



The Corporation of the Town of Milton

Report To: Council

From: Jill Hogan, Commissioner, Development Services

Date: September 12, 2022

Report No: DS-109-22

Subject: Recommendation Report _Objections to the Designation of 111 Mary Street (Edwin Earl House)

Recommendation: **THAT Report DS-109-22, be APPROVED ;**
THAT Council affirms its decision of June 20, 2022 (Item 8.d), stating its intention to designate the property at 111 Mary Street under Part IV, Section 29 of the Ontario Heritage Act;
THAT if there is an appeal to the Ontario Land Tribunal (OLT), Council directs Staff to take any necessary action to participate in the hearing;
AND FURTHER THAT Council authorizes the Commissioner, Development Services to retain the necessary legal and technical resources to defend Council's decision in accordance with all applicable Town policies and procedures.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Town has received a letter of objection to the Notice of Intention to Designate for 111 Mary Street from the property owner within the statutory timeline of 30 days.

Staff has reviewed the objections raised by the owner and is of the opinion that despite these objections, the properties meet Ontario Regulation 9/06, the criteria prescribed for municipal designation under Part IV, Section 29 of the Ontario Heritage Act under all three categories of design and physical, historical and associative and contextual values as per the Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) recommendations.

Designation will enable Council to review proposed alterations for the property, enforce heritage property standards and maintenance, and refuse demolition.

REPORT

Background

Background

On June 20, 2022, Council approved the Notice of Intention to Designate (NOID) 111 Mary Street as outlined in Section 29 (4) of the Ontario Heritage Act. The NOID for the property was served on the Owner and the Ontario Heritage Trust on July 28, 2022. In accordance with Section 29 of the Ontario Heritage Act, the notice was published in a newspaper on July 21, 2022.

In accordance with clause 29(5) of the Heritage Act, a person who objects to a proposed designation shall, within thirty days after the date of publication of the notice of intention, serve the clerk of the municipality a notice of objection setting out the reason for the objection and all relevant facts.

The 30-day period of objection ended on August 20, 2022. The Town Clerk received a letter of objection from the property owner on August 19, 2022. The letter is appended to this report as Appendix 'A'.

The letter of objection from the owners, Andrew and Caroline Kocher, stated that the decision to designate their property *“severely restricts our ability to deal with our property. Aside from that, we have been mindful stewards of the historical integrity of the property and have no intention of compromising the valuable historical characteristics of the structure. The staff recommendation fails to consider the lengthy term of ownership during which our family has had care and custody of the property.”*

Discussion

According to the Heritage Act Section 29, when a letter of objection for designation is received within 30 days of the NOID, Council will have 90 days to:

1. Withdraw the NOID and serve a notice of withdrawal to:

- The Property owner
- Any other people who objected
- Ontario Heritage Trust
- Published in the newspaper

OR,

2. Proceed with the designation within 120 days of the NOID and serve a copy of the by-law to:

- The Property owner
- Any other people who objected
- Ontario Heritage Trust



Discussion

If Council proceeds with (2) the designation by-law, the owner can appeal to the Ontario Land Tribunal (OLT) for a final decision.

If Council fails to meet these timelines, the NOID is considered withdrawn, and Council will still need to issue the notice of withdrawal. However, for clarity, the deemed withdrawal of a NOID to designate a property under subsection (9) does not prevent the Council from giving a new notice of intent to designate the property.

In consideration of the reasons for objection, Staff is of the opinion that the reason provided did not justify why the property was not worthy of designation. On the contrary, the HIA (see Appendix 'B') fully supports the importance of designating this valuable listed heritage property.

Should Council proceed with the designation by-law despite any notice of objection, Clause 29(11) of the Heritage Act states that any person who objects to the proposed designation by-law may appeal to the Tribunal by giving the Tribunal and the clerk of the municipality notice within 30 days after the date of publication.

The Tribunal decision on the appeal will either support or override the Council decision on the proposed designation.

Financial Impact

There is no financial impact associated with this report.

Respectfully submitted,

Jill Hogan
Commissioner, Development Services

For questions, please contact: Anthony Wong, Senior Policy Planner Phone: Ext. 2565

Attachments

Appendix 'A' Letter of Objection from Owner
Appendix 'B' heritage Impact Assessment for 111 Mary Street

Approved by CAO
Andrew M. Siltala



Chief Administrative Officer

Recognition of Traditional Lands

The Town of Milton resides on the Treaty Lands and Territory of the Mississaugas of the Credit First Nation. We also recognize the traditional territory of the Huron-Wendat and Haudenosaunee people. The Town of Milton shares this land and the responsibility for the water, food and resources. We stand as allies with the First Nations as stewards of these lands.

Andrew and Caroline Kocher
107 Mary St. Milton, ON L9T 1L8

Attn: Meaghen Reid, Town Clerk
The Corporation of the Town of Milton
150 Mary Street
Milton, ON L9T 6Z5

August 19, 2022

Please consider this letter as our formal written objection to the decision by The Council of the corporation of the Town of Milton, to designate 111 Mary St. Milton, Ontario L9T 1L8 as an Historical Property. This decision severely restricts our ability to deal with our property. Aside from that we have been mindful stewards of the historical integrity of the property and have no intention of compromising the valuable historical characteristics of the structure. The staff recommendation fails to consider the lengthy term of ownership during which our family has had care and custody of the property. We are disappointed with the decision and intend to appeal the decision to the fullest extent possible.

