

HERITAGE VAUGHAN REPORT

DATE: Wednesday, October 17, 2018

WARD(S): 1

**TITLE: DEMOLITION OF TWO DETACHED BUILDINGS AND NEW
DEVELOPMENT
9560 AND 9570 KEELE STREET
MAPLE HERITAGE CONSERVATION DISTRICT**

FROM:

Jason Schmidt-Shoukri, Deputy City Manager, Planning and Growth Management

ACTION: DECISION

Purpose

The purpose of this report is to seek a recommendation from the Heritage Vaughan Committee regarding a Heritage Permit application to demolish of the two detached houses municipally known as 9560 and 9570 Keele Street and the proposed new construction of 9 townhouse and 8 semi-detached dwelling units on a common element road on the properties as shown in Attachment #1, located within the Maple Heritage Conservation District ("Maple HCD").

Report Highlights

- The Owner is proposing to demolish the existing detached dwellings at 9560 and 9570 Keele Street and construct 9 townhouse and 8 semi-detached dwelling units on a common element road.
- Heritage Vaughan Committee review and Council approval is required under the *Ontario Heritage Act*.
- That, as per the minutes of the August 15, 2018 Heritage Vaughan Committee minutes, "consideration of this matter was deferred to the September 12, 2018, Heritage Vaughan meeting."

Recommendations

1. THAT the Heritage Vaughan Committee recommend to Council the approval of the Heritage Permit application to demolish of the detached dwellings at 9560 and 9570 Keele Street.
2. THAT the Heritage Vaughan Committee recommend approval to Council for the proposed new construction of 9 townhouse and 8 semi-detached dwelling units on a common element road under Section 42 of *Ontario Heritage Act*, subject to following conditions:
 - a) The related Development Applications under the *Planning Act* must receive final approval prior to the issuance of the Heritage Permit. It is understood that Heritage Vaughan Committee recommendations to Council regarding the issuance of a Heritage Permit do not constitute support for any Development Application under the *Planning Act* or permits or requirements currently under review or to be submitted in the future by the Owner as it relates to the subject application;
 - b) Any significant changes to the proposal may require reconsideration by the Heritage Vaughan Committee, which shall be determined at the discretion of the Director of Development Planning and Manager of Urban Design and Cultural Heritage;
 - c) That an Arborist Report and Tree Preservation Plan be finalized to the satisfaction of the City; and
 - d) That a final materials list be submitted to the City and finalized to the satisfaction of City Urban Design and Cultural Heritage staff.

Background

Location and Heritage Status

The two properties, known municipally as 9560 and 9570 Keele Street, form the lands subject to this application (hereinafter referred to as the "Subject Lands"). The Subject Lands are located on west side of Keele Street, south of Knightswood Avenue, as shown on Attachment #1. The Subject Lands are located within the Residential Village Area of the Maple HCD, and are protected under Part V of the *Ontario Heritage Act* ("OHA"). The Subject Lands are designated "Low-Rise Residential" by Vaughan Official Plan 2010 ("VOP 2010") and are located within a "Community Area" as identified in Schedule 1, the "Urban Structure" of VOP 2010.

This application was first presented to the Heritage Vaughan Committee at the August 15, 2018 meeting for their review. Following the staff report and presentations, the Committee discussed the proposal with the applicant and City staff. However, the

Heritage Vaughan Committee expressed their need for more review time and requested that the applicant submit colour renderings in support of their application. The applicant has subsequently supplied Cultural Heritage staff with the renderings as shown in Attachment #11. There is no other new information to consider and there are no alterations in design or materials.

The September Heritage Vaughan meeting was cancelled due to lack of quorum and this application has been brought forward to the October meeting to be reviewed by the Heritage Vaughan Committee prior to the 90 day deadline of November 13, 2018.

Previous Reports/Authority

Not applicable.

Analysis and Options

The Proposal requires the demolition of the two existing dwellings

The Subject Lands contain two dwellings that are described in the Maple HCD Inventory as shown on Attachment #3. The structure on 9560 Keele Street was built circa 1947 and the Maple HCD Inventory identifies its sympathetic construction and materials and notes that the “*building provides fitting and dignified presence at south end of village.*” The building at 9570 Keele Street is also known to have been built prior to 1954 and is identified as being a “good fit” for Maple, but not identified as strongly sympathetic as the building at 9560 Keele Street. Both entries identify several mature trees as part of the Maple streetscape. However, the structures are not identified as “Heritage Buildings” within 9.3.1 of the Maple HCD Plan. A review of the Subject Lands is included as part of the Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment (“CHIA”) submitted in support of the application, included as Attachment #5.

The Proposal is for 9 townhouse and 8 semi-detached dwelling units on the Subject Lands

The proposed new construction consists of 9 townhouse and 8 semi-detached dwelling units in 6 blocks for a total of 17 units as shown in Attachment #6. The proposed townhouse units are 3-storeys, measuring in height from 8.83 m (Block 1) to 9.34 m (Block 5). Blocks 2 – 4 facing Keele Street measure 9.06m to 9.25m from the established grade at Keele Street.

The applicant has filed an Official Plan Amendment (File OP.15.008), Zoning By-Law Amendment (File Z.15.034), a subdivision application (File 19T-15V014) and Site Development Application (DA.16.116) with the Development Planning Department. The applicant has appealed the Official Plan Amendment, Zoning By-Law Amendment and the Draft Plan Subdivision applications to the Local Planning Appeal Tribunal (LPAT formerly known as the OMB) for non-decision and the appeal is scheduled for a hearing on February 11, 2019.

The Site Development application has not been appealed and remains open. As the Site Development will require the approval of a Heritage Permit under the *Ontario Heritage Act*, this application is to be considered under the Act and the Maple Heritage Conservation District Plan.

The Proposal is subject to the applicable policies of the Maple HCD Plan

The Subject Lands are located within the Residential Village Area of the Maple HCD, and therefore the following applicable policies have been reviewed in consideration of the proposed development:

Section 4.3.3 – Non-Heritage Buildings – Demolitions

Generally, the demolition of a Non-Heritage building is not supported, if the building is supportive of the overall heritage character of the District.

Section 4.4.1 Design Approach – New Residential Buildings

- a) *The design of new buildings will be products of their own time, but should reflect one of the historic architectural styles traditionally found in the District.*

The proposed style of the townhouse and semi-detached units is inspired by the Victorian Vernacular style traditionally found in the District. This style has been adapted to be simpler and more restrained to be distinguishable as a product of its own time. The front facing Blocks 2-4 onto Keele Street and the semi-detached Block 5 which faces sideways along Keele Street provide more architectural detail for visual interest and to break up the visual elements of the semi-detached units.

- b) *New residential buildings will complement the immediate physical context and streetscape by: being generally the same height, width, and orientation of adjacent buildings; being of similar setback; being of like materials and colours; and using similarly proportioned windows, doors, and roof shapes.*

The proposed townhouse units are 3 storeys with a maximum height of 9.34 m which is consistent with the adjacent two-storey dwelling located at 9580 Keele Street. Semi-detached units are proposed along Keele Street (Blocks 2-4,5) with a smaller frontage than the remaining internal blocks (Block 1 and 6). The Keele Street blocks (2 – 4) are oriented towards Keele Street which is consistent with the immediate physical built context.

Block 5 is oriented internal to the Subject Lands, but the side elevation is designed to have the metal roof portion carried over to this facade to create a porch along the Keele Street streetscape. The remaining blocks (Blocks 1 and 6) are oriented towards the internal road, however they are

set behind the Keele Street fronting blocks so their orientation is screened from the Keele Street streetscape.

The setback of the units facing Keele Street is greater than the setback of the garage of the dwelling located at 9580 Keele Street, but this setback can be supported as it meets the policy of Section 9.5.2.1 (see below further discussion on setbacks).

The proposed brick materials, asphalt gable and the window and door proportions are consistent with the materials and detailing found on contributing buildings within the Maple HCD.

- c) *New residential building construction will respect natural landforms, drainage, and existing mature vegetation.*

The proposal will necessitate the removal of two hedges and 24 trees and the replanting a total of 12 new trees. Please see further discussion on plantings in the Cultural Heritage Landscapes section below.

- d) *Larger new residential buildings will have varied massing, to reflect the varied scale of built environment of the historical village.*

The applicant has proposed 3 semi-detached units along Keele Street, to provide an appropriate built form along the public street.

- e) *Historically appropriate façade heights for residential buildings has been 1 - 1/2 or 2 storeys. The façade height of new residential buildings should be consistent with the façade height of existing buildings. Differences in façade heights between buildings on adjacent properties within the district should be no more than 1-storey. In all instances the height of new buildings shall conform to the provisions of the City's Zoning By-law.*

The proposed townhouse units are 3-storeys in height, measuring from 8.83 m (Block 1) to 9.34 m (Block 5) in height. Blocks 2 – 4 facing Keele Street measure 9.06 m to 9.25m from the established grade at Keele Street, according to the HIA and submitted elevations. The proposed height of the development is compatible when compared from the street with the adjacent 2-storey dwelling located at 9580 Keele Street due to differences in the grading along Keele Street (as shown in Attachment #8). The proposed semi-detached units conform to the above policy.

Section 9.5.2.1 Residential Village – Site Planning

- *Site new houses to provide setbacks and frontages that are consistent with the variety of the village pattern.*

The proposed setback of the semi-detached units including the road widening from Keele Street, is greater than garage of the adjacent residential property 9580 Keele Street and the recent development of 9529 Keele Street (as shown in Attachment #5 - Figures 36 and 37 page 55).

Section 9.5.2.2 Residential Area – Architectural Style

- *Design houses to reflect one of the local heritage Architectural Styles. See Section 9.1.*

The proposed style of the townhouse and semi-detached dwelling units is inspired by the Victorian Vernacular style depicted in Section 9.1. This style has been adapted to be simpler and more restrained to be distinguishable as a product of its own time.

- *Use appropriate materials. See Section 9.8.*

The proposal includes two separate material schemes for the alternating blocks. The first material package includes ‘Old School’ Brampton Brick for the main facades and a ‘Aurora’ Brampton Brick accent. The second package includes ‘Crimson’ Brampton Brick for the main facades and a ‘Canyon’ Brampton Brick accent. The window and door materials for all units will be wood or vinyl pending further discussion of the materials list as shown on Attachment #9.

Section 9.5.2.3 Residential Area – Scale and Massing

- *New buildings should be designed to preserve the scale and pattern of the historic District.*

The semi-detached units facing Keele Street (Blocks 2 – 5) provide a building scale and pattern consistent with the historic District pattern. The proposed development also provides a transition “between the large estate homes north of the Subject Lands on the west side of Keele Street and the multi-residential apartments on the east side of Keele Street” (HIA).

- *New houses should be no higher than the highest building on the same block, and no lower than the lowest building on the same block.*

As previously stated, the proposed 3-storey (maximum 9.34 m) height is consistent with the adjacent 2-storey dwelling located at 9580 Keele Street, as shown in Attachment #8.

- *As far as possible, modern requirements for larger houses should be accommodated without great increases in building frontage. For example, an existing 1½-storey house could be replaced by a 2-storey house with a plan that included an extension to the rear. This might double the floor area without affecting the scale of the streetscape.*

As previously mentioned, the Keele Street facing blocks (Blocks 2 – 5) have been designed as semi-detached dwellings and provide a building scale and pattern consistent with the historic District pattern. Blocks 1 and 6 have larger frontages but both blocks are partially screened behind the Keele Street fronting blocks and therefore do not create a large building frontage along Keele Street, as shown in Attachment #8.

Cultural Heritage Landscape

The 2005 Maple HCD Inventory entry for 9560 and 9570 Keele Street identifies that the trees on this property are significant contributing elements to the Maple streetscape.

The proposal will preserve 9 of the existing trees on the Subject Lands including the Eastern Black Walnut trees on the south-east corner and the Norway Maple at the front of the property. The proposal will require the removal of two hedges and 24 individual trees.

In the context of the existing streetscape, the proposal will feature significantly more built form than currently exists. To mitigate the loss of the existing deciduous trees, the applicant is proposing new trees to be planted along Keele Street and interior to the site. These plantings include Green Mountain Sugar Maple, Autumn Blaze Maple, Common Hackberry, Skycole Honey Locust Ivory Silk Tree Lilac, Glenleven Linden and Accolade Elm, as shown on Attachment #10.

Archaeology

The properties have been identified as possibly having archaeological potential, the following standard clauses shall be applied to the Site Plan:

- i) *Should archaeological resources be found on the property during construction activities, all work must cease and both the Ontario Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport, and the City of Vaughan's Urban Design and Cultural Heritage Division in the Development Planning Department shall be notified immediately.*
- ii) *In the event that human remains are encountered during construction activities, the proponent must immediately cease all construction activities. The proponent shall contact the York Regional Police Department, the Regional Coroner and the Registrar of the Cemeteries Regulation Unit of the Ministry of Consumer and Business Services.*

Timeline

This application is subject to the 90 day review under the OHA. This application was declared complete on August 15th, 2018, and must be deliberated upon by Council by November 13, 2018, to meet the 90-day timeline. If this application is not considered by

Council by the 90 day deadline, it is considered to be approved as outlined under the OHA.

Financial Impact

There are no requirements for new funding associated with this report.

Broader Regional Impacts/Considerations

There are no broader Regional impacts or considerations.

Conclusion

Cultural Heritage staff have reviewed the Heritage Permit application to demolish the two existing structures and the proposed new construction for the lands known municipally as at 9560 and 9570 Keele Street. The proposed new construction is generally consistent with the Maple HCD Plan. Staff recommends that the Heritage Vaughan Committee approve the Recommendations in this report, including a Recommendation that Council approve a Heritage Permit for the proposed demolition and new construction.

For more information, please contact: Rob Bayley, Manager of Urban Design and Cultural Heritage, ext. 8254.

Attachments

1. Location Map
2. Site Photos
3. Maple Heritage Conservation District Inventory (Excerpt)
4. 1954 Aerial Photo
5. Cultural Heritage Resource Impact Assessment
6. Site Plan
7. Elevation Drawings
8. Colour Elevation Drawing
9. Materials List
10. Landscape Plan
11. Colour Renderings


Prepared by

Shahrzad Davoudi-Strike, Senior Urban Designer, ext. 8653


Rob Bayley, Manager of Urban Design & Cultural Heritage, ext. 8254

/CM

Location Map



Subject Property



Attachment 2

Subject Lands



9560 Keele Street



9570 Keele Street



Keele Street (west side)9560 Keele Street

- Tall, 1½ storey, red-brick house with large gabled block between hipped-roof wings (1950s).
- **Description** – South-facing house appears to be late interpretation of Arts-and-Crafts style, with variety of multiple-pane, double-hung wooden windows and storm windows, and with wooden trim throughout. East elevation faces Keele Street, and consists of one-storey, hipped-roof pavilion with central, paired 6/6 windows (behind 2-pane storms). Apertures have pre-cast sills, decorative wooden shutters, and header bricks over steel lintels (except at paired windows, which may be later). Entrance is to north, consisting of solid, panelled door (behind metal storm). Principal elevation is south façade, which is symmetrical composition of large, gabled central block and slightly recessed, hip-roofed wings to either side, in ABA rhythm. Central, gabled block has asymmetrical fenestration at ground floor, with triple, 6/6 windows to left of centre, and smaller, 3/1 unit to right; all with pre-cast sills and decorative shutters and, in this location, with header-course of red bricks over metal lintel. Windows in south elevation, side pavilions are single, 6/6 units, with other elements as described. All windows have multiple-pane wooden storms. Soffits are trimmed with v-jointed boards, and gable has narrow wooden fascia with simple batten as shingle-moulding. Roof is clad in asphalt shingles and there are no chimneys. A single-bay, flat-roof, red-brick garage is built against north wall of house.
- **History** – unknown; post-George Garrow.
- **Comments** – An unusual house, in good original condition and attractive in a variety of ways. House might be considered last-gasp Arts-and-Crafts, or even precursor to Post-Modernism; but using traditional materials throughout, with exception of concrete block at prominent foundation level. House is well screened from roads by combination of coniferous and

deciduous trees in various sizes. Building provides fitting and dignified presence at south end of village.

Keele Street (west side)

9570 Keele Street

- 1½ storey, stone-clad house with central large, gabled, second-floor dormer (1950s).
- **Description** – Modest, pitched-roof house has split-faced, random-course-rubble sandstone cladding throughout ground floor. Building is roughly symmetrical, with entry invisible from street, set in gabled north elevation. Ground floor has projecting central block, with large, asymmetrical window at north and small, tall window at south. North window consists of large, wooden, single-pane fixed sash, with 1/1 unit to right, while south window is unusual be 12-pane unit with metal muntins. At north wing, window is wide 1/1 unit (with metal storm), and at south wing, fenestration consists of 1/1 units flanking large, single-pane fixed sash (all behind single-pane wooden storms. Windows throughout robust stone sills and modest stone lintels, suggesting steel lintels behind. Large, gabled, second-floor dormer exists at central block, set above small asphalt-shingled roof. Dormer and is clad in horizontal aluminium siding, presumably over similar wooden siding. Soffits and eaves are clad throughout in aluminium, again assumed to hide original wooden trim beneath. Roof is clad in asphalt shingles. A pitched-roof, stone-clad, single-bay garage, with aluminium gladding at front gable, exists to north of house.
- **History** – unknown; post-George Garrow.
- **Comments** – An intriguing house, combining elements of the bungalow with more traditional element of gabled central upper floor. Use of coursed-rubble cladding, with large masonry units, is reminiscent of traditional construction, though stone in this instance if from unknown and non-local source – possible Credit Valley sandstone. House is set in heavily treed garden, with large conifer to south, and large deciduous tree to north. Building is a good fit within block of early suburban Maple Village.

Attachment 4

1954 Aerial Photo (source: York Region Mapping)





9560 and 9570 Keele St., Vaughan, ON
Cultural Heritage Resource Impact Assessment

SEPTEMBER 2015 with revisions up to December 2015

March 2018 Rev.1

July 2018 Rev.2

Prepared for:

Laurier Harbour (Keele) Inc.
150 Connie Crescent, Unit 4
Concord, ON L4K 1L9

Prepared by:



Architects Rasch Eckler Associates Ltd.
15 Lola Road, Toronto, ON M5P 1E5
p: 416.696.1969 // f: 416.696.1966 // m: mail@areaarchitects.ca

1 Table of Contents

| | | |
|--------|---|-----|
| 1 | Table of Contents | i |
| 2 | List of Figures | iii |
| 3 | List of Tables..... | v |
| 1 | Background & Summary to the Report | 1 |
| 1.1 | Reason for a Cultural Heritage Resource Impact Assessment | 1 |
| 1.2 | Reference Documents..... | 2 |
| 1.3 | Photos and Site Investigation..... | 2 |
| 2 | Property Context and Heritage Status | 3 |
| 2.1 | Property Description | 3 |
| 2.2 | Heritage Status of Subject Properties | 5 |
| 2.3 | Criteria for Heritage Evaluation | 7 |
| 3 | Heritage Evaluation of 9560 & 9570 Keele Street..... | 9 |
| 3.1 | Historical (or Associative) Value..... | 9 |
| 3.1.1 | History of Property Ownership..... | 9 |
| 3.1.2 | Village of Maple Chronology | 14 |
| 3.1.3 | Assessment of Historical Value | 17 |
| 3.2 | Environment (or Contextual) Value | 19 |
| 3.2.1. | Context within the Maple HCD..... | 19 |
| 3.2.2. | Overview of Adjacent Properties | 21 |
| 3.2.3. | Assessment of Environmental / Contextual value..... | 23 |
| 3.3 | Architectural (Design or Physical) Value | 25 |
| 3.3.1 | Documentation of Built Structure | 25 |
| 3.3.2 | Assessment of Existing Conditions | 32 |
| 3.3.3 | Assessment of Architectural Value..... | 36 |
| 4 | Heritage Significance of 9560 & 9570 Keele Street..... | 42 |
| 4.1 | Summary of Heritage Assessment | 42 |
| 4.2 | Grading of Heritage Value..... | 44 |
| 4.3 | Contributing Attributes of 9560 & 9570 Keele Street..... | 45 |
| 5 | Description and Implementation of Development Proposal | 46 |
| 5.1 | Proposed Townhouse Development..... | 46 |
| 5.2 | Townhouses Replacing Existing Houses..... | 47 |
| 5.3 | Implementation of Design Guidelines..... | 48 |
| 6 | Impacts of the Proposed Development | 49 |
| 6.1 | Demolition of Non-Heritage Buildings | 49 |
| 6.2 | Balance of Conservation and Growth | 50 |
| 6.3 | Densification for Future Economic Viability..... | 51 |

| | | |
|-----|--|----|
| 7 | Compatible Redevelopment Strategies..... | 53 |
| 7.1 | Site Planning..... | 53 |
| 7.2 | Scale, Massing and Height | 55 |
| 7.3 | Design Compatibility | 57 |
| 8 | Design Revisions & Recommendations | 59 |
| 8.1 | Design Consultation | 59 |
| 8.2 | Commemorative Measures..... | 61 |
| 8.3 | Concluding Recommendation..... | 61 |
| 9 | Appendices..... | 62 |
| | Appendix A. City of Vaughan, Guidelines for Cultural Heritage Resource Impact Assessment | 1 |
| | Appendix B. City of Vaughan, Built Heritage Evaluation Form | 1 |
| | Appendix C. City of Vaughan, Vaughan Heritage Inventory, Extract, pp. 1 & 22 | 1 |
| | Appendix D. Village of Maple HCD, Property Inventory, 9560 & 9570 Keele Street..... | 1 |
| | Appendix E. Qualifications of AREA | 1 |

