

ADDENDUM

Date: Monday, March 4, 2024
Time: 6:30 p.m.
Location: Virtual Meeting

Live streaming video is available on <https://www.oakville.ca/town-hall/mayor-council-administration/agendas-meetings/live-stream> or at the town's YouTube channel at <https://www.youtube.com/user/TownofOakvilleTV>. Information regarding written submissions and requests to delegate can be found at <https://www.oakville.ca/town-hall/mayor-council-administration/agendas-meetings/delegations-presentations>.

Pages

***7. Discussion Item(s)**

***7.1 Notice of Intention to Demolish – 530 Carson Lane**

3 - 42

Recommendation:

1. That the property at 530 Carson Lane be removed from the Oakville Register of Properties of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest; and,
2. That, prior to demolition, the property owners allow for the salvage of materials from the house.

***9. Advisory Committee Minutes**

***9.1 Heritage Oakville Advisory Committee Minutes February 27, 2024**

43 - 46

Recommendation:

That the following recommendation pertaining to Item 4.1 of the Heritage Oakville Advisory Committee minutes from its meeting on February 27, 2024 be approved and the remainder of the minutes be received:

4.1 Heritage permit application HP005/24-42.20R 27 Reynolds Street – construction of a new second storey rear addition and ground floor staircase

1. That Heritage Permit Application HP005/24-42.20R for the construction of a new second storey rear addition with ground floor staircase at 27 Reynolds Street, as attached in Appendix B to the report dated February 13, 2024 from Planning Services, be approved subject to the following:
 - a. That final details on the windows, doors, trim, cladding materials and paint colours be submitted to Heritage Planning staff for final approval;
2. That this heritage permit expire two years from the date of final approval by Council.

***12. Consideration and Reading of By-laws**

Item 12.1 - By-law 2024-005, as revised February 29, 2024.

That the following by-law(s) be passed:

***12.1 By-law 2024-005, as revised**

47 - 52

Memorandum from Planning Services February 29, 2024

A by-law to designate the Miller House at 361 Macdonald Road as a property of cultural heritage value or interest, as revised.

REPORT

Planning and Development Council

Meeting Date: March 4, 2024

FROM: Planning Services Department

DATE: February 27, 2024

SUBJECT: Notice of Intention to Demolish – 530 Carson Lane

LOCATION: 530 Carson Lane

WARD: Ward 3

Page 1

RECOMMENDATION:

1. That the property at 530 Carson Lane be removed from the Oakville Register of Properties of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest; and,
2. That, prior to demolition, the property owners allow for the salvage of materials from the house.

KEY FACTS:

The following are key points for consideration with respect to this report:

- The subject property is on the Oakville Register of Properties of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest as a listed property.
- A notice of intention to demolish has been received with a supporting Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report.
- It is recommended that the property at 530 Carson Lane *not* be designated under the *Ontario Heritage Act* and that the property be removed from the Oakville Register of Properties of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest.
- Council must make a decision on the subject notice by March 22, 2024.

BACKGROUND:

The subject property is located on the south side of Carson Lane between Howard Avenue and Chartwell Road. The property contains a historic detached house. A location map is attached as Appendix A. Details on the property are included in the Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report, attached as Appendix B.

The Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report was completed by SMDA Design Inc. and submitted by the owners along with a notice of intention to demolish for the property.

The property was listed on the Oakville Register of Properties of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest as a non-designated property in 2009 based on its potential cultural heritage value or interest as the Cyrus W. Anderson House, a circa 1900 cottage-style house.

The submission was deemed complete on January 22, 2024. In accordance with the *Ontario Heritage Act*, Council has 60 days to consider the request. The 60-day notice period expires on March 22, 2024. The Heritage Oakville Advisory Committee considered this submission at the meeting on February 27, 2024 and supported the staff recommendation.

COMMENT/OPTIONS:

Process

When a notice of intention to demolish is submitted for a listed property, staff completes and/or reviews research to determine the design/physical, historical/associative, and contextual merits of the property. Through this process, the property is evaluated to determine if it is worthy of designation under the *Ontario Heritage Act*.

If the property meets criteria outlined in Ontario Regulation 9/06 and is considered to merit designation, a recommendation can be made to Heritage Oakville and to Council that a notice of intention to designate be issued for the property. If Council supports a recommendation to designate, Council must move that a notice of intention to designate be issued within 60 days of the notice of intention to demolish being submitted to the town.

If the staff investigation of the property does not provide sufficient evidence that the property merits designation, a recommendation can be made to remove the property from the Oakville Register of Properties of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest (the 'Heritage Register'). If Council supports the staff recommendation and does not issue a notice of intention to designate the property within the 60 days, the property is removed from the Heritage Register and the owner may then proceed with applying for demolition permit.

Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report

The owners have submitted a Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report that provides an overview of the property and the house and an assessment of its cultural heritage value. The report concludes that the property does not meet two or more of the criteria outlined in Ontario Regulation 9/06, as required by the *Ontario Heritage Act*.

In terms of design/physical value, the report notes that the building does retain a portion of the original cottage, but that the house has been heavily altered and is no longer a representative example of this style. It further concludes that the house does not display a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit and does not demonstrate a high degree of technical or scientific achievement.

In terms of historical/associative value, the report indicates that the property is associated with Cyrus Anderson, a prominent local banker, but that this was likely a rental property that he never occupied, diminishing the associative value. However, the first known owner who occupied the cottage was George C. Atkins, who purchased the property in 1945. Atkins was the publisher of the Oakville Record-Star, the local weekly newspaper. He also served as a trustee of the Oakville School Board for 18 years and then was appointed administrator of the high school board of trustees. Differing from the CHER conclusion, staff is of the opinion that the association with George C. Atkins meets the criteria for having historical or associative value *'because it has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization or institution that is significant to a community.'*

The report goes on to note that there is no evidence that the property has potential to yield significant information about a community or culture, and it is not known to be associated with a significant architect, artist, builder, designer or theorist.

In terms of contextual value, the report concludes that the property is generally linked to the Orchard Beach, or Orchard Park, development, although the connection is looser because the house pre-dates the development by around ten years. The report also concludes that the property is not important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of the area, which has seen significant change over the past three decades and is not considered to be a landmark.

Generally, staff concur with the findings of the Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report, apart from staff's opinion regarding the associative value with George C. Atkins. Based on staff's review of the report and an assessment of the property, the property only meets one criteria of Ontario Regulation 9/06 and is therefore not considered to have sufficient heritage value to merit designation under section 29, Part IV of the *Ontario Heritage Act*.

Review of Applicable Planning Policies

Provincial Policy

The Province of Ontario has made a clear commitment to the conservation of significant cultural heritage resources through its legislation and policies, including the *Ontario Heritage Act* (2021), *Planning Act* (1990, as amended) Provincial Policy Statement (2020), the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (2019).

The PPS (2020) and Growth Plan (2019) function together with the *Ontario Heritage Act* (OHA) by the shared principle that cultural heritage resources shall be conserved. The OHA sets out the procedures for evaluating and protecting heritage resources at the provincial and municipal levels. This includes the use of Ontario Regulation 9/06 as the means for determining if a property has cultural heritage value.

