Queen's University
Heritage Study

METHODOLOGY

1. INTRODUCTION

The project was undertaken to produce a comprehensive and evaluated inventory of all university-owned buildings and all planned landscapes within a university precinct generally extending north to Earl Street and south to King Street. The inventory identifies the man-made elements that have been placed on the campus since its inception, including old and new buildings and landscapes. The layers of land use and patterns of settlement have been identified as a "cultural landscape" in order to understand the context of the campus within its neighbourhood and to determine the extent to which former landscapes have been obliterated and others have survived. The Commonwealth Historic Resource Management Limited research team including project manager John Stewart, and Harold Kalman, Carl Bray, Erik Hanson and Larry Turner built their analysis upon previous work on the Campus Master Plan undertaken by Du Toit, Allsopp, Hillier of Toronto. The document that follows will serve as a long-range strategic planning and management tool for the university.

1.1 Study Scope

- Review of existing heritage inventories and evaluation processes for the classification of buildings and landscapes at Queen's University.

- Inventory of all institutional buildings on the Queen's University Campus.

- Inventory of Queen's-owned residential buildings in Kingston as well as a few buildings that are a part of a streetscape or cluster of buildings involving Queen's property.

- Inventory of university precinct landscapes.

- Classification and evaluation of buildings and landscapes based upon clearly defined evaluation criteria.

- Summary of the development of Queen's University and the transformation of cultural landscapes within the university precinct and its neighbourhood.

1.2 Geographical Scope

The inventory and evaluation considered all institutional buildings on the Queen's University campus (except west campus) in Kingston, Ontario as well as residential buildings owned by the university. Landscapes and streetscapes (including areas where Queen's did not own all of the property) were inventoried and evaluated within the university precinct and its immediate neighbourhood (bounded by King Street West, Earl Street, Barrie Street and Collingwood Avenue).

1.3 Project Schedule

Commonwealth was retained in May 1993. The project team participated in an initial meeting on July 6, 1993, with Queen's Campus Planning and Development and the Kingston Local Architectural Conservation Advisory Committee. The first meeting determined the purposes of the inventory, project scope, information needs, and identified existing historical and architectural data as well as photographs and plan records. Subsequent team meetings in August (9, 12, 17) involved both Queen's Campus Planning and Development and LACAC in evaluation of the inventoried resources. Commonwealth has since completed further research and text amendments, as requested by the client, and in response to comments from the City.

2. PRODUCTS

2.1 Technical Report

This consists of a history of the cultural landscape in and around the Queen's University campus and an illustrated statement of significance of inventoried and evaluated landscapes, residential and institutional buildings. Photographs and summary descriptions of all buildings as well as maps of landscapes are included in the report. Residential buildings have been listed by street address and institutional buildings have been listed using a numbering system established in the Queen's University Architectural Inventory (1993). Landscapes are keyed to maps. The final report takes into consideration various comments received as a result of the distribution of the draft report. This report will present all of the findings and recommendations of the study.

2.2 Report on Methodology

This report outlines the nature of the research, the method of undertaking the inventory, the process for establishing the criteria and means by which the evaluation was applied.

2.3 Report on Planning Policies and Controls

This report reflects current (June 1998) discussions between Queen's and the City regarding buildings that could be designated under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act. Draft policy guidelines are presented for each area proposing regulations for the treatment of private and open spaces, landscape and streetscape features, and vacant lands.

2.4 Inventory and Evaluation Files

Every building and landscape was given a file that contains a photograph, field inventory and evaluation form, and any relevant data copied from other reports and sources. The inventory forms do not reflect changes made as a result of later research. Inventories and evaluations were made of 27 landscapes, 124 residential buildings and 63 Queen's University institutional buildings. To provide additional context, 20 buildings not owned by Queen's were also inventoried and evaluated.

2.5 Computerized Data Entry

Text and images have been entered on Adobe PageMaker software. The inventory and evaluation was also entered on disc using Commonwealth's Visual Archiver software, another means of providing text and visual images.

