

Conservation
Review Board

Commission des
biens culturels

655 Bay St Suite 1500
Toronto, ON M5G 1E5
Tel (416) 326-3594
Fax (416) 326-6209
Email: conservation.review.board@ontario.ca
Website: www.crb.gov.on.ca

655 rue Bay Bureau 1500
Toronto, ON M5G 1E5
Tel (416) 326-3594
Fax (416) 326-6209



ISSUE DATE:

October 29, 2012

CRB1103

CONSERVATION REVIEW BOARD

RE: THE CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF GUELPH – INTENTION TO DESIGNATE THE PROPERTY KNOWN AS THE WILSON/INGRAM FARMHOUSE, 80 SIMMONDS DRIVE, GUELPH

Stuart W. Henderson, Chair

Karen Haslam, Member

Monday, June 4 and Tuesday, June 5, 2012

This hearing was convened under s.29(8) of the Ontario Heritage Act., R.S.O. 1990, Chapter O.18, amended 2009 (“Act”), for the purpose of reporting to the Council of the City of Guelph (“City”), whether in the opinion of the Conservation Review Board, on the basis of the evidence it heard, the property known as 80 Simmonds Drive, Guelph (“Wilson/Ingram Farmhouse”) should be protected by bylaw under s.29 of the Act.

The legal description of the subject property is Block 52, Registered Plan 61M-122.

Background

In 2005, the City of Guelph acquired a parcel of land through a parkland dedication in the Northern Heights subdivision. This subdivision is located north of Woodlawn Road and west of Victoria Road North. The park’s municipal address upon which the subject property is located, 80 Simmonds Drive, may change once a planned severance of the farmhouse parcel is completed. The park fronts on Simmonds Drive, Kinlock Street, Webster Street and Ingram Drive. The original dedicated parcel of parkland is 1.72 hectares in size (4.5 acres).

In August of 2006, as a consequence of the determination of the cultural heritage value and interest of the farmhouse parcel, the City's original intent was to utilize the farmhouse and adjoining land as a community centre. BJC Architects Inc. was retained by the City to prepare a building review outlining the condition of the building and necessary upgrades. In 2007, Heritage Guelph was requested to prepare the information required for Council to consider designation pursuant to s.29 of the Ontario Heritage Act.

In April of 2010, Council directed staff to offer the Wilson/Ingram Farmhouse site for sale on the open market and requested Heritage Guelph to prepare a report in regard to the designation of that parcel of property under s.29. Staff was directed to develop a Park Master Plan with active and passive recreational components for the remaining lands. Should the proposed severance go ahead, the farmhouse property would be approximately .15 hectares in size (.37 acres).

In February of 2011, Council received the Heritage Report from Heritage Guelph for the proposed designation. In July of 2011, the entire designation initiative was referred back to Council to reconsider the parkland and severance process. At that time, Council reaffirmed their intention to proceed with the designation of the Wilson/Ingram Farmhouse parcel of property.

The Review Board held two prehearing conferences on this matter on September 23, 2011, and January 10, 2012. There was no agreement of settlement or any signed agreed statement of facts between the parties at the commencement of the Hearing.

Notice of this Hearing was served by the Review Board on the parties. The public notice was published by the City in the manner required under the Act in the Thursday, May 24, 2012 edition of the *Guelph Tribune*.

The Monday, June 4, 2012 Hearing commenced at 10:00 a.m. at Meeting Room No. 12, City of Guelph, City Hall, 1 Carden Street, Guelph, Ontario.

The parties and members of the Review Board attended a site visit at 8:00 a.m. on the morning of Monday, June 4, 2012.

This Hearing ended in the late afternoon of June 5, 2012, after two consecutive hearing days.

Parties in Order of Appearance

Ms. Susan Smith – Solicitor for the City of Guelph

Mr. Mike Lackowicz – Representing the Northern Heights Liaison Group

Witnesses in Order of Appearance

Mr. Steven Robinson – Senior Heritage Planner for City of Guelph

Mr. Robert Reynor – Manager of Inspection Services for City of Guelph

Mr. Derek Higdon – Higdon’s Masonry

Mr. Owen Scott – OALA, FCSLA, CAHP

Members of the Public in Order of Appearance

Daniel Clayton – grandson of previous owner, Jack Ingram

Andy Van Hellemond – Councillor – Ward 2

Jurisdiction of the Board

All parties were reminded that the jurisdiction of the Conservation Review Board is to hear evidence within the confines and framework of Ontario Regulation 9/06, which is an integral part of the Ontario Heritage Act, to assess the cultural heritage value or interest of a property being proposed for designation under s.29 of the Act.

