

GANANOQUE HERITAGE PROPERTIES OF INTEREST LIST

This proposal for the Gananoque Heritage Properties of Interest List, provides an introduction to the legislative parameters stemming from the Ontario Act, the approach behind the augmentation of the list which focuses on greater inclusivity, the methodology for content which includes samples of the criteria for Ontario Regulation 9/06, and a statement of qualifications of the author.

INTRODUCTION

The Town of Gananoque has requested that its Heritage Properties of Interest List be augmented under the guidance of the Municipal Heritage Advisory Panel (MHAP) generically called a Municipal Heritage Committee under the Ontario Heritage Act. Hereafter the List will be called the Heritage Register as the Ontario Heritage Act uses the term Register. The preparation and filing of a Heritage Register is authorised under the Ontario Heritage Act, Section 27 (1), which states: *“The clerk of a municipality shall keep a register of property situated in the municipality that is of cultural heritage value or interest. 2005, c. 6, s. 15.”* Designated properties are required to be included on the Heritage Register.

In addition to highlighting buildings that are of cultural heritage value or interest for the municipality and community, the Heritage Register recognises that if a building or buildings on a duly noted property of the Heritage Register receive a request for demolition or removal by the property owner, the municipality in consultation with the heritage committee has up to 60 days to determine if the municipality wishes to designate the building(s). Being included on the Heritage Register does not require municipal approval for alterations unless the building is designated.

This is current until the following that has not yet been proclaimed.

Note: On a day to be named by proclamation of the Lieutenant Governor, section 27 of the Act is repealed and the following substituted: (See: 2019, c. 9, Sched. 11, s. 6)

Register

27 (1) The clerk of a municipality shall keep a register of property situated in the municipality that is of cultural heritage value or interest. 2019, c. 9, Sched. 11, s. 6.

Contents of register

(2) The register kept by the clerk shall list all property situated in the municipality that has been designated by the municipality or by the Minister under this Part and shall contain, with respect to each property,

(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. 2019, c. 9, Sched. 11, s. 6.

Same

(3) In addition to the property listed in the register under subsection (2), the register may include property that has not been designated under this Part but that the council of the municipality believes to be of cultural heritage value or interest and shall contain, with

respect to such property, a description of the property that is sufficient to readily ascertain the property. 2019, c. 9, Sched. 11, s. 6.

Consultation

(4) If the council of a municipality has appointed a municipal heritage committee, the council shall, before including a property that has not been designated under this Part in the register under subsection (3) or removing the reference to such a property from the register, consult with its municipal heritage committee. 2019, c. 9, Sched. 11, s. 6.

Notice to property owner

(5) If a property that has not been designated under this Part has been included in the register under subsection (3), the council of the municipality shall, within 30 days after including the property in the register, provide the owner of the property with notice that the property has been included in the register. 2019, c. 9, Sched. 11, s. 6.

Same

(6) The notice under subsection (5) shall include the following:

- 1. A statement explaining why the council of the municipality believes the property to be of cultural heritage value or interest.*
- 2. A description of the property that is sufficient to readily ascertain the property.*
- 3. A statement that if the owner of the property objects to the property being included in the register, the owner may object to the property's inclusion by serving on the clerk of the municipality a notice of objection setting out the reasons for the objection and all the relevant facts.*
- 4. An explanation of the restriction concerning the demolition or removal, or the permitting of the demolition or removal, of a building or structure on the property as set out in subsection (9). 2019, c. 9, Sched. 11, s. 6.*

Objection

(7) The owner of a property who objects to a property being included in the register under subsection (3) shall serve on the clerk of the municipality a notice of objection setting out the reasons for the objection and all relevant facts. 2019, c. 9, Sched. 11, s. 6.

Decision of council

(8) If a notice of objection has been served under subsection (7), the council of the municipality shall,

(a) consider the notice and make a decision as to whether the property should continue to be included in the register or whether it should be removed; and

(b) provide notice of the council's decision to the owner of the property, in such form as the council considers proper, within 90 days after the decision. 2019, c. 9, Sched. 11, s. 6.

Restriction on demolition, etc.

(9) If a property that has not been designated under this Part has been included in the register under subsection (3), the owner of the property shall not demolish or remove a building or structure on the property or permit the demolition or removal of the building or structure unless the owner gives the council of the municipality at least 60 days notice in

writing of the owner's intention to demolish or remove the building or structure or to permit the demolition or removal of the building or structure. 2019, c. 9, Sched. 11, s. 6.