The evaluation of the house at 530 Carson Lane has not demonstrated that the property has sufficient cultural heritage value to be considered a cultural heritage resource that warrants protection under the OHA.

Town Policy – Livable Oakville Plan

Section 5 of the Livable Oakville Plan states, “Conservation of cultural heritage resources forms an integral part of the town’s planning and decision making. Oakville’s cultural heritage resources shall be conserved so that they may be experienced and appreciated by existing and future generations, and enhance the Town’s sense of history, sense of community, identity, sustainability, economic health and quality of life.”

Further, Section 5.3.1 of the Livable Oakville Plan states, “The Town shall encourage the conservation of cultural heritage resources identified on the register and their integration into new development proposals through the approval process and other appropriate mechanisms”. The Livable Oakville Plan is clear that cultural heritage resources should not only be conserved, but also incorporated into new developments. Commemoration is not considered ‘conservation’.

As the property at 530 Carson Lane has not been identified as having significant cultural heritage value or interest through the application of provincial policies such as Ontario Regulation 9/06, it is not required to be conserved through the cultural heritage policies of the Livable Oakville Plan.

Conclusion

Based on staff’s review of the property, including the Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report, the property only meets one criteria of Ontario Regulation 9/06 and does not have significant cultural heritage value. Therefore, the property does not merit designation under section 29, Part IV of the *Ontario Heritage Act*.

Staff recommends that the owner allow for the salvaging of architectural elements of the building. It is a standard practice to include salvaging as a condition as it allows for the retention and re-use of these materials and keeps these items from going to the landfill.

CONSIDERATIONS:

(A) PUBLIC

There are no public implications to consider.

(B) FINANCIAL

There are no financial implications to consider.

(C) IMPACT ON OTHER DEPARTMENTS & USERS

There is no direct impact on other departments and users.

(D) COUNCIL STRATEGIC PRIORITIES

This report addresses Council's strategic priority of Accountable Government.

(E) CLIMATE CHANGE/ACTION

A Climate Emergency was declared by Council in June 2019 for the purposes of strengthening the Oakville community commitment in reducing carbon footprints. The recommendation to salvage materials from the house helps to contribute to the town's initiatives to reduce carbon footprints.

APPENDICES:

Appendix A – Location Map

Appendix B – Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report

Prepared by:


Susan Schappert, CAHP, MCIP, RPP
Heritage Planner

Recommended by:

Kirk Biggar, MCIP, RPP
Manager, Policy Planning and Heritage

Submitted by:

Gabe Charles, MCIP, RPP
Director, Planning Services



Town of Oakville, Maxar; Microsoft

530 CARSON LANE

LOCATION

Community Development Commission



0 15 30 60
Meters



HERITAGE IMPACT STATEMENT

EFFECT OF DEVELOPMENT AT 530 CARSON LANE, OAKVILLE

PROPOSED DEMOLITION OF EXISTING BUILDING

JANUARY 5, 2024



Land Acknowledgement:

Honouring the Land and Territory Oakville, as we know it today, is rich in the history and modern traditions of many First Nations. From the lands of the Anishinaabe, to the Attawandaron and Haudenosaunee, these lands surrounding the Great Lakes are steeped in First Nations history. As we gather today on the sacred lands of Treaties 14 and 22, we are in solidarity with Indigenous brothers and sisters to honour and respect Mother Earth, the original nations of the trees and plants, the four legged, the flyers, the finned and the crawlers as the original stewards of Mother Earth. We acknowledge and give gratitude to the waters as being life and being sacred and to the carriers of those water teachings, the females. We acknowledge and give gratitude for the wisdom of the Grandfathers and the four winds that carry the spirits of our ancestors that walked this land before us.

The Town of Oakville is located on the Treaty Lands and Territory of the Mississaugas of the Credit. We acknowledge and thank the Mississaugas of the Credit First Nation, the Treaty holders, for being stewards of this traditional territory.

Overview & Background:

This report is prepared to address the proposed demolition of an existing single family residence located at 530 Carson Lane in the Town of Oakville (property description Part Lot 47, Plan 114). The property owners wish to demolish the building to allow the site to be redeveloped with a newer single family home. The particulars of the proposed home are not presently known.

530 Carson Lane is presently listed (not designated) under the Ontario Heritage Act. The building is identified for its cultural heritage value as follows:

Statement of Potential Cultural Heritage Value or Interest: Cyrus W. Anderson House - this property has potential cultural heritage value for its c. 1900 cottage house. ¹

The home has a plaque supplied by the Oakville Historical Society that indicates the construction date as c.1900 and the builder as Cyrus W. Anderson, Banker. Research below will confirm that this is likely correct as regards the original part of the home.

Rick Mateljan CAHP of SMDA Design Ltd. was engaged by the property owners to complete a Heritage Impact Study to assess the impact of this proposal. Original research was undertaken by Richard Collins, heritage consultant. A chain of title search was performed by Diane Harman, title searcher.

¹ Town of Oakville Property Information website

Terms of Reference:

The Town required terms of reference for Heritage Impact Assessments are as follows:

1. Introduction to the Property:

- a location plan and current site plan of the property/properties
- a written description of the property, its location and surroundings, including the heritage status of the development site and adjacent properties
- a written description of the heritage attributes of the site, including any significant features, buildings, landscapes and vistas

2. Research and Analysis

- a comprehensive review of the history of the property's development as documented in pictorial and textual records and as observed in as-found evidence
- a chronological history of the development of any structures, such as additions, removals, conversions, etc.
- an evaluation of the cultural heritage significance of the site in terms of its history, architecture and local context
- the reproduction of any pictorial records found, including relevant maps, atlases, drawings, photographs, permit records, land title records, assessment rolls, etc.

3. Statement of Cultural Heritage Value of Interest:

- a statement of cultural heritage value or interest and description of heritage attributes of the cultural heritage resource(s), in accordance with provincial legislation Ontario Regulation 9/06
- this statement will be informed by current research and analysis of the site as well as pre-existing heritage descriptions
- this statement will be written in a way that does not respond to or anticipate any current or proposed interventions to the site

4. Assessment of Existing Conditions

- a comprehensive written description of the physical condition of the structures on the site, including their exterior and interior
- current photographs of the property, including:
 - views of the area surrounding the property to show it in context with adjacent properties
 - exterior views of each elevation of each building
 - views of the property including all significant landscape features
 - interior views of each room in each building
 - close-up views of all significant interior heritage features

5. Impact of Development on Heritage Attributes:

- a discussion of the potential impacts the proposal may have on the site's heritage attributes
- negative impacts on cultural heritage resources may include:
 - destruction of any, or part of any, significant heritage attribute

- alteration that is not sympathetic to the heritage attribute*
- shadows created by new development that alter the appearance of or change the viability of a heritage attribute*
- isolation of a heritage attribute from its surrounding environment, context or significant relationship*
- direct or indirect obstruction of significant views or vistas*
- a change in land use which negates the property's cultural heritage value*
- land disturbances such as a grade change that alters soils and drainage patterns that adversely affect a cultural heritage resource*

6. *Considered Mitigation and Conservation Strategies:*

- an assessment of alternative options, mitigation measures and conservation methods that may be considered in order to avoid or limit the negative impact on the cultural heritage resource(s)*
- alternatives and strategies should have consideration for relevant cultural heritage policies (Provincial Policy Statement; Official Plan; Heritage Conservation District Plan, Designation By-law, if applicable)*
- recommendations for additional studies to be undertaken related to, but not limited to: restoration specifics, design guidelines, interpretation and commemoration, lighting, signage, landscaping, structural analysis, additional written and photo documentation prior to demolition, long-term maintenance plan*

1.0 Introduction to Property:


1.1 Existing conditions on-sight



AIR PHOTO SHOWING DIVISION OF BUILDING INTO ELEMENTS




FRONT ELEVATION



EAST ELEVATION



REAR ELEVATION



WEST ELEVATION



FRONT ELEVATION



REAR ELEVATION

530 Carson Lane is a one-storey, single family home with stucco cladding, wood windows and trims and asphalt shingles. It presents itself in three discrete elements. Two of these are visible from the street and are labelled “A” and “B” in the air photo above. The third element “C” is visible from the rear.

