Meeting held on April 14, 2010, commencing at 5:30 p.m.


ALSO PRESENT: O. Katolyk and D. Menard

REGRETS: J. Shaughnessy and G. Thompson.

I YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS:

1. (13) That the attached proposal, to have the blank, rear-side of City of London heritage plaques painted BE SUPPORTED and the London Advisory Committee on Heritage BE AUTHORIZED to pursue this initiative.

2. (20) That, on the recommendation of the Director of Planning, with the advice of the Heritage Planner, the Heritage Alteration Permit application of K. Kemmis and C. Meyette requesting permission for an alteration to the designated heritage property located at 907 Queens Avenue, BE APPROVED SUBJECT TO the approval of the Heritage Planner as to the roofing material to be used; it being noted that the Heritage Planner has reviewed the proposed alteration and has advised that the impact of such alteration on the heritage features of the property, identified in the reasons for designation, is negligible.

3. (Add) That, on the recommendation of the Director of Planning, with the advice of the Heritage Planner, the attached Heritage Alteration Permit application of First Christian Reformed Church requesting permission for an alteration, to the designated heritage property located at 513 Talbot Street BE APPROVED; it being noted that the Heritage Planner has reviewed the proposed alterations and has advised that the impact of such alteration on the heritage features of the property identified in the reasons for designation is negligible; it being also noted that the London Advisory Committee on Heritage does not object to the proposed demolition of the property located at 529 Talbot Street as the LACH received drawings of the renovation and was advised that every effort will be made to protect the heritage features of the building at 529 Talbot Street; it being further noted that the LACH heard a presentation from R. Dykstra on behalf of the First Christian Reformed Church.

II YOUR COMMITTEE REPORTS:

4. (i) That the London Advisory Committee on Heritage was advised that D. Dudek will participate on the Planning and Policy Sub-Committee.

5. (ii, 19) That the London Advisory Committee on Heritage accepted the attached text for the proposed plaque for Theatre Royal; it being noted that a location for the plaque has not yet been determined.

6. (iii) That the London Advisory Committee on Heritage (LACH) heard a presentation from J. O'Neil, Chair, Stewardship Sub-Committee and received the report from its Stewardship Sub-Committee meeting held on March 31, 2010. The LACH held a general discussion with respect to insurance costs for heritage properties.

7. (iii, 17) That the London Advisory Committee on Heritage (LACH) approved the Statement of Significance, prepared by its Stewardship Sub-Committee, with respect to the property located at 100 Stanley Street. The LACH asked the Heritage Planner to forward the Statement of Significance to the owner for signature.

8. (v) That the London Advisory Committee on Heritage was advised by D. Menard that the City is in the process of determining which Department will be responsible for work associated with the archive needs assessment and associated matters.
9. (vii) That the London Advisory Committee on Heritage (LACH) was advised by D. Menard that the consultants for the Wortley Village-Old South Heritage Conservation District (HCD) have commenced taking photographs of properties and researching the heritage information on the properties in the HCD. The LACH was also advised that the consultants for the Downtown HCD are in the process of selecting a date for a meeting.

10. (14) That the London Advisory Committee on Heritage (LACH) heard a presentation from J. Cushing with respect to LACH's role related to natural areas. The LACH asked that the Manager of Parks Planning and Design attend the next LACH meeting to inform the LACH of the process of installing boardwalks in natural areas.

11. (15, Add) That the London Advisory Committee on Heritage (LACH) heard a presentation and received the attached communication from G. Georgopolos, on behalf of Dr. Chiu, received a communication dated March 8, 2010 from the Manager of By-law Enforcement and the attached photographs of the property from the Heritage Planner, all with respect to a demolition application related to the property located at 420 Fanshawe Park Road East. The LACH indicated that it objects to the demolition of the building at this time.

12. (18) That the London Advisory Committee on Heritage (LACH) received communications dated April 12, 2010, from D. Brock and G. Scott, 7179 Arkona Road, with respect to the War of 1812 Bicentennial Commemoration. The LACH asked A. Hallam, Executive Director, London Heritage Council, to attend the next meeting of the LACH to advise it of the events being planned for the War of 1812 Bicentennial Commemoration.