Same

(10) Subsection (9) applies only if the property is included in the register under subsection (3) before any application is made for a permit under the Building Code Act, 1992 to demolish or remove a building or structure located on the property. 2019, c. 9, Sched. 11, s. 6.

Same

(11) The notice required by subsection (9) shall be accompanied by such plans and shall set out such information as the council may require. 2019, c. 9, Sched. 11, s. 6.

Extracts

(12) The clerk of a municipality shall issue extracts from the register referred to in subsection (1) to any person on payment of the fee set by the municipality by by-law. 2019, c. 9, Sched. 11, s. 6.

Application of subs. (5) to (8)

(13) Subsections (5) to (8) do not apply in respect of properties that were included in the register under subsection (3) before section 6 of the Schedule 11 to the More Homes, More Choice Act, 2019 comes into force. 2019, c. 9, Sched. 11, s. 6.

As communicated immediately above in subsection 13, properties included in the Heritage Register prior to the proclamation by the Lieutenant Governor follow the earlier version of the Act. However, if Town Council wishes to update the Heritage Register prior to this, the procedures for notification of property owners would reflect the process of other municipalities that have updated their Heritage Registers.

APPROACH

For the Gananoque Heritage Register, an extensive number of properties have been noted for possible listing. These reflect properties noted by the MHAP, and trends from many other municipalities that have opted for a more inclusive approach.

Greater inclusivity incorporates a broader range of building dates, forms and materials. Monumental and iconic buildings in town that are not on the list have been proposed as well as representative examples including retail buildings, vernacular buildings, early row housing (rare for Gananoque), and buildings that illustrate structures that were formerly common but which are now rare in the town's building stock. Further diversity is reflected in the inclusion of more recent architecture such as a mid-20th century residence because of its association with the McCarney family – highly respected proprietors of the Gananoque Inn across the street, and because of its fashionable bungalow design for the time. Residences from the 1920s-40s are also included as some are updated traditionalism, or appear to be designs from popular catalogues called 'bungalows' (even though they are 1.5 storeys) and often feature a porch across the front that was incorporated into the structure.

By drawing attention to a more diverse range of building types this also highlights the built history of Gananoque that is being rapidly eroded by demolition or demolition by neglect, most notably industrial architecture. Nos. 5, 9 and 21-23 King Street East illustrate this as the only remaining undisturbed cluster of Gananoque's former extensive industrial heritage infrastructure, complete with the complex

additive and irregular rear sections of these structures. Similarly, 185 Mill Street, a designated property, also illustrates this attrition by neglect with the December 2020 demolition of the Brick Building on the site (photographic documentation shows the roof was breached as long ago as 2014 if not earlier). Dating from 1871 and ca. 1895, the Brick Building provided accommodation for a variety of traditional Gananoque industrial uses. However, it was likely the only structure in Gananoque that would have qualified for national historic significance stemming from its association with the construction of Link Aviation Trainers for the Second World War, and the British Commonwealth Air Training Plan (BCATP) – a programme that has been deemed of national historic significance by the Historic Sites and Monuments Board of Canada.

Buildings with materials that define an era, but which are less common now, have been included such as decorative concrete block (popular from about 1900-15), and buildings originally clad or re-clad with asbestos wall shingles – an inert material if undisturbed, extremely long lasting, and popular for exterior cladding from the 1940s-50s.

METHODOLOGY

If a more extensive list is desired, it is best to provide a succinct rationale for including the property, particularly as this will be required when revisions to the Heritage Act are proclaimed. In consultation with the MHAP, inclusion should reflect at least one of the nine sub-categories of the O. Reg. 9/06 Criteria, or list heritage attribute(s). This provides greater justification for its inclusion on the Heritage Register, as this can help address possible public response. For the MHAP, at the end of this introduction, a sample of the analysis for the 9/06 criteria is included from Christ Church, a designated building. Following this is an emptied table that should automatically expand as desired if a member wishes to use this format. If such automatic adjustment does not occur, just pull down the horizontal cell divider. Not all cells need to be filled. Members may prefer to make notes in another manner, such as simply recording their initial with each property highlighted to show their support for inclusion on the Heritage Register and modifications to the succinct rationale for inclusion on the Heritage Register.

If available, important or key information for inclusion on the Register encompasses:

- date or era (known or approximate),
- style (although many will be vernacular which is not a style per se, but there can be vernacular interpretations of a style),
- architect, designer or builder,
- original or important owners – current businesses can be important but these can readily change and so must be used with discretion,
- original use with later uses if significant,
- a historical theme with which it is associated,
- environmental importance (e.g., community context, monument),
- distinguishing feature(s) which may include the previous three points.

