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1 Executive Summary

The purpose of this report is to determine if the subject property qualifies as a cultural heritage landscape. Cultural heritage landscapes are cultural heritage resources which provide context and a broader understanding of how heritage buildings, structures, natural features, and land uses function together as a whole to provide an understanding of heritage value or interest. The subject property was assessed to determine if it has cultural heritage value per the Town of Oakville’s Cultural Heritage Landscape Strategy and if it meets Ontario Regulation 9/06.

Gairloch Gardens is a Designed Landscape cultural heritage landscape. It is an elegant example of an early 20th century, rural lakefront estate built by and for a wealthy Toronto family, which falls within the category of a “clearly defined landscape designed and created intentionally by man.”1 Further, the subject property meets the definition of a cultural heritage landscape, which is described as “a defined geographical area [which has] been modified by human activity and is identified as having cultural heritage value or interest by a community.”2 The subject property includes “structures, spaces [and] natural elements that are valued together for their interrelationship, meaning and association.”3

Although the Province of Ontario has identified cultural heritage landscapes as a type of cultural heritage resource, there is no province-wide standard methodological approach for their assessment. To fill this gap, Town Planning staff authored the Cultural Heritage Landscapes Strategy (the Strategy) which was adopted by Council in January 2014. The Strategy directs that a potential cultural heritage landscape should be evaluated using Ontario Regulation 9/06, Criteria for Determining Cultural Heritage Value or Interest under the Ontario Heritage Act, (OHA). As such, consideration was given to the layered, nested, and overlapping aspects of the property, including the evolution of its land-use history and its current conditions.

Should it be determined that the property be evaluated for its Provincial or National significance, a third party should be engaged to undertake this assessment.

The subject property is a public park which is known locally as Gairloch Gardens. It is located on the south side of Lakeshore Road East, east of Trafalgar Road and west of Winston Churchill Boulevard. Lower Morrison Creek runs along the west side of the property and Lake Ontario lies to the south.

Gairloch Gardens is owned by the Town of Oakville and is a Part IV heritage designated property, (under Section 29 of the Ontario Heritage Act), pursuant to By-law 1986-192. The designation by-law is attached as Appendix B. A plan showing the extent of the property is attached as Appendix C.

The subject property straddles Lots 7 and 8, Concession 4 South of Dundas Street (SDS), which originally was known as Broken Front concession. In 1812, the Patentee Richard Willclose received a 35-acre Crown Grant for Lot 7, Broken Front concession. In 1839, the Patentee Richard Coates Sr. (1778 – 1868) received a Crown Grant for Lot 8, Broken Front concession, for what appears to be 46-acres.

---

3 Ibid., page 40.
Although Land Registry records indicate that Richard Willcose owned Lot 7 for just three months (between April and July 1812) before selling the property, the 1806 Samuel L. Wilmot Map plan shows Willcose as the owner/resident of both this parcel and the 200-acre lot immediately north of the subject property (Lot 7, Conc. 3 SDS). Despite this, Willcose seems to have left no historic record of his time in, nor his association with, Trafalgar Township.

Other notable early Lot 7 owners include William Francis Romain; William Leach; and, Reuben Simeon Bacon.

Richard Coates Sr. retained ownership of Lot 8, Conc. 4 SDS for slightly more than fifteen years until he sold 46 acres to his son Richard Coates Jr. Land Registry records indicate that most of the property remained in the Coates family until Orpheus A. and Sabina E. Coates sold 36 acres to Richard Hallaran in April 1863.

No other notable early owners of Lot 8 were found.

