

**Heritage Committee Meeting  
AGENDA**

Monday, February 13, 2017, 6:00 pm  
Tecumseh Town Hall  
[www.tecumseh.ca](http://www.tecumseh.ca)

**Pages**

1. **CALL TO ORDER**
2. **ROLL CALL**
3. **DISCLOSURE OF PECUNIARY INTEREST**
4. **DELEGATIONS**
5. **COMMUNICATIONS**
  - a. Heritage Committee Minutes - January 16, 2017 2 - 4
  - b. Ontario Heritage Trust, Email dated January 24, 2017 Re: Heritage Week 2017 5 - 5
6. **REPORTS**
7. **UNFINISHED BUSINESS**
  - a. Heritage Property Listing 6 - 7
    1. Ontario Heritage Tool Kit - Heritage Property Evaluation 8 - 53
    2. Ontario Heritage Act - Criteria for Determining Cultural Heritage Value or Interest 54 - 54
  - b. Log Cabin - Update
  - c. Heritage Portal - Update
8. **NEW BUSINESS**
9. **NEXT MEETING**
  - a. Monday, March 20, 2017 at 6:00 pm
10. **ADJOURNMENT**

## MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE HERITAGE COMMITTEE FOR THE TOWN OF TECUMSEH

A meeting of the Heritage Committee for the Town of Tecumseh was held on Monday, January 16, 2017 in the Sandwich South Meeting Room at Town Hall, 917 Lesperance Road, Tecumseh at the hour of 6:00 pm.

(HC 1-1)

## ORDER

The Director Corporate Services & Clerk, calls the meeting to order at 6:07 pm.

(HC 1-2)

## ROLL CALL

Councillor	- Brian Houston
Councillor	- Rita Ossington
Member	- Jerome Baillargeon
Member	- Rhonda Dupuis
Member	- Ian Froese
Member	- Terry England
Member	- Dwayne Ellis

Also Present:      Director Corporate      - Laura Moy  
                         Services & Clerk  
                         Deputy Clerk      - Christina Hebert

Absent: Member - Chris Carpenter

(HC 1-3)

## DISCLOSURE OF PECUNIARY INTEREST

None Reported.

## Election of Chair

The Director Corporate Services & Clerk opens the floor to nominations for Committee Chair for the Heritage Committee for a one year term, ending December 1, 2017. Member Ian Froese nominates Member Jerome Baillargeon seconded by Member Rhonda Dupuis. The nomination is accepted by Member Jerome Baillargeon.

Motion: (HC-01/17)      Moved by      Member Ian Froese  
Seconded by      Member Rhonda Dupuis

**THAT** Member Jerome Baillargeon be appointed Chair of the Heritage Committee for the Town of Tecumseh for a one (1) year term, ending December 1, 2017.

Carried

### Election of Vice-Chair

The Director Corporate Services & Clerk opens the floor to nominations for Committee Vice-Chair for the Heritage Committee for a one year term, ending December 1, 2017. Member Rhonda Dupuis nominates Member Ian Froese seconded by Chair Jerome Baillargeon. The nomination is accepted by Member Ian Froese.

Motion: (HC-02/17)	Moved by	Member Rhonda Dupuis
	Seconded by	Chair Jerome Baillargeon

**THAT** Member Ian Froese be appointed Vice Chair of the Heritage Committee for the Town of Tecumseh for a one (1) year term, ending December 1, 2017.

Carried

(HC 1-4)

## DELEGATIONS

DELL  
None.

(HC 1-5)

**COMMUNICATIONS**Minutes

a) Heritage Committee Meeting held November 21, 2016

Motion: (HC-03/17) Moved by Member Rhonda Dupuis

Seconded by Vice-Chair Ian Froese

**THAT** the Minutes of the Heritage Committee meeting held November 21, 2016, be approved.

Carried

Communication for Information

b) Betrand Duclos, Heritage Outreach Consultant, Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport. Email dated November 30, 2016. Re: The Municipal Register of Heritage Properties

c) National Trust for Canada, Email dated December 1, 2016. Re: Breaking News: Bill for Heritage Tax Credits

d) National Trust for Canada, Email dated January 10, 2017. Re: Regeneration Works Webinars

Motion: (HC-04/17) Moved by Member Rhonda Dupuis

Seconded by Councillor Brian Houston

**THAT** Communications B through D on the January 16, 2017, Agenda be received.

Carried

(HC 1-6)

**REPORTS**

None.

(HC 1-7)

**UNFINISHED BUSINESS**Heritage Property Listing

Member Rhonda Dupuis provides a condensed version of the Heritage Property Listing.

Administration, using the Town's existing approved Municipal Register of Cultural Heritage Properties, will 'track' changes to incorporate the inventory listing provided this evening and bring it back to the Committee for review. The Listing of properties is the first step in the identification and evaluation of a property that may warrant some form of heritage conservation, recognition and/or long-term protection.

The Committee will then identify properties of cultural heritage value or interest. Once finalized, the Committee will need to bring a report to Council for their consideration in amending the Municipal Register of Cultural Heritage Properties.

It is recommended that the proposed Bus Tour be scheduled once a finalized listing has been prepared and properties of cultural heritage value or interest have been identified and prioritized.

Log Cabin Update

There is no further update to be given at this time.

As previously reported on, a property search for ownership of 6455 Walker Road (Log Cabin) indicated who previously owned the property, but prior ownership was listed as 'unknown'.

Administration will contact Mr. Brian Sherwell to inquire on the status of the legal property search for the Log Cabin.

Heritage Portal Update

Administration will create a 'drop box' for the Committee to store and access information collected from research conducted on the Heritage Property Listing.

(HC 1-8)

**NEW BUSINESS****2017 Project Planning**

The Committee concurs with focusing on the Heritage Property Listing as the main objective for 2017.

By creating a comprehensive register of cultural heritage properties will assist in the planning for the conservation of heritage properties and provide interim protection from demolition.

To create a comprehensive register of cultural heritage properties, the Committee will adhere to the following process:

1. 'Track' changes to incorporate the condensed inventory listing into the approved Municipal Register of Cultural Heritage Properties and bring back to Committee for review;
2. Review listing for completeness, including legal description of property and brief description for why property has been listed and rationale for why property is of cultural heritage value or interest and accordingly, carry out research for same;
  - a. Listing can be updated to include a photo of the property, if gathered from the Committee's research
3. Prioritize Listing to identify 'non-designated' properties that the Committee would like to recommend be listed on the Register;
4. Prepare a report to Council with the Committee's recommendation for Council's consideration in amending the Municipal Register of Cultural Heritage Properties.

The Criteria for Determining Cultural Heritage Value or Interest and the Heritage Property Evaluation will be listed on the next Agenda, for ease of reference.

(HC 1-9)

**NEXT MEETING**

The next meeting of the Heritage Committee will be held on Monday, February 13, 2017, at 6:00 pm.

(HC 1-10)

**ADJOURNMENT**

Motion: (HC- 05/17) Moved by Member Rhonda Dupuis  
 Seconded by Vice-Chair Ian Froese

**THAT** there being no further business, the January 16, 2017 meeting of the Heritage Committee be adjourned at 6:54 p.m.

Carried

---

Jerome Baillargeon, Chair

---

Ian Froese, Vice Chair



## Heritage Week 2017 – Promote your event

Dear Friends and Partners:

Ontario Heritage Week 2017 runs from Monday, February 20 to Sunday, February 26 and provides an opportunity for the people of Ontario to celebrate the province's rich and diverse history. In 2017, Ontario is celebrating the anniversary of Confederation. Ontario's history stretches back more than 10,000 years. This is a special moment and a great opportunity for Ontarians to explore our past and imagine our future through the Trust's **MyOntario - A vision over time** initiative.

The Trust will once again host information about community events on our calendar. To post the details of your event, please visit the Heritage Week [event submission page](#).

**The deadline for submitting your event is January 30, 2017.**

For additional information about Heritage Week please email [Dawson Bridger](#), Community Programs Officer, or phone 416-314-3586.

## Semaine du patrimoine 2017 – Faites la promotion de votre événement

Chers amis et partenaires,

La Semaine du patrimoine de 2017, qui se déroulera du lundi 20 février au dimanche 26 février, donne aux habitants de l'Ontario l'occasion de célébrer l'histoire riche et diversifiée de leur province. L'Ontario célèbre en 2017 l'anniversaire de la Confédération. L'histoire de l'Ontario a commencé il y a plus de 10 000 ans. La Semaine du patrimoine est un moment spécial et une fantastique occasion pour les Ontariennes et les Ontariens d'explorer leur passé et d'imaginer leur avenir par le truchement de l'initiative de la Fiducie **MonOntario – une vision au fil du temps**.

La Fiducie hébergera de nouveau dans son calendrier de l'information sur les événements communautaires. Pour mettre en ligne les renseignements relatifs à votre événement, veuillez aller à la [page des événements communautaires](#) de la Semaine du patrimoine.

**La date limite pour proposer votre événement est le 30 janvier 2017.**

Pour obtenir d'autres renseignements sur la Semaine du patrimoine, veuillez communiquer par courriel avec [Dawson Bridger](#), agent des programmes communautaires, ou téléphoner au 416 314-3586.