2.6 Project Team

John J. Stewart was project manager, and also participated in the field survey and evaluation. Harold Kalman participated in field survey and the evaluation. Stewart and Kalman designed the criteria for the evaluation in consultation with the client and LACAC. Erik Hanson conducted most of the inventory and participated in the evaluation process. Larry Turner was responsible for historic research and participated in the field survey. Photography was by Erik Hanson and Larry Turner. Carl Bray prepared the revised report and he and John Stewart conducted revisions and additions to the inventory and evaluation. Sandy Crozier was responsible for production while Cara Buffam, Tracey Tysick and Jean Rocheleau entered information into the Visual Archiver and produced plans. Rhonda Stewart was the team administrator.

The team appreciated the active participation of Jeanne Ma, Director of Campus Planning and Development. She was the primary client and in her role as project manager for the University, was responsible for client review of text and images. She also assisted in detailed copy editing. Co-operation with the Kingston Local Architectural Conservation Advisory Committee also contributed to the success of the project. Members of LACAC involved in the evaluation process were: Margaret Angus, Bruce Downey, George Muirhead, Janet Ouilihan, P. Ross.

3. INFORMATION GATHERING AND RESEARCH

Research for the inventory was based on several previous reports associated with the university and adjacent residential areas. New research was also undertaken, as discussed below.

1. Historical accounts, early maps, insurance plans, and aerial photos of Kingston were consulted to understand the historical development of the study area.

2. A thorough examination of Municipal Directories (in the special collections of Douglas Library and the Kingston Public Library) provided the following information:

    • A likely construction date for most buildings

    • Building occupancy and occupation of early residents

    • Earliest known occupants

    • Material on social history and patterns

    • The residences of prominent citizens

    • Buildings were named after the earliest known occupants

3. The Land Registry Office was consulted to inspect registered plans and investigate specific building lots and sites.

4. Plans and documents at the Queen's University Engineering Office were consulted.

5. Interviews were conducted with local historian Margaret Angus, and architectural historian Fern Mackenzie Graham.

6. Application was made of a computerized image archiving system developed by Commonwealth Historic Resource Management Ltd. to aid in research and enhance the final presentation of the inventory and evaluation.

7. Descriptions were augmented in the text for all properties evaluated as *Excellent* or *Very Good*. Several properties rated as *Good* were also discussed in greater detail, in response to the City's intent to designate them under Part IV of *The Ontario Heritage Act*.

4. SITE INSPECTION AND INVENTORY

4.1 Inventory Process

A file was opened on each resource, whether building or landscape, which included photographs, inventory form and supporting documentation. The inventory form was developed by Commonwealth Historic Resource Management Ltd. and was submitted to the University for review and testing. The revised form was used to record information on each structure and landscape. Visual inspection helped fill in several fields and those queries not answered were followed up with research.

Noted on the inventory forms are the sources for historical data and references used as the basis of conclusions. Building architects and landscape architects were identified through previous documentation where possible. Architectural style was identified where possible, with some residential buildings being classified by era. Integrity refers to the degree to which the building or structure has been altered or modified since original construction. Any information on significant persons, organizations, institutions, or events that are associated with buildings or landscapes was noted as well as sites that may effectively illustrate broad patterns of socio-cultural history. Each file contains at least one print photograph of the facade or elevation for buildings and the spatial setting or streetscape for principal landscapes.

4.2 Landscapes

The university precinct and neighbourhood was subdivided into defined landscapes that reflect a unity of purpose or pattern of development (for example: quads, fields, walkways, concourses, streetscapes and blocks). By breaking down the campus into parts, an assessment was made of earlier landscapes and changing patterns of development.

The landscape inventory form included the following categories: identification and location; historical significance; physical description; and design. Survey documentation was not carried out. Under "physical description", special reference was made to the following: views and viewsheds; edges of spatial landscape; spatial groupings; and significant features and people, events, or patterns of historic interest associated with the site.

Each landscape was visited and photographed by the research team. Descriptions of the landscape were derived from the Queen's University Campus Assessment draft (March 1993) by Du Toit, Allsopp, Hillier and additions were made in terms of historical context.