Lieutenant Colonel William Gordon MacKendrick (1864-1959), who made his fortune as a road builder, “gradually purchased 400 acres of farm property” running from Lake Ontario to Upper Middle Road. Land Registry Office records indicate that MacKendrick made two purchases in Lot 7, Concession 4 SDS. The first purchase occurred on 7 June 1910, when MacKendrick and his wife Sarah Corrine King (1866-1913) bought the “westerly half of broken front, Lot number Seven in the Fourth concession South of Dundas Street in the said Township of Trafalgar, containing by admeasurement twenty acres...more or less”, from the Ontario Oddfellows Home Association, for $35,500. The second purchase occurred in November 1921, when Col. MacKendrick bought 11.47 acres of “part of Lot Number Eight in the Broken Front, or Fourth Concession, S.D.S.” from William Henry Brouse for $15,500. It was after this second purchase that Colonel MacKendrick, as he was more commonly known, built his home. Constructed between 1923 and 1924 and developed as a private, waterfront estate, MacKendrick named the property “Chestnut Point”.

Architecturally, the focal point of the property is Lt. Col. William G. MacKendrick’s early 1920s residence and James Arthur Gairdner’s (1893-1971), late 1940s artist studio. MacKendrick’s Tudor style building was constructed as a residence for his family shortly after he purchased the second parcel of land in 1921. It is prominently situated at the top of a man-made hill, toward the east side of the lot. Gairdner purchased the subject property in September 1960 and moved his studio west down Lakeshore Road from Toronto Township (now Mississauga). Known today as The Studio in Gairloch Gardens, the building was designed by Oakville Architect William Gould Armstrong, who, with Gairdner’s move to the subject property, also became his neighbour. It lies north of the former MacKendrick family residence.

---

5 Land Registry Office records. Indenture 10038, being a Bargain & Sale, dated 7 June 1910.
The final principal structure on the property is the large, open, stone and wood shelter which sits close to the lake, toward the south-east corner of the property. Known as The Teahouse, the early 20th century structure was also constructed by Lt. Col MacKendrick and, like his former home, it displays many elements typical of Tudor style (Arts and Crafts movement inspired) architecture.

There are two accessory structures on the property. One is an equipment storage shed which lies south of the trellis enclosed, rose garden and is used by the Town’s Parks and Open Space staff. The second is a small pre-cast utility building, which sits north of the stairs that lead down from the driveway to table land near to the north-most pond and the walking path. These buildings date from the early 1980s and 2005, respectively.

Gairloch Gardens remained private property until it was bequeathed to the Town in January 1972 by the estate of James A. Gairdner. At the time of the writing of this report it is the location of Oakville Galleries in Gairloch Gardens, a not-for-profit contemporary art museum; and, Gairloch Gardens, a public park. At the north end of the property there is a large open park with intricate and well-manicured gardens; to the south there are three man-made ponds which are fed by a small meandering stream; and, a variety of plantings. The property and buildings are open to the public and provides visitors with walking trails and views of Lake Ontario.
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2 Project Overview

2.1 Project Background

The Livable Oakville Plan provides that the town will protect and preserve cultural heritage landscapes by utilizing applicable legislation. Cultural heritage landscape provisions are included in the Ontario Heritage Act; the Planning Act; and, the Provincial Policy Statement, 2014. While the Livable Oakville Plan does not require a specific strategy for cultural heritage landscapes, other heritage planning studies and policies identified the need to provide a consistent process of identification, evaluation and conservation. Further, during the 2012 Bronte Village Heritage Resource Review and Strategy process the public indicated their support for additional heritage conservation tools. The result is the Town of Oakville’s Cultural Heritage Landscape Strategy.

In January 2014, the Town of Oakville adopted the Cultural Heritage Landscapes Strategy, which was created based on industry best practices. The purpose of the strategy was to provide a “framework for the identification and protection of cultural heritage landscapes in the Town of Oakville and direction for protecting and managing these resources for the future.” Recognizing that “any landscape that has been deliberately modified by humans is a cultural landscape”, the Strategy expands on that definition, indicating that “only those cultural landscapes that have a deep connection with the history of the community and are valued by the community can be identified as ‘cultural heritage landscapes’.\(^8\)\(^,\)\(^9\)\(^,\)\(^10\)

In February 2015, Town Council “requested staff to undertake a review of the town’s major open space areas in order to determine if they should be appropriately designated as a cultural heritage landscape”.\(^11\) In doing so, it was determined that the implementation of the Cultural Heritage Landscapes Strategy be split into three phases, being: Inventory; Research and Assessment; and, Implementation of Protection.

