the CHVI of the property. Given the position of the property adjacent to the undertaking proposed for the Project, it was determined that the most appropriate course of action was to consider the portion of the resource visible from the roadway in this CHAR. Based on a detailed background history of the site it is understood that the portion visible from the roadway of 1424 Clarke Road is associated with use of the property subsequent to the c 1860s residence. Therefore, the access road which forms the corridor visible from the roadway was evaluated for CHVI according to this use and not its historic 19th century use.

Table 3: Municipally Identified and Protected Cultural Heritage Resources within the Study Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location/Municipal Address</th>
<th>Level of Recognition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1424 Clarke Road</td>
<td>Listed on the City of London Inventory of Heritage Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1511 Clarke Road</td>
<td>Listed on the City of London Inventory of Heritage Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1588 Clarke Road</td>
<td>Listed on the City of London Inventory of Heritage Resources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.2 FIELD PROGRAM

5.2.1 Potential Cultural Heritage Resources

As described in Section 2.3, a pedestrian and windshield survey of the study area was undertaken to identify potential cultural heritage resources situated within the study area and confirm the presence of previously identified protected heritage properties. Where identified, the potential cultural heritage resource was photographed from publicly accessible roadways.

During the course of the survey a total of seven sites including farm properties, gravel pits, bridges, rivers, and civic properties were identified as containing potential cultural heritage resources. Detailed property descriptions of the potential resources can be found in Appendix A.

Of those identified as potential cultural heritage resources four had been previously identified by municipal staff as outlined in Section 5.1 above.
5.2.2 City of London Cultural Heritage Landscape Criteria

As described in Section 2.4.2, the study area as a whole has been evaluated according to the City’s Guidelines for the Identification of Cultural Heritage Landscapes in London. The evaluation of the study area against these criteria is provided in Table 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Discussion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LAND OWNERSHIP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Publicly owned lands</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The study area contains, and is adjacent to, publicly owned lands including the roadway. A small portion of Fanshawe Conservation Area, owned and operated by the Upper Thames River Conservation Authority, is located within the study area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Privately owned lands consenting to be recognized as a cultural heritage landscape</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Research and evaluation of the study area has not shown any indication of private land owners consenting to have their property identified as a CHL.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOGRAPHIC AREA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A: Area contains features that make a significant contribution to its heritage character</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Views/Vistas</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Views of the Thames River can be seen from the J.W. Carson Bridge within the study area. However, this view is not considered significant and similar views of the Thames River can be seen at other crossings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Rivers/streams/springs</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The study area includes the Thames River. However, the river is not readily accessible from the study area and does not factor prominently or contribute significantly to the heritage character of the study area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Ponds/wetlands</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The study area contains wetlands. The wetlands are not readily accessible from the study area and do they contribute significantly to the heritage character of the study area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Forests</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The study area contains forested areas. The forested areas are located adjacent to the Thames River and west of Clarke Road, north of Fanshawe Park Road. This forested area does not contribute significantly to the heritage character of the study area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Discussion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Woodlands/woodlots</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The study area contains woodlands. The woodlands do not contribute significantly to the heritage character of the study area and area visually similar to other wooded areas in the City of London.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Rare/important collections of flora/fauna</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Research and evaluation of the study area found no indication of rare/important collections of flora/fauna in the study area, neither historically or in the present-day.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Thickets/old fields</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The study area contains former agriculture land in natural ecological succession, including the northwest corner of Kilally Road and Clarke Road and areas on Clarke Road along the gravel pits. These areas do not contribute significantly to the heritage character of the study area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Other</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None Identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: Area has historical land use/uses</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The historical land use for the study area is agricultural. During the mid-20th century portions of the study area transitioned to industrial and recreational use. Parts of the study area still contain active agricultural land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C: Combination of individual features/attributes in area creates a significant heritage landscape.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The individual features and attributes of the study area do not constitute a significant cultural heritage landscape. The study area is neither a significant designed cultural landscape, associative cultural landscape, nor an evolved cultural landscape.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CULTURAL HERITAGE SIGNIFICANCE

Area contains built features that make a significant contribution to its heritage character:

A: Built Heritage

| 1. Structures | No     | While the study area contains several properties determined contain CHVI based on the presence of historic structure, none of these were determined to contain components that contribute significantly to the heritage character of the study area. Rather, these resources were determined to have CHVI on an individual property basis and include 1511 Clarke Road, 1588 Clarke Road, and 1424 Clarke Road. |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Discussion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Roads/Paths</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The study area contains portions of Clarke Road, Kilally Road, and Fanshawe Park Road East, as well as a tree lined roadway leading to the Fanshawe Conservation Area. None of the municipal roads were determined to have CHVI, although the tree lined roadway was determined to be a contributing attribute to the conservation area. Nonetheless, the roads within the study area do not significantly contribute to the heritage character of the study area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Fences</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No fences were identified as making a significant contribution to the heritage character of the study area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Bridges</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The study area contains the J.W. Carson Bridge over the Thames River. The bridge is directly associated with J.W. Carson, who was a significant figure in local history and to whom the bridge was dedicated. However, the bridge itself was determined to be typical design and not an important built feature in the landscape.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Waterworks</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No waterworks were identified in the study area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Rail lines/corridors</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No railway lines or corridors were identified in the study area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Cemeteries</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No cemeteries were identified in the study area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Other</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None Identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: Area contains archaeological (prehistoric and/or historic) ruins above or beneath ground</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td>Archaeological potential was considered in the e. Portions of the study area were determined to retain archaeological potential and future studies are proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C: Area contains modified land features</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Farms</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The study area contains three properties associated with agricultural activities and are representative of other 19th century farmsteads located in the City of London and former Township of London.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Gardens</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No gardens were identified within the study area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Orchards</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No orchards were identified within the study area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Parks</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The roadway to the Fanshawe Conservation Area is within the study area. The roadway is not a significant part of the parkland. The park activities associated with the conservation area are outside of the study area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Discussion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Vistas</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No vistas were identified within the study area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Abandoned farmlands</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>There was no abandoned farmland identified within the study area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Plantations</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No plantations were identified within the study area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Other</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None Identified.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A: Area associated with historic events, beliefs, themes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No significant historic events, beliefs, or themes were identified to have taken place within the study area.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B: Area associated with historic person/s</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>One of London Township’s earliest settlers, leader of a colonization plan, and relative of Colonel Thomas Talbot, Richard Talbot, owned land within the study area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C: Area illustrates broad patterns of socio-cultural history</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The study area does not illustrate a broad pattern of socio-cultural history. The settlement and development of the study area is similar to other locations within the former Township of London.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area valued by community from heritage perspective</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No community interest, from a heritage perspective, has been identified within the study area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area, on the whole, has maintained its heritage integrity</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Since the post-war period, the study area has transitioned from an agricultural area to a mixed-use area including industrial and recreational properties. Much of the study area has transitioned away from its historical use as an agricultural area, or been modernized, diminishing the heritage integrity of the study area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak of significance is comparatively old in the context of the region</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Although some of London Township’s earliest settlers lived in the study area, their significance and date of settlement is not particularly old or unique within the context of the region of southwestern Ontario.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.3 **ONTARIO REGULATION 9/06 EVALUATION**

Where a potential cultural heritage resource was identified within the study area, an evaluation of the CHVI of the property was undertaken. Detailed evaluations are contained within Appendix A. As described in Section 2.4 each potential cultural heritage resource was evaluated according to O. Reg. 9/06, the criteria for determining CHVI. Each potential cultural heritage resource was considered both as an individual structure and as a landscape (Figure 6). Where CHVI was identified a structure or landscape was assigned a CHR and the property was determined to contain a cultural heritage resource.

Following evaluation, five cultural heritage resources were identified on properties within the study area (Figure 7). A summary of properties assessed and corresponding CHR, where appropriate, is provided in Table 4 below.

**Table 5: Summary of Determination of CHVI**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipal Address</th>
<th>Previous Heritage Recognition</th>
<th>Resource Type</th>
<th>Photograph</th>
<th>Identified Attributes</th>
<th>CHVI</th>
<th>CHR #</th>
<th>Relationship to Study Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1865 Clarke Road</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Adjacent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17888 Clarke Road</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Adjacent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipal Address</th>
<th>Previous Heritage Recognition</th>
<th>Resource Type</th>
<th>Photograph</th>
<th>Identified Attributes</th>
<th>CHVI</th>
<th>CHR #</th>
<th>Relationship to Study Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A – J.W. Carson Bridge over the Thames River</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Plaque at the southeast railing dedicating the bridge to J.W. Carson</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>BHR-1</td>
<td>Within</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A – Thames River</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shallow but wide riverbed lined with river stone and riparian vegetation.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>CHL-1</td>
<td>Within</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1511 Clarke Road</td>
<td>Yes - Listed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Residence: One and a half storey, side gable roof, buff brick exterior. Southern Barn: side gable roof, timber construction, stone foundation. Farmstead: cultivated fields</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>CHL-2</td>
<td>Adjacent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipal Address</th>
<th>Previous Heritage Recognition</th>
<th>Resource Type</th>
<th>Photograph</th>
<th>Identified Attributes</th>
<th>CHVI</th>
<th>CHR #</th>
<th>Relationship to Study Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1588 Clarke Road</td>
<td>Yes - Listed</td>
<td>Residence: Not visible. Farmstead: Cultivated fields</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>CHL-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Adjacent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1424 Clarke Road</td>
<td>Yes - Listed</td>
<td>Long linear drive lined with intermediate and mature silver maples, mid-century stone gates</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>CHL-4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Within</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure No. 7
Title: Potential Heritage Resources

Legend:
- Study Area
- Potential Heritage Resource

Notes:
1. Coordinate System: NAD 1983 UTM Zone 17N
Air photo date Spring 2017.

6.0 ANTICIPATED IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

6.1 DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED PROJECT UNDERTAKING

Clarke Road is currently designated as an Expressway in the City’s Official Plan and is intended to provide priority to vehicles and freight movement, move high volumes of vehicular traffic, and provide a quality standard of urban design to promote the City. The City is undertaking the EA and preliminary design for the improvements to Clarke Road between Veterans Memorial Parkway (VMP) north extension and Fanshawe Park Road East. The recommended alternative includes widening Clarke Road from two to four lanes in each direction with the intent to plan for and protect land for an ultimate six lane configuration.

Three alternatives were considered as part of the EA process:

- Alternative 1: Widen Clarke Road from two to four lanes to the east of the existing road centerline, with the provision for six lanes beyond 2031. This includes a center median between the existing lanes (to become the new southbound lanes) and the new northbound lanes.

- Alternative 2: Widen Clarke Road from two to four lanes to the west of the existing road centerline, with the provision for six lanes beyond 2031. This includes a center median between the new southbound lanes and the existing northbound lanes (to become the new northbound lanes).

- Alternative 3: Widen Clarke Road from two to four lanes symmetrically, with the provision for six lanes beyond 2031. This includes an additional lane in each direction.

The recommended design is to widen Clarke Road from two to four lanes symmetrically, with the ability to accommodate the ultimate widening to six lanes (Alternative 3). This alternative reduces impacts to property entrances, reduces impacts to utility corridors, reduces impacts to natural features, meets requirements for construction staging and geomatic design, and ties into the VMP design.

The design is expected to include a four-lane rural cross section with 3.75 metre lanes, 3.0 metre paved shoulders for cycling, and a multi-use pathway along the west side of Clarke Road. The multi-use pathway will link to the future Thames Valley Parkway to a controlled crossing of Clarke Road at the Veterans Memorial Parkway and Clarke Road intersection and a linkage to Ted Early Park. It is noted that during the detailed design phase, there may be a need identified for the construction of one metre retaining walls at the property line of 1511 and 1588 Clarke Road, depending on property acquisitions and grading requirements. The retaining walls would be required in order to avoid grading within the property parcel boundaries.