4.3 Residential Buildings

Every Queen's-owned residential building and selected contextual buildings that are a part of a streetscape or cluster of buildings involving Queen's property, were inventoried and evaluated. The research team visited every building, photographed it and made out an inventory form on site. Description and evaluations of all buildings not owned by Queen's, but included for contextual comparison, are found in Appendix A.

The architecture inventory form included the following: identification and location; historical significance; architecture and structure, and; context. Survey documentation was not carried out. The visual assessment included comments on condition and integrity on the exterior elevations of buildings only. Additions were noted only when they altered, to a significant degree, the nature of the original building. Significant landscape features were noted where buildings formed a part of a spatial grouping or streetscape. Adjacent buildings suited for heritage groupings were noted as well as people or events of historic interest associated with the site.

Descriptions were derived from the following sources: Margaret Angus, *Buildings of Architectural and Historic Significance* Vol. VII (Kingston: LACAC, 1991); Du Toit, Allsopp, Hillier, *Queen's University Architectural Inventory* (February 1993); and observations by Erik Hanson, John Stewart, Harold Kalman and Larry Turner. An attempt was made to determine the first resident/owner for each building as well as dating each structure using period directories and insurance plans. In some cases dates are estimated based on surviving evidence and some names may not reflect original owners/ residents, especially if the buildings preceded 1881.

4.4 Institutional Buildings

Institutional buildings at Queen's were inventoried using the same process as has been outlined above. Descriptions of the spatial context and architectural style of the buildings were largely derived from Du Toit, Allsopp, Hillier, *Queen's University Architectural Inventory* (February 1993) with historical context added by Larry Turner using sources from Margaret Angus, *Buildings of Architectural and Historic Significance* (1991); Professor Arthur Jackson, *Queen's University at Kingston: Buildings- Past and Present* (typescript on file at Queen's University Archives, April 1972); Margaret Angus, *Cornerstones and Plaques: Queen's History in Names* (Kingston: Queen's Alumni Assoc., 1991) and other secondary sources.

4.5 Inventory Forms

4.5.1 Landscape Inventory Form (following pages)

4.5.2 Building Inventory Form (following pages)

RECORD NO.: _____

LANDSCAPE INVENTORY FORM

1. IDENTIFICATION AND LOCATION

1.1 COMMON NAME(S) GIVEN TO LANDSCAPE: _____

_____

_____

_____

1.2 NAME AND RECORD NO. OF BUILDING(S) ASSOCIATED WITH LANDSCAPE: _____

_____

_____

_____

1.3 LEGAL DESCRIPTION (IF APPLICABLE):

LOT: _____ BLOCK: _____

PLAN: _____ DL: _____

1.4 ZONING: _____

1.5 OWNER: _____

2. HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE

2.1 PREVIOUS SITE OCCUPATION: _____

_____

2.2 ARCHAEOLOGICAL POTENTIAL: _____

_____

2.3 YEAR COMPLETED (FOR DESIGNATED LANDSCAPES): _____

LANDSCAPE INVENTORY FORM   RECORD NO.: _____

2.4 LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT: _____

    REFERENCE SOURCE: _____

2.5 BUILDER: _____

    REFERENCE SOURCE: _____

2.6 PEOPLE, EVENTS OR PATTERNS OF HISTORIC INTEREST ASSOCIATED WITH THE SITE:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