Town of Tecumseh - Potential Heritage Sites						
Name of Property	Street #	Street Name	Year	Architecture/Style	Sector	Brief Description
Bell at St. Anne Highschool	12050	Arbour Street			Tecumseh	
First Brewer's Retail Store - <del>St. Anne's Highschool Property</del>	12050	Arbour Street			Tecumseh	<del>St. Anne's High School Property</del>
Banwell Cemetery		Banwell Road Plan 65 lot A1 to 20 inclusive		Cemetery	Sandwich South	
Seguin House	424	Brighton Road			St. Clair Beach	
St. Mary's Cemetery	12048	County Road 34		Cemetery	Maidstone	
Victoria Public School	12433	Dillon Dr.	1926	School	Tecumseh	
Original Meeting House for Sandwich South that first Sandwich South meeting was held	across from Rd's garage SS	Highway #3		Hotel/Road House	Oldcastle	
St. Stephen's Church	5280	Howard			Oldcastle	
St. Stephen's Cemetery	5282	Howard			Oldcastle	
Lachance Farm		Intersection Road			Sandwich South	
Old Power House - Family Traditions Property	1192	Lacasse Blvd. @- <del>Tecumseh Rd.</del>			Tecumseh	
Poisson House		Lacasse Boulevard			Tecumseh	
Lacasse Park	590	Lacasse Boulevard			Tecumseh	
Tecumseh United Church	333	Lacasse Boulevard			Tecumseh	
Lessard House		Lesperance Road			Sandwich South	
Desjardin House		Lesperance Road			Sandwich South	
Log Cabin	2290	Lesperance Rd.			Sandwich South	Gary Peters
Aspect House	1107	Lesperance Road			Tecumseh	
St. Anne's Cemetery		Lesperance Road			Tecumseh	
Lemire House	1061	Lesperance Road			Tecumseh	
Sylvestre House		Manning Road			St. Clair Beach	
Lakewood Golf Course	13451	Riverside Drive			St. Clair Beach	
Lakewood Club House	13438	Riverside Drive	1919		St. Clair Beach	Privately Owned by Bob Oakman & Bert Manning
Beach Grove Club House	14134	Riverside Drive	1922		St. Clair Beach	First Club House Wooden - burned in 1927 Rebuilt in 1929
	13749	Riverside Drive				
Sutter Property	13158	Riverside Dr.				
St. Mark's by the Lake Anglican Church	150	St. Marks	1953		St. Clair Beach	First Church in St. Clair Beach
D.M. Eagle School Site	14194	Tecumseh Rd.	1928		St. Clair Beach	
Old Cada Homestead	14242	Tecumseh Rd.			St. Clair Beach	
Robinet Hardware	12222	Tecumseh Road			Tecumseh	
Lacasse House	12125	Tecumseh Road			Tecumseh	
Home Hardware		Tecumseh Road			Tecumseh	
Tecumseh Area Historical Society site including log cabin and sheds	12350	Tecumseh Road			Tecumseh	
Campeau House		Tecumseh Road			Tecumseh	Blue House on Tecumseh Road
Log Cabin	6455	Walker Road			Sandwich South	
Lachance House		William Street			Tecumseh	Building near track field
St. Mary's Cemetery					Maidstone	
Grain Elevator					Maidstone	
Mrs. John's General Store					Maidstone	
Old Seven Ponds					Sandwich South	E.C. Row near Shawnee
				Century Farm	Sandwich South	Mrs. Mary (Emmett) McCarthy
				Century Farm	Sandwich South	Mr. & Mrs. Ted Ure

Moved to Designated Property  
May 20, 2013 By-law  
No. 2013-20

HC Feb 22/16  
Request Remove as  
relocated to TAHS

HC Feb 22/16  
Requested to Add to  
Listing

Duplicate

				Century Farm	Sandwich South	Mr. & Mrs. Frank O'Neil
				Century Farm	Sandwich South	Gary & Russ O'Neil
				Century Farm	Sandwich South	Lonboroug/Bed ford Family
				Century Farm	Sandwich South	Ron & Joyce Holden
				Century Farm	Sandwich South	Edmund & Donna Curtis
				Century Farm	Sandwich South	Murry & Marcy McKenzie
				Century Farm	Sandwich South	Doug & Annie Pettypiece
				Century Farm	Sandwich South	Gordon & Thomas Collins
				Century Farm	Sandwich South	The Battersby Family
				Century Farm	Sandwich South	The Halford Family
				Century Farm	Sandwich South	The White Family
				Century Farm	Sandwich South	Pearl Farough & Family



# HERITAGE PROPERTY EVALUATION

*A Guide to Listing, Researching and Evaluating  
Cultural Heritage Property in Ontario Communities*

Ontario Heritage Tool Kit



*A.J. Casson (1898-1992)*  
*Village House c.1955*  
*oil on hardboard*  
*50.9 x 61.0 cm*  
*Gift of Mr. and Mrs. C.A.G. Matthews*  
*McMichael Canadian Art Collection*  
*1974.13.1*

This guide is one of several published by the Ministry of Culture as part of the Ontario Heritage Tool Kit. It is designed to help municipal Councils, municipal staff, Municipal Heritage Committees, land use planners, heritage professionals, heritage organizations, property owners, and others understand the heritage conservation process in Ontario.





All across Ontario, communities are working together to protect and promote our cultural heritage properties.

Our cultural heritage reflects the expressions and aspirations of those who have gone before us as well as today's culturally diverse communities.

"Since I immigrated to Canada in 1960 to a small northern community, I have watched firsthand how people of many nationalities have worked together to make our community a vibrant place. As a councillor, this is what motivates me to work for the community.... I believe that municipal councillors have a responsibility to preserve our stories, documents and historical landmarks.... They represent the challenges and struggles met by our communities in their growth and evolution."

*Helen Lamon, Township  
of Michipicoten Councillor*

Cultural heritage can take many forms – buildings and monuments, bridges and roadways, streetscapes and landscapes, barns and industrial complexes, cemeteries, museums,

archives and folktales. They enrich us, inspire us and guide us forward to build vibrant, liveable communities for future generations.

The conservation of cultural heritage properties is vital to a community's overall cultural and economic development plan. An integrated approach to cultural and economic planning leads to the revitalization of main streets, neighbourhoods and individual properties, creates employment, encourages new business, brings tourist dollars and can even increase property values.

Identification and evaluation are a vital part of the conservation process. This guide is designed to help identify and evaluate the cultural heritage value or interest of properties in our communities. It outlines the Ontario Heritage Act requirements (section 27) for a municipal register of property of cultural heritage value or interest. It also assists in evaluating heritage properties against criteria prescribed in Ontario Regulation 9/06 of the Ontario Heritage Act for the purposes of protection (designation) under section 29 of the Act.





# What’s in this guide?

<b>1. Cultural Heritage Properties</b>	<b>5</b>
This section describes what is meant by “cultural heritage property” and “cultural heritage value or interest,” and outlines the framework for heritage conservation in Ontario. The provisions for protection of Natural Features, Cultural Heritage Landscapes and Archaeological Resources and Areas of Archaeological Potential are explained. A checklist, Cultural Heritage Properties: From Survey to Protection, is included.	
<b>2. Compiling a Register of Cultural Heritage Properties</b>	<b>8</b>
The requirements of the Ontario Heritage Act and the basics for compiling a Register of Cultural Heritage Properties are outlined.	
<b>3. The Importance of Research and Site Analysis</b>	<b>18</b>
The importance of historical research and site analysis is introduced in this section.	
<b>4. Municipal Criteria: Ontario Regulation 9/06</b>	<b>20</b>
This presents Ontario Regulation 9/06, Prescribing Criteria for Determining Property of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest, its meaning and use. Included in this section is a summary: Listing and Evaluation in the Municipal Designation Process.	



## 5. Researching a Property ..... 28

This is a how-to guide for undertaking historical research and examining the physical evidence of a property.

## Resources and Further Information ..... 41

Note: The Ministry of Culture has published this Guide as an aid to municipalities. Municipalities are responsible for making local decisions including compliance with applicable statutes and regulations. Before acting on any of the information provided in this Guide, municipalities should refer to the actual wording of the legislation and consult their legal counsel for specific interpretations.



# Cultural Heritage Properties

# 1

The Ontario Heritage Act provides a framework for the conservation of properties and geographic features or areas that are valued for the important contribution they make to our understanding and appreciation of the history of a place, an event or people.

These properties and features or areas contain built heritage resources, cultural heritage landscapes, heritage conservation districts, archaeological resources and/or areas of archaeological potential that have cultural heritage value or interest. These are the cultural heritage properties that are important in our everyday lives, give us a sense of place, and help guide planning in our communities.

The conservation of cultural heritage properties encompasses a range of activities directed at identification, evaluation, conservation and celebration. Properties can be protected for the long term under the Ontario Heritage Act through municipal designation bylaws and heritage conservation easement agreements.



*Inge-Va, Perth (Photo courtesy of Ontario Heritage Trust)*

The Ontario Planning Act and Provincial Policy Statement support heritage conservation as part of land-use planning.

Cultural heritage properties include:

- Residential, commercial, institutional, agricultural or industrial buildings
- Monuments, such as a cenotaph, public art or a statue
- Structures, such as a water tower, culvert, fence or bridge
- Natural features that have cultural heritage value or interest
- Cemeteries, gravestones or cemetery markers
- Cultural heritage landscapes
- Spiritual sites
- Building interiors
- Ruins
- Archaeological sites, including marine archaeology
- Areas of archaeological potential
- Built/immoveable fixture or chattel attached to real property

The task for each municipality is to identify, evaluate and conserve those cultural heritage properties that have lasting cultural heritage value or interest to their community. This process begins with compiling a register of properties of cultural heritage value or interest to the community.

## Cultural Heritage Properties: From Survey to Protection

---

- **Learn** about the cultural heritage of the community
- **Survey** properties in the community using a recording form
- **Screen** the surveyed properties using preliminary criteria
- **List** screened properties of cultural heritage value or interest on the municipal register of cultural heritage properties
- **Research** properties that are candidates for protection (designation) under section 29 of the Ontario Heritage Act
- **Evaluate** properties for protection under section 29 using the criteria in Ontario Regulation 9/06 and determine best means of conservation
- **Protect** properties under the Ontario Heritage Act or other conservation measures

# DESIGNATION UNDER SECTION 29, ONTARIO HERITAGE ACT

## **Natural Features**

For a natural feature to be designated under section 29, it must have a cultural association. An example is the maple tree in Toronto that inspired Alexander Muir in 1867 to compose “The Maple Leaf Forever.” Natural features without a cultural association can be protected by other mechanisms.