The building finishes are uniform with light gray stucco, cream-white trims and windows, and blue doors and shutters on the front elevation.

The building is generally in good condition and was recently inhabited. No significant areas of deterioration or concern as regards building structure or systems were observed. Exterior and interior finished had obviously received regular maintenance and there was no apparent reason that the present residential use could not be continued indefinitely.

As would be expected in a building of this age and type, all of the bathrooms and the kitchen have been renovated with non-original finishes and fixtures.

Easterly Element “A”

On the west side of the site is a one-storey, gable roofed structure approx.. 23’ wide x 16” deep. The roof is low-slope with ridge parallel to the road. When viewed from the street this building element is significantly lower than the easterly element “B”. The front elevation of “A” consists of three shuttered, paired casement windows.

Element “A” consists on the interior of the Hall, Kitchen, Study, one Bedroom with Ensuite Bathroom and stairs to the basement. “A” is the only part of the building with a basement. The basement is finished as a Recreation Room and Laundry Room.

Element “A” presents on the east elevation as simple gable wall with a single, shuttered, paired casement window. On the south (rear) elevation “A” is minimally visible as it is generally covered by Element “C” described below. “A” is not visible on the west elevation.

Analysis below will conclude that this is the oldest part of the building.

Westerly Element “B”

Element “B” is located to the west of “A”, on the right side of the front elevation. “B” is also a gable roof structure with ridge parallel to Carson Lane but it is significantly taller than “A” and also more prominent because it’s front wall is closer to the street than “A”. “B” presents on the street with two pairs of shuttered French windows with wrought iron guards. These windows are a handsome proportion and create an interesting level of detail on the front elevation.

“B” also includes the front porch and associated roof and columns. The front door is four-panelled wood with paired sidelites. There is a flat-roofed canopy at the front door with square wood columns and pilasters. The columns and pilasters are trimmed with a false wood panel detail.

“B” consists on the interior of the front vestibule, main house bathroom, master bedroom, living room and dining room. These are all attractive rooms of pleasing size and proportions. There is no basement, only a shallow crawlspace beneath this area.

“B” presents on the west elevation as a gable wall with a single, shuttered, paired casement window and another newer, rectangular window near the peak. There is a chimney breast but no other detail. On the south (rear) elevation “B” is minimally visible because as it is generally covered by Element “C” described below, although the higher roofline of “B” continues to be a prominent element.

Analysis below will conclude that this is the second oldest part of the building.

Southerly Element “C”

Element “C” presents as two flat roofed octagonal bay windows on the south side of the dwelling. By their appearance and detailing they are obviously newer than the rest of the building. It is obvious that no great effort went into integrating these into the fabric of the original parts of the building. They appear very obviously added on, although not unattractive.

Analysis below will conclude that these are the newest parts of the building.

Site and Environs

The site is generally treed and quite dense with various plantings, low masonry walls and garden accoutrements. There is a shed at the south-west corner of the rear yard. This building is quite articulated and presents as a garden folly. The former use of this building is not known. It appears to have some general storage and tools inside now.

The community surrounding the subject site consists of single family homes on typical suburban lots on a street characterized by a suburban road profile. The surrounding homes are a mix of older, smaller homes that have been extensively renovated and expanded and newer, contemporary homes. There is very little of the original building fabric extant in the community. Research below will show that this building (specifically Element “A”) was likely the original building in this community but the majority of buildings that followed it have been removed in the later 20th and early 21st centuries and little original building stock remains. There are no other heritage listed or designated homes in the immediate vicinity.

Architectural style and assessment:

The original building exhibits vernacular neo-classical elements in its form, materials and massing. It is of attractive proportions and the windows, trims and shutters provide interesting level of detail and craftsmanship. Despite the fact that it was constructed incrementally the various building elements are sympathetic to each other and the building presents as an attractive, unified composition.

2.0 Research & Analysis

2.1 List of Property Owners

September 6, 1806 – purchased by British crown through Treaty 14
February 25, 1808 – Conc. 4 SDS, Lot 11 “and other lands” (including Lot 12) transferred to land agent Samuel Fraser. He settled on Lot 12.
September 24, 1813 – all of Lot 11 sold by Fraser to George W. Griggs
Griggs began selling Lot 11 in portions
June 30, 1857 – Griggs sold a portion of Lot 11 to Cyrus John Patterson
all land transfers following are for the portion of Lot 11 that includes the subject property.
September 20, 1884 – purchased by Charles and Elizabeth Norman
May 16, 1889 – purchased by Jonathan Palmer, and transferred that same day to James and Eliza Jackson
September 18, 1890 – purchased by Cyrus William Anderson
December 13, 1902 – acquired by the Bank of Hamilton from the assets of Cyrus W. Anderson
March 14, 1903 – transferred to Edward Roper Curzon Clarkson, insolvency receiver
January 7, 1907 – to Joseph Augusten [indecipherable last name], representing the Bank of Hamilton as land agent
May 10, 1907 – purchased by Charles David Carson
November 28, 1907 – registration of Plan 114 with the Township of Trafalgar by Charles D. Carson, subdivided the portion of Lot 11 purchased on
June 30, 1857. All transfers following are for all or part of Lot 47 of Plan 114
July 15, 1911 – purchased by James J. Allward
March 31, 1920 – granted to George Stanley Harding
September 23, 1925 – Lot 47 subdivided
September 23, 1925 – easterly portion of Lot 47 purchased by Jonathan Hall Shields
May 10, 1939 – purchased by Evelyn Mable Scott from the estate of Jonathan H. Shields
April 12, 1945 – purchased by George C. Atkins
May 18, 1965 – purchased by Richard Victor Bingham Caldwell
October 12, 1966 – bequeathed by the late Richard V.B. Caldwell to his widow, Phyllis E. Caldwell (Ramsay-Smith, from 1970)
December 21, 1972 – purchased by Diana and Katherine Caldwell
May 22, 1980 – to Phyllis B. Caldwell
April 1, 1987 – purchased by Patricia D. Mair
April 11, 1987 – purchased by Beverley Bellis and James MacLean
January 31, 1990 – purchased by John Barry French and Gloria J. French

2.2 Historical Relevance of Property Owners

Mississauga Nation

Haudenosaunee and Anishinabe people have been living in the Oakville area for at least 8,000 years, based on tradition and archaeological evidence. It is known that an Anishinabe community – the Mississaugas – had settlements at the Twelve Mile (Bronte) and Sixteen Mile (Oakville) creeks when the British Crown negotiated a land surrender for this area in 1805.