3. PHYSICAL DESCRIPTION

3.1 PREDOMINANT USE: _____

3.2 CIRCULATION: _____

3.3 SITE STRUCTURES: _____

3.4 VEGETATION RELATED TO USE: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

LANDSCAPE INVENTORY FORM

RECORD NO.: _____

3.6 VIEWS AND VIEWSHEDS: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

3.7 DEFINING EDGES OF SPATIAL LANDSCAPE: _____

_____

_____

_____

3.8 LANDSCAPE SPATIAL GROUPINGS: _____

_____

_____

_____

3.9 SIGNIFICANT LANDSCAPE FEATURES (FEATURES, BUILDINGS, MONUMENTS, FENCES):

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

LANDSCAPE INVENTORY FORM   RECORD NO.: _____

4. DESIGN

    4.1 DESIGN DESCRIPTION: _____

          _____

          _____

          _____

          _____

          _____

          _____

          _____

    4.2 INTEGRITY: _____

          _____

          _____

5. SURVEY DOCUMENTATION

    5.1 ASSESSMENT INFORMATION: _____

    5.2 LOCATION OF ADDITIONAL MATERIAL CONSULTED (DRAWINGS,PHOTOS, MAPS,

        SITE PLANS, ADDITIONAL SURVEYS, ETC.): _____

        _____

        _____

    5.3 SURVEYOR: _____

    5.4 DATE OF SURVEY: _____

    5.5 IMAGE REFERENCE NO.: _____

RECORD NO.: _____

ARCHITECTURAL INVENTORY FORM

1. IDENTIFICATION AND LOCATION

    1.1 NAME OF BUILDING: _____

    1.2 STREET ADDRESS: _____

    1.3 LEGAL DESCRIPTION (IF APPLICABLE):

        LOT: _____   BLOCK: _____

        PLAN: _____   DL: _____

    1.4 ROLL NUMBER: _____   ZONING: _____

    1.5 ORIGINAL USE: _____

    1.6 PRESENT USE: _____

2. HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE (INDICATE SOURCE)

    2.1 CONSTRUCTION DATE: _____

    2.2 ORIGINAL OWNER: _____

    2.3 ARCHITECT: _____

    2.4 BUILDER OR CONTRACTOR: _____

    2.5 ENGINEER, LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT: _____

ARCHITECTURAL INVENTORY FORM   RECORD NO.: _____

2.6 PEOPLE OR EVENTS OF HISTORIC INTEREST ASSOCIATED WITH THE SITE:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

3. ARCHITECTURE & STRUCTURE

3.1 FOUNDATION MATERIAL: _____

3.2 BASEMENT: _____

3.3 NUMBER OF STOREYS: _____

3.4 STRUCTURAL MATERIAL: _____

3.5 CLADDING: _____

3.6 WINDOWS: _____

3.7 ROOF TYPE: _____

3.8 ROOF COVER: _____

3.9 APPROXIMATE DIMENSIONS: _____

ARCHITECTURAL INVENTORY FORM   RECORD NO.: _____

3.10 DESIGN DESCRIPTION: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

3.11 CONDITION: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

3.12 INTEGRITY: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

4. CONTEXT

4.1 SITING: _____

4.2 ADJACENT BUILDINGS SUITABLE FOR HERITAGE GROUPING: _____

_____

_____

_____

ARCHITECTURAL INVENTORY FORM   RECORD NO.: _____

    4.3 SIGNIFICANT LANDSCAPE FEATURES: _____

        _____

        _____

        _____

        _____

        _____

5. SURVEY DOCUMENTATION

    5.1 ASSESSMENT INFORMATION: _____

        _____

    5.2 LOCATION OF ADDITIONAL MATERIAL CONSULTED (DRAWINGS, PHOTOS, MAPS,

       SITE PLANS, ADDITIONAL SURVEYS, ETC,): _____

        _____

        _____

    5.3 SURVEYOR: _____

    5.4 DATE OF SURVEY: _____

    5.5 IMAGE REFERENCE NO.: _____

5. THE EVALUATION PROCESS

The buildings and landscapes surveyed and researched during the course of the inventory process were evaluated to determine their heritage significance, using the agreed-upon evaluation criteria summarized in Sections 5.1 and 5.2, below. It is important to note that members of LACAC and Queen's University Campus Planning and Development participated in the evaluation process when they attended sessions in which the majority of buildings and landscapes were discussed. Slides for each site were screened, grades were discussed, and decisions were made based upon the consensus of the participants. Four joint evlauation meetings were held in August 1993.

The evaluation process for heritage resources consists of the following steps:

- Identify appropriate criteria of significance for the type of heritage resource being evaluated

- Determine the extent to which the heritage resource meets the criteria of significance, based on careful site inspection and sound historical research; and the tabulation of the results on an evaluation worksheet

- Determine whether the heritage resource meets a pre-set standard of significance, either by analyzing the tabulation or by using a numerical scoring system.