## **Cultural Heritage Landscapes**

A cultural heritage landscape can be designated as a unit under section 29 or protected as part of a larger heritage conservation district under Part V. (See Heritage Conservation Districts, A Guide to District Designation Under the Ontario Heritage Act) These are geographical areas that involve a grouping of features such as buildings, spaces, archaeological sites and natural elements, which collectively form a significant type of cultural heritage resource. Examples might include villages, parks, gardens, battlefields, main streets and other streets of special interest, golf courses, farmscapes, neighbourhoods, cemeteries, historic roads and railways and industrial complexes.

## **Archaeological Resources**

Archaeological resources and areas of archaeological potential (including the grounds associated with a historic structure that may contain artifacts that yield information about the site) can be protected under section 29 (individual properties), Part V (Heritage Conservation Districts) and Part VI of the Ontario Heritage Act. Part VI addresses the management of archaeological resources and areas of archaeological potential. The archaeological assessment process is set out in provincial standards and guidelines. Only an archaeologist licensed under the Act can undertake fieldwork. For these reasons, this guide is not designed for archaeological resources and areas of archaeological potential.



# 2

## COMPILING A REGISTER OF Cultural Heritage Properties

### Which Properties Should Be Placed On the Register?

Under subsection 27(1) of the Ontario Heritage Act, the municipal clerk is required to keep a current register of properties of cultural heritage value or interest situated in their municipality.

This register must include all properties in the municipality that are designated under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act by the municipality or by the Minister of Culture and shall include:

- (a) a legal description of the property;
- (b) the name and address of the owner; and
- (c) a statement explaining the cultural heritage value or interest of the property and a description of the heritage attributes of the property. *OHA, ss. 27(1.1)*

The Ontario Heritage Act also allows a property that has not been designated, but that the municipal Council believes to be

of cultural heritage value or interest, to be placed on the register. This is commonly referred to as listing. A description sufficient to identify the property is required.

*OHA, ss. 27(1.2)*

Under this provision, a municipal council may choose to include for example, properties protected by heritage conservation easements, and/or recognized by provincial or federal jurisdictions, such as properties commemorated by the Historic Sites and Monuments Board of Canada, or properties listed on the provincial register.



*Alton Mill, Caledon. (Photo courtesy of Sally Drummond, Town of Caledon)*



Cultural heritage properties can be added to the register at any time by council. In municipalities where there is a municipal heritage committee, the Ontario Heritage Act requires that council consult with the committee before a non-designated property is added or removed from the register.

OHA, ss. 27(1.3)

The register is a planning document that can be consulted by municipal decision makers when development proposals or permits are being considered. Mapping listed properties using Geographic Information Systems (GIS) or other cultural mapping also can be a useful component of the broader data collection and management framework of the municipality. Property owners and the public should be aware of the existence of the register, mapping and other cultural heritage property management tools.

## Why List a Property?

Listing a property of cultural heritage value or interest is the first step a municipality should take in the identification and evaluation of a property that may warrant some form of heritage conservation, recognition and/or long-term protection such as designation.

In many cases, listed (non-designated) properties are candidates for protection under section 29 of the Ontario Heritage Act. These require further research and an assessment using a more comprehensive evaluation that is consistent with Ontario Regulation 9/06 prescribing criteria for determining property of cultural heritage value or interest.

Although listing non-designated properties does not offer any protection under the Ontario Heritage Act, section 2 of the Provincial Policy Statement of the Planning Act acknowledges listed properties.

## A REGISTER OF CULTURAL HERITAGE PROPERTIES:

- Recognizes properties of cultural heritage value in a community
- Fosters civic identity and pride by drawing attention to the heritage and development of a community
- Promotes knowledge and enhances an understanding of a community's cultural heritage
- Provides easily accessible information about cultural heritage value for land-use planners, property owners, developers, the tourism industry, educators and the general public
- Is a central element of a municipal cultural plan that begins with mapping local cultural resources and then leverages these resources for economic development and community building



Waterloo Pioneer Memorial Tower (Photo courtesy of Canadian Parks Service)

PPS Policy 2.6.1 states: “*Significant built heritage resources and significant cultural heritage landscapes shall be conserved.*”

The PPS defines built heritage resources as: “One or more significant buildings, structures, monuments, installations or remains associated with architectural, cultural, social, political, economic, or military history and identified as being important to a community. These resources may be identified through designation or heritage conservation easements under the Ontario Heritage Act, or **listed** by local, provincial, or federal jurisdictions.”

The PPS defines a cultural heritage landscape as: “A defined geographical area of heritage significance which has been modified by human activities and is valued by a community. It involves a grouping(s) of individual heritage features such as structures, spaces, archaeological sites and natural elements, which together form a significant type of heritage form, distinctive from that of its constituent elements or parts. Examples may include, but are not limited to, heritage conservation districts designated under the Ontario Heritage Act; and villages, parks, gardens, battlefields, mainstreets and neighbourhoods, cemeteries, trailways and industrial complexes of cultural heritage value.”

Together, the Ontario Heritage Act and the Provincial Policy Statement of the Planning Act offer methods for conserving cultural heritage properties. This makes listing cultural heritage properties on the municipal register an important tool in managing their conservation.

## Getting Started

When creating a register of cultural heritage properties, or adding to an existing register of designated properties, each municipality can decide on the best approach for surveying and researching properties in the community. This decision is based on the available resources and expertise.

Compiling the register can be as simple as completing a survey or recording form and photographing properties from the nearest public vantage point. Good practice includes ensuring that the essential details of street address and legal property description, type of heritage feature, and general observations on the physical characteristics and context are recorded, by description and photography. If maintained as an electronic database, this information can easily be cross-referenced, updated, studied and made available for research.

Registers that use some preliminary evaluation criteria should be compiled by individuals with some training or expertise in recognizing and evaluating cultural heritage properties. An inexperienced recorder is more likely to list the obvious “old looking” buildings or landmarks in good condition. An experienced recorder or heritage consultant will be able to see past the current appearance of a property and recognize its potential for cultural heritage value or interest.

Councils of municipalities with a municipal heritage committee could assign the task of compiling the register to the committee and provide any municipal resources and staff support that might be needed.

# Sample: Property Survey Recording Form

This form collects the information useful as an initial survey of properties that may be listed on the municipal register of cultural heritage properties. Other categories of local importance can be added. Recorders are encouraged to learn about the heritage of the community as a whole before undertaking this survey.

## Recorder

- 1 Date of recording
- 2 Name of recorder
  - ☐ Municipal Heritage Committee
  - ☐ Municipal Staff
  - ☐ Heritage Consultant
  - ☐ Student
  - ☐ Other
- 3 What is your level of expertise in identifying and describing a cultural heritage property?
  - ☐ Beginner
  - ☐ Some Experience
  - ☐ Expert

## Property Identification

- 4 Street address and legal description
- 5 Name of building, if any
- 6 Name and address of owner

## Design or Physical Value

- 7 Identify the type of property  
*Examples:* Residential, commercial, institutional, agricultural or industrial building; monument such as a cenotaph, statue or public art; structure such as a water tower, culvert, fence or bridge; natural feature that has cultural heritage value or interest; cemetery, grave-stone or cemetery marker; cultural heritage landscape; spiritual site; interior; ruins or other feature

- 8 Identify the materials used  
*Examples:* Wood, stone, metal, plastic or other
- 9 Does the property display any particular qualities of artistic merit, craftsmanship, technical or scientific achievement, expression or innovation?

## Historical or Associative Value

- 10 What do you know about this property from research or local traditions? List sources
- 11 Does the property have any features similar to other properties?

## Contextual Value

- 12 Does the property define, maintain or support the character of an area?
- 13 Is the property physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings?
- 14 Is the property a landmark?

## Status

- 15 Identify any physical or other risks to the condition and/or integrity of the property and/or individual features

## Photographs

- 16 Photographs should be taken from the nearest publicly accessible viewpoint. (Do not enter a property without permission.) The front or prominent feature will be used as the key image. Identify all images with north, south, east and west orientation.

## Recommendation

- 17 Make an initial recommendation or comment on whether or not to list a property on the municipal register. Give reasons.





*Built in 1792, the Hay Bay Church near Adolphustown is the oldest United Church in existence today. The pioneers of Hay Bay were the makers of Canada. Architecturally, the Hay Bay Church is an example of rural public design. (Photo: Ministry of Culture)*

Councils of municipalities without a municipal heritage committee may ask municipal staff to compile the register, or seek the assistance of a local heritage or community organization. Another option is to engage a heritage consultant with expertise in cultural heritage properties. The Ministry of Culture can be contacted for guidance on how to develop the register.

## The Listing Process

In most Ontario municipalities, it is impractical to survey every (heritage and non-heritage) property and undertake sufficient research and analysis to confidently eliminate those with no cultural heritage value or interest. Some preliminary rationale or criterion for listing a property is needed to make compiling the register an efficient

task that is achievable within a reasonable time frame.

Ontario Regulation 9/06 must be applied to properties being considered for designation under section 29 of the Ontario Heritage Act. Screening properties for potential protection in accordance with the criteria in the regulation is a higher evaluation test than required for listing non-designated properties on the register. The evaluation approach and categories of Design/Physical Value, Historical/Associative Value, and Contextual Value set out in the regulation, however, are useful to consider when developing a preliminary rationale or criteria for listing properties. This also will provide continuity in the evaluation of properties on the register that may later be considered for designation under section 29.