The Board does not address issues of demolition or partial or selective demolition, the expenses involved with physical maintenance or repairs of the property, any planning applications or issues that are under the jurisdiction of the Planning Act, the current state of repair of a property, or any future planned or proposed use of the property.

Evidence on any of these above matters will only be entertained and heard if they give context to the discussion of cultural heritage value or interest, and any heritage attributes or features that may support that value or interest. The comparative weight of this evidence will be assessed and balanced by the Review Board in arriving at its final recommendation(s).

The Review Board advised the parties that it would be diligent in abiding by this framework and reminded all parties of the practice of limiting evidence and argument deemed to be outside the mandate and scope of the powers of the Board.

Procedural Matters

At the outset of the Hearing, Ms. Smith and Mr. Lackowicz raised the matter of the two Black Walnut “heritage” trees adjacent to the farmhouse structure. Since both the City and Objector agree that the trees be included as part of the designation proposal, evidence regarding maintenance of them would not be accepted nor heard at this Hearing.

Additionally, Scott Tracey, a reporter with the *Guelph Mercury*, was present and was reminded that no audio or visual recording equipment was permitted during the course of the Hearing, to which he agreed.

Case for the City of Guelph

The City tabled its book of authorities; five large panels of photos; two aerial location maps and their document book which were accepted as Exhibits 1, 2, 3 and 4 respectively.

The Review Board accepted the City's evidence that it has complied with the statutory requirements of the Act in its publication of the Notice of Intention to Designate and Notification of this Hearing.

Witness – Mr. Steven Robinson

Ms. Smith called Mr. Steven Robinson, Senior Heritage Planner for the City, as the City's first witness. On consent of the parties, Mr. Robinson was sworn in as an expert in heritage planning.

Mr. Robinson reviewed the past history involving this property as outlined earlier in this report and confirmed that the City intends to move ahead with designation on the basis that the property and its heritage attribute of the Wilson/Ingram Farmhouse display design or physical value, and as historical or associative value, pursuant to Ontario Regulation 9/06.

Specifically, the City outlined the following in its Notice of Intention to Designate with regard to the Wilson/Ingram Farmhouse:

- Original gable roof lines of the main house block and tail, with the exception of the west slope of the tail roof;
- All exterior walls and clay brick in the original bonding pattern;
- Jointing and Tooling, with the exception of the west wall of the tail;
- Fieldstone foundation and wall exterior with the exception of the west wall of the tail;
- All extant exterior wood elements of the original house, design/verge soffits, frieze and cornices with the exception of the west wall of the tail;
- All original window and door openings and their functional and decorative components/frames, sashes, muntins, glazing, sills, heads, jambs and mouldings, with the exception of: the west door, main floor window and dormer of the tail; right-hand main floor window and upper gable on east façade of the tail;
- Lancet (pointed) arch window in the gable on the south façade;
- Italianate window on the east façade;
- Front door within the east façade porch;
- Presence of the porch of the east façade that has the foot print and single storey height of the existing front door entrance porch; and

- Two large mature black walnut trees adjacent to the farmhouse building.

Mr. Robinson gave his opinion that the evaluation by City staff utilizing the Criteria for Determining Cultural Heritage Value or Interest is a proper conclusion and should be followed by Council. He believes that the house is a representative example of late 19th century, vernacular Ontario Gothic farmhouse architecture once common in the rural areas surrounding Guelph. He believes its historical or associative value is unquestionable because of its association with the Wilson family, early settlers who purchased the land from the Canada Company in 1836 and farmed the land for over a century. From a contextual perspective, he believes its value is rooted in its physical location perched atop the planned City parkland. He portrayed it as a physical “benchmark.”

The subject property and adjacent lands were originally part of a much larger parcel and neighboured other similar farms, all of which have been demolished and the lands are now part of the adjoining subdivision.

With respect to the condition and maintenance of the building, Mr. Robinson advised that its windows were boarded up from the inside in November of 2008 and the adjoining shed was demolished in accordance with a City Report and with the support of Heritage Guelph in 2010. Additional exterior boards were installed and painted, and the soffit and fascia patched in early 2011. A basement hatch was secured, the basement ventilated, and tree maintenance was carried out in November of 2011. New basement stairs were constructed in December 2011 and additional roof patching was carried out in March 2012. He is of the opinion that the City has taken all necessary steps to maintain and preserve the integrity of the building until such time as it can be modified for City use or sold to a third party. The structure’s “current condition does not impact the Heritage value”. He indicated that the window boarding will cause minimal damage and it is more important that the building be secured. The roof line repair has not impacted its original state and the soffit/fascia/cornice work can be easily replaced and/or repaired. Any damage to foundation stone and bricks can be repaired, replaced, or repointed.