In July 2015, Laurie Smith Heritage Consulting (LSHC) was retained to provide consulting services for the Phase One Inventory. LSHC’s report, entitled Cultural Heritage Landscape Strategy Implementation – Phase 1: Summary Report, identified 63 properties. Eight were identified as high priority properties, sixteen as medium priority properties, twenty-seven as low priority properties and twelve properties for which no further action was recommended. Properties identified as being in the high and medium priority categories were deemed to be vulnerable to change (development pressures, natural forces, and neglect); to have insufficient existing protection; and/or, to have a high level of cultural heritage value or interest. Gairloch Gardens was identified as a medium priority property.

In February 2016, Council directed the eight high priority properties proceed to Phase Two: Research and Assessment. The objective of Phase Two is to build on the findings of Phase One and to complete cultural heritage landscape assessments for properties identified in Phase One. In August 2016, Letourneau Heritage Consulting Inc. was retained to undertake this work. The Phase Two assessment of the eight high priority properties was completed in October 2018.

\(^9\) Ibid., page 5.
\(^10\) Ibid., page 5.
In July 2018, Heritage Planning staff began a Phase Two assessment of the medium-priority Gairloch Gardens property, located at 1288-1306 Lakeshore Road East.

2.2 Phase Two: Research and Assessment
The subject property was assessed and identified as a potential cultural heritage landscape in the Part One Inventory, based on the methodology laid out in the Town’s 2014 Cultural Heritage Landscape Strategy. The property was approached as a comprehensive layered unit, including all structures and other potential cultural heritage resources on site (including potential archaeological resources).

Background research included consultation with, and review of pertinent primary and secondary records held by the Land Registry Office; the central branch of Oakville Public Library; current and past Gallery staff; the Mississaugas of the Credit First Nation (formerly Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation); the archival collections of the Oakville Historical Society and the Trafalgar Township Historical Society; a review of current and historical aerial imagery and mapping; and, consultation with former residents and Gairdner and Armstrong family members.

Multiple site visits were undertaken by Heritage Planning staff during August, October and December 2018, to document current conditions and features of the property and relevant surrounding properties.

3 Cultural Landscapes and the Heritage Planning Framework

3.1 Understanding and Defining Cultural Landscapes
The term “cultural landscape” embodies a wide range of elements, including the material; the social; and, the associative. The current understanding of cultural landscapes is that they are multi-layered entities which embody a community’s cultural values. A fulsome assessment of cultural landscapes relies on compliance frameworks entrenched in heritage planning policy; defined evaluation criteria which considers both the physical and the cultural characteristics of the setting under study; and, professional expertise. The result should reflect a holistic assessment of the subject property.

3.2 Heritage Planning Frameworks

3.2.1 Municipal
In its Cultural Heritage Landscapes Strategy, the Town of Oakville describes a cultural heritage landscape as an area which displays “the recognizable imprint of human settlement and activities on land over time.”

The Strategy goes on to clarify that, “[w]hile any landscape that has been deliberately modified by humans is a cultural landscape, only those cultural landscapes that have a deep connection with the history of the community and are valued by the community can be identified as ‘cultural heritage landscapes’.”

3.2.2 Provincial
The provincial planning framework provides for the protection of cultural heritage resources, including cultural heritage landscapes. Under the Planning Act, the conservation of cultural heritage is identified as a matter of provincial interest. Part I (2, d) states:

“The Minister, the council of a municipality, a local board, a planning board and the Municipal Board, in carrying out their responsibilities under this Act, shall have regard to, among other

---

13 Ibid., page 5.
matters, matters of provincial interest such as, the conservation of features of significant architectural, cultural, historical, archaeological or scientific interest.”