Carl Klein
Andrew Kocher

**Edwin Earl House
111 Mary Street
Milton, Ontario**

Heritage Impact Assessment



Prepared for Caroline and Andrew Kocher
by Robinson Heritage Consulting
16 August 2014



ROBINSON
Heritage Consulting

Edwin Earl House

111 Mary Street

Milton, Ontario

Heritage Impact Assessment

Table of Contents

1. Introduction
 - 1.1 Commissioning of Report
 - 1.2 Limitations
 - 1.3 Present Owner Contact Information
2. Detailed Site History
 - 2.1 Land Ownership History
 - 2.2 Determining Provincial Significance
 - 2.3 Cultural Heritage Value or Interest – the Edwin Earl House
3. General Description of the Edwin Earl House
 - 3.1 Fire Insurance Plans
 - 3.2 Evolution of the House Construction
4. Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest
 - 4.1 Heritage Attributes
5. Outline of Proposed Development
6. Primary Conservation Treatment and Options for Mitigation
7. Photographic Documentation
8. Information Sources

1. Introduction

The primary purpose of this Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) is to provide Caroline and Andrew Kocher (the Client and proponent) and the Town of Milton with an accurate and objective assessment of the cultural heritage value of the property at 111 Mary Street in the Town of Milton (the “subject property”). The proponent is seeking approval from the Town of Milton to permit demolition of the subject dwelling or to permit the alteration to adapt the subject building as a coach house for their own property at 107 Mary Street. As the subject property (Figures 18-20) has been identified by the Town of Milton as a property with potential cultural heritage value or interest, an objective heritage assessment is required by the Town.¹

The owner client provides this Heritage Impact Assessment of 111 Mary Street to the Town of Milton in order to inform any decisions to be made regarding the development or demolition/alterations proposed for the subject property. The Heritage Impact Assessment will confirm the cultural heritage value or interest and the property’s heritage attributes as well as assess any potential impacts on the subject property caused by potential alterations to the subject property proposed by the proponent. The Heritage Impact Assessment will offer recommendations for mitigation.

Policy Framework

The Planning Act requires that Councils of municipal governments,

“in carrying out their responsibilities under this Act, shall have regard to, among other matters, matters of provincial interest such as [...] the conservation of features of significant architectural, cultural, historical, archaeological or scientific interest;”²

According to the 2014 Provincial Policy Statement, and specifically Policy 2.6.1:

¹ Ontario Heritage Act, R.S.O. 1990, c., O.18, Section 27 (1). The clerk of a municipality shall keep a register of property situated in the municipality that is of cultural heritage value or interest. 2005, c. 6, s. 15.

² Ontario Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. P.13, Section 2, sub (d).

“Significant built heritage resources and significant cultural heritage landscapes shall be conserved.”

The subject property is within what is known in the Town of Milton Official Plan as “Old Milton” and is one of the original 19th century, Victorian homes built to front onto the northwest side of what was originally Court House Square (now Victoria Park) (Figure 1). The property is known legally as Lot 3 in Block 7 of Plan 7 (Foster’s Survey) and the parcel was surveyed in 1992 as shown in Figure 2. The present day context is seen in the 2013 air photo shown in Figures 3 and 4.

The property is currently zoned RLD (Residential Low Density) permitting 2-storey and 9.5 metre building heights (Figure 5). The property is indicated on the Urban Area Central Business District Land Use Plan (Official Plan, Schedule C) as being within the Low Density Residential Sub Area and is indicated within a Community Improvement Area and just outside the business improvement area boundary (Figure 6).

The subject property has been included in the Official Plan’s Schedule C.7.D.CBD as being within a “special heritage area” or “residential sub-area or cluster of significant architectural merit” (Figure 7). This special heritage area includes properties fronting on Mary Street from the northwest corner of Brown Street, west to the east side of Bronte Street South. It should be noted that Victoria Park has not been indicated as part of a special heritage area and that houses on the southeast side of the park are included as part of a special heritage area of properties fronting on King Street from Hugh Street, west to the east side of Bowes Street. The consultant recommends that an additional special heritage area should be established for Victoria Park that includes the properties that front onto the Park with particular interest in those early residences or institutional buildings that faced the original Court House Square. Example properties would include: 150 Mary Street – the County Court House and 141 King Street – the Land Registry Building (Figures 145 and 146); 110 King Street - a 5-bay, Georgian style house, indicated as being built about 1855 and occupied by John Turner, blacksmith

(Figure 150)³ and 48 Bell Street - an asymmetrical 3-bay, Ontario cottage style house, indicated as being built about 1874 and occupied by Thomas Lavery, stonemason (Figure 149).

1.1 Commissioning of Report

Robinson Heritage Consulting was retained on 25 June 2014 by Caroline and Andrew Kocher on behalf of Douglas Clarence Kocher and Judith Ross Kocher, the current owners of the subject property, to carry out a Heritage Impact Assessment according to the Town of Milton's Heritage Assessment Study Guidelines.

1.2 Limitations

The information contained in this report represents the professional opinion of Stephen Robinson, MA, CAHP, of Robinson Heritage Consulting.

This report is intended for the client named. The material in this report reflects the consultant's best judgment in light of the information available at the time of preparation.

Any use a third party makes of this report, or reliance on, or decisions made based on it are the responsibility of such third parties. The consultant accepts no responsibility for damages, if any suffered by any third party as a result of decisions made or actions based on this report.

1.3 Present Owner Contact Information

Douglas Clarence Kocher and Judith Ross Kocher are the present owners of the subject property 111 Mary Street in the Town of Milton and the owners are represented by Caroline and Andrew Kocher as proponents. Their contact information is:

³ The construction date and name of occupant is displayed on a Milton Historical Society plaque on the front door hood and is the opinion of the Milton Historical Society. The consultant has not conducted research to verify the plaque information.

107 Mary Street
Milton, ON L9T 1L8
(905) 693-8058

The subject property (Figures 1 and 2) is located at on the northwest side of Mary Street, between Brown and Bell Streets, facing Victoria Park. The subject property is described legally as being Lot 3 within Block 7 of Registered Plan 7 (Foster's Survey) in the Town of Milton.⁴ The subject property is a roughly rectangular property parcel measuring 18.97 m along Mary Street, 40.37 m along the northeast side lot line, 40.45 m along the southwest side lot line and 18.77 m along the rear lot line.⁵

Currently the subject property contains one detached, single-family house which has not been designated under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act but has been identified by the Town of Milton as being a property with potential cultural heritage value or interest according to Section 27 of the Ontario Heritage Act. The subject property is not within or adjacent to a Heritage Conservation District designated under Section 41 of the Ontario Heritage Act. The subject property is not adjacent to a protected heritage property as defined by the Provincial Policy Statement.