The recommended alternative would also result in the removal of the existing J.W. Carson Bridge over the Thames River and replacement with a new structure that can accommodate four 3.75 metre lanes with a one metre centre median, 1.5 metre shoulders, and a three metre multi-use pathway on the west side of the bridge.
6.2 **ANTICIPATED IMPACTS**

Where a component of a cultural heritage resource was situated within the study area, the impacts of the proposed undertaking were evaluated (Table 5). The impacts, both direct and indirect, were evaluated according to Info Sheet #5 (Government of Ontario 2006b). See Section 2.5 for further discussion of impacts assessed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Direct Impact</th>
<th>Indirect Impact</th>
<th>Discussion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A—J.W. Carson Bridge over Thames River (BHR-1)</td>
<td>A N N N N N N</td>
<td>N/A—J.W. Carson Bridge over Thames River (BHR-1)</td>
<td>The cultural heritage resource is proposed to be removed and replaced as part of the road widening. However, only the plaque affixed to the bridge was found to contain CHVI. The bridge itself does not demonstrate CHVI. Therefore, measures must be prepared to mitigate direct impacts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A—Thames River (CHL-1)</td>
<td>N P N N N N N</td>
<td>N/A—Thames River (CHL-1)</td>
<td>The cultural heritage resource is positioned within 50 metres of the project activities. As the J.W. Carson bridge is expected to be replaced, a new bridge structure will be constructed at the crossing, with potential to alter the existing river banks when new abutments or piers are required. Therefore, mitigation measures must be prepared to mitigate potential direct impacts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1511 Clarke Road (CHL-2)</td>
<td>N N N N N P</td>
<td>1511 Clarke Road (CHL-2)</td>
<td>It is noted that during the detailed design phase, there may be a need identified for the construction of one metre retaining walls at the property line. The retaining wall would be required to avoid grading within the property parcel boundaries that would result in construction areas positioned in closer vicinity to the cultural heritage resources. The cultural heritage resource is positioned within 50 metres of project activities. This suggests the potential for indirect impacts resulting from vibrations. This is categorized</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Anticipated Impacts and Mitigation Measures

**January 8, 2019**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Direct Impact</th>
<th>Indirect Impact</th>
<th>Discussion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Destruction</td>
<td>Alteration</td>
<td>Shadows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1588 Clarke Road (CHL-3)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1424 Clarke Road (CHL-4)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes**

N = Impacts not anticipated

P = Potential for impact

A = Impacts anticipated

### 6.3 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS

Of the five cultural heritage resources identified within the study area, potential direct impacts were identified for BHR-1 (J.W. Carson Bridge over the Thames River) and CHL-4 (1424 Clarke Road) due to alterations associated with road widening alternatives. Indirect impacts were identified for CHL-2 (1511 Clarke Road) and CHL-3 (1588 Clarke Road) due to potential vibrations as a result of construction activities.
Clarke Road) and CHL-3 (1588 Clarke Road), due to the location of heritage attributes within 50 metres of the proposed road improvements and construction activities. Indirect impacts include the potential for vibration effects resulting from construction. Where impacts are identified, mitigation measures are required to reduce adverse impacts of the proposed development on cultural heritage resources. Mitigation measures are discussed in Section 7.0.

It is noted that during the detailed design phase, there may be a need identified for the construction of one metre retaining walls at the property line of 1511 and 1588 Clarke Road, depending on property acquisitions and grading requirements. The retaining walls would be required in order to avoid grading within the property parcel boundaries. This work would result in construction areas positioned in closer vicinity to the cultural heritage resources. These retaining walls are not considered to be adverse impacts, as they do not directly or indirectly impact heritage attributes identified for the two properties outlined in Appendix A. However, should the retaining walls be determined to be required, review of the recommendations contained within this report should be undertaking. The presence of retaining walls would change views to the properties as they currently exist, but the views from Clarke Road were not identified as a heritage attribute, as both residences front on Kilally Road in accordance with the typical farm layout and settlement pattern that emerged in the area.
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7.0 MITIGATION

7.1 J.W. CARSON BRIDGE

Where potential direct impacts have been identified, these relate to the location of the bridge within an area where the road widening is being considered and destruction of the cultural heritage resource is anticipated to occur. For the J.W. Carson Bridge, the only heritage attribute is the plaque at the southeast railing dedicating the bridge to J.W. Carson. The bridge itself was found not to demonstrate CHVI. The plaque should be removed, stored, and reinstalled on the replacement bridge structure following construction completion.

7.2 THAMES RIVER

Alteration of the Thames River is anticipated in localized areas of the riverbank and embankments where the abutments and piers for a replacement bridge structure will be located. The bridge design will be confirmed during the detailed design stage of the project, and as such, the locations of these alterations are not yet known. It is recommended that the riverbanks and vegetation be restored similarly to pre-construction conditions following completion of the new bridge. Restoration should include replacement or similar vegetation if vegetation is removed, preferably using native riparian species to maintain the naturalized character of the banks.

7.3 1424 CLARKE ROAD

Mitigation for 1424 Clarke Road is related to the roadway and tree allée within the study area, not the larger conservation area or 1860 Ontario farmhouse. At 1424 Clarke Road, there may be potential for minor vegetation removal at the end of the driveway to facilitate road widening or construction activities. Avoidance of the mature maple trees at 1424 Clarke Road is preferred. If construction at 1424 Clarke Road results in the removal of mature maple trees at the end of the driveway, replanting with the same species should occur following construction, where possible. As the majority of the driveway trees are anticipated to remain intact and not be altered or removed during the road widening, the cultural heritage value of the resource as a whole will not be lost.

7.4 1511 CLARKE ROAD AND 1588 CLARKE ROAD

Where potential indirect impacts have been identified at 1511 and 1588 Clarke Road, components of cultural heritage resources are positioned within the 50 metres of where project activities are anticipated. Given this distance, the resource is not at risk of removal and will be retained intact. Therefore, a preventive approach through the use of planning mechanisms will best serve to reduce the risk of indirect impacts. Prior to establishment of planning mechanisms, further assessment to refine the areas of potential impact may be beneficial as ground movements induced by construction vibration are found to dissipate with distance from the source. The severity of soil movements depends primarily on type and compactness and/or consistency of the surrounding soils particularly between the source, receiver, and
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groundwater levels. The source, duration, frequency of occurrences of vibration, and the foundation-footing interaction also contribute to the strains induced in structures. As a result, there is a variance in what buffer may be appropriate. For the purposes of conserving cultural heritage resources, a 50 metre buffer represents a conservative approach. However, it is recognized that construction within 50 metres of 1511 and 1588 Clarke Road is likely to occur given the nature of the proposed undertaking. Further understanding the interaction between heritage attributes and vibration will better refine the area where construction activities may be permissible. Assessment by an appropriately trained building scientist or geotechnical engineer will refine the specific buffer zone required.

Should the 50 metre buffer be retained unchanged and where construction activities cannot be avoided within the 50 metre buffer zone, it is recommended that activities do not exceed maximum acceptable vibration levels, or peak particle velocity (PPV) levels, as determined by a qualified engineer. Establishing the PPV threshold should occur prior to any construction activities (pre-construction survey). A bridge condition specialist should make determinations on the appropriate approach to establish baseline conditions.

At appropriate points, construction within the defined buffer zone should be monitored to confirm that acceptable PPV levels are not exceeded. All construction activities should cease if levels are exceeded until an acceptable solution can be identified. Equal care should be applied during decommissioning activities to safeguard cultural heritage resources.

In addition, the potential for effects related to possible retaining wall construction should be considered. Although the need for retaining walls has not yet been established, if during the course of detailed design, retaining walls are required the effects of such construction should be evaluated at that time.
8.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

Direct impacts to the J.W. Carson Bridge (BHR-1) have been identified as a result of potential alteration of the structure depending on the widening alternative selected. However, only the plaque affixed to the bridge was found to demonstrate CHVI. The bridge itself does not demonstrate CHVI. Some disturbance and vegetation removal may be required at the Thames River (CHL-2) where new bridge piers or abutments are required. Direct impacts may also occur on 1424 Clarke Road (CHL-4) if mature trees at the end of the driveway are removed as a result of widening or construction. Finally, there is potential for indirect impacts to 1511 and 1588 Clarke Road (CHL-2 and CHL-3), as the resource is located within 50 metres of where construction activities are expected to occur.

Based on the potential for adverse impacts identified to the cultural heritage resource, it is recommended that the following mitigation measures be implemented:

- Salvage the plaque from the existing J.W. Carson Bridge such that it can be reinstalled at the replacement bridge, following construction.
- Restore to existing or similar conditions the Thames River banks altered by construction of replacement bridge abutments and piers, preferably using native riparian vegetation species.
- Where possible, avoid removal of mature maple trees at the end of the driveway at 1424 Clarke Road. If removal is required, replant following construction with the same species.
- Where possible, establish a 50 metre buffer zone around the cultural heritage resource at 1511 Clarke Road where all construction activities should be avoided, including but not limited to ground disturbance and the movement of equipment and people to and from the site.
- If a 50 metre buffer area around the cultural heritage resource at 1511 Clarke Road is not feasible given the construction requirements and site constraints, prepare vibration studies by a qualified engineer to determine the maximum acceptable vibration levels, or peak particle velocity (PPV) levels and the appropriate buffer distance between Project activities and the cultural heritage resource.
- Monitor construction within the defined area at appropriate points at 1511 Clarke Road to confirm that acceptable PPV levels are not exceeded. All construction activities should cease if levels are exceeded until an acceptable solution can be identified.
- The impacts of the potential retaining wall on 1511 and 1588 Clarke Road (CHL-2 and CHL-3) should be considered further when the Detailed Design is available.
9.0 CLOSURE

This report has been prepared for the sole benefit of the City of London and may not be used by any third party without the express written consent of Stantec Consulting Ltd. Any use which a third party makes of this report is the responsibility of such third party.

We trust this report meets your current requirements. Please do not hesitate to contact us should you require further information or have additional questions about any facet of this report.

Yours truly,

STANTEC CONSULTING LTD.

Meaghan Rivard, MA, CAHP
Senior Cultural Heritage Specialist
Tel: (519) 645-3350
Cell: (226) 268-9025
Meaghan.Rivard@stantec.com

Tracie Carmichael, BA, B. Ed
Senior Associate, Environmental Services
Tel: (519) 675-6603
Cell: (226) 927-3586
Tracie.Carmichael@stantec.com
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APPENDIX A:
CULTURAL HERITAGE RESOURCE/LANDSCAPE RECORD FORM
Municipal Address: 1865 Clarke Road
Former Township or County: London Township
Municipality: City of London
Lot/Concession: Lot 5, Concession 4
Resource Type: Industrial Property
Associated Dates: After 1961
Relationship to Project: Within Study Area

Description: The property contains Lafarge Aggregates London and CoCo Paving Incorporated. The property includes aggregate extraction areas, asphalt crushing and recycling area and interior roadways. The main building in the southeast corner of the property is a modern single storey structure with a flat roof. There is a small single storey modern gatehouse with a front facing gable roof. The site is separated from the road by an earth berm. Vegetation and trees in various stages of growth are present throughout the site.

Indicators of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest from O. Reg. 9/06:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. The property has design value or physical value because it,</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i. Is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, expression, material or construction method,</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit, or</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. The property has historical value or associative value because it,</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i. Has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity organization or institution that is significant to a community,</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of a community of culture, or</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer or theorist who is significant to a community.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. The property has contextual value because it,</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i. Is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an area,</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings, or</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Is a landmark.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluation of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest According to O. Reg. 9/06:

Design or Physical Value: The gravel pit and associated buildings are functional in design and do not meet the criteria in O. Reg. 9/06 for design or physical value.

Historical or Associative Value: The gravel pit and associated buildings do not meet the criteria in O. Reg 9/06 for historical or associative value.

Contextual Value: The gravel pit and associated buildings do not meet the criteria in O. Reg 9/06 for contextual value. The property is not important in defining, maintaining, or supporting the character of the study area. Formerly a farmstead, the current structures and gravel pit are not physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings. Although visible from Clarke Road, it is not a distinctive feature of the landscape and cannot be considered a landmark.

Identified Heritage Attributes: None Identified

Identification of CHVI: N/A
BHR/CHL Number: N/A
Completed by (name): Frank Smith
Date Completed: August 18, 2017
**Municipal Address:** 1788 Clarke Road  
**Former Township or County:** London Township  
**Municipality:** City of London  
**Lot/Concession:** Lot 4, Concession 4  
**Resource Type:** Industrial Property  
**Associated Dates:** Late 1950s to Early 1960s  
**Relationship to Project:** Within Study Area

**Description:** This property contains an asphalt plant and associated outbuildings owned by Dufferin Construction. There are several modern trailers present in the parking lot that serve as offices. An asphalt plant and storage areas for aggregate are located just south of the entrance. The site is separated from Clarke Road by an earth berm. Trees and vegetation in various stages of growth are present on the property. Based on aerial photography, extraction of aggregate on the premises has ended. The former pits are in various stages of ecological succession.

**Indicators of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest from O. Reg. 9/06:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. The property has design value or physical value because it,</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i. Is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, expression, material or construction method,</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit, or</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. The property has historical value or associative value because it,</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i. Has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity organization or institution that is significant to a community,</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of a community of culture, or</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer or theorist who is significant to a community.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. The property has contextual value because it,</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i. Is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an area,</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings, or</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Is a landmark.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evaluation of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest According to O. Reg. 9/06:**

Design or Physical Value: The asphalt plant and associated buildings are functional in design and do not meet the criteria in O. Reg. 9/06 for design or physical value.

Historical or Associative Value: The asphalt plant and associated buildings do not meet the criteria in O. Reg. 9/06 for historical or associative value. Although historically associated with the local paving companies T.J. Branton and Riverside Construction, the property does not provide notable evidence of the historic association with these companies.

Contextual Value: The gravel pit and associated buildings do not meet the criteria in O. Reg 9/06 for contextual value. The property is not important in defining, maintaining, or supporting the character of the study area. Formerly a farmstead, the current structures and gravel pit are not physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings. Although visible from Clarke Road, it is not a distinctive feature of the landscape and cannot be considered a landmark.