Additional information on this process may be found in Harold Kalman, *The Evaluation of Historic Buildings*, Parks Canada, 1979; and in Commonwealth Historic Resource Management Limited, *A Cultural Heritage Inventory for the Management Board Secretariat, Phase I: Cultural Heritage Protocol Process*, Prepared for Management Board Secretariat, Government of Ontario, 1993.

5.1 Landscape Evaluation Process and Form

The following is a list and description of the criteria recommended for use in the heritage evaluation of landscapes at Queen's University.

Criteria:

DESIGN	Architectural Value Style / Type / Construction Landscape Architect / Contractor
HISTORY	Association / Pattern Age
CONTEXT	Landmark / Character Patterns / Spatial Organization
INTEGRITY	Alterations

For each criterion, a resource receives one of the following grades:

E	Excellent (highest value)
VG	Very good (very high value)
G	Good (this grade is intended as the mean)
F/P	Fair/Poor (little value or no heritage value, or no information)

The following is a detailed description of each criterion and the meaning of each grade.

Evaluation Process for Landscapes

DESIGN

Criterion	*Grade*	*Description*

Architectural Value
Artistic merit, or uniqueness of composition, craftsmanship, or detail. Reference may be made to the space as a whole or individual units of the whole. In the case of streetscapes this includes sideviews along secondary and tertiary streets.

E   Excellent composition, craftsmanship, or detail.

VG   Very good composition, craftsmanship, or detail.

G   Good composition, craftsmanship, or detail.

F/P   Fair or poor composition, craftsmanship, or detail.

Style / Type / Construction
Notable, rare, unique, or early example of landscape style, type, method of construction, or material, in the context of other landscapes on or near the Queen's Campus.

E   Excellent or extremely early example of a style, type, method of construction, or material if many survive; or very good example if few survive.

VG   Very good example if many survive, or good example if few survive.

G   Good example if many survive; or some extraordinary feature.

F/P   Fair or poor example.

Landscape Architect / Contractor
Designed or built by a Landscape architect, contractor, or other designer who has made a significant contribution to Queen's, Kingston, Ontario, or Canada.

E   Landscape Architect, contractor, or designer of particular importance.

VG   Landscape Architect, contractor, or designer of considerable importance.

G   Landscape Architect, contractor, or designer of some importance.

F/P   Landscape Architect, contractor, or designer not important or not identified.

HISTORY

Criterion   *Grade* *Description*

Association / Pattern
Associated with a person, organization, activity, or event that has made a significant contribution to Queen's, Kingston, Ontario, or Canada; or effectively illustrative of broad themes or patterns of educational or socio-cultural history.

E Person, organization, event, or theme of primary importance which is closely associated with the landscape or site, and this association is well documented.

VG Person, organization, event, or theme of secondary importance which is closely associated with the landscape or site; one of primary importance is loosely associated with it; or one of primary importance is closely associated with it, but poorly documented.

G Person, organization, event, or theme of secondary importance which is loosely associated with the landscape or site.

F/P No identified association with person, organization, event, or theme of established importance; or one of minor importance is associated with it.

Age
Comparatively old in the context of Queen's and Kingston. (In the case of streetscapes, the majority of the construction on a street should have been completed by the evaluation dates; in the case of interior courtyards, it should relate to the dates of surrounding buildings)

E Built before 1880.

VG Built between 1881 and 1910.

G Built between 1911 and 1949.

F/P Built 1950 or later; or date unknown.

Evaluation Process for Landscapes

CONTEXT

Criterion   *Grade* *Description*

Landmark / Character

The landscape is a particularly familiar visual or symbolic landmark; or it is (or was) particularly significant to the university community or the City because of its use or for sentimental or symbolic reasons.

E   A landmark that may be taken as a primary symbol of the University or the City; or of the highest significance to the community.

VG   A particularly conspicuous and familiar space in the context of the University; or of considerable significance to the community.

G   A familiar space in the context of the neighbourhood; or of moderate significance to the community.

