



Canada-United States-Ontario-Michigan Border Transportation Partnership

Built Heritage Impact Assessment

Technically and Environmentally Preferred Alternative

December 2008

PREFACE

The Detroit River International Crossing (DRIC) Environmental Assessment study was conducted by a partnership of the federal, state and provincial governments in Canada and the United States in accordance with the requirements of the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act (CEAA), the Ontario Environmental Assessment Act (OEAA), and the U.S. National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). In 2005, the Canadian and U.S. Study Teams identified 15 potential river crossing locations and associated plaza and access road alternatives. The results of the assessment of these alternatives led to the identification of an Area of Continued Analysis (ACA). Within the ACA, practical alternatives were developed for the crossings, plazas and access road alternatives.

Through the analysis of the practical alternatives, and in conjunction with ongoing consultation efforts, a new alternative was developed that combined beneficial features of the original alternatives. The new alternative was identified as The Parkway in August 2007 and included 7 kilometres of below grade freeway, an optimized service road system, a green corridor with 10 tunnelled sections totalling 1.5 km in length, a grade separated recreational trail system, and extensive green areas.

Upon completion of the analysis of the practical alternatives, the alternatives were evaluated. The Partnership announced the results of the evaluation for the access road component in May 2008. Referred to as The Windsor-Essex Parkway, the Technically and Environmentally Preferred Alternative (TEPA) access road consisted of the major components of the Parkway with some refinements made to reflect additional community consultation and analysis. These refinements included an additional tunnel in the Spring Garden area, more green space and a refined trail network. The components of the TEPA for the international bridge crossing (Crossing X-10B) and Canadian plaza (Plaza B1) were announced in June 2008.

The remainder of 2008 focused on detailed analysis and identification of impacts and appropriate mitigation measures for the TEPA, along with further refinements. A separate Technical Memorandum (December 2008) documents the assessment of further refinements that were made to the TEPA. This report summarizes the work undertaken in this regard specific to the Built Heritage Assessment and the TEPA. These measures were also documented in a draft version of the Ontario Environmental Assessment Report, which was made available to the public, agencies, municipalities, First Nations, and other interested parties for review in November 2008.

Additional reports and details are available at the study website:
(www.partnershipborderstudy.com).

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This document provides an overview of the Built Heritage Impact Assessment completed for the Technical and Environmentally Preferred Alternative (TEPA) as part of the Detroit River International Crossing (DRIC) Environmental Assessment.

Built Heritage Resources are described under three broad headings: Built Heritage Features (BHF), Built Heritage Resources (BHR) and Cultural Landscape Units (CLU). These are defined in MTO's environmental glossary. Generally, a BHF is understood to be "an individual part of a cultural heritage landscape such as buildings or structures of various types, cemeteries, planting and landscaping structures, etc that contribute to the heritage character of the cultural heritage landscape". In other words the Term Built Heritage Feature acts as a catch-all term that includes individual BHR and CLU features.

A BHR is defined as "(O)ne or more significant buildings, structures, monuments, installations or remains associated with architectural, cultural, social, political, economic or military history and identified as being important to a community. These resources may be identified through designation or heritage conservation easement under the Ontario Heritage Act, or listed by local, provincial or federal jurisdictions.

Cultural landscapes are "(a) defined geographical area of heritage significance that has been modified by human activities and is valued by a community. It involves a grouping(s) of individual heritage features such as structures, spaces, archaeological sites and natural elements, which together form a significant type of heritage form, distinctive from that of its constituent elements or parts. Examples may include, but are not limited to, heritage conservation districts designated under the Ontario Heritage Act; and villages, parks, gardens, battlefields, main streets and neighborhoods, cemeteries, trail ways and industrial complexes of cultural heritage value.

The analysis of impacts to Built Heritage features within the TEPA has included four major elements: The identification of BHF's within the TEPA, Assessment of Cultural Heritage value or interest for all identified BHF's, Description of Impacts and identification of mitigation options and requirements.

Assessing Impacts to Built Heritage Features

As described in the Ministry of Transportation's *Environmental Guide for Built Heritage and Cultural Landscapes* the assessment of impacts to identified Built Heritage Features includes preparation of detailed documentary research for a historical review, determination of heritage value for individual BHF's, followed by the specific description of impacts

The identification of BHF's was originally conducted by Archaeological Services Inc. in 2005/2006. The results of their initial identification were documented in *The Practical Alternative Evaluation Working Paper, Cultural Heritage* (March 2008, hereafter *Working Paper 2008*). This document identified 13 Built Heritage Features within the TEPA.

