

---

# Queen's University Heritage Study



---

M

### **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.

---

M

## **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

### 4.3 Residential Buildings

---

**M**

**RECORD NO.:**



---

M

---

M

**LANDSCAPE INVENTORY FORM**

RECORD NO.:

3.6 VIEWS AND VIEWSHEDS:

**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.: \_\_\_\_\_

## 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 evaluation 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, *Cultural Heritage Inventory for the Management Board Secretariat, Phase I: Cultural Heritage Protocol Process*, Prepared for Management Board Secretariat, Government of Ontario, 1993.



---

M

---

Me

**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.

---

M

## EVALUATION WORKSHEET FOR CULTURAL LANDSCAPES

Common Name or

Relative Location : \_\_\_\_\_ Record No. : \_\_\_\_\_

*Criterion*

*Grade (Circle One)*

*Reasons*

## 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:

<b>DESIGN</b>	Architectural Value Style / Type / Construction Architect / Builder
<b>HISTORY</b>	Association / Theme Age
<b>CONTEXT</b>	Landmark / Character Site / Landscape
<b>INTEGRITY</b>	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:

---

Me

DESIGRad2



## 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**
- F/P E**

**Landmark / Character**

Building 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 structure in the context of the University or the City; or of considerable 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 setting contribute to the continuity or character of the street or neighbourhood.

- E** Of particular importance in establishing the dominant character of the area or the block.
- VG** Of some importance in establishing or maintaining the dominant character of the area or block.
- G**

**INTEGRITY***Evaluation Process for  
Buildings**Criterion**Grade Description***Alterations**

Exterior of the building has undergone little alteration and retains most of its original materials and design features.	<b>E</b>	Exterior unchanged, or changes are not visible from the roadway.
	<b>VG</b>	Changes are minor in nature and easily reversible or restorable.
	<b>G</b>	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.
	<b>F/P</b>	The character of the building has been severely compromised or lost by alterations.



---

## 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.