British military forces defeated the French in North America in 1760. In 1763, officers of King George III drafted a royal proclamation declaring the people inhabiting North America at that time as the rightful owners of the land, and that if the British crown desired to settle any land in North America they would have to negotiate treaties to purchase land from each respective Indigenous nation. A conference held a year later at Fort Niagara (present-day Youngstown, New York; which was still British territory, at the time) between representatives of Britain's Department of Indian Affairs and chiefs and councilors of 22 Indigenous nations agreed on territorial boundaries. At this meeting, the watershed area consisting of all lands where rivers drained into the western half of Lake Ontario, from the Niagara River to the Trent River, were acknowledged as the ancestral lands of the Mississauga Nation (identified at the time as the "Chippewas of Toronto").

British Crown

In 1805, the Deputy Superintendent General of Indian Affairs, William Claus met with four representatives of the Mississauga Nation living in villages on the 12 Mile and 16 Mile Creeks, and the Credit River; Chechalk (crane clan), Quenepenon (otter clan), Wabukanyne the younger (eagle clan) and Okemapenesse (eagle clan). These Mississauga leaders agreed to sell the land from Etobicoke Creek to Burlington Bay to the Crown, extending northward to today's Eglinton Avenue. Treaty 13A permitted British surveyors to occupy their lands for the purpose of determining the size and extent of land to be sold. Treaty 14, signed a year later, officially transferred the 13A lands to the Crown, with the Mississauga nation retaining exclusive fishing rights on the Credit, and the 12 Mile and 16 Mile Creeks. The subject property – 530 Carson Lane – is part of the Treaty 14 Surrender.

During the survey, which divided the tract into concessions and lots, the subject property became part of a larger lot identified as Lot 11 of Conc. 4 SDS (south of Dundas Street); or Conc. 4 SDS, Lot 11.

Crown Land Agents, and Owners Who Did Not Settle on the Subject Property

In order to develop the recently surveyed Mississauga Tract, the Crown appointed land agents to sell properties to newly-arrived immigrants. Samuel Fraser was assigned as Crown agent for a number of lots on Concession 4 SDS. He settled on Lot 12, and sold Lot 11 to George Griggs in 1813. Griggs appears to have had difficulty selling land during and after the War of 1812. Peace in Canada in 1814 was part of a larger post-Napoleonic peace in the British empire. A healthy postwar economy at home slowed immigration to Canada from the UK. Most new settlers to Canada, and to Trafalgar Township, were Americans looking for cheap land north of the border. Griggs began selling portions of Lot 11 around 1850, and finally sold the portion of Lot 11 that contains the subject property to Cyrus Patterson in 1857. Patterson established a farm on this lot, but this home was on another part of the lot not associated with today's 530 Carson Lane, although the subject property was part of the Patterson's farm. The subject property remained farmland or fallow lands through the next few land owners until

the land was further subdivided, with a portion of this being sold in September 1890 to Cyrus William Anderson. He built the residence on the current subject property. It cannot be confirmed that Cyrus lived in the residence on the subject property.

Cyrus W. Anderson

The Anderson family owned several lots in Trafalgar Township and had established a large farm comprising all of Conc. 2 SDS, Lot 13 (about 2 km north of the subject property). Cyrus also owned property in Oakville on the northeast corner of Lakeshore Road and Allan Street, on which he commissioned a home around 1880 (demolished ~1965). So, Cyrus simultaneously owned two properties with a residential structure, just ~700 metres apart, from 1890 to 1902. One of these two was likely Cyrus' main residence. The other was likely a summer rental property. Given 530 Carson Lane's proximity to the lake shore, it is more likely that it was the rental property, and that Cyrus lived in the larger home at Lakeshore and Allan.

Cyrus' Ancestors

Cyrus Anderson's grandfather, Charles Anderson settled in Grimsby and is said to have been a friend of Joseph Brant; the leader of the Mohawk nation who received land in what is now Burlington after the American Revolution in recognition of his efforts to bring his nation into an alliance with Britain during the revolution. Charles named his eldest son Joseph Brant Anderson (1800-1879) in honour of the chief. Joseph is the father of the man who built the residence on the subject property. Joseph moved his family from Grimsby to Oakville soon after marrying Mary Elizabeth Moore (1808-1874) in 1827. Cyrus was the eldest of their children.

Cyrus' Family

Cyrus William Anderson (October 18, 1836 to Oct 22, 1920) married Margaret Hall (1838-1933) in 1860. They had six children.

- Orpha Emeline Anderson (1862-1914)
- Egbert Brant Anderson (1863-1907)
- James Hall Anderson (1865-1947)
- William Moore Anderson (1869-1909)
- Lucy May Anderson Hambrook (1870-1960)
- Stanley Pierce Anderson (1879-1923)

All of the children were born in Oakville. All of them died in Oakville, except the youngest, Stanley who moved to Inglewood, California and became a land developer there during one of Los Angeles' many housing boom-and-bust cycles.

Cyrus Anderson's Bank

Cyrus Anderson appears to have been a well respected member of the Oakville community. He was councilor for several years and was asked twice to run for office as the Liberal candidate for Halton, but refused both times, stating during the candidacy race in Halton in 1878 that his farm enterprises in Trafalgar Township kept him too busy to move to Ottawa. Cyrus' farming duties didn't stop him from establishing a private bank in 1887 to help farmers, like himself who had a hard time getting loans from the big charter banks.

Oakville's first bank was opened by the Bank of Toronto in 1855, but it closed for 1859 because there was too little businesses in such a small village to keep the branch open. Oakville had grown in the generation since that first bank's failure, so Cyrus decided in 1887 to open a bank. This was not a branch of a larger chartered bank, but an independent company that Anderson formed to attract local businessmen and farmers in the Oakville area who were displeased by the chartered banks that did not offer the long-term loans that farmers – especially market fruit farmers like those in Oakville – needed when investing in new saplings to replace aging fruit trees.

Anderson's bank, C.W. Anderson & Company (CWA&C), was not a chartered bank. Its customers' assets were not protected like banks there were chartered by the federal government. In return for government protection of its assets, chartered bank had to charge and pay out interest at levels set by the Bank of Canada. Private banks, like C.W. Anderson & Company did not seek government protection, and were free to charge interest on loans at self-imposed rates. Local banks that weren't bound to government regulation were popular in small farming villages – which Oakville was in the 1890s. Many of CWA&C's customers were area farmers who grew market fruits, like apples and peaches. Farmers investing in new saplings to replace aging trees might have to wait a decade for these trees to produce commercially-feasible crops, so they preferred unregulated banks like Anderson's which offered a longer repayment time on loans; albeit at higher rates of interest in return (which chartered banks were prohibited from doing).