**Identified Heritage Attributes:** None Identified

**Identification of CHV:** No  
**BHR/CHL Number:** N/A  
**Completed by (name):** Frank Smith  
**Date Completed:** August 18, 2017
**Title:** CULTURAL HERITAGE RESOURCE/LANDSCAPE RECORD FORM

**Filepath:** \cd1217-f01\work_group\01609\active\1609 archaeology internal\165001055 - clarke road widening ea\work_program\report\final\app_inventory_165001055_20190108.docx

**Municipal Address:** N/A

**Former Township or County:** London Township

**Municipality:** City of London

**Lot/Concession:** Lot 5, Concession 4

**Resource Type:** Bridge

**Associated Dates:** 1967

**Relationship to Project:** Within the study area

**Description:** Four-span concrete slab and steel I-Beam girder bridge with concrete abutments, wing walls, and concrete Y-shaped piers. The bridge has a concrete parapet barrier and steel tube railing. A dedication plaque is located at the southeast railing.

**Indicators of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest from O. Reg. 9/06:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The property has design value or physical value because it,
   i. Is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, expression, material or construction method, ☑
   ii. Displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit, or ☑
   iii. Demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement. ☑

2. The property has historical value or associative value because it,
   i. Has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity organization or institution that is significant to a community, ☑
   ii. Yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of a community of 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. The property has contextual value because it,
   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. ☑

**Evaluation of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest According to O. Reg. 9/06:**

**Design or Physical Value:** The bridge is a common cast in-place concrete and steel I-beam design. The design was common at the time of construction, uses common materials, and does not demonstrate a high degree of technical or scientific achievement. It does not contain artistic or decorative detailing.

**Historical or Associative Value:** The bridge is named in honour of J.W. Carson on his retirement. Carson served as chairman for the London and Suburban Roads Commission for 25 years. The bridge was designed by County Engineer F.D.B. Arnold of the London Suburban Roads Commission and constructed by the London Suburban Roads Commission. The London Suburban Roads Commission was responsible for road and bridge maintenance in areas of Middlesex County not incorporated into the City of London. The suburban road commission maintained the J.W. Carson Bridge until this portion of the study area was annexed into the City of London in 1989.

**Contextual Value:** The bridge is not important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of the area, as the Clarke Road does not have a defined historic character, as it is comprised of a variety of property types with structures of varying dates. While functionally related to its surroundings as a bridge crossing, any structure at the location would fulfill the same role, and as such there is not sufficient connection to warrant contextual value. The bridge is not a landmark structure.

**Identified Heritage Attributes:** Plaque at the southeast railing dedicating the bridge to J.W. Carson

**Identification of CHVI:** Yes  **BHR/CHL Number:** BHR-1

**Completed by (name):** Frank Smith  **Date Completed:** August 18, 2017

---

**Stantec**

Client/Project: City of London

Clarke Road Widening EA
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CULTURAL HERITAGE RESOURCE/LANDSCAPE RECORD FORM
Municipal Address: N/A - Thames River
Former Township or County: London Township
Municipality: City of London
Lot/Concession: Lot 4, Concession 4 and Lot 5, Concession 4
Resource Type: River
Associated Dates: N/A
Relationship to Project: Within the study area

Description: The Thames River is a watercourse spanning 273 kilometres in its watershed, draining an area of over 5,285 kilometres squared. It is the second largest watershed in southwestern Ontario. At the study area, the river is located downstream from the Fanshawe dam and reservoir. The Thames River is a Canadian Heritage River. It has a wide but shallow riverbed and is lined with river stone and dense riparian vegetation.

Indicators of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest from O. Reg. 9/06:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. The property has design value or physical value because it,</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i. Is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, expression, material or construction method,</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit, or</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. The property has historical value or associative value because it,</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i. Has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity organization or institution that is significant to a community,</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of a community of culture, or</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer or theorist who is significant to a community.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. The property has contextual value because it,</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i. Is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an area,</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings, or</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Is a landmark.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluation of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest According to O. Reg. 9/06:

Design or Physical Value: None identified. The river is a natural feature and does not demonstrate design or physical value.

Historical or Associate Value: The Thames River was known to the Indigenous inhabitants of the region as the ‘Antler River’ and French traders referred to it as ‘The Ditch.’ John Graves Simcoe gave the Thames River its current name. The river has played a role in transportation and settlement in the area.

Contextual Value: The river is a landmark in the area. It is important in maintaining the character of the area, particularly in proximity to the Fanshawe Conservation Area.

Identified Heritage Attributes: Shallow but wide riverbed lined with river stone and riparian vegetation.

Identification of CHVI: Yes
BHR/CHL Number: CHL-1
Completed by (name): Frank Smith
Date Completed: August 18, 2017
**Municipal Address:** 1511 Clarke Road  
**Former Township or County:** London Township  
**Municipality:** City of London  
**Lot and Concession:** Lot 5, Concession 3  
**Resource Type:** Farmstead  
**Associated Dates:** circa 1860s  
**Relationship to Project:** Within study area  

**Description:**

This property contains a residence and farm complex. The residence is a one and a half storey structure with a steep pitched side gable roof, brick chimney, and gable peak. The exterior is buff brick. The residence is Ontario Farmhouse in design style. Due to distance from roadway and vegetation, the style of windows and foundation are indeterminate. The southernmost barn is a timber frame structure with a side gable roof and stone foundation. The silo is a modern construction and painted blue with a Canadian flag decal. Additional outbuildings are also modern in date of construction. Residence is similar in design to 1588 Clarke Road.

**Indicators of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest from O. Reg. 9/06:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>The property has design value or physical value because it,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i. Is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, expression, material or construction method,</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii. Displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit, or</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii. Demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement.</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>The property has historical value or associative value because it,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i. Has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity organization or institution that is significant to a community,</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii. Yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of a community of culture, or</td>
<td></td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii. Demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer or theorist who is significant to a community.</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>The property has contextual value because it,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i. Is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an area,</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii. Is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings, or</td>
<td></td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii. Is a landmark.</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evaluation of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest According to O. Reg. 9/06:**

**Design or Physical Value:** The property contains a farmstead with a 19th century dwelling, barn, and outbuilding. The property has other outbuildings that date to the mid to late 20th century. The house is representative of a 19th century Ontario Farmhouse. The style was common in rural areas in the mid to late 19th century. The barn is a representative example of a gable roof barn typical to the 19th century. Gable roof barns with stone foundations were constructed throughout rural areas of Southern Ontario in the 19th century.

**Historical or Associative Value:** This property is associated with the Pemberton family. The Pemberton family were the first settlers on this property, occupying the land when the Crown Reserve lots were sold off in the mid-19th century. The property is associated with the agricultural settlement of London Township in the 19th century,
Contextual Value: This farmstead maintains and supports the 19th century agricultural character of a small remaining stretch of Clarke Road between the Fanshawe Conservation Area and Kilally Road. The property is historically linked to its surroundings, including original survey roads (Killary Road and Clarke Road). The farmstead originally fronted on Kilally Road, but by the at least the 1940s driveway access to the property has been from Clarke Road.

**Identified Heritage Attributes:** Residence: One and a half storey, side gable roof, buff brick exterior. Southern Barn: side gable roof, timber construction, stone foundation.

**Identification of CHVI:** Yes  
**BHR/CHL Number:** CHL-2  
**Completed by (name):** Frank Smith  
**Date Completed:** August 18, 2017
**Municipal Address:** 1588 Clarke Road  
**Former Township or County:** London Township  
**Municipality:** City of London  
**Lot and Concession:** Lot 4, Concession 3  
**Resource Type:** Farmstead  
**Associated Dates:** 1862 to 1863  
**Relationship to Project:** Within study area  

**Description:**

The property, although partially obscured by mature trees and vegetation, was determined to contain a residence and farm complex. The residence is a one and a half storey structure with a steep pitched side gable roof and gable peak containing a window. Similar to 1511 Clarke Road, the residence of an Ontario Farmhouse design and constructed with buff brick. Adjacent to the residence are three buildings, one of which is a timber frame barn with stone foundation (Photo Source: Krista Gowan, 2018).

**Indicators of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest from O. Reg. 9/06:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. The property has design value or physical value because it,</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, expression, material or construction method,</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit, or</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement.</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. The property has historical value or associative value because it,</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity organization or institution that is significant to a community,</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of a community of culture, or</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer or theorist who is significant to a community.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. The property has contextual value because it,</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an area,</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings, or</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Is a landmark.</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evaluation of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest According to O. Reg. 9/06:**

**Design or Physical Value:** The property contains a farmstead with a 19th century dwelling, barn, and outbuilding. The house is representative of a 19th century Ontario Farmhouse. The style was common in rural areas in the mid to late 19th century. The barn is a representative example of a gable roof barn typical to the 19th century. Gable roof barns with stone foundations were constructed throughout rural areas of Southern Ontario in the 19th century.

**Historical or Associative Value:** Property is associated with the Tackabury family. John and Elizabeth Tackabury arrived in London Township from Wicklow, Ireland in 1829. The Tackabury family were among the earliest settlers in the Study Area and prominent citizens of ‘The Grove’, a hamlet located to the south of the Study Area.
Contextual Value: This farmstead maintains and supports the 19th century character of a small remaining stretch of Clarke Road between the Fanshawe Conservation Area and Kilally Road. The property is historically linked to its surroundings, including original survey roads (Kilally Road and Clarke Road). The farmstead originally fronted on Kilally Road, but by the at least the 1940s driveway access to the property has been from Clarke Road.

**Identified Heritage Attributes:** Residence: One and a half storey, side gable roof, buff brick exterior. Barn: side gable roof, timber construction, stone foundation.

**Identification of CHVI:** Yes  
**Heritage Resource/Landscape Number:** CHL-3

**Completed by (name):** Frank Smith  
**Date Completed:** August 18, 2017 (Photo added December 2018)
Municipal Address: 1424 Clarke Road
Former Township or County: London Township
Municipality: City of London
Lot and Concession: Lot 4, Concession 3
Resource Type: Other
Associated Dates: 1950-1953
Relationship to Project: Adjacent to study area

Description: The property contains Fanshawe Conservation Area. The portion of the study area visible from Clarke Road contains a tree lined roadway that facilitates access to the Fanshawe Conservation area entrance gate. The road is lined with silver maple trees at intermediate and mature stages of growth and was originally constructed to facilitate the building of the Fanshawe Dam. Prior to the construction of the J.W. Carson Clarke Road Bridge, this road and the Fanshawe Dam was used to bring traffic over the Thames River in this area. Note: The conservation area is a vast swath of land and is listed on the City’s Inventory of Heritage Resources. The rationale for the listing is the presence of an Ontario farmhouse, c. 1860, that is located approximately 800 metres east of the study area. Given the relationship of the study area to the conservation area property, the evaluation of CHVI focuses exclusively on the portion visible from the roadway where project interaction may occur.

Indicators of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest from O. Reg. 9/06:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. The property has design value or physical value because it,</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i. Is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>style, type, expression, material or construction method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>merit, or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>achievement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The property has historical value or associative value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>because it,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Has direct associations with a theme, event, belief,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>person, activity organization or institution that is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>significant to a community,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Yields, or has the potential to yield, information that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contributes to an understanding of a community of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>culture, or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>architect, artist, builder, designer or theorist who</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is significant to a community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The property has contextual value because it,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>character of an area,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Is physically, functionally, visually or historically</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>linked to its surroundings, or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Is a landmark.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluation of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest According to O. Reg. 9/06:

Design or Physical Value: The portion of the study area visible from Clarke Road does not meet the criteria in O. Reg. 9/06 for design or physical value.

Historical or Associative Value: The access road is historically associated with construction of Fanshawe Dam. The access road once acted as not only a transportation route for those involved in the Fanshawe Dam’s construction, but also a main throughway transporting people across the Thames River prior to construction of the J.W. Carson Bridge. Construction of the Fanshawe Dam is considered to be a historically significant event in the City of London as it has modified the flow of water throughout the City since its construction. The access road provides a direct association with the construction and subsequent use of the Fanshawe Dam, an historically significant event.

Contextual Value: The access road within the study area is historically linked to the construction of the Fanshawe Dam and has since provided access to the Fanshawe Conservation Area. Through the planting of maple trees lining the road a grand entrance to the conservation area was established. The maple trees post-date the association with dam construction but contribute significantly to the subsequent use of the
property as a conservation area established in response to construction of the Fanshawe Dam. The roadway providing for a naturalized environment entering the conservation area property.

**Identified Heritage Attributes:** Long linear drive lined with intermediate and mature silver maples, mid-century stone gates.