Details about provincial interest as it relates to land use planning and development in the province are outlined further within the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS). The 2014 PPS explicitly states that land use planning decisions made by municipalities, planning boards, the Province, or a commission or agency of the government must be consistent with the PPS. The PPS addresses cultural heritage in Sections 1.7.1 d) and 2.6, including the protection of cultural heritage landscapes. Specifically, the definition of a cultural heritage landscape is:

“...a defined geographical area that may have been modified by human activity and is identified as having cultural heritage value or interest by a community, including an Aboriginal community. The area may involve features such as structures, spaces, archaeological sites or natural elements that are valued together for their interrelationship, meaning or association. Examples may include, but are not limited to, heritage conservation districts designated under the Ontario Heritage Act; villages, parks, gardens, battlefields, mainstreets and neighbourhoods, cemeteries, trailways, viewsheds, natural areas and industrial complexes of heritage significance; and areas recognized by federal or international designation authorities (e.g. a National Historic Site or District designation, or a UNESCO World Heritage Site).”

3.2.3 National

Parks Canada’s, The Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada, or simply the Standards and Guidelines, is a Pan-Canadian benchmark document which provides guidance on best practices in the field of heritage conservation. At its April 8, 2013, Planning and Development Council meeting, Town of Oakville Council endorsed the Standards and Guidelines, with the stated purpose of assisting “with the planning, stewardship and conservation of all listed and designated heritage resources within the Town of Oakville, in addition to existing heritage policies, plans and policies.”14 The document is intended to be used by Town staff, Heritage Oakville and Council when “reviewing proposals which impact heritage resources, such as heritage permits and development applications.” Further, Town staff should consult the Standards and Guidelines “when developing new heritage studies, plans and policies.” 15

3.2.4 International

The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, (UNESCO), identified three categories of cultural heritage landscapes. They are the:

1. Designed Landscape - the “clearly defined landscape designed and created intentionally by man.”
2. Organically Evolved Landscape - that “results from an initial social, economic, administrative, and/or religious imperative and has developed in its present form in response to its natural environment”; and,
3. Associative Cultural Landscape – which is “justifiable by virtue of the powerful religious, artistic, or cultural associations of the natural element rather than material cultural evidence, which may be insignificant or even absent.”

Within the Organically Evolved Landscape category, two sub-categories were identified. They are the:

15 Ibid., page 3.
a) Relict landscape, “in which an evolutionary process came to an end at some time in the past”, and for which “significant distinguishing features, are, however still visible in material form.”; and

b) Continuing landscape which “retains an active social role in contemporary society closely associated with the traditional way of life, and which the evolutionary process is still in progress.”

These categories were adopted by Council in January 2014, as part of the Town’s Cultural Heritage Landscapes Strategy.

4 Subject property

4.1 Property description

Gairloch Gardens is known municipally as 1288-1306 Lakeshore Road East. Legally it is identified as:

Part of Lots 7 and 8, Concession 4 Trafalgar South of Dundas Street, as in 330179, 381274, except Part 1 on Plan 20R-5754; Oakville

Gairloch Gardens is a 4.5-hectare (11.2 acre) public park which fronts onto Lake Ontario. Originally constructed as a private waterfront estate in an area which was subsequently labelled “millionaire’s row”, the property remains largely intact, including the former residential structures (1306 Lakeshore Road East), the painter’s studio (1302 Lakeshore Road East); the meandering stream which feeds three man-made ponds; and, the formal landscaped areas including the rose garden. The property’s built and natural heritage attributes maintain a remarkable degree of integrity. The estate has cultural

heritage value and significance in its evolution, design, and association with major figures and events in the history of Oakville.