13. That the London Advisory Committee on Heritage (LACH) received and noted the following:

(a) (1) the 4th Report of the LACH from its meeting held on March 10, 2010; it being noted that clause 1 was amended by deleting the words "(third floor)" in part (a) and the words "(grade level and second floor)" in part (b);

(b) (2) a Notice, dated March 18, 2010 from A. MacLean, Senior Planner, with respect to the application of Lakefield Homes relating to the property located at 895 Fanshawe Park Road West;

(c) (3) a Notice, dated March 19, 2010 from A. Anderson, Planner II, with respect to the application of Sportscliffe Holdings Inc. relating to the property located at 418 Wharncliffe Road South;

(d) (4) a Notice, dated March 30, 2010 from B. Debbert, Senior Planner, with respect to the application of 1129289 Ontario Limited relating to the property located at 1111 Elias Street;

(e) (5) Municipal Council resolutions adopted at its meeting held on March 2, 2010 with respect to service growth requests approved for one-time funding in the City’s 2010 Budget;

(f) (6) a Municipal Council resolution adopted at its meeting held on March 8, 2010 with respect to the Sarnia Road Bridge;

(g) (7) a Municipal Council resolution adopted at its meeting held on March 8, 2010 with respect to the Heritage Alteration Permit application of S. Davies and M. Landry relating to the property located at 371 St. James Street;

(h) (8) a Municipal Council resolution adopted at its meeting held on March 8, 2010 with respect to the Heritage Alteration Permit application of D. Hall, Friends of Brick Street Cemetery relating to the property located at 370 Commissioners Road West;
(i) (9) A Municipal Council resolution adopted at its meeting held on March 8, 2010 with respect to the Heritage Alteration Permit application of the Ontario Realty Corporation relating to the property located at 165 Elmwood Avenue East;

(j) (10) Municipal Council resolutions adopted at its meeting held on March 29, 2010 and a communication from G. Goodlet with respect to the Heritage Alteration Permit application of the City of London relating to the Military Stores Building located at 652 Elizabeth Street; it being noted that the LACH supported the actions noted in Mr. Goodlet's communication;

(k) (11) A Municipal Council resolution adopted at its meeting held on March 29, 2010 with respect to the heritage designation of the Meadowlily Bridge;

(l) (12) A communication from S. Harding with respect to the preservation and upkeep of Locomotive 86;

(m) (16) the Community Heritage Ontario publication "CHOnews", March, 2010; and,


III MATTERS REFERRED TO SUB-COMMITTEES:

14. (iv) That the London Advisory Committee on Heritage asked its Stewardship Sub-Committee to determine whether or not any of the buildings on the South Street Campus of the London Health Sciences property should be designated.

15. (22) That the London Advisory Committee on Heritage (LACH) heard a presentation from the Manager of By-law Enforcement and received an information report from the Director of Building Controls and Chief Building Official, with respect to the proposed property standards by-law amendments relating to heritage properties. The LACH referred this matter to its Planning and Policy Sub-Committee for consideration and to report back at a future LACH meeting; it being noted that there will be a public participation meeting of the Community and Protective Services Committee on Monday, June 7, 2010 with respect to this matter.

16. (Add) That the London Advisory Committee on Heritage (LACH) received the attached Heritage Designation Application for the property located at 602 Princess Avenue. The LACH asked the Stewardship Sub-Committee to prepare a Statement of Significance for the property.

17. That the next meeting of the London Advisory Committee on Heritage (LACH) will be held on Wednesday, May 12, 2010 at 5:30 p.m.

The meeting adjourned at 9:10 p.m.
Proposal to Paint the Rear Side of London Heritage Plaques
by Joseph ONeil, Chair, Stewardship sub-committee

1) Introduction

The London Advisory Committee on Heritage (LACH) over the years has placed a number of bronze plaques around the city to mark various sites of historical importance.