2. Detailed Site History

2.1 Land Ownership History

The Abstract to Deeds for the Town of Milton in Halton County (now part of the Regional Municipality of Halton) are located at the Halton Land Registry Office in Milton.

Part of the Village of Milton, in the Township of Trafalgar (County of Halton) was surveyed by Henry Winter in 1854 for Mr. Hugh Foster and was registered as Plan 7.

⁴ The original lot indicated on Foster's Survey (survey 4 May 1854) was measured as 30 square perches. One square perch equals 272.25 sq ft

⁵ Measurements taken from surveyor's plan by Fred G. Cunningham Inc., 1992

This registered plan became commonly known as “Foster’s Survey” (Figures 8 and 9). The real property at 111 Mary Street (formerly West Mary Street) has cultural heritage value as it is a parcel established in the original survey and subdivision of this area of the Town of Milton.

According to the Abstract to Deeds for Lot 3 in Block 7 of Plan 7 (Figure 10), the subject property was sold in 1855 by Hugh Foster and his wife to Joseph H. Robinson. There was no monetary consideration indicated for this transaction. Reverend Joseph Hiram Robinson, a Methodist New Connexion minister who travelled giving ministerial support in a circuit area that included the Town of Milton, is described in the section titled, “Provincial Significance” below.

In 1874 several transactions occurred that suggest that the original house may have been built about 1874. In that year Reverend Joseph H. Robinson and his wife sold Lot 3 to James Henderson for the sum of \$100, subject to taxes for that year. James Henderson was indicated in the 1877 Atlas as born in Scotland, settled in Milton in 1869 and as a merchant tailor on Main Street. In the same year, Francis Barclay and his wife received a mortgage for \$500 and purchased Lot 3 from James Henderson and his wife for \$700. “F. Barclay” was indicated in the 1877 Illustrated Historical Atlas of the County of Halton as being born in Scotland, settled in Milton in 1837, became a Reeve and was a general merchant on Main Street.

In 1881, Francis Barclay and his wife discharged their mortgage and sold the property to Minnie Margaret Lavery, wife of Thomas H. Lavery for the sum of \$500. In 1891, Edwin F. Earl and his wife Mary Ann (Houston) received a mortgage from Earl’s parents (Eliza Jane and Ameltha Earl) and purchased Lot 3 from Minnie Margaret Lavery for the sum of \$900.

In 1940, Catherine and Bertram Bentley were granted ownership of Lot 3 which they owned until 1976 when Bertha Akins received the deed to the property from the last will

of Catherine Bentley. The property was transferred from the Bertha Akins estate to Douglas and Judith Kocher in 1992.

2.2 Determining Provincial Significance

The life of Reverend Joseph Hiram Robinson, a Methodist minister and editor, is described in the *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*⁶ (Figure 11). Born in England in 1807, Robinson joined the Methodist New Connection Church in 1822, married Jane Scholey in 1833, and was appointed superintendent of the Canadian Wesleyan Methodist New Connexion Church in 1851. According to Robinson's biographer Albert Burnside:

"Robinson served as superintendent of the New Connexion missions for 15 years, and he was elected president of conference in 1852, 1856, 1861, 1865, and 1869. As superintendent, he did not serve as a minister, but he visited circuits, consulted with and counselled ministers, provided liaison between the mother church and the Canadian body, and encouraged the raising of funds. During this period he was also involved in the temperance movement, and he was one of the chief organizers of the British American Order of Good Templars, serving for several years as president.

Recognizing the need for a journal to promote the work of his denomination, Robinson founded the *Evangelical Witness* in 1854 in London, Upper Canada, his principal residence from 1856."

Robinson was recalled by the English conference in 1870. After the Canadian New Connexion conference approved a plan of union with the Canadian Wesleyan Methodist Church in 1873, Robinson's mission work in Canada concluded. At this point Robinson decided to spend his retirement in Canada where several of his family had settled. In 1875 he was received into the ministry of the Methodist Church of Canada by its London (Ontario) conference. For 15 years, though officially retired, he served as an

⁶ Albert Burnside, "ROBINSON, JOSEPH HIRAM," in *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*, vol. 12, University of Toronto/Université Laval, 2003–, accessed July 14, 2014, http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/robinson_joseph_hiram_12E.html.

assistant to the ministers at Dundas Street Centre Methodist Church in London. In 1890 Robinson and his wife made their home with a daughter and son-in-law in Ottawa.

According to Ontario Regulation 10/06, a property such as 111 Mary Street could have cultural heritage value or interest of provincial significance if “the property has a strong or special association with the life or work of a person, group or organization of importance to the province or with an event of importance to the province”.

What is known about the subject property indicates that Reverend Joseph H. Robinson and his wife did own the subject property during Robinson’s tenure as Superintendent of the Canadian Wesleyan Methodist New Connexion Church. Even though Robinson’s principle residence was in London (Ontario), the amount of travel necessary to support the circuit may have made it necessary to have secondary residences, or at least accommodation, in other places.

It has been suggested by Marcia Waldie and Jack Charlton in their book *Historic Homes and Buildings of Milton*, that during the period of Reverend Robinson’s ownership of the subject property (1855-1874) the Reverend had the house built in 1858. The consultant was unable to find evidence that would prove or disprove this belief. It is possible that Robinson purchased the lot on speculation, had the original house built and then sold the property when his mission work concluded in Canada by 1874. However, no evidence to support this has been found in the consultant’s research.

Some of the architectural features of the house described in Section 3 of this report could be seen as evidence to support Waldie and Charlton’s belief that the original house on Lot 3 was built for Reverend Robinson. There is also other evidence that leads the consultant to believe that it is also possible that the original elements of the existing house were built about 1874 with alterations made during ownership by Edwin F. Earl.