Subsequently, URS Canada prepared detailed documentary research of all features identified to be of potential interest within the revised TEPA. This research included

reference to Registry Plans and abstracts, local histories, archival maps, and secondary sources. Based on these findings, a field review of these features, and the application of the Criteria listed in Regulation 9/06 of the Ontario Heritage Act (R.S.O. 1990), seven Built Heritage Features have been rejected as potential Cultural Heritage Resources, while six (five residences and one institutional structure) are recommended for continuing analysis and determination of impacts. These include Five residential structures and /a single CLU. All six features are considered to be of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest.

Predicted Built Heritage Impacts

Impacts to Built Heritage Resources are generally classed as direct or indirect. Direct Impacts include loss or significant alteration of BHF's and loss of overall contextual integrity as a result of an undertaking. Indirect impacts are generally less severe and include, but are not limited to, encroachment of non-sympathetic elements in proximity to a feature and introduction of noise, dust, vibration and other elements that may affect the long-term stability and integrity of the resource. For the DRIC project, all of the impacts to identified BHF are direct. In all six cases, removal of the structure will be required.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation measures were investigated for the six Built Heritage Features. All mitigation options will require a Built Heritage Resource Documentation Report. This report includes detailed photo-documentation of the structure and a plan of salvage for character contributing architectural elements.

Only two mitigation options are considered practical for the DRIC project:

- 1) Relocation of individual structures within the City of Windsor or,
- 2) Salvage of significant architectural elements followed by demolition.

Where relocation is recommended, the City of Windsor Heritage Committee should be consulted.

Conclusions

Based on the Built Heritage analyses completed, the following key conclusions can be drawn:

1. Without mitigation, there is a potential for the loss of six heritage features with cultural heritage value or interest within the TEPA.
2. A Built Heritage Documentation Report will be required for all six Built Heritage Resources.
3. Relocation of individual structures may be done through MTO's Heritage House Relocation programme.
4. For those features not deemed sufficiently noteworthy for relocation, salvage and demolition will be recommended.

Built Heritage Impact Assessment

Technically and Environmentally Preferred Alternative

Table of Contents

Preface	i
Executive Summary	ii
1. Introduction.....	1
2. Historical Background.....	2
3. Evaluation of Cultural Heritage Resources	3
3.1. Rejected Features	3
3.2. Continuing Analysis	3
4. Impact	4
5. Mitigation	5
6. Recommendations	6
7. Sources Consulted	9

List of Appendices

Appendix	Cultural Heritage Resource Forms
----------	----------------------------------

1. Introduction

This report summarizes work carried out by URS Canada between July and October 2008. It builds on recommendations and findings of *The Practical Alternative Evaluation Working Paper, Cultural Heritage* (March 2008, hereafter Working Paper 2008) prepared by Archaeological Services Inc. (ASI). The ASI paper identified three potential cultural heritage landscapes (CHLs) and 20 potential built heritage resources (BHRs) within the Area of Continued Analysis (ACA). Since that time, the development and selection of the Technically and Environmentally Preferred Alternative (TEPA) route has reduced the number of identified features that will be impacted by the undertaking. Consequently, two CHLs and eight BHRs identified within the ACA are not located within the TEPA and are not part of the analysis described in this report.

Detailed documentary research was carried out on the remaining 13 features to further assess their heritage status. Subsequently, a second field survey of the TEPA was undertaken with the new information in hand.

This report provides a summary historical context for the TEPA corridor, enhancing the general history of the Windsor area documented in the *Working Paper 2008* (Appendix A: Summary of Euro-Canadian History; Appendix B: Heritage Sensitive Areas within the Initial Study).

Cultural Heritage Resource Forms are included for all features identified in the *Working Paper 2008* to be of potential interest remaining within the TEPA (Appendix). The potential impact of the construction of the TEPA on these features, and recommendations for mitigation options are also discussed.

2. Historical Background

Research carried out during this phase on specific properties within and adjacent to the TEPA provides a clearer picture of land use and property development in the area. For a general history of the Windsor area, see the *Working Paper 2008* (Appendix A: Summary of Euro-Canadian History; Appendix B: Heritage Sensitive Areas within the Initial Study).

As discussed in the ASI document, three major episodes of development are recognized for the Windsor/Essex County Region: An early, late 18th century French settlement period, with farm lots laid out close to the Detroit River; a 19th century British period characterized by extension of settlement inland from the river and use of the standard lot and concession system seen across Ontario; and, Early 20th century housing and industrial development.