The witness conceded that the structure is showing signs of neglect, but stated that its present condition does not impact the built elements in a way that would diminish their cultural heritage value. As such, the property is worthy of designation under the Act.

Cross Examination of Mr. Robinson by Mr. Lackowicz:

In his questioning of Mr. Robinson, Mr. Lackowicz outlined what he considers to be the elements that constitute a “true farm.” He noted that the outbuildings, sheds, and barns have been removed, thus diminishing the significance of a true and accurate farming site. Mr. Robinson replied that contextually, the removal of such elements did not diminish the status of the property as a “benchmark” in the area. Being in its original location grants it bearing and reference to its site location and related associative value.

Mr. Robinson reiterated that the Wilson/Ingram Farmhouse is the last tangible element left on the property. The barn and ancillary buildings did make a contribution to the farming context but when removed, they did not render the farmhouse meaningless. This, in fact, buttresses the

reality that the Wilson/Ingram Farmhouse is the last physical element on the property to attest to the architectural and historical context of the farm as a whole.

Mr. Lackowicz also pointed out that the original report of City Staff (Tab 4, Page 34) lists a number of interior features to be designated but these are not in the Notice of Intention to Designate. Mr. Robinson was candid in his reply that the City removed reference to the interior as it did not want to set up a potentially impossible situation for any future prospective owner, public or private, and that it would be reasonable to accept some rehabilitation of the property. The City would encourage owners to keep such interior elements.

Mr. Robinson conceded that the house does not fit contextually with the surrounding neighbourhood; allowed that it does not relate to Victoria Road any longer; and it also fails to relate to the new subdivision.

Witness – Mr. Robert Reynor

Mr. Reynor was called by the City to give evidence as to the past and existing condition of the farmhouse. He is head of the City's Building and Construction Property Standards Department and the parties consented to having him qualified as an expert to give evidence in such matters.

Mr. Reynor reported that he inspected the farmhouse in May 2003, November 2011, and January and May of 2012. He testified that the building is generally sound with noted exceptions: cosmetically; the need to install a roof membrane to prevent flooding; and the interior needs a gutted renovation and insulation. He felt the cracks in the brickwork and foundation are not a major concern and in no way does the foundation need to be replaced. He believes it better to repair and stabilize stone foundations, and then repair the bricks above.

Cross Examination of Mr. Reynor

Mr. Lackowicz inquired of Mr. Reynor that if the building had been heated, would frost damage be less. His response was that he believes there was no substantial damage due to frost; the ridges are good and the rafters may sag but this is not indicative of a faulty roof. The soffit and fascia need significant restorative work. He conceded that the roof is not up to Code but is functioning and would be fine if new shingles were installed. The cracks in the foundation and bricks may have increased over the years but have not done irreparable harm. Remedial work on the foundation would satisfy any long term concerns.

Case for the Objector: The Northern Heights Liaison Group

Witness: Derrick Higdon

Mr. Higdon was sworn as a witness for the Objector.

Mr. Higdon advised that he has been a mason for twenty-five years and is the owner of Higdon Masonry. As a neighbour for the last three years, he has passed the farmhouse many times and noted the cracks in the foundation and patchwork repair done in major areas of the

foundation. At the request of Mr. Lackowicz, he further inspected the foundation and reported that there is damage to the brick corners, likely due to frost and the constant movement of the basement foundation.

In reference to Exhibit 5, Tab D, Page 23D, Picture F-3, he pointed out the cracks due to foundation deterioration. If the foundation is not reconstructed in the correct manner, the cracks, even if patched, will continue to be present. He is also of the belief that the west wing requires a major reconstructive project. He stated that the house is not double-bricked. In his opinion, there is mould in the wood members of the structure and the chimney is not properly tied into the house.

Cross Examination of Mr. Higdon

In referencing Tab D, Page 23D of Mr. Higdon's report, Ms. Smith inquired if he was around in 2005 or 2006 to compare the damage that he noticed in 2011. Mr. Higdon started to look at the property approximately two years ago. He examined the photographs from the prior City Report and noted the worsening of the corners. He believes the foundations and brick corners could be repaired but that the bricks higher up must be replaced. He disagrees with the City Report (Exhibit 4, Tab 7, Page 67, Item 2.15) where it states that: "the cracks are not excessive and are not a structural concern . . . these cracks need to be repaired to prevent moisture damage and further deterioration." Mr. Higdon reiterated that a full reconstruction is needed, not just mere repair or minor remedial work.