# BASICS OF A MUNICIPAL REGISTER OF CULTURAL HERITAGE PROPERTIES

1	<p>The Ontario Heritage Act requires that the register include all properties that are protected by the municipality (under section 29) or by the Minister of Culture (under section 34.5). <i>OHA, ss. 27(1.1)</i> For these properties there must be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a legal description of the property;</li> <li>• the name and address of the owner; and</li> <li>• a statement explaining the cultural heritage value or interest of the property and a description of the heritage attributes.</li> </ul>
2	<p>The Ontario Heritage Act allows a municipality to include on the register property that is not designated but considered by the municipal council to be of cultural heritage value or interest. There must be sufficient description to identify the property. <i>OHA, ss. 27(1.2)</i></p>
3	<p>A municipality may consider including properties on the register that are protected by heritage conservation easements and/or recognized by provincial or federal jurisdictions.</p>
4	<p>The rationale or selection criteria used to survey the community and compile the register should be clearly stated.</p>
5	<p>The recorder(s) undertaking the survey of properties should have knowledge of the heritage of the community and some training in identifying and evaluating cultural heritage properties.</p>
6	<p>Information about all properties should be recorded in a consistent and objective way.</p>
7	<p>Not all cultural heritage properties are old. Many recent structures hold cultural heritage value or interest in their design, craftsmanship, function, ownership or for other reasons.</p>
8	<p>Using physical condition as a determining factor in whether or not to list a property on the register is not advised. A property may be in an altered or deteriorated condition, but this may not be affecting its cultural heritage value or interest.</p>
9	<p>A commitment to maintaining and revising the register through historical research and analysis of the listed properties will give the register more credibility in local heritage conservation and planning.</p>
10	<p>The register should be readily available to municipal staff and officials, property owners and the public.</p>
11	<p>The register can be a valuable tool for land-use planners, educators, tourism, and economic developers. For example, it can be used to plan Doors Open events, educational programs, celebrate historic events and anniversaries, promote a community and encourage innovative development.</p>

## Know Your Community

When first developing a municipal register, it is recommended that the main themes and key developments, and any specific events, activities, people and circumstances that have shaped the community be identified. This is the important community context that should ensure that those properties with characteristics that hold cultural heritage value or interest to the community will be captured in the survey and on the register. Much of this background information can be learned from published histories, as well as libraries, museums, archives, historical associations and from residents. Whoever undertakes the survey should be familiar with the heritage of the community, as this will give them local knowledge and perspective when identifying properties for listing.

For example, knowing the boundaries of the first town plan or survey can help identify where the oldest properties may be found. Areas that were annexed as the town grew may also have value or interest to their original municipality before annexation, such as a bordering hamlet or township. Knowing the patterns of settlement, transportation routes and other local developments may indicate likely locations of former industrial sites, battlefields or

landmarks where ruins or structures associated with that activity or event may exist.

This basic documentation, combined with the recorder's experience in identifying cultural heritage properties, will guide the initial selection of properties to be listed on the register.

## Rating a Property

Municipalities may find it useful to develop a system of comparative ratings for properties on the register. This can help with setting priorities for further research, heritage conservation and/or long-term protection under the Ontario Heritage Act.

There are several models for rating cultural heritage properties:

- Some evaluation criteria have a numeric rating system; for example, #1 has no cultural heritage value or interest, while #10 warrants long-term protection.
- An alphabetical rating system may assist to categorize; for example, an A has protection and conservation priority; B is conserved in some manner, but not designated; C should be documented before demolition or has minimal cultural heritage value or interest.
- A checklist of questions about the design/physical, historical/associative and contextual values of the property can generate discussion that concludes with a Yes/No. The discussion response and explanatory notes form the argument for or against heritage conservation. No numeric or alphabetical rating is used.



*Mossington Bridge, Georgina (Photo: Ministry of Culture)*





*Whalen Building, Thunder Bay (Photo: Ministry of Culture)*

## Making Comparisons

A municipality compiling its first register will learn a great deal about its cultural heritage properties during the surveying phase. Caution should be used in applying rating systems until a sufficient number of properties have been listed and researched to establish some base for comparisons.

If the survey is comprehensive and the information is recorded in a consistent and objective way, patterns or themes in the cultural heritage value or interest of the listed properties often emerge.

For example, the survey may reveal that one architectural style is characteristic of a neighbourhood; a certain type of technology is used for several industries; there is a popular local building material; there were design changes in types of engineering works such as bridges; or some cemetery headstones have unique markings. A particular decorative motif in the gable of a house may

be a clue to the work of a local craftsman; a change in that motif may have some significance in his career.

A comprehensive survey will also show differences and similarities in the features or heritage attributes of the listed properties. Typical or similar examples can be compared to each other, and will also highlight the uniqueness of other examples. Several properties may be associated with a particular event, but only one may stand out as a vivid expression of what that event truly meant to the community.

As the register is compiled, it may become evident that an inventory of a specific type of cultural heritage property would be useful. For example, separate inventories for barns, cultural heritage landscapes or very old and increasingly rare buildings such as those that predate Canada's confederation in 1867 will help with the evaluation of these types of cultural heritage properties.

## Selecting Properties for Further Research

Recognizing patterns, themes, similarities and differences is an important part of studying and understanding a community's heritage. It also makes it easier to develop a rating system or checklist of questions that truly reflects what holds cultural heritage value or interest in the community. It can help with choosing properties that warrant further research and heritage conservation.

For example, a community may have been founded when a prospector discovered a valuable mineral. The earliest industrial structures, dwellings and institutions date

to the opening of the mine and the first years of the mine's operation. The mine may now be closed and a secondary economy may have taken its place. The cultural heritage properties associated with the mining heritage of the community are found, through the survey of community properties, to be disappearing. The properties associated with mining will have a higher priority for further research and possibly protection under the Ontario Heritage Act.

Another example could be in a community where a fire destroyed structures built on the main street. Any structures or remnants that survived the fire, or have evidence of the fire, are likely rare. These are important to understanding the character of this early, pre-fire period of community history. Their loss now would have consequences to the study of the community's heritage. These properties should be given priority in undertaking further research and conservation.



*Former Walkerville  
Post Office, Windsor  
(Photo courtesy of  
Nancy Morand,  
City of Windsor)*



*Dunlop Street Fire in 1875, Barrie (Photo: Simcoe County Archives)*



## A Work-in-Progress


The register is essentially a work-in-progress that is revised and updated as needed and as local resources become available. The register is never a finite document; it should continue to grow, change and be updated as the cultural heritage values or interest of the community also change. No final decisions about the cultural heritage value or interest of a property on the register should be made without undertaking further historical research and site analysis of that specific property.




*Townsite Shaft 1 Headframe, Cobalt (Photo: Ministry of Culture)*



*Gosfield Black (Negro) Cemetery, Kingsville (Photo courtesy of Yolanda Asschert, Kingsville Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee)*





# 3

## THE IMPORTANCE OF Research and Site Analysis

The historical research and site analysis needed for listing a property on a register of cultural heritage properties is often preliminary in its scope. Properties being proposed for protection under section 29 of the Ontario Heritage Act require more in-depth study by a qualified individual or committee. This involves:

- Understanding and knowledge of the overall context of a community's heritage and how the property being evaluated fits within this context;
- Researching the history and cultural associations of the property being evaluated; and
- Examining the property for any physical evidence of its heritage features or attributes, past use or cultural associations. The physical context and site are also important to examine. For example, other buildings, structures or infrastructure nearby may be associated with this particular property.

This background information is best compiled through extensive historical research and site analysis. Neither is useful without the other. For example, the historical research might suggest that a house was built at a certain date. The architectural style, construction techniques and building materials may confirm or deny this as the date of construction.



*Cenotaph in Confederation Park, Peterborough  
(Photo courtesy of City of Peterborough)*



## Historical Research

Historical research is necessary for compiling the specific history and development of a property and to identify any association it has to the broader context of community heritage. This involves the use of land records, maps, photographs, publications, archival materials and other documentation.

Research should reveal dates of construction, original and later uses, significant people or events, technologies, philosophy, factors such as natural disasters or fires and other details about the property. This information is useful in the identification and evaluation of the cultural heritage value or interest of the property. It also provides clues for examining and interpreting the physical evidence.

*For detailed guidance on how to undertake historical research and site analysis, refer to Section 5: Researching a Property.*

## Site Analysis


Ideally, a property being evaluated should be examined at least twice. A preliminary site visit will give some context and raise questions to be addressed by the historical research.

The historical research findings may reveal use of the property, key dates or associations not previously known. A second site visit is an opportunity to look for physical evidence of these findings. Explanations or inconsistencies may be revealed in the existing features, missing elements or some hint or remnant that can now be examined in more detail. These are tests of observation and interpretation.

Recording the property using photographs, measurements and notes will help when applying evaluation criteria and compiling a list of heritage attributes. The evolution of architectural style, construction techniques, materials, technology, associated landscapes and other factors are essential clues when analyzing a cultural heritage property.

## Evaluation and Report

The findings of the historical research and site analysis constitute the background information that will be used in deciding the appropriate course of action for conserving a cultural heritage property. The findings are best assembled in a written report that is thorough and accurate. The report is a permanent record of the property and should be readily available to council, municipal staff, municipal heritage committees, property owners, heritage consultants and the public.



*Fursman Farm, Grey County (Photo: Illustrated Atlas of the Dominion of Canada, 1881)*





# 4

## MUNICIPAL CRITERIA

# Ontario Regulation 9/06

Non-designated properties listed on the municipal register of cultural heritage properties and newly identified properties may be candidates for heritage conservation and protection. Section 29 of the Ontario Heritage Act enables municipalities to pass bylaws for the protection (designation) of individual real properties that have cultural heritage value or interest to the municipality. Heritage designation is a protection mechanism with long-term implications for the alteration and demolition of a cultural heritage property.