Despite the time depth for historic settlement in the region, much of the area to be affected by the TEPA remained primarily agricultural into the early 20th century. Today evidence remains of the unique settlement history for the region with a fusion of the French pattern of long, narrow lots, and the rectilinear British grid of standard lots and concessions.

In step with the growth of Windsor and environs, development pressure came to bear on land flanking major roads, or near commercial or industrial focal points. A plan of subdivision for Lot 50, Concession II along Huron Church Road was registered in 1920 (Plan 1020, Sandwich West Township), creating Spring Garden Road. In 1928, Lot 1 Concession IV, at the intersection of Talbot and Huron Church Line Roads, was subdivided into residential lots by the owners of 2746 Talbot Road (BHR 1; Plans 1299, 1437 Sandwich West Township). All of the BHRs are located in these two neighbourhoods.

The riverfront area, from which the new bridge will rise, is also of historic interest although now much altered from its original character. The Sandwich Fish Hatchery, one of the first fish hatcheries in the country, was located on Lot 59, Concession I Sandwich West Township. Immediately to the north, in Park Lot B, sulphur springs were discovered in 1867 while drilling for oil. This launched a temporary resort industry, with hotels and a spa that drew visitors from around the world to "take the waters." A canal from the river to the spring was created, with a shaded Willow Walk and other amenities. Business dropped off during the 1880s and the hotels closed early in the 1890s. The whole area was overtaken by industry during the first half of the 20th century and nothing remains of either of these operations.

3. Evaluation of Cultural Heritage Resources

Building on the Working Paper 2008, detailed documentary research was carried out with reference to all features identified to be of potential interest remaining within the TEPA. This research included reference to Registry Plans and abstracts, local histories, archival maps, and secondary sources. Based on these findings, a field review of these features, and the application of the Criteria listed in Regulation 9/06 of the Ontario Heritage Act, seven features have been rejected as potential Cultural Heritage Resources, while six are recommended for continuing analysis.

3.1. Rejected Features

The following features were found not to meet the Criteria for determining Cultural Heritage value or interest. They lack historical associations, design quality and contextual integrity, and have been removed from the list of potential Cultural Heritage Resources.

CHL 2:	Brighton Beach Subdivision, Windsor
BHR 3:	3905 Huron Church Line Road, Windsor
BHR 4:	3495 Huron Church Road, Windsor
BHR 5:	2765 Reddock Avenue
BHR 15:	325 Page Street, Windsor
BHR 16:	332 Healy Street, Windsor
BHR 17:	354 Healy Street

3.2. Continuing Analysis

The remaining features have some potential as heritage resources according to the Criteria for determining Cultural Heritage value or interest for architectural, historical or community associative reasons, and further investigation is recommended (Table 1).

BHR 1:	2746 Talbot Road, Windsor
BHR 2:	Legion Branch 594, 3920 Huron Church Line Road, La Salle
BHR 7:	2310 Spring Garden Road, Windsor
BHR 8:	2290 Spring Garden Road, Windsor
BHR 9:	2284 Spring Garden Road, Windsor
BHR 19:	2369 Spring Garden Road, Windsor

4. Impact

According to the *MTO Environmental Guideline for Built Heritage and Cultural Heritage Landscapes* (2007), impacts to heritage resources are described as either direct or indirect. These relatively self-explanatory terms identify the relative degree to which individual resources may be affected by a particular undertaking. Indirect impacts are understood to mean isolation, encroachment, the introduction of physical, visual, audible or atmospheric elements that are not in keeping with the character and setting of the cultural heritage resources. Direct impacts include disruption and displacement.

The six structures that have been identified as having cultural heritage value or interest lie entirely within the footprint of the TEPA and, thus, the project will have a direct impact on each structure. All of the structures will be removed to accommodate construction of the parkway or plaza. For this reason, consideration is given below to possible mitigation factors based on the relative heritage character and sensitivity of the individual built heritage resources.

5. Mitigation

The mitigation options available are relocation, with possible adaptive reuse, or documentation followed by salvage of specific architectural elements prior to demolition. Preservation *in situ* of the subject properties is not an available mitigation alternative.

Three of the six structures that were carried forward in the analysis presented here may warrant consideration for relocation. These are BHR 1, 8 and 9. However, before that decision can be made, more detailed analysis and recording will be required.