**Identification of CHVI:** Yes  
**BHR/CHL Number:** CHL-4  
**Completed by (name):** Frank Smith  
**Date Completed:** August 18, 2017
APPENDIX B:
CITY OF LONDON
CULTURAL LANDSCAPES
That, on the recommendation of the General Manager of Planning and Development, based on the application of the City of London with respect to Cultural Heritage Landscapes:

(i) A by-law **BE INTRODUCED** at the Municipal Council meeting on February 17, 2003, to amend the Official Plan (in accordance with the attached amendment) to add to Chapter 13, Heritage Resources Policies, the following new sections:

13.4 Cultural Heritage Landscapes
- 13.4.1 Guidelines for the Identification of Cultural Heritage Landscapes
- 13.4.2 Conservation of Cultural Heritage Landscapes
- 13.4.3 Preparation of Guidelines for Specific Cultural Heritage Landscapes
- 13.4.4 Public Works and Projects
- 13.4.5 Listed Cultural Heritage Landscapes

and to amend Section 19.2.2.(ii) to add the following new sections:

(o) Guidelines for the Identification of Cultural Heritage Landscapes
(p) Cultural Heritage Landscape Guidelines

(ii) A by-law **BE INTRODUCED** at Municipal Council on February 17, 2003, to adopt Guidelines for the Identification of Cultural Heritage Landscapes (as attached) under the provisions of Section 19.2.2 as amended in (i) above.

There has been a significant amount of research and discussion on the subject of Cultural Heritage Landscapes in London (see Appendix 3, PC report of March 11, 2002).

Staff have had many discussions with the London Advisory Committee on Heritage, other City stakeholders, the province and experts in other Ontario communities to develop proposed Cultural Heritage Landscape policies for London. On March 11, 2002, staff submitted a report for receipt and circulation to stakeholders regarding Cultural Heritage Landscapes with the intent of bringing forward a recommended Official Plan amendment at a subsequent public meeting of Planning Committee. This report contained the following:

- Issues regarding the various definitions of Cultural Heritage Landscapes
- Provincial Policy statements regarding the need for Cultural Heritage Landscape conservation
- Background of the City’s research to date regarding Cultural Heritage Landscapes
- Existing mechanisms for heritage resource conservation in the City of London
Major issues regarding conservation of Cultural Heritage Landscapes
Focussing on conservation of publicly owned Cultural Heritage Landscapes
Examples of Cultural Heritage Landscape policies in other communities
Proposed approach for conserving Cultural Heritage Landscapes in London
Proposed Official Plan amendment
How Cultural Heritage Landscape policies would be implemented in London

Since that time staff have received feedback on the Cultural Heritage Landscapes report through meetings, and oral and written communications. Based on this feedback and input, this report provides a revised policy.

ISSUES RAISED THROUGH THE CONSULTATION PROCESS AND RESPONSES

Below are the key points raised by those submitting comments on the March 11th Cultural Heritage Landscapes report, as part of the consultation process, followed by staff’s summary response.

Definition of term Cultural Heritage Landscapes

Comment: The definition for Cultural Heritage Landscapes in the Official Plan Policy should include: "...Such landscapes may be associated with historic events, activities, or people. Within London, landscapes may be categorized as one of three types: historical vernacular landscapes, historical designed landscapes, or special historic landscapes."

Response: As the March 11th report explains, there are various definitions of Cultural Heritage Landscapes due to their complexity and composite nature. For the purpose of clarity, the definition in the proposed Official Plan policy is the one used by the province. This definition does refer to a Cultural Heritage Landscape’s “association with historic events, activities, or people”. The definition does not include three “types” of landscapes because it is not necessarily helpful as a tool to preserve Cultural Heritage Landscapes and can confuse, rather than clarify, the definition.

Definition of the term conservation

Comment: A definition of the term “conservation” should be included in the Cultural Heritage Landscapes Official Plan Policy, which reads: “For the purpose of this section the term conservation shall mean protection of the resources from loss or destruction that would diminish its heritage significance or prevent its use or appreciation as a cultural heritage resource.”

Response: The definition of “conservation” is not being incorporated into the Cultural Heritage Landscapes Official Plan Policy. The Official Plan is a broad-based policy document that does not attempt to specifically define all terms used within it (i.e., there is no glossary). The only term that is necessary to define is “Cultural Heritage Landscapes” because it is new to the Official Plan and its meaning needs to be clarified in order to implement the policies.

Cultural Heritage Landscapes on publicly owned land

Comment: Cultural Heritage Landscapes should not be limited to publicly owned lands but should include privately owned lands where the owner consents to his/her property being recognized as a Cultural Heritage Landscape. This approach is consistent with the approach taken to the designation of heritage buildings. Privately owned Cultural Heritage Landscapes do not have to be contiguous with municipal lands.

Response: The proposed Cultural Heritage Landscapes Official Plan policy has been revised to include privately owned land where ownership consent is given. However, Cultural Heritage Landscapes will be recognized primarily on publicly owned lands.

Public works and projects having “regard” for Cultural Heritage Landscapes Guidelines

Comment: In the “Public Works and Projects” section of the Cultural Heritage Landscapes policy, the phrase “…will have regard for applicable Cultural Heritage Landscapes Guidelines” is
Agenda Item #  Page #

C. NELSON

not strong enough in terms of assuring that new projects will be compatible with the heritage integrity of the Cultural Heritage Landscape. It should read "...will comply with applicable Cultural Heritage Landscapes Guidelines."

Response: The Cultural Heritage Landscapes policy under the above-mentioned section has been revised to read "...will conform to applicable Cultural Heritage Landscapes Guidelines."

Listing of potential Cultural Heritage Landscapes in the Official Plan Policy

Comment: Listed potential Cultural Heritage Sites in the Official Plan Policy should include Victoria Park, Sifton Bog, Meadowlily Woods, Gibbons Park, Thames River Valley Corridor, Pond Mills, Medway River Valley, London Port Stanley Railway line and all cemeteries.

Response: The Official Plan Policy will only list those Cultural Heritage Landscapes that have been identified based upon the Guidelines for the Identification of Cultural Heritage Landscapes. The above-listed sites may be appraised as potential Cultural Heritage Landscapes, although some of these sites are already recognized and conserved as heritage resources (e.g., Victoria Park is designated under the Ontario Heritage Act, Part IV). It is not intended that all, or even most, of the natural heritage areas in the City will be identified as Cultural Heritage Landscapes. It is expected that these will represent a relatively limited number of Cultural Heritage Landscapes identified in the Official Plan. It should be recognized that there are many other mechanisms already in place to identify, manage and protect natural heritage areas.

Introductory section for the “Guidelines for the Identification of Cultural Heritage Landscapes”

Comment: In the “Guidelines for Identification of Cultural Heritage Landscapes” section of the Official Plan policy, each potential Cultural Heritage Landscape evaluation should include an introductory section which gives an overview of how the landscape formed initially and how it has evolved to its present-day state & usage. This provides context for a more detailed evaluation of the categories listed in the chart.

Response: The revised Guidelines for the Identification of Cultural Heritage Landscapes now includes a section entitled "Process" which lists a number of points that must be addressed with respect to assessing the potential Cultural Heritage Landscape. Along with the "checklist," a detailed description of the specific elements of the proposed Cultural Heritage Landscape (as they relate to each criterion within the checklist) must be included. Also, a summary assessment must be included which shows how the components of the landscape collectively merit recognition as a Cultural Heritage Landscape. Through this detailed assessment process one can incorporate how the landscape has evolved over time to its present-day state and usage.

Additions to the Guidelines for the Identification of Cultural Heritage Landscapes checklist

Comment: The Guidelines for Identification of Cultural Heritage Landscapes checklist in the Official Plan Policy should be more inclusive, adding such categories as "views, streams, springs, wetlands, woodlots, soils, vegetation, topography, thickets, old fields". Also, section 1 should include "privately owned lands with owner's consent"; section 3 should be titled "Cultural Heritage Significance"; section 4 should be titled "Historical Significance", section 6 should be titled "Area, on the whole, has maintained its heritage integrity" and section 7 should be titled "Peak of significance is comparatively old in the context of the region."

Response: The revised Guidelines for the Identification of Cultural Heritage Landscapes checklist includes the items suggested above.

Additions to the Guidelines for specific Cultural Heritage Landscapes

Comments: The Guidelines for specific Cultural Heritage Landscapes should include a section about the maintenance and rehabilitation of significant natural heritage features.

Response: The guidelines for each Cultural Heritage Landscape will be site specific and address heritage features within that landscape. If natural heritage features are a component of the Cultural Heritage Landscape, then issues such as maintenance and rehabilitation will be addressed accordingly.
Bill 179, "An Act to promote government efficiency and to improve services to taxpayers by amending or repealing certain Acts and by enacting one new Act" was given Royal Assent on November 26, 2002. The new legislation includes eighteen different amendments to the Ontario Heritage Act. Of specific relevance:

"5. Under Part IV of the Act, municipalities will designate property as having cultural heritage value or interest, rather than historic or architectural value or interest, to reflect the current practice of viewing heritage holistically and not merely in terms of buildings and districts."

The term "cultural heritage value or interest" will be utilized in the Act. What remains to be clarified is whether this change will have a specific effect on a municipality's ability to designate Cultural Heritage Landscapes under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act.

Despite this change in legislation, it is Staff's opinion that the policy approach recommended in this report is the best means for identifying and conserving Cultural Heritage Landscapes. These policies give clarity around the means for identifying these landscapes. They allow for the recognition of such landscapes and the important elements within them. Furthermore, they establish guidance for each important landscape and shape the way that these landscapes will be enhanced and conserved.

If these policies are adopted and implemented by Council, the community will have the opportunity to identify, officially list (within the Official Plan) and prepare guidelines for a specific Cultural Heritage Landscape (it is anticipated that Springbank Park/Thames Valley Golf Course will be the first such landscape). Through this process the landscape will be enhanced in many different ways (identification, recognition of specific elements, celebration, physical improvements, programming). The discussion at the end of this report, relating to the proposed designation of the Thames Valley Golf Course, further clarifies the benefits of the proposed approach.

As a result of the consultation process, the proposed Official Plan amendment that was circulated through the March 11, 2002 report to Planning Committee has been revised. Below is the revised Official Plan Policy that is being recommended for adoption. Deletions from the March 11th version are shown as a single strikethrough; additions are highlighted. (See Appendix 1 for the final recommended Official Plan Policy amendment)

13.4 CULTURAL HERITAGE LANDSCAPES

The Provincial Policy-Statement states that it is policy of the province it is a provincial policy that Cultural Heritage Landscapes will be conserved. The Policy-Statement goes on to define cultural heritage landscapes as: "a defined geographical area of heritage significance which has been modified by human activities. Such an area is valued by a community, and is of significance to the understanding of the history of a people or place." The following Section of the Plan provides policies provide guidance for the identification and conservation of Cultural Heritage Landscapes in London.
Cultural Heritage Landscapes will only be recognized on municipally owned lands, except where adjacent property owners wish to be included within a Cultural Heritage Landscape which is ownership consent is given. Cultural Heritage Landscapes will be recognized primarily located on municipally publicly owned lands. Under the provisions of Section 13.4.2 of this Plan but may also be identified on privately owned property. Cultural Heritage Landscapes will be identified based upon Guidelines for the Identification of Cultural Heritage Landscapes in London, as prepared adopted by the City of London Council under the provisions of Section 19.2.2 of the Plan.

Cultural Heritage Landscapes will be identified based upon Guidelines for the Identification of Cultural Heritage Landscapes in London, as prepared adopted by the City of London Council under the provisions of Section 19.2.2 of the Plan.

All Public works and projects, including, but not limited to, park improvements and open space conservation projects, will conform to have regard for applicable Cultural Heritage Landscape Guidelines.
13.4.5
Listed Cultural Heritage Landscapes

The following are Cultural Heritage Landscapes that will be conserved under the policies of Section 13.4 of this Plan:

In addition to the above changes to Section 13 of the Official Plan, Section 19.2.2.(ii) will add the following clause to the list of potential guideline documents:

(a) Guidelines for the Identification of Cultural Heritage Landscapes
(b) Cultural Heritage Landscapes Guidelines

As a result of the consultation process, the proposed amendment to the City's Official Plan Policy that was circulated through the March 11, 2002 report to Planning Committee has been revised. Below are the revised Guidelines for the Identification of Cultural Heritage Landscapes that is being recommended for adoption. Deletions from the March 11th version are shown as a single strikethrough; additions are highlighted. (See Appendix 2 for the recommended guidelines in full)

**PROPOSED GUIDELINE-DOCUMENT GUIDELINES FOR THE IDENTIFICATION OF CULTURAL HERITAGE LANDSCAPES IN LONDON**

**PURPOSE**

Cultural Heritage Landscapes (CHLs) are somewhat difficult to assess and identify, due to their inherent composite nature. These guidelines are created to assist in the evaluation of CHLs on municipally owned lands. They are prepared subject to Section 19.2.2 (Guideline Documents) of the City of London Official Plan. They provide, in greater detail, a means by which CHLs may be identified. In general, the guidelines recognize that a CHL must have a number of historical qualities and heritage components in order to be formally recognized as such.