Many of these plaques in recent years have been the target of graffiti, especially the rear or blank back side of these plaques. The city does a good job of painting over the graffiti but from my personal monitoring of some of these sites; it seems that almost as soon as this is done, new graffiti appears within a week or less.

One possible solution would be to paint the backs of these plaques ourselves with our own artwork. Looking around the city at other sanctioned street art, such as on Dundas street near the parking lot where the old Mews was, or some of the art in Old East, such as the Banting mural on the old Bank of Montreal building at Adelaide and Dundas, and other sites around the city, such artwork is seldom tampered with or painted over by other graffiti artists. It is my belief that we could not only deal with the issue of graffiti on our plaques, but also expand the experience of the plaques themselves.

2) Method

Roughly put, the process would work in this manner:

a) An inventory of all LACH plaques and locations would be put to paper, followed by a site visit by a member of LACH, (most likely a member of either the monitoring sub-committee or the education sub-committee), digital photograph of the plaque, and then followed up by an assessment of the plaques most covered in graffiti or at greatest risk if recently cleaned and painted over by the city.

LACH may choose to eventually paint the back of all plaques over a period or time, or just a few to start and see how the program works out.

b) Members of LACH could come up with suggestions for the back of each plaque. Suggested themes would have to relate directly to the subject matter of the plaque and in some way help illustrate the plaque itself, almost as if a person where illustrating a book.

For example, on the back of the Richard Harrison plaque (Wellington at the river), we could have an illustration of how the original hotel on that site looked, or an artistic interpretation of the 1934 front cover of Time magazine that featured Richard Harrison.

It goes without saying that the subject material would have to be non-offensive in nature.

c) Identification of the proper materials and/or paints that can be used would have to take place.

d) City staff would be approached and asked to deal with the issues of liability and safety for painting the plaques. It is my opinion that since other street art currently exists on both public and private lands, that this issue has been dealt with before and we would have a model to follow. For example, an artist chosen for painting a plaque would likely have to sign a waiver of liability, the wording and content of which we need City help with.

e) The cost of the painting materials should come from the LACH budget in whole or part, but the labour itself would have to be donated for free.
My idea is to approach the London Arts Council and/or the senior art program at HB Beal High School (or both) and propose something of an open contest. Artists would be invited to submit a rough draft of their painting, in any format (hard copy or digital image) following the guidelines set forth by LACH. Or perhaps we could have a public contest wide open to the entire city.

The artists chosen would not receive any financial remuneration, would recognize and acknowledge to the City ahead of time that they know this; however they would receive full credit for their artwork including a letter of recognition and thanks from the City, which in turn that artist would use in their work resume.

While LACH will suggest subjects for each plaque, if a potential artist in question wishes to research a historical subject on their own time and come up with an alternative suggestion that is in keeping with the subject manner and is in good taste, LACH will consider this too.

f) It is my opinion that only one plaque per artist be allowed when we start this program to allow a greater diversity of artwork.

g) LACH would meet and choose the winners, then publically announce the results. My suggestion is that we do this in small groups, such as 3-5 plaques at a time, maybe once a year in summer, or twice a year in spring and fall. It is unlikely that painting could take place in winter.

3) Benefits

It is my opinion that in addition to deterring future graffiti on our plaques, the publicity generated would help raise awareness of our heritage and history, as well and just having a pleasing bit of artwork to look at around the city.

Another idea I have, is that we could tie this event in with other events. For sake of argument, perhaps instead of LACH making the final choice, we could place the final entries at the downtown branch of the Public Library or perhaps on display at a downtown even such as the Folk Festival or Sunfest at Victoria Park and ask the public to vote for their favourite. These are possibilities we should explore.

4) Timeline.

As much as I would love to see something happen this year, realistically if we start on this program now, the spring or summer of 2011 would likely be the start of any real artwork happening.

5) Next Step

My proposal to LACH is to make a motion at the next Planning Committee meeting to start the process in action.