Should these structures have sufficient heritage character and integrity to warrant relocation, the MTO Heritage House Relocation program could be applied to place the buildings in an appropriate setting that would preserve and, possibly, enhance their value. Under this program, houses are made available to members of the public for relocation, restoration and re-occupation. The involvement of the Windsor Heritage Committee could be useful in determining suitable new locations.





The structures identified for documentation and salvage should be recorded and all salvageable elements removed for reuse in an appropriate context.



6. Recommendations

Detailed documentation should be prepared for each of the subject properties in order to confirm preliminary findings. This will include:

- examination and recording of the structure (interior & exterior)
- specific primary research to confirm and clarify implications of preliminary findings

For BHRs 1, 8 and 9 detailed Cultural Heritage Evaluation Reports should be prepared as described in the MTO *Environmental Guide for Built Heritage and Cultural Heritage Landscapes*. For the remainder, Cultural Heritage Resource Documentation Reports should be prepared following the requirements of Section 6.3.1.4 of the *Environmental Guide for Built Heritage and Cultural Heritage Landscapes*.

BHR No.	Address	Impact/ Mitigation	Rationale	
BHR 1	2746 Talbot Road, Windsor	Direct/ candidate for relocation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> located in area of direct impact reflects early settlement and housing types associated with prominent early settlers' family that played a significant role in the ongoing history of Sandwich and Windsor size and construction of the building is suitable for relocation 	
BHR 2	Legion Branch 594, 3920 Huron Church Line Road, La Salle	Direct/ document and salvage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> located in area of direct impact building has local significance as a community focal point structure cannot be relocated 	
BHR 7	2310 Spring Garden Road, Windsor	Direct/ document and salvage Possible candidate for relocation as a group with BHR 8 and BHR 9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> located in area of direct impact significance lies largely in its role as part of a small group with BHR 8 and BHR 9 possible case for relocating all three houses together 	
BHR 8	2290 Spring Garden Road, Windsor	Direct/candidate for relocation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> located in area of direct impact good example of the 1930s bungalow with a high degree of design integrity size and structure are suitable for relocation part of a small group with BHR 7 and BHR 9, possible case for relocating all three houses together 	

BHR No.	Address	Impact/ Mitigation	Rationale	
BHR 9	2284 Spring Garden Road, Windsor	Direct/document and salvage Possible candidate for relocation as a group with BHR 7 and BHR 8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> located in area of direct impact significance lies largely in its role as part of a small group with BHR 7 and BHR 8 possible case for relocating all three houses together 	
BHR 19	2369 Spring Garden Road, Windsor	Direct/candidate for relocation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> located in area of direct impact in its present form, very unprepossessing, however the log structure within the shell (?) could be salvaged and reconstructed 	

7. Sources Consulted

Canada. Census of 1851, 1871, 1881 (Library and Archives Canada).

Canada-United States-Ontario-Michigan Border Transportation Partnership, *Practical Alternatives Evaluation Working Paper: Cultural Heritage* (March 2008).

City of Windsor. Windsor's register of heritage buildings (Updated to June 2008)

Essex County Registry Office. Abstracts of land transactions and Registered Plans for the Township of Sandwich West.

Foot, Andrew. <http://www.internationalmetropolis.com/>

Mancell, Leslie, ed. *Illustrated Historical Atlas of the Counties of Essex and Kent*, H. Belden & Co. (1881), reprint ed. (Chatham, Ont.: Kent County Branch, Ontario Genealogical Society, 1994).

McPhillips, George. *Plan of the Township of Sandwich West*, Windsor, Ont. Oct. 29th 1894.

..... *Plan of the Township of Sandwich - West, East and South of the Towns of Walkerville and Sandwich and the City of Windsor*, Windsor Ont, April 26th, 1898.


Ministry of Transportation. *Environmental Guide for Built Heritage and Cultural Heritage Landscapes*, February 2007.


..... *Cultural Heritage - Built Heritage and Cultural Heritage Landscapes: Technical Requirements for Environmental Impact Study and Environment Protection/Mitigation*, October 2006.