These guidelines are prepared to assist in the evaluation of Cultural Heritage Landscapes in London. They are prepared subject to Section 19.2.2 (Guideline Documents) of the City of London Official Plan. They provide a range of criteria by which landscapes can be assessed and describe the extent that is required in order to identify an area as a Cultural Heritage Landscape.

**PROCESS**

Cultural Heritage Landscapes will only be recognized where ownership consent is given.

Cultural Heritage Landscapes will be recognized primarily on publicly owned lands, but may also be identified on privately owned property.

Recognized Cultural Heritage Landscapes in the City of London are listed in policy 13.4.5, in (b) the Official Plan. To add an area to this list, a detailed assessment will be required to show that this area merits recognition as a Cultural Heritage Landscape. This assessment will include the following:

- A new CHL to the Official Plan, the proposed area must meet the criteria in these guidelines.
- If the criteria are met, planning staff will bring forth an amendment to Municipal Council to add the proposed CHL to the list in policy 13.4.5, of the Official Plan.

1. A "checklist" assessment of the proposed Cultural Heritage Landscape based on the criteria included in this guideline.

2. A detailed description of the specific elements of the proposed Cultural Heritage Landscape as they relate to each criterion within the checklist.

3. A summary assessment which shows how the components of the proposed Cultural
Heritage Landscape: measured against these criteria, collectively warrant the formal recognition of this area as a Cultural Heritage Landscape.

The assessment will be brought forward to Council who will consider and make a final decision on whether the proposed Cultural Heritage Landscape warrants formal recognition under Policy 43.4.5 of the Official Plan.

CRITERIA

The criteria below are based on the grounds that a Cultural Heritage Landscape is a defined geographical specific geographic area of heritage significance, composed of a number of heritage elements. Such a landscape is valued by Londoners and is of significance to the understanding of the history of a people or place. As defined by the province, a CHL is valued by the community and is of significance to the understanding of the history of a people or place. Because of its complex nature, a CHL must meet a substantial number of criteria, as set forth below, that represent a unified and integrated whole. Suggested numbers of criteria are included; however, this is not a strictly mathematical process. A detailed analysis of the criteria listed below must be included as part of the CHL identification document.

1. LAND OWNERSHIP
   1. City-owned lands
   2. Other publicly owned lands consenting to inclusion in the CHL—Privately owned lands consenting to be recognized as a CHL

2. GEOGRAPHIC AREA
   A. Area contains features that contribute to its heritage character
      1. Vistas
      2. Rivers/streams
      3. Ponds/wetlands
      4. Forests
      5. Wooded areas—Woodlands/woodlots
      6. Rare/important collections of plant/animal species
      7. Other
   B. Area has historical land uses
   C. Composition of individual features/attributes in area creates a significant particularly important historic-visual landmark

3. CULTURAL HERITAGE SIGNIFICANCE
   Area contains built features that contribute to its heritage character
   A. Built
      1. Structures
      2. Roads/paths (circulation patterns)
      3. Fences
      4. Bridges
      5. Waterworks
      6. Rail lines/corridors
      7. Other
   B. Cemeteries
   C. Other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAND OWNERSHIP</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. City-owned lands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Other publicly owned lands consenting to inclusion in the CHL—Privately owned lands consenting to be recognized as a CHL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GEOGRAPHIC AREA</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Vistas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Rivers/streams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Ponds/wetlands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Forests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Wooded areas—Woodlands/woodlots</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Rare/important collections of plant/animal species</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CULTURAL HERITAGE SIGNIFICANCE</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area contains built features that contribute to its heritage character</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Structures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Roads/paths (circulation patterns)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Fences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Bridges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Waterworks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Rail lines/corridors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Cemeteries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C. Nelson

B. Area containing archaeological (prehistoric and/or historic) ruins above or beneath ground.

C. Area containing modified land features:
   1. Farmlands
   2. Gardens
   3. Orchards
   4. Parks
   5. Other
   6. Abandoned Farmlands
   7. Plantations
   8. Other

4. SIGNIFICANCE TO THE UNDERSTANDING OF HISTORY OF PEOPLE/PLACE - HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE
   A. Area associated with historic events, beliefs, themes
   B. Area associated with historic person/s
   C. Area illustrates broad patterns of socio-cultural history

5. GEOGRAPHIC AREA VALUED BY COMMUNITY FROM HERITAGE PERSPECTIVE
   A. Area has significant heritage value for a variety of reasons

6. INTEGRITY - AREA, ON THE WHOLE, HAS MAINTAINED ITS HERITAGE INTEGRITY
   A. Area, on the whole, has maintained its heritage integrity

7. AGE PEAK OF SIGNIFICANCE IS COMPARATIVELY OLD IN THE CONTEXT OF THE REGION
   A. The period on which the area was created or was at its peak of significance is comparatively old in the context of the region.

The London Advisory Committee on Heritage (LACH) has recommended that the E.V. Buchanan Thames Valley Golf Course be designated through Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act. Council deferred consideration of this recommendation until such time as Staff brought forward this report on Cultural Heritage Landscapes.

The difficulties with designating the Thames Valley Golf Course are clear when considering the "reasons for designation" which must be developed for any property designated under the Ontario Heritage Act. The reasons for designation are intended to spell out the critical heritage elements of a property that are to be retained. These "reasons" are registered on title and form the basis for regulated preservation. Any proposed changes to elements listed in these reasons for designation must be approved by Council through a heritage alteration permit process.

What reasons for designation of the Thames Valley Golf Course have been put forward to date (see Appendix 4 - Reasons for Designation for Thames Valley Golf Course as prepared by the LACH)? Primarily, they relate to the history of the golf course. While they are an excellent description of how, when and why the golf course was created, they give little or no guidance for what needs to be preserved through the heritage designation: Are we to regulate changes to:
   o The trees on the property? Which ones are important? Can they be pruned? Can they be cut down without a heritage alteration permit?
o The topography of the property? Can a new green or tee be created? Can grading occur?
o The buildings on the property? There are no heritage buildings on the site.
o The golf course function? Heritage designation is not intended to preserve a LAND USE —
this is the role of zoning.

This regulatory approach brings little value to the conservation of the golf course. However,
inclusion of the Golf Course within a larger Cultural Heritage Landscape plan does offer value. First,
the golf course could be recognized together with Springbank Park as a cultural heritage landscape
within the Official Plan if it meets the necessary criteria. In doing so, the important elements of the
landscape would be identified (many of those noted above). Rather than taking a purely regulatory
approach, a guideline document would be prepared which underscores the importance of the
landscape to London’s history. It would explain how the landscape could be recognized and
celebrated (through signage, visitor infrastructure, interpretation techniques, programming). It would
also clearly spell out the key goals, objectives and guidelines for conservation — and all public
projects would need to be consistent with these guidelines (to conform with the Official Plan — a
requirement of the Planning Act). This approach would set out a responsibility for the property
owner (the City) to value and conserve this landscape.

It is Staff’s opinion that this approach provides a superior tool for conserving Cultural Heritage
Landscapes over a purely regulatory, and inflexible tool, offered by designation under Part IV of the
Ontario Heritage Act. This approach gives the opportunity to conserve the landscape while raising
the profile of this valuable heritage resource to Londoner’s and visitors alike.

A Cultural Heritage Landscape is a dynamic place where cultural processes and change constantly
affect it. It is a public place where a community imagines, experiences and discovers. Cultural
Heritage Landscapes contribute to the development of individual and community identity and
knowledge of the world. They are important locations of human activity that enrich our experience of
culture and a sense of place. By formally recognizing, conserving and promoting Cultural Heritage
Landscapes in London, the community as well as outside visitors, will have an opportunity to share
in the enjoyment, exploration and celebration of part of London’s rich cultural heritage, today and in
the future.

PREPARED BY: JOHN M. FLEMING PLANNING ADMINISTRATOR - POLICY

RECOMMENDED BY: V. A. COTÉ GENERAL MANAGER OF PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

January 29, 2003

Attachment: Appendix 1: Official Plan Policy amendment
Appendix 2: Official Plan Policy amendment — Guidelines for the Identification of Cultural Heritage Landscapes
Appendix 3: March 11, 2002 Cultural Heritage Landscapes report to PC
Appendix 4: Reasons for Designation — E.V. Buchanan Thames Valley Golf Course
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Appendix 1

AMENDMENT NO. 1

to the

OFFICIAL PLAN FOR THE CITY OF LONDON

A. PURPOSE OF THIS AMENDMENT
The purpose of this Amendment is to add policies within Section 13 of the Official Plan for the City of London to recognize the intent of Municipal Council to (i) recognize the importance of Cultural Heritage Landscapes in London, (ii) describe the criteria by which they will be recognized and (iii) identify the means by which they will be conserved. This amendment will also add “Cultural Heritage Landscape Guidelines” to the list of guideline documents described in Section 19.2.2 of the Official Plan.

B. LOCATION OF THIS AMENDMENT
This City-wide amendment applies to lands located in the City of London.

C. BASIS OF THE AMENDMENT

- Since the passing of the Ontario Heritage Act in 1975, the province has been expanding the scope of its interest in heritage from individual buildings as landmarks to, among other things, Cultural Heritage Landscapes (CHL).
- While it is recognized on both a provincial and municipal level that cultural heritage resources are an important part of a community on a multitude of levels, some components of the City’s heritage, including CHLs, have not been given the recognition and protection that they merit.
- Realizing that historic resource commemoration and protection should be included in a community’s planning goals and policies, this Official Plan Amendment seeks to identify and conserve important Cultural Heritage Landscapes.

THE AMENDMENT
The Official Plan for the City of London is hereby amended by adding a new subsection to Section 13, the wording of which would read as follows:

13.4 CULTURAL HERITAGE LANDSCAPES
It is a provincial policy that Cultural Heritage Landscapes will be conserved.
The following policies establish the means for identifying and conserving Cultural Heritage Landscapes in London.

13.4.1 Guidelines for the Identification of Cultural Heritage Landscapes
A Cultural Heritage Landscape is a specific geographic area of heritage significance composed of a number of heritage elements. Such landscapes may be associated with historic events, activities, or people. Such a landscape is valued by Londoners and is of significance to the understanding of the history of a people or place.

Cultural Heritage Landscapes will only be recognized where ownership consent is given. Cultural Heritage Landscapes will be recognized primarily on publicly owned lands, but may also be identified on privately owned property. Cultural Heritage Landscapes will be identified based upon Guidelines for the Identification of Cultural Heritage Landscapes, as adopted by City Council under the provisions of Section 19.2.2 of this Plan.

13.4.2 Conservation of Cultural Heritage Landscapes
Conservation of Cultural Heritage Landscapes will be managed through the use of guideline documents. These guidelines will identify physical features that are to be conserved and will describe opportunities for recognition, interpretation, promotion and conservation. Such guidelines will be prepared for each Cultural Heritage Landscape listed in Policy 13.4.5 of the Official Plan.
13.4.3 Preparation of Guidelines for Specific Cultural Heritage Landscapes

Subject to the provisions of Section 19.2.2 of this Plan, Cultural Heritage Landscape Guidelines will be adopted for each Cultural Heritage Landscape identified in Policy 13.4.5 of this Plan. These guidelines will include, but not be limited to:

i. A refined delineation of the Cultural Heritage Landscape
ii. The important history and physical features, activities and processes that have shaped the Cultural Heritage Landscape
iii. The physical features within the Cultural Heritage Landscape that should be retained
iv. The opportunities for recognizing and interpreting the Cultural Heritage Landscape
v. Guidelines for all future projects within the landscape to promote, enhance and conserve the Cultural Heritage Landscape

13.4.4 Public Works and Projects

All Public works and projects, including, but not limited to park improvements and open space conservation projects, will conform to applicable Cultural Heritage Landscape Guidelines.

13.4.5 Listed Cultural Heritage Landscapes

The following are Cultural Heritage Landscapes that will be conserved under the policies of Section 13.4 of this Plan:

2. In addition to the above changes to Chapter 13 of the Official Plan, Section 19.2.2 (ii) will add the following clause to the list of potential guideline documents

(o) Guidelines for the identification of Cultural Heritage Landscapes
(p) Cultural Heritage Landscape Guidelines

Y:\Shared\POLICY\HERITAGE\PC reports\CHL PC report Feb 10, 2003 Appendix 1.doc
Appendix 2

GUIDELINES FOR THE IDENTIFICATION OF CULTURAL HERITAGE LANDSCAPES IN LONDON

PURPOSE

These guidelines are prepared to assist in the evaluation of Cultural Heritage Landscapes in London. They are prepared subject to Section 19.2.2 (Guideline Documents) of the City of London Official Plan. They provide a range of criteria by which landscapes can be assessed and describe the process that is required in order to identify an area as a Cultural Heritage Landscape.