According to the land title abstracts, Francis Barclay and his wife received a mortgage and purchased the subject property in 1874. F. Barclay is listed in the 1877 Historical Atlas of Halton County as a native of Scotland and having come to Milton in 1837. Barclay is described as a Reeve and a general merchant on Main Street. The consultant has found no other references or information on Francis Barclay.

As no reference to Reverend Joseph Hiram Robinson was found in the Halton County, Trafalgar Township or Town of Milton Census records, the title abstracts remain the only primary archival evidence we have that assists in the determination of when the house at 111 Mary Street was built. Full copies of the tax assessment rolls for property owners living in Milton from the second half of the 19th century are not held by the Milton Public Library, the Town of Milton, the Halton Region Museum and Archives, the Archives of Ontario, the Milton Historical Society or the Family History Research Centres⁷ in the area.

It is customary for an architectural historian to rely most heavily on the extant physical evidence of the building in question and the sequence of property purchases and transactions shown in the chain of title. The consultant's findings in these information sources have lead the consultant to believe that the subject property played only a small part in the life of Reverend J. H. Robinson and, therefore, can only be seen as having minor provincial cultural heritage value or interest. However, at the local municipal level, the house at 111 Mary Street definitely has cultural heritage value or interest that will be summarized in the following section of this report.

⁷ Family Research Centres have access to genealogical research materials held by the Church of Latter Day Saints in Salt Lake City, Utah.

2.3 Cultural Heritage Value or Interest – the Edwin Earl House

While little is known of the Robinson, Henderson and Barclay owner/occupancies, much more is known of the subsequent owner and occupant of 111 Mary Street. Edwin Franklin Earl (1855-1931) and his wife Mary (Houston) purchased the subject property in 1891. Edwin and Mary Ann raised six children in the house – three girls and three boys. (Figures 12 and 13).

According to *Milton Area Biographies* and *Historic Homes and Buildings in Milton* (both published by the Milton Historical Society), Edwin Earl was a very active and well-known member of Milton society and politics during his lifetime. Earl was a tinsmith and plumber by trade, and was member of the United Church, the Independent Order of Foresters, the Royal Templars of Temperance and was elected a Town councilor 1893-1896 and 1899-1900. Earl was Reeve for Milton on Halton County Council (Figure 14) and served as County Warden in 1913 before serving as Mayor of Milton from 1917-1921. He was Milton Fire Chief from 1894 until 1930. Edwin Earl died at his home on Mary Street in 1931 and was buried in Evergreen Cemetery.

3. General Description of the Edwin Earl House

The subject dwelling is a 1.5-storey, front gable house built in wood frame construction on a rubblestone foundation – originally with no basement other than a crawlspace. The medium pitch, front gable façade is in Greek Revival style - 3 bays on the main floor with the front door on the right similar. This style of house design was popular in the mid-19th century Ontario architecture and is also seen in contemporary houses at 101 Main Street East and 80 Robert Street (Figures 143a and 143b). The main roof of the subject property now has a rug brick chimney shaft rising from the centre of the ridge. The house has been more recently been clad in vinyl siding that mimics a medium width horizontal clapboard siding.

Front porch

The front porch of the house has the appearance of classicism seen in very late Victorian or early Edwardian style common in the late 19th and early 20th centuries in Ontario. Both the enclosed porch and the open lower porch have a flat roof with a skirt that matches the main roof pitch. The upper porch has a deep soffit covered with modern metal siding that partially covers wooden denticulation at the visible top of the entablature over the porch windows on all three sides. Paired casement windows open into the upper porch - four on both sides and eight at the front. Each casement sash is divided into eight lights or panes with traditional wood muntin bars. The roof of the open lower porch extends beyond the sides of the upper porch with the roof skirts extending past the main wall corners. Upper and lower porches both have wooden denticulation where the entablature meets the soffit. The lower porch beam is supported at the wall by a sandwiched wooden corbel and by three panel columns resting on a battered or sloped railing wall now clad in wide, horizontal metal siding.

Inside the front porch main floor are two large windows with a pedimented top casing over 2-over-2 wooden sash windows with rectangular panes and thin wooden muntin bars (Figures 40 and 41). The current vinyl cladding is trimmed against a thin wooden raised casing surround and the pedimented window head has been retained in many cases. There is evidence of shutter hinge hardware on most of these window casings. (Figures 22-27, and 33-34). Pedimented window heads and wooden shutters are architectural features that were popular in the mid-19th century Ontario architecture.

Front Door and Entrance Hall

The front door has a two-light transom over a half-glass door with 8 window panes over three raised wood panels. The interior door casings (flat butt joint in top corners) and baseboard profile of the front entrance hall is shown in Figures 49 and 50. Varying width plank floor roughly 5' in width has a decorated cast iron floor grate. A triple push button light switch is on the hall wall.

Front Room with fireplace

Figure 54 shows the view from the front hall to the front room. The front room has a dropped ceiling with modern acoustic tile, medium width plank floors, a bay window and a central fireplace. The front two windows display what is likely the original window casing, stool and skirt profiles - the latter with ends cut at a slight angle and with a simple bead along the bottom edge (Figure 57). The sashes are constructed with doweled, flat butt joint corners (Figure 58). The sash lock in the front right window has patent date of “1874” (Figure 58).

The front room displays many features that were not likely original but added as improvements in the early 20th century. The interior trim of the bay window has a simple entablature top, smooth casings cut with a miter corner and a simple stool and skirt profile. The centre window in the bay has a 12-over-1 pane arrangement while the side windows in the bay each have nine divided lights over a single lower sash. These features are, in the consultant’s opinion, in keeping with very late Victorian classical motifs seen in the design of the front porch and unlike the other window trims that are thought to be original. There is no visual evidence of shutter hardware on the bay window casings.