Basic information such as the original function of the building and primary building material(s), are included as searchable terms. This can be a valuable tool for quantifying rarity, such as sandstone versus brick, or red brick versus yellow, or a combination creating dichromatic brick.

In this proposal for the Heritage Register, the properties submitted to the MHAP are listed in alpha-numeric order by street name followed by street number. This is preceded by two levels of suggested priority. The first ranking system is with asterisks based on what is currently understood about the architectural, historical or environmental significance of the property: * = low, ** = medium, *** = high. This ranking system will not be provided for designated properties.

The second ranking system indicates a more current level of priority:

- HC Heritage Concern – e.g., in a transition zone or state of neglect;
- HI – Heritage Interest – e.g., properties that are well regarded for their heritage qualities and for which at present there may be little concern about their preservation;
- CC – Community Context – e.g., properties that reinforce the heritage qualities of its surroundings, serve as an example of an under-represented form, style or material in Gananoque, or have little concern about their preservation;
- D – Designated – i.e., a property that has already been designated. As noted above designated properties must be including in the Heritage Register.

The Heritage Concern category may lead to interest in producing a non-binding heritage report that would be readily available if the municipality chooses to pursue designation of the property, or any property on the Heritage Register. Additionally, properties with a triple *** classification or less, may direct the MHAP and Town to pro-actively pursue research and designation independent of imminent concern.

Clusters of properties, such as in South Ward, or the Church and Princess streets cluster, may lead to consideration of Conservation District (Part V) designation under the Ontario Heritage Act, even if many of the properties are not listed on the Heritage Register. Many of the buildings in these areas, even with later claddings, would qualify under the above proposed Community Context classification as they have the form and scale of traditional structures indicating they are of the 19th century, further communicated by stone foundations – as opposed to concrete.

Each property is also provided with a photo that is dated and provides a source of origin. Sometimes multiple photos are provided to show different elevations if this is helpful, and/or archival images.

Sample of completed O. Reg. 9/06 Criteria, and list of heritage attribute(s) for Christ Church, Gananoque, a designated building.

O. Reg. 9/06 Criteria	Meets Criteria (Y/N)	Summary
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,	Yes	Built in 1857-58, with the tower and spire completed ca. 1880 to the original design, Christ Church Gananoque is an early example of the Ecclesiological (also called the Oxford or Tractarian) Movement interpretation of the Gothic Revival style in Eastern Ontario that appeared in Britain and its colonies starting in the 1840s.
ii. displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit, or	Yes	Christ Church Gananoque is distinctive for the high quality of its masonry construction of predominantly local sand stone combined with limestone components.
iii. demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement.	No	Christ Church shows only modest technical or scientific achievement for the area for its time, despite the breadth of the nave, and the height of the tower and spire.
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,	Yes	Christ Church Gananoque has direct associations with the influence of the establishment Church of England (now Anglican) in Gananoque, in what became Canada. The parish has had notable involvement with broader prominent Anglican endeavours including the Women’s Auxiliary, the Anglican Young People’s Association, various on-going Scouting activities, and Camp Hyanto – a leading Anglican youth outreach facility in Eastern Ontario.
ii. yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of a community or culture, or	Yes	Located to the west of the Gananoque River, in an area dominated by commodious and grand houses, the property illustrates the development of this area of Gananoque for the land-holding and manufacturing elite. The property may exhibit some archaeological potential. However,

O. Reg. 9/06 Criteria	Meets Criteria (Y/N)	Summary
		archaeology can be addressed through another process.
iii. demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer or theorist who is significant to a community.	Yes	Christ Church Gananoque was designed by its first rector, Rev. John Carroll. Although not known to be a trained architect or designer, it is believed that he was conversant with the design precepts of the Ecclesiological Movement. Any subsequent architectural designs by him are not known.
3. The property has contextual value because it,		
i. is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an area,	Yes	The property is an integral feature in maintaining the character of the area on the west side of the Gananoque River, and the traditional setting amongst commodious and grand residences of the 19 th and early-20 th centuries. In the 19 th century, churches promoted and set the tone for town development.
ii. is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings, or	Yes	The property is of high correlation to the physical, visual and historical surroundings in which it is located. It is believed to be the first structure of consequence on the site.
iii. is a landmark.	Yes	As a long-standing religious structure with a highly prominent spire, that is still a dominating feature of Gananoque, the property is a landmark.