Walkerville Times. <http://www.walkervilletimes.com/index.htm>

Windsor's Community Archives

APPENDIX
CULTURAL HERITAGE RESOURCE FORMS

CULTURAL HERITAGE RESOURCE FORM: CULTURAL HERITAGE LANDSCAPES (CHL)	
Cultural Heritage Landscape No.: CHL 2	
Lot: 55	
Concession: I	
Municipality: Sandwich West Township, Windsor	
County/R.M.: Essex	
Landscape Category: Former residential community	
Landscape Feature: n/a	
Current Use: Largely abandoned, 3 occupied houses	Brighton Beach Subdivision (photo courtesy Andrew Foot)
Integrity: Very low.	
Alterations: Several Streets now closed, vegetation cover has regenerated in many lots.	
Comments: At one time the Brighton Beach neighbourhood may have been of interest as a representative streetscape of a period in the history of Sandwich/Windsor, but too little is extant to express the character of the old subdivision.	
History: In 1913 a large steel plant was planned for Ojibway, south of Sandwich on the river, initiating a surge of residential development in the surrounding area. Brighton Beach was subdivided and the plan (no. 688) registered on 13 September 1913. The anticipated plant was not built until after the war, and then on a much smaller scale than originally proposed. Growth at Brighton Beach was slow, but it eventually became filled in during the 1920s and 1930s. Since expropriation, many of the houses and business have been destroyed by neglect or arson.	
Association/Themes: The surviving features of Brighton Beach no longer express any themes or associations of significance.	
Landmark: While the story of Brighton Beach is generally known locally, there is insufficient fabric or identifiable form to qualify as a landmark.	
Associated BHR/CHL: none	
Statement of Significance: No designation is currently in effect. No further investigation is recommended regarding the Brighton Beach site, as its potential value as a CHL has been terminally compromised by loss of fabric and context.	


CULTURAL HERITAGE RESOURCE FORM: BUILT HERITAGE RESOURCE (BHR)	
Built Heritage Resource No.: BHR 1	
Lot: 1	
Concession: IV	
Municipality: Sandwich West Township, Windsor	
County/R.M.: Essex	
Resource Category: building	
Resource Type: house	
Current Use: residential	
2746 Talbot Road, Windsor	
Architecture/Engineering: standard construction for the late 19 th century, with replacement windows & doors, new verandah and deck.	
Construction Period: ca1880	
Storeys: 1½	
Structural Material: frame on stone foundation; concrete block foundation under addition to the rear.	Cladding: vinyl.
Roof Type: side gable with centre front gable.	Roof Material: asphalt shingles.
Style/Design: vernacular Ontario farm house Notable Features: steeply pitched roof suggests design roots in gothic revival; the house retains much of its original character, although the removal of original details and the introduction of new materials has altered it somewhat.	
Historical Associations: In 1848 this property was purchased by Jerome Reaume. Parts of the original homestead of 76 acres were severed and sold over the years, and the Reaume family owned several other parcels elsewhere in the township. The subject property was subdivided in 1928 by then-owners Annette, Arsène, Ernest & Ulysses Reaume, allowing the development of the residential neighbourhood in the new streets behind the house.	
Landmark: the house is prominently situated near the intersection of Talbot Road and Huron Church road.	
Group Value/CHL Association: n/a	
Statement of Significance: No designation is currently in effect. The building has a good degree of integrity, is prominently located and a good example of its type. It is also associated with a family that were considerable landowners in the mid-19 th century. Further investigation in documentary sources and with local historical resources is appropriate.	


CULTURAL HERITAGE RESOURCE FORM: BUILT HERITAGE RESOURCE (BHR)	
Built Heritage Resource No.: BHR 2	 <p style="text-align: right; color: yellow; font-size: small;">RCL Br 594 - Dennis Cave June 2001</p>
Lot: 1	
Concession: IV	
Municipality: Town of La Salle	
County/R.M.: Essex	
Resource Category: building	
Resource Type: institutional	
Current Use: Legion Hall	
<p>Legion Branch 594, 3920 Huron Church Line Road (photo: http://www.windsor.igs.net/~gladden/Br594RCL/INDEX.HTM)</p>	
<p>Architecture/Engineering: very straightforward structure of concrete, metal siding, etc, all typical for the period.</p>	
<p>Construction Period: 1961</p>	
<p>Storeys: 1</p>	
<p>Structural Material: concrete.</p>	<p>Cladding: textured siding, material unknown.</p>
<p>Roof Type: flat.</p>	<p>Roof Material: flat asphalt.</p>
<p>Style/Design: modern. Notable Features: very utilitarian design, with an imposing entrance that is the only remarkable feature.</p>	
<p>Historical Association: Legion Branch 594 received its charter in 1961. It is actively involved in local affairs and the hall is used for a wide variety of occasions.</p>	
<p>Landmark: potential value due to its use & role in community affairs.</p>	
<p>Group Value/CHL Association: n/a.</p>	
<p>Statement of Significance: No designation is currently in effect. Further investigation is recommended due to the prominent function of the building in La Salle and its value as a social venue.</p>	