Still, customers were cautious of banks that weren't able to protect their money from a bank failure, so Anderson affiliated with the government-chartered Bank of Hamilton. This larger bank offered protection for CWA&C's customers, but CWA&C had to pay a regular fee to the Bank of Hamilton in return for its protection. If CWA&C were to fail (which it later did), the Bank of Hamilton would become the main creditor of CWA&C's assets.

Anderson had a local competitor, Andrew & Howarth. It was affiliated with the Bank of Ontario. An earlier Oakville-based bank, Scott's, opened in 1880 but did not affiliate with a chartered bank and, as a result failed during a North American-wide recession in 1884.

In 1900, the name of the bank was changed to *Anderson & Sons* (A&S) when Cyrus appointed his first and third sons, Egbert and William to the board of his bank. Cyrus moved to Palmerston briefly to oversee the opening of a bank there which he had invested in along with partner J.W. Scott; leaving his sons to manage the Oakville bank.

Though considered a local bank, A&S was an institution with considerable financial strength. When the Andersons bank failed in 1902, it was the 14th largest in Ontario of 116 private banks. (It's local

competitor, Andrew & Howarth, was 96th.) The *Toronto Globe* noted, “The business of the Anderson Bank extended from Streetsville to Burlington, and back ten to 15 miles into the country.”

Despite its assets, Anderson and his sons had loaned about \$200,000 more than they could be expected to call back in short notice. This concerned the members of the board of the Bank of Hamilton, with which the Anderson were affiliated, and they called for the dissolution of the Anderson’s bank. The effects of the bank’s collapse on the community was devastating. The *Toronto Globe* observed, “every well-known merchant in Oakville . . . has an account of size with the bank.” After the Anderson family’s assets were stripped, most of these businesses got back about 12 cents on every dollar deposited.

Property in Receivership

Land registry records for the subject property show that in March 1903 Anderson’s property on Carson Lane was transferred to Edward Roper Curzon Clarkson, along with other lots owned by Cyrus. Clarkson did not live in the residence on the subject property. He was the “receiver” placed in charge of Anderson’s assets, so that his property, possessions and money could be “liquidated” to compensate people who had invested in his bank, or who had deposited money there. Anderson lost the subject property during the liquidation.

Cyrus Anderson, after the Bank’s Collapse

An article in the *Toronto Globe* following the bank’s collapse observed, “not one of nearly a score of creditors interviewed had a word of reproach or condemnation for Anderson & Son[s].” Still, it appears that the tragedy of the bank failure took a toll on the Andersons. The eldest son Egbert Brant Anderson died only four years later at age 43. The *Toronto Globe* noted in Egbert’s obituary, “all the time he was worrying over the failure . . . the worry resulting in the pernicious anaemia from which he died.” In better days, Egbert was an Oakville town councilor and a member of Halton County council. His brother, and partner in the bank, William Moore Anderson died two years later, at age 39.

Cyrus Anderson lost the retail and office rental building that he had built on Lakeshore Road in 1887. His bank was located in one of the units. As a final insult, the liquidators sold the office block in 1903 to an owner who immediately rented out the unit where Anderson’s bank had been to the Bank of Toronto, which opened an Oakville branch. There was a slight consolation, however. Cyrus’ youngest son, Stanley was appointed assistant manager of the new bank.

This office block, commissioned by Cyrus (at 134-138 Lakeshore Road East) was designated under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act in 1990.

Cyrus Anderson died at the age of 83 at the Conc. 2 SDS, Lot 13 farm that he moved to after his two residences within the Town of Oakville (including the subject property) were lost in the bank collapse. The Anderson family was able to protect its Conc. 2 SDS, Lot 13 farm from the Bank of Hamilton’s liquidation because Cyrus had transferred ownership of the farm to son J. Hall Anderson – the one son of Cyrus’ four that Cyrus may have intentionally kept out of the banking firm to protect the family’s farm assets in the event of the bank’s possible failure.

Charles David Carson

Cyrus' property at Conc. 3 SDS, Lot 12 was sold by the Bank of Hamilton to developer William Sinclair Davis. Today's *Brantwood Survey* residential neighbourhood – bounded by Allen Street, the QEW, Gloucester Avenue and Lakeshore Road East – was developed on this property. Carson was an investor in Davis' *Brantwood Survey* subdivision. This neighbourhood was named after Cyrus' father, Joseph Brant Anderson (1800-1879).

Like Davis, Carson was a property developer. In 1907, he purchased Cyrus Anderson's farm on part of Conc. 4 SDS, Lot 11 – which includes the subject property – from the Bank of Hamilton. He formed a partnership with Samuel Edward Bacon, and had Cyrus' property (and others) registered with the Township of Trafalgar as Plan 114. The subject property became Lot 74 of this plan.

Because the subject building was already standing on the new subdivision, Carson either lived in this house while lots were sold for developed, or Carson may have continued to rent the home, as Cyrus had likely been previously doing.

Carson & Bacon, Developers

In the October 22, 1906 edition of the *Toronto Star*, three small ads appeared in the classified section for the benefit of those in Toronto and Hamilton with the money and the interest to buy cottage land in Oakville. The ads were placed by a land agency, Nisbet & Bacon. Samuel Bacon was born in Plumstead, England but moved to Canada when he was two. He married Reverend Nisbet's daughter Mary Jane and in doing so acquired the Bacon waterfront lands. As Oakville began its transition from harbour town to cottage country, Bacon chose to subdivide his lakeside properties for development. But to do that he needed an experienced homebuilder and contractor. That man was Charles David Carson (1864 to 1944).

Carson lived his entire 80 years in Oakville. He was the youngest son of William Thomas Carson of St. Andrews, New Brunswick. Charles Carson built the Oakville Trafalgar High School in 1909. A year later he served as a town councilor. His wife Margaret's parents were founders of St. John's Methodist Church (St. John's United Church, from 1925). Charles was a temperance leader in Oakville during the Depression.

Orchard Beach

In 1906, Bacon registered Plan 110, and hired Carson as a contractor for new homes on the development. A year later, Carson invested in a second development project immediately to the west, when he acquired Cyrus Anderson's lot (which included the subject property). Together the Plan 110 and Plan 114 developments occupy the land south of Lakeshore Road East between Park Avenue and the Eight Line (Chartwell Road). Carson marketed this development as *Orchard Beach*, although the development was later re-branded as *Orchard Park* to avoid confusion with a resort development on Lake Simcoe which had also adopted the *Orchard Beach* name.

The subject building is part of the *Orchard Park* neighbourhood, although it appears that this house predates the development; making it the oldest house in the neighbourhood.

James John Allward

The subject property was sold in 1911 to James J. Allward. He was a jeweller and watchmaker in Hamilton who moved to Toronto in 1897. Allward was living in Toronto when he purchased the subject property, so it is possible that 530 Carson Lane was his summer residence. Or possibly it was a summer rental property, since Allward also owned other nearby properties in Plan 114, including Lots 18, 28 and 29. Allward's name appears in the 1913 edition of *Dau's Society Blue Book of Toronto and Hamilton* (a social register of the area's elite families) with his main residence identified as 11 Dunbar Road, Toronto. The entry does not include a summer residence. This suggests that Allward owned 530 Carson Lane, and his other Oakville lots, as rental properties.

George Stanley Harding

No information was found on this property owner.