Individual properties being considered for protection under section 29 must undergo a more rigorous evaluation than is required for listing. The evaluation criteria set out in Regulation 9/06 essentially form a test against which properties must be assessed. The better the characteristics of the property when the criteria are applied to it, the greater the property's cultural heritage value or interest, and the stronger the argument for its long-term protection.

To ensure a thorough, objective and consistent evaluation across the province, and to assist municipalities with the process, the Ontario Heritage Act provides that:

29(1) The council of a municipality may, by bylaw, designate a property within the municipality to be of cultural heritage value or interest if,

(a) where criteria for determining whether property is of cultural heritage value or interest have been prescribed by regulation, the property meets the prescribed criteria; . . .

Regulation 9/06 prescribes the criteria for determining property of cultural heritage value or interest in a municipality. The regulation requires that, to be designated, a property must meet "one or more" of the criteria grouped into the categories of Design/Physical Value, Historical/Associative Value and Contextual Value.

This does not mean that the property is only evaluated within “one” category or must meet a criterion in each category in order to allow for protection. When more categories are applied, more is learned about the property and its relative cultural heritage value or interest. As a result, a more valid decision regarding heritage conservation measures can be made. Council must be satisfied that the property meets at least one of the criteria set out in Regulation 9/06 before it can be designated under section 29.

Regulation 9/06 was developed for the purposes of identifying and evaluating the cultural heritage value or interest of a property proposed for protection under section 29.



*The Rideau Canal Corridor is a unique cultural heritage landscape. (Photo Copyright 2006 Ontario Tourism)*



*Limestone townhouses, Kingston (Photo courtesy of Marcus Létourneau, City of Kingston)*

# ONTARIO REGULATION 9/06

MADE UNDER THE

## ONTARIO HERITAGE ACT

---

### CRITERIA FOR DETERMINING CULTURAL HERITAGE VALUE OR INTEREST

#### Criteria

1. (1) The criteria set out in subsection (2) are prescribed for the purposes of clause 29 (1) (a) of the Act.

(2) A property may be designated under section 29 of the Act if it meets one or more of the following criteria for determining whether it is of cultural heritage value or interest:

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 or culture, or
  - iii. demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer or theorist who is significant to a community.

3. 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.

#### Transition

2. This Regulation does not apply in respect of a property if notice of intention to designate it was given under subsection 29 (1.1) of the Act on or before January 24, 2006.





*Woodstock Museum, Woodstock (Photo Copyright 2006 Ontario Tourism)*

Through the evaluation process of Regulation 9/06, it should be possible to:

- Recognize a property that warrants long-term protection under section 29, and give reasons;
- Recognize a property for which levels of heritage conservation, other than section 29, are more appropriate;
- Determine that a property has no cultural heritage value or interest to the jurisdiction;

- Formulate the statement explaining the cultural heritage value or interest of the property, as required in a section 29 designation bylaw; and,
- Identify clearly the physical features or heritage attributes that contribute to, or support, the cultural heritage value or interest, as required in a section 29 designation bylaw.

A successful municipal cultural heritage conservation program starts with meeting the standards of Regulation 9/06. Many municipalities have methods for evaluating the cultural heritage value or interest of a property being considered for protection. Existing or new evaluation models must apply the criteria specified in Regulation 9/06. Existing evaluation models may have to be revised to take into account the mandatory criteria set out in the regulation.

It is advisable that an approach or model to apply the criteria be adopted as a standard municipal procedure or policy. The adoption of a policy or standard practice enables council, municipal heritage committees, municipal staff including planning and building officials, land use planners, heritage organizations, property owners and the public to apply the criteria in a consistent and defensible manner.

## Who does the Evaluating?

Under the Ontario Heritage Act, a municipal heritage committee can be appointed to advise council on matters relating to the Act and other heritage conservation matters. This can include compiling the register of cultural heritage properties and using criteria for evaluating the cultural heritage value or interest of a property. By using a committee, the objectivity of the evaluation is maintained.

For municipalities without a municipal heritage committee, others such as heritage planning staff, municipal staff, community or heritage organizations, a heritage expert, or an individual who understands the purpose of evaluating the cultural heritage value or interest of a property, could undertake the evaluation. Knowledge of the heritage of the community and expertise in cultural heritage properties are recommended.

The municipal evaluation criteria should be such that, whoever undertakes the evaluation, there is a reasonable expectation that the process will lead to valid decisions about the heritage conservation of the property.

Ultimately, a municipal designation bylaw and its statement of cultural heritage value or interest is subject to appeal and must be defensible at the Conservation Review Board. Council has the final decision on whether to proceed with protection under the Ontario Heritage Act. When council refuses to issue a demolition permit for a designated property, the matter can be appealed to the Ontario Municipal Board, which makes the final decision.

## ONE STRUCTURE – MANY VALUES AND INTERESTS

Knowing the characteristics and evolution of local construction techniques and materials will help when evaluating cultural heritage properties. For example, depending on the community, a stone structure could hold different cultural heritage values or interests:

- It represents the earliest type of building form, and stone construction is no longer typical; or
- It represents the typical building form and/or has a particular quality in design or physical value, historical or associative value and/or contextual value; or
- The use of stone is unique and its use is possibly a reflection on the owner or builder who went to extraordinary means to acquire the materials; or
- Other reasons depending on the cultural heritage of the community.



*White Otter Castle, Atikokan  
(Photo courtesy of Dennis Smyk)*



*The St. Cyril & Methodius Ukrainian Cathedral Church in the City of St. Catharines was designed by well-known architect Rev. Philip Ruh in the Byzantine style of Ukrainian churches in Western Canada. The interior is adorned with iconography by artist Igor Suhacev. (Photo: Ministry of Culture)*

# LISTING AND EVALUATION IN THE MUNICIPAL DESIGNATION PROCESS

1

## REGISTER OF CULTURAL HERITAGE PROPERTIES

A property the municipal Council believes to be of cultural heritage value or interest is listed on the municipal register of cultural heritage properties.

2

## RESEARCH AND ANALYSIS

When a property on the register becomes a candidate for protection under section 29 of the Ontario Heritage Act, research about the property's history and cultural associations, and a physical site analysis are undertaken.

- **Community Context**

Knowledge of the history, achievements and aspirations of the community gives perspective to what cultural heritage value or interest may be held by the property.

- **Historical Research**

Historical research involves consulting land records, maps, photographs, publications, archival materials and other documentation to learn the history and cultural associations of the property. A preliminary site visit can be useful in formulating research questions about the property.

- **Site Analysis**

A site analysis can involve photographs, measurements, observation and analysis of the physical characteristics of the property. The historical research findings compared with the physical evidence should ensure collaboration in the known information about the property.

3

## EVALUATION

Within the context of the heritage of the community, the findings of the historical research and site analysis are used to evaluate the property for Design/Physical Value, Historical/Associative Value and Contextual Value in accordance with Ontario Regulation 9/06.

4

## STATEMENT OF CULTURAL HERITAGE VALUE OR INTEREST

Prepare a statement of cultural heritage value or interest and a description of the physical features or heritage attributes of the property that support that heritage value or interest.

5

## CONSERVATION AND PROTECTION

Depending on the outcome of the evaluation, the property may warrant long-term protection under section 29 of the Ontario Heritage Act, or other heritage conservation and land-use planning measures.



## Integrity

A cultural heritage property does not need to be in original condition. Few survive without alterations on the long journey between their date of origin and today. Integrity is a question of whether the surviving physical features (heritage attributes) continue to represent or support the cultural heritage value or interest of the property.

For example, a building that is identified as being important because it is the work of a local architect, but has been irreversibly altered without consideration for design, may not be worthy of long-term protection for its physical quality. The surviving features no longer represent the design; the integrity has been lost. If this same building had a prominent owner, or if a celebrated event took place there, it may hold cultural heritage value or interest for these reasons, but not for its association with the architect.



*Forster-Rawlinson Log House & Barns,  
Richmond Hill  
(Photo: Ministry of Culture)*

Cultural heritage value or interest may be intertwined with location or an association with another structure or environment. If these have been removed, the integrity of the property may be seriously diminished. Similarly, removal of historically significant materials, or extensive reworking of the original craftsmanship, would warrant an assessment of the integrity.

There can be value or interest found in the evolution of a cultural heritage property. Much can be learned about social, economic, technological and other trends over time. The challenge is being able to differentiate between alterations that are part of an historic evolution, and those that are expedient and offer no informational value.

An example would be a sawmill originally powered by a waterwheel. Many mills were converted to steam turbine technology, and later to diesel or electrical power. Being able to document or present the evolution in power generation, as evidenced in this mill, has cultural heritage value or interest.



## Physical Condition

Physical condition is another difficult consideration. Some cultural heritage properties are found in a deteriorated state but may still maintain all or part of their cultural heritage value or interest. The ability of the structure to exist for the long term, and determining at what point repair and reconstruction erode the integrity of the heritage attributes, must be weighed against the cultural heritage value or interest held by the property.

### The Case of St. Raphael's Roman Catholic Church

St. Raphael's Roman Catholic Church in South Glengarry County was built in 1818 under the supervision of Alexander Macdonell, the vicar general who was appointed in 1826 as the first Roman Catholic Bishop of Upper Canada. This large stone church served

a congregation of Scottish Highlanders who had settled in the easternmost county of Upper Canada in 1786. St. Raphael's is recognized as the founding church for the English-speaking Catholics of Ontario. A fire in 1970 destroyed the roof, 1830s-era tower and the interior decorations. Fortunately, the outer walls were spared and thus its plan, impressive scale and fine masonry work remain.