Architecturally, the focal point of the property is Lt. Col. William G. MacKendrick’s early 1920s residence, and James Arthur Gairdner’s late 1940s artist studio. Located to the south-east of the property, MacKendrick constructed his home in the Tudor Revival style of architecture. Today, it is the location of Oakville Galleries in Gairloch Gardens. Sitting slightly north of the MacKendrick’s home is James A. Gairdner’s relocated artist studio, known today as “The Studio in Gairloch Gardens”. Originally constructed in Toronto Township (now the City of Mississauga), the vernacular building was moved to the property after Gairdner divorced his wife, Kathleen (Harding) Bell and moved to the subject property.18

Not to be overlooked, the other principal structure on the property is the large, open, stone and wood shelter which sits close to the lake, toward the south-east corner of the property. Known as The Teahouse, it was also constructed by Lt. Col MacKendrick and, like his former home, it displays many elements typical of Tudor style (Arts and Crafts movement inspired) architecture. Although it is hard to consider the structure a focal point of the property, tucked away as it is toward the far end of the property, the teahouse plays an important supporting role as a physical reminder of the lifestyle enjoyed by the property’s well-to-do owners.

The focal point of the property’s landscape heritage elements include a large park at the north end of the property; “intricate and well-manicured gardens” including a formal rose garden; Lake Ontario; and, man-made ponds and plantings towards the south.19 Lt. Col. MacKendrick is credited with designing and landscaping the gardens “carrying over many of the features of his Rosedale property including [the] pergola, rock garden, formal flower garden, etc. all popular features of Arts and Crafts homes being sold at the time in north Toronto.”20 He is also credited with using his company’s road building equipment to create the “entire valley fronting the Tudor-style residence [which] was carved out of a 20-foot bluff”, and with the construction of two of the three ponds.21, 22

As well as the regrading of the subject property, Lower Morrison Creek was altered. According to “‘Chestnut Point,’ Residence of Col. W. G. MacKendrick Near Oakville, Ontario”, an August 1926, Canadian Homes and Gardens magazine article about the property:

“Originally a little stream came down to the water through a swampy marshland. By damming its sluggish flow, sufficient water was secured to divert into this effective water-path, at once

---

20 Teresa Casas, former Oakville Galleries employee, interview by Planning Services staff, Oakville, Ontario, 9 December 2018.
22 Teresa Casas, former Oakville Galleries employee, interview by Planning Services staff, Oakville, Ontario, 9 December 2018.
draining the property and providing a charming landscape note. It is filled with small fry, and wild water-fowl are constantly attracted to its surface.

Rock gardens form a major part of the decorative scheme of the MacKendrick property. They are much enhanced by the use of a water-eaten rock secured from the shore of Lake Ontario near Port Credit which, being filled with innumerable small cavities, provides a natural nesting place for alpine plants.

These gardens represent an almost phenomenal development, as one realizes that three years ago, it did not exist. It is a tribute to the ingenuity in conceiving and tirelessness in carrying out the owner’s plans. The use of bordering conifers with the slight formality of benches adds dignity to this vista. This walk is the nearest approach to formality which the garden offers.”23

These landscape heritage elements physically embody “Picturesque” design principles. Picturesque landscape design emerged in Britain in the 18th century and came to North America in the latter half of the 19th century. Principal features include: “open, smoothly undulating and grass-covered landforms integrated with streams or bodies of water; trees planted in irregular groupings that frame and articulate open spaces; meandering, serpentine roads and pathways that follow the undulations of the land; and, singular specimen trees, buildings, bridges or other structures that play a supportive and “punctuating” role within the larger landscape composition.”24

Gairloch Gardens is a picturesque landscape which has been described as “one of the Town of Oakville’s major natural attractions.”25 It is comprised predominantly of open natural areas which include hardscaping features (pathways, garden structures, seating areas) and man-made landscape features (ponds and gardens) which compliment, and take advantage of, the property’s natural landscape elements.

3.2 Context
Gairloch Gardens is owned by the Town of Oakville and is a Part IV heritage designated property, (under Section 29 of the Ontario Heritage Act), pursuant to By-law 1986-192. The designation by-law is attached as Appendix B. A plan showing the extent of the property is attached as Appendix C.