Other features that have been the result of late 19th or early 20th century renovations are the rug brick fireplace mantel (Figures 61 and 62) and a red quarry tile hearth. This type of brick with its rough, combed face was not produced until the early 20th century. The flat arch of the fireplace opening in rowlock brick set on a steel lintel is also a masonry style typical of this period. The cast iron fireplace and cleanout doors in the basement (Figures 101 and 102) were manufactured by the Galt Stove & Furnace Company in Galt, Ontario. The brick foundation for the fireplace was constructed in a smooth, pressed brick – a material that also seems more typical of the early 20th century.

Cast iron radiators are the heat source throughout the house. These radiators are the “Copley” model announced as a new design by its manufacturer, the Gurney Company in the late 1920s (Figure 153). The water supply pipes for the radiators have been installed on the outside of the interior walls and partitions, indicating that the radiator system was not likely the original heat source. The fireplace and later the radiators likely replaced a wood stove heating system.

Dining Room and Kitchen

On the back of the front room fireplace wall is the stair to the upper floor. This is a notable feature. It was common in early to mid-19th century Ontario domestic architecture to place the stairs to the upper floor along the fireplace wall to take advantage of the masonry support. In most Victorian era house designs, the stairs usually rose from near the front door entrance.

This central wall is also shared by the dining room area which has a door to a back corner bedroom and a door to the kitchen (Figure 71). The dining room and kitchen floors have been covered with hardwood strip flooring and the dining room has an older type of dropped ceiling with larger panels than the modern acoustic tiles of the front room. The kitchen has what may be the original wood tongue-and-groove ceiling (Figure 77) and wood wainscoting (Figure 78). Figures 83 to 87 show an impressive built-in, Victorian kitchen cupboard with diagonal, tongue-and-groove inset panels and butterfly hinges – quite likely a feature of the original house.

The door to the basement stair is typical of the other main floor doors with four moulded inset panels and simple butt hinges. The basement door does have a late 19th century rim lock with white porcelain handles (Figure 95). This, however, does not appear to be the original hardware as there is a keyhole below from a previous rim lock - probably much like the 1870s-80's period rim lock on the back door of the kitchen (Figure 79) or the back bedroom door.

The inside walls of the basement stairway are constructed with sawn lath and plaster (Figure 98) which is not a sign that this is a particularly early building. It appears that the basement stairway was created by cutting into the wall of what was originally a closet off the dining room. This stairway was likely created when the basement floor was excavated out to create adequate ceiling height under the dining room and kitchen for a boiler heat source. Figure 106 shows a coal bin in the northeast corner of the basement – likely a fuel source for a boiler and/or the fireplace.

All floor joists appear to nominal size (2" x 10"), saw cut members that are notched into the sill plate. Several of the foundation walls have had concrete benching added to reinforce the interior.

Upper Floor

The central stairway (Figures 107 and 108) begins at the front corner of the dining room rising to the central upper hall lit by a low window along the west wall (Figure 112) beside a small inset for the secondary door to the front bedroom. The stairway railing in the upper hall has a turned endpost and turned balusters (Figures 109 and 110).

The back bedroom also has a window sash lock with the date "1874" (Figure 116). The ceiling hatch seen in Figure 17 allows access to the attic. The roof construction has the rafters meeting each other with no roof ridge beam to unite them. This is likely a clue to the original house having an older (mid-19th century) framing construction technique. The upper rooms all have vertical batten doors with simple butt hinges (Figures 121, 124 and 126) – another indication of older construction. All upper floors, except the bathroom, have been covered with hardwood strip flooring. The bathroom has the original 5" floor boards exposed.

The front bedroom is almost the full width of the house with a built-in storage space along the west wall beside the secondary door leading back to the top of the stairs.

The upper front window within the enclosed upper porch has a 2-over-2 pane arrangement divided by muntin bars that are thicker with a simpler profile than those in the front main windows. Four window shutter pintels are still attached to the window casing indicating that this was previously an exterior window (Figures 127 and 134).

Also revealed in the enclosed upper front porch is the original exterior cladding - a horizontally oriented, v-grove wooden siding (Figures 131 and 132). There are cut nail heads still visible between some of the boards. This type of cladding would have had an appearance similar to the home of The Honorable George Crawford McKindsey⁸ at 399 Pearl Street (Figures 151 and 152) and, therefore, it is possible that these houses were built about the same time. McKindsey was Deputy Sheriff from July 1855 until October 1858, and the second Sheriff of the County of Halton from October 1858 until June 1882.⁹ In 1872 and 1882, McKindsey ran (unsuccessfully) for election to the House of Commons and was appointed on the advice of John Alexander Macdonald to the Senate in January 1884 representing the senatorial division of Milton.¹⁰

The entrance door to the enclosed porch does not have the same casing or interior trim work as on the original window or doors (Figures 128 and 130). This simple, flat trim work with mitered corners and the wooden screen door with a chamfered, single lower panel and a 3-over-1 glass insert is quite likely the result of later alterations that converted this opening from a window to an upper porch door.

3.1 Fire Insurance Plans

Details from three fire insurance plans (1893, 1916 and 1927) of the Town of Milton are presented here which show the subject property and its surroundings during the late Victorian and inter-war period.

⁸ <http://images.halinet.on.ca/2324462/data?n=8>

⁹ http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/George_Crawford_McKindsey

¹⁰ <http://www.parl.gc.ca/parlinfo/Files/Parliamentarian.aspx?Item=d4d2abf2-f105-4f0c-ad85-8fe823901095&Language=E&Section=ALL>

Goad's 1893 Fire Insurance Plan for the Town of Milton (Figure 15) indicates Lots 1, 2, 3 and 4 in Block 7 of Plan 7 with dwellings facing Court House Square (now Victoria Square). Lot 3 shows a 2-storey, wood frame house with a wood shingle roof and a footprint similar to the existing house at 111 Mary Street. It should be noted that porches are indicated on the dwellings at what are now 117 Mary Street, 99 Mary Street and 100 Main Street East. No front porch (open or enclosed) is indicated on 111 Mary Street but the front façade is indicated as protruding well past that of 117 or 107 Mary Street. Therefore, it is possible that the enclosed upper storey of the front porch is shown as an extension of the main floor footprint without indicating the open main floor porch beneath, similar to the house today indicated on the surveyor's plan in Figure 2. No bay window is indicated on the southwest wall of 111 Mary or on the front of 107 Mary Street.