Despite its fire-damaged condition, the property was designated under the Ontario Heritage Act and in the 1990s was declared a National Historic Site. Its condition, although regretful, did not take away its cultural heritage value and interest. The ruins silhouetted against the rural landscape "powerfully engages the minds of all who see it, evoking those early days in the history of the Church and preserving the memory of those intrepid settlers."

*(Source: Friends of St. Raphael's Ruins)*



*St. Raphael's Roman Catholic Church, Glengarry County (Photo: Ministry of Culture)*





# 5

## Researching a Property

Researching a cultural heritage property involves reviewing documentary sources, merging this primary information with the physical evidence, and making some conclusions about the history and evolution of the property. This background information is needed to evaluate the cultural heritage value or interest of the property to the community.

### Community Context

The more that is known about the overall history and development of a community, the easier it will be to make sense of the property research puzzle. Secondary sources such as community, family, institutional and business histories can outline the community context and help answer some initial questions such as:

- When and why was the community established?
- Where is the property located relative to local development? Is it in the historic core or an area of later growth? Is it near an early waterway, road, crossroads or railway line?
- Do any people, events, places, commercial activities or other factors contribute to the cultural heritage of the community?
- Were there any floods, fires, tornadoes or other disasters that may have altered the property?
- When were the local mills, brickworks, iron foundries or other manufacturers of products relevant to the property established?
- When did the railway arrive to bring imported products?
- Are there any traditions associated with a former occupant, builder, event, design, type of engineering or use of the property?



*Originally part of a large complex of pulp, paper, iron and steel and power plant, the St. Marys Paper Inc./Abitibi-Price Building is one of the finest examples of Romanesque revival architecture in an industrial context in Ontario.  
(Photo: Ministry of Culture)*

## Historical Research

### Land Records

Determining dates of construction and use of a cultural heritage property starts with tracing the legal ownership of the real property or land. In Ontario, it is the parcel of land that is bought and sold, not the individual improvements on it (except for condominiums). Few land records accurately record what buildings or features exist on the property over time.

Historically, once an area was surveyed by the “Crown” (province) into a grid of concessions and lots, ranges, or plans, it was opened for settlement. The survey created the legal description. This is not the same as the street address. This legal description, for example, Lot 12, Concession 6, Oro Township, or Lot 6, north side, Blake Street, Plan 6, is key to finding the relevant land records.

## Pre-Patent Land Records

An application by an individual for a grant or purchase of Crown land was called a petition. It contained an explanation of why the petitioner might be entitled to receive a land grant (free or paying fees only); or is a request to buy or lease Crown land.

If the Crown approved the petition, the surveyor general assigned a lot and issued a Ticket of Location stating required settlement duties, such as clearing part of the lot and erecting a shanty. Government land agents might later inspect the lot to verify the satisfactory completion of these duties. (Township Papers Collection) Once all requirements were met, a first deed was issued.

The final step in transferring ownership from the Crown involved having the lot surveyed and paying a fee for the Crown patent. The patent was only mandatory when the lot was to be sold to a non-family member. Generations of one family could live on the lot before the patent was issued. This needs to be considered when studying early structures and compiling a complete history of the lot. The patent date is rarely the date of arrival of the owner or the date of construction of the first features on the property. Many of these events predate the patent.

RUN DATE - FEBRUARY 26 1979 PAGE NO. 3455

ONTARIO ARCHIVES LAND RECORD INDEX  
ALPHABETICAL LISTING BY NAME OF LOCATEE

NAME OF LOCATEE	TOWNSHIP / TOWN / CITY	LOT	CONC.	DATE ID	ISSUE DATE	TRANS. TYPE	TYPE OF LEASE / FG, SALE	ARCHIVAL REFERENCE RG SERIES VOL PG
DRINKWATER JAMES RESIDENCE	CHINGUACOUSY	E 1/2 20	4WHST	8	18241124 18241208	FG	FF DEED NO.	01 C13 054 105
DRINKWATER JRS RESIDENCE	COCHRANE	S1/2 6	3	1	19080620 19080727	FG	V DEED NO.	01 C1118 003 043
DRINKWATER JNO SR RESIDENCE	ORILLIA NO		2	1	18320804 NO	FG	DEED NO.	01 C14 023 011
DRINKWATER JNO SR RESIDENCE	ORILLIA NO	W1/2 1	3	1	18320804 NO	FG	DEED NO.	01 C14 023 011
DRINKWATER JOHN RESIDENCE	ORILLIA ORILLIA	W1/2 1	3ND	5	18350522 NO	S	CR DEED NO.	01 C1114 010 016
DRINKWATER JOHN H S RESIDENCE	ORILLIA ORILLIA	1	2ND	8	18400527 NO	S	CR DEED NO.	01 C1114 010 069
DRINKWATER THOS H RESIDENCE	TISDALE ORILLIA	W1/2 1	5	1	19040722 19080603	FG	V DEED NO.	01 C1118 007 022

Ontario Archives

The Ontario Archives Land Record Index is organized alphabetically by surname of the locatee (person issued the lot) and by township/town/city. Each entry is coded and notes the archival reference to the original record ("RG Series, Vol., Pg"). The extract provided above is by locatee: The first entry in the above sample indicates that James Drinkwater was a resident of Chinguacousy township when he received the east half of Lot 20, Concession 4, West Hurontario Street ("E1/2 20 4WHST") by an Order-in-Council (Date ID "8") issued November 24, 1824. This was a free grant (Transaction type "FG") for which he paid full fees (Type FG."FF"). He was "located" (Date ID "1" issued a Ticket of Location) on December 8, 1824.



It is also possible that the person issued the patent is not the original occupant of the lot. The patentee may have been a non-resident owner who leased the lot to a tenant. The first occupant may have abandoned the lot before receiving the patent and the lot was re-issued by the Crown. The first occupant may have negotiated the “sale” of the lot on the condition that the next “owner” could apply for the patent using the occupant’s name. (This was a common, but illegal, practice.)

When disputes arose over who was entitled to apply for the patent, the matter was referred to the Heir and Devisee Commission. The heir or family descendant, devisee (recipient through a will), or person “sold” the lot by the first occupant, could present evidence of their patent claim to this court of review.

The early system of granting Crown land in Ontario involved several steps and was frequently adjusted. Before making any conclusions about the early history of a property, several records should be checked. Hopefully, the findings will collaborate and give some insight into the origin of the earliest physical evidence on the property.


Several collections relating to pre-patent transactions are indexed as the Ontario Archives Land Record Index (1780s to about 1918). The Upper Canada Land Petitions, Heir and Devisee Commission records (1804-1895), and Township Papers are available at the Ontario Archives in Toronto and the National Archives of Canada in Ottawa. Some public libraries, regional archives, and genealogical resource centres may have copies.

## Land Registry Offices

It is only when the patent is issued that a file for the lot is opened at the county or district Land Registry Office. There were two systems of filing all subsequent legal documents relating to the lot: the land registry system and the land titles system.

In the land registry system, this lot file is known as the conveyances abstract or Abstract of Title. It starts with the patent and assigns a number to each legally registered transaction (called instruments) for the lot, listing them in chronological order to today. These include mortgages, deeds (sometimes called Bargain and Sales, B&S), grants, leases, discharges, deposits, liens, bylaws, wills, court orders, surveys, site plans and other documents regarding the property. The Abstract is the index to these registered instruments.

The land titles system was primarily used in northern Ontario. The legal ownership of the lot is certified and entered into land titles. When the lot is sold again, it is not necessary to verify any transactions earlier than the date it was entered into land titles. Lots in the land registry system have been slowly converted to land titles. A system based on land titles is now used at all Land Registry Offices. Each parcel of land is assigned a



*Fire insurance plans are a useful source of information  
(Photo: Insurors' Advisory Organization Inc.)*

Property Identification Number (PIN).

The PIN number is used to access the recent (40-year average) history of a parcel of land.

For historical research, it is usually necessary to go beyond the 40-year history.

The current legal description (or PIN) of the parcel of land being researched is the key to accessing the Abstract and instruments that relate to the parcel and eventually to the larger lot of which the parcel may only be a part. The history or "root" of the parcel is traced from today, back through all the subdivisions, to the original size of the whole lot at the date of the patent. It is critical to trace only the chronology of the specific parcel of interest by tracking the survey boundaries or assigned description of that parcel. It may be necessary to look at a second or third Abstract, as the parcel is reconstituted to its original lot and concession or plan description.

Reading the Abstract and the instruments can reveal information about a property. Clues such as the occupation of the owner, for example an innkeeper or miller, may identify the use of the property. When a parcel too small for farming is severed from a larger lot, it may mean the construction of possibly a second dwelling, inn, church, school or cemetery. When industries are sold, the physical assets may be described. Right of way agreements suggest the need to access a new or existing structure, water source, road or railway line. Family relationships, court settlements, mechanic's liens describing unpaid work done and other clues contained in the instruments establish a framework of names, dates and uses that are relevant to the property and needed to search other documentary sources.

Ontario,  
**REGISTRY OFFICE,**  
**BARRIE,**  
County of Simcoe.

Abstract does not purport to give entries from the general register.