Jonathan Hall Shields

The Hon. Johnathan H. Shields (1849 to January 4, 1939) was a Halton County magistrate for 27 years. He lived his entire life in Oakville. He married Mary Foster. They had five daughters. Johnathan's obituary states that he died in his Oakville home on George Street, so the property he owned at 530 Carson Lane at the time of his death was likely a rental property.

Evelyn Mable Scott

No information was found on this property owner.

George Carman Atkins

George C. Atkins and Marie Eddington Boyd Atkins were the next owners of the subject property, and are the first owners which can be confirmed as using this home as a primary residence. They had two sons. The eldest, George Atkins, Jr was born in 1925 and died in 1943 during an RCAF training mission in Saskatchewan before seeing action in WWII. The younger son, Thomas served in the Lorne Scot Regiment during WWII and became a commercial printer after the war.

George C. Atkins was the publisher of the *Oakville Record-Star*. The weekly newspaper's office and printing press was at Church Street and Thomas Street. George was also a trustee of the Oakville School Board for 18 years, and was then appointed administrator of the high school board of trustees. These positions were by public election, so he must have been popular with Oakville voters, but it seems a generation in Oakville residents too young to vote didn't share their parents' opinion on Atkins. In 1961, when the school proposed to change the name of Oakville-Trafalgar High School to *George C. Atkins Secondary School*, in honour of the long-serving trustee, there was a student protest over the name change; although one student interviewed by the *Toronto Star* seemed to dislike the proposed change of school name because, "we'd have to learn new yells".

Richard Victor Bingham Caldwell and descendants

Richard Caldwell (?-1966) married Phyllis Elizabeth Pattison (1917-2015) in 1940. Richard was a captain with the Royal Canadian Armoured Corps during WWII, and was a major with the Royal Canadian Dragoons – a reserve unit stationed in Toronto – after the war. He had been living at 38 Crescent Drive in Rosedale, but purchased the subject property in 1965 at the time he retired from the Canadian armed forces. He died a year later in Oakville, but the property remained with his family for 22 more years.

Dr. J. Barry French

Barry French (born 1931) purchased the subject property in 1990. French was a professor of aerospace engineering at the University of Toronto's *Institute for Aerospace Studies*, from 1968 to 1985. This institute developed optical spectrometers that were used on NASA's *Viking* space probe to accurately determine the chemical make-up of stars and planets.

In April 2008, Dr. French was awarded the *Order of Canada* at a ceremony at Rideau Hall – the residence of the governor general – for his “scientific insights and entrepreneurship”. In investing French with Canada’s highest honour, the Right Honourable Michaëlle Jean noted that Dr. French was “a long-time proponent of university-industry collaboration, [who] has been a role model to many young scientists.”

In April 1970, Dr. French headed a team of five scientists at the University of Toronto when they received an urgent call from engineers at Grumman Aerospace asking for the assistance of French and his team to help save the lives of three astronauts. Specialists at Mission Control in Houston were uncertain how to bring Apollo 13’s command module home safely after a crisis in orbit forced the crew to return to Earth earlier than planned, with the command module and the lunar module still attached. (Only the command module was designed to re-enter the atmosphere.) Mission Control needed French and his team to crunch numbers (to within a fraction of pounds/square inch) to determine how much pressure to apply to the lunar module just before re-entry, to separate it from the command module without tearing the hatch off and suffocating the crew. And they needed the answer fast. Grumman’s engineers hadn’t taken a potential disaster into account in designing the “Lem”. They needed the world’s foremost experts on the “blast wave effect” to help them separate the Lem under an untested situation and get the command module home. French and his team worked out the problem over the phone and reported their results back to Mission Control. Their efforts, as is well known to history, were successful and the astronauts were returned safely.



TRAFALGAR TOWNSHIP MAP SHOWING HOLDINGS OF CYRUS ANDERSON (SUBJECT SITE LOCATION IN RED)

PLAN
OF A PART OF THE TOWN OF

OAKVILLE

BEING A SUBDIVISION OF PART OF
LOT NO. 11. CON. IV.

TRAFALGAR

SCALE
200 FEET - AN INCH

County of
Haldon
No. 114

I, Harvey Francis Fisher, the Town of Oakville
in the County of Haldon, make oath and say

1. That I was personally present and did see the within
plan duly signed by Chas. D. Carson
2. That the said plan was executed at the Town of Oakville
aforesaid
3. That I know the said Party
4. That I am a subscribing witness to the said plan

Sworn before me at Oakville in
the County of Haldon this 9 day
of May in the year of our
Lord 1907

N. J. Fisher

Notary Public

Owners Certificate

I hereby certify that this plan correctly
represents the subdivision of my land
and is prepared under my instructions

Witness
Chas. D. Carson

I hereby certify that this plan accurately shows the manner
in which the land included therein has been surveyed and
subdivided by me; and that the said plan is prepared
in accordance with the provisions of the Registry Act

Dated at Oakville Ont.
this 10th day of May 1907

Edgar Bray
Ontario Land Surveyor

I, Logan E. Murray, the Sheriff of Trafalgar in the County of Haldon, do hereby
certify that this plan and the registration thereof
dated the 10th day of May 1907.

Witness:


N. J. Fisher

COLBORNE STREET

The Corporation of the Town of Oakville hereby
consents to the width of streets as shown herein
as per resolution passed and dated the 28th day of
May 1907

John Kelly Mayor
Oakville, Ontario
May 11, 1907

Chas. A. Broadway Clerk




I certify that this plan
is duly registered in the Registry Office
in the Registry Office in the County
of Haldon on the 28th day of November
A.D. 1907 at 11.08 o'clock A.M. No. 114

LAKE ONTARIO

Former division of Lot D. 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60

PLAN OF SUBDIVISION. SUBJECT SITE LOCATION IN RED



PROPERTY ABSTRACT

3.0 Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest

The property must be evaluated under the criteria for designation under Ontario Regulation 9/06, *CRITERIA FOR DETERMINING CULTURAL HERITAGE VALUE OR INTEREST* Ontario Heritage Act.

The criteria are:

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.

Analysis: 530 Carson Lane is an example of vernacular neo-classical architecture. It presents as charming and pastoral but it has been highly modified since its original construction. The original building is the more minimal part of the building's mass when viewed from the street. It displays typical levels of craftsmanship and detail for a very small, residential building. It does not display significant technical or scientific achievement. The building does not rise to the level of Part IV designation because of its design or physical value.

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 the 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.

Analysis: 530 Carson Lane has historic and associative value because several of its early owners were of interest and renown in the local community, however the evidence is that this building was in many cases not their principal residence and when it was it does not appear that the home was in any way part of the historical or associative value of these individuals. Their place of business would typically be more closely associated with their cultural heritage importance. The most recent owner, Dr. French, is an interesting individual and of historical importance but again, this importance was in no way associated with his residence. The building does not rise to the level of Part IV designation because of historical or associative value.

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.

Analysis: 530 Carson Lane is not located in an established heritage community. The predominant character of the area is of newer, larger homes. As such, it does not define, maintain or support the character of the area. It is not physically, functionally or visually linked to its surroundings. It

is not a landmark. The building does not rise to the level of Part IV designation because of contextual value.