2 List of Figures

| | |
|--|----|
| Figure 1 – Aerial Photo of 9560 and 9570 Keele St. and their context (Google Maps) annotated by AREA to show the boundaries of the subject land assembly. | 3 |
| Figure 2 – Survey of Land Assembly (Rady-Pentek and Edward Surveying Ltd ²) annotated by AREA to show building footprints of existing residential structures. | 4 |
| Figure 3 – Location of subject properties within Maple HCD | 5 |
| Figure 4 – Maple HCD Boundaries (shown red, solid line), showing Cultural Heritage Resources and the original Police Village (shown blue, dash line), 2007, annotated by AREA to show location of subject properties within Maple HCD. | 6 |
| Figure 5 – Line Family Properties, County Map of the Township of Vaughan, 1879 (McGill University), annotated by AREA to show approximate location of subject properties at 9560 & 9570 Keele Street, and the properties boundaries, owned by William, John, and Samuel Line | 10 |
| Figure 6 – 1968 Map, Subdivision of Lot Properties, 1968 annotated by AREA to show approximate location of subject properties at 9560 & 9570 Keele Street. | 10 |
| Figure 7 – Aerial Photographs of 9560 & 9570 Keele Street, Vaughan, 1946 & 1954, Phase I Environmental Site Assessment May 2018 | 11 |
| Figure 8 – Land Registry Office records, Lot 18, Conc.4, sheet 3, York LRO..... | 12 |
| Figure 9 – County Map of the Township of Vaughan, 1879 annotated by AREA; Base map obtained from: 1880 Map of Ontario Counties: The Canadian County Atlas Digital Project. McGill University, 2001. Web. Accessed 06 April 2015. | 14 |
| Figure 10 – Village of Maple, Fire Insurance Map, 1928 (subject properties not shown); Base map obtained from: Village of Maple Heritage Conservation District Plan, 2007, Volume 3. City of Vaughan, 2006-2007. PDF. 19 March 2015. | 14 |
| Figure 11 – Village of Maple, 1955 | 15 |
| Figure 12 – Village of Maple and Subdivision Developments within the Police Village, Post-1955; Base map obtained from: Village of Maple Heritage Conservation District Plan, 2007, Volume 3. City of Vaughan, 2006-2007. PDF. 19 March 2015. | 15 |
| Figure 13 – Village of Maple, Heritage Conservation District Established Boundaries, 2007 annotated by AREA to show approximate location of subject properties at 9560-9570 Keele St. | 16 |
| Figure 14 – Maple Heritage Conservation District Boundaries, annotated by AREA to show location of 9560-9570 Keele St | 20 |
| Figure 15 – Location of Noble and Rupert Properties, Villages of Teston, Sherwood, and Maple, and Approximate Location of Subject Properties, 9560-9570 Keele Street, annotated by AREA from 1879 County Map of Vaughan. | 20 |
| Figure 16 – Frank Robson Cabin | 21 |
| Figure 17 & 18 – New townhouse development, 9529 Keele Street, located north-east of Keele Street and Rutherford Drive | 22 |
| Figure 19 – Kmhur Buddhist Temple of Ontario at 9575 Keele Street | 22 |
| Figure 20 – Estate-type house at 9580 Keele Street | 22 |
| Figure 21 – New multi-residential development at 9589 Keele Street | 22 |
| Figure 22 – School property at 9600 Keele Street..... | 22 |

| | |
|--|----|
| Figure 23 – Subdivision houses at 9613, 9597, and 9593 Keele Street, contemporary architectural style, occurring further north on Keele Street | 22 |
| Figure 24 – Estate-type houses at 9652 and 9654 Keele Street..... | 22 |
| Figure 25 – Ontario Cottage Style Flower Shop at 9715 Keele Street (approx. 450-m away from subject properties) | 22 |
| Figure 26 – First (Main) Floor Key Plan, not to scale, sketch by AREA, annotated to refer to Photos E-1 to E-11..... | 25 |
| Figure 27 – First (Main) Floor Key Plan, not to scale, sketch by AREA, annotated to refer to Photos M-1 to M-8..... | 26 |
| Figure 28 – Basement Floor Key Plan, not to scale, sketch by AREA, annotated to refer to Photos B-1 to B-6 | 27 |
| Figure 29 – Second Floor Key Plan, not to scale, sketch by AREA, annotated to refer to Photos S-1 to S-7 | 28 |
| Figure 30 – First (Main) Floor Key Plan, not to scale, sketch by AREA, annotated to refer to Photos E-1 to E-7..... | 29 |
| Figure 31 – First (Main) Floor Key Plan, not to scale, sketch by AREA, annotated to refer to Photos M-1 to M-8..... | 30 |
| Figure 32 – Second Floor Key Plan, not to scale, sketch by AREA, annotated to refer to Photos S-1 to S-6 | 31 |
| Figure 33 –Site Plan, RN Design, July 2018..... | 46 |
| Figure 34 – Sites for Approved or Undergoing Development Applications (shown hatched) ... | 52 |
| Figure 35 – Recommended Placement of New Buildings | 53 |
| Figure 36 – Setbacks of Neighbouring Buildings (North of Land Assembly) and Proposed Setback of Subject Development, from Google Maps 2015, annotated by AREA to show proposed development(blue) neighbouring buildings (red). | 54 |
| Figure 37 – Setbacks of Nearby Buildings (South of Land Assembly) and Proposed Setback of Subject Development, from Google Maps 2015, annotated by AREA to show proposed development (blue) & nearby building (red). | 54 |
| Figure 38 –Subject Development’s Floorplate (Blue) and Surrounding Building’s Floorplates (Red), from Google Maps 2015, annotated by AREA..... | 55 |
| Figure 39 – From top-left corner, clockwise: Keele St Elevation of Subject Development by RN Design, Residential Estate at 9580 Keele Street, and Multi-Residential Development at 9529 & 9586 Keele Street. | 55 |
| Figure 40 – Proposed Elevation Design from Keele Street, RN Design, July 2018..... | 57 |
| Figure 41 – Respectful Development Proposals within the Maple HCD, obtained from the Maple HCD Study Vol.2 | 57 |
| Figure 42 – Tree Preservation Plan, BTi Landscape Architecture, July, 2018..... | 60 |

3 List of Tables

| | |
|--|----|
| Table 1 – Site Statistics of Land Assembly..... | 4 |
| Table 2 – OHA Provincial Criteria | 7 |
| Table 3 – City of Vaughan Criteria for Determining Cultural Heritage Value..... | 8 |
| Table 4 – 9560 & 9570 Keele Street, Maple, Registry Office Abstract ⁸ | 13 |
| Table 5 – Assessment of Historical Value..... | 18 |
| Table 6 – Assessment of Contextual Value | 24 |
| Table 7 - Assessment of Architectural Value of 9560 Keele Street | 36 |
| Table 8 - Assessment of Architectural Value of 9570 Keele Street | 39 |
| Table 9 – Summary of Historical Evaluation for 9560 and 9570 Keele street | 44 |
| Table 10 – Overview of Heritage Value of Subject Properties at 9560 and 9570 Keele Street..... | 44 |
| Table 11 – Site Statistics of New Development..... | 46 |
| Table 12 – Maple HCD Plan Objectives for Non-Heritage Properties & New Developments .. | 48 |
| Table 13 – Summary of Heritage Issues & Responses..... | 59 |

1 Background & Summary to the Report

1.1 REASON FOR A CULTURAL HERITAGE RESOURCE IMPACT ASSESSMENT

1. Maple Heritage
Conservation District
Volume 1: Building
Inventory. City of
Vaughan. PDF.
November 2005

On June 12, 2014, the client-developer engaged heritage architects, *AREA, Architects Rasch Eckler Associates Ltd.* ('AREA') for the preparation of a Cultural Heritage Resource Impact Assessment ('CHRIA') report for the land assembly comprising two lots, with municipal addresses, 9560 and 9570 Keele Street, Vaughan, ON, and legal description, Part of Lot 18, Concession 4 65R 34170 and Part of Lot 18, Concession 4, 65R 34161 respectively. The property has since been sold and AREA has continued as the heritage consultant for the new owner. Both properties are contained within the Village of Maple Heritage Conservation District ('Maple HCD'). As part of the Maple HCD, all properties are designated under Part V of the Ontario Heritage Act R.S.O 1990, Chapter O.18 ('OHA'). The land assembly is proposed to be developed as low-rise residential townhomes and semi-detached houses.

The original CHRIA Report of September 2015 has undergone several revisions as noted on the cover page but still retains most of the initial information. This March 2018 CHRIA shall evaluate the heritage context of, and the development impacts on 9560-9570 Keele Street, which are identified by the 2006-2007 Village of Maple HCD Study and Plan as "non-heritage properties", or properties within the Maple HCD that do not individually form part of the City's Heritage Inventory. Prior to the HCD Study, neither house property was individually *listed* in the City's Heritage Register or Inventory ('Inventory'), nor was *designated* under Part IV of the OHA. However, being located within the boundaries and on the southern edge of the Village of Maple Heritage Conservation District ('Maple HCD'), they are protected under Part V of the OHA. In consultation with City of Vaughan Heritage Planning Staff on May 12, 2014, in a conference call and e-mail correspondence, staff indicated that only the property at 9560 Keele Street required heritage evaluation. It is also adjacent to a City-owned public park, which incorporates the historic Frank Robson Log House, individually listed on the Inventory, with municipal address, 9470 Keele St. However, in a subsequent March 9, 2016 Memorandum from Cultural Heritage Section with comments on the earlier submission of this CHRIA, staff required a heritage evaluation of 9570 Keele Street as well.

The research findings of this CHRIA attribute little heritage significance to the properties at 9560 & 9570 Keele Street. They scored low on their historical, environmental / contextual, and architectural values. There is not enough evidence to recommend their re-assignment from a "non-heritage" to a "heritage" building category within the Maple HCD. The 9560 & 9570 Keele Street properties are respectively a .67-acre lot, and a .34- acre lot that resulted from the subdivision of a historic 200-acre farm lot between the periods of 1923 and 1947. The subdivided lots themselves cannot be associated with any historic figure, and have never functioned as landmark sites. The existing 1-1/2 storey residential structures within the property land assembly were described as having a "last-gasp Arts-and-Crafts style" (9560) and a "suburban 1950s building style" (9570)."¹ Most of their original building features and assemblies are in good condition; however, they do not fully represent unique stylistic features and construction techniques.

The low heritage values of the property at 9560 Keele Street, as well as the adjacent property at 9570 Keele Street, therefore do not preclude the redevelopment of this land assembly. However, the land assembly should be developed compatibly within the Maple HCD character. The contributing characteristics of these two houses to the District – such as their building orientation, form and massing, and window profile – could be used as inspiration for the proposed development in addition to its compliance with the Maple HCD Design Guidelines.

This CHRIA report consults the provincial and municipal documents, comprising widely-accepted standards, guidelines, and policies on heritage planning (see 1.2). It will form part of the development submissions by the owner and its other consultants related to their application for minor Official Plan Amendment (OPA), Zoning By-law Amendment (ZBA), Draft Plan of Subdivision (DPS), future Site Plan Application (SPA), and future Draft Plan of Condominium. This report will be subject to the review of Heritage Vaughan Committee ('HVC'), and ultimately, Council. This CHRIA follows the requirements of the City of Vaughan's "Guidelines for Cultural Heritage Resource Impact Assessment Reports" ('GfCHRIA', Appendix A) with David Eckler, B.E.S., B.Arch., OAA, MRAIC of AREA (see Appendix E), being their primary author.

1.2 REFERENCE DOCUMENTS

The following provincial and municipal documents comprising widely-accepted standards, guidelines, and policies on heritage planning, are consulted in this report:

- Ontario Heritage Act R.S.O 1990, Chapter O.18, with revisions up to 2009 ('OHA');
- Provincial Policy Statement, 2014 ('PPS');
- City of Vaughan, Official Plan, 2010 ('OP');
- Ontario Heritage Toolkit ('OHTK'), Ontario Ministry of Culture, 2006;
- City of Vaughan, Guidelines for CHRIA, September 2012, ('GfCHRIA', Appendix A);
- City of Vaughan, Built Heritage Evaluation Form, 2005 (Appendix B);
- City of Vaughan, Heritage Inventory, n.d., (relevant pages, Appendix C);
- Village of Maple, City of Vaughan, Heritage Inventory, November 2005 (relevant pages, Appendix D);
- Village of Maple, Heritage Conservation District Study, February 2006 ('Study'); and,
- Village of Maple, Heritage Conservation District Plan, May 2007 ('Plan').

1.3 PHOTOS AND SITE INVESTIGATION

On June 16, 2014 and on February 22, 2018, AREA Staff conducted site investigation, documentation, and review of the land assembly. The site photographs, contained and cited in this report, were taken by AREA, unless indicated otherwise. Archival and historical research was also undertaken based on pre-existing background information, including relevant Environmental Assessments, Geotechnical Studies, Cultural Heritage Reports, Land Registry Records, historical and aerial maps, cemetery and census records, and other published materials that relate to the subject property.

2 Property Context and Heritage Status

2.1 PROPERTY DESCRIPTION

The land assembly is comprised of two adjacent lots with municipal addresses, 9560 and 9570 Keele Street, and with legal description, Part of Lot 18, Concession 4 65R 34170 and Part of Lot 18, Concession 4, 65R 34161 respectively (shown shaded, Figure 1).

The immediate boundaries of the subject land assembly comprises the adjacent properties as follows: a residential property with municipal address, 9580 Keele Street, to the north; the southern portion of George Bailey School at 9600 Keele Street to the west; Frank Robson Park, Block 191, 9470 Keele Street, to the south and southwest; and Regional Road, Keele Street, to the principal east frontage (Figure 1).





Figure 1 – Aerial Photo of 9560 and 9570 Keele St. and their context (Google Maps) annotated by AREA to show the boundaries of the subject land assembly.

- The land assembly has site statistics described below in Table 1 and, in total, has a 67.50-metre frontage and a lot depth of 59.60-59.70 metres (Table 1). Its combined lot area is 0.407 hectares, with a developable area of 0.333 ha (Table 1). The two lots comprising the land assembly have single-detached residential houses at 1-1/2 storeys height.

| | | | |
|--|-------------------|-------------------|---|
| | 9560 Keele Street | 9570 Keele Street | Land Assembly |
| Frontage | 44.70 m | 22.80 m | 67.50 m |
| Lot Depth | 59.60 m | 59.70 m | 59.60-59.70 m |
| Area (including road widening allowance) | 0.271 ha | 0.136 ha | 0.407 ha (0.333 ha excluding road widening allowance) |
| Area of Existing Building Footprint ² | 135.47 sm | 103.07 sm | 238.54 sm |



2.2 HERITAGE STATUS OF SUBJECT PROPERTIES

3. Image, "Revised Study Area Boundary for the street-by-street examination", obtained from Village of Maple Heritage Conservation District Plan, Vol. 2, City of Vaughan, February 2006. PDF. p. 28; annotated by AREA to show location of subject properties within Maple HCD.

Prior to the Maple HCD Study, the subject properties at 9560 and 9570 Keele Street were not individually listed in the City of Vaughan's Municipal Register of Cultural Heritage Resources ('Inventory'). However, both properties are located within the boundaries of the Village of Maple Heritage Conservation District ('Maple HCD', Figure 3), approved by Council on December 6, 2006, through By-Law 366-2004. Both properties are therefore regulated by the 2007 Village of Maple HCD Plan and Guidelines ('Maple HCD Plan', Volumes 1-3), and Part V of the OHA.




Figure 3 – Location of subject properties within Maple HCD³

4. Image captioned, "Map 4. Shaded properties are properties identified in the City's Listing of Buildings of Architectural and Historical Value", obtained from [Village of Maple Heritage Conservation District Plan, Vol. 3](#), City of Vaughan, May 2007. PDF. p. 8; annotated by AREA to show location of subject properties within Maple HCD.

The Maple HCD Plan includes 51 properties that were previously listed on the City's Inventory, and 4 that were subsequently added due to their architectural and historical significance. These 55 properties comprise the "Heritage Buildings" within the Maple HCD. Under Section 2.4.2, "Objectives for Heritage Buildings" of the Maple HCD Vol. 3, the HCD's Heritage Buildings are specifically identified on the map below (shaded, Figure 4). The majority of other properties (not shaded, Figure 4) – including the subject lots, 9560 and 9570 Keele Street (hatched, Figure 4) – were not "pre-listed" prior to the HCD, and were therefore categorized as "Non-Heritage Buildings." Non-heritage properties do not possess sufficient historical, contextual, and architectural values to warrant individual listing or designation.




Figure 4 – Maple HCD Boundaries (shown red, solid line), showing Cultural Heritage Resources (shaded blue) and the original Police Village⁴ (shown blue, dash line), 2007, annotated by AREA to show location of subject properties within Maple HCD.

2.3 CRITERIA FOR HERITAGE EVALUATION

In consultation with City of Vaughan Heritage Planning Staff on May 12, 2014, in a conference call and e-mail correspondence, only the property at 9560 Keele Street required heritage evaluation for this CHRIA. Although the building at 9560 Keele Street was not identified in Maple HCD Plan as a 'Heritage Building', it was determined by Heritage Planning Staff that, as a "Heritage *Style*", it would require further evaluation. However, in a subsequent March 9, 2016 Memorandum from Cultural Heritage Section with comments on the earlier submission of this CHRIA, staff required a heritage evaluation of 9570 Keele Street as well.

The Maple HCD Plan provided a brief property inventory based on exterior visual evaluation and limited background research. This property inventory provided a general overview, with photos and brief text under categories, 'description', 'history', and 'comments.' No evaluation scoring system or criteria grade was applied to the subject properties during this 'windshield' survey, conducted in 2005. The two subject properties were provided with such a 'property inventory' as part of the HCD Plan (see Appendix D).

Typically, each property listed in a Municipal Heritage Inventory would be evaluated by the City Heritage Staff according to the set of provincial criteria established in Ontario Regulation 9/06 under the OHA. A property must then possess at least one of the criteria to be considered as a 'Heritage Building', versus a 'Non-Heritage Building.' These two categories are among four categories of properties identified in the Maple HCD Plan (see 5.3 below). The provincial criteria for a 'Heritage Building' are listed on the chart below:

Table 2 – OHA Provincial Criteria

| OHA O.Reg. 9/06 Criteria | Description of OHA Heritage Criteria |
|------------------------------------|---|
| 1. Historical or Associative Value | <ul style="list-style-type: none">i. direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization or institution that is significant to a communityii. yields information that contributes to an understanding of a community or cultureiii. demonstrates the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer or theorist who is significant to a community |
| 2. Contextual Value | <ul style="list-style-type: none">i. defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an areaii. physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundingsiii. a landmark |
| 3. Design or Physical Value | <ul style="list-style-type: none">i. rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, expression, material or construction methodii. high degree of craftsmanship or artistic meritiii. high degree of technical or scientific achievement |

On June 21, 2005, the City's Commissioner of Community Services and the Commissioner of Planning, in consultation with the Director of Recreation and Culture and the Director of Policy and Urban Planning, sought Council approval for the then proposed "Strategy for the Maintenance and Preservation of Significant Heritage Buildings" ('Heritage Strategy Report', 'HSR') This report explained that "The 'Built Heritage Evaluation Form' ('BHEF', Appendix B) as found in Attachment 2 was used as a criteria to evaluate heritage buildings. This evaluation form was approved by Heritage Vaughan Committee at its meeting of May 18, 2005. Those buildings rated 'very significant' or 'significant' were included in the final 'Listing of Building of Architectural and Historical Significance'".

Upon the approval of the HSR on June 27, 2005, the BHEF then formed the standard evaluation criteria for the City's heritage buildings by assigning numerical points to a total of 8 sub-criteria, which, in essence, expanded the 3 aforementioned provincial criteria (Table 3 below):

Table 3 – City of Vaughan Criteria for Determining Cultural Heritage Value

| 1. HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE | |
|--|---|
| 1.1. Historical Significance | Structure is associated with the life or activities of a person, group, organization or event significant to the history of Vaughan, or illustrative of the community's cultural social political, economic or industrial history. |
| 2. ENVIRONMENT | |
| 2.1. Environment/ Streetscape/ Community | Structure contributes to the continuity or character of the street, community, or area. Heritage buildings in a rural areas (i.e. former farm buildings), not yet developed or part of a Block Plan development, that have a good architectural rating should be rated for its community and/or contextual significance based on the criteria defined. |
| 3. ARCHITECTURE | |
| 3.1. Style | Good, notable, rare, unique, or early example of a particular architectural style or type. Exterior architectural style only should be evaluated. (i.e. change in roofline, skylights, additions, or removal of features, etc. that have changed the style of the building.) |
| 3.2. Construction | Good, notable, rare, unique, or early example of a particular material or method of construction. (i.e.) log construction, pre-1850, stone, board on board construction, etc.) |
| 3.3. Age | Comparatively old in the context of the City of Vaughan's architectural history. |
| 3.4. Interior | Integrity of interior arrangement, finish, craftsmanship, and/or detail are particularly attractive or unique and/or still exist. |
| 3.5. Alterations | Building has undergone minor exterior alterations, and retains most of its original materials and design features. Checklist includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Original Exterior Siding 30% ▪ Windows/doors 30% ▪ Verandahs/trim 30% ▪ Foundation/location 10% ▪ Structural Plan (no modern or sympathetic additions) 10% |
| 3.6. Condition | Exterior/interior of building is in good structural condition (i.e. evidence of decay in exterior siding, roof, or interior basement, wall surface, flooring, or ceiling, suggesting structure to be unsound.) Checklist: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Exterior Siding/Gutters (cracks, spalling) ▪ Roof/Interior Ceiling/Gutters ▪ Flooring, unstable, depressions ▪ Interior Wall surface, cracks, etc ▪ Basement (leaks mold, dry or wet rot on beams) |

For the purposes of this CHRIA, the BHEF will be used to evaluate 9560 & 9570 Keele Street to determine its cultural heritage significance to the community. Section 3.0 follows the BHEF in outline format, to incorporate and to discuss research information that is relevant to each criteria.

3 Heritage Evaluation of 9560 & 9570 Keele Street

3.1 HISTORICAL (OR ASSOCIATIVE) VALUE

3.1.1 HISTORY OF PROPERTY OWNERSHIP

5. In Search of Your Canadian Past: The Canadian County Atlas Digital Project. Digital Collections Program, Rare Books and Special Collections Division, McGill University, 2001. Web. Accessed June 2014

6. Described in Plaque No. 25, Location: Fire Hall, Richmond Hill. Installed in 1975 by the Town of Vaughan in co-operation with Vaughan Township Historical Society

The properties at 9560 & 9570 Keele Street (“subject property”) form 0.41 ha of the original Line family farm lots, which would encompass the present-day block, bounded by Major Mackenzie Drive to the north, Keele Street to the east, Rutherford Road to the south, and as far as Jane Street to the west (Figure 5). The first family settler, John Line, arrived in the Village of Sherwood, Township of Vaughan as early as 1800⁶. The 1879 County Map⁵ (Figure 5) already depicts the subdivision and transfer of the original farm lot among the family’s third and/or fourth generations: William Line, Lots 15 and 19, Concession 4, John Line, Lot 18, Concession 4, Samuel Line, Lot 17, Concession 4.

Based on birth certificates, marriage licenses, obituaries, and government census, the various family members have been researched. Records show that William Henry, born in 1852, married to Margaret Graham in 1876, was the brother of Samuel, married to Emily Quantz, in 1873. William and Samuel were identified as the property owners of Lots 15 and 19, and Lot 17, respectively, in Concession 4, in the 1879 County Map. Their property may have been from a larger parcel, which had been registered to their parents, William Line and Susannah Snider.

John Line, registered owner of Lot 18, Concession 4, was a senior Line family member, possibly a cousin of the neighbouring Line brothers, William and Samuel. John, the son of Henry and Elizabeth Line and married to Martha Bennett in 1858, granted a section of his land parcel to the Common School Trustees of School Section VI in the Township of Vaughan. John and Martha had 6 daughters and 1 son. Their only son, also a ‘William Henry’, was married to Louise Evelyn Brown from Tottenham, Simcoe, Ontario. William Henry, son of John Line, moved out to and settled in Tottenham until 1924. John Line appeared to have granted the remaining sections of his property to William and Margaret, owners of Lots 15 and 19, who eventually transferred it to Norman Line on April 17, 1914.

During the same year, other properties in Maple, Vaughan, were also registered to Norman Line and his wife, Ida, such as the undeveloped portions of land between present-day Kayla Crescent and Jane Street, registered as Part of Lot 19 Concession 4 (north of the subject property). It is evident that in 1914, during the Norman Line tenure, the block-width farm lots, which were likely 200 acres, were still intact, until the year 1923, when new property title holders – for the same lots and concessions – tripled.

From 1923 to 1946, Norman Line appeared to have subdivided the land and transferred the portions to John Byron Ray, Sydney Thomas, and the Noble families (Table 4). In the 1968 subdivision plan of properties in Vaughan (Figure 6), the Noble family continued to own several lots along Keele Street, on both the north and south sides of the school property, while the subject properties at 9560 & 9570 Keele Street, were transferred to the Saundersons and the Sniders, respectively (Table 4). It appears that the Noble family was responsible for subdividing and building on their acquired lots for increased residential occupancy of several family members (Figure 6).

7. Vaughan Planning
Base Map – 1968.
 Acquired from Shaw, J.
 City of Vaughan
 Archives, 1968. JPG.
 Accessed 18 June
 2014.

The chronology of deed of registrations in Table 4 of 9560 & 9570 Keele Street identifies numerous members of the Noble family – Robert Ira Myles, William Henry, Margaret Jane, and William Henry, again. The 1968 Map shows Russell and Lorna Noble at 9580 Keele Street, and William and Mildred Noble as owners of houses, now part of the school property at 9600 Keele Street (Figure 6). The existing 1-1/2 storey houses at 9560 & 9570 Keele Street, appear to have been a result of the modest intensification in 1946 by the Noble family and were likely constructed just after the lot subdivisions. Aerial Photographs from 1946 and 1954 (Figure 7) were provided in the properties' Phase I ESA and they indicate respectively vacant land without buildings (1946) and subsequently the houses constructed (1954). Land Registry Office records (Figure 8) indicate that the two lots of 9560 & 9570 Keele Street were created in 1946 by severance from the former 50-acre portion of the south-east quarter of Lot 18, Concession 4. The lots were registered as R21775 (9560) and R21776 (9570) and were sold by William Noble to separate purchasers, Margaret Sauderson and Andrew & Dorothy Snider, respectively.

Regarding more recent ownership changes for 9560 Keele Street, in 2012, then owner, Luciano Di Domizio, acquired the property, inherited by his late wife Josie née Fezza, whose immediate family, the Fezzas, bought it from the Saundersons. According to Di Domizio, the house has been used for renting, and the massing, and layout have been unaltered since his wife's family owned it in 1971.




Figure 5– Line Family Properties, County Map of the Township of Vaughan, 1879 (McGill University)⁵, annotated by AREA to show approximate location of subject properties at 9560 & 9570 Keele Street, and the properties boundaries, owned by William, John, and Samuel Line




Figure 6 – 1968 Map, Subdivision of Lot Properties, 1968⁷ annotated by AREA to show approximate location of subject properties at 9560 & 9570 Keele Street.