3 Certify, that the following are correct Extracts from the  
Lot Number *Twenty three in the Town*

REGISTERED No. OF THE INSTRUMENT.	THE NATURE OF THE INSTRUMENT.	THE DATE.	THE DATE OF REGISTRY.	NAME, RESIDENCE AND ADDITION OF GRANTOR, LESSOR DEVISOR, OR PLAINTIFF, MENTIONED IN SAID INSTRUMENT.	NAME, RESIDENCE DEVISOR, OR PLAINTIFF, MENTIONED IN SAID INSTRUMENT.
	<i>Patent</i>	<i>15 Oct 1835</i>		<i>Mc Craun</i>	<i>Septu</i>
<i>2622</i>	<i>BrS</i>	<i>15 Nov 1836</i>	<i>10 Aug 1838</i>	<i>Septu's Heir? &amp; son</i>	<i>John J</i>
<i>2623</i>	<i>BrS</i>	<i>8 Aug 1838</i>	<i>10 Aug 1838</i>	<i>John Jant elux</i>	<i>Thomas</i>
<i>P 13819</i>	<i>BrS</i>	<i>23 Aug 1844</i>	<i>27 Nov 1854</i>	<i>Thomas Chris elux</i>	<i>Thomas</i>
<i>P 58616</i>	<i>BrS</i>	<i>6 Oct 1870</i>	<i>8 Oct 1870</i>	<i>Charles J Chapman elux</i>	<i>William</i>
<i>P 58617</i>	<i>BrS</i>	<i>6 Oct 1870</i>	<i>8 Oct 1870</i>	<i>William Thompson elux</i>	<i>James</i>



Land Registry Offices are open to the public. Abstracts and instruments before 1958 are also available on microfilm at the Ontario Archives.

## Property Tax Assessment Rolls

Property tax assessment rolls have been compiled annually since the early 19th century. The rolls that survive are usually found in municipal offices, regional archives, museums and in provincial and national archives. Each identifies the name of the occupant (tenant or owner), the legal description, some personal and statistical information and a breakdown of real and personal property assessed values. Real property includes the land, buildings and fixed assets. Personal property includes taxable income and movable assets such as carriages and livestock. An increase in the

assessed value is a good indicator of some improvement on the property being completed, such as building construction. A few municipalities have dates of construction recorded on the tax roll.

The tax rolls should be reviewed for each year but particularly for the years that correspond to significant names or dates learned at the Land Registry Office. The information in each tax roll needs to be compared within the single year and from one year to the next. There are several possible comparisons:

- Compare the real property value with nearby properties of equal size, as examples:  
Your lot is assessed at \$50 and most lots in the vicinity are assessed at \$200 each, it may be that your lot is vacant; or,

**ABSTRACT OF TITLE.**

HART & RIDDELL, Stationers, 27 Wellington St. West, Toronto.

only Instruments Recorded at this Office upon The East Bay of Toronto  
Concession of the Twp of Toronto in the County of Simcoe and Province of Ontario.

NAME AND ADDITION OF GRANTEE, LESSEE, OR DEFENDANT, MENTIONED IN THE INSTRUMENT.	CONSIDERATION OR MORTGAGE MONEY.	THE PART OF SAID LOT MENTIONED IN THE INSTRUMENT... AND REMARKS.
James Mackey		Lot 29 Conts Toronto = 200 acres
of William	\$826	Lot 29 Cont 1 Toronto = 200 acres
Christie	\$100.	Lot 29 Cont Toronto = 200 acres,
of Wm Cunningham	\$150.	Lot 29 Cont Toronto = 200 acres,
Chapman		
of Wm Cunningham	\$3800.	all of lot 150 acres, "called Broken Lot,"
Thompson		
of Seymour		
J. Chapman wife of	\$3800.	all of lot 150 acres "called Broken Lot"

Simcoe County Land Registry Office



Your lot is assessed at \$200 and comparable lots are valued at \$400, you may have a frame house while the others are brick and therefore of a higher assessed value; or,

Your lot may be assessed at \$3,000, in which case it may be a substantial estate or it has other assets such as a commercial or industrial operation.

This answer may be obvious from the occupation of the resident (and other research findings).

- Note the changes in the assessed value of the real property from one year to the next.  
For example, in 1875 and 1876 the value is \$50, but in 1877, it rises to \$400. A building may have been completed enough by 1877 to account for the higher assessed value. This may coincide with a change in ownership or mortgaging registered at the Land Registry Office.

There are some factors to consider when using tax assessment rolls. Few assessors made annual inspections of each lot so any change in value may be one to several years behind the actual date of the improvement. A slight increase in the assessed value may be indicative of a major renovation to an existing structure, not new construction.

Fluctuation in value can be the result of a widespread economic situation, such as a recession that devalues the real estate market. There is also the possibility that the structure burned, was not reassessed during reconstruction and returned at the same assessed value as before the fire. Investigating other research sources should explain these apparent puzzles and inconsistencies.

## Other Research Sources:

---

- Personal and agricultural census records exist for most jurisdictions each decade from 1842 to 1911. Some identify individuals and family groups, location, dwelling, industries, production rates, and other information.
- Directories are published lists of individuals and businesses organized by location. Some were compiled by commercial publishers using tax assessment rolls or land records. Others list only subscribers, with the result that the lists are incomplete.
- Photographs are a valuable source. Many institutional collections are filed by location, name or type of structure.
- Illustrated atlases may plot buildings on a map and have artistic depictions of structures and landscapes. Historic maps can also be useful.
- Newspapers contain an assortment of information and some are indexed.
- Insurance plans of urban areas are measured outlines of structures coded for type of construction, building materials, use and fire risk.
- Business records, private manuscript materials (for example, diaries, letters, scrapbooks) and municipal records may provide relevant information.
- Other materials held by the National Archives of Canada, Ontario Archives, local archives and libraries, museums, and historical, architectural and genealogical research societies and groups.



*Bird's Eye View drawings depict the locations of buildings in a community. Orillia 1875 (Photo: Beautiful Old Orillia, Orillia Museum of Art and History)*

## Site Analysis and Physical Evidence

Through historical research, a profile of the ownership, use, history, development and associations of a property should begin to emerge. For some properties, it is the association with certain people, events or aspects of the community that have value or interest, not the physical appearance. For other properties, there is a need to examine, interpret, and evaluate the physical evidence. When trying to identify and interpret any physical evidence presented by the property, knowledge of the following topics is useful:

- architectural styles
- construction technology
- building materials and hardware
- building types including residential, commercial, institutional, agricultural and industrial
- interiors

- infrastructure such as bridges, canals, roads, fences, culverts, municipal and other engineering works
- landscaping and gardens
- cemeteries and monuments
- spiritual places that have a physical form

Having a sense of what to look for will help develop observation skills and answer some important questions such as:

- What is the architectural style? When was it popular in your community? Are there additions or upgrades that can be dated based on style?
- What elements or features are typical of the architectural style or building type?
- What level or type of technology seems to be original? For example, are there remnants of earlier methods of accomplishing some mechanical task?
- What building materials are used in the basic construction and any additions? Is it log, frame, concrete, steel, glass or some unique material?

- What are the decorative features such as coloured and patterned brick, terracotta tiles, ornamental stone, wood trim, brackets or carvings? Do they appear to be handmade and unique, or commercially made and common in the community? (Some of these innovations and trends can be dated.)
- Are similar examples of the style, form, type, decoration or engineering works found elsewhere in the community?
- What is the original shape of the window opening and type of sash?

## Benchmark Dates

There are benchmark dates for the popularity of an architectural style, new developments in construction techniques, building materials, philosophies toward a particular practice and other innovations. This is true overall for Ontario but also applies to when each community was willing and able to incorporate these developments and innovations locally. It is this variation in local experience that is the overriding factor in identifying which properties have cultural heritage value or interest to each community.



*Fireplace Mantel, 1904 (Photo: Universal Design Book)*

## Building Materials

The closer the initial development of a property is to the date of the founding of a community, the more likely the building materials were locally available. The most common early structures used logs cut from the lot, notched together and raised to the height that could be reached by non-mechanical means. Timber framing, where the logs were squared with an axe or pit sawn, was the next level of sophistication. It required someone capable of joining the structural frame together using, for example, mortise and tenon construction. Communities with an abundance of natural building stone could have early stone structures.

The early 19th century development of steam power reliable enough to drive sawmill machinery resulted in the production of standard dimension lumber. The use of logs and timbers for construction could be replaced with lumber. The availability of lumber and the development of cut or “square” nails that were less expensive than blacksmith made nails signalled an end to the complex joinery of mortise and tenon construction. Dimensioned lumber could be quickly nailed together to create a building frame.

The 19th century also witnessed the decline in hand craftsmanship and the rise in manufactured products produced locally or stocked by local suppliers. Examples are the planing mills producing mouldings and trim; lath mills that meant the narrow strips of wood needed for plastered walls no longer needed to be hand split; window sash and door factories; and foundries casting iron support columns, decorative ironworks and hardware. Knowing the dates these mills or manufacturers were established or their products available locally can help to date a structure.





*Advertisement, 1899 (Photo: Canadian Architect and Builder)*

Brick making is an old technology but brick construction was not universal in early Ontario. Enough bricks needed for the fireplace hearth and chimney or a brick structure could be made in a temporary kiln on the site. Communities on waterways may have acquired the bricks used by ships as ballast weight and removed to reload the hull with cargo. Once a machine to commercially produce bricks was patented, and the expansion of the railway network allowed their transport, more communities had the option of brick construction. Opening local brickworks would, over time, change the look of a community. Locally available clay and sand may have produced a regional brick colour and texture. A local mason may have favoured a combination of brick colours and laid them in a particular bond and decorative pattern.

The 20th century brought innovations such as structural steel, reinforced concrete, elevators, plastics, composite materials and artificial stone.

These resulted in increased height, scale, interior spaciousness and embellishment to structures. Structural steel and reinforced concrete also allowed load bearing to be allocated to selected points. Now window openings could be large, delicate and thinly separated as they were no longer integral to the structural strength of the wall. A new approach to design developed in the architectural community.