Conclusion

Any further ideas and/or suggestions please forward to me anytime.
TO: CHAIR AND MEMBERS
LONDON ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON HERITAGE
WEDNESDAY APRIL 14, 2010

FROM: J.M. FLEMING
DIRECTOR OF PLANNING

SUBJECT: HERITAGE ALTERATION APPLICATION BY:
STEWARDS: FIRST CHRISTIAN REFORMED CHURCH
513 TALBOT STREET

RECOMMENDATION

That, on the recommendation of the Director of Planning, with the advice of the Heritage Planner, the Heritage Alteration Permit Application of First Christian Reformed Church requesting permission for an alteration by removal and addition to the designated heritage property located at 513 Talbot Street BE APPROVED; it being noted that the Heritage Planner has reviewed the proposed alterations and has advised that the impact of such alteration on the heritage features of the property identified in the reasons for designation is negligible.

PREVIOUS REPORTS PERTINENT TO THIS MATTER
None

PURPOSE AND EFFECT OF RECOMMENDED ACTION

Approval of the recommended actions will alter the existing structure by removing building elements at the rear of the church and by their replacement with a new structure at the rear of a proposed atrium feature on the north facade.

BACKGROUND

Proposed Alterations

The Stewards/Trustees of First Christian Reformed Church, on behalf of the congregation, are proposing to construct a new 765 sq. m. addition to the existing church building at 513 Talbot Street. The new addition is comprised of a 3 level education wing at the rear of the building and an atrium on the north side of the existing church. The completion of the project will require the demolition of the building at 529 Talbot Street, a Priority 3 structure and the removal of the existing rear classroom section of the church. Consultants and managers for the project are AGM Surveying-Engineering and Reinders & Reider.

Heritage Property

Designated by By-law L.S.P.-3318-193 in 2000, First Christian Reformed Church (formerly Talbot Street Baptist Church) is significant for a number of reasons among them, that this building was designed by the architectural firm of Tracy and Durand. It is one of the few remaining urban churches designed by George Durand for the London area. Its architectural features are described in the attached Statement of Significance (Appendix 2- Schedule B) It should be noted that, with respect to the present application, particularly related to the north facade, references are made to the elaborate window tracery and the unusually large foundation windows and the red wash on the brickwork that has been removed from the main facade. The Statement of Significance specifically notes that the wings at the west end of the church (proposed for removal and replacement in this application) are not essential to the character of
the building.

Proposed Alterations

The concept drawing submitted in support of the site plan discussions (Appendix 3- Drawings), identifies the removed portion at the west end (rear) of the current structure. As noted, it has not been identified as having heritage importance but its removal will require heritage alteration approval.

The plan also shows the floor plan proposed for the new addition to the north façade to contain an atrium and, at the rear, the proposed three storey addition to provide classroom and meeting space. A conceptual drawing has also been submitted. (Appendix 4). The drawing identifies an atrium area enclosed in glass with metal framing along the existing north façade. The entrance to the atrium area is to the extreme north of the structure. The use of glass and metal as illustrated allows for the retention and visibility of the original Durand design elements on the north façade and clearly establishes the

The rear addition is to be constructed of brick and features architectural details which transition the north façade from the original structure to the more modern addition at the extreme rear. The transitional elements reflect features in the original Durand design – the pointed arch in the window and door and the use of bichromatic brick coursings.

To accommodate the addition, the building at 529 Talbot must be demolished. It is listed as a Priority 3 vernacular style building built c. 1865. (Appendix 5 – Photos). As a listed property, its demolition must be approved at a public participation at the Planning Committee and then by Municipal Council with consultation with the LACH.

Interior features identified in Schedule B as significant will not be impacted by these proposed changes.