Conclusion:



530 Carson Lane does not meet the criteria for designation under Ontario Regulation 0/07. The building is not required to be conserved.

4.0 Assessment of Existing Conditions

The building has recently been occupied. Observation of the building reveals that it is in generally good condition and with regular maintenance could be made to function indefinitely. No cracks or leaks were observed. The building is square, level and plumb and all floors felt solid underfoot. It has obviously had regular ongoing maintenance. Nothing about the Building's condition is atypical for a building of this age, indeed given its apparent age the condition is remarkably good.



FRONT AND REAR ELEVATIONS SHOWING REGULAR MAINTENANCE, SERVICEABLE CONDITIONS



FLOORPLANS SHOWING SEQUENCE OF CONSTRUCTION

Element “A” is clearly the original part of the building. This is obvious from a number of factors including similarity in windows, flooring materials, wall thicknesses and the presence of a basement under only this part of the building. It was not possible to observe any original framing materials that would have given any more clarity of the construction date but generally the date of c. 1900 identified the front door plaque and confirmed by the historical research appears to be accurate.



PARTIAL FRONT ELEVATION SHOWING HISTORICAL PLAQUE

Element “B” was clearly built much later than “A” although the detailing and massing of these elements are similar. The date of construction of “B” cannot be determined conclusively but there are some clues that would indicate early to mid-20th century. The strongest indication of this comes from the framing materials which can clearly be seen in the crawlspace under “B”. These are modern, dressed joists that only became available in the mid 20th century. Early 20th century buildings were typically built with rough-cut joists. Another clue is the absence of any evidence of knob-and-tube wiring in the crawlspace. Even if this wiring had been removed, which often was done, it would leave a tell-tale pattern of paired holes in the joists and evidence of where the knobs had been fastened with wood screws to the joists. There is no evidence of this in the exposed framing in the crawlspace. This further substantiates a mid-20th century construction date for this building element.

There are also significant differences between the windows and window hardware when comparing Elements “A” and “B”, with those in “B” similar to “A” but clearly newer.



CRAWLSPACE UNDER "B" SHOWING MODERN FRAMING MATERIALS

Element "C" is clearly a much more modern addition to the building. This is obvious from the window details, the exterior cladding and trim materials (aluminum trims), the octagonal shape which was a design feature of the late 20th century. All of these details let us determine with confidence that this addition was added likely in the 1980's or 1990's.



ORIGINAL WINDOW ELEMENT "A"



WINDOW ELEMENT "B". NOTE SIMILAR MUNTIN PATTERN BUT DIFFERENT HARDWARE FROM "A", FRAME WIDTH



MODERN WINDOW ELEMENT "C"



LIVING ROOM "B", WINDOW "C" AT RIGHT



MARBLE FIREPLACE "B"



DINING ROOM "B"



KITCHEN "A". NOTE INTERIOR FINISHES NOT ORIGINAL



SITTING ROOM "C"



HALL "A" LOOKING TOWARD FRONT ENTRY "B"



PRIMARY BEDROOM "B"



BASEMENT RECREATION ROOM "A"



GARDEN SHED/FOLLY REAR YARD

5.0 Impact of Development on Heritage Attributes

The development will cause the loss of the heritage attributes of the subject site. Analysis of the building in Section 3 above indicates that the building does not meet the requirements of Ontario Regulation 9/06 as regards designation under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act and accordingly the development may proceed.

6.0 Considered Mitigation and Conservation Strategies

The loss of the heritage attributes of the subject site is mitigated by the documentation in this report. There are no materials on site that are worthy of preservation or re-use as part of a future development. The original windows and potentially the marble fireplace may be of interest to someone for re-use elsewhere and this would be desirable but any association with this building would be lost by that re-use. Accordingly the materials should be offered for re-use but in the absence of any interest no other mitigation would be necessary and the materials would simply be discarded.

There is no requirement for any on-site commemoration of the subject building.

The primary character-defining element of the building is its small size and scale, and this would almost certainly be lost in any development and there would be no effective way to retain it.

Conclusion

530 Carson Lane does not meet the requirements of Ontario Regulation 9/06, no mitigation is necessary beyond the documentation of this report and the building should be removed from the Oakville Heritage Register.

Bibliography:

Annual Publications

Dau's Society Blue Book of Toronto and Hamilton: Edition for 1913. New York, NY: Dau Publishing Co., 1912

Books

Ahern, Frances Robin, *Oakville - A Small Town – 1900-1930.* Erin, ON: Boston Mills Press, 1981

Mathews, Hazel Chisholm. *Oakville and the Sixteen.* Toronto, ON; University of Toronto Press, 1953

Pope, J.H. (editor). *Illustrated Historical Atlas of the County of Halton, 1877.* Toronto ON: Walker & Miles, 1877

Thorning, Stephen E.. *Hayseed Capitalists – Private Bankers in Ontario.* Hamilton, ON: McMaster University, 1994

Land Registry records

Halton County land registry records

Newspapers

The Globe/Globe & Mail. Toronto, ON, various issues from 1887 to 2014

Toronto Daily Star/Toronto Star. Toronto, ON, various issues from 1900 to 2014

Websites

Canadian County Atlas Digital Project; www.digital.library.mcgill.ca/countyatlas/searchmapframes.php



Heritage Oakville Advisory Committee

MINUTES

Date: February 27, 2024

Time: 9:30 am

Location: Virtual Meeting

Members: Drew Bucknall, Chair
Gerarda (Geri) Tino, Vice-Chair
Councillor Gittings
Jonathan McNeice
Russell Buckland
Kerry Colborne
George Gordon
Susan Hobson
Bob Laughlin (As of 9:40 a.m.)
Brenda Sweeney

Regrets: Jason Judson

Staff: Kirk Biggar, Manager of Policy Planning and Heritage
Carolyn Van Sligtenhorst, Supervisor of Heritage Conservation
Susan Schappert, Heritage Planner
Andrea Holland, Manager of Council and Committee Services
Natasha Coric, Council and Committee Coordinator

A meeting of the Heritage Oakville Advisory Committee was held on February 27, 2024, virtually commencing at 9:30 a.m.

These minutes will go forward to the Planning and Development Council meeting of March 4, 2024 for approval. Please view those minutes to note any changes Council may have made.

1. Regrets

Regrets are noted above.

2. Declarations of Pecuniary Interest

No declarations of pecuniary interest were declared.

3. Confirmation of Minutes of Previous Meeting(s)

3.1 Minutes January 30, 2024

Moved by Brenda Sweeney

That the minutes of the Heritage Oakville Advisory Committee meeting of January 30, 2024 be approved.

CARRIED

4. Discussion Item(s)

4.1 Heritage permit application HP005/24-42.20R 27 Reynolds Street – construction of a new second storey rear addition and ground floor staircase

The following delegate spoke on this item:

Terry Martino, Gren Weis Architect and Associates

Moved by Brenda Sweeney

1. That Heritage Permit Application HP005/24-42.20R for the construction of a new second storey rear addition with ground floor staircase at 27 Reynolds Street, as attached in Appendix B to the report dated February 13, 2024 from Planning Services, be approved subject to the following:
 - a. That final details on the windows, doors, trim, cladding materials and paint colours be submitted to Heritage Planning staff for final approval;
2. That this heritage permit expire two years from the date of final approval by Council.