Figure 7 – Aerial Photographs of 9560 & 9570 Keele Street, Vaughan, 1946 & 1954, Phase I Environmental Site Assessment May 2018



| REGISTRATION NO. | INSTRUMENT | DATE OF INSTRUMENT | REGISTRATION DATE | GRANTOR | GRANTEE | CONSIDERATION ETC. | LAND AND REMARKS |
|--------------------------------|----------------|--------------------|-------------------|---|--|--------------------|---|
| 18734 | Grant | 26 Apr 1940 | 29 Nov 1940 | William H. Noble & Henry Harper Exors Ira M. Noble Consent Treas. of Ontario | William H. Noble | \$1. etc | S E 1/4 Ex School Section |
| 18735 | Mtg E | 29 Nov 1940 | 29 Nov 1940 | William H. Noble & Mildred his wife | Edgar Puterbaugh | \$2500. | S E 1/4 Ex. School Section Not in full June 28 '61 EGB |
| 19713 | D.M. E | 1943 | 26 July 1943 | Alvin Puterbaugh | Richard D. MacNaughton | \$1800. | Mtg 17037 Jan 27 '54 W.I.H. |
| 21746 | Q.C. | 16 Sept 1946 | 18 Oct 1946 | Geoffrey T. Clarkson & Isaac E. Waldon Liquidator Home Bank of Canada | William H. Noble | \$1. | S E 1/4 con 50 ac |
| See Deposit No. 9452 (S E 1/4) | | | | | | | |
| 21774 | P.D.M. E | 26 Oct 1946 | 28 Oct 1946 | Edgar Puterbaugh | William H. Noble | \$1. | S 312'10 1/2" of E 195'13" 18734 June 28 '61 EGB |
| 21775 | Grant | 18 Sept 1946 | 28 Oct 1946 | William H. Noble & Mildred his wife | Margaret E. Saunderson | \$850. | S 150' of E 195'13" |
| 21776 | Grant | 27 Sept 1946 | 28 Oct 1946 | William H. Noble & Mildred his wife | Andrew E. Snider & Dorothy E. his wife as joint tenants | \$1. etc | N 75' of S 225' of E 195'18" |
| 21777 | Grant | 19 Sept 1946 | 28 Oct 1946 | William H. Noble & Mildred his wife | Russell L. Noble | \$1. etc | N 82'10 1/2" of S 312'10 1/2" of E 195'11" |
| 22767 | Mtg A | 1 Nov 1947 | 7 Nov 1947 | Andrew E. Snider & Dorothy E. Snider | Eugene H. Brueis | \$3000. | N 75' of S 225' of E 195'18" Not in full May 15 '64 W.I.H. |
| 22918 | Mtg B | 30 Nov 1947 | 8 Jan 1948 | Ronald McClelland | Richard D. MacNaughton | \$10000. | N 394'0" on N limit (3784.7" on S limit) & way Not in full May '62 W.I.H. |
| 22919 | Grant | 1 Dec 1947 | 8 Jan 1948 | Richard D. MacNaughton & Pearl E. his wife | Ronald McClelland | \$13750. | N 394'0" on N limit (3784.7" on S limit) & way Sketch attd |
| See Deposit No. 10486 | | | | | | | |
| 22927 | Cert D.L.P. | 12 Jan 1948 | 13 Jan 1948 | Supreme Court of Ontario | Margaret Line (Pltf) Hessa A. Nichols, James Roe, Frank Line, Ralph Line, Norman Line (Defts) | \$ | Lis Pen 10894 Cons 4 already Dispt by Hesperus Court (Defts) |

Figure 8 – Land Registry Office records, Lot 18, Conc.4, sheet 3, York LRO

8. 9560 & 9570 Keele St. Deeds of Registration from 1914 to 2012, information obtained from Goldman, Spring, Kichler & Sanders LLP (GSKS) & Owens Wright LLP, who conducted title searches for the properties at the York Land Registry Office.

Table 4 – 9560 & 9570 Keele Street, Maple, Registry Office Abstract ⁸

| 9560 Keele Street, Maple | | | 9570 Keele Street, Maple | | |
|--------------------------------|---|--|--------------------------------|---|--|
| Date of Deed Registration | Grantors | Grantees | Date of Deed Registration | Grantors | Grantees |
| APRIL 17, 1914 & SEPT 11, 1914 | ESTATE OF WILLIAM HENRY LINE (DIED DEC. 30, 1912) (HESSE A. NICHOLLS JAMES ROE EXORS.) | NORMAN LINE | APRIL 17, 1914 & SEPT 11, 1914 | ESTATE OF WILLIAM HENRY LINE (DIED DEC. 30, 1912) (HESSE A. NICHOLLS JAMES ROE EXORS.) | NORMAN LINE |
| MAY 23, 1923 | NORMAN LINE | JOHN BYRON RAY | MAY 23, 1923 | NORMAN LINE | JOHN BYRON RAY |
| OCT 1, 1923 | JOHN BYRON RAY | SYDNEY ERNEST THOMAS & JEAN THOMAS | OCT 1, 1923 | JOHN BYRON RAY | SYDNEY ERNEST THOMAS & JEAN THOMAS |
| NOV 21, 1923 | SYDNEY ERNEST THOMAS & JEAN THOMAS | ROBERT NOBLE | NOV 21, 1923 | SYDNEY ERNEST THOMAS & JEAN THOMAS | ROBERT NOBLE |
| MAY 20, 1929 | IRA MYERS (SHOULD BE MYLES) NOBLE & WILLIAM HENRY NOBLE (EXECUTORS OF ROBERT NOBLE, DIED APR. 16, 1929) | MARGARET JANE NOBLE | MAY 20, 1929 | IRA MYERS (SHOULD BE MYLES) NOBLE & WILLIAM HENRY NOBLE (EXECUTORS OF ROBERT NOBLE, DIED APR. 16, 1929) | MARGARET JANE NOBLE |
| NOV 29, 1940 | WILLIAM HENRY NOBLE (EXECUTOR OF MARGARET JANE NOBLE, DIED JAN. 25, 1939) | WILLIAM HENRY NOBLE | NOV 29, 1940 | WILLIAM HENRY NOBLE (EXECUTOR OF MARGARET JANE NOBLE, DIED JAN. 25, 1939) | WILLIAM HENRY NOBLE |
| OCT 28, 1946 | WILLIAM HENRY NOBLE | MARGARET ETHEL SAUNDERSON | OCT 28, 1946 | WILLIAM HENRY NOBLE | ANDREW E. SNIDER & DOROTHY E. SNIDER |
| | | | JAN 23, 1952 | ANDREW E. SNIDER & DOROTHY E. SNIDER | COLIN ALEXANDER CAMPBELL |
| JUNE 16, 1953 | MARGARET ETHEL SAUNDERSON | MARGARET ETHEL SAUNDERSON & MARY EVELYN SAUNDERSON | FEB 2, 1953 | COLIN ALEXANDER CAMPBELL | WILLIAM BOYD & DOROTHY HELEN BOYD |
| JULY 8, 1971 | MARGARET ETHEL SAUNDERSON (MARY EVELYN SAUNDERSON, DIED NOV 11, 1970) | OSVALDO FEZZA & ADA FEZZA | OCT 30, 1987 | WILLIAM BOYD & DOROTHY HELEN BOYD | PAMAR CONSTRUCTION COMPANY LIMITED |
| | | | JUNE 29, 1988 | PAMAR CONSTRUCTION COMPANY LIMITED | NICK TRAVAGLINI |
| JUNE 26, 2003 | OSVALDO FEZZA (ADA FEZZA DECEASED) | JOSEPHINE DI DOMIZIO & OSVALDO FEZZA | OCT 7, 1996 | NICK TRAVAGLINI | TERESA PARISE & ANTONIO PARISE |
| AUG 5, 2009 | JOSEPHINE DI DOMIZIO & OSVALDO FEZZA | JOSEPHINE DI DOMIZIO, LUCIANO DI DOMIZIO & OSVALDO FEZZA | NOV 14, 2007 | TERESA PARISE & ANTONIO PARISE | MANDANA MEHRANI & MONA MEHRANI |
| | | | JUNE 14, 2010 | MANDANA MEHRANI & MONA MEHRANI | FRANCESCO LANZILLOTTI & GINETTE BUTEAU-LANZILLOTTI |
| MAY 3, 2012 | LUCIANO DI DOMIZIO | CAL-KEELE DEVELOPMENTS INC. | MAY 3, 2012 | FRANCESCO LANZILLOTTI & GINETTE BUTEAU-LANZILLOTTI | CAL-KEELE DEVELOPMENTS INC. |
| SEPT. 24, 2014 | CAL-KEELE DEVELOPMENTS INC (CENTRA (KEELE) INC.) | LAURIER HARBOUR (KEELE) INC. | SEPT 24, 2014 | CAL-KEELE DEVELOPMENTS INC (CENTRA (KEELE) INC.) | LAURIER HARBOUR (KEELE) INC. |

3.1.2 VILLAGE OF MAPLE CHRONOLOGY

- c. 1829 • In the first half of the 19th century, the historic Village of Maple was a budding settlement area that was undeveloped in comparison to the more prosperous Villages of Teston and Sherwood nearby (Figure 9). Originally, the main road ran on the east-west direction, with one of the earliest establishment, being an 1829 Presbyterian church (now demolished), built by Scottish settlers.
- c. 1848 • Later developments along present-day Keele Street were concentrated where the street intersects with east-west roads that offered alternate routes to what was then an inaccessible swamp. The Noble family, for example, settled around the intersection of present-day Keele Street and Major Mackenzie Drive, while the Rupert family's estate was in close proximity to the intersection of Keele Street and Cromwell-Fieldgate Drives. These founding settler families inspired the early references to the Village (c.1848) as "Noble's Corners", "Nobleville", or "Rupertsville."
- c. 1852 • In 1852, Joseph Noble was appointed as the first postmaster to the "Maple" post office. At that time, the village experienced the opening of several local businesses, such as a blacksmith shop, a sawmill, a photo studio, a rope factory, and even two hotels.
- c. 1853 • In 1853, the railway station of the Northern Railway was located in the eastern section of Maple, which began to prosper. Its first bank, the Sterling Bank, was built during the same year. Other businesses, such as a liquor store, shoemakers' shops emerged.
- 1904-1928 • In 1904, the railway station was burned and then rebuilt by Ontario-Huron-Simcoe Railway (later called the Canadian National Railway) as the "Maple Station." New banks emerged. By 1910, telephone services and motor vehicles were made available to local businesses and residents. Hydro services were installed around 1914, and a community hall was built in 1921. In 1928, the Village of Maple found an increase in its population to 2,000. The area then became a self-regulating and self-financed "Police Village" (Figure 10).




Figure 9 – County Map of the Township of Vaughan, 1879 annotated by AREA; Base map obtained from: 1880 Map of Ontario Counties: The Canadian County Atlas Digital Project. McGill University, 2001. Web. Accessed 06 April 2015. <<http://digital.library.mcgill.ca/countyatlas/>>




Figure 10 – Village of Maple, Fire Insurance Map, 1928 (subject properties not shown); Base map obtained from: Village of Maple Heritage Conservation District Plan, 2007, Volume 3. City of Vaughan, 2006-2007. PDF. 19 March 2015. <www.vaughan.ca>

1930s-1960s • In 1945, the Maple Artificial Breeding Association set up the first successful artificial breeding plant through the leadership of its Board of Directors, with G.W. Keffer as President. The plant was established on a one-acre land parcel, purchased from the G. Bailey property. The Association expanded its membership to include York and Simcoe Counties, and then worldwide. It later became the United Breeders Inc. of Guelph.

- It was not until 1968-1969 that the Toronto and York Road Commissions improved and paved Keele Street. Prior to this, the area remained rural. Built heritage structures (shaded in blue, Figures 4 & 11) were still concentrated within the boundaries of the historic Village of Maple, around the intersection of Keele Street and Major Mackenzie Drive, while other built structures were dispersed on the south and east ends of the larger Police Village (Figures 4 & 11).

- 1960s-1980s • In 1962, a big explosion at an Industrial Propane Depot within the Village of Maple damaged many homes and buildings. Perhaps as a result of this incident, house construction, which included replacement homes, increasing significantly in the 1960s.
- Between the 1960s and 1980s, residential subdivision developments began to fill in vacant land parcels within the Police Village, such as the Gram and Naylor area (see Figure 12, annotated as 'A'), the Railway and Simcoe area, ('B') and the Goodman Crescent area ('C'). The Gram and Naylor area, established in the 1960s, is characterized by 20-m x 50-m property lots, built with single detached bungalows at approximately 1- and 1-1/2- storeys with low-sloped roofs and wide eaves (area 'A'). This lot and house form was adopted and could still be observed on the immediate east side of Keele Street, where the Village of Maple's (east) boundary is opposite the Gram and Naylor area.




Figure 11 – Village of Maple, 1955 annotated by AREA to show approximate location of the subject properties; Base map obtained from: Village of Maple Heritage Conservation District Plan, 2007, Volume 3. City of Vaughan, 2006-2007. PDF. 19 March 2015. <www.vaughan.ca>



Figure 12 – Village of Maple and Subdivision Developments within the Police Village, Post-1955; Base map obtained from: Village of Maple Heritage Conservation District Plan, 2007, Volume 3. City of Vaughan, 2006-2007. PDF. 19 March 2015. <www.vaughan.ca>

1980s-1990s • Two-storey suburban residences later became popular, and were built on new subdivision sites, such as those within the Railway-Simcoe (area 'B', Figure 12) and Goodman Crescent areas (area 'C', Figures 12). This two-storey house form, with an approximately 12-m x 20-m building footprint, was sited on 15-m x 45-m infill lots, and can be mostly found on the west side of Keele Street within Maple. These 1980s houses changed the built proportions of the village with large structures leaving limited greenery on their lots and reducing property distances or setbacks.

c.2000-present • Around 1995, two-storey suburban homes were built as semi-detached houses that replaced a series of adjacent 1960s bungalows. As the area continues to be attractive for new residents, especially with its close proximity to the City of Toronto, new developments started to emerge, mostly in the form of low-rise, multi-residential complexes (e.g. townhouse complexes).

2006-Present, The Village of Maple Heritage Conservation District • In the 2006 Maple HCD Study, the boundaries of the Village of Maple, now officially termed as the "Village of Maple Heritage Conservation District", were determined based on Maple's rich history and development patterns (Figures 9-12). The boundaries excluded post-war housing developments after 1955 (Figure 13), and includes the following areas (Figures 13 & 14):

- the properties along Keele Street and Major Mackenzie Drive, up to the boundaries of the historic Police Village,
- beyond the northern boundaries of the historic Police Village, up to Hill and Station Streets, to include the cemetery and the railway station,
- beyond the southern boundaries of the historic Police Village to include the historic Village of Sherwood, located at the four corners of Sherwood Sideroad, or the present-day Rutherford Road and Keele Street, and
- the individually designated 9470 Keele Street property, which is a City-owned public park, containing the Frank Robson Log House.




Figure 13 – Village of Maple, Heritage Conservation District Established Boundaries, 2007 annotated by AREA to show approximate location of subject properties at 9560-9570 Keele St.

3.1.3 ASSESSMENT OF HISTORICAL VALUE

In conclusion, the subject properties cannot be associated with any of the above-mentioned historical figures, members of the Line family, who would have been part of the early settlement of the Village of Maple, as summarized in Table 5 below.

Several other factors demonstrate that these properties do not possess historical value:

- The creation of these lots and the construction of these houses is now confirmed as occurring from 1946 to 1954 and therefore does not reflect the “interwar stage” of Maple’s development.
- The subject properties’ association with the Noble family is merely transactional in that William H. Noble severed and sold the two lot from the rest of his land holdings (Figure 8). But this was purely a business transaction and the subsequent houses were built by the lot purchasers – Saunderson (9560) and Sniders (9570) – and has no connection to the Noble family.
- The Noble family’s historical association with the early founding of Maple is located at the intersection of present-day Keele Street and Major Mackenzie Drive. In 1852, Joseph Noble was appointed as the first postmaster of Maple and the “Noble Estate” is identified at the south-east corner of that intersection in the Township of Vaughan 1879 county map (Figures 9 & 15). Historical value is not imparted to these lands just because the descendent of Joseph Noble continued to live and own land in this area but a distance from the original nineteenth-century family “Estate”.

Table 5 – Assessment of Historical Value

| HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE | EVALUATION CRITERIA | GRADING | COMMENTS |
|--|---|--|--|
| <p>Structure is associated with the life or activities of a person, group, organization, or event significant to the history of Vaughan, or illustrative of the community's cultural social political, economic or industrial history.</p> | <p>E – Individual, group, event, or site of primary significance to the surrounding community. (Political official, prominent community member, religious leader, significant site or landmark in history of Vaughan)</p> <p>VG – Individual, group, event, or site of some significance to the surrounding community. (Owner or family was long-standing member/s of the community.)</p> <p>M – Individual, group, event, or site of minor or little significance to the surrounding community (No historical background on structure or individual that built structure or family.)</p> <div> <p>F/P – Site, structure, has no significance to Vaughan's History</p> </div> | <p>E – 5</p> <p>VG – 3</p> <p>M – 2</p> <div> <p>F/P – 0</p> </div> | <div> <p>The properties only forms 0.41 ha out of the original 80.94 ha, or 200 acres (or more) of the Line family's farm lots during the historic period of the Village of Maple. The subject property was among the undeveloped portions of their block-wide land parcel, which was later subdivided and transferred to other families (the Ray Thomas and the Noble families).</p> <p>The extant structures on the properties, as well as the structures on the adjacent (northern) properties, resulted from the 1946 and after lot subdivision, and increase in occupancy on the former (undeveloped) portions of a larger agricultural lot. The structures, therefore, do not bear any historical association to the Line family or to any of its prominent members, such as John Line, who are associated with the original nineteenth century farmstead. Also, the structures do not possess a significant site or landmark stature.</p> </div> |

3.2 ENVIRONMENT (OR CONTEXTUAL) VALUE

3.2.1. CONTEXT WITHIN THE MAPLE HCD

9. By-Law 366-2004:
Section 7 Village of
Maple Heritage
Conservation District
Study and Plan Public
Meeting Pursuant to the
OHA, Preliminary Report.
City of Vaughan, 05
September 2006.

10. Section 4.2 of the
Village of Maple
Heritage Conservation
District Plan Vol. 3
(‘Maple HCD Vol.3’),
City of Vaughan, May
2007.

11. Section 9.0 of the
Village of Maple
Heritage Conservation
District Plan Vol. 3
(‘Maple HCD Vol.3’),
City of Vaughan, May
2007.

The boundaries of the Maple HCD were determined by the Study and Plan, developed in a three-volume research undertaken by Philip H. Carter Architect and Planner. The boundaries included: (1) the historic block of Church and Jackson Streets, and (2) the properties along Keele Street and Major Mackenzie Drive up to the boundaries of the historic Police Village (Figure 4).

The boundaries also extended beyond the southern boundaries of the Police Village, to include: (3) the Village of Sherwood, which was historically located at the four corners of Sherwood Sideroad, or the present-day Rutherford Road and Keele Street, and (4) the individually designated 9470 Keele Street property, which is a City-owned public park, containing the Frank Robson Log House (Figure 4)⁹.

The properties at 9560 & 9570 Keele Street appeared to be included within the Maple HCD, because they were located near the District’s southern boundary (Figures 13) as defined by the Frank Robson Log House (sub-area ‘4’ of the four above-cited areas). As such, these properties were not contained within the historic boundaries of the original Police Village (Figure 4).

In 2005, these properties were neither identified nor “pre-listed” as cultural heritage resources with architectural and historical values, and would have been classified as ‘Non-Heritage Buildings’ within the Maple HCD (Figure 4). As Non-Heritage Buildings within the Maple HCD, the subject properties may also be otherwise termed as “non-contributing” structures to the character-defining attributes of the Maple HCD. To verify this condition, its context within the historic period of the Village of Maple is further explored.

The Village of Maple is, historically, a nineteenth century settlement area, first associated with the Noble and Rupert families (Figure 15). In 1879, the property of the Noble family, then called “Noble’s Corner” was surveyed on the south-east portion of the present-day Major Mackenzie Drive and Keele Street intersection, while Dr. Rupert’s property was located on the north-east portion of the current Cromwell Road/Fieldgate Drive and Keele Street intersection (Figure 15).

At that time, Keele Street was an inaccessible swamp, and residential development was concentrated in the Villages of Maple, Teston and Sherwood (Figure 15). By the late nineteenth century, the construction of the Ontario-Huron-Simcoe Railway – later changed to the Canadian National Railway – encouraged the area’s modest expansion in 1904. In 1928, the Village of Maple’s population grew to 2,000 residents, and the area became the self-regulating and self-financing Police Village (Figure 4). This historic character of the Village of Maple, and its heritage value was identified in the 2007 Maple HCD Plan, specifically in its section Part D, Design Guidelines,

“Maple is well known for its attractive collection nineteenth and early twentieth century village buildings of varied types and styles... Although some of the buildings are not in their original uses, the distinctiveness of their form and compatibility of their adaptations serve to perpetuate the historical village environment¹⁰.

The character of Maple consists of many elements: ... Significant cultural elements include the informal village plan with its varied lot sizes and setbacks, rich planting, and almost 150 years of architectural history. The historic buildings serve to define the heritage character of the village¹¹.”




Figure 14 – Maple Heritage Conservation District Boundaries, annotated by AREA to show location of 9560-9570 Keele St

The 1879 County Map represents the historic period of the Village of Maple (Figures 5, 9 & 15). It graphically identifies, conjecturally, the approximate location of homesteads (shaded squares), dirt road paths (dashed lines), and orchards (stipple) for each property. The subject properties, with current municipal addresses, 9560 & 9570 Keele Street, form part of the historic John/Sam. (Samuel) Line farms (Figures 9 & 15, also see subsection 3.1.1), which established homesteads in the middle of their original block-wide properties.

It appears that these structures took advantage of the site's topography, being located in the immediate areas beside the creek (ie. west side) that would typically offer natural water supply or eradication systems (Figures 5, 9 & 15). These locations also represent the most logical sites for farmsteads, in order to manage the extent of the Line family's farm lots from central positions.

Confirming the preceding discussion of the subject property's site and ownership history (subsection 3.1.1), the existing 1-1/2 storey residences at 9560 & 9570 Keele Street, were non-existent during the historical period of the Village of Maple. Instead, they are the result of the partitioning of the Line family's farm lots in the 1920s to the 1950s by Norman Line and William Noble. The properties, therefore, do not represent the 'informal' village plan that characterizes the Maple HCD. They are among the 'non-heritage' buildings, established during the village's intensification and subdivision planning.




Figure 15 – Location of Noble and Rupert Properties, Villages of Teston, Sherwood, and Maple, and Approximate Location of Subject Properties, 9560-9570 Keele Street, annotated by AREA from 1879 County Map of Vaughan⁵.

3.2.2. OVERVIEW OF ADJACENT PROPERTIES

a. FRANK ROBSON LOG HOUSE

- Built in 1820, Georgian Style Log House; and
- Formerly located near the intersection of Keele Street and Rutherford Road, it is currently located on Part of Lot 17, Concession 4, on the City-owned Frank Robson Public Park.
- The park is located immediately to the south of the subject properties at 9560-9570 Keele Street;
- Wood lots and landscaped sports fields buffer the log house from all adjacent structures. These features also hide the house from major public roads.
- Heritage Status: Listed, September 2005



Figure 16 – Frank Robson Cabin

b. NEARBY
PROPERTIES

The adjacent properties along Keele Street were surveyed on June 16, 2014. The properties included in this CHRIA are within a 500-metre distance to the north of the subject properties at 9560-9570 Keele Street (Figures 16 -24). These adjacent properties include:

- i. **1890s Heritage Building at 9715 Keele Street** (Figure 25), built in Ontario Gothic Style.
- ii. **Two Institutional Properties:** George Bailey Public School at 9600 Keele Street (Figure 22), and the Kmher Buddhist Temple at 9575 Keele Street (Figure 19).
- iii. **1970s** (Figure 23) **suburban houses.**
- iv. **Large Estate Lot Houses** appear to have been constructed within the last decade (Figures 20 & 24).
- v. **New Low-Rise, Multi-Residential Developments** constructed within the last 5 years (Figures 17 & 21).