PROCESS

Cultural Heritage Landscapes will only be recognized where ownership consent is given. Cultural Heritage Landscapes will be recognized primarily on publicly owned lands, but may also be identified on privately owned property.

Recognized Cultural Heritage Landscapes are listed in policy 13.4.5. of the Official Plan. To add an area to this list, a detailed assessment will be required to show that this area merits recognition as a cultural heritage landscape. This assessment will include the following:

1. A "checklist" assessment of the proposed Cultural Heritage Landscape based on the criteria included in this guideline.

2. A detailed description of the specific elements of the proposed Cultural Heritage Landscape as they relate to each criterion within the "checklist".

3. A summary assessment which shows how the components of the proposed Cultural Heritage Landscape, measured against these criteria, collectively warrant the formal recognition of this area as a Cultural Heritage Landscape.

The assessment will be brought forward to Council who will consider and make a final decision on whether the proposed Cultural Heritage Landscape warrants formal recognition under Policy 13.4.5. of the Official Plan.

CRITERIA

The criteria below are based on the grounds that a Cultural Heritage Landscape is a specific geographic area of heritage significance, composed of a number of heritage elements. Such landscapes may be associated with historic events, activities, or people. Such a landscape is valued by the community and is of significance to the understanding of the history of a people or place.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERION</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. LAND OWNERSHIP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Publicly owned lands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Privately owned lands consenting to be recognized as a Cultural Heritage Landscape</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. GEOGRAPHIC AREA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Area contains features that make a significant contribution to its heritage character</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Vistas/views</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Rivers/streams/springs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Ponds/wetlands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Forests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Woodlands/woodlots</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Rare/important collections of flora/fauna</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Thickets/old fields</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Area has historical land use/s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. CULTURAL HERITAGE SIGNIFICANCE

Area contains built features that make a significant contribution to its heritage character:

A. Built
1. Structures
2. Roads/paths (circulation patterns)
3. Fences
4. Bridges
5. Waterworks
6. Rail lines/corridors
7. Cemeteries
8. Other

B. Area contains archaeological (prehistoric and/or historic) ruins above or beneath ground.

C. Area contains modified land features:
1. Farmlands
2. Gardens
3. Orchards
4. Parks
5. Vistas
6. Abandoned farmlands
7. Plantations
8. Other

4. HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE

A. Area associated with historic events, beliefs, themes

B. Area associated with historic person/s

C. Area illustrates broad patterns of socio-cultural history

5. AREA VALUED BY COMMUNITY FROM HERITAGE PERSPECTIVE

6. AREA, ON THE WHOLE, HAS MAINTAINED ITS HERITAGE INTEGRITY

7. PEAK OF SIGNIFICANCE IS COMPARATIVELY OLD IN THE CONTEXT OF THE REGION.
That, on the recommendation of the Commissioner of Planning and Development, the following report and proposed Official Plan amendment BE RECEIVED and that Staff BE DIRECTED to circulate this report to the London Advisory Committee on Heritage, the Heritage and Museum Coordinating Committee, Tourism London, the London Development Institute, the London Home Builders Association, the London and Area Planning Consultants, the Urban League and other interested parties for comment and feedback, with the intent of bringing forward a recommended Official Plan amendment at a subsequent Public meeting of the Planning Committee.

**Purpose of This Report**

This report will:

i. Define Cultural Heritage Landscapes and the issues that they present;

ii. Propose a policy framework for addressing Cultural Heritage Landscapes; and

iii. Use an illustrative example of a Cultural Heritage Landscape at Springbank (including publicly-owned lands at Reservoir Hill, Springbank Park and the Thames Valley Golf Course) to demonstrate how this policy framework would be implemented.

It is important to understand that a considerable amount of public consultation and planning work remains to be done to complete the Cultural Heritage Landscape guidelines for Springbank. This will occur in a separate process, following Council's decision on a general policy approach for dealing with Cultural Heritage Landscapes across the City. However, the use of Springbank as an example is helpful to illustrate how this general approach would be applied to a specific landscape.

**Definition of Cultural Heritage Landscape**

There are various definitions of Cultural Heritage Landscapes (CHLs) in Canada and the United States and they all emphasize the interrelationship between people and physical landscapes. Cultural Heritage Landscapes are characterized by the activities and processes that have shaped them and it is the shared sense of values they represent that make them significant.

The London Advisory Committee on Heritage defines a CHL as: "...a geographic area, including both natural and cultural resources, that depicts the result of human activities over time in modifying landscapes. Such landscapes will be associated with historic events, activities, or people. Within London, landscapes will be categorized as one of three types: historic vernacular landscape, historic designed landscape, special historic landscape."

Ontario's Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) provides a clear definition of Cultural Heritage Landscapes as: "...a defined geographical area of heritage significance which has been modified by human activities. Such an area is valued by a community and is of significance to the understanding of the history of a people or place."

**The Issue**

The Province of Ontario recognizes the importance of CHLs in the preamble to its Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) where it states that "The Province's resources - its agricultural land base, mineral resources, natural heritage resources, water supply and cultural heritage resources - provide economic, environmental and social benefits. The wise use and protection of these resources over
the long term is a key provincial interest." Moreover, the "Principles" section of the PPS states that "Ontario’s long term economic prosperity, environmental health and social well-being depend on...protection for their economic use and/or environmental benefits..." As suggested by the Province, Cultural Heritage Landscapes represent an economic opportunity. They offer cultural capital which can be used to attract tourists and generate job opportunities.

The Provincial Policy Statement states that "Significant built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes will be preserved". While this general statement is not supported through regulations or legislation, it clearly states the province’s intention to recognize and preserve significant cultural heritage landscapes.

Recognition of Cultural Heritage Landscapes, as such, is new in Ontario and London. Currently, the City of London does not formally recognize Cultural Heritage Landscapes. There are no Official Plan policies which recognize their significance within the community and their contribution to the City’s history. Similarly, there are no formal means by which these landscapes can be conserved for future generations of Londoners. Finally, the significance of London’s Cultural Heritage Landscapes is not celebrated or communicated as an important part of London’s heritage resources (and a potential draw for culture and heritage tourists).

This report will explore and recommend the means by which London can identify, commemorate and preserve Cultural Heritage Landscapes. The report will (1) discuss what the City has done to date; (2) identify existing mechanisms for heritage resource preservation; (3) discuss issues involved in the identification, assessment, preservation, maintenance and regulation of CHLs; (4) provide examples of other areas and how they deal with CHLs; (5) propose an approach and Official Plan policies for addressing CHLs in London; (6) use Springbank Park as an illustrative example of how CHL policies would be applied to an individual landscape.

Background History
There has been a significant amount of research and discussion on the subject of CHLs in London. Most of this has been led by the London Advisory Committee on Heritage. The following shows a chronology of events relating to CHLs in the City.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nov 1996</td>
<td>&quot;Cultural Heritage Landscape Study of London&quot; report by Historica Research Ltd (Chris Andreae) prepared for the LACH; gives definition of CHL; explains how CHLs can be identified and described; recommends approach for City to adopt regarding identifying, assessing, conserving, managing, preparing guidelines and policy for CHLs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 1997</td>
<td>Historica Research Ltd. contracted by Planning to continue work on above recommendations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 1997</td>
<td>&quot;Cultural Heritage Landscapes in London&quot; report prepared for the LACH by Historica Research Ltd recommends City identify CHLs within community planning areas and identify methods to incorporate them into overall development of the planning areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 1997</td>
<td>The LACH reviews and approves above report in principle, refers it to PC and Heritage Planner for final editing and re-submission to the LACH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 1998</td>
<td>The LACH requests Administration to prepare an amendment to Official Plan to include CHLs. Staff identify the need to better understand the issues of CHLs and how they may be applied in a &quot;real world setting&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 1998</td>
<td>&quot;Cultural Heritage Landscape Assessment Template&quot; report prepared for the LACH by Cecilia Paine; recommends template be used as part of community planning process to assist with identification of CHLs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 1999</td>
<td>The LACH approves &quot;CHL Template&quot; report from its Planning &amp; Policy Subcommittee; requests Administration to prepare a more user-friendly template for use by the City and developers; requests Administration to apply the template to 2 areas of City as test sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept 1999</td>
<td>The LACH (1) requests Administration to develop Official Plan policies for CHL conservation, (2) approves C. Andreae’s two CHL reports and C. Paine’s CHL report (with certain amendments) for use by planning and development communities, and (3) recommends that where a CHL is present on a proposed development site, the developer be required to submit to the LACH a report outlining how CHL will be conserved.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As can be seen from the above chronology, there has been a long history relating to Cultural Heritage Landscapes in London. The City and the LACH have made several attempts to clarify and operationalize the meaning of Cultural Heritage Landscapes. Furthermore, the City and the LACH have put a substantial effort into exploring the means by which CHLs can be identified and preserved.

### Analysis

1. **Existing Mechanisms for Heritage Resource Preservation in London**

   There are a number of mechanisms that provide protection for the City's heritage resources - at both a provincial and municipal level. For example, built heritage, natural heritage and archaeological resources are covered by the Ontario Heritage Act. Moreover, London's Official Plan and Zoning By-Laws help to preserve the City's built, natural and archaeological heritage. The following table shows those mechanisms which are currently in place to preserve London's valuable heritage resources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual Buildings &amp; Sites</th>
<th>The Ontario Heritage Act Part IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Allows for the designation of buildings and sites to conserve historic and/or architectural components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Allows for municipal heritage easements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History Sites and Monuments Act</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>States that the Minister may provide for the preservation and maintenance of any historic place acquired pursuant to this Act. The Minister may make agreements with any persons for the care and preservation of any places marked or commemorated historic places</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13.2.1 Architectural and Historical Heritage Resources Inventory: Allows for the preparation and maintenance of heritage inventory for protection of each heritage resource.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.2.2 Criteria for Designation: States that Council can designate heritage resources through by-laws, in accordance with OHA Part IV.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.2.3 Alteration or demolition: States that where resources are designated under OHA, no alteration or demolition can be done that would adversely affect reasons for designation, except in accordance with OHA.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City of London Policy Manual, Planning &amp; Development, Chapter 19 (27) Demolition Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>States that if a residential building, proposed for demolition, is on the Inventory of Heritage Resources, a public meeting must be held and Planning Committee can recommend to Council to refuse demolition on merits of request.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill 18: Special Legislation Applying to London's Heritage Designated Buildings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>States that where an owner who is refused a demolition permit, subsequently demolishes a designated heritage building or structure after a 180 day waiting period, that owner must substantially complete the new building to be erected on the site within a two year period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>States that the demolition of a heritage designated property, without appropriate approvals, is an offence that can be fined up to $1 million.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ontario Heritage Act Part V: Heritage Conservation Districts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allows for the heritage designation of districts (small and large).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly discourages the demolition of buildings within the district.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>London Official Plan: Heritage Resources Policies:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13.3.1 Designation of Heritage Conservation Districts (HCD): States that Council can designate a portion of the city as a HCD in accordance with OHA Part V.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>London Official Plan: Changes to Buildings or Structures:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13.2.2: States that erection, alteration, demolition or removal of buildings or structures within a HCD is subject to provisions of the OHA.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
London Z-1 Zoning By-law: HER Zoning:

- 34.3 Regulations: States that one cannot erect or use any building or structure, or use any land or causes or permit any building or structure to be erected or used, or cause or permit any land to be used, in any HER zone except in conformity with the regulations.

Ontario Heritage Act Part VI: Conservation of Resources of Archaeological Value

- Allows for conservation of archaeological resources.

Provincial Policy Statement (PPS); Cultural Heritage and Archaeological Resources:

- 2.5.2: States that where significant archaeological resources must be preserved on site, only development and site alteration which maintain the heritage integrity of site will be permitted.

Cemeteries Act: Burial sites #63-87

- Allows for the protection of burial sites.

Environmental Assessment Act

- Includes archaeological resources in its definition of "environment".

Planning Act

- Places increased responsibility for management of archaeological concerns at municipal level. 34 (1) States that zoning by-laws may be passed by councils...
- 3.3.(f): States that Council can prohibit all or any use of land that is the site of a significant archaeological resource.

London Official Plan

- Heritage Resource Policies 13.2.4: States that Council will facilitate efforts to preserve and excavate historic and prehistoric archaeological resources.

London Official Plan: Archaeological Master Plan (AMP)

- 13.2.4.1: States that the City will prepare and maintain AMP to provide for the conservation of archaeological resources.
- 13.2.4.2: Imposes the requirement of archaeological assessment where necessary.

Provincial Policy Statement: Heritage

- 2.3: States that natural features will be protected as a legacy of the natural landscape of an area.

Environmental Assessment Act

- Provides for the protection, conservation and wise management of Ontario's environment.