Heritage Attributes

- an early example of the Gothic Revival style in Gananoque reflecting the Ecclesiological Movement of Britain and its colonies
- local sandstone of the walls and buttresses, with limestone accents such as a drip course protecting the top of the foundation line and buttress caps
- picturesque, asymmetrical composition with a dominating corner entrance tower supported by angle buttresses, capped by an attenuated cedar shingle-clad spire ventilated with louver fronted dormers at two levels, with a stone stringcourse of decorative, small corbels between the tower the and spire
- the main entrance, through the tower, features elaborate hinged brackets that support the wood double entrance doors (two per door), it is located on the north/side of the tower under a curved-pointed double-arch setback below two relieving arches and under a triangulated decorative label drip mold topped by an ornamental boss

E. Tumak: Draft Heritage Register – Rationale, 20 January 2021

- windows that are mostly squat and triangular-topped – which are exceedingly unusual for a stone Ecclesiological Movement structure, save for the most sacred window above the altar (a more expensive treatment) which features a more traditionally proportioned Gothic Revival style curved-pointed arched window, set below a double-arch recessed opening
- three dormers on each side of the single-cell nave roof, with no dormers over the lower chancel
- squat buttresses support the nave, with an angle buttress used at the southeast corner
- all the window glazing featuring memorial and non-memorial stained and early glass windows
- 1910 bell
- Exclusions: parish hall, non-traditional church shingling of the nave and chancel

Sample of clear O. Reg. 9/06 Criteria table.

O. Reg. 9/06 Criteria	Meets Criteria (Y/N)	Summary
1. The property has design value or physical value because it,		
ii. 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,		
ii. 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		

O. Reg. 9/06 Criteria	Meets Criteria (Y/N)	Summary
iv. 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,		
iv. is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an area,		
v. is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings, or		
vi. is a landmark.		

STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS

Edgar Tumak, B.A. (Hons., Cultural History), M.Sc. (Architecture), CAHP

145 John Street

Gananoque ON K7G 1A6

office 613-382-3103, cell 613-770-5496, email newtumson@gmail.com www.edgartumakheritage.com

Edgar Tumak, B.A. (Hons., Cultural History), M.Sc. (Architecture), CAHP, is an Architectural Historian and Cultural Heritage Specialist. He holds a Master's Degree from the Bartlett School of Architecture and Planning, University College, University of London, England, and has pursued Canada's architectural history of the 19th - 20th centuries, since 1987. Born in Saskatoon, he has also lived in Winnipeg, Montreal, and Ottawa (where he graduated with Honours History from Carleton University). He also lived in Vienna, working with the United Nations Secretariat Information Service.

Returning to Canada from England, he was a research assistant for the foremost survey of architecture in Canada by Harold Kalman. Later, he worked for Parks Canada, promoting the value of more recent architectural heritage, as well as the City of Ottawa as a heritage planner. Much of his career has been as a consultant. Clients include various levels of government: e.g., National Historic Sites Directorate, Heritage Conservation Programme of Public Works and Government Services Canada, Valued Assets of Foreign Affairs and International Trade, and municipalities. He has also worked with authors, designers, and heritage organisations. With his spouse he moved to the small town of Deseronto, west of Kingston, Ontario (an easy commute to Ottawa, Toronto or Montreal), starting in 2002, to reside in and restore an 1878-88 former Anglican church, designed by architect Frank Darling whose firm designed many structures for the University of Toronto, the Anglican Diocese of Toronto, and the Centre Block of Parliament in Ottawa. He now lives in Gananoque.

Edgar has served on numerous professional and volunteer bodies: e.g., Executive Member of the Society for the Study of Architecture in Canada (Treasurer), and the City of Ottawa Heritage Committee. His scholarly articles include 25 biographies of Canadian architects and planners for the international art history encyclopaedia, the Allgemeines Künstlerlexikon (Leipzig: K.G. Saur Verlag GmbH & Co.).

Edgar served for two terms as a town councillor (2006-14) for the Town of Deseronto, focusing on Economic Development, Transit—now an award-winning regional rural public transit system (chairperson of the management committee since 2007), environmental issues particularly as a board member of the Quinte Conservation Authority, and land claim issues—informed by his role with the Mohawk Anglican Parish of Tyendinaga, notably as a church warden and elder (even though not Mohawk). Edgar has backgrounds in French, German, Mohawk and Ukrainian languages.