F/P Little or no familiarity and significance within the neighbourhood.

Patterns / Spatial Organization

The landscape or streetscape contributes to a broader pattern of development or continuity of character within the University or in the city.

E   Of particular importance in establishing the dominant character of the space.

VG   Of some importance in establishing or maintaining the dominant character of the space.

G   Compatible with the dominant character of the space.

F/P Incompatible with the dominant character of the space.

INTEGRITY

Criterion	*Grade*	*Description*
Alterations The landscape has undergone little alteration and retains most of its original materials and design features.	E	Unchanged, or changes are not visible except on close inspection.
	VG	Changes are minor in nature and easily reversible or restorable.
	G	Changes of some consequence have occurred, but the overall character of the site has been retained; or changes are minor but not easily reversible or restorable.
	F/P	The character of the site has been severely compromised or lost by alterations.

EVALUATION WORKSHEET FOR CULTURAL LANDSCAPES

Common Name or
Relative Location : _____   **Record No. :** _____

Criterion	*Grade (Circle One)*	*Reasons*
DESIGN		
1. Architectural Value	**E VG G F/P**	
2. Style/Type/Construction	**E VG G F/P**	
3. Landscape Architect / Contractor	**E VG G F/P**	
HISTORY		
4. Association/Pattern	**E VG G F/P**	
5. Age	**E VG G F/P**	
CONTEXT		
6. Landmark/Character	**E VG G F/P**	
7. Patterns/Spatial Organization	**E VG G F/P**	
INTEGRITY		
8. Alterations	**E VG G F/P**	

Tabulation

To establish the overall value of a landscape, use the following grades (for any criteria other than *Alterations*):

E   E for two or more criteria in different groups

VG   E for one criterion and VG for three or more others; *or* VG for four or more criteria

G   VG or better for one criterion and G for three or more others; *or*
           G for four or more criteria

If the site receives F/P for *Alterations*, then it must receive at least one more G than stated above.

5.2 Architectural Evaluation Process and Form

The following is a list and description of the criteria recommended for use in the heritage evaluation of buildings at Queen's University.

Criteria:

DESIGN	Architectural Value
	Style / Type / Construction
	Architect / Builder
HISTORY	Association / Theme
	Age
CONTEXT	Landmark / Character
	Site / Landscape
INTEGRITY	Alterations

For each criterion, a resource receives one of the following grades:

E	Excellent (highest value)
VG	Very good (very high value)
G	Good (this grade is intended as the mean)
F/P	Fair/Poor (little or no heritage value)

The following is a detailed description of each criterion and the meaning of each grade:

Evaluation Process for Buildings

DESIGN

Criterion	*Grade*	*Description*

Architectural Value

Artistic merit, or uniqueness of composition, craftsmanship, or detail. Reference may be made to the exterior and/or to major interior spaces. (This has been evaluated in du Toit Allsopp Hillier, *Queen's University: Campus Assessment*, Draft, March 1993; the assessment from that study will be used.)

E	Excellent composition, craftsmanship, or detail.
VG	Very good composition, craftsmanship, or detail.
G	Good composition, craftsmanship, or detail.
F/P	Fair or poor composition, craftsmanship, or detail.

Style / Type / Convention

Notable, rare, unique, or early example of an architectural style, type, method of construction, or material, in the context of other buildings on or near the Queen's Campus. (Reference may be made to the exterior and to major interior spaces.)

E	Excellent or extremely early example of a style, type, method of construction, or material if many survive; or very good example if few survive.
VG	Very good example if many survive, or good example if few survive.
G	Good example if many survive; or some extraordinary feature.
F/P	Fair or poor example.

Architect / Builder

Designed or built by an architect, builder, or other designer who has made a significant contribution to Queen's, Kingston, Ontario, or Canada.

E	Architect, builder, or designer of particular importance.
VG	Architect, builder, or designer of considerable importance.
G	Architect, builder, or designer of some importance.
F/P	Architect, builder, or designer not important or not identified.