Recommendation

First Congregational Reformed Church is an important heritage structure in its downtown setting along the Talbot streetscape. The Church has been featured several times in the Doors Open event and on heritage walking tours. The proposed changes represent a sympathetic addition to the original church. It will allow for the retention of the important Durand designed features and for them to remain visible. It transitions to the enlarged meeting space and classroom areas in a manner that complements the original building and clearly identifies the newer areas. These alterations will allow the congregation to continue its presence in the downtown area by satisfying its requirements for growth. It is recommended that the alterations, including the demolitions, be approved.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PREPARED BY:</th>
<th>SUBMITTED BY:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D. MENARD, HERITAGE PLANNER</td>
<td>G. BARRETT, AICP, MANAGER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CITY PLANNING/RESEARCH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RECOMMENDED BY:
J.M. FLEMING, DIRECTOR OF PLANNING

April 8, 2010

Attach: Appendix 1 – Location Map 513 & 529 Talbot Street
Appendix 2 – Schedule B – By-Law L.S.P. 3318-153
Appendix 3 – Concept Plan – 513 Talbot Street
Appendix 4 – Concept Drawing – 513 Talbot Street
Appendix 5 – Photos 513 Talbot; 529 Talbot Street
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Appendix 1 – Location Map – 513 & 529 Talbot Street

![Location Map Image]
Appendix 2: Schedule B; By-Law L.S.P. – 3318-193

Reasons for Designation
First Christian Reformed Church
(Originally, Talbot Street Baptist Church)
513 Talbot Street

Historical Reasons
The Talbot Street Baptist church was constructed in 1881-82 for the city's first Baptist congregation, founded in 1845, which by the 1880s was in need of more expansive quarters than their initial chapel, at the corner of York and Talbot Streets, could provide. The new church building was designed by the architectural firm of Tracy and Durand, then headed by George Durand, who was arguably the best and most widely recognized architect to work in London during the nineteenth century. The church is one of the few remaining urban churches designed by Durand for the London area. In 1953 the building was purchased by the First Christian Reformed Church, which has worshipped there since the dedication service held on March 27, 1954.

Architectural Reasons
The plan for the Talbot Street Church showed the innovative and imaginative approach to design for which Durand was acclaimed. Broad polygonal stair towers anchor each side of the facade and create a visual tension between their heavy solidity and the lighter, more strongly vertical centre section, which once terminated in a parapet wall with a bell-cote above the peak of the roof and conical spires at the tops of the octagonal pinnacles. Though the bell-cote and tops of the pinnacles have been removed in the course of necessary repairs to the roof of the church, the exterior of the building still shows the fine detailing characteristic of Durand's work. In the several pointed-arch windows that adorn the facade (a three-light window over the main door, flanked by lancet windows on each side, with paired lancet windows on each side of the door below, an elaborate transom over the door; and high basement windows at the street level), the stair towers, and the sides of the building, elaborate window tracery explores variations on the quatrefoil and trefoil motifs, which are also echoed in the stone window panels. The main window of the facade contains a Star of David, a Judeo-Christian icon popularly used in nineteenth-century churches. Several of the windows, such as those above the front door, contain their original stained glass; the coloured glass borders of the sanctuary windows are also original. A freely-interpreted composite column separates the two double-leaf main doors, all with panelling of diagonal boarding. The drip moulds culminate in finely sculptured stops. Along the sides of the building, unusually large foundation windows that echo the double lights and tracery of the sanctuary windows above give generous light to the Sunday school room in the basement. An oversized oculus outlined in brick decorates the west gable.

The building is constructed of local buff-coloured brick, with decorative dichromatic brickwork used to emphasize various sill and lintel courses and to outline the oculi above the paired first-storey windows of the facade; the sides of the building are still covered with a red wash that has been removed from the facade. Grey stone is also used for one string course, for the hood moulds over the main windows of the facade, for decorative panels at the bottoms of some windows, and for topping the stepped portions of the buttresses. Red sandstone decorates sections of the pinnacles; the foundation is of fieldstone.

Several interior elements are also worthy of special recognition. The circular stair towers feature impressive newel posts and spindles in an Eastlake-inspired design. The horseshow-shaped balcony in the sanctuary is supported by composite columns that echo the column of the facade, and it is protected by ornate metal railings. The folding plywood seats of the balcony, with their cast iron sides, have metal hat racks under the seats; these chairs were manufactured in Preston, Ontario. At the channel end of the sanctuary are pointed-arched wooden doors, with simple mouldings and panels that conform to the shape of the doors. The elaborate plaster ceiling of the original church has been replaced by a series of tie-beams for structural reasons.