CULTURAL HERITAGE RESOURCE FORM: BUILT HERITAGE RESOURCE (BHR)	
Built Heritage Resource No.: BHR 3	
Lot: 40	
Concession: II	
Municipality: Town of La Salle	
County/R.M.: Essex	
Resource Category: building	
Resource Type: house	
Current Use: Abandoned	
3905 Huron Church Line Road, Town of La Salle	
Architecture/Engineering: This vacant house is in poor condition. It was a vernacular design and appears to have been enlarged over time to its present configuration. The structural system is typical for the late 19 th -early 20 th century, with no noteworthy or exceptional features.	
Construction Period: late-19 th century, additions 1920s and/or 1930s.	
Stores: 1½	
Structural Material: frame structure on parged stone foundation, probably concrete block under parts; aluminum windows have replaced the originals.	Cladding: vinyl siding.
Roof Type: intersecting gable.	Roof Material: asphalt shingles.
Style/Design: vernacular.	
Notable Features: no distinguishing design features.	
Historical Association: This building and the associated farm have historical links with two early settlers' families. The whole of Lot 40/II was settled by George Jessop (1895-1851), his wife Sarah Bailey (ca1796-1864), and their family who immigrated in 1833. George Jessop Sr died in 1851, but not before selling the subject property (20 acres). It was purchased by Elizabeth Ann Moore, and held by the Moore family until 1973. The Moore's settled in Sandwich in about 1850.	
Landmark: no value	
Group Value/CHL Association: no value	
Statement of Significance: No designation is currently in effect. This building does not possess any noteworthy design quality, historical associations or significance as an element in a cultural landscape. No further action is recommended.	


CULTURAL HERITAGE RESOURCE FORM: BUILT HERITAGE RESOURCE (BHR)	
Built Heritage Resource No.: BHR 4	
Lot: 43	
Concession: II	
Municipality: Sandwich West Township, Windsor	
County/R.M.: Essex	
Resource Category: building	
Resource Type: house	
Current Use: residence	3495 Huron Church Road, Windsor
Architecture/Engineering: Standard house construction for its period, a typical bungalow, new siding & windows.	
Construction Period: 1930s	
Storeys: 1½	
Structural Material: frame on concrete foundation.	Cladding: vinyl siding.
Roof Type: side gable with front dormer.	Roof Material: Asphalt shingles.
Style/Design: vernacular bungalow.	
Notable Features: This is a fairly typical 1930s bungalow (defining characteristics: main roof extends over verandah, 1½ storey, compact rectangular plan). It is representative of its type.	
Historical Association: The property was subdivided for development in 1929 (registered plan #1355); the house has no known historical associations.	
Landmark: no value.	
Group Value/CHL Association: no value.	
Statement of Significance: No designation is currently in effect. This building does not possess any noteworthy design quality, historical associations or significance as an element in a cultural landscape. No further action is recommended	


CULTURAL HERITAGE RESOURCE FORM: BUILT HERITAGE RESOURCE (BHR)	
Built Heritage Resource No.: BHR 5	
Lot: 43	
Concession: II	
Municipality: Sandwich West Township, Windsor	
County/R.M.: Essex	
Resource Category: building	
Resource Type: house	
Current Use: residential	
2765 Reddock Avenue, Windsor	
Architecture/Engineering: This is a typical two-storey frame foursquare house on a concrete foundation, reflecting standard construction techniques for its time; the building has been renovated, introducing more modern materials, such as vinyl siding, aluminum windows.	
Construction Period: early 20 th century.	
Storeys: 2	
Structural Material: frame on concrete block foundation.	Cladding: vinyl siding.
Roof Type: hipped with front dormer.	Roof Material: asphalt shingles.
Style/Design: foursquare, vernacular. Notable Features: The house is a very simple vernacular design with no notable design features.	
Historical Association: The building has no known associations with any historical events or persons and does not represent any distinctive phase of local development.	
Landmark: no value.	
Group Value/CHL Association: no value.	
Statement of Significance: No designation is currently in effect. This building does not possess any noteworthy design quality, historical associations or significance as an element in a cultural landscape. No further action is recommended.	