HISTORY

Criterion   *Grade* *Description*

Association / Pattern

Associated with a person, organization, activity, or event that has made a significant contribution to Queen's, Kingston, Ontario, or Canada; or effectively illustrative of broad themes or patterns of educational or socio-cultural history.

E   Person, organization, event, or theme of primary Importance is closely associated with the building, and this association is well documented.

VG Person, organization, event, or theme of secondary importance is closely associated with the building; one of primary importance is loosely associated with it; or one of primary importance is closely associated with it, but poorly documented.

G   Person, organization, event, or theme of secondary importance is loosely associated with the building.

F/P No identified association with person, organization, event, or theme of established importance; or one of minor importance is associated with it.

Age

Comparatively old in the context of Queen's and Kingston.

E   Built before 1880.

VG Built between 1881 and 1910.

G   Built between 1911 and 1949.

F/P Built 1950 or later or date unknown.

Evaluation Process for Buildings

CONTEXT
Criterion   *Grade   Description*

Landmark / Character
Building is a particularly
familiar visual or symbolic   **E**   A landmark that may be taken as a primary symbol of the
landmark; or it is (or was)   University or the City; or of the highest significance to the
particularly significant to the   community.
university community or the
City because of its use or for **VG**   A particularly conspicuous and familiar structure in the
sentimental or symbolic   context of the University or the City; or of considerable
reasons.   significance to the community.

                                G   A familiar structure in the context of the neighbourhood;
                                         or of moderate significance to the community.

                                F/P Little or no familiarity and significance within the
                                         neighbourhood.

Streetscape / Landscape
Building, landscape, and/or   **E**   Of particular importance in establishing the dominant
setting contribute to the   character of the area or the block.
continuity or character of the
street or neighbourhood.   **VG**   Of some importance in establishing or maintaining the
                                         dominant character of the area or block.

                                G   Compatible with the dominant character of the area or
                                         block.

                                F/P Incompatible with the dominant character of the area or
                                         block.

INTEGRITY

Criterion   *Grade* *Description*

Alterations

Exterior of the building has undergone little alteration and retains most of its original materials and design features.

E   Exterior unchanged, or changes are not visible from the roadway.

VG Changes are minor in nature and easily reversible or restorable.

G   Changes of some consequence have occurred, but the overall character of the building has been retained; or changes are minor but not easily reversible or restorable.

F/P The character of the building has been severely compromised or lost by alterations.

EVALUATION WORKSHEET FOR BUILDINGS

Common Name or
Relative Location : _____   **Record No. :** _____

A succinct reason must be given for assigning each particular grade. Space for this is provided on the worksheet.

Criterion	*Grade (Circle One)*	*Reasons*
DESIGN		
1. Architectural Value	E VG G F/P	
2. Style/Type/Construction	E VG G F/P	
3. Architect/Builder	E VG G F/P	
HISTORY		
4. Association/Theme	E VG G F/P	
5. Age	E VG G F/P	
CONTEXT		
6. Landmark/Character	E VG G F/P	
7. Streetscape/Landscape	E VG G F/P	
INTEGRITY		
8. Alterations	E VG G F/P	

Tabulation

To establish the overall value of a building, use the following grades (for any criteria other than *Alterations*):

E   E for two or more criteria in different groups;
VG   E for one criterion and VG for three or more others; *or* VG for four or more criteria;
G   VG or better for one criterion and G for three or more others; *or* G for four or more criteria;

If the building receives F/P for *Alterations*, then it must receive at least one more G than stated above.

6. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The evaluated inventory has several roles. Its primary purpose is to assist in the ongoing planning and decision-making process for the Campus. It also helps promote a better understanding of the campus. The benefits include:

1. A structured and analytical heritage inventory places the Campus Plan on a firmer footing and ensures that planning decisions are made on a fully informed basis, thereby avoiding potential conflicts over land use and other issues.

2. An evaluated inventory provides additional hard data for the determination of the most suitable building sites in the Campus Plan.

3. The inventory produces an educational resource that documents the history of the campus and assists in the interpretation of the campus to the university community and visitors.

4. The inventory reinforces the concept of the landscape as an academic resource and helps people to appreciate the campus through its buildings and landscapes.