3.3 Current Conditions
Gairloch Gardens is located on the south side of Lakeshore Road East, east of Trafalgar Road and west of Winston Churchill Boulevard. Lower Morrison Creek runs along the west side of the property. Lake Ontario forms the property’s south-most boundary, the result of which is “an uninterrupted view of Lake Ontario and the waterfront shoreline.”26

The property lies approximately half way between old Oakville at Sixteen Mile Creek and the Town’s eastern border at Winston Churchill Boulevard. It is the largest public open space east of Sixteen Mile Creek and south of Lakeshore Road East.

Residential areas surround the property, including several heritage properties. Amongst these are ‘grand estate houses’ which were built for wealthy, 19th and early 20th century Torontonians. Some properties of note include Ennisclare at 40 Cox Drive; Dearcroft Montessori School (formerly Peterkin House) at 1167 Lakeshore Road East; Ballymena Estate at 1198-1208 Lakeshore Road East; and, Grenvilla Lodge at 1248 and 1250 Lakeshore Road East.

Figure 3: “Inventory Report: 1288-1306 Lakeshore Rd. East, Gairloch Estate”

3.4 Structures
As a “clearly defined landscape [which was] designed and created intentionally by man” Gairloch Gardens is a multi-layered property which includes five structures; three principal and two accessory. These include the Mackendrick family’s early 1920s residence and teahouse, an open-sided, stone, tile

---

and wood shelter; James Gairdner’s relocated, late 1940s artist studio; and, two late 20th/early 21st century accessory outbuildings.

5 History of the area

Indigenous history indicates that several centuries of human activity occurred in the area.30 “The Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation is part of the Ojibway (Anishinabe) Nation, one of the largest Aboriginal Nations in North America.”31 “Before contact with Europeans and until the late 1600s,” the Mississaugas were located on territory “just to the west of Manitoulin Island and east of Sault Ste. Marie.”32 Historians generally agree that it wasn’t until the late 17th or early 18th century, after many years of military conflict and “full-scale regional warfare” between the Anishinabe and Iroquois, that the Mississaugas settled permanently in Southern Ontario, having “negotiated a peace treaty with the Mohawk Nation” and after the Iroquois’ final removal from the area.33, 34 These Mississauga settlers “are the direct ancestors of the present Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation” now known as the Mississaugas of the Credit First Nation.35

At the same time, around the early to mid-17th century, and with more Europeans arriving and establishing colonies, Eastern North America’s Aboriginal Nations found themselves in “increasingly complex political, economic and military alliances with the two main competing European Nations – France and England.”36 Throughout the 18th century the local Mississaugas were involved in the fur trade, and although they continued to follow a seasonal cycle of movement and resource harvesting, they also practiced agriculture of domesticated food crops.37, 38, 39

“From the time of the conquest of New France in 1760, the British Crown recognized the inherent rights of First Nations and their ownership of the lands they occupied.”40 Further, the Royal Proclamation of 1763 “prevented anyone, other than the Crown, from purchasing that land.”41 In 1788, by proclamation under the Imperial Act of Parliament, the, “first municipal organization of what is now the Province of Ontario, was made by Lord Dorchester.”42 By 1792, the subject property lay within the Home District of Upper Canada.

---

31 Ibid., page 4.
32 Ibid., page 2.
33 Ibid., page 6.
34 Ibid., page 7.
36 Ibid., page 6.
37 Ibid., page 10.
38 Ibid., page 11.
39 Ibid., page 4.
41 Ibid.
42 Pope, J.H., Illustrated Historical Atlas of the County of Halton, Ont., 1877. Page 54
On 2 August 1805, the Mississaugas of the Credit and the Crown entered into a provisional agreement, known as *Head of the Lake Treaty (provisional)*. The agreement saw the Mississaugas cede “70 784 acres of land bounded by the Toronto Purchase of 1787 in the east, the Brant Tract in the west, and a northern boundary that ran six miles back from the shoreline of Lake Ontario.” In return they “were to receive £1000 of trade goods and the sole right of fisheries at 12 and 16 Mile Creeks along with the possession of each creek’s flats.” Thirteen months later, on 5 September 1806, the *Head of the Lake Treaty (provisional)* was confirmed with the signing of the *Head of the Lake Treaty, No. 14*. The subject property lies within the lands covered by this treaty.