CULTURAL HERITAGE RESOURCE FORM: BUILT HERITAGE RESOURCE (BHR)	
Built Heritage Resource No.: BHR 7	
Lot: 50	
Concession: II	
Municipality: Sandwich West Township, Windsor	
County/R.M.: Essex	
Resource Category: building	
Resource Type: house	
Current Use: residence	
2310 Spring Garden Road, Windsor	
Architecture/Engineering: typical plan and structure for small houses built between the wars.	
Construction Period: 1920s (subdivision plan was registered 20 October 1920).	
Storeys: 1½	
Structural Material: frame on textured concrete block foundation.	Cladding: asbestos shingles.
Roof Type: hipped with single front dormer.	Roof Material: asphalt shingles.
Style/Design: vernacular bungalow Notable Features: typical 1920s compact home which is a precursor to the post World War II veterans' housing.	
Historical Association: The house has no known association with any historical theme, person or event.	
Landmark: no value.	
Group Value/CHL Association: This is one of three bungalows from approximately the same era that form a group reflecting the character, scale and style of residential housing between the wars; they have retained their design integrity and may have some merit as a CHL.	
Statement of Significance: No designation is currently in effect. Alone this house is not an exceptional example of its type, however because it survives in its original context it contributes to the character of the setting. Further investigation is recommended.	


CULTURAL HERITAGE RESOURCE FORM: BUILT HERITAGE RESOURCE (BHR)	
Built Heritage Resource No.: BHR 8	
Lot: 50	
Concession: II	
Municipality: Sandwich West Township, Windsor	
County/R.M.: Essex	
Resource Category: building	
Resource Type: house	
Current Use: residential	
2290 Spring Garden Road, Windsor	
Architecture/Engineering: possibly architect-designed, a good example of its type; structure and materials typical of its time, some introduction of new materials but integrity quite good.	
Construction Period: 1929	
Storeys: 1½	
Structural Material: frame on textured concrete block foundation, brick verandah posts.	Cladding: vinyl siding.
Roof Type: side gable with centre dormer; bell-cast slope may be a regional French derivation.	Roof Material: asphalt shingles.
Style/Design: Arts & Crafts Bungalow	
Notable Features: very good design with deep verandah under the main roof, stout square piers and Arts & Crafts detailing; the verandah has been rebuilt sympathetically and consistent with the original design.	
Historical Association: The house has no known association with any historical theme, person or event.	
Landmark: unlikely.	
Group Value/CHL Association: This is one of three bungalows from approximately the same era that form a group on Spring Garden Road reflecting the character, scale and style of residential housing between the wars; they have retained their design integrity and may have some merit as a CHL.	
Statement of Significance: No designation is currently in effect. This is the best of the three houses in the row, and deserves to be evaluated on its own merit; it dominates the smaller houses on either side. Further investigation is recommended.	

CULTURAL HERITAGE RESOURCE FORM: BUILT HERITAGE RESOURCE (BHR)	
Built Heritage Resource No.: BHR 9	
Lot: 50	
Concession: II	
Municipality: Sandwich West Township, Windsor	
County/R.M.: Essex	
Resource Category: building	
Resource Type: house	
Current Use: residential	
2284 Spring Garden Road, Windsor	
Architecture/Engineering: typical plan and structure for small houses built between the wars.	
Construction Period: 1920s (subdivision plan was registered 20 October 1920).	
Storeys: 1½	
Structural Material: frame on concrete foundation.	Cladding: vinyl siding.
Roof Type: side gable with shed dormer.	Roof Material: asphalt shingles.
Style/Design: vernacular bungalow Notable Features: typical 1920s compact home which is a precursor to the post World War II veterans' housing .	
Historical Association: The house has no known association with any historical theme, person or event.	
Landmark: no.	
Group Value/CHL Association: This is one of three bungalows from approximately the same era that form a group reflecting the character, scale and style of residential housing between the wars; they have retained their design integrity and may have some merit as a CHL.	
Statement of Significance: No designation is currently in effect. Alone this house is not an exceptional example of its type, however because it survives in its original context it contributes to the character of the setting. Further investigation is recommended.	