*Lloyds' Insurance Survey of Milton (1916)*¹¹ (Figure 16) indicates the same building characteristics for 111 Mary Street and still no front porch or bay window is indicated. Porches are indicated on the dwellings at what are now 117 Mary Street, 99 Mary Street, 100 Main Street East and 114 Main Street East. 111 Mary Street now has a detached, wood frame/metal clad auto garage and a small wood frame shed at the north corner of the property.

The 1927 Goad Fire Plan¹² (Figure 17) indicates the street address number as 54 West Mary Street. A wood frame auto garage is in the same position as the previous fire insurance plan but the wood frame shed has been moved to the middle of the rear lot line.

¹¹ *Lloyds' Insurance Survey of Milton, Ontario (Milton West P.O.) County Seat of Halton County*. August 1916 [Sheet 6]. (Source: Gore Mutual Insurance Company Archive, Cambridge, Ontario, Box 64)

¹² Charles E. Goad, *Town of Milton Fire Plan Insurance Plan, 1927*. (Source: Milton Historical Society website)

3.2 Construction Evolution of the House

It is the consultant's opinion that the original house at 111 Mary Street could have been built as early as 1858 as suggested by Waldie and Charlton. The roof framing method, the cut nails in the original wall cladding, the Greek Revival form of the front façade, the pedimented window and door heads and the presence of window shutters - all give credence to the early construction date. However, the chain of title showing a sharp increase in property value when the property was sold in 1874 from Henderson to Barclay leads the consultant to believe that the house was more likely built just before or shortly after that transaction. It is hard to avoid speculating that either the "1874" window sash locks were brand new hardware and installed when the house was built – or where introduced by the purchasers of the property in 1874.

The original house had much the same massing and shape as it has today with the exception of the front porch. Although the fire insurance plans for the Town of Milton seem to be somewhat inconsistent when porches are indicated, it is reasonable to assume that the front porch had been added before 1893 as it appears at this time as part of the overall floor plan. It may be reasonable to surmise that Edwin Earl and his family, after buying the property in 1891 may have added this feature and possibly the side bay window to the house. Its architectural design and style seems to employ some the classical motifs popular in very late Victorian style although it would only be fair to add that Greek Revival style is also based largely on classical motifs. The side bay window does not appear in the fire plans, it does not have evidence of shutter hardware and its windows were not designed in the same manner as those of the original house – as seen at 107 Mary Street (Figure 139)¹³ and at 23 Mary Street (Figure 144). This suggests to the consultant that the bay window at 111 Mary Street was not an original architectural element of the house.

¹³ The existing house at 107 Mary Street was rebuilt to match its original design after fire had destroyed the house.

4. Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest

According to Regulation 9/06 under the Ontario Heritage Act, a property may be designated under Section 29 of the Act if it meets one or more of the following criteria for determining whether it is of cultural heritage value or interest:

1. The property has design value or physical value because it,
 - i. is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, expression, material or construction method,
 - ii. displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit,or
 - iii. demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement.

2. The property has historical value or associative value because it,
 - i. has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization or institution that is significant to a community,
 - ii. yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of a community or culture, or
 - iii. demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer or theorist who is significant to a community.

3. The property has contextual value because it,
 - i. is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an area,
 - ii. is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings, or
 - iii. is a landmark.

It is the consultant's recommendation that the existing house at 111 Mary Street in the Town of Milton, has cultural heritage value and interest as, even though the exterior has been covered with modern day siding, almost all of its exterior form and much of the interior design or physical value features have been preserved over the years. Some major alterations to the home were made during the occupancy of Edwin Earl but the house has design value or physical value because it is a representative example of mid-Victorian domestic architectural style seen particularly in the Greek Revival form of the front façade, the pedimented window and door heads.

The consultant's recommendation is that the property has minor provincial cultural heritage significance as Reverend Joseph H. Robinson, circuit minister with the Canadian Wesleyan Methodist New Connexion Church, appears only to have been an early owner of the property (land) and no conclusive evidence has been found that supports the belief that Rev. Robinson had the house built. However, the house does have significant local cultural heritage value due to its architectural value and its historical or associative value in that for 40 years this was the home of Edwin F. Earl, a former mayor of Milton, Halton County Reeve and a well-known community figure in the Town. For this reason, the consultant suggests that an appropriate historical name to adopt for this significant built heritage resource would be the Edwin Earl House.

The Edwin Earl House is in its original location on an original subdivision lot created by Foster's Plan in 1854. The house and property have contextual value in that they help to maintain and define the original nature of the early town settlement pattern in this area. The house is one of the original buildings built to face onto Victoria Square and contributes to the cultural heritage value of the Mary Street streetscape, the Victoria Park area and this portion of Old Milton.

4.1 Heritage Attributes

- existing location of the house and its orientation to Mary Street and to Victoria Park
- original form, rooflines and massing of the 1.5-storey house exterior (with the exception of the rear porch off of the kitchen tail)
- original wood cladding (with horizontal orientation and v-groove joint)
- original window and door elements of the original house (front and sides of main block and kitchen tail)
- front porch, enclosed upper sleeping porch and side bay window are to be retained or reconstructed to match the existing original based on documentary evidence
- window sash locks with patent date of "1874"
- wooden, built-in kitchen cupboard

5. Outline of Proposed Development

The consultant has been informed by the Client that they are seeking approval to either demolish the existing house at 111 Mary Street or convert the existing house to construct a coach house for use by 107 Mary Street.