Witness: Mr. Lackowicz

Mr. Lackowicz was sworn as the agent representing Northern Heights Liaison Group, a neighbourhood group comprised of residents of the streets abutting and in the vicinity of the subject property. He conducted the case on the group's behalf and gave evidence.

Mr. Lackowicz stated that the concerns of Northern Heights Liaison Group members are based primarily on the fact that the farmhouse originally sat on a hundred acres of land and that all the associated outbuildings are now gone. There is no longer a "true" farmhouse context. It has become "an old house out-of-place in a new modern subdivision" and there was no attempt in the development of the area to nestle the property within the subdivision. There is no curb appeal and no front yard as it was "gouged" out by the adjoining street. "The structure is now perched in the air" and the modern armour stone retaining wall installed by the City is not "heritage friendly." Although admittedly not an expert in this area, Mr. Lackowicz finds that the removal of the original flagstone patio; removal of the front yard and trees to allow the construction of a road; removal of the original four chimneys and original porch, as well as a garage and vestibule; removal of the ancillary buildings; and the apparent alteration of two original doors and two windows, have all combined to erode the heritage and cultural integrity of the property. His position on behalf of Northern Heights Liaison Group is that this heritage farmstead has suffered "a significant change in and erosion in heritage criteria and integrity."

Mr. Lackowicz pointed out that the City's own estimate for building repairs, i.e., \$277,000 in 2006 and now \$500,000, is reason enough not to move ahead with the designation process.

His position is best summarized on Page 18, Tab C of Exhibit 5, wherein it states:

The house will not speak about its farmhouse past, it will be mostly a reconstructed structure with a modern interior and large modern addition sitting on the extreme edge of a park and it will not portray any symbols to the farmhouse set on 100 acres with barns, outbuildings and many mature trees.

In short, the Objector believes the City has been negligent in not maintaining and heating the farmhouse or allowing it to be occupied to prevent such deterioration. The City also failed to utilize and implement proper planning procedures. This combination has led to the deterioration of the property's heritage elements and features, and resulted in an overall erosion of its heritage integrity.

Cross Examination of Mr. Lackowicz

Ms. Smith queried whether Mr. Lackowicz or Northern Heights Liaison Group had done any research on similar properties. He conceded that these conclusions are the Group's opinions and not based on expert factual research or evidence.

Ms. Smith questioned if the rise in the cost of the alleged repairs merely represent the current costs or could it have been caused by factors other than deterioration and neglect by the City. Mr. Lackowicz reiterated that the City's failure to retain at least some of the contextual features; and its inability to implement proper planning, have led to the erosion of the heritage integrity of the property.

Witness – Mr. Owen Scott

The parties consented to qualifying Mr. Scott as an expert in heritage landscape research and conservation. He has appeared as an expert before the Review Board, as well as our provincial tribunals.

Mr. Scott testified that the Wilson/Ingram Farmhouse is not a good example of a 19th century vernacular farmhouse. From a design or physical value perspective, he believes that the definition of "representative" is one that serves as an example or type for others of the same classification". It should be something to look up to and be emulated. He testified that he is completely at a loss as to how this property, so greatly transformed due to the removal of its ancillary buildings, could possibly satisfy the criteria of Regulation 9/06. The property is not rare or unique.

From a historical or associative value perspective, he could not determine anything that the Wilson family had accomplished that was exceptional. He could find no evidence that the family had significance within the community. The farmhouse does not inform on the "development of farming in the area" because it now sits in the middle of a modified landscape and has no present function in the neighbourhood.

In regard to the deterioration of the structure, Mr. Scott believes there is a difference between replacing essential features and "total reconstruction." With this property, some elements could

be restored but a number will entail total reconstruction. This building has been allowed to deteriorate to where some of the heritage character elements that the City seeks to preserve may have to be replaced due to poor condition. He does not agree that the increased cost for such remedial work from \$277,000 in 2006 to \$500,000 in 2011 can be explained by a few years of general cost increases.

Mr. Scott recommended that a public/private relationship should be forged to deal with the property; but how this would be implemented or whether it was possible, he did not know. Simply put, he does not believe that the building is a “good fit.”