Figure 17 & 18 – New townhouse development, 9529 Keele Street, located north-east of Keele Street and Rutherford Drive



Figure 19 – Kmher Buddhist Temple of Ontario at 9575 Keele Street



Figure 20 – Estate-type house at 9580 Keele Street



Figure 21 – New multi-residential development at 9589 Keele Street




Figure 22 – School property at 9600 Keele Street



Figure 23 – Subdivision houses at 9613, 9597, and 9593 Keele Street, contemporary architectural style, occurring further north on Keele Street



Figure 24 – Estate-type houses at 9652 and 9654 Keele Street



Figure 25 – Ontario Cottage Style Flower Shop at 9715 Keele Street (approx. 450-m away from subject properties)

3.2.3. ASSESSMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL / CONTEXTUAL VALUE

In conclusion, the subject properties do not represent the historic boundary of the Police Village of Maple and therefore do not contribute to the contextual significance of the Maple HCD as summarized in Table 6 below.

Several other factors demonstrate that these properties do not possess contextual value:

- The structures referenced in the Section 3.2.1 (Figure 15) are the original homesteads of the John and Samuel Line farms which would have been located much further west from Keele St. and therefore has no relevance to the siting of the existing 1950s houses.
- Those original farmhouses no longer exist but would have been located in “central positions” of their original 200-acre farms which would be, in the current road network, mid-way between Keele and Jane Streets adjacent to Maple Creek behind the present-day Waterside Crescent.
- The early 200-acre farm was inherited by Norman Line from the estate of William Henry Line. However, once Norman Line subdivided the land in 1923, the 50-acre south-east quarter transferred to John Byron Ray (and subsequently to Robert Noble) was separated from the original nineteenth century homestead in the western (and separated) portion of the previous 200- acre Line farm.

Table 6 – Assessment of Contextual Value

| ENVIRONMENT/ STREETSCAPE/ COMMUNITY | EVALUATION CRITERIA | GRADING | COMMENTS |
|--|--|--|--|
| <p>Structure contributes to the continuity or character of the street, community, or area.</p> <p>Heritage building in a rural area (ie. former farm buildings), not yet developed or part of a Block Plan development that have a good architectural rating should be rated for its community and/or contextual significance based on the criteria defined.</p> | <p>E – Of particular importance in establishing the dominant or historic character of the area, community, or streetscape.</p> <p>VG – Of importance in establishing the dominant or historic character of the area, landscape, or significant to the community for its architectural evaluation portion form.</p> <p>M – Compatible with the dominant character of the area</p> | <p>E – 15</p> <p>VG – 10</p> <p>M – 8</p> <div>F/P – 0</div> | <p>The subject properties are located within the Maple HCD boundaries, but are not included among the HCD's 'Heritage Buildings', or pre-listed buildings with architectural or historical values (section 3.2.1). They are therefore, 'Non-Heritage Buildings', which may otherwise be termed as "non-contributing" structures to the historic character of the HCD.</p> <p>The 1879 Map, although executed conjecturally, verified that the subject properties were only part of the undeveloped portions of the historic Line farm lands. The existing 1-1/2 brick structures within the properties were also not established during the Village of Maple's historic period. Confirming the research on the properties' site and ownership history (section 3.1.1), these structures are the result of a modest subdivision of lots, most likely implemented by the Noble family.</p> <p>The subject properties are adjacent to the listed Frank Robson Log Cabin at 9470 Keele Street, which is buffered by landscaped City-owned amenities, and are near to the 1890 Ontario Cottage Style House at 9715 Keele Street (section 3.2.2). They are also near the District's 'South Gateway', the area marked by the major intersection at Fieldgate Drive-Cromwell Road, as defined in Section 5.2 Gateways of the Maple HCD Study.</p> <p>The subject properties are not critical in establishing the dominant historic character of the area, community, or streetscape. Yet, as non-heritage buildings within the HCD, as neighbours to the 'listed' Frank Robson Log Cabin, and being in close proximity to the Maple HCD South Gateway, any future alteration, or site development, must consider the design guidelines stipulated in the Maple HCD Plan.</p> |
| | <div>F/P – Site, structure, has no significance to Vaughan's History</div> | | |

3.3 ARCHITECTURAL (DESIGN OR PHYSICAL) VALUE

A general building survey was conducted on November 2005 for the Maple HCD Inventory report. At that time, buildings were not inspected at close range, and were not evaluated to include access to their interiors. Although this “windshield survey” helped understand the overall heritage conditions of the Maple HCD, it still required detailed inspections of individual District properties, such as the subject properties at 9560 & 9570 Keele Street (Appendix D). Additional information for the subject properties is supplemented by this CHRIA, through detailed photo documentation (3.3.1) and conditions assessment (3.3.2), as discussed below.

3.3.1 DOCUMENTATION OF BUILT STRUCTURE

3.3.1.1 BUILT STRUCTURE OF 9560 KEELE STREET

a. Exterior Conditions




Figure 26 – First (Main) Floor Key Plan, not to scale, sketch by AREA, annotated to refer to Photos E-1 to E-11



'Photo E-1', East Elevation



'Photo E-2', East Elevation Window, Former Wood Shutters Removed



'Photo E-3', Spalling Bricks at Entry Porch



'Photo E-4', North Elevation, L-Side



'Photo E-5', North Elevation, R-Side



'Photo E-6', West Elevation



'Photo E-7', West Elevation, Abutment of One-Storey Garage



'Photo E-8', Blocked Window Lightwell



'Photo E-9', South Elevation



'Photo E-10', Concrete Patio with incised dates



'Photo E-11', South Elevation R-side Window, Former Wood Shutters Removed

b. Interior Conditions, First (Main) Floor




Figure 27 – First (Main) Floor Key Plan, not to scale, sketch by AREA, annotated to refer to Photos M-1 to M-8




'Photo M-1', Interior Hallway Looking at Main Door




'Photo M-2', Typical Profile of Existing Windows




'Photo M-3', Kitchen Area



'Photo M-4', Main Floor Bathroom




'Photo M-5', Office Space




'Photo M-6', Hallway to Kitchen, Dining, Living Rooms



'Photo M-7', Living Room



'Photo M-8', Dining Room



'Photo B-1', Storage Room 2



'Photo B-2', Storage Room 3

Figure 28 – Basement Floor Key Plan, not to scale, sketch by AREA, annotated to refer to Photos B-1 to B-6



'Photo B-3', Height of Door Openings



'Photo B-4', Stair Width



'Photo B-5', Stairs, View to Main Floor



'Photo B-6', Storage Room 4




Figure 29 – Second Floor Key Plan, not to scale, sketch by AREA, annotated to refer to Photos S-1 to S-7



'Photo S-1', Second Floor Hallway



'Photo S-2', Stair Post Detail



'Photo S-3', Stair Rail Detail



'Photo S-4', Window Moulding Detail



'Photo S-5', Second Floor Bathroom



'Photo S-6', Bedroom 1



'Photo S-7', Bedroom 2

3.3.1.2 BUILT STRUCTURE OF 9570 KEELE STREET

a. Exterior Conditions



Figure 30 — First (Main) Floor Key Plan, not to scale, sketch by AREA, annotated to refer to Photos E-1 to E-7



'Photo E-1', South-West Elevation



'Photo E-2', North- East Elevation, Second Entrance



'Photo E-3', West Elevation



'Photo E-4', North- East Elevation, Second Entrance & Parking access



'Photo E-5', South Elevation, Porch and Entrance to Living Room



'Photo E-6', North-East Elevation, Main Entrance



'Photo E-7', East Elevation, Projection & Dormer Above



'Photo E-8', West Elevation Concrete Deck

b. Interior Conditions, First (Main) Floor



Figure 31 – First (Main) Floor Key Plan, not to scale, sketch by AREA, annotated to refer to Photos M-1 to M-8



'Photo M-1', Kitchen Looking at North (Parking) Entrance




Photo 'M-2', Kitchen Looking at Dining Room



'Photo M-3', Bedrooms/Bathroom Corridor



Photo M-4', Bathroom Looking at Exterior



'Photo M-5', Dormer Stairs



'Photo M-6', Main Entrance (East)



'Photo M-7', Living Room



'Photo M-8', Dining Room

c. Interior Conditions, Second floor (Dormer)



Figure 32 — Second Floor Key Plan, not to scale, sketch by AREA, annotated to refer to Photos S-1 to S-6



'Photo S-1', Stairs looking at Hallway

'Photo S-2', Hallway

'Photo S-3', Storage Room knee-wall



'Photo S-4', Bathroom

'Photo S-5', Bedroom



'Photo S-5', Storage Room knee-wall

3.3.2 ASSESSMENT OF EXISTING CONDITIONS

3.3.2.1. EXISTING CONDITIONS OF 9560 KEELE STREET

a. House Composition

12. Rady-Pentek & Edward Surveying Ltd. Sketch Showing Elevations of Part of Lot 18 Concession 4 City of Vaughan Regional Municipality of York. Survey, 2012 July 12. AutoCAD, DWG format.

The outermost dimensions of the 1-1/2 storey brick structure are 13.20 metres in depth, east-west direction, and 8.53 metres in width, in the north-south direction¹². Its building footprint has an actual area of 135.70 square metres¹², comprising a central, north-south oriented, gabled block structure, traversed by east-west hip-roof wings. It is abutted on the north side, by a one-storey car garage, currently used for general storage. The main portion of the structure has full-height, unfinished, basement wall foundations, while the north one-storey car garage was constructed on a concrete slab-on-grade foundation.

b. Wall Assembly and Cladding

The red brick cladding has a vertical scratch texture, also called a rug-finish, bonded with mortar, applied in a flush joint. The wall has a running bond pattern, the simplest bonding pattern in masonry construction, consisting only of stretchers. This, together with the soldier coursing above the wall openings, indicate the use of steel lintels, and would therefore suggest a brick masonry veneer wall construction with a wood-stud frame back-up. This type of construction was in common use in the mid-twentieth century bungalow style, in North America, and its use on the subject structure would further confirm its speculated building period to be between 1946 -1954.

c. Concrete Porch

A concrete porch was installed on the south side of the structure in 1971. This porch would have been semi-enclosed, as indicated by traces of two former posts. Another concrete porch that is smaller in size, currently serves as the main entry, on the east side of the structure. This smaller concrete porch would have been constructed the same time as the rest of the building, as it accounts for the height difference of the main floor and the exterior grading. It is only on this side of the structure, where the wall assembly displays spalling and mortar failure.

d. Masonry

The type of disrepair found between the eastern concrete porch and the brick wall is a result of the stresses caused by the two adjoining components. Their differences in material and assembly subject them to varying reaction to changes in temperature, moisture, structural loading, or foundation support, and when joined, without sufficient elasticity, can cause cracks and failure. The installation of this concrete slab contiguous to and connected to the brick masonry wall may have been poorly constructed. Typically, both materials should have been joined by box ties (rectangular ties) or ladder-type ties.

e. Roofing Structure, Material, and Assembly

The main portions of the structure (excluding the garage) have high-pitched gable and hip roofs that the current owner recently re-roofed with asphalt shingles. The roofing structure has well-functioning water drainage systems in painted galvanized steel. The downspouts, installed on the rear (west) and south sides of the structure, are approximately 7 metres apart from each other, and are extended with a plastic downspout to channel storm water away from the building. Another downspout is located on the south-east corner of the structure, without plastic extensions. The downspouts channel the water towards the south-west portion of the site, where its lowest point, occurs in close proximity to the City-owned park.

On the east side of the structure, the gutter shows signs of deformation, perhaps, due to wind uplifting, or heavy loading. The fascia board, and the underside of the roof overhang, are constructed in wood, which is painted with a white finish that is currently peeling.

f. Fenestration Layout, Windows and Doors

The location of windows and doors is asymmetrical, while it reflects the partitioned interior layout of the house. Its windows have the same profile all throughout the elevations, with variations occurring only in their dimensions. The multi-pane, 6-over-6, single-glazed windows have newly-painted wood sashes, with no indication of rotting or failure. However, the windows on the east hip-roof wing, were formerly installed with wood shutters, which the current owner removed due to extreme deterioration. Traces of these former wood shutters are observable on the red brick cladding on this portion of the structure.

g. Interior Layout

The interior layout of the structure is partitioned. Upon entering from the main (eastern) doorway, one would immediately access the L-shaped hallway with doors, leading to the office, the main floor bathroom, kitchen and dining rooms, and lastly, the living room. This type of layout is not typical to historic floor plans, implemented throughout Ontario. Heritage residences would oftentimes feature a central or a side hall plan.

h. Interior Trims and Finishes

The immediately previous owner, Di Domizio, refinished the interior walls and trims with a water-based interior paint, in a neutral gray. The 6-1/2 inch baseboard trims, and crown mouldings, as well as the framing on the interior doors, were never replaced, at least during the Fezza family's ownership. These trim elements have only been repainted, as part of the owners' maintenance activities. The existing hardwood flooring is also original, but has been sanded and re-stained. The balustrades of the stairs from the main floor to the second floor, are only 0.76-metre high, and do not comply with present-day building code. The balustrade from the main floor to the basement is 1.05-metre high, and is therefore compliant. The stairs, interior trims, and flooring are integral to the structure, and have not undergone major alterations, except for refinishing.

i. Ceilings

The main floor ceiling does not have a particular architectural decoration as it only features a smooth, painted drywall finish. The upper floor appears to have been applied with smooth plaster to follow and cover the interior silhouette of the roofing structure.

j. Basement, Floor Joists for Main Level

From the inspection of the Basement Level, the floor joists of the central gabled block and the east wing span the north-south axis, while the floor joists of the west wing are perpendicular to it. Electrical wiring was installed through the floor joists, hence, explaining the diagonal floor bracing on some portions of the structure. The basement level, and the main level's flooring are exposed and not insulated. This condition would have caused extreme heat loss during the winter periods. The uninsulated, and unfinished basement features four large storage areas, with painted concrete block walls, and painted drywall partitions in some areas.

3.3.2.2. EXISTING CONDITIONS OF 9570 KEELE STREET

a. House Composition

The outermost dimensions of the 1-1/2 storey wood and stone structure are 8.23 metres in depth, in the east-west direction with a 1.27 metres projection, and 12.55 metres in width, in the north-south direction¹². Its building footprint has an actual area of 103.07 square metres, comprising a central, north-south oriented, gabled block structure, with modest, pitched-roof and second floor dormer. On the north side, slightly separated from the house, is a one-storey car garage. The structure has full-height, unfinished, basement wall foundations, while the north one-storey car garage was constructed on a concrete slab-on-grade foundation

b. Wall Assembly and Cladding

The modest, pitched-roof house has split-faced, random-course-rubble sandstone cladding throughout ground floor. A dormer is clad in horizontal aluminum siding, presumably over old wooden siding. Soffits and eaves are clad throughout in aluminum, again assumed to hide original wooden trim beneath. Use of coursed-rubble cladding, with large masonry units in ground floor, is reminiscent of traditional construction, though stone in this instance is from an unknown and non-local source - possible Credit Valley sandstone.

c. Concrete Porch

The main concrete porch was installed on the east side of the structure and serves as the formal entry of the house. Also another concrete porch was installed on the south, adjacent to the Living Room. The both concrete porch would have been constructed the same time as the rest of the building, as it accounts for the height difference of the main floor and the exterior grading. A third concrete deck which is clad in rubble-sandstone on its base walls, is located on the west side of the structure overlooking the garden .

d. Masonry

The type of disrepair found between the west concrete deck and the stone-rubble base walls as well as at the bottom part of the south-west corner walls and basement's concrete block walls is a result of the stresses caused by the two adjoining components. Their differences in material and assembly subject them to varying reaction to changes in temperature, moisture, structural loading, or foundation support, and when joined, without sufficient elasticity, can cause cracks and failure. The installation of this concrete slab contiguous to and connected to the stone masonry wall may have been poorly constructed. Typically, both materials should have been joined by box ties (rectangular ties) or ladder-type ties.

e. Roofing Structure, Material, and Assembly

The structure has a central large, gabled roof covered with asphalt shingles. Two second-floor dormers exist at the central block, set above the asphalt-shingled roof. The roofing structure has well-functioning water drainage systems in pre-finished metal eavestroughs and downspouts some of which are fallen off or damaged. Soffits and eaves are clad throughout in aluminum, assumed to hide original wooden trim beneath.

f. Fenestration Layout, Windows and Doors

The building is roughly symmetrical, with entry from the street set in the East Elevation. The fenestration of the street facing East Elevation will be described in this section. The ground floor has a projecting central block, with a large window at the north and a small, tall window at the south. The north window consists of a large, wooden, single-pane fixed sash, with a 1/1 unit to the right, while the south window is an unusual 12-pane unit with metal muntins. At the north wing, the window is a wide 1/1 unit (with metal storm), and at the south wing, fenestration consists of 1/1 units flanking a large, single-pane fixed sash (all behind single-pane wooden storms). Windows throughout have robust stone sills and modest stone lintels, suggesting steel lintels behind.

g. Interior Layout

The interior layout of the structure is partitioned. Upon entering from the main (eastern) doorway, one would immediately access the hallway with closet, leading to living area with a door to a second porch, dining area, kitchen back entrance and dormer stairs, and lastly to the corridor with access to main floor bathroom and two bedrooms. This type of layout is typical of Suburban Bungalow Style houses implemented throughout Ontario.

h. Interior Trims and Finishes

The stairs, interior trims, and flooring are integral to the structure, and have not undergone major alterations, except for refinishing. The trims, and the framing on the interior doors, are original. The existing hardwood flooring is also original, but has been covered over in places with other flooring. All of the interior finishes are in poor and dilapidated condition because the house has been vacant and boarded shut for some time.

i. Ceilings

The main floor ceiling does not have a particular architectural decoration as it only features a smooth, painted drywall finish. The upper floor appears to have been applied with smooth plaster to follow and cover the interior silhouette of the roofing structure.

3.3.3 ASSESSMENT OF ARCHITECTURAL VALUE

In conclusion, the subject houses constitute simple construction, with no discernable style or features and therefore do not possess physical or design value as summarized in Tables 7 & 8 below.

3.3.3.1 ARCHITECTURAL VALUE OF 9560 KEELE STREET

Several other factors demonstrate that these properties do not possess architectural value:

- Further research has confirmed that the houses' construction dates are later, post-WWII, mid-century and therefore NOT early twentieth century construction.
- It seems therefore that the lot purchasers in 1946 – Saunderson (9560) and Sniders (9570) – went on to build their own houses sometime before 1954 (Figures 7 & 8). The houses, therefore, were not built by the Noble family and were simply the result of a severance process that resulted in William Noble selling off these residential lots from his remaining lands.

Table 7 - Assessment of Architectural Value of 9560 Keele Street

| STYLE | EVALUATION CRITERIA | GRADING | COMMENTS |
|--|---|--|--|
| Good, notable, rare, unique, or early example of a particular architectural style or type. Exterior architectural style only should be evaluated. (i.e. change in roofline, skylights, additions, or removal of features, etc. that have changed the style of the building.) | <p>E – Excellent to very good or extremely early example of its style.</p> <p>VG – Good example of its style with little to no changes to the structure.</p> <p>G – Good to fair example of its style (e.g. style evident in structure, however changes have occurred to building).</p> <div>F/P – Style is not evident or considered a good example.</div> | <p>E – 20</p> <p>VG – 15</p> <p>M – 8</p> <div>F/P – 0</div> | <p>The structure is described as a “last-gasp Arts-and-Crafts, or even precursor to Post-Modernism” in the November 2005 Village of Maple Building Inventory. This reflects the structure’s lack of adherence to a particular style. It does not possess the bold expression of materials and assembly, or the open, “flowing”, and inside-out design of the Arts and Craft Style. The only factor that could be attributed to this architectural style is the structure’s steep roofs. In reference to the 2007 Maple HCD, the structure does not fit any of the listed Heritage and Non-Heritage Styles, prevalent in the Maple HCD for Residential Buildings.</p> |

| | | | |
|--|---|---|--|
| <p>CONSTRUCTION</p> <p>Good, notable, rare, unique, or early example of a particular material or method of construction. (i.e.) log construction, pre-1850, stone, board on board construction, etc.)</p> | <p>EVALUATION CRITERIA</p> <p>E – Excellent or early example of its construction method.</p> <p>VG – Good or early example of its construction method.</p> <p>G/F – Good to fair example of its construction method.</p> <div>P – Construction method is not significant in nature nor is it of particular interest.</div> | <p>GRADING</p> <p>E – 10</p> <p>VG – 8</p> <p>G/F – 5</p> <div>P – 0</div> | <p>COMMENTS</p> <div>The structure’s method of construction is not significant in nature nor is it of particular interest. It reflects the technology prevalent and economical during its building period for “production-type” subdivision housing. The wood-stud construction and the brick veneer cladding in running bond pattern constitute time-efficient means for building. Its lack of brickwork pattern, or incorporation of unique building features and details, reflect ‘generic’ housing, and lack of social stature for the residence.</div> |
| <p>AGE</p> <p>Comparatively old in the context of the City of Vaughan’s architectural history.</p> | <p>EVALUATION CRITERIA</p> <p>E – Built between dates 1790-1820.</p> <p>VG – Built between dates 1821-1910.</p> <p>G – Built between dates 1911-1939.</p> <div>F/P – Built since 1940.</div> | <p>GRADING</p> <p>E – 5</p> <p>VG – 3</p> <p>G – 2</p> <div>F/P – 0</div> | <p>COMMENTS</p> <div>The building period that was estimated for the structure is between 1946 to 1954. The structure’s method of construction, veneer masonry, was in common use for the mid-century bungalow style. The structure, would have been built post-1946 based on the aerial photographs. Hence, for this criteria, it is appropriate to assign a numerical value that would reflect this later building period.</div> |
| <p>INTERIOR</p> <p>Integrity of interior arrangement, finish, craftsmanship, and/or detail are particularly attractive or unique and/or still exist.</p> | <p>EVALUATION CRITERIA</p> <p>E – Excellent interior (80-100% intact).</p> <p>VG – Very good interior (70-79% intact).</p> <div>G – Good interior (50-69% intact).</div> <p>F/P – Fair or poor (0-49% intact).</p> | <p>GRADING</p> <p>E – 5</p> <p>VG – 3</p> <div>G – 2</div> <p>F/P – 0</p> | <p>COMMENTS</p> <div>The existing interior arrangement, trims, and details are original to the structure. The immediately previous building owner, Di Domizio, has performed maintenance and repair activities by sanding and refinishing the baseboards, crown mouldings, flooring, and wall finishing. However, the interior layout and trim is not unique, and, as mentioned, represents standard subdivision-type residential finishes.</div> |

| ALTERATIONS | EVALUATION CRITERIA | GRADING | COMMENTS |
|--|--|--|---|
| <p>Building has undergone minor exterior alterations, and retains most of its original materials and design features.</p> <p>Checklist includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Original Exterior Siding 30% Windows/doors 30% Verandahs/trim 30% Foundation/location 10% Structural Plan (no modern or sympathetic additions) 10% | <p>E – Exterior of building is unchanged. (90-100% intact)</p> <p>G – Exterior of building has changed somewhat, but character retained. (61-89% intact)</p> <p>F – Exterior of building has changed somewhat and original character compromised. (40-60% intact)</p> <p>P – Original exterior character destroyed. (0-30% intact)</p> | <p>E – 20</p> <p>G – 15</p> <p>F – 8</p> <p>P – 0</p> | <p>The building has not undergone any major alterations since its construction. According to the immediately previous property owner, Di Domizio, the existing form and massing have been unaltered since the occupancy of the Fezza family. The close inspection and interior observation of the structure revealed that all structural components – the basement wall foundations, the wall assembly, and the roofing structure – are all integral to each other. Minor changes occurred, in the form of refinishing the exterior trims, gutters, and downspouts.</p> |
| CONDITION | EVALUATION CRITERIA | GRADING | COMMENTS |
| <p>Exterior/interior of building is in good structural condition (i.e. evidence of decay in exterior siding, roof, or interior basement, wall surface, flooring, or ceiling, suggesting structure to be unsound.)</p> <p>Checklist:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Exterior Siding/Gutters (cracks, spalling) Roof/Interior Ceiling/Gutters Flooring, unstable, Depressions Interior Wall surface, cracks, etc Basement (leaks mold, dry or wet rot on beams) | <p>G – Good structural condition. (No evidence of decay)</p> <p>S – Somewhat good structural Condition. (Minor/little evidence of decay)</p> <p>F – Fair structural condition (Some (i.e. 2 from adjacent list) evidence of decay).</p> <p>P – Poor structural condition. (Significant/considerable evidence of decay.)</p> <p>structure, however changes have occurred to building).</p> | <p>G – 20</p> <p>S – 15</p> <p>F – 10</p> <p>P – 0</p> | <p>The structure exhibits sound condition, with little evidence of damage or decay other than peeling finishing on exterior trims. However, it is speculated, based on site investigation, that the main floor level may be experiencing high heat loss with the absence of insulation on its subflooring or in the basement walls. This lack of thermal or moisture control may cause future damage</p> |