London Official Plan; Environmental Policies

- 15.1.1i: Natural Heritage Objectives: Provide for the identification and rehabilitation of significant natural heritage areas.
- 15.2.2: Purpose of Natural Heritage Policies: The establishment of requirements for protection of natural heritage system through preparation of area planning studies and environmental impact studies.
- 15.3: Natural Heritage Areas Designated Open Space: States that areas designated as open space represent significant natural features and ecological functions and additional measures to provide for their protection are considered necessary.
- 15.4.1 ESA: States that ESAs contain natural features that warrant protection.
- 15.4.1.5 ESA: Potentially Environmentally Significant Areas. Identifies specific candidate sites as possible ESAs,
- 15.5 ESA: States that environmental impact studies are required prior to approval of development to prevent negative impacts on the Natural Heritage System.

London Official Plan: City Structure Policies

- 2.4: States that the City shall have regard for environmentally sensitive areas.

London's Z-1 Zoning By-law: Open Space Zones:

In contrast to many of the preservation mechanisms noted above (eg. preservation of buildings, districts, archaeological resources, environmental features, etc.), Cultural Heritage Landscapes are not recognized nor supported by any provincial legislation. While the PPS provides an expression of provincial policy, it does not have the strength of statute that accompanies the heritage resource mechanisms cited in the above table. Clearly, the legislative basis for regulating CHLs is not equal to that supporting several other heritage preservation tools.
2. Major Issues Surrounding the Preservation of Cultural Heritage Landscapes

As noted in the background chronology of this report, an extensive amount of work on CHLs has been prepared for the City by various consultants. Unfortunately, these reports did not resolve, nor clarify, the key issues relating to Cultural Heritage Landscapes. In many cases, work done by consultants raised further questions. Specifically, the "real world" issues of applying CHL policies were not addressed and assistance in reaching the goal of applying useful, legal and beneficial policies was not provided. The following discussion considers some of these issues that were not addressed "head on".

Difficult to Define

Cultural Heritage Landscapes are complex and difficult to identify and evaluate because of their composite nature. Defining the extent of the landscape requires an evaluation of its components and an understanding of the influences and activities that shaped them. However, nowhere does the Province nor the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Recreation define what the "components" are, in order for municipalities to clearly identify and evaluate them. Without such guidelines the identification of CHLs is extremely subjective.

Depending on one's interpretation of CHLs and their component parts, almost any physical landscape could be considered a CHL. For example, Professor Cecelia Paine (University of Guelph, School of Landscape Architecture) defines CHLs, in part, as "Places from which societies may derive inspiration, knowledge and identity. Landscape qualities which are indicators of cultural heritage include historic qualities...aesthetic qualities...contextual qualities...social qualities...and scientific qualities." Within this definition a wide range of areas in London could be interpreted as a CHL. The LACI used Cecelia Paine's suggested definition to identify certain CHLs within the City, however, the model they proposed is extremely complex and difficult to understand. While it maximizes the usefulness of Ms. Paine's definition of CHLs, the model is not workable nor supportable for the purpose of preserving cultural heritage landscapes through regulation.

Provincial Guidance

Provincially, there is very little guidance for the preservation of Cultural Heritage Landscapes and the incorporation of these landscapes into the municipal planning process. The Provincial Policy Statement declares that CHLs "Provide economic, environmental and social benefits", however it does not provide guidelines for municipalities as to how these landscapes should be integrated into the planning process to provide these benefits. In 1994, under a different political regime, provincial guidelines for Cultural Heritage Landscapes were being developed by the MECF, but to date they have not been completed nor implemented.

Legislative Framework

The concept of protecting Cultural Heritage Landscapes through regulation adds more complexity to the issue. The Provincial Policy Statement declares that Cultural Heritage Landscapes will be "conserved", however, it does not define the term "conserve" and there is no corresponding legislation to support a regulatory approach. As listed in the previous section of this report, there are numerous ways in which a variety of heritage resources are conserved and protected at both the provincial and municipal level through regulation. For example, heritage resources of a built nature are protected under the Ontario Heritage Act- Parts IV and V. Natural heritage resources as well as archaeological resources also have provincial, and therefore municipal, mechanisms for protection. However, Cultural Heritage Landscapes have no such mechanisms for protection due to the lack of provincial guidelines and corresponding legislation.

Regulatory Approach

Regulating CHLs is problematic with regard to privately owned lands. The problem is two-fold: (1) as mentioned above, there are no clear provincial guidelines for regulation and no clear regulating mechanisms which could be legally imposed upon a private land holder, and (2) without clear provincial guidelines for defining and identifying CHLs, regulating land uses within and around CHLs could be seen as arbitrary.

3. Focusing on the Conservation of Publicly Owned Cultural Heritage Landscapes

Conserving Cultural Heritage Landscapes relating to publicly owned lands is less problematic. Recognizing and conserving publicly owned Cultural Heritage Landscapes changes the government's role from that of being regulatory to that of being supportive. In fact, this is the means by which CHLs are currently conserved in Ontario. For example, the Ontario Realty Corporation, through the Management Board Secretariat, uses a complex evaluation tool to identify CHLs on properties that they own. Through this mechanism they seek to recognize and conserve Cultural Heritage Landscapes on their own property. Similarly, the National Park Service of the United States
uses the U.S. Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties on lands that the Park Service owns. The province of British Columbia has a Cultural Heritage Management Program for its park system. Through their conservation program policies, the province identifies, protects and conserves its cultural heritage features on publicly owned lands. Each of these examples of CHL management relates to public lands, not private.

4. Examples of Cultural Heritage Landscape Policies in Other Communities

It is important to recognize that the province and other levels of government do recognize the importance of CHLs. Below are some examples of where CHLs have been incorporated into Official Plans, Standards and Guidelines, Land Use Policies, Management Practices, etc.

**Government of Ontario Management Board Secretariat**


**County of Simcoe Official Plan**

- Niagara Escarpment Plan: States that a number of development and growth objectives in plan ensure that natural and cultural heritage values are maintained in Minor Urban Centres.
- Cultural Heritage Resources Conservation Guidelines for Simcoe County: States that Cultural Heritage Landscapes should be conserved wherever feasible.

**Official Plan, Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton**

- Cultural Heritage Resources: States that Council shall recognize the need to identify and manage Ottawa-Carleton's significant cultural heritage resources in a coordinated and responsible manner.

**British Columbia Ministry of Environment, Lands & Parks**

- BC Parks Conservation Management Plan Part One, Conservation Program Policies: Allows for the identification, protection, conservation and management of cultural heritage features within the BC park system and ecological reserves.

**U.S. Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for the Treatment of Cultural Landscapes**

- These standards, used by the National Park Service, address the preservation, rehabilitation, restoration and reconstruction of CHLs within the National Park system.

As noted above, the US National Park Service, the Ontario Management Board Secretariat and the British Columbia Ministry of Environment, Lands & Parks apply Cultural Heritage Landscape policies exclusively to publicly owned lands. In both the County of Simcoe and the Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton, policies can relate to privately owned lands. However, to date neither municipality has designated a CHL on privately-owned lands. In fact, Planning Division staff could not find any examples where a CHL had been designated on privately-owned lands in any Ontario municipality (i.e., a CHL that goes outside of the definition of a Heritage Conservation District that the City of London already has policies in place to address).

### THE PROPOSED APPROACH FOR CONSERVING CULTURAL HERITAGE LANDSCAPES IN LONDON

1. Basis for the Proposed Policy Approach

The approach recommended in this report is based on the following facts which have been discussed above:

- Cultural Heritage Landscapes are currently not recognized in London as an important part of London's heritage resources.
- There are many mechanisms already in place to conserve heritage resources in London (including mechanisms to designate sites, buildings, archaeological resources and heritage districts).
- There is no strong legislative basis to regulate privately owned lands that may be defined as Cultural Heritage Landscapes (no provincial legislation).
The Provincial Policy Statement does indicate that CHLs will be conserved, but the province has not backed this policy with legislation nor guidelines for how this will be done (it is important to make a distinction between provincial policy [eg. PPS] and statutes of law [eg. Ontario Heritage Act]).

There are some examples of upper tier Official Plans which include policies relating to Cultural Heritage Landscapes on privately owned lands. To date, there are no examples where these policies have been applied to regulate privately owned lands (outside of what we would refer to as a Heritage Conservation District - for which the City of London already has Official Plan policies).

There are several examples whereby governments have recognized Cultural Heritage Landscapes on their own property for the purpose of long term conservation.

2. The Proposed Policy Approach

Realizing that historic resource identification, commemoration and protection should be included in a community's planning goals and policies, the Official Plan amendment proposed in this report seeks to identify and preserve important Cultural Heritage Landscapes on publicly owned lands in London. Once identified as such, these Cultural Heritage Landscapes will become a more focused part of the City's historic identity, through such avenues as formal signage, a unified historic and cultural design theme, holistic long-term preservation and maintenance strategies, and educational components that cater to the local community as well as visitors. Although it is a non-regulatory approach, the Official Plan amendment will help raise awareness, foster recognition and encourage the celebration and preservation of the City's valuable Cultural Heritage Landscapes.

Based on the above, it is recommended that policies be inserted into the Official Plan to: (i) recognize the importance of Cultural Heritage Landscapes in London; (ii) describe the criteria by which they will be recognized; (iii) identify the means by which they will be preserved.

3. Proposed Official Plan Policies

Based on the above-described policy approach, the following Official Plan amendment is proposed for insertion into Section 13 of the City of London Official Plan.

13.4

CULTURAL HERITAGE LANDSCAPES

The Provincial Policy Statement states that it is policy of the province that cultural heritage landscapes will be conserved. The Policy Statement goes on to define cultural heritage landscapes as "a defined geographical area of heritage significance which has been modified by human activities. Such an area is valued by a community, and is of significance to the understanding of the history of a people or place." The following Section of the Plan provides guidance for the identification and conservation of Cultural Heritage Landscapes in London.

13.4.1 Conservation of Cultural Heritage Landscapes

Cultural Heritage Landscapes on municipally owned lands which are listed in Policy 13.4.5 of this Plan will be conserved. Conservation will be coordinated through the preparation of Cultural Heritage Landscape Guidelines which will identify physical features that are to be preserved and will describe opportunities for recognition, interpretation, promotion and conservation of the Cultural Heritage Landscape.

13.4.2 Guidelines for the Identification of Cultural Heritage Landscapes

Cultural Heritage Landscapes will only be recognized on municipally owned lands, except where adjacent property owners wish to be included within a Cultural Heritage Landscape which is primarily located on municipally owned lands. Under the provisions of Section 19.2.2 of this Plan, Cultural Heritage Landscapes will be identified based upon Guidelines for the Identification of Cultural Heritage Landscapes in London, as prepared by the City of London.
Cultural Heritage Landscape Guidelines will be prepared for each Cultural Heritage Landscape (CHL) identified in Policy 13.4.5 of the plan. These guidelines will include, but not be limited to:

i. A refined delineation of the Cultural Heritage Landscape
ii. The important history and physical features associated with the Cultural Heritage Landscape
iii. The physical features within the Cultural Heritage Landscape that should be retained
iv. The opportunities for recognizing and interpreting the Cultural Heritage Landscape
v. Recommended guidelines for all future projects within the landscape to promote, enhance and conserve the Cultural Heritage Landscape

All Public works and projects, including park improvements and open space conservation projects, will have regard for applicable Cultural Heritage Landscape Guidelines.

The following are Cultural Heritage Landscapes that will be conserved under the policies of Section 13.4 of this plan:

1. Defining and Identifying Cultural Heritage Landscapes
   Recognizing that the proposed approach will only consider Cultural Heritage Landscapes on publicly owned lands, the criteria by which CHLS will be identified and evaluated will not need to be as rigorous as that proposed by the LACH. It is recommended that the following considerations act as criteria in the evaluation of landscapes to determine if they qualify as a CHL worthy of conservation:

   i. Land ownership (municipally owned)
   ii. Geographic area in terms of historical land use and historical features (past and present)
   iii. Heritage significance
   iv. Significance to the understanding of history of people/place
   v. Valued by the community from a heritage perspective
   vi. Integrity of landscape
   vii. Age of landscape

   These criteria are incorporated into a guideline document, included in Appendix 2 of this report. The guideline document describes how Cultural Heritage Landscapes will be identified for inclusion within the Official Plan and the criteria that must be met before a landscape will be considered for identification and conservation. The guideline document will be utilized under Section 19.2.2 (Guideline Documents) of the Official Plan. Cultural Heritage Landscapes that, in the opinion of Council, meet the criteria in the guideline document will be added to the Official Plan under Section 13.4.5.

2. Potential Cultural Heritage Landscapes in London
   There are several good candidates as Cultural Heritage Landscapes, such as those that follow:

   i) Springbank (Springbank Park/E.V. Buchanan Thames Valley Golf Course/Reservoir Park)
   ii) Forks of the Thames
   iii) Meadowlily/Park Farm Park
   iv) Westminster Ponds

   It is noteworthy that, currently, with the exception of recent projects at the Forks of the Thames, none of the potential CHLs listed above are not clearly identified as significant heritage resources within the London context. They are not adequately celebrated nor commemorated and they are not designed and maintained with a coordinated effort to display their historical value. Furthermore,
they currently do not contribute to the attraction of London as a culture and heritage tourism destination and are not marketed as interesting components of London’s history. Formally recognizing these landscapes as Cultural Heritage Landscapes could change all of this.