Cross Examination of Mr. Owen Scott

Ms. Smith asked Mr. Scott if the representative “definition” that he was relying upon came from a dictionary or heritage literature. He responded that this property is simply not a good example. He cited, for example, that the front door is not on the front; the chimney is on the front; there is a missing front window; the Carpenter Gothic style lancet window is “odd,” as is the Italianate style window. This is an ordinary type of building and is similar to other farmhouses of its time, but it is not a good representative candidate. The setting has been totally changed. The farmhouse is perched high on a hill with a modern stacked retaining wall abutting it, all within a modern 21st century subdivision.

Members of the Public

Mr. Daniel Clayton

Mr. Clayton is the grandson of the last private owner of the property, Mr. Jack Ingram. Mr. Ingram donated the property after owning it from 1962 to 2005. He occupied the farmhouse until 2005. Mr. Clayton was attending on behalf of his grandfather, who wished to express that the house had deteriorated considerably since 2005. This is shown by the photographs of the interior and exterior at Exhibit 5, Tab E, Page 27A and 27C. His grandfather had wanted the farmhouse to be a heritage home and converted to public use/space. The deterioration of the property has significantly jeopardized his original intention.

Mr. Andy Van Hellemond

Mr. Van Hellemond is a Councillor for Ward 2, within which the subject property is located. He was not aware of any prior problems with the property but now considers that Council did not have enough information and evidence before them to make an informed decision for designation. It was part of a consolidation vote at the time. No information was attached or reports given to Council. He stated that Council is now reconsidering its position on selling the property to private interests.

Reply Evidence of Mr. Robert Reynor

To the Objector's case, Mr. Reynor felt that Mr. Higdon's statement in his report that there has been a "severe increase in deterioration as evidenced in all of the photographs" is simply incorrect. He reiterated that the foundation can be repaired and need not be reconstructed. In further cross-examination by Mr. Lackowicz, Mr. Reynor stated that the majority of the foundation problems are caused by water from leaking downspouts and resulting frost then acting on the stones. He stated that waterproofing the foundation and repairing the soffits and downspouts to prevent leakage are needed.

Reply Evidence of Mr. Steven Robinson

Ms. Scott asked Mr. Robinson to elaborate on the term "vernacular" when referring to the style of the Wilson/Ingram Farmhouse. He repeated that the architecture of this property conforms to the vernacular Ontario Gothic farmhouse construction of the later 19th century (Exhibit 4, Tab 2, Page 11). Vernacular means reinterpretation of a style, not a textbook example. In his opinion, the Wilson/Ingram Farmhouse is a good example of an interpretation of a Gothic farmhouse and in some ways it is unusual, and thus a good example of a "vernacular."

Mr. Robinson disagrees with the description of the lancet window by Mr. Scott as "Carpenter Gothic." Although not elaborate, it fits with the other elements of a simple Gothic farmhouse. He also takes umbrage with the term "common" used by Mr. Scott. The house was certainly not "high style" but it is a "simple style" representative of many farmhouses built in the Wilson time period. With respect to the "odd" Italianate window as described by Mr. Scott, Mr. Robinson is of the belief that it is not unusual for that type of window to be found on this type of house. The fact that it is placed on the front façade, where there are usually two feature windows, makes it a good example of vernacular interpretation of a style.

From an historical or associative value perspective, Mr. Robinson emphasized that the value and significance of the Wilson family rest in the fact they were an early settler family and the first family to buy, settle and clear land in what is now part of the City of Guelph.

Mr. Robinson did concede that Mr. Scott's assertion that "the grading of the development was allowed to leave the farmhouse perched in the air" far above its neighbours, removing any context it might have had, is accurate; however, the fact that it is in its original location in context to Victoria Avenue is essential to its continuing value. Mr. Robinson then concurred with Mr. Reynor to disagree with Mr. Higdon's opinion that the brickwork had diminished substantially and thus the heritage value had been eroded. "Mr. Higdon is not an expert in heritage."

Summation of the Case for the City

In closing, Ms. Smith pointed out that the planning and development issues and the related subdivision agreement are not within the mandate of the Review Board; nor is any testimony on the prospective use of the building. The Review Board concurred.

Ms. Smith stated that the property meets the design or physical value category of Regulation 9/06 as being typical of a vernacular Ontario Gothic style farmhouse and that it has representative value as a typical type of farmhouse of that age.

Under historical or associative value, the Wilsons were the first settler family in the area and this, in and of itself, gives this building and property significance. That the structure remains in its same location imputes to a value as the original farmstead, plus its orientation to Victoria Road reveals its value in showing the development in farming over the centuries.