3.3.3.2 ARCHITECTURAL VALUE OF 9570 KEELE STREET

Table 8 - Assessment of Architectural Value of 9570 Keele Street

| STYLE | EVALUATION CRITERIA | GRADING | COMMENTS |
|--|---|--|--|
| Good, notable, rare, unique, or early example of a particular architectural style or type. Exterior architectural style only should be evaluated. (i.e. change in roofline, skylights, additions, or removal of features, etc. that have changed the style of the building.) | <p>E – Excellent to very good or extremely early example of its style.</p> <p>VG – Good example of its style with little to no changes to the structure.</p> <p>G – Good to fair example of its style (e.g. style evident in structure, however changes have occurred to building).</p> <p>F/P – Style is not evident or considered a good example.</p> | <p>E – 20</p> <p>VG – 15</p> <p>M – 8</p> <p>F/P – 0</p> | <p>The structure is described as a “combining elements of the bungalow with more traditional element of gabled central upper floor” in the November 2005 Village of Maple Building Inventory. This reflects the structure’s lack of adherence to a particular style. It would be described as an ordinary 1950’s suburban bungalow. It does not possess the bold expression of materials and assembly of any style. The only factor that could be attributed to this architectural style is the use of coursed-rubble cladding, with large masonry units. In reference to the 2007 Maple HCD, the structure does not fit any of the listed Heritage and Non-Heritage Styles, prevalent in the Maple HCD for Residential Buildings.</p> |
| CONSTRUCTION | EVALUATION CRITERIA | GRADING | COMMENTS |
| Good, notable, rare, unique, or early example of a particular material or method of construction. (i.e.) log construction, pre-1850, stone, board on board construction, etc.) | <p>E – Excellent or early example of its construction method.</p> <p>VG – Good or early example of its construction method.</p> <p>G/F – Good to fair example of its construction method.</p> <p>P – Construction method is not significant in nature nor is it of particular interest.</p> | <p>E – 10</p> <p>VG – 8</p> <p>G/F – 5</p> <p>P – 0</p> | <p>The structure’s method of construction is not significant in nature nor is it of particular interest. It reflects the technology prevalent and economical during its building period for “production-type” subdivision housing. The wood-stud construction and the random-course-rubble sandstone cladding throughout ground floor is reminiscent of traditional construction but is suburban in its composition. Its lack of unique building features and details, reflect ‘generic’ housing, and lack of social stature for the residence.</p> |

| | | | |
|--|--|---|--|
| <p>AGE</p> <p>Comparatively old in the context of the City of Vaughan's architectural history.</p> | <p>EVALUATION CRITERIA</p> <p>E – Built between dates 1790-1820.</p> <p>VG – Built between dates 1821-1910.</p> <p>G – Built between dates 1911-1939.</p> <div>F/P – Built since 1940.</div> | <p>GRADING</p> <p>E – 5</p> <p>VG – 3</p> <p>G – 2</p> <div>F/P – 0</div> | <p>COMMENTS</p> <div>The building period that was estimated for the structure is between 1946 to 1954. The structure's method of construction, coursed-rubble cladding in ground floor and seemingly wooden siding in the dormers which has been covered by horizontal aluminum siding later, is evocative of a generic suburban bungalow.</div> |
| <p>INTERIOR</p> <p>Integrity of interior arrangement, finish, craftsmanship, and/or detail are particularly attractive or unique and/or still exist.</p> | <p>EVALUATION CRITERIA</p> <p>E – Excellent interior (80-100% intact).</p> <p>VG – Very good interior (70-79% intact).</p> <div>G – Good interior (50-69% intact).</div> <p>F/P – Fair or poor (0-49% intact).</p> | <p>GRADING</p> <p>E – 5</p> <p>VG – 3</p> <div>G – 2</div> <p>F/P – 0</p> | <p>COMMENTS</p> <div>The existing interior arrangement, trims, and details are original to the structure. However, the interior layout and trim is not unique, and, as mentioned, represents standard subdivision-type residential finishes.</div> |

| ALTERATIONS | EVALUATION CRITERIA | GRADING | COMMENTS |
|--|--|--|---|
| <p>Building has undergone minor exterior alterations, and retains most of its original materials and design features.</p> <p>Checklist includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Original Exterior Siding 30% Windows/doors 30% Verandahs/trim 30% Foundation/location 10% Structural Plan (no modern or sympathetic additions) 10% | <p>E – Exterior of building is unchanged. (90-100% intact)</p> <p>G – Exterior of building has changed somewhat, but character retained. (61-89% intact)</p> <p>F – Exterior of building has changed somewhat and original character compromised. (40-60% intact)</p> <p>P – Original exterior character destroyed. (0-30% intact)</p> | <p>E – 20</p> <p>G – 15</p> <p>F – 8</p> <p>P – 0</p> | <p>The building has not undergone any major alterations since its construction. The close inspection and interior observation of the structure revealed that all structural components – the basement wall foundations, the wall assembly, and the roofing structure – are all integral to each other. Minor changes occurred, in recladding of second floor and dormer in horizontal aluminum siding presumably over old wooden siding. Soffits and eaves are clad throughout in aluminum, again assumed to hide original wooden trim beneath.</p> |
| CONDITION | EVALUATION CRITERIA | GRADING | COMMENTS |
| <p>Exterior/interior of building is in good structural condition (i.e. evidence of decay in exterior siding, roof, or interior basement, wall surface, flooring, or ceiling, suggesting structure to be unsound.)</p> <p>Checklist:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Exterior Siding/Gutters (cracks, spalling) Roof/Interior Ceiling/Gutters Flooring, unstable, Depressions Interior Wall surface, cracks, etc Basement (leaks mold, dry or wet rot on beams) | <p>G – Good structural condition. (No evidence of decay)</p> <p>S – Somewhat good structural Condition. (Minor/little evidence of decay)</p> <p>F – Fair structural condition (Some (i.e. 2 from adjacent list) evidence of decay).</p> <p>P – Poor structural condition. (Significant/considerable evidence of decay.)</p> <p>structure, however changes have occurred to building).</p> | <p>G – 20</p> <p>S – 15</p> <p>F – 10</p> <p>P – 0</p> | <p>The structure exhibits sound condition, with little evidence of damage or decay other than peeling finishing on exterior trims. However, it is speculated, based on site investigation, that the foundation structure is experiencing settlement and cracking. Furthermore, the interior finishes are in poor and dilapidated condition because the house has been vacant and boarded shut for some time.</p> |

4 Heritage Significance of 9560 & 9570 Keele Street

4.1 SUMMARY OF HERITAGE ASSESSMENT

The research findings and site investigations discussed in subsections 3.1 to 3.3 are summarized using the City's Built Heritage Evaluation Form ('BHEF', see Tables 8 and 9). The assessed properties at 9560 & 9570 Keele Street, gained scores in the following three BHEF sub-criteria for Architectural Value:

- Interior: Integrity of interior arrangement and finishes still exist and are intact, except with some deterioration. But the craftsmanship, and/or detail are not particularly attractive or unique.
- Alterations: Building has undergone minor exterior alterations, and retains most of its original materials and design features.
- Condition: Exterior/interior of building is in good structural condition (i.e. evidence of decay in exterior siding, roof, or interior basement, wall surface, flooring, or ceiling, suggesting structure to be unsound.)

These three sub-categories value the integrity and soundness of a built structure. The existing houses at 9560 & 9570 Keele Street still retain most of their original building features from the 1950s. They exhibit little or no alterations, and appear to have been well-maintained (up until they were boarded shut). There is no evidence of irreparable decay or structural failure. Physical deterioration is limited to spots of peeling paint on exterior components, spalling and masonry cracking.

However, these houses did not score on the three other sub-categories for Architectural Value – Style, Construction, and Age (see Tables 7 & 8).

The houses do not have sufficient physical features to represent the unique principles of an architectural style. The house at 9560 Keele Street was described as a "last-gasp Arts-and-Crafts", and its character-defining element is limited to its steep roof structure. The house at 9570 Keele Street was described as an ordinary 1950's suburban bungalow. Both houses do not represent innovation in building construction. The houses are the result of "production-type" subdivision housing.

The two houses are quite commonplace suburban 1950s houses and are NOT considered to have a heritage style, according to the HCD Plan. These houses would somewhat fit the Architectural Style category of a "Vernacular Bungalow" house which is identified in the Maple HCD Plan under "Non- Heritage Styles, Residential Buildings" (HCD Plan 9.1.4, p. 78, underline added for emphasis). The City's Built Heritage Evaluation Form (BHEF) criteria for architectural or physical cultural heritage value allocates a grading of '0' for buildings constructed since 1940 (Section 3.3.3, pp. 36 & 39) which the subject houses' construction dates well exceed.

These lots have no contextual relationship to the nineteenth-century location of the Line homestead which would have been about a half concession (approximately .6 miles) west of these Keele Street lands. These 1950s non- heritage houses are located (to reference the BHEF criteria) on a "site [that] has no significance to Vaughan's History" and, as such, fulfill the definition of a Fair or Poor grading of '0' (Section 3.2.3, p. 22). See consultant responses 3.1 to 3.3 above and others in this table.

Furthermore, the houses, themselves, do not represent the historic period and character of the Village of Maple. They do not have any historical and contextual significance (see Tables 5 and 6). They cannot be attributed to a historical figure or event. They also never functioned as landmarks within the Maple HCD.

These houses have no relationship to the settler members of the Noble family (i.e. Joseph Noble) or even their descendent, William Noble, who merely severed and sold the lots to Margaret Saunderson (9560 Keele St.) and the Sniders (9570 Keele St.) and the new lot owners built, on their own, vernacular suburban homes. These 1950s bungalows have no association with the nineteenth-century or early twentieth-century establishment of the Village of Maple which involved the Noble family but at a different location at the corner of Keele Street and Major Mackenzie Drive. The association of these lots with the Noble family name is merely circumstantial and transactional. The indirect genealogical connection of William Noble to the subject land does not entail a physical manifestation in a built form wherein it would be more appropriately commemorated in a plaque instead. The built form of the houses themselves are not connected to the Noble family or other founders of the village and (to reference the BHEF criteria) are “structures [that have] no significance to Vaughan’s History” and, therefore, are assigned a Fair or Poor grading of ‘0’ (Section 3.1.3, p. 16).

The combined heritage value of the houses maintains their current “Non-Heritage” building status within the Maple HCD.

This conclusion, however, still assumes that the new development should represent sympathetic alterations to the subject land assembly. Although the land assembly is comprised of essentially, two Non-Heritage Buildings, they have compositional attributes that are complementary to the Maple HCD (see subsection 4.3). As they remain included in the Maple HCD, future site alterations, or development proposals should consider the Maple HCD Plan and its Design Guidelines. The proposed new development should consider the HCD design guidelines for new construction to be compatible with the heritage character of the District, since it will be subject to review by the City’s Heritage Vaughan Committee, and ultimately, approval by Council.

4.2 GRADING OF HERITAGE VALUE

Based on the Section 3 Heritage Evaluation, the grading of the subject houses are calculated using the City's criteria in the Tables 9 and 10 below. Both houses at 9560 and 9570 Keele Street have similar (low) heritage value which is reflected in their equal evaluation grading. The resulting heritage assessments renders a total grading of 37 and, therefore, both buildings are classified classification as a Group D having "little or no significance."

Table 9 – Summary of Historical Evaluation for 9560 and 9570 Keele street

| CRITERIA | GRADING |
|---|---------|
| HISTORICAL VALUE | 0 |
| ENVIRONMENTAL (CONTEXTUAL) VALUE | 0 |
| ARCHITECTURE (DESIGN OR PHYSICAL) VALUE | |
| Style | 0 |
| Construction | 0 |
| Age | 0 |
| Interior | 2 |
| Alterations | 20 |
| Condition | 15 |

Table 10 – Overview of Heritage Value of Subject Properties at 9560 and 9570 Keele Street

BUILDING STRUCTURE: 9560 & 9570 Keele Street

COMMON NAME OF BUILDING STRUCTURE: 9560 Keele Street, 9570 Keele Street,

BLOCK: Concession: 4 Lot: 18

COMMUNITY: Maple



| YES | NO | DESCRIPTION |
|-----|----|--|
| X | | Included in the City of Vaughan Heritage Inventory |
| | X | Included in the City of Vaughan "Listing of Buildings of Architectural and Historical Value" |
| | X | Designated under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act |
| X | | Designated under Part V of the Ontario Heritage Act within a Heritage Conservation District |

TOTAL GRADING: 37

GROUP: D

KEY TO GRADING:

- 90-100 GROUP A – Very Significant
- 60-79 GROUP B – Significant
- 40-59 GROUP C – Modest Significance
- 0-39 GROUP D – Little or No Significance

4.3 CONTRIBUTING ATTRIBUTES OF 9560 & 9570 KEELE STREET

Although the houses at 9560 & 9570 Keele Street remain as 'Non-Heritage Buildings' within the Maple HCD, some of their characteristics may still be used as inspiration for the proposed development. As stated in Subsection 9.5.1 of the Maple HCD Plan (underlines added for emphasis),

"Within the design of any individual building, architectural elements contribute to the character of the public realm of the street. Massing, materials, scale, proportions, rhythm, composition, texture, and siting all contribute to the perception of whether or not a building fits its context." These elements may be expressed in the form of a unique architectural style, suitable to and inspired by the local heritage character of the Maple HCD, or by a specific architectural precedent.

For the development of the land parcel assembly, the character-defining elements ('CDE') of the subject properties at 9560 & 9570 Keele Street are the most relevant components for future incorporation, reproduction, or reinterpretation. According to the Standards and Guidelines for the Preservation of Historic Places in Canada, administered by Parks Canada, Second Edition ('Standards and Guidelines'), character-defining elements are defined as,

"The materials, forms, location, spatial configurations, uses and cultural associations or meanings that contribute to the heritage value of a historic place..."

Although the term is often used for buildings with significant cultural values that would warrant individual listing or designation, this report uses the term, 'CDE', to enumerate the subject properties' characteristic features that are recognizable, despite their lack of inherent compliance to a high-form architectural style. The subject property's CDEs include:

- **Building Orientation** The prominent east-facing (front) elevations provide a direct relationship with the (Keele St.) street frontage with the entry porches and their doors accessed from the sidewalk. The proposed new houses should likewise provide for some of the entry porches and doors facing the street.
- **Form and Massing** The gable rooflines, with soffits, trimmed with siding boards, incorporated an upper floor within the roof height. The exterior ABA massing formation of the houses provides projecting middle bays creating a rhythm of recesses alternating with projections. These massing characteristics may be reinterpreted in the new development through a contemporary or historical design approach.
- **Materials** Both houses incorporated masonry and wood trim which are commonplace materials through the HCD as noted in its Study and Plan. Even though these materials are used in the subject houses in an unremarkable and commonplace way, it is nevertheless encouraged that masonry and wood trim be the primary cladding for new development as opposed to the stucco finish of some of the adjacent houses from the recent period.

It must be emphasized that these building elements are quite limited in terms of how they contribute to the heritage character of the Maple HCD. The incorporation of these elements should be executed, through the balancing of simple contemporary construction methods and traditional reproduction elements. There must be a consistent and conscientious design that would respectfully relate the old to the new, without falsifying historic appearance, and with sufficient distinguishability. "Distinguishability" is a general conservation principle applied to alterations and additions to a heritage resource. The Maple HCD Plan, in particular, recommends to "make new work physically and visually compatible with, subordinate to, and *distinguishable* from the heritage resource" (Maple HCD Plan, 4.2.2.a). By applying this principle, the new development should exemplify design standards that will add value to the Village of Maple Heritage Conservation District.

5 Description and Implementation of Development Proposal

5.1 PROPOSED TOWNHOUSE DEVELOPMENT

The proposed development seeks to develop the subject land assembly at 9560-9570 Keele Street by replacing the existing single-detached houses with a new townhouse development. The development will be comprised of six blocks, each comprising the units as follows (Figure 33):

- Block 1- 5 units, townhouses
- Block 2- 2 units, semi-detached
- Block 3- 2 units, semi-detached
- Block 4- 2 units, semi-detached
- Block 5- 2 units, semi-detached
- Block 6- 4 units, townhouses

The six development blocks were sited along the perimeter of the land assembly. The 17 townhouse units are based on four basic layouts, Types “A”, “B”, “C”, and “D”, which range from 172-193 sm in area. The development’s site statistics are provided in Table 11 below.




Figure 33 –Site Plan, RN Design, July 2018

Table 11 – Site Statistics of New Development

| | |
|--|----------------|
| Gross Floor Area | 3,055-sq.m |
| Net Developable Area (exluding Keele Street road widening allowance) | 0.333-ha |
| Development Density | 51.02 units/ha |
| Floor Space Index | 0.92 |
| Lot Coverage | 38.04% |

5.2 TOWNHOUSES REPLACING EXISTING HOUSES

The existing buildings at 9560 and 9570 Keele Street will be demolished. The heritage evaluation of the properties (Section 4) concludes that the house structures do not have sufficient contextual, historical, or architectural significance to be among the 'Heritage Buildings' within the Maple HCD and do not warrant individual protection.

The house structures comprising the subject property lots are not associated with the Line or Noble families. The original Line family concession lots were subdivided to create the existing property lots at 9560 and 9570 Keele Street. Both properties do not have associations with any historical figures or events. The house structures within the property lots are also not associated with any architect or builder, and are not reflective of any formal architectural style.

As an example of 1950s, subdivision suburban housing, the design of both house types reflects only the economic expediency that led to their construction. These types of houses, with their pattern-book templates, helped realize the efforts by government and developers to provide cost-efficient housing. These two-house structures are, furthermore, infill structures, and they do not belong to a neighbourhood development that would represent the consolidation and establishment of a street "character."

The only heritage value afforded to the subject properties is by virtue of their inclusion within the Maple HCD. The circumstances of the structures' low heritage value, poor architectural quality, and their lack of compatibility with the evolving Maple HCD preclude their retention, conservation, or reuse. The structures, by themselves, do not represent the historic period of the District, and are not able to accommodate the pressing demand for the village's growth and development.

The subject house structures at 9560 and 9570 Keele Street are non-contributing to the heritage character of the HCD. The substitution of these existing non-heritage house structures with a new townhouse development is found to be an effective way for the subject properties to acquire an active and contributory role within the Maple Heritage Conservation District.

5.3 IMPLEMENTATION OF DESIGN GUIDELINES

The subject development is guided by implementation strategies derived from the Maple HCD Plan Volume 3 ('Maple HCD Plan Vol.3'). The Maple HCD Plan Vol.3 report concludes the findings of the three-year Maple HCD initiative with a set of "District Policies" to successfully implement "sympathetic" future interventions for the District's four property categories:

- (1) heritage properties,
- (2) non-heritage properties,
- (3) new developments, and
- (4) landscapes.

The applicable property categories for the subject development include "(2) non-heritage properties" and (3) new developments." The objectives for these two property categories (see Table 12) seek to retain, conserve, and enhance the architectural, historical, and contextual character of the Maple HCD with compatible infill construction to "complement the area's village like" heritage character.

To implement these objectives, Section 9.0 "Guidelines for Buildings and Surroundings" of Maple HCD Plan Vol. 3 is referenced in this CHRIA. These guidelines are described as being "...based on the concepts of preserving the existing heritage buildings, maintaining their character when they are renovated or added to, and ensuring that new development respects the qualities of place established by the existing heritage environment." The Maple HCD Plan Section 9.0 Design Guidelines discusses:

- for non-heritage properties, the types of design approaches; and
- for new (residential) developments, the site planning, architectural style, scale and massing.

To discuss these factors affecting non-heritage properties and new residential developments, and to implement the applicable objectives for the Maple HCD, the CHRIA sections to follow discuss the subject development's design strategies in terms of:

- (1) siting,
- (2) massing, and
- (3) design.

The successful interpretation of these themes will ultimately define the subject proposal's compatibility with the Maple HCD's defining physical, visual, and spatial elements.

Table 12 – Maple HCD Plan Objectives for Non-Heritage Properties & New Developments

| OBJECTIVES FOR NON-HERITAGE PROPERTIES (obtained from 2.4.3 of Maple HCD Vol. 3): | OBJECTIVES FOR NEW DEVELOPMENTS (obtained from 2.4.5 of Maple HCD Vol. 3): |
|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">– to retain and to enhance complementary characteristics of non-heritage buildings, and– to encourage improvements to non-complementary buildings so that they further enhance the heritage character of the District. | <ul style="list-style-type: none">– to ensure compatible infill construction that will enhance the District's heritage character and complement the area's village-like, human scale of development, while promoting densities sufficient to secure the District's future economic viability.– to guide the design of new development to be sympathetic and compatible with the heritage resources and character of the District while providing for contemporary needs. |

6 Impacts of the Proposed Development

6.1 DEMOLITION OF NON-HERITAGE BUILDINGS

The proposed development seeks to remove the existing single detached houses at 9560 and 9570 Keele Street, and to replace them with newly built townhouse units. As these properties form part of the District, they are subject to the guidelines of the Maple HCD Study and Plan. The Maple HCD Study and Plan anticipated the possibility of demolition for non-heritage properties, as it states (underline for emphasis),

“Generally, the demolition of a Non-Heritage building is not supported if the building is supportive of the overall heritage character of the District (Maple HCD Plan, Section 4.3.3., p.20).”

Only the property at 9560 Keele Street was initially subject to this CHRIA’s heritage evaluation, as directed by Heritage Planning Staff in May 2014. However, Heritage Planning Staff subsequently requested a heritage evaluation of the adjacent 9570 Keele Street property as well.

The house at 9570 Keele Street was subject to the research and evaluation of this CHRIA report (see sections 3 and 4), and was assessed to have insufficient heritage value to be considered as a Heritage Building within the Maple HCD. The house on this property is a Non-Heritage Building within the District. It is not attributed with any architectural interest (Maple HCD Inventory). Its history was “unknown; post-George Garrow”, and its contributing characteristic was described as a “good fit within the block of early suburban Maple Village” (Maple HCD Inventory) which defines it as production subdivision housing distinct from the historic period of the Village of Maple.

The house at 9560 Keele Street, likewise, was subject to the research and evaluation of this CHRIA report (see sections 3 and 4), and was assessed to have insufficient heritage value to be considered as a Heritage Building within the Maple HCD. The house on this property is a Non-Heritage Building within the District. The property is a result of subsequent severances to a historic concession lot originally owned by the Line family settlers. Built in 1950s, the house, itself, does not have any associations with a historic figure.

Neither building represents an individual architect’s ideas, a formal architectural style, or a landmark status. With these findings, both houses scored low on both the OHA Provincial Criteria, and the City of Vaughan’s Built Heritage Evaluation categories that encompass historical, contextual, and architectural values (also see section 4). Therefore, because of their lack of heritage criteria, the houses at 9570 & 9560 Keele Street are deemed Non-Heritage buildings that can be demolished.

The heritage evaluation reports, preceding and comprising this CHRIA, have concluded that both properties at 9560 and 9570 Keele Street are Non-Heritage properties. They incorporate only limited “contributing attributes” to the heritage character of the District such as their building orientation, form and massing, and materials (also see subsection 4.3). These contributing attributes provide opportunities to be “enhanced” by being adopted into new development. As stated in the Maple HCD Plan Vol. 3, the objectives for Non-Heritage Buildings are (also see Table 12, underline for emphasis),

“...to retain and to enhance complementary characteristics of non-heritage buildings, and to encourage improvements to non-complementary buildings so that they further enhance the heritage character of the District.”

The substitution of these existing non-heritage houses with a new townhouse development provides opportunities for the properties to have an active and contributory role within the Maple HCD.