6. Primary Conservation Treatment and Options for Mitigation

It is the consultant's opinion that the cultural heritage value of the existing house at 111 Mary Street in the Town of Milton is significant and recommends rehabilitation as the primary conservation treatment. Options provided to the owner and the Town of Milton on how the heritage attributes of the heritage resource at 111 Mary Street may be best conserved, in a sympathetic context are as follows.

Robinson Heritage Consulting recommends the following options, in order of preference:

- a) That the existing house at 111 Mary Street be retained and maintained for appropriate residential use and that the owner/proponent conserves the heritage attributes of the built heritage resource in any proposed development or alteration of the property.

- b) If a coach house structure is required for 107 Mary Street that the current owner or proponent consider options that would allow a detached structure to be built at the rear of 107 Mary Street or at the rear of 111 Mary Street in such a way that the new building or structure is designed to be compatible and subordinate to the existing house at 111 Mary Street.

7. Photographic Documentation



Figure 1 – Current parcel fabric of area (Image source: Town of Milton GIS, 2014)




Figure 2 – Surveyor's Plan of Lot 3, Block 7, Plan 7 by Fred G. Cunningham, 1992 (Image source: property owner)



Figure 3 – 2103 Air photo. (Image source: Town of Milton GIS, accessed July 2014)



Figure 4 – 2103 Air photo. (Image source: Town of Milton GIS, accessed July 2014)



Figure 5 – Zoning map. (Image source: Town of Milton GIS, accessed July 2014)




Figure 6 – Urban Area Central Business District Land Use Plan (dotted line indicates business improvement area. (Image source: Town of Milton Official Plan, Schedule C)




Figure 7 – Special heritage areas (Image source: Town of Milton Official Plan, Schedule C.7.D.CBD)




Figure 8 – Milton Registered Plan 7, 1854.
Henry Winter, P.L.S.
(Image: Halton Land Registry Office)




Figure 9 – Detail of Milton Registered Plan 7, 1854. Henry Winter, P.L.S.
(Image: Halton Land Registry Office)

Figure 10 – Abstract to Deeds for Lot 3, Block 7 of Plan 7 (Foster's Survey) (Image: Halton Land Registry Office). Transcription by RHC below.

Instr #	Instr	Instr Date	Regist'n Date	Grantor	Grantee	Qty	Consid'n	Remarks
779 C*	B & Sale	23 Apr 1855	12 Sept 1857	Hugh Foster and wife	Joseph H. Robinson	Lot 3		
871 B	B & Sale	30 July 1874	15 July 1875	Reverend Joseph H. Robinson and wife	James Henderson	Lot 3, 29 sq. per.	\$100	Subject to taxes for current year *
872 B	B & Sale	24* Oct 1874	15* July 1875	James Henderson and wife	Francis Barclay	Lot 3, 29 sq. per.	\$700*	
873 B*	Mortgage	? Oct 1874	25* July 1875*	Francis Barclay & wife	Robert Harris*	Lot 3, 29 sq. per.	\$500	Discharged 1486 C
1438 C	B & Sale	26 Jan 1881	? Feb 1881	Francis Barclay & wife	Minnie Margaret Lavery, wife of Thomas H. Lavery	Lot 3, 29 sq. per.	\$500	
1486 C	Discharge of Mortgage	7 Feb 1881	23 Aug 1881	Robert Harris*	Francis Barclay	Lot 3, 29 sq. per.		Mortgage 873 B
2320 C	Agent for sale	10 Jan 1891	13 Jan 1891	Minnie Margaret Lavery, wife of Thomas H. Lavery	Edwin F. Earl	Lot 3	\$900	
2326 C	B & Sale	9 Feb 1891	11 Feb 1891	Minnie Margaret Lavery and Thomas H. Lavery her husband	Mary Ann Earl, wife of Edwin Franklin Earl	Lot 3, 29 perches	\$900	
?	Mortgage	? Feb 1891	? March 1891	Mary Ann Earl and Edwin Franklin Earl her husband	Eliza Jane Earl, wife of Ameltha Earl		?	?
?	Discharge of Mortgage	?	? Sept ?	Eliza Jane Earl, widow	Mary Ann Earl, wife of Edwin Franklin Earl		?	?
6882 ?	Tax* Deed	19 Oct 1939	21 Oct 1954	Adam Armstrong and Adam Sproat, Mayor and Treasurer of Town of Milton	George E. Syer*	Lot 3	\$477.35*	29 perches
6883 ?	Grant	21 Sept 1940*	21 Oct 1940*	George E. Syer* and wife	Catherine Bentley, married woman and Bertram Bentley as joint tenants	Lot 3	\$1,000	29 perches
82?? ? M	Certificate	8 July 1955	12 July 1955	Leslie M. Frost, Treasurer of Ontario	Estate of Bertram Bentley	Lot 3		
435952	Certificate	28 June 1976	30 June 1976	Arthur K. Marns, Minister of Revenue	Estate of Catherine Bentley	Lot 3		As in #6883
428176	Executor's Deed	7 July 1976	10 Aug 1976	Bertha Akins, executrix of last will of Catherine Bentley, widow deceased	Bertha Akins in her personal capacity	Lot 3		See recitals
79316	Transfer		30 Sept 1992	AKINS, Bertha - ESTATE	KOCHER, Douglas Clarence and KOCHER, Judith Ross		\$160,000	

Figure 11 – Mr. Joseph Robinson
(Image: Library and Archives of Canada MIKAN 3451428;
Shown in the *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*)




Image 2 of 2 - Robinson, Joseph Mr.
Source: Library and Archives Canada/MIKAN 3451428



Figure 12 - The Earl Family
(Back L-R - Laura (Dixon) Earl, Edna (Peacock). Middle - Cecil, Mary Ann (Auntie Mae) (Houston), Hazel (Wheeler), Edwin Earl, Chester Earl. Front – Harold

(Image: Milton Images accessed online July 2014 at
<http://images.milton.halinet.on.ca/72413/data?n=7>



Figure 13 - Edwin Earl (1855-1931)
 (Image: Milton Images accessed online July 2014 at <http://images.milton.halinet.on.ca/2351387/image/1061841?n=32>)



Figure 14 - Halton County Council, 1913
 (Image: Milton Images accessed online July 2014 at <http://images.milton.halinet.on.ca/2302501/image/916174?n=43>)



Figure 15 – Charles E. Goad, *Fire Insurance Plan for the Town of Milton*, May 1893 (Sheet 3). (Image: Gore Mutual Archives, Cambridge).