It is conceded by the City that the property and farmhouse need significant restoration and repair, especially to the interior. This does not mean that the significant restoration required will impact the historical elements of the building. The house has good structural integrity.

Summation of the Case for the Objector

Mr. Lackowicz reiterated the position of Northern Heights Liaison Group that no evidence had been proffered that the Wilson family made any significant contribution to the community. Many of the heritage features of the house and property are irrefutably destroyed or have disappeared in their entirety. This is not a highly crafted house nor is it an early style of significance. The farmhouse has lost its contextual value, notably due to the loss of all the outlying buildings and barns. It is “perched in the air” with no relationship to its adjoining neighbourhood. He would prefer that it be designated as a “ruin” such as can be found at St. Raphael’s Roman Catholic Church in Glengarry County (Exhibit 1, Tab 3, Page 27).

Findings of the Board

As is increasingly often the case with the Conservation Review Board, the significant development of municipalities and the demand for housing and services has incontrovertibly placed pressure upon such municipalities in identifying and preserving appropriate examples of farmstead structures, such as farmhouses, outbuildings and barns.

As noted, the Review Board’s responsibility is to examine all of the evidence within the parameters of the Act and how this template relates to the property in question. The parties agree that the farmhouse on the subject property is one of the last remaining vestiges of Guelph’s agrarian past of the 1800s. They disagree on the relative importance of its original and subsequent owners and fail to arrive at consensus as to the representative nature of the vernacular farmhouse model, which goes to the crux of its cultural heritage value or interest.

The position of Northern Heights Liaison Group, the Objector in this matter, is that this property and structure, albeit old, fails to fit the criteria of Regulation 9/06. The Objector believes that it has lost its contextual value as a late 19th century farmstead due to its isolated, “perched” locale surrounded by a modern subdivision, with no remnant of its agrarian past. They believe that it is not representative of the typical vernacular farmhouse and is, in the opinion of the Objector’s

expert witness, “an ugly duckling.” Yet, the final submission of the Objector concluded that they are not opposed to allow the structure to remain, in some fashion, as a ruin, as some sort of memorial to the past.

The Review Board recognizes that the Objector’s motivation is to compel the City to utilize the property in some way for public/civic purposes. By objecting to the designation, the City presumably would be pressured to change its position of severing the farmstead parcel and selling it to private interests.

It would appear conclusively on the evidence that this structure, albeit diminished from its original hundred acre size and loss of its ancillary buildings, is a typical example of 19th century, vernacular Ontario Gothic farmhouse architecture. It is not a perfect example due to certain idiosyncrasies of original construction and additions over the years, and its present condition is neither perfect nor pristine. The City acknowledges the interior needs significant work but the property, based on the expert evidence of the City before the Review Board is, for all, intents and purposes, sustainable.

It is the conclusion of the Review Board that upon the evidence presented by the parties it is evident that this property, with its farmhouse structure and including the black walnut trees, is worthy of designation for its design or physical and historical or associative values to the community, as defined by Ontario Regulation 9/06 and deserves protection under section 29 of the Ontario Heritage Act. The expert evidence submitted by the City carried substantial weight in the Review Board’s consideration of the evidence in this case. The testimony of the Objector’s expert witness was candid and informative but was significantly outweighed by that of the City. While all agreed that the property is certainly not a landmark in the area, the Review Board concurs with the City’s position that it is a benchmark for the community and reflective of the City’s once vibrant agricultural past.

Board Recommendation

For the reasons given above and based on the evidence heard, the Review Board recommends that the Council of the City of Guelph proceed with the designation of the property known as the Wilson/Ingram Farmhouse, 80 Simmonds Drive, Guelph, Ontario, under section 29 of the Ontario Heritage Act., R.S.O. 1990, Chapter O.18, amended 2009.

The Review Board appreciates the efforts of all participants in these proceedings.

“Stuart W. Henderson”

Stuart W. Henderson, Chair

October 26, 2012

“Karen Haslam”

Karen Haslam, Member
October 26, 2012

Appendix A Attached.

Appendix A List of Exhibits

EXHIBIT NO.	FILED BY	DESCRIPTION OF EXHIBIT
1	Susan Smith	Brief Book of Authorities
2	Susan Smith	5 large panel pictures of property and house
3	Susan Smith	2 large area location maps
4	Susan Smith	Document Book
5	Mike Lackowicz	Wilson Farm Exhibit Book
6	Conservation Review Board	Affidavit of Notice of Hearing