Relative to the evaluation template shown in Appendix 2 of this report, these four areas of the City have the following characteristics which mark them as valuable potential CHLs.

i. They are publicly owned (those portions that would be eligible for identification as a CHL)

ii. They have historical land uses and contain historic features, both of which contribute greatly to their heritage character and significance.

iii. The composition of the individual features within each CHL creates particularly important historic visual landmarks.

iv. They are valued by Londoners from a heritage perspective.

v. They have maintained a certain integrity with regard to their heritage features.

It is recognized that further evaluation of these potential CHL’s will be necessary. Once a general policy approach is determined by Council to deal with CHL’s, the evaluation of specific CHLs and their associated conservation guidelines can begin. Staff will work closely with the LACH and other members of the Public to prepare this future work.

3. Springbank Cultural Heritage Landscape (Springbank Park/Thames Valley Golf Course/Reservoir Park) - An Example of Cultural Heritage Landscape Policies in Action

An Example to Illustrate the Proposed Policies

It is useful to consider an illustrative example of a CHL to help all parties understand how the policy approach, and Official Plan amendment, proposed in this report would be applied.

- How would the policies work?
- What effect would they have?
- How would they serve to conserve Cultural Heritage Landscapes?
- Would implementation of these policies be legal and supportable?

This report (specifically the attached Appendices 3 & 4) uses Springbank (Springbank Park, EV Thames Valley Golf Course and Reservoir Park) to make a first attempt at evaluating a cultural heritage landscape and developing Cultural Heritage Landscape Guidelines. It is important to recognize that there is a substantial amount of consultation and process that must be implemented before these documents are complete. This process will result in additions, deletions and revisions to the text of these two documents. However, attached to this report, they provide a good demonstration for how the proposed policy approach and Official Plan policies will be applied.

Springbank Cultural Heritage Landscape - Brief Description

The Springbank area, as shown on Map #1, offers a range of natural heritage, built heritage and history that suggests it may well qualify as a CHL. The area includes the City’s largest park - the 350 acre Springbank Park - the E.V. Buchanan Thames Valley Golf Course and Reservoir Park. These publicly-owned lands represent an integrated whole which has played a significant role in the history of London and its region.

The area has distinctive geological features, including the highest peak in the London region (providing for panoramic views) and cleansed ground water which seeps through the gravel of Springbank’s glacial moraine. London’s history of development and expansion is directly tied to the clean waters that were collected at the Pumphouse since the 1880’s and then pumped up to the reservoir to serve as the City’s major water supply.

Recently recommended by the LACH as a heritage site in its own right, the E.V. Thames Valley Golf Course, first opened in 1922, was one of the first public golf courses in Ontario. It complements the many recreational uses that have been supported in the Springbank Cultural Heritage Landscape throughout London’s history, including picnicking, boat rides, Storybook Gardens, etc. Reservoir Park also provides important heritage context for London and its region. It was the site of skirmishes during the War of 1812 and has provided unmatched views of London from various formal lookout.
Appendix 3 and Appendix 4 provide much more detail on the significant cultural landscape elements of the Springbank area. In a separate process, these documents will be revised to add and delete information where necessary.

The Impact of Identifying Springbank Park as a Cultural Heritage Landscape
What would be the effect of identifying the publicly owned lands within the Springbank area as a Cultural Heritage Landscape? Appendix 4 provides some detail as to how guidelines may be prepared to support the identification of this area as a CHL. In general, however, the following are some of the anticipated outcomes:

1. The Springbank area would be identified in several ways as a Cultural Heritage Landscape (e.g., signage, interpretive displays, programming, promotion, etc.). This identification is key to begin instilling a recognition of this important Cultural Heritage Landscape by both residents of London and those that visit the City.

2. Linkages between the components of the Cultural Heritage Landscape would be reinforced wherever possible.

3. Guidelines would identify significant built heritage structures in the parks that are to be retained.

4. Guidelines would provide guidance for:
   - maintenance, renovation, alterations or additions to built heritage structures in the CHL
   - maintenance, alteration or protection of archaeological sites in the CHL
   - maintenance or alterations of historic land features in the CHL
   - compatible development within the CHL

5. Guidelines would elicit opportunities for recognition and interpretation that could be implemented in future projects relating to the CHL.

6. Programming could be developed to enhance and celebrate the CHL and its history. This could possibly be tied to the City's goals of attracting culture and heritage tourism.

Next Steps
It is recommended that this document regarding the celebration of Cultural Heritage Landscapes be circulated to appropriate heritage organizations, community groups and development agencies, as well as various other organizations and interested parties for their review and input. Staff will make necessary changes to the proposed amendments and bring them forward in a Public meeting of the Planning Committee.

If the general policy framework and Official Plan policies are approved by Council, staff will begin work on a separate process to build on the products that have been produced to date for the purpose of evaluating, designating and creating guidelines for Springbank and other Cultural Heritage Landscapes in London.

Appendices:
1. Proposed Amendment to the City of London Official Plan
2. Guideline Document for the Identification of Cultural Heritage Landscapes
3. Evaluation of Springbank Potential Cultural Heritage Landscape
4. Springbank Potential Cultural Heritage Landscape - Guidelines
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Reasos for Designation - E.V. Buchanan Thames Valley Golf Course
850 Sunninghill Ave.
(bounded by the Thames River, Hyde Park Rd., Riverside Drive, and Sunninghill Rd.)

HISTORICAL REASONS

The first public golf course in Ontario opened in Toronto in 1897, though later relocated to Port Credit under the name of Lakeview. By 1918 there were only a few public courses in Canada. Thames Valley Golf Course is significant as the first publicly owned course in London and one of the earliest publicly owned and operated golf courses in Ontario. The site combines designed landscapes with natural beauty, recreation and heritage.

The history of the site of Thames Valley Golf Course dates back to 1848 when the Ward family received a land grant from Colonel Thomas Talbot. In 1878, the Board of Water Commissioners expropriated 'water rights' on the Ward property. They used the underground springs constructing wells which connected via pipe under the River to the Springbank Pump House as part of the project to supply the City's growing demands for water. The wells are still intact throughout the course (although they were capped and are no longer used); one was known as the 'pump-hole' as golfers could quench their thirst during a round (now on Classic #13).

Originally on the present 17th fairway, Ward's Hotel was built by Mike Ward as a summer hotel in 1880. It became a focal point for sporting events including shooting, baseball, horse races, cock fighting and rowing. The London Rowing Club's annual regattas were held over the Ward course until 1914. The steamers traveling to Springbank Park made Ward's Hotel one of the stops along the route. The worst catastrophe in our region occurred in 1881 when the Steamer Victoria collided in the Thames River. There was a loss of over 180 lives on the ill-fated trip of May 24th. Ward's Hotel would have been the Victoria's last scheduled stop on the return to London except the Captain bypassed the dock because the boat was already dangerously overloaded. In 1923 the old Ward's Hotel was dismantled, although pieces of the pilings for the Ward's Hotel dock still exist at the site.

E.V. Buchanan, general manager of the London Public Utilities Commission promoted the construction of a city owned course. This occurred after Mr. Buchanan accompanied Thomas Adams on a trip to the United Kingdom in 1922. Mr. Adams was a well regarded international town planner who recommended in his plans the establishment of open spaces, the acquisition of river banks for parkland and development of public golf courses. During the trip, Buchanan was so impressed by the public courses viewed that he approached the P.U.C. to build a public golf course in London. The land suggested was the 100 acres already owned by the P.U.C. located on the north bank of the Thames opposite the Springbank Pumping Station. After some opposition from the City to fund this proposition, Buchanan brought a proposal forward to build 6 holes initially at $1,000 a hole with the assistance of private donations from Rotary Club members by taking out a $10 membership. Mr. Ralph Connable, general manager of Woolworth Company of Canada contributed $500 to raise the full $6,000 needed. Buchanan was then authorized to build the course. Sir Adam Beck was one of the first to become a member. The name 'Thames Valley' was suggested by Mrs. Rene Fraser. This public course allowed post WWI working class the ability to play golf for a minimal fee and the opportunity to enjoy their expanded leisure time.
The original 6 holes were designed by John Innes, the professional at Highland Golf Course. It was constructed with horse teams and by dynamiting the tree stumps. Official opening day on June 14, 1924 began with P.U.C. chairman Jared Vining hitting the first ball. The first official round on June 15th were the foursome of John Innes, Emery “Kerney” Marsh, the professional at London Hunt Golf Club, Sandy Somerville and Fred Brown. Over the next year, 3 more holes were added due to demand for play on the course. The London Free Press on May 29, 1926 commented “Perhaps the outstanding accomplishment of the London Public Utilities Commission in recent years has been the establishment of the Thames Valley Golf Course...” By 1926 the season opened having expanded to 18 holes with green fees $1.00 per round. In 1927 the membership rate rose to $15 and stayed the same until 1958. After purchasing more land, nine new holes were designed by John Innes and completed in 1932. There have been a total of 10 different layouts to the Thames Valley course. The course now consists of an 18 hole layout, named the Classic in a traditional layout, with a 9 hole track known as the Hickory Nine.

The original construction led to uneven fairways and a very natural look to the terrain. The grounds are mature, well maintained and well known for their beautiful specimens of trees including Northern red oak, white oak, tulip trees and white spruce. Most of the original oak forest in the central part of the course stands after 77 years of operation.

Golfers arrived at Thames Valley by taking the London Street Railway in electric cars to the Springbank Park Pumphouse. The Pumphouse was used as a temporary clubhouse as a change area and cloak room and then golfers crossed the river using a floating pontoon bridge supported by empty oil barrels. By 1928, golfers were also ferried across in flat bottom boats pulled by a cable suspended across the river. Later that year a steel suspension footbridge from Springbank to Thames Valley was built and paid for by golfers’ fees. This last remaining suspension bridge in London will be replaced in 2002 with a cable-stayed bridge, the closest modern equivalent, by the City of London. The first clubhouse, made of wood was built in 1930 with renovations occurring over the years. It was intentionally burned in 1967 to make way for the current clubhouse built during the winter of 1967-68.

In 1931, Thames Valley hosted the first 36 hole tournament of the Western Ontario Public Golf Course Association. An important event was the Opening Day Match held on July 29, 1934 to open the championship 18 hole classic layout, to promote golf during the depression and boost attendance after poor seasons. This friendly match was between Canadian golfers Sandy Somerville (also a Londoner) and Jack Nash, PGA pro’s Gene Sarazen, one of golf’s all-time greats, and trick shot artist, Joe Kirkwood. With the establishment of the Annual Thames Valley Invitational golf tournament in 1937, a great tradition began and still attracts golfers for this recognized competition.

Major events to affect Thames Valley Golf Course were the flood of 1937 and military use between 1940-45. The flood caused major damage to the grounds and clubhouse due to water and silt deposits. In late 1940 the course was turned over to the Military District No. 1 for training purposes. By March 1941 the City Council agreed to the request for Thames Valley to be used by the military full-time for maneuvers and military camp, with the clubhouse being used as the officers mess. The Department of National Defense leased the property and paid $3,000 per season for lost revenue. After the war the golf course was reclaimed after much clean up and
grooming, to reopen in 1946. Remnants of structures of the military camp are still evident including concrete foundations of the showers and cookhouse.

Through Thames Valley's history there have only been three club managers, John Innis, 1926-1958, John Moffitt Sr., 1958-1970 and, since 1970, Fred Kern, club pro/manager. There are currently three municipal public golf courses operated by the City of London: Thames Valley, Fanshawe and River Road. Thames Valley is one the busiest public courses in Canada.

E.V. Buchanan said "Thames Valley was his greatest achievement". This is quite a statement from a man involved in the management of water, hydro, parks and recreation in the City of London. In a fitting tribute, Thames Valley was renamed in 1983 the E.V. Buchanan Thames Valley Golf Course in honour of his service as General Manager of the London Public Utilities Commission from 1915 to 1952.

ARCHITECTURAL REASONS

Several significant artifacts of the past at the Golf Course are still present and deserve specific mention and preservation. Several well structures can be found along the immediate river bank in the lower portions of the course. These structures date back to the late 1870's when the water collection system was constructed to utilize the underground springs to supply water to the City of London. Alongside the 17th fairway, at the site of the Ward's Hotel, pieces of the hotel's dock pilings can be found in the river bank.

To commemorate the military use of the golf course during World War II, the concrete foundations of the Army's showers and cookhouse can be seen in a number of locations.

CONTEXTUAL REASONS

Thames Valley Golf Course forms part of the landscape and park system that borders the Thames River - a Canadian Heritage River designated in 2000 by the federal Department of Canadian Heritage. Springbank Park and Thames Valley Golf Course were the forerunners of an extensive network of parks, trails, path system and green spaces which Londoners enjoy today along the Thames River.