6.2 BALANCE OF CONSERVATION AND GROWTH

Overall, the development supports conservation and growth within the Maple HCD. Its conservation and design strategies accommodate a modest increase in density that is in line with the objectives and recommendations of the Maple HCD Study and Plan, as well as the City of Vaughan's "Official Plan 2010: A Plan for Transformation", as partially approved by the Ontario Municipal Board on July 23, 2013, December 2, 2013, February 3, 2014 and September 30, 2014; with October 2014 office consolidation ("Vaughan's OP"). "Schedule 13 Land Use" of Vaughan's OP designates areas within the Maple HCD as,

- a "Local Centre", for land portions within the boundaries of the Historic Village of Maple, and as
- a "Community Area", for properties to the north and south areas of the Historic Village of Maple.

The subject land assembly forms part of the Maple HCD Community Areas, and is therefore governed by Section "2.2.3 Community Areas" of Vaughan's OP. As such, the subject land assembly is appropriate to (with "[]" for added text, and underlines for emphasis):

- 2.2.3.1 provide most of the City's low-rise housing stock, as well as local-serving commercial uses and community facilities...
- 2.2.3.2. [be] considered Stable Areas...with existing development not intended to experience significant physical change.
- 2.2.3.3. [permit] limited intensification...as per the land use designations on Schedule 13 and in accordance with the policies of Chapter 9 of this Plan.

The subject development proposes three-storey townhouses that meet the criteria for low-rise housing stock, stability, and limited intensification for Community Areas. As defined in Vaughan's OP "9.2.2 Land Use Designations", "Low-Rise Residential" uses are governed by the following policies (with "[]" for added text, and underlines for emphasis):

- 9.2.2.1.a ...to consist of buildings in a low-rise form no greater than three storeys,
- 9.2.2.1.b.i ... [to permit] Residential units,
- 9.2.2.1.c.i-ii ... [to permit] Semi-Detached House [and] Townhouse.

Furthermore, the proposed development meets Vaughan's OP 9.1.2.1.a objective, which states that, "in Community Areas, new development will be designed to respect and reinforce the physical character of the established neighbourhood within which it is located." The new development's three-component design strategy, involving siting (7.1), scale and massing (7.2), and street elevation design (0) also adopts the following elements set out in Vaughan's OP 9.1.2.2:

- a. the local pattern of lots, streets and blocks;
- b. the size and configuration of lots;
- c. the building type of nearby residential properties;
- d. the heights and scale of nearby residential properties;
- e. the setback of buildings from the street;
- f. the pattern of rear and side-yard setbacks; and,
- g. conservation and enhancement of heritage buildings, heritage districts and cultural heritage landscapes.

6.3 DENSIFICATION FOR FUTURE ECONOMIC VIABILITY

One of the objectives for new developments within the Maple HCD is (underline for emphasis) “to ensure compatible infill construction that will enhance the District's heritage character and complement the area's village-like, human scale of development, while promoting densities sufficient to secure the District's future economic viability” (see 4.2 of CHRIA, and 2.4.5 of Maple HCD Vol.3). The subject development proposal supports growth and development while also promoting heritage-compatible strategies to maintain and to enhance the character-defining elements of the Maple HCD.

Increase in density has been the prevalent direction throughout the Maple HCD. This has resulted in developments that have been deemed, for the most part, as successfully compatible following the City's rigorous planning approval process. The Maple HCD studies as well as its resulting Designation By-Law have created thorough and careful development procedures to ultimately guide the success and compatibility of new projects.

The location of the subject properties within the Maple HCD provides sites that are well-fit for moderate densification. The subject properties are located outside of the original Police Village of Maple boundaries, and are in fact, on the southernmost boundaries of the District. This portion of the Maple HCD is barely comprised of Heritage Buildings, built c. 1860s-1920s. A majority of the properties were previously vacant lots slated for multi-residential developments since the 1960s. At present, at least 4 townhouse developments are approved or undergoing development applications (Figure 34).

The characteristics of the existing Maple HCD context – its “villagescape”, which is characterized by the variety in setbacks, the mixture of built forms, its pedestrian-friendly scale, the abundance of trees, etc. – must be consistently protected and upheld. The proposed townhouse development incorporates various design strategies in terms of site planning, scale and massing, and local heritage style. It must be conscientious in terms of building placement, site setbacks, site allowances, building height, and blocking. The proposed development incorporates mitigation strategies that are recommended by the City's policies and guidelines with regards to the Maple HCD (see Section 7).

With other matters to be addressed under the *Planning Act*, the City must consult with its appropriate departments and agencies with regard to adjacent uses (ie. compatibility of the size, shape, and the proposed use of the subject lot with the adjacent uses), access considerations, and availability of services. But overall, the strategy of infilling in an existing urban area and heritage conservation district economizes the use of urban space without disrupting the prevalent pattern of both existing and new developments. As the subject proposal complies with the City's applicable policies and guidelines, it perpetuates a desirable pattern of development, such as recent Maple HCD developments that have already been deemed acceptable by the City. It is the conclusion of this CHRIA that the subject development proposal is in line with the City's goals and objectives.


7 Compatible Redevelopment Strategies

7.1 SITE PLANNING


13. See
9.5.
2.1
Site
Pla
nni
ng
of
the
Ma
ple
HC
D
Vol.
3,
Ma
y
200
7,
p.
112

New developments are encouraged to provide setbacks and frontages that are consistent with the variety of the village pattern¹³. Building placement has been diversely applied within the District throughout its development. The variety of distances from the buildings' façade to the existing road curb (referred to as "curb-distance" or "building placement" by this CHRIA) is acknowledged as one of Maple HCD's distinct heritage attributes. This variety in building placement is reflective of the HCD's different periods of construction. While the District is characterized with differences in lot sizes, frontages, and setbacks, it generally reflects the following pattern:

- The "northern" cluster of 1860s-1920s buildings around the Keele Street-Major Mackenzie Drive intersection are close to the major roads, with curb-distances of 8- to 12-m.
- The "southern" cluster of 1860s-1920s buildings, such as St. Andrew's Presbyterian Church and G. Keffer House, incorporate greater curb-distances of 18- to 20-m, which recalls how Keele Street was originally an inaccessible marsh. Southern 1860s-1920s buildings were perhaps located farther away from Keele Street, and were alternatively accessed from other concession or sideroads.
- As one approaches Sherwood-Fieldgate Drive, the southern boundary of the District, 1860s-1920s buildings are absent. This southernmost portion previously had numerous vacant lots, and has therefore become an area for recent developments that began in the 1960s. These recent developments incorporate curb-distances of approximately 16- to 18-m, which reflect presently governing regulations.



Respect the existing site similar, but not identical front. Place a new building to setbacks of neighbouring building.



An extreme difference in set buildings is not appropriate.

Figure
35 -
Recom
mended
Placeme
nt of
New
Building
s¹³

The Maple HCD Plan recommends new developments to "respect the existing site plan character" by mediating between neighbouring buildings (Figure 35). This recommendation, however, is not entirely applicable to the subject development since its surrounding built structures reflect drastic differences in building placement. The George Bailey School and the Frank Robson House are at least 45-m from Keele Street, while the adjacent residential property at 9580 Keele Street is built with gates flushed to the curb (Figure 36). The subject development proposes a 3.05-m setback beyond the required road allowance of 21.5-m from the centreline of Keele Street (see Figures 33 and 37). This setback could also be observed from recent developments, such as the nearby property at 9529 Keele Street (Figures 17,18 and 37).

Historically, buildings within the District have been variedly placed within lots, depending on the site challenges and the governing regulations of a particular building period. The subject development's compliance to current site planning guidelines differentiates it from the arbitrary placements of the District's historic buildings, like the nearby Frank Robson House. With this strategy, the subject development is therefore, distinguished as a new addition to the District. It continues the District's prevalent village pattern, and is therefore contributory to its uniqueness and sense of place.



Figure 36 - Setbacks of Neighbouring Buildings (North of Land Assembly) and Proposed Setback of Subject Development, from Google Maps 2015, annotated by AREA to show proposed development (blue) & neighbouring buildings (red).




Figure 37 - Setbacks of Nearby Buildings (South of Land Assembly) and Proposed Setback of Subject Development, from Google Maps 2015, annotated by AREA to show proposed development (blue) & nearby building (red).

7.2 SCALE, MASSING AND HEIGHT

14. Weston Consulting
Ltd. Planning
Justification Report –
9560 and 9570 Keele
Street, October 2015,
page 28

The location of the subject development within the Maple HCD has already encouraged densification. Since the 1960s, the southernmost portion of the Maple HCD has been accommodating developments converting previously vacant lots into subdivisions, multi-residential condominiums, and single-family residential estates. These developments were approved to be built after rigorous permit processes concerning the Maple HCD.

As cited from Maple HCD Vol.3, one of the objectives for new developments include the promotion of densities sufficient to secure the District's future economic viability (Table 12). On a larger scale, the City of Vaughan Major Transit Network and the Region of York Official Plan designate Keele Street as a Regional Transit Policy Network¹⁴. Higher density development, such as the proposed project, will contribute to the necessary ridership to support this transit network¹⁴.

To support density while respecting the existing heritage character, the subject development proposes a built form that transitions well with the adjacent properties (see Figures 37 and 38). The proposal for a townhouse-type of development mediates between the block massing of single-detached residential estates and multi-residential apartments/condominiums (Figure 39).




Figure 38 –Subject Development's Floorplate (Blue) and Surrounding Building's Floorplates (Red), from Google Maps 2015, annotated by AREA




Figure 39 – From top-left corner, clockwise: Keele St Elevation of Subject Development by RN Design, Residential Estate at 9580 Keele Street, and Multi-Residential Development at 9529 & 9586 Keele Street.

Updated elevations within the streetscape rendering are shown in Figure 40, and are updated based on proposed grading and survey information. The height as measured from the established grade for the proposed 3-storey townhouse and semi detached blocks range from 8.97 metres (Block 1) to 9.37 metres (Block 5). Blocks 2-4 facing Keele Street in particular are measured at approximately 9.2 metres from the established grade at Keele Street.

Using survey data, the height of the adjacent 2 storey dwelling (9580 Keele St.) is 9.5 metres which has an attached one storey garage. The Maple Heritage Conservation District Plan allows for adjacent buildings to have a difference in facade height of 1 storey and should be consistent with the City's Zoning By-law:

Historically appropriate façade heights for residential buildings has been 1 - 1/2 or 2 storeys. The façade height of new residential buildings should be consistent with the façade height of existing buildings. Differences in façade heights between buildings on adjacent properties within the district should be no more than 1 storey. In all instances the height of new buildings shall conform to the provisions of the City's Zoning By-law (Section 4.4.1 e).

The proposed elevations are both within one storey and are lower in height than the adjacent 2-storey 9.5 metre dwelling (9580 Keele St.). Furthermore, the height of the townhouse and semi-detached units are also consistent with the maximum height provision for its existing zone (R1) which allows for a maximum height of 9.5 metres.

7.3 DESIGN COMPATIBILITY

Figure 40 - Proposed Elevation Design from Keele Street, RN Design, July 2018



Figure 41 - Respectful Development Proposals within the Maple HCD, obtained from the Maple HCD Study Vol.2



16. See [4.4 New Residential Buildings](#) of the Maple HCD Vol. 3, May 2007, p. 21
17. See [4.4.1.a New Residential Buildings](#) of the Maple HCD Vol. 3, May 2007, p. 21
18. See [9.1 Architectural Styles](#) of the Maple HCD Vol. 3, May 2007, p. 62

The built heritage, found within the Maple HCD, is comprised of a varied design language, translated into several architectural styles, elements, features, and compositions, to which the new developments must be “sympathetic.” New residential buildings within the Maple HCD must “have respect for and be compatible with the heritage character of the District.”¹⁶ There is no singular prescription in achieving a compatible design, however, the Maple HCD recommends that new buildings “reflect the historic built form of their historic neighbours”¹⁷, while being “...products of their own time.”¹⁷

This recommendation is further elaborated by the design approach recommended for new residential developments within the Maple HCD¹⁶:

‘New residential buildings will have respect for and be compatible with the heritage character of the District. Designs for new residential buildings will be based on the patterns and proportions of the 19th century and early 20th century building stock that are currently existing or once existed in the village.’

The subject development reflects this heritage-compatibility approach by giving an appearance of an older building adhering to one of the historic styles found in the district – Victorian Vernacular¹⁸.

The proposed design also applies materials, details, and ornaments already found within the District. RN Design incorporates a dichromatic building envelope by using red bricks combined with buff brick and white stone trims and details (Figure 40). The strategy for a two-tone exterior has been widely-adopted by recent developments that were deemed “respectful” to the Maple HCD’s heritage character (Figure 41). This is implemented through the application of consistent materials, details, and ornaments that are found from the prevalent Victorian Gothic architectural style within the Maple HCD. However, even this specific design approach can be elaborated in different ways.

RN Design prepared elevation drawings that took inspiration from Maple HCD’s prevalent Victorian Gothic architectural style to achieve a streetscape façade that integrates with the surrounding and adjacent heritage buildings. For example, the proposed design incorporated a gable roof structure, which is a prevalent building form within the District (Figure 25).

The development's proposed height and bay composition also approximately resemble that of the other historic houses in the district (Figure 25). The proposed townhouses incorporate a third storey within the main roof line which slopes 'away' and becomes less visible from Keele Street. This also allowed the subject proposal to relate to nearby contemporary but compatible recent developments, such as 9529 & 9589 Keele Street (Figure 3917, 18, 21 & 39).

While the townhouses take cues from the existing built structures within the District, they incorporate subtle deviations to become products of their own time. For example, while the Victorian style incorporates round-head or segmental-arched, windows, the proposed design incorporates modern, flat-arched windows and substitutes elaborate dormer designs with simple, well-lit dormers. The window openings employ steel lintels rather than brick arches and therefore are articulated as flat to signal that they are "products of their own time".

These deviations, particularly in its window fenestration, promotes "distinguishability" at close inspection. Distinguishability, a widely-accepted concept in heritage conservation, is generally applied to different forms of new work within a historic context. It promotes compatibility with sufficient restraint, so as not to misconstrue history. Distinguishability at close inspection also allows the proposed design to veer away from being a "hybrid" that inappropriately mixes foreign and incompatible historical styles.

8 Design Revisions & Recommendations

8.1 DESIGN CONSULTATION

This March and July 2018 revisions of the CHRIA incorporate several updates since the earlier reports of September and December 2015, the City Cultural Heritage Coordinator, Katrina Guy, provided Memoranda on March 9, 2016 and December 21, 2017 with comments (both memos included similar comments) about the proposed design and the original CHRIA, submissions in December 2015. In addition, several discussions and meetings have occurred between the owner accompanied by their planning consultant, Weston Consulting, and City Staff from Planning Department and Urban Design and Cultural Heritage Sections. This revised CHRIA report incorporates the design revisions and other responses to the City Comments as summarized in the table below:

Table 13 – Summary of Heritage Issues & Responses

| Heritage Issue | Cultural Heritage Staff | Maple HCD Plan Design Guideline | Design Revision &/or Responses |
|-----------------------------|---|---|--|
| Siting & Setback | Heritage Staff request to change “the setback and siting of the proposed townhomes to reflect the Village Residential guidelines.” | The south residential area of the District was developed beginning in the 1960s and therefore has varied street setbacks to be mediated: “The heritage character of the residential village includes: ... A variety of front-yard setbacks.” (9.5.2) “Place a new building to mediate between setbacks of neighbouring buildings.” (9.5.2.1) | Proposed setback of 3.05 m from Keele St. Property Line is greater than the adjacent residential property at 9580 Keele St. and the nearby recent development at 9529 Keele St. (see subsection 7.1, Figures 36 & 37). In their cover letter with their submission, Weston Consulting relates that “Urban Design confirm that the setbacks of 3 metres along Keele Street is appropriate as shown.” |
| Massing | Heritage Staff express concern that the development massing forms “the streetscape into a long, uninterrupted building frontage facing directly along Keele Street, particularly the Block 2 building because of its closeness to the sidewalk...” | The Residential Village area of the District has a wide range of building sizes and yards which are also in transition: “The residential village has a variety of lot sizes, frontages, and setbacks... The use of the yards has changed, and they provide more pleasure and less production now” (9.5.2) | The Site Plan has been revised by breaking down the size of the street facing block. The former uninterrupted 5-Unit block has been divided with 1.45 m breaks into separated Blocks 2, 3 and 4 of 2 units (semi-detached). To support the District’s future economic viability (Maple HCD Plan 2.4.5, See Table 12), the proposed development provides a transition and mediation between the large estate homes and the multi-residential apartments. See subsection 7.2, Figures 38 & 39. |
| Height | The heritage staff requested drawings to demonstrate that the building heights are compatible with adjacent properties: “Historically, façade heights in the district have been 1 ½ or two storeys. The proposed building indicates 3 storeys. The applicant should provide drawings or renderings indicating how the proposed design is appropriate in scale and massing at the streetscape level, showing adjacent properties” | The HCD Plan policies for new Residential Buildings use the criteria of one storey difference between adjacent properties: “Historically appropriate façade heights for residential buildings has been 1 ½ or 2 storeys. The façade height of new residential buildings should be consistent with the façade height of existing buildings. Differences in façade heights between buildings on the adjacent properties within the district should be no more than 1 storey. In all instances the height of new buildings shall confirm to the provisions of the City’s Zoning By-law.” (4.4.1.e.) | The proposed townhouse and semi-detached blocks with respect to height and its surrounding context are fully consistent with both the City’s Zoning By-law and height provision of the Maple Heritage Conservation District Plan. The proposed height of the development is compatible with the adjacent dwelling and overall surrounding context of the residential area of the Maple Heritage District. See subsection 7.2, Figure 40. |

| | | | |
|--------------------|--|--|---|
| Style | Heritage Staff found the expression of the residential style in the previous design was not compatible with the District local heritage styles, in the Plan's Design Guidelines: "The designs and proportions of the proposed new townhomes do not reflect the patterns and proportions of late 19th and 20th Century building stock represented in Maple Village. The expression of the Second Empire style does not represent or reflect the local expression of Second Empire as found in the District. ... select a design that reflects one of the local heritage styles of Maple." | New buildings should adopt and adapt a suitable local heritage precedent style while still expressing its current times: "The design of new buildings will be products of their own time, but should reflect one of the historic architectural styles traditionally found in the District..." (4.4.1.a) | The elevations design has been revised from Second Empire Style to a Victorian Vernacular Style which is quite prevalent as a local precedent style in the HCD Plan (9.1.1.1). The former style was incompatible with the residential use, being too large-scale and commercial in appearance to be applicable for the proposed townhouses. At the same time, the Victorian architectural design has been adapted to be simpler and more restrained in order to be "distinguishable" on close inspection as a "product of its own time". See subsection 7.3, Figures 40 & 41. |
| Landscaping | Heritage Staff caution against the potential impact to reduce the "existing cultural heritage landscape of mature trees and green space, and erode the streetscape connection of the park to the District..." | Developments should be designed, in their site layout, to preserve trees, especially in its setbacks: "Site new houses to preserve existing mature trees..." (9.5.2.1) | The development's site layout has been adjusted by deleting two units on the south side of the property. The reduction of units – from 8 to 6 – in the southern portion has created larger setbacks at the front and rear yards at the street (east) and the park (west) respectively. In so doing, these more generous yards have five more mature trees (nos. 3, 10, 11, 12, 13) since the previous design. Altogether, of the mature trees there will be four (nos. 2, 3, 25, 30) in the front (east) yard (Keele St.) and six (nos. 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13) in the side/rear (south/west) yards (on Frank Robson Park). See Figure 42. |



Figure 42 – Tree Preservation Plan, BTi Landscape Architecture, July, 2018

8.2 COMMEMORATIVE MEASURES

The City's CHRIA Guidelines identifies three types of mitigation options: (i) "Avoidance Mitigation" permits developments to proceed with the retention of the subject buildings in-situ; (ii) "Salvage Mitigation" explores the possibility of building relocation or architectural salvage; while, (iii) "Historical Commemoration" recalls the historical development of the property and the subject buildings through a feature within the new development.

Among the three types of mitigation options, only "'(iii)' Historical Commemoration" is suitable for the subject property. The poor architectural quality of the houses within the property does not warrant their in-situ conservation or their relocation within the combined land assembly. But most importantly, their low cultural significance does not merit their retention or even partial salvage of these modest structures. Generally, Historical Commemoration – as opposed to physical retention – is typically achieved with the following measures: (1) partial salvage, (2) documentation through drawings or photographs, (3) naming of streets and public spaces, or (4) installation of historical plaques. In particular, the historical documentation contained in this report can be incorporated into commemorative measures such as the following:

- the design of landscaping features,
- naming of public parks,
- naming of proposed private streets, and/or
- historical plaque(s) or interpretative panel(s).

These considerations must however, be finessed, to avoid misconstruing history. For example, the private lane within the new residential development may be named, for example, "Line Street" since the subject property lots are direct derivations of the Line family property. Some commemoration options, such as '(1) partial salvage' and '(2) documentation', are only applicable if the house structures, proposed for demolition, possess unique physical attributes that are worth salvaging. However, the simplicity of the subject house structures will not yield salvageable materials and assemblies, worthy to be displayed or kept for future reference. So only the commemorative options of (3) street names, and (4) historical plaques are applicable to these lands.

As a form of Historical Commemoration, research-related information, contained in this CHRIA and other component studies for the subject property, may be incorporated into an information depository. Such records will aid in the planning of the project and other future developments in the area.

8.3 CONCLUDING RECOMMENDATION

This CHRIA and other submissions for various applications will require the City's heritage approval through the Heritage Planning Staff, Heritage Vaughan Committee, and ultimately, Council. Therefore, during the development process, the City heritage authority will have the opportunity to review and approve the heritage compatibility of this project.

It is the opinion of this CHRIA that the subject development proposal is acceptable for incorporation within the Village of Maple Heritage Conservation District. It is a fine example of an infill residential development that is developed sympathetically with its heritage context.

9 Appendices

- Appendix A. City of Vaughan, Guidelines for Cultural Heritage Resource Impact Assessment
- Appendix B. City of Vaughan, Built Heritage Evaluation Form
- Appendix C. City of Vaughan, Vaughan Heritage Inventory, Extract, p 22 of 64
- Appendix D. City of Vaughan, Village of Maple Heritage Conservation District, Property Inventory
- Appendix E. Qualifications of *AREA*, and David Eckler



GUIDELINES FOR CULTURAL HERITAGE RESOURCE IMPACT ASSESSMENT REPORTS

Policy Provisions for Cultural Heritage Resource Impact Assessment Reports

On June 27, 2005, Council approved a document entitled "Strategy for the Maintenance & Preservation of Significant Heritage Buildings". Section 1.4 of the "Strategy" has the following provision as it relates to Cultural Heritage Resource Impact Assessment requirements:

"Policy provisions requiring Cultural Heritage Resource Impact Assessment reports by heritage property owners shall be included in the City's Official Plan and Official Plan Amendments. Cultural Heritage Resource Impact Assessment (CHRIA) reports will provide an assessment of the heritage site or property and the impact the proposed development will have on the heritage structure. CHRIA reports will also include preservation and mitigation measures for the heritage property."

In addition, Section 4.2.6.4 of OPA 600 policy states, in part, the following:

(i) Block Plans

The City shall require that a comprehensive Cultural Heritage Resource Impact Assessment be prepared by a qualified heritage consultant as supporting material for a Block Plan. The purpose of the Cultural Heritage Resource Impact Assessment is to document and assess existing heritage features including buildings and other structures, sites, landscapes, areas and environments by means of historical research, photographic documentation and architectural assessment and an archaeological resource assessment.

(ii) Cultural Heritage Assessment

A detailed Cultural Heritage Resource Impact Assessment prepared by a qualified cultural heritage consultant may be required for development applications which affect either directly or indirectly, an individual property or a group of properties identified in the Inventory, archaeological sites or other significant heritage features.

As a result of the above policy statements, a Cultural Heritage Resource Impact Assessment may be requested by the City of Vaughan as part of the block plan development process for OPA 600 lands.

Buildings identified in the City's "*Listing of Buildings of Architectural and Historical Value*" or listed in the "*City of Vaughan Heritage Inventory*" may be subject to review in a Cultural Heritage Resource Impact Assessment.

A Cultural Heritage Resource Impact Assessment should not be confused with an archaeological resource assessment. To better differentiate the two, a cultural heritage assessment will identify, evaluate and make recommendations on *built heritage resources and cultural landscapes*.