Figure 16 – *Lloyd's Insurance Survey of Milton, Ontario*, August 1916 (Sheet 4). (Image: Gore Mutual Archives, Cambridge).




Figure 17 – Fire Insurance Map of Milton, Ontario. 1927 (Sheet 6).
(Image: Milton Historical Society webpage accessed 15 July 2104)
<http://www.miltonhistoricalsociety.ca/the-archives/fire-insurance-maps/>



Figure 18 –

View from south

(Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 19 –

Front facade

(Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 20 –

View from south

(Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 21 (Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 22 (Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 23 (Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 24 (Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 25 (Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 26 (Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 27 (Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 28 (Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 29 (Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 30 (Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 31 (Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 32 (Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 33 (Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 34 (Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 35 (Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 36 (Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 37 (Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 38 (Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 39 (Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 40 (Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 41 (Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 42 (Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 43 (Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 44 (Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 45 (Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 46 (Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 47 (Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 48 (Photo: RHC, June 2014)




Figure 49 (Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 50 (Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 51 (Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 52 (Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 53 (Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 54 (Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 55 (Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 56 (Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 58 (Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 57 (Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 59 (Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 60 (Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 61 (Photo: RHC, June 2014)

Figure 62
(Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 63 (Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 64 (Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 65 (Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 66
(Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 68 (Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 67 (Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 69 (Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 70 (Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 71 (Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 72 (Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 73 (Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 74 (Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 75 (Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 76 (Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 77 (Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 79
(Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 78 (Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 80
(Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 81 (Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 82 (Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 83 (Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 84 (Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 85 (Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 87 (Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 86 (Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 88 (Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 89 (Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 90 (Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 91 (Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 92 (Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 93 (Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 94 (Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 95 (Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 96 (Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 97 (Photo: RHC, June 2014)




Figure 98 (Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 99 (Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 100 (Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 101 (Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 102 (Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 103 (Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 104 (Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 105 (Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 106 (Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 107 (Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 108 (Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 109 (Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 110 (Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 111 (Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 112 (Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 113 (Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 114 (Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 115 (Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 116 (Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 117 (Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 118 (Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 119 (Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 120 (Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 121 (Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 122 (Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 123 (Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 124 (Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 125 (Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 126 (Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 127 (Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 128 (Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 129 (Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 130 (Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figures 131 and 132 (Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 133 (Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 134 (Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 135 (Photo: RHC, June 2014)

Related Properties and Images



Figure 136 – 117 Mary Street
(Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 137 – 117, 111, 107 and 99 Mary Street, seen from rear at Brown Street
(Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 138 – 107 Mary Street
(Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 139 – 107 Mary Street
(Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 140 – 99 Mary Street
(Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 141 – 94 Main Street East
(Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 142 – 114 Main Street East
(Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 143a – 101 Main Street East
(Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 143b – 80 Robert Street (moved from original location east of 101 Main Street East)
(Photo: Google Streetview 2014)



Figure 144 – 23 Mary Street
(Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 145 – 150 Mary Street
(County Court House)
(Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 146 – 141 King Street (Land Registry Building)
(Photo: RHC, June 2014)




Figure 147 – Victoria Park, Cenotaph
(Photo: RHC, June 2014)

Figure 148 – Victoria Park, Band shell
(Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 149 – 48 Bell Street (Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 150 – 110 King Street (Photo: RHC, June 2014)



Figure 151 – 399 Pearl Street
(Photo: RHC, June 2014)




Figure 152 – Hon. Geo. C. McKindsey,
Sheriff and Senator. (Image: Halton
Images MHS002324462f)




Figure 153 – new “Copley” radiator
from Gurney catalogue from late 1920s
(Photo: RHC, June 2014)

8. Information Sources

Albert Burnside, "ROBINSON, JOSEPH HIRAM," in *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*, vol. 12, University of Toronto/Université Laval, 2003–, accessed July 14, 2014, http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/robinson_joseph_hiram_12E.html.

Fred G. Cunningham, Surveyor's Plan of Lot 3, Block 7, Plan 7 (111 Mary Street, Milton), 1992.

Abstract to Deeds (Lot 3 in Block 7 of Registered Plan 7 (Foster's Survey)
(Source: Halton Land Registry Office)

Charles Goad, *Town of Milton Fire Insurance Plan*, May 1893, Sheet 3 (Source: Gore Mutual Archives, Cambridge)

Lloyds' Insurance Survey of Milton, Ontario (Milton West P.O.) County Seat of Halton County. August 1916 [Sheet 4]. (Source: Gore Mutual Insurance Company Archive, Box 64)

Fire Insurance Map of Milton, Ontario. 1927 (Sheet 6).
(Image: Milton Historical Society webpage accessed 15 July 2104)

Historical Atlas of the County of Halton (1877) (Source: Canadian County Atlas Digital Project. Montreal: McGill University, 2001.

Milton Registered Plan 7 (1854), known as Foster's Survey. (Source: Halton Land Registry)

Tremaine's Map the County of Halton (1858) (Source: Oakville Public Library Collection)

Ontario Heritage Act, R.S.O. 1990, c., O.18

Ontario Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. P.13

Ontario Regulation 9/06, made under the Ontario Heritage Act. (Source: Ontario Heritage Toolkit, Heritage Property Evaluation, p.22)

Provincial Policy Statement 2014, Policy 2.6.

Town of Milton GIS

Town of Milton Official Plan, Schedule C - Urban Area Central Business District Land Use Plan.

Town of Milton Official Plan, Schedule C.7.D.CBD – Special Heritage Areas.

Marsha Waldie and Jack Charlton, *Historic Homes and Buildings of Milton* (Volume II). Milton Historical Society, 2000.