It is important to note that, per a 21 September 2016, Statement of Claim, the Mississaugas’ contend that:

> At no time did the MNCFN or their ancestors surrender their aboriginal title to the water, beds of water, or floodplains in the MNCFN lands. The treaties signed by the “River Credit” Mississaugas with the British Crown are silent on water. No water within the MNCFN traditional territory was included or excluded in the treaties, with the exception of one treaty (Surrender No. 23).

This includes the waters of Lower Morrison Creek, which flows through the west side of the subject property.

---

43 Oakville Public Library, *Sketch of Land Purchase from the Mississauga Indians 1805*, OPLOIMI0001
45 Ibid.
47 Mississaugas of the Credit First Nation, *Aboriginal Title to Water, Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation (Formerly Known As Mississaugas of the New Credit Indian Band), Statement of Claim*, 21 September 2016. Page 4.
Upon the finalization of the land surrender and in order to facilitate European settlement, Samuel Street Wilmot, a Deputy Provincial Surveyor, conducted a survey of the area. Known as the Wilmot Map, Dundas Street was used as the baseline for the survey, having, in 1793, already been surveyed as a military road. Wilmot’s survey divided the area into three townships. Originally, Township No. 1 on the east “was given the Indian name of Toronto. No. 2 was named Alexander and no. 3, Grant, in honour of the President and Administrator of the Government of Upper Canada, the Honourable Alexander Grant.” However, a few weeks later, during “Britain's greatest naval victory,” Vice Admiral Horatio Lord Nelson was fatally wounded during the Battle of Trafalgar. The victory and Nelson’s ultimate sacrifice overshadowed Lieutenant Governor Grant’s accomplishments, and his namesake townships were renamed to Trafalgar and Nelson respectively.

Settlement quickly followed, “effectively surrounding the Mississauga and depleting the forests, fisheries and other resources on which they depended.” In 1853, the County of Halton was formed and consisted of the Townships of Esquesing, Trafalgar, Nelson, and Nassagaweya. In 1857, the municipality of the Town of Oakville was added to the County of Halton.

---

Figure 5: “Trafalgar, Plan of the Second Township, In the Tract of Land lately Purchased from the Mississagna [sic] Indians”, by Samuel L. Wilmot, Surveyor. 28 June 1806.52

Figure 6: Detail of “Trafalgar, Plan of the Second Township, In the Tract of Land lately Purchased from the Mississagna [sic] Indians”, by Samuel L. Wilmot, Surveyor. 28 June 180653

52 Oakville Public Library, *Map of Trafalgar Township 1806*, OPL43051
53 Ibid.
5.1 History of the property

5.1.1 Post Contact (1806 – present)
The subject property straddles Lots 7 and 8, Concession 4 SDS, which was originally known as Broken Front concession. In 1812, the Patentee Richard Willcose received a 35-acre Crown Grant for Lot 7, Broken Front concession. In 1839, the Patentee Richard Coates Sr. (1778 – 1868) received a Crown Grant for Lot 8, Broken Front concession, for what appears to be 46-acres.

Although Land Registry records indicate that Richard Willcose owned Lot 7 for just three months before selling the property, the Wilmot Map, (Samuel L. Wilmot’s 1806 plan), shows Willcose as the owner/resident of both this parcel and the 200-acre lot immediately north of the subject property (Lot 7, Conc. 3 SDS). Despite this, Willcose seems to have left no historic record of his time in, nor his association with, Trafalgar Township.

Richard Coates Sr. retained ownership of Lot 8, Conc. 4 SDS for slightly more than fifteen years until he sold 46 acres to his son Richard Coates Jr. Land Registry records indicate that most of the property remained in the Coates family until Orpheus A. and Sabina E. Coates sold 36 acres to Richard Hallaran in April 1863.