***Guidelines for Cultural Heritage Resource Impact Assessment Reports
Updated September 2012***

Page 1 of 4



Conversely, an archaeological resource assessment identifies, evaluates and makes recommendations on *archaeological resources*.

Purpose

The purpose of undertaking a Cultural Heritage Resource Impact Assessment is to identify and evaluate cultural heritage resources in a given area (i.e. real property) to determine the impact that may result from a specific undertaking or development of the subject property. As a result of this assessment process by a qualified consultant, the following is to be determined:

1. Whether a building is significant and should be preserved and incorporated within the proposed development. If the building is not considered significant, valid reasons on why it is not should be presented in the Impact Assessment report.
2. Preservation option (as found below) for the significant building and how it will be preserved or incorporated in a development (whether commercial or residential).

Requirements of a Cultural Heritage Resource Impact Assessment

The requirement of a Cultural Heritage Resource Impact Assessment shall be identified and requested by Cultural Services staff in its review of development applications as circulated by the Vaughan Planning Department for comment. Notification of the requirement to undertake a Cultural Heritage Resource Impact Assessment shall be given to a property owner and/or his/her representative as early in the development process as possible. Cultural Services staff will identify the known cultural heritage resources on a property that are of interest or concern.

In conjunction to the requirements set out in these guidelines, please refer to Ontario Heritage Toolkit, InfoSheet #5, as it assists in the understanding of the Provincial Policy Statement, 2005 policies related to the conservation planning of cultural heritage and archaeological resources.

The following items are considered the minimum required components of a Cultural Heritage Resource Impact Assessment report:

1. The hiring of a qualified heritage consultant to prepare the Cultural Heritage Resource Impact Assessment report. It is recommended that the consultant be a member of C.A.H.P. (Canadian Association of Heritage Professionals).
2. A concise history of the property and its evolution to date.
3. A history and architectural evaluation of the built cultural heritage resources found on the property.
4. The documentation of all cultural heritage resources on the property by way of photographs (interior & exterior) and /or measured drawings, and by mapping the context and setting of the built heritage.
5. An outline of the development proposal for the lands in question and the potential impact the proposed development will have on identified cultural heritage resources.
6. A comprehensive examination of the following preservation/mitigation options for cultural heritage resources. Recommendations that result from this examination should be based

Guidelines for Cultural Heritage Resource Impact Assessment Reports
Updated September 2012

Page 2 of 4



on the architectural and historical significance of the resources and their importance to the City of Vaughan's history, community, cultural landscape or streetscape. The options to be explored include (but are not limited to):

Avoidance Mitigation

Avoidance mitigation may allow development to proceed while retaining the cultural heritage resources in situ and intact. Avoidance strategies for heritage resources typically would require provisions for maintaining the integrity of the cultural heritage resource and to ensure it does not become structurally unsound or otherwise compromised. Feasible options for the adaptive re-use of built heritage structure or cultural heritage resources should be clearly outlined.

Where preservation of the entire structure is not feasible, consideration may be given to the preservation of the heritage structure/resource in part, such as the main portion of a building without its rear, wing or ell addition. The preservation of facades only, while not a preferred option, may be considered.

Salvage Mitigation

In situations where cultural heritage resources are evaluated as being of minor significance or the preservation of the heritage resource in its original location is not considered feasible on reasonable and justifiable grounds, the relocation of a structure or (as a last resort) the salvaging of its architectural components may be considered.

Historical Commemoration

While this option does not preserve the cultural heritage of a property/structure, historical commemoration by way of interpretive plaques, the incorporation of reproduced heritage architectural features in new development, or erecting a monument-like structure commemorating the history of the property, may be considered.

Review/Approval Process

Four copies of the Cultural Heritage Resource Impact Assessment shall be distributed to the City of Vaughan: 2 copies to the Vaughan Planning Department and 2 copies to the Cultural Services Department (one copy shall be stored for research purposes in the City of Vaughan Archives).

Staff will determine whether the minimum requirements of the Impact Assessment have been met and review the conclusions and recommendations outlined in the subject report. City staff will meet with the owner/applicant to discuss the Impact Assessment report and recommendations contained therein.

Heritage Vaughan Committee, a statutory advisory committee to Vaughan Council, will also review all Impact Assessment reports. Heritage Vaughan Committee may make recommendations to Vaughan Council with regards to the recommendations contained in the subject reports.

The preparation and submission of a Cultural Heritage Resource Impact Assessment report may be a required condition of approval for development applications and draft plan of subdivision applications.

***Guidelines for Cultural Heritage Resource Impact Assessment Reports
Updated September 2012***

Page 3 of 4



Any questions or comments relating to these guidelines may be directed to:

Cecilia Nin Hernandez, B.E.D.S, M.Arch

Cultural Heritage Coordinator

Cultural Services Division, Department of Recreation and Culture

2141 Major Mackenzie Drive, Vaughan, ON., L6A 1T1

Phone: (905) 832-8585, ext. 8115

Fax: (905) 832-8550

cecilia.nin@vaughan.ca

Daniel Rende, M.Pl.

Cultural Heritage Coordinator

Cultural Services Division, Department of Recreation and Culture

2141 Major Mackenzie Drive, Vaughan, ON., L6A 1T1

Phone: (905) 832-8585, ext. 8112

Fax: (905) 832-8550

daniel.rende@vaughan.ca

*Guidelines for Cultural Heritage Resource Impact Assessment Reports
Updated September 2012*

Page 4 of 4

BUILT HERITAGE EVALUATION FORMBUILDING/STRUCTURE ADDRESS:
LOT: CON:

COMMUNITY:

COMMON NAME OF BUILDING/STRUCTURE (IF KNOWN):

ARCHITECTURE
(Maximum 80 points)TOTAL
ARCHITECTURE:

| STYLE | EVALUATION CRITERIA | GRADING | COMMENTS |
|--|---|---------|----------|
| Good, notable, rare, unique, or early example of a particular architectural style or type. Exterior architectural style only should be evaluated. (i.e. change in roofline, skylights, additions, or removal of features, etc. that have changed the style of the building.) | E-Excellent to very good or extremely early example of its style. | E – 20 | |
| | VG-Good example of its style with little to no changes to the structure. | VG – 15 | |
| | G- Good to fair example of its style (e.g. style evident in structure, however, changes have occurred to building). | G- 8 | |
| | F/P- Style is not evident or considered a good example. | F/P – 0 | |

| CONSTRUCTION | EVALUATION CRITERIA | GRADING | COMMENTS |
|--|---|---------|----------|
| Good, notable, rare, unique, or early example of a particular material or method of construction. (i.e.) log construction, pre-1850, stone, board on board construction, etc.) | E-Excellent or early example of its construction method. | E – 10 | |
| | VG- Good or early example of its construction method. | VG – 8 | |
| | G/F- Good to fair example of its construction method. | G/F- 5 | |
| | P- Construction method is not significant in nature nor is it of particular interest. | P- 0 | |

| AGE | EVALUATION CRITERIA | GRADING | COMMENTS |
|--|------------------------------------|---------|----------|
| Comparatively old in the context of the City of Vaughan's architectural history. | E- Built between dates 1790-1820. | E – 5 | |
| | VG- Built between dates 1821-1910. | VG – 3 | |
| | G- Built between dates 1911-1939. | G- 2 | |
| | F/P- Built since 1940. | F/P – 0 | |

| INTERIOR | EVALUATION CRITERIA | GRADING | COMMENTS |
|---|---|---------|----------|
| Integrity of interior arrangement, finish, craftsmanship, and/or detail are particularly attractive or unique and/or still exist. | E- Excellent interior (80-100% intact). | E – 5 | |
| | VG- Very good interior (70-79% intact) | VG – 3 | |
| | G- Good interior (50-69% intact) | G- 2 | |
| | F/P- Fair or poor (0-49% intact). | F/P – 0 | |

| ALTERATIONS | EVALUATION CRITERIA | GRADING | COMMENTS |
|---|--|---------|----------|
| Building has undergone minor exterior alterations, and retains most of its original materials and design features. Checklist includes: Original Exterior Siding 30% Windows/doors 30% Verandahs/trim 30% Foundation/location 10% Structural Plan (no modern or sympathetic additions) 10% | E- Exterior of building is unchanged. (90-100% intact) | E - 20 | |
| | G- Exterior of building has changed somewhat, but character retained. (61-89% intact) | G - 15 | |
| | F- Exterior of building has changed somewhat and original character compromised. (40-60% intact) | F - 8 | |
| | P- Original exterior character destroyed. (0-30% intact) | P - 0 | |

| CONDITION | EVALUATION CRITERIA | GRADING | COMMENTS |
|--|--|---------|----------|
| Exterior/interior of building is in good structural condition (i.e. evidence of decay in exterior siding, roof, or interior basement, wall surface, flooring, or ceiling, suggesting structure to be unsound.) Checklist: Exterior Siding/Gutters (cracks, spalling) Roof/Interior Ceiling/Gutters Flooring, unstable, depressions Interior Wall surface, cracks, etc. Basement (leaks, mold, dry or wet rot on beams) | G- Good structural condition. (No evidence of decay) | G- 20 | |
| | S- Somewhat good structural condition. (Minor/little evidence of decay) | S - 15 | |
| | F- Fair structural condition (Some, i.e. 2 from adjacent list) evidence of decay.) | F - 10 | |
| | P- Poor structural condition. (Significant/considerable evidence of decay.) | P - 0 | |

HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE **(Maximum 5 points)**

TOTAL HISTORY:

| HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE | EVALUATION CRITERIA | GRADING | COMMENTS |
|--|--|---------|----------|
| Structure is associated with the life or activities of a person, group, organization or event significant to the history of Vaughan, or illustrative of the community's cultural, social, political, economic or industrial history. | E- Individual, group, event or site of primary significance to the surrounding community. (Political official, prominent community member, religious leader, significant site/landmark in history of Vaughan.) | E- 5 | |
| | | VG- 3 | |
| | | M-2 | |
| | | F/P- 0 | |
| | VG -Individual, group, event or site of some significance to the surrounding community. (Owner /family was long-standing member/s of community.) | | |
| | M -Individual, group, event or site of minor or little significance to the surrounding community. (No historical background on structure or individual that built structure or family.) | | |
| | F/P-Site, structure, has no significance to Vaughan's history. | | |

ENVIRONMENT
(Maximum 15 points)

**TOTAL
ENVIRONMENT:**

| ENVIRONMENT/STREETSCAPE/COMMUNITY | EVALUATION CRITERIA | GRADING | COMMENTS |
|--|---|------------------|----------|
| Structure contributes to the continuity or character of the street, community, or area. | E- Of particular importance in establishing the dominant/historic character of the area, community, or streetscape. | E – 15 VG –10 | |
| Heritage buildings in a rural areas (i.e. former farm buildings), not yet developed or part of a Block Plan development, that have a good architectural rating should be rated for its community and/or contextual significance based on the criteria defined. | VG- Of importance in establishing or maintaining the dominant/historic character of the area, landscape, streetscape, or significant to the community for its architectural value (i.e. received a 79+ rating under the architectural evaluation portion of this form). | G –8 F/P – 0 | |
| | G- Compatible with the dominant character of the area or streetscape or considered of some significance to the rural architectural history of the area/community (i.e. building is not part of historic streetscape, but an architecturally good building, based on a high evaluation under the architectural evaluation section of this form/64-79 total.) | | |
| | F/P- Incompatible with the dominant character of the area, streetscape and of no particular significance architecturally to the community, based on its architectural evaluation in the first section of this form/0-64 total. | | |

GRADING:

TOTAL

KEY TO GRADING

80-100 = GROUP A –VERY SIGNIFICANT

65-79=GROUP B- SIGNIFICANT

40-64 =GROUP C- MODEST SIGNIFICANCE

0-39= GROUP D – LITTLE OR NO SIGNIFICANCE



City of Vaughan Heritage Inventory

The City of Vaughan Heritage Inventory includes:

- **all individually designated properties**
(Buildings or structures designated under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act.)
- **all properties within a Heritage Conservation District**
(Buildings or structures designated under Part V of the Ontario Heritage Act.)
- **all properties in the *Listing of Buildings of Architectural and Historical Value***
(The City of Vaughan's Register of Property of Cultural Heritage Value as per Part IV, Subsection 27 of the Ontario Heritage Act (approved by Council on June 27, 2005.)
- **all properties of interest to Cultural Services Division**
(After further review or research, these properties may be determined to have cultural heritage significance.)

| | |
|----------------|--|
| Address | Properties are arranged alphabetically by street name and then street number |
| Bldg | Multiple buildings or structures within the same municipal address are identified by a letter |
| LSHS | Building or structure included in the <i>Listing of Buildings of Architectural and Historical Value</i> . <i>Approved by Council in 2005, commonly known as Register of Property of Cultural Heritage Value</i> |
| Part IV | Building or structure designated under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act |
| Part V | Building or structure is within a Heritage Conservation District and, therefore, designated under Part V of the Ontario Heritage Act |
| HCD | (KN) Kleinburg-Nashville Heritage Conservation District (T) Thornhill Heritage Conservation District (M) Maple Heritage Conservation District (W) Woodbridge Heritage Conservation District |

City of Vaughan, 2141 Major Mackenzie Drive, Vaughan ON L6A 1T1 Tel. 905-832-8585 www.vaughan.ca

Vaughan Heritage Inventory

| | Property Address | Name | Architectural Style | Year Built | Registered | | | HCD |
|-----|-------------------|------|---------------------|------------|------------|---------|--------|-----|
| | | | | | in LSHS | Part IV | Part V | |
| 400 | 9519 Keele Street | | | | | | ✓ | M |
| 401 | 9560 Keele Street | | | | | | ✓ | M |
| 402 | 9570 Keele Street | | | | | | ✓ | M |
| 403 | 9575 Keele Street | | | | | | ✓ | M |
| 404 | 9580 Keele Street | | | | | | ✓ | M |
| 405 | 9589 Keele Street | | | | | | ✓ | M |
| 406 | 9593 Keele Street | | | | | | ✓ | M |
| 407 | 9597 Keele Street | | | | | | ✓ | M |
| 408 | 9600 Keele Street | | | | | | ✓ | M |
| 409 | 9611 Keele Street | | | | | | ✓ | M |
| 410 | 9631 Keele Street | | | | | | ✓ | M |
| 411 | 9635 Keele Street | | | | | | ✓ | M |
| 412 | 9643 Keele Street | | | | | | ✓ | M |
| 413 | 9649 Keele Street | | | | | | ✓ | M |
| 414 | 9652 Keele Street | | | | | | ✓ | M |
| 415 | 9654 Keele Street | | | | | | ✓ | M |
| 416 | 9655 Keele Street | | | | | | ✓ | M |
| 417 | 9656 Keele Street | | | | | | ✓ | M |
| 418 | 9664 Keele Street | | | | | | ✓ | M |

Page 22 of 64

Village of Maple, City of Vaughan

Inventory

Keele Street (west side)



9560 Keele Street

- Tall, 1½ storey, red-brick house with large gabled block between hipped-roof wings (1950s).
- **Description** – South-facing house appears to be late interpretation of Arts-and-Crafts style, with variety of multiple-pane, double-hung wooden windows and storm windows, and with wooden trim throughout. East elevation faces Keele Street, and consists of one-storey, hipped-roof pavilion with central, paired 6/6 windows (behind 2-pane storms). Apertures have pre-cast sills, decorative wooden shutters, and header bricks over steel lintels (except at paired windows, which may be later). Entrance is to north, consisting of solid, panelled door (behind metal storm). Principal elevation is south facade, which is symmetrical composition of large, gabled central block and slightly recessed, hip-roofed wings to either side, in ABA rhythm. Central, gabled block has asymmetrical fenestration at ground floor, with triple, 6/6 windows to left of centre, and smaller, 3/1 unit to right; all with pre-cast sills and decorative shutters and, in this location, with header-course of red bricks over metal lintel. Windows in south elevation, side pavilions are single, 6/6 units, with other elements as described. All windows have multiple-pane wooden storms. Soffits are trimmed with v-jointed boards, and gable has narrow wooden fascia with simple batten as shingle-moulding. Roof is clad in asphalt shingles and there are no chimneys. A single-bay, flat-roof, red-brick garage is built against north wall of house.
- **History** – unknown; post-George Garrow.
- **Comments** – An unusual house, in good original condition and attractive in a variety of ways. House might be considered last-gasp Arts-and-Crafts, or even precursor to Post-Modernism; but using traditional materials throughout, with exception of concrete block at prominent foundation level. House is well screened from roads by combination of coniferous and deciduous trees in various sizes. Building provides fitting and dignified presence at south end of village.

Nicholas A. Holman MA, OAQ

November 2005

Keele Street (west side)

**9570 Keele Street**

- 1½ storey, stone-clad house with central large, gabled, second-floor dormer (1950s).
- **Description** – Modest, pitched-roof house has split-faced, random-course-rubble sandstone cladding throughout ground floor. Building is roughly symmetrical, with entry invisible from street, set in gabled north elevation. Ground floor has projecting central block, with large, asymmetrical window at north and small, tall window at south. North window consists of large, wooden, single-pane fixed sash, with 1/1 unit to right, while south window is unusual be 12-pane unit with metal muntins. At north wing, window is wide 1/1 unit (with metal storm), and at south wing, fenestration consists of 1/1 units flanking large, single-pane fixed sash (all behind single-pane wooden storms. Windows throughout robust stone sills and modest stone lintels, suggesting steel lintels behind. Large, gabled, second-floor dormer exists at central block, set above small asphalt-shingled roof. Dormer and is clad in horizontal aluminium siding, presumably over similar wooden siding. Soffits and eaves are clad throughout in aluminium, again assumed to hide original wooden trim beneath. Roof is clad in asphalt shingles. A pitched-roof, stone-clad, single-bay garage, with aluminium cladding at front gable, exists to north of house.
- **History** – unknown; post-George Garrow.
- **Comments** – An intriguing house, combining elements of the bungalow with more traditional element of gabled central upper floor. Use of coursed-rubble cladding, with large masonry units, is reminiscent of traditional construction, though stone in this instance if from unknown and non-local source – possible Credit Valley sandstone. House is set in heavily treed garden, with large conifer to south, and large deciduous tree to north. Building is a good fit within block of early suburban Maple Village.

Nicholas A. Holman MA, OAQ

November 2005



FIRM PROFILE | HERITAGE & MUSEUM WORK

AREA is a full service firm, based in Toronto and operating across Canada, which specializes in the restoration and adaptive re-use of historic buildings, urban design for heritage streetscapes and approvals under the Ontario Heritage Act. The firm has a history extending over 30 years of practice, and is managed by 2 principals and 8 technical staff – including intern architects, interior designers and architectural technologists – with experience in the documentation and restoration of historic buildings and sites. Although we are qualified for heritage and museum projects, the members of our firm have also undertaken a wide range of institutional and commercial projects often involving the integration of historic components into new developments.

AREA and its staff are members of various heritage associations and advisory boards across Canada. David Eckler, B.E.S., B.Arch., OAA, MRAIC is an active member in many heritage associations including the Architectural Conservancy of Ontario Advisory Board. He is a former Vice-Chair of Heritage Toronto, which advised Toronto City Council on heritage matters as a LACAC under the Heritage Act. Bernard Rasch, B.Arch., PPOAA, FRAIC, ARIBA has served on a number of heritage committees and boards including the Markham District Historical Society and City of York Historical Committee and the Metro Board of Management for The Guild from 1984 to 1998 where he served in many positions including Chair & Vice-Chair of the Board.

Historical Façade Improvement Guidelines & Heritage Districts

- Stouffville Main Street Revitalization, 1998, DEA was presenter at workshop
- Yonge Street Commercial Façade Improvement Program, 1996, received City approval of grant
- Woodstock Façade Improvement Program, 1995, DEA initiated program for City
- Hazelton-Yorkville Area Heritage Conservation District Study, City-sponsored study
- Fergus Downtown Community Masterplan & Design Guidelines

Historic Museums, Institutional & Cultural Buildings

- Officers' Quarters (1830), Military & Naval Establishment, Discovery Harbour, Penetanguishene
- Spence Half-Way House Restoration (c. 1850), Muskoka Pioneer Village, Huntsville
- Sharon Temple Compound (1821), Sharon, York Region
- Heliconian Hall (first Olivet Sunday Schoolhouse, circa 1876), (Yorkville)
- Cedar Ridge Studio Gallery (1918), 225 Confederation Drive, (Scarborough)
- Aurora Historical Society Museum (1886 school), 22 Church Street, Aurora
- The Niagara Institute (early 20th.c), 9 Weatherstone Crt., Niagara on the Lake
- St. Lawrence Hall (1840) – renovations of town hall to accommodate National Ballet School

Historic House Restorations

- Jacob Ross House Restoration (1852), 108 Stayner Ave.
- William Wonch House Restoration (1840), 2777 Woodbine Ave., Markham
- Robert Milroy House Restoration (c. 1833), 7111 Reesor Rd., Markham
- McDougall Farmhouse (1893) Heritage Assessment, James Snow Parkway, Milton, ON
- Devonian House Restoration & Addition (circa 1923), 144 John St. E., Niagara on the Lake
- Savage House & Blacksmith Shop (c. 1840), 1480 Derry Rd. E., Mississauga

Converted Historic Residences

- Old Post Inn (c. 1830), 367 Kingston Road East, Ajax
- Valley Halla Villa (Jackson Residence, 1922), Toronto Zoo, Rouge Valley, Scarborough
- Armour Heights Officer's Mess (1913, 'Strathrobyn'), Canadian Forces College, 215 Yonge Blvd.
- Bellevue Daycare Centre (1887), 95 Bellevue Ave.
- Gerrard & Bay Historic Houses (1860-1890), 68-84 Gerrard St. W.
- Toronto French School Restoration (Sifton Estate, 1923), 294 – 318 Lawrence Ave. E.

AREA

EDUCATION

University of Waterloo
B Arch (1985)
B.E.S. (1982)

MEMBERSHIPS

Ontario Association of
Architects
(Former Councillor & Chair
Awards Committee)

Royal Architectural Institute of
Canada

Canadian Standards
Association (CISA)

Architectural Conservancy of
Ontario Advisory Board

Society for the Study of
Architecture in Canada

Heritage Canada Foundation

Ontario Historical Society

CAREER SUMMARY

AREA, Architects Rasch Eckler
Associates Ltd.
President
2001 to Present

David Eckler Architect
1991 - 2001

Page & Steele Architects
1989 - 1991

Arthur Erickson Architects
1986 - 1989

DAVID ECKLER BES, B.Arch., OAA, MRAIC
AREA, Architects Rasch Eckler Associates Ltd.
President & Principal - Senior Heritage Architect

David Eckler is the firm's principal and is responsible for the design, construction drawings, specifications and construction administration of all heritage projects in the office. Mr. Eckler has over 25 years experience in the conservation, restoration and adaptive reuse of heritage structures for government, non-profit agencies and private sector owners and developers. Mr. Eckler directs the Concept Design, Design Development and Contract Documents phases of heritage projects and authors many of the firm's heritage assessment reports.

Mr. Eckler established a specialization in heritage conservation beginning in 1992 with his previous firm *David Eckler Architect (DEA)* and continuing in his current practice, *AREA Architects*. His architectural heritage services include feasibility studies, preservation planning, infill projects within historic districts, adaptive reuse and building restoration. David is an active member in many architectural and heritage associations including the *Architectural Conservancy of Ontario Advisory Board*. He is a past member of the *Canadian Association of Professional Heritage Consultants* and is a former Vice-Chair of *Heritage Toronto*, which advised Toronto City Council on heritage matters under the Heritage Act and as an advisory board for the city's museums.

Mr. Eckler has particular experience in the restoration of heritage properties within public parks and cultural landscapes. An example of a heritage attraction in a park setting is the restoration of the Officers' Quarters within the *Discovery Harbour* museum in Penetanguishene. He has most recently worked on the restoration of the historic site of the *1910 Allan Gardens Conservatory*.