At the west end of the church are wings added to create additional classroom and meeting space; these additions are not essential to the character of the building.

Contextual Reasons
The church is within the boundaries of the proposed “Talbot North” Heritage Conservation District.
Appendix 3: Concept Plan – Proposed Addition to 513 Talbot Street
Appendix 4: Concept Drawing – 513 Talbot Street

Appendix 5 – Photos – 513 Talbot Street
Appendix 5 Continued – 529 Talbot Street and Streetscape (west side)
513 Talbot – Structure to be removed
529 Talbot – Priority 3 – To be Demolished
THEATRE ROYAL

The 73rd and 85th Regiments of the London Garrison opened the city’s first theatre on December 18th, 1839. The theatre, a converted frame barn, had a capacity of 200 people. The box seating was reportedly constructed with an “attempt of style”, while the pit seating used benches supported by stumps. The main entrance was on Wellington Street, with a "dark passageway by a door on North Street" (Queens Avenue). Amenities included a well-equipped gymnasium, with foils for fencing. The cost of admission was 2s 6d ($0.50 US) for the “highbrow” box seats, and 1s 3d ($0.25 US) for the “lowbrow” pit. The theatre later became the home of local theatrical groups, including The Gentlemen Amateurs (1844) and The Shakespeare Club (1845). One of Canada’s most successful 19th century actors, Graves Simcoe Lee (1828-1912), began his career at the Theatre Royal.
Dear Sir / Madame,

I, George Georgopoulos, represent Dr. D. Chiu, owner of the above noted property.

Please be advised that the Application for Demolition on this property is withdrawn effective immediately.

Kindest Regards,

GEORGE GEORGE

Via My BlackBerry Wireless
CITY OF LONDON – GENERAL APPLICATION FORM
HERITAGE DESIGNATION APPLICATION

TYPE OF APPLICATION
☐ VOLUNTARY ☐ INVOLUNTARY

PART OF ACT
Post IV - Section 29

REASONS FOR DESIGNATION - Provide background information to be used in evaluation of request.

Is the property listed in the City of London inventory of Heritage resources?
☒ YES ☐ NO

Priority 2

DATE OF CONSTRUCTION YR MO DAY STYLE/PERIOD
1869

Italianate

Is this property located in a potential conservation district?
☒ YES ☐ NO

CONDITION OF PROPERTY/SITE (consider structural integrity, maintenance, degree of alteration, etc.)
Outside: E.F. Gray - Close to Original + Inside: All New

Very Good / ☐ Good / ☐ Fair / ☐ Poor

Inside / Outside

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS ON CONDITION OF PROPERTY SITE

PROPOSED RENOVATION/RESTORATION ACTIVITY

OTHER INFORMATION

CHECK OTHER OUTSTANDING PROPERTY ISSUES:
☐ REZONING ☐ FIRE/BUILDING CODE INFRACTIONS ☐ PROPERTY
☐ OFFICIAL PLAN ☐ BUILDING PERMIT ☐ COMMITTEE OF
AMENDMENT ☐ STANDARDS DEFICIENCY ORDER ADJUSTMENT

☐ OTHER

PROPERTY

DATE APPROVED BY
YR MO DAY SIGN-OFF SIGNATURE
REVIEW SUB-COMMITTEE
DATE APPROVED BY LACH
YR MO DAY SIGN-OFF SIGNATURE
DATE APPROVED BY PLANNING COMMITTEE
YR MO DAY SIGN-OFF SIGNATURE
DATE APPROVED BY CITY COUNCIL
YR MO DAY SIGN-OFF SIGNATURE
DATE APPROVED BY ON TITLE
YR MO DAY SIGN-OFF SIGNATURE

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

OWNER/APPLICANT
Vera Pieckenhagen Brooks

http://www.london.ca/Planning/GeneralPlanningApplication2007/word.doc