CARRIED

4.2 Notice of Intention to Demolish – 530 Carson Lane

The following delegate spoke on this item:

Rick Mateljan, SMDA Design

A separate staff report(s) will be forwarded to a future Planning and Development Council meeting for consideration.

Moved by Councillor Gittings

1. That the property at 530 Carson Lane be removed from the Oakville Register of Properties of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest; and,
2. That, prior to demolition, the property owners allow for the salvage of materials from the house.

CARRIED

4.3 Notice of intention to designate – Multiple properties – February 27, 2024

A separate staff report(s) will be forwarded to a future Planning and Development Council meeting for consideration.

Moved by Kerry Colborne

That a notice of intention to designate be issued under section 29, Part IV of the *Ontario Heritage Act* for the following properties:

1. Thomas and Electa Leach House at 159 Balsam Drive;
2. Dunhope Heath at 2069 Lakeshore Road East; and
3. Louth House at 1099 Sixth Line.

CARRIED

5. Information Item(s)

5.1 Heritage Conservation District Update

5.2 Designation Project Update

Moved by Jonathan McNeice

That the information item(s) be received.

CARRIED

6. Date and Time of Next Meeting

Tuesday March 26, 2024 at 9:30 a.m.

7. Adjournment

Moved by George Gordon

That this meeting be adjourned.

CARRIED

The meeting adjourned at 10:05 a.m.

THE CORPORATION OF THE TOWN OF OAKVILLE

BY-LAW NUMBER 2024-005

A by-law to designate the Miller House at 361 Macdonald Road as a property of cultural heritage value or interest.

WHEREAS pursuant to Section 29, Part IV of the *Ontario Heritage Act*, R.S.O. 1990, chapter O.18, the council of a municipality is authorized to enact by-laws to designate a real property, including all buildings and structures thereon, to be of cultural heritage value or interest;

WHEREAS the property described in Schedule A to this By-law (“the Property”) contains the cultural heritage resource known as the Miller House;

WHEREAS the council of the Corporation of the Town of Oakville, by resolution passed on November 13, 2023, has caused to be served on the owner of the lands and premises at 361 Macdonald Road, Oakville, ON and upon the Ontario Heritage Trust, notice of intention to designate the Miller House at 361 Macdonald Road as a property of cultural heritage value or interest, and further, has caused the notice of intention to be published on the town’s website in accordance with the town’s *Ontario Heritage Act* Alternative Notice Policy;

WHEREAS no objection to the proposed designation was served on the municipality by December 15, 2023, being the last date for filing an objection;

AND WHEREAS the Town Council has described the Property, set out the statement of cultural heritage value or interest for the Property, and described the heritage attributes of the Property in Schedule “B” to this By-law, which forms part of this By-law;

COUNCIL ENACTS AS FOLLOWS:

1. That the real property legally described in Schedule “A” to this By-law, is hereby designated to be of cultural heritage value or interest under Section 29 of the *Ontario Heritage Act*.
2. That the attached Schedules form part of the By-law.
3. And that the Town Solicitor be authorized to cause a copy of this by-law to be registered against the property described in Schedule “A” at the Land Registry Office.

PASSED this 4th day of March, 2024

MAYOR

CLERK

SCHEDULE "A" TO
BY-LAW 2024-005

In the Town of Oakville in the Regional Municipality of Halton, property description as follows:

Miller House
361 Macdonald Road
Part Lots 58 & 59, Plan 113; As In 347520; OAKVILLE
PIN: 24806-0159

SCHEDULE "B" TO BY-LAW 2024-005

STATEMENT OF CULTURAL HERITAGE VALUE OR INTEREST

Description of Property

The property at 361 Macdonald Road is a corner lot located on the northeast corner of Macdonald Road and Allan Street in the Brantwood neighbourhood. The property contains a one-and-a-half storey, red-brick, wood shingles, and rough-cast stucco and half-timbering clad house that was built in 1913.

Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest

Design and Physical Value

The Miller House has design and physical value as a representative and early example of a Bungalow style home in Oakville built during the Arts and Crafts movement of the early 1900s. The house, which was built in 1913, features many architectural elements typical of the style including its one-and-a-half storey ground-hugging massing that is typical of the Bungalow style. With its broad, gently pitched gable roof covering its expansive porch, and its red-brick, wood shingles, and rough-cast stucco and half-timbering cladding materials, the Miller House reflects the Arts and Crafts movement's commitment to informality and the use of rustic and natural building materials. The house contains many original architectural elements that are reflective of the Bungalow style of architecture, including: a variety of window styles, including the typical Bungalow style small-paned casement windows; exposed rafter tails; a rusticated stone foundation; stone pillars topped by wood columns; and a large rustic stone chimney.

Historical and Associative Value

The Miller House property has cultural heritage value for its direct associations with the theme of the development of the local residential area known as 'Brantwood', an early 20th century subdivision of Oakville. The Arts and Crafts era character of the house has contributed to the neighbourhood's character over the last 100 years. Its presence contributes to the story of Oakville's early 20th century residential development that was defined by large lots with well-designed homes built by well-to-do families.

Contextual Value

The subject property has contextual value because it defines, maintains and supports the character of the Brantwood neighbourhood. As one of the earliest properties to be developed, and as a representative and early example of the Bungalow style of architecture in Brantwood, the Miller House property's presence as well as its design

elements are important in supporting and maintaining the historic character of Brantwood. The property is physically, functionally, visually, and historically linked to the surrounding residential neighbourhood. As an anchor point in the Brantwood neighbourhood, this house helps to define the original aesthetic of Arts and Crafts aesthetic of Brantwood and continues to support and maintain the character of the neighbourhood.

Description of Heritage Attributes

Key attributes of the Miller House that exemplify its cultural heritage value as a representative example of a Bungalow style house, as they relate to the original one-and-a-half storey house, include the following:

- Its massing and form with gently pitched gable roof and covered front porch;
- The presence of a front gable dormer in the Bungalow style;
- Brick cladding on the first storey and shingle cladding on the upper storey;
- Front porch with exposed eaves, stone piers, square columns, gently sloping arched fascia, and low railings with square pickets;
- The presence of windows and doors that retain the Bungalow style of the house with dressed stone sills; and
- Lakestone chimney on the west elevation.

For the purpose of clarity, the cultural heritage value or interest and heritage attributes do not include:

- The small one-storey, lean-to entryway section on the rear elevation;
- The single car detached garage; and
- The bay windows on the east and west elevations.

Memo

To: Planning and Development Council
From: Carolyn Van Sligtenhorst, Planning Services
Date: February 29, 2024
Subject: Heritage Designation By-law 2024-005 for the Miller House at 361 Macdonald Road – Minor revisions to by-law

Comments:

The owners of 361 Macdonald Road have requested minor edits to the list of Heritage Attributes on page 5 of the designation by-law. Staff is supportive of these changes as they are minor and still allow for the conservation of this cultural heritage resource. There are no changes to any other parts of this by-law.

The original By-law 2024-005 published on February 23, 2024 has been replaced.