RELEVANT EXPERIENCE: Toronto (location unless indicated)

Heritage Adaptive Re-use


- Goldring Student Centre (Wymilwood, 1954) - 150 Charles St. W., Toronto
- Warwick Office Building (1905) - 401-409 King St. W.
- Church of Christ, Scientist (1928) Condominium Redevelopment, 70 High Park
- Eglinton Hunt Club (1929) - Condominiums, 1355 Kingston Rd.
- Hutton House (1853) - Community Centre, Ardmore Park, St. Marys
- Bellevue Daycare Centre (1887) - 95 Bellevue Avenue

Restoration of Institutional Historic Buildings

- Allan Gardens Conservatory Complex (1910) - 160 Gerrard St. E.
- Aurora Historical Society Museum (Church Street School, 1886)
- Toronto French School (Sifton Estate, 1924) - 306 Lawrence Ave E.
- Armour Heights Officers' Mess ('Strathrobyn' 1913) - 215 Yonge Blvd.
- Medical Arts Building Restoration (circa 1929)
- Officers' Barracks (1830) - Discovery Harbour, Penetanguishene
- Heliconian Hall (first Olivet Church, 1876) - 35 Hazelton Ave.

Heritage Planning, Parks & Streetscape Design

- Cookstown Heritage Conservation District - Innisfil, ON
- Old Pickering Village Planning & Heritage Study, Ajax
- Yorkville-Hazelton Avenue Heritage Conservation District
- Limehouse Kilns Heritage Masterplan, Halton Hills
- Confederation Commemorative Park, Charlottetown, PEI
- Gerrard & Bay Historic Houses (1860-1890)







[illegible]

| | ISSUED OR REVISION COMMENTS | DATE | INITIALS |
|---|-----------------------------|------|----------|
| 0 | PRELIMINARY | | |

| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 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 | 61 | 62 | 63 | 64 | 65 | 66 | 67 | 68 | 69 | 70 | 71 | 72 | 73 | 74 | 75 | 76 | 77 | 78 | 79 | 80 | 81 | 82 | 83 | 84 | 85 | 86 | 87 | 88 | 89 | 90 | 91 | 92 | 93 | 94 | 95 | 96 | 97 | 98 | 99 | 100 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|-----|
| 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 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 | 61 | 62 | 63 | 64 | 65 | 66 | 67 | 68 | 69 | 70 | 71 | 72 | 73 | 74 | 75 | 76 | 77 | 78 | 79 | 80 | 81 | 82 | 83 | 84 | 85 | 86 | 87 | 88 | 89 | 90 | 91 | 92 | 93 | 94 | 95 | 96 | 97 | 98 | 99 | 100 |

[illegible][illegible][illegible][illegible][illegible]

RN DESIGN LTD.

**8095 JANE STREET, SUITE 200
VAUGHAN ONTARIO L4K 5Y2
T: 905-738-3177 | F: 905-738-5443**

| | |
|--|--|
| | |
| | |

| | |
|--|--|
| | |
| | |



CLIP
LAURIER GROUP

PROJECT LOCATION
9560, 9570 KEELE STREET
VAUGHAN, ONTARIO

BLOCK 4 - ELEVATIONS

| | |
|------|-----------|
| DATE | LOCAL |
| BY | SIGNATURE |

| | |
|----------------|----------------|
| DATE | DATE |
| PROJECT NUMBER | PROJECT NUMBER |
| ISSUE | ISSUE |



RN DESIGN LTD.
Design • Interiors • Design




8036 JANE STREET, SLATE 200
VAUGHAN ONTARIO L4K 5Y7
T: 905-708-9177 F: 905-708-6468

| NO | DESK NO | DATE | NAME |
|-----|---------|------------|-------|
| 1 | 1 | 10/10/2018 | 10000 |
| 2 | 2 | 10/10/2018 | 10000 |
| 3 | 3 | 10/10/2018 | 10000 |
| 4 | 4 | 10/10/2018 | 10000 |
| 5 | 5 | 10/10/2018 | 10000 |
| 6 | 6 | 10/10/2018 | 10000 |
| 7 | 7 | 10/10/2018 | 10000 |
| 8 | 8 | 10/10/2018 | 10000 |
| 9 | 9 | 10/10/2018 | 10000 |
| 10 | 10 | 10/10/2018 | 10000 |
| 11 | 11 | 10/10/2018 | 10000 |
| 12 | 12 | 10/10/2018 | 10000 |
| 13 | 13 | 10/10/2018 | 10000 |
| 14 | 14 | 10/10/2018 | 10000 |
| 15 | 15 | 10/10/2018 | 10000 |
| 16 | 16 | 10/10/2018 | 10000 |
| 17 | 17 | 10/10/2018 | 10000 |
| 18 | 18 | 10/10/2018 | 10000 |
| 19 | 19 | 10/10/2018 | 10000 |
| 20 | 20 | 10/10/2018 | 10000 |
| 21 | 21 | 10/10/2018 | 10000 |
| 22 | 22 | 10/10/2018 | 10000 |
| 23 | 23 | 10/10/2018 | 10000 |
| 24 | 24 | 10/10/2018 | 10000 |
| 25 | 25 | 10/10/2018 | 10000 |
| 26 | 26 | 10/10/2018 | 10000 |
| 27 | 27 | 10/10/2018 | 10000 |
| 28 | 28 | 10/10/2018 | 10000 |
| 29 | 29 | 10/10/2018 | 10000 |
| 30 | 30 | 10/10/2018 | 10000 |
| 31 | 31 | 10/10/2018 | 10000 |
| 32 | 32 | 10/10/2018 | 10000 |
| 33 | 33 | 10/10/2018 | 10000 |
| 34 | 34 | 10/10/2018 | 10000 |
| 35 | 35 | 10/10/2018 | 10000 |
| 36 | 36 | 10/10/2018 | 10000 |
| 37 | 37 | 10/10/2018 | 10000 |
| 38 | 38 | 10/10/2018 | 10000 |
| 39 | 39 | 10/10/2018 | 10000 |
| 40 | 40 | 10/10/2018 | 10000 |
| 41 | 41 | 10/10/2018 | 10000 |
| 42 | 42 | 10/10/2018 | 10000 |
| 43 | 43 | 10/10/2018 | 10000 |
| 44 | 44 | 10/10/2018 | 10000 |
| 45 | 45 | 10/10/2018 | 10000 |
| 46 | 46 | 10/10/2018 | 10000 |
| 47 | 47 | 10/10/2018 | 10000 |
| 48 | 48 | 10/10/2018 | 10000 |
| 49 | 49 | 10/10/2018 | 10000 |
| 50 | 50 | 10/10/2018 | 10000 |
| 51 | 51 | 10/10/2018 | 10000 |
| 52 | 52 | 10/10/2018 | 10000 |
| 53 | 53 | 10/10/2018 | 10000 |
| 54 | 54 | 10/10/2018 | 10000 |
| 55 | 55 | 10/10/2018 | 10000 |
| 56 | 56 | 10/10/2018 | 10000 |
| 57 | 57 | 10/10/2018 | 10000 |
| 58 | 58 | 10/10/2018 | 10000 |
| 59 | 59 | 10/10/2018 | 10000 |
| 60 | 60 | 10/10/2018 | 10000 |
| 61 | 61 | 10/10/2018 | 10000 |
| 62 | 62 | 10/10/2018 | 10000 |
| 63 | 63 | 10/10/2018 | 10000 |
| 64 | 64 | 10/10/2018 | 10000 |
| 65 | 65 | 10/10/2018 | 10000 |
| 66 | 66 | 10/10/2018 | 10000 |
| 67 | 67 | 10/10/2018 | 10000 |
| 68 | 68 | 10/10/2018 | 10000 |
| 69 | 69 | 10/10/2018 | 10000 |
| 70 | 70 | 10/10/2018 | 10000 |
| 71 | 71 | 10/10/2018 | 10000 |
| 72 | 72 | 10/10/2018 | 10000 |
| 73 | 73 | 10/10/2018 | 10000 |
| 74 | 74 | 10/10/2018 | 10000 |
| 75 | 75 | 10/10/2018 | 10000 |
| 76 | 76 | 10/10/2018 | 10000 |
| 77 | 77 | 10/10/2018 | 10000 |
| 78 | 78 | 10/10/2018 | 10000 |
| 79 | 79 | 10/10/2018 | 10000 |
| 80 | 80 | 10/10/2018 | 10000 |
| 81 | 81 | 10/10/2018 | 10000 |
| 82 | 82 | 10/10/2018 | 10000 |
| 83 | 83 | 10/10/2018 | 10000 |
| 84 | 84 | 10/10/2018 | 10000 |
| 85 | 85 | 10/10/2018 | 10000 |
| 86 | 86 | 10/10/2018 | 10000 |
| 87 | 87 | 10/10/2018 | 10000 |
| 88 | 88 | 10/10/2018 | 10000 |
| 89 | 89 | 10/10/2018 | 10000 |
| 90 | 90 | 10/10/2018 | 10000 |
| 91 | 91 | 10/10/2018 | 10000 |
| 92 | 92 | 10/10/2018 | 10000 |
| 93 | 93 | 10/10/2018 | 10000 |
| 94 | 94 | 10/10/2018 | 10000 |
| 95 | 95 | 10/10/2018 | 10000 |
| 96 | 96 | 10/10/2018 | 10000 |
| 97 | 97 | 10/10/2018 | 10000 |
| 98 | 98 | 10/10/2018 | 10000 |
| 99 | 99 | 10/10/2018 | 10000 |
| 100 | 100 | 10/10/2018 | 10000 |

PROJECT COMPLETION

THESE DRAWINGS ARE NOT TO BE SCALED:
ALL DIMENSIONS MUST BE GIVEN BY CONTRACTOR PRIOR TO COMMENCEMENT OF ANY WORK, AND DISCREPANCIES MUST BE REPORTED DIRECTLY TO ARCHITECT-P.C.

| | | | |
|-------------------------|---|------------------|------|
| NAME | LAWLER GROUP | | |
| PROJECT NAME | 9540, 9570 KEELE STREET VAUGHAN, ONTARIO | | |
| STANDARD | BLOCK 5 - ELEVATIONS | | |
| DATE | ISSUE | SCALE | |
| 03/04/2016 | 1.0/1.1/1.2 | | |
| DESIGNED BY SD | CHECKED BY SD | DATE OF REVISION | |
| PROJECT NUMBER 17006 | DATE OF REVISION | | |
| | | | A205 |



*WITH PREJUDICE

THIS DRAWING IS NOT TO BE USED FOR CONSTRUCTION PURPOSES. IT IS A PRELIMINARY DRAWING AND IS SUBJECT TO CHANGE WITHOUT NOTICE. IT IS NOT TO BE USED FOR ANY OTHER PURPOSE.

NOTES

- 1. ALL DIMENSIONS ARE IN METERS UNLESS OTHERWISE SPECIFIED.
- 2. ALL MATERIALS AND FINISHES ARE TO BE AS SHOWN ON THE DRAWING.
- 3. ALL WORK IS TO BE DONE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE CANADIAN NATIONAL BUILDING CODE.
- 4. ALL WORK IS TO BE DONE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE CANADIAN NATIONAL ELECTRICAL CODE.
- 5. ALL WORK IS TO BE DONE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE CANADIAN NATIONAL PLUMBING AND MECHANICAL CODE.
- 6. ALL WORK IS TO BE DONE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE CANADIAN NATIONAL FIRE PROTECTION CODE.
- 7. ALL WORK IS TO BE DONE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE CANADIAN NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL CODE.
- 8. ALL WORK IS TO BE DONE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE CANADIAN NATIONAL SAFETY CODE.
- 9. ALL WORK IS TO BE DONE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE CANADIAN NATIONAL QUALITY ASSURANCE CODE.
- 10. ALL WORK IS TO BE DONE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE CANADIAN NATIONAL STANDARDS FOR CONSTRUCTION.

SCALE: 1:100

| NO. | DESCRIPTION | DATE | BY | CHECKED |
|-----|-----------------------------|------------|----------|----------|
| 1 | 13m Elev. C. Elev. INTERIOR | 2018-01-15 | J. Smith | J. Smith |
| 2 | 13m Elev. B. Elev. INTERIOR | 2018-01-15 | J. Smith | J. Smith |
| 3 | 13m Elev. A. Elev. INTERIOR | 2018-01-15 | J. Smith | J. Smith |
| 4 | 13m Elev. D. Elev. INTERIOR | 2018-01-15 | J. Smith | J. Smith |
| 5 | 13m Elev. E. Elev. INTERIOR | 2018-01-15 | J. Smith | J. Smith |
| 6 | 13m Elev. F. Elev. INTERIOR | 2018-01-15 | J. Smith | J. Smith |
| 7 | 13m Elev. G. Elev. INTERIOR | 2018-01-15 | J. Smith | J. Smith |
| 8 | 13m Elev. H. Elev. INTERIOR | 2018-01-15 | J. Smith | J. Smith |
| 9 | 13m Elev. I. Elev. INTERIOR | 2018-01-15 | J. Smith | J. Smith |
| 10 | 13m Elev. J. Elev. INTERIOR | 2018-01-15 | J. Smith | J. Smith |

RN DESIGN LTD.
8885 JANE STREET, SUITE 200
VAUGHAN, ONTARIO L4K 5V2
905.709.1111 | WWW.RNDESIGN.COM

CLIENT: LAURIER GROUP

PROJECT LOCATION:
9560, 9570 KEELE STREET
VAUGHAN, ONTARIO

DATE: BLOCK 6 ELEVATIONS


| | |
|-----------------------|---------------------|
| DATE: JULY 2018 | SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0" |
| DRAWN BY: SD | CHECKED BY: SD |
| PROJECT NUMBER: 17006 | SHEET NUMBER: A306 |



FRONT ELEVATION @ KEELE STREET

LAURIER HOMES
 9785 Keele Street, Vaughan
 SPA Exterior Colour Package
 RN JOB# 17005
 Created: August 24, 2017
 Revised: August 13, 2018 (reverse main and accent brick in pkg #2), window colours in pkg #1 changed

| EXTERIOR COLOUR SELECTIONS | MANUFACTURER | PACKAGE 1 |
|----------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Roof | CERTAINTED LANDMARK | Moire Black |
| Metal Roof (where applicable) | COLOUR STEELS (or equivalent) | Black |
| Main Brick | BRAMPTON BRICK | Crimson |
| Accent Brick (quoins & headers) | BRAMPTON BRICK | Canyon |
| Shutter | KAYCAN | Black (02) |
| Aluminum | KAYCAN (or equivalent) | White SG |
| Soffit/Fascia/Downspouts | PARA PAINTS | Courtyard P5220-44 |
| Columns/Railings/Decorative Trim | PARA PAINTS | Walkin' In the Rain P5204-85 |
| Front Door | PARA PAINTS | Stoneware Tint 3 P2064-02 |
| Garage Door | JELDWEN (or equivalent) | Black |
| Windows | | |



SHINGLE




MAIN BRICK



ACCENT BRICK



METAL ROOF



WINDOW



SOFFIT/FASCIA



SHUTTER



COLUMN/RAILINGS



GARAGE DOOR



FRONT DOOR

Notes:
 1) All flashing to match shingle

LAURIER HOMES
9785 Keele Street, Vaughan
SPA Exterior Colour Package
RN JOB# 17005
Created: August 24, 2017
Revised: August 13, 2018 (reverse main and accent brick in pkg #2), window colours in pkg #1 changed

| EXTERIOR COLOUR SELECTIONS | MANUFACTURER | PACKAGE 2 |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Roof | CERTAINTED LANDMARK | Driftwood |
| Metal Roof (where applicable) | COLOUR STEELS (or equivalent) | Dark Brown |
| Main Brick | BRAMPTON BRICK | Aurora |
| Accent Brick (quoins & headers) | BRAMPTON BRICK | Old School |
| Shutter | KAYCAN | Clay (08) |
| Aluminum Soffit/Fascia/Downspouts | KAYCAN (or equivalent) | Khaki |
| Columns/Railings/Decorative Trim | PARA PAINTS | Stoneware Tint 1 P2062-1 |
| Front Door | PARA PAINTS | Blackfoot Trail P2109-05 |
| Garage Door | PARA PAINTS | Stoneware Tint 3 P2064-02 |
| Windows | JELDWEN (or equivalent) | Claystone |



SHINGLE




MAIN BRICK



ACCENT BRICK



METAL
ROOF



WINDOW



SOFFIT/FASCIA



SHUTTER



COLUMN/RAILINGS



GARAGE DOOR




FRONT DOOR

Notes:
1) All flashing to match shingle



FENCE POST SPACING AT EXISTING TREE LOCATIONS



1. Plant material to conform to the Canadian Nursery Trade association
2. Contractor to verify quantities listed. Plant quantities to be supplied quantities listed.
3. All plant material to be sourced from nurseries within an 800km radius
4. Provide one year warranty for all plant material.


PLANT LIST

[illegible]

Specifications

1. Constructing a list of the names of all patients who have been diagnosed with a specific disease.
2. Interviewing the listed patients and their parents and asking them about various symptoms and signs, such as changes in weight, changes in eating habits, changes in sleeping habits, changes in behavior, changes in school performance, changes in social relationships, changes in personality, changes in appearance, changes in voice, changes in hair, changes in skin, changes in teeth, changes in eyes, changes in ears, changes in nose, changes in mouth, changes in throat, changes in lungs, changes in heart, changes in stomach, changes in intestines, changes in bladder, changes in reproductive system, changes in other organs.
3. Comparing the results of the interviews with the results of the medical records.
4. Identifying the patients who have been diagnosed with the disease and who have also been interviewed.
5. Interviewing the identified patients and their parents and asking them about various symptoms and signs, such as changes in weight, changes in eating habits, changes in sleeping habits, changes in behavior, changes in school performance, changes in social relationships, changes in personality, changes in appearance, changes in voice, changes in hair, changes in skin, changes in teeth, changes in eyes, changes in ears, changes in nose, changes in mouth, changes in throat, changes in lungs, changes in heart, changes in stomach, changes in intestines, changes in bladder, changes in reproductive system, changes in other organs.
6. Comparing the results of the interviews with the results of the medical records.
7. Identifying the patients who have been diagnosed with the disease and who have also been interviewed.
8. Interviewing the identified patients and their parents and asking them about various symptoms and signs, such as changes in weight, changes in eating habits, changes in sleeping habits, changes in behavior, changes in school performance, changes in social relationships, changes in personality, changes in appearance, changes in voice, changes in hair, changes in skin, changes in teeth, changes in eyes, changes in ears, changes in nose, changes in mouth, changes in throat, changes in lungs, changes in heart, changes in stomach, changes in intestines, changes in bladder, changes in reproductive system, changes in other organs.
9. Comparing the results of the interviews with the results of the medical records.
10. Identifying the patients who have been diagnosed with the disease and who have also been interviewed.
11. Interviewing the identified patients and their parents and asking them about various symptoms and signs, such as changes in weight, changes in eating habits, changes in sleeping habits, changes in behavior, changes in school performance, changes in social relationships, changes in personality, changes in appearance, changes in voice, changes in hair, changes in skin, changes in teeth, changes in eyes, changes in ears, changes in nose, changes in mouth, changes in throat, changes in lungs, changes in heart, changes in stomach, changes in intestines, changes in bladder, changes in reproductive system, changes in other organs.
12. Comparing the results of the interviews with the results of the medical records.
13. Identifying the patients who have been diagnosed with the disease and who have also been interviewed.
14. Interviewing the identified patients and their parents and asking them about various symptoms and signs, such as changes in weight, changes in eating habits, changes in sleeping habits, changes in behavior, changes in school performance, changes in social relationships, changes in personality, changes in appearance, changes in voice, changes in hair, changes in skin, changes in teeth, changes in eyes, changes in ears, changes in nose, changes in mouth, changes in throat, changes in lungs, changes in heart, changes in stomach, changes in intestines, changes in bladder, changes in reproductive system, changes in other organs.
15. Comparing the results of the interviews with the results of the medical records.

SHIRUBS



NOTES

1. For planting in poorly drained soils install plant material so that root collar is 7.5-10cm above grade
2. Remove container and mulch soil ball intact. Container to be cut carefully away from root system so as not disturb soil ball.


SHIRUBS



from outer of plate

Set top of roof ball 50mm minimum above finished grade. For poorly drained soil, set below. Provide topsoil spacer 100mm at finished grade. Fit and secure to be sealed with water immersion after installation.

100



NOTES:



























1. The tree girth shall be left open over night.
2. Stakes surfaces of all tree girths to be secured.
3. For glazing in goodly discolored spots: install splint material so that root collar is 75-100mm above.
4. Trees to be planted by hand or backhoe. No tree spades or bagging permitted.
5. Remove stakes at close of second growing season or upon expiry of warranty period.

Contracted fill is undisturbed along side

DECIDUOUS TREES

NTS

LEGEND

- | | | | |
|---|---|---|-----------------------|
|  | Proposed Decision Tree |  | Existing Tree to Beam |
|  | Proposed Decision & First Split |  | |
|  | Proposed Primitives & Grid |  | |
|  | <p>Layer 1: Beam 10mm and 50mm</p> <p>Layer 2: Primitives</p> <p>Layer 3: Primitives</p> <p>Layer 4: Primitives</p> |  | |
|  | <p>Proposed 1.5m H.</p> <p>Class: Left face</p> |  | |
|  | <p>Proposed 1.0m H.</p> <p>Model: Left face</p> |  | |
|  | <p>Proposed 1.0m H.</p> <p>Model: Left face</p> |  | |
|  | <p>Proposed 2.5m H.</p> <p>Model: Left face</p> |  | |
|  | <p>The new decision function</p> <p>Plan (Dev 1, 1) by Baker</p> |  | |
|  | <p>Proposed 1.5m H.</p> <p>Model: Left face</p> |  | |
|  | <p>Proposed 1.0m H.</p> <p>Model: Left face</p> |  | |
|  | <p>Proposed 1.0m H.</p> <p>Model: Left face</p> |  | |
|  | <p>Proposed 1.0m H.</p> <p>Model: Left face</p> |  | |

REVISION

- | DATE | DISCUSSION |
|-------------|--|
| 16 July, 18 | Issued for Review |
| 16 May, 18 | Revised & Resubmitted for Submission |
| 31 Oct, 17 | Revised & Resubmitted for Submission |
| 07 Sept, 17 | Revised & Resubmitted for Submission |
| 19 Dec, 16 | Revised & Resubmitted for Submission |
| 19 Nov, 16 | Revised & Resubmitted as per Q1 Comments |
| 29 Sep, 16 | Revised & Resubmitted for Submission |
| 14 Sep, 15 | Issued for Submission |
| 06 May, 15 | Issued for Client Review |

on the project




Suite 300
 8501 Midwayburg Road
 Brampton Ontario L6Y 5G8
 email: blue@bluewin.com

| | | |
|---|------------------------|---------------|
| 99560, 9570 Keele Street Vaughan, ON Landscape Plan & Details | Date November, 2014 | Issued |
| Job Number 18T-1211 | Drawn MJS | Checked By |

PROGRESS PLOT
Client Review Online
Construction

Sheet Number: **File Number**
L1 of 2



BTi

10000 Highway 100, Suite 100
 Burnaby, BC V5A 4E5
 Tel: (604) 431-8888
 Fax: (604) 431-8889
 Email: info@bti.ca
 Website: www.bti.ca

BTi

10000 Highway 100, Suite 100
 Burnaby, BC V5A 4E5
 Tel: (604) 431-8888
 Fax: (604) 431-8889
 Email: info@bti.ca
 Website: www.bti.ca

BTi

10000 Highway 100, Suite 100
 Burnaby, BC V5A 4E5
 Tel: (604) 431-8888
 Fax: (604) 431-8889
 Email: info@bti.ca
 Website: www.bti.ca

BTi

10000 Highway 100, Suite 100
 Burnaby, BC V5A 4E5
 Tel: (604) 431-8888
 Fax: (604) 431-8889
 Email: info@bti.ca
 Website: www.bti.ca

BTi

10000 Highway 100, Suite 100
 Burnaby, BC V5A 4E5
 Tel: (604) 431-8888
 Fax: (604) 431-8889
 Email: info@bti.ca
 Website: www.bti.ca

BTi

10000 Highway 100, Suite 100
 Burnaby, BC V5A 4E5
 Tel: (604) 431-8888
 Fax: (604) 431-8889
 Email: info@bti.ca
 Website: www.bti.ca

BTi

10000 Highway 100, Suite 100
 Burnaby, BC V5A 4E5
 Tel: (604) 431-8888
 Fax: (604) 431-8889
 Email: info@bti.ca
 Website: www.bti.ca

BTi

10000 Highway 100, Suite 100
 Burnaby, BC V5A 4E5
 Tel: (604) 431-8888
 Fax: (604) 431-8889
 Email: info@bti.ca
 Website: www.bti.ca