Glassmaking made advances from hand blown with obvious imperfections, to glass rolled in sheets. The size of the glass for window panes increased, while the number of panes used in each window sash, decreased. A window with two sashes of 12 panes each (12 x 12), became a 6 x 6, then a 2 x 2, 1 x 1, until large sheets of glass were capable of becoming a wall structure. The exception to this chronology are the 20th century Period Revival styles that used multipaned sash to introduce a sense of antiquity.



*This would be described as a 12 over 12 window sash (Photo: Su Murdoch)*

Some architectural styles favoured certain shapes of window openings such as flat, pointed or round-headed. Gothic Revival re-introduced the use of stained glass.

As urban areas became densely populated, etched and art glass was used to let in light and maintain privacy. Glass was used as door panels, transoms over doors and dividers in an attempt to lighten otherwise dimly lit interiors.

## Architectural Style

In Ontario, the founding architectural styles of the 18th and early 19th century are Georgian, Neoclassical and Regency.

The Gothic Revival style and its increasing level of complexity and decoration dominated the 19th century, but there were other popular styles during this period. The 20th century saw the rise of Period Revivals and “modern” styles with simple lines and often innovative designs made possible by the new materials available.

Many publications about architectural styles are available as reference. These will also identify which design features or elements are typical of each style.

For example, the balanced façade, returned eaves and classical doorcase with its sidelights and a transom, are elements typical of Georgian styling.

Pointed window openings and roof gables, steep roofs and fanciful trim are featured on Gothic Revival buildings.

Although many structures are a mix of styles, most have a dominant style impression. Recognizing that dominant style is a clue to its date.



*Georgian Style,  
McGregor-Cowan House,  
Windsor (Photo courtesy  
of Nancy Morand,  
City of Windsor)*



*Gothic Revival Style, Burton House, Allandale (Photo: Simcoe County Archives)*



## Interiors

Interiors also changed with technological developments. For example, in some communities the fireplace as the only source of heat, cooking and evening light may have dominated the interior of a settlement period dwelling. Open hearths were a fire hazard and as soon as possible the kitchen was segregated to an outbuilding, basement, rear or side wing. Smaller heating fireplaces and heating stoves were installed in the main house and eventually replaced with central heating. As cooking stoves became safer and affordable, more kitchens became part of the main floor plan. (Just as many bathrooms came indoors with the invention of flush toilets and availability of pressurized water.)

Physical evidence of this evolution may be found, for example, in the discovery of the hearth behind a wall, or stovepipe holes that were later cut through a wall as they were not part of the original framing.

Another example of technological evolution is in lighting. By the mid 19th century, candle and oil lamps were being replaced with kerosene lamps. Gaslight was soon available but its sulphurous fume killed plants, tarnished metal, and discoloured paint. Most kept it outside until the 1886 invention of a safer gas mantle. It brought brilliant light into rooms after dark and changed the way interiors were designed. If a local gasworks was established, gaslight became possible and buildings were equipped with the necessary pipes and fixtures. The early 20th century witnessed the development of local hydroelectric plants, changing the standard in many communities to electric lighting.

Each change in lighting may have left some physical evidence such as ceiling hooks for oil and kerosene lamps, gas pipes and early knob and tube electrical wiring.



*Dining room, Kingsmith House, Toronto (Photo: Ontario Association Architects, 1933)*



## Context and Environment

A cultural heritage property may have a single feature, or it may be in some context or environment that has associative value or interest. These could be, for example, a unique landscape feature, garden, pathways or outbuildings. An industrial site may have evidence of the flow of the production process. The neighbourhood may have workers' cottages. A former tollbooth or dock may be near a bridge. There may be ruins on the property that represent an earlier or associated use. These elements are also important to examine for clues to the property. There is often evidence of these "lost" landscape features or remnants such as fences, hedgerows, gardens, specimen and commemorative trees, unusual plantings, gazebos, ponds, water features or walkways. These may have made a significant difference to how the main building related to the street or another structure on the property.

Consideration should always be given to adjacent properties. This is especially important in an urban or traditional town setting where properties abut. The front, side and rear yard setbacks may have been prescribed by early zoning regulations within a planned community, or perhaps evolved over time without any plan.

The views to and from a property can also be significant. Views can be considered from an historic perspective, how did views develop or was there a conscious effort to create and/or protect views), and the relevance of views to and from the site today.

## Evaluation

A cultural heritage property does not have to be a pure form or best example of a style, or incorporate the latest available in technological innovation, materials or philosophy.

Its cultural heritage value or interest is in what was created given the resources of the community at a particular time in its history. Ultimately, the questions to be answered are those posed in the criteria for determining property of cultural heritage value or interest as outlined in this guide.

## RESEARCHING A PROPERTY

### Community Context

- Learn about community history and activities that may hold cultural heritage value or interest

### Visit the property

### Historical Research

- Search pre-patent land records for early properties
- Search Land Registry Office property Abstracts and registered documents
- Review property tax assessment rolls
- Review sources such as census records, directories, photographs, maps, newspapers, insurance plans, business records and family materials

### Site Analysis and Physical Evidence

- Develop knowledge of construction, materials, architectural style and other related topics
- Analyse and record the physical characteristics of the property

### Evaluation and Report

- Merge the historical research information with the physical evidence
- Make conclusions and deductions based on the supporting documentation
- Identify any cultural heritage value or interest of the property
- Describe the heritage attributes that support that value or interest



## RESOURCES AND Further Information

Strengthened in 2005, the Ontario Heritage Act was passed in 1975 and has resulted in the protection of several thousand properties in Ontario. Many of these designated properties are identified in the Ontario Heritage Properties Database available online through the Ministry of Culture website ([www.culture.gov.on.ca](http://www.culture.gov.on.ca)). The Ontario Heritage Trust, as an agency of the Ministry of Culture, maintains a register of all designated and easement properties in Ontario as well as properties of cultural heritage value or interest.

The Canadian Register of Historic Places, an on-line, searchable database showcasing historic properties Canada-wide, is being developed under the Historic Places Initiative, a federal-provincial-territorial partnership. It can be viewed at [www.historicplaces.ca](http://www.historicplaces.ca)

Several publications providing guidance on conserving Ontario's cultural heritage properties are available from the Ministry of Culture and Publications Ontario.

For more information on the Ontario Heritage Act and conserving your community heritage, contact the Ministry of Culture or the Ontario Heritage Trust at:

### Ministry of Culture

900 Bay Street  
4th Floor, Mowat Block  
Toronto, ON M7A 1C2  
Tel: 416-212-0644  
1-866-454-0049  
TTY: 416-325-5170  
[www.culture.gov.on.ca](http://www.culture.gov.on.ca)

### Ontario Heritage Trust

10 Adelaide Street East  
Toronto, ON M5C 1J3  
Tel: (416) 325-5000  
[www.heritagetrust.on.ca](http://www.heritagetrust.on.ca)

## Acknowledgements

---

The Ministry of Culture would like to thank Su Murdoch and Kurt Schick for their valuable contributions to this guide.

Special thanks also to the following individuals and organizations for their thoughtful comments and contributions: the Ontario Tourism Marketing Partnership, the Ontario Heritage Trust, the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing, Community Heritage Ontario, the Architectural Conservancy of Ontario, the Ontario Historical Society, Parks Canada, the Ontario Urban Forest Council, the Insurance Bureau of Canada, McMichael Canadian Art Collection, the Town of Aurora, the City of Brampton, the Town of Caledon, the City of Guelph, the City of Hamilton, the City of Kingston, the Town of Markham, the City of Mississauga, the City of Ottawa, City of Peterborough, the City of Toronto, the City of Windsor, Simcoe County Archives, Friends of White Otter Castle, Friends of St. Raphael's Ruins, Insuror's Advisory Board, Janet Amos, Yolande Asschert, Michele Beckstead, Adrian Benvenuto, John Blumenson, Jamie Boulton, Anita Brunet-Lamarche, Catherine Campbell, Dennis Carter-Edwards, Natalie Champagne, Sally Coutts, Ginny Cuning, Shahan Deirmenjian, Sally Drummond, David Cuming, David Ellis, Dana Hall, Beth Hanna, Regan Hutcheson, Paul King, Helen Lamon, Jim Leonard, Marcus Létourneau, Bob Martindale, Richard Moorhouse, Nancy Morand, Fran Moscall, Rollo Myers, Patricia Neal, Lou O'Hara, Brian Osborne, Ian Panabaker, Neil Patterson, Don Purdy, Nora Reid, Paul Ross, André Scheinman, Eva Salter, James Scott, Robert Saunders, Michael Seaman, Therisa Singh, Alida Stevenson, Marcia Wallace, Mark Warrack and Erica Weider.

Thanks also to the many others in the heritage community who helped with the development of this guide and have provided ongoing assistance and advice to staff at the Ministry of Culture.

The Government of Ontario gratefully acknowledges the Government of Canada's contribution to this publication.







**Ontario Heritage Act****ONTARIO REGULATION 9/06****CRITERIA FOR DETERMINING CULTURAL HERITAGE VALUE OR INTEREST**

**Consolidation Period:** From January 25, 2006 to the [e-Laws currency date](#).

No amendments.

*This is the English version of a bilingual regulation.*

**Criteria**

**1.** (1) The criteria set out in subsection (2) are prescribed for the purposes of clause 29 (1) (a) of the Act. O. Reg. 9/06, s. 1 (1).

(2) A property may be designated under section 29 of the Act if it meets one or more of the following criteria for determining whether it is of cultural heritage value or interest:

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 or culture, or
  - iii. demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer or theorist who is significant to a community.
3. 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. O. Reg. 9/06, s. 1 (2).

**Transition**

**2.** This Regulation does not apply in respect of a property if notice of intention to designate it was given under subsection 29 (1.1) of the Act on or before January 24, 2006. O. Reg. 9/06, s. 2.