CULTURAL HERITAGE RESOURCE FORM: BUILT HERITAGE RESOURCE (BHR)	
Built Heritage Resource No.: BHR 15	
Lot: 50	
Concession: I	
Municipality: Sandwich West Township, Windsor	
County/R.M.: Essex	
Resource Category: building	
Resource Type: house	
Current Use: residential	
325 Page Street, Windsor (photo courtesy Andrew Foot)	
Architecture/Engineering: A frame bungalow clad in brick veneer on the first floor, on a concrete block foundation; typical construction for the period.	
Construction Period: 1930s or 1940s	
Storeys: 1½	
Structural Material: probably frame with brick veneer, concrete block foundation, upper floor frame.	Cladding: brick veneer & shingles.
Roof Type: side gable with bell-cast, shed-roofed dormer.	Roof Material: asphalt shingles.
Style/Design: vernacular bungalow.	
Notable Features: a local variation of the bungalow with the changing slope of the roof, possibly of French derivation; not a particularly good example of the type.	
Historical Association: the house has no known association with any historical theme, person or event.	
Landmark: no value.	
Group Value/CHL Association: one of three remaining houses in the Brighton Beach subdivision (see CLU 2); insufficient context survives to justify assigning any value.	
Statement of Significance: No designation is currently in effect. This building does not possess any noteworthy design quality, historical associations or significance as an element in a cultural landscape. No further action is recommended.	

CULTURAL HERITAGE RESOURCE FORM: BUILT HERITAGE RESOURCE (BHR)	
Built Heritage Resource No.: BHR 16	
Lot: 50	
Concession: I	
Municipality: Sandwich West Township, Windsor	
County/R.M.: Essex	
Resource Category: building	
Resource Type: house	
Current Use: residential	332 Healy Street, Windsor
Architecture/Engineering: Fair example of the early 20 th century 2-storey foursquare house. No notable architectural features.	
Construction Period: 1890-1915	
Storeys: 2	
Structural Material: probably frame structure with brick veneer, foundation unknown.	Cladding: brick
Roof Type: hipped with front dormer.	Roof Material: asphalt shingles.
Style/Design: vernacular foursquare.	
Notable Features: no notable design features.	
Historical Association: The house has no known association with any historical theme, person or event.	
Landmark: no value.	
Group Value/CHL Association: One of three remaining houses in the Brighton Beach subdivision (see CLU 2); insufficient context survives to justify assigning any value.	
<p>Statement of Significance: No designation is currently in effect.</p> <p>This building does not possess any noteworthy design quality, historical associations or significance as an element in a cultural landscape.</p> <p>No further action is recommended.</p>	

CULTURAL HERITAGE RESOURCE FORM: BUILT HERITAGE RESOURCE (BHR)	
Built Heritage Resource No.: BHR 17	
Lot: 50	
Concession: I	
Municipality: Sandwich West Township, Windsor	
County/R.M.: Essex	
Resource Category: building	
Resource Type: house	
Current Use: unknown	<p>354 Healy Street, Windsor (<i>photo from: The Practical Alternative Evaluation Working Paper, Cultural Heritage [March 2008]</i>)</p>
<p>Architecture/Engineering: The building displays no architectural or structural features of note or quality. Much altered from original appearance.</p>	
<p>Construction Period: 1930s</p>	
<p>Storeys: 1</p>	
Structural Material: probably frame.	Cladding: vinyl siding.
Roof Type: hipped, front gable.	Roof Material: asphalt shingles.
<p>Style/Design: vernacular. Notable Features: none.</p>	
<p>Historical Associations: The house has no known association with any historical theme, person or event.</p>	
<p>Landmark: no value.</p>	
<p>Group Value/CHL Association: One of three remaining houses in the Brighton Beach subdivision (see CLU 2); insufficient context survives to justify assigning any value.</p>	
<p>Statement of Significance: No designation is currently in effect.</p> <p>This building does not possess any noteworthy design quality, historical associations or significance as an element in a cultural landscape. It was previously listed because the central chimney suggested it might be of an earlier date than the 1930s, however subsequent research has uncovered no evidence to support this.</p> <p>No further action is recommended.</p>	

CULTURAL HERITAGE RESOURCE FORM: BUILT HERITAGE RESOURCE (BHR)	
Built Heritage Resource No.: BHR 19	
Lot: 50	
Concession: II	
Municipality: Sandwich West Township, Windsor	
County/R.M.: Essex	
Resource Category: building	
Resource Type: house	
Current Use: residential	2369 Spring Garden Road, Windsor
Architecture/Engineering: local information suggests that this house is log construction, and may be of interest for that reason.	
Construction Period: possibly mid-19 th century.	
Storeys: 1½	
Structural Material: log (?) on stone foundation.	Cladding: aluminum siding.
Roof Type: side gable with salt box tail.	Roof Material: asphalt shingles.
Style/Design: vernacular cottage. Notable Features: proportions and fenestration suggest timber frame or log construction.	
Historical Association: early settlement period of Essex.	
Landmark: no.	
Group Value/CHL Association: no.	
Statement of Significance: No designation is currently in effect.	