Figure 7: Tremaine’s Map of the County of Halton, Canada West, 1858

---

Tremaine, George C., *Tremaine’s map of the county of Halton, Canada West*, Town of Oakville, Heritage Planning files.
Lower Morrison Creek, formerly known as Coates’ Creek, runs through the property. It is likely that Coates’ Creek was named after Richard Coates Senior.

Coates was a well-known and respected resident who had a varied career. Before immigrating to Upper Canada, he served as Bandmaster in the British Army, where he “led his band at the Battle of Waterloo.”55 In his 1824 land petition, Coates described himself as a painter, who was described by a peer as an “estimable and ingenious man, whose name is associated...with the early dawn of the fine arts in York [later Toronto].”56 His work included portraits and “symbolical decorations of the interior of the Temple of Sharon”, which he painted at the request of David Willson, the founder of the “Children of Peace”, an Upper Canadian Quaker sect.57, 58

As well as being a gifted painter, Coates Sr. built organs. In addition to the one he built for himself, he built one for the Children of Peace, for whom he was the first organist and choirmaster.59 In 1831, Coates Sr. relocated to Trafalgar Township where he purchased property, (Lot 8, 3 Concession SDS), which he named “Thornton Farm” after his birthplace in England.60 After acquiring the subject property in late 1839, Coates Sr. set up a sawmill on the creek that was named in his honour.61 Coates Sr. retained ownership of Lot 8, Conc. 4 SDS for slightly more than fifteen years, until he sold 46 acres to his son, Richard Coates Jr., for “his natural love and affection...and the sum of five pounds.”62 Land Registry records indicate that most of the property remained in the Coates family until Orpheus A. and Sabina E. Coates sold 36 acres to Richard Hallaran in April 1863 for $825.63

The most likely candidates for whom Morrison Creek was renamed are John, James and Peter Morrison. Natives of Dunblane, Scotland, the three brothers were butchers and cattle exporters. Every year they purchased “two or three hundred head of cattle” which they kept on their farm located west of the subject property.64 They also ran a butcher shop “east of the Romain Block” and every July when local farmers brought their stock to the Morrison’s shop to be weighed, the “east end of Colborne Street near the bridge was filled with lowing and milling cattle.”65 The house on the Morrison farm, which today is known municipally as 1189 Lakeshore Road East, was “built by brothers John, James and Peter Morrison in 1886 [and] was the second house on the property.”66

55 Hazel C. Mathews, Oakville and the Sixteen: The History of an Ontario Port (University of Toronto Press Incorporated, 1953), Page 278.
56 Ibid., page 278.
57 Ibid., page 278.
59 Hazel C. Mathews, Oakville and the Sixteen: The History of an Ontario Port (University of Toronto Press Incorporated, 1953), Page 278.
60 Ibid., page 278.
61 Ibid., page 278.
62 Land Registry Office record, Instrument 591, being a Bargain & Sale dated 4 February 1856.
63 Land Registry Office record, Instrument 209, being a Bargain & Sale dated 21 April 1863.
64 Hazel C. Mathews, Oakville and the Sixteen: The History of an Ontario Port (University of Toronto Press Incorporated, 1953), Page 358.
65 Ibid., page 358.
Alternatively, the creek could have been named for William Morrison, a son of one of the brothers who later ran the family farm.  

Other notable early Lot 7 owners include William Francis Romain; William Leach; and, Reuben Simeon Bacon.

William Francis Romain (1818-1869), was a Canadian businessman and politician. Between 1849 and 1851, Romain owned Lot 7. Born in Quebec City, he was the first Postmaster of Brampton, where he was also a grain merchant. Relocating to Oakville in 1847, he married Esther Ann Chisholm, a daughter of Oakville founder William Chisholm. Romain served as Reeve of Trafalgar Township; as a member of Town Council; and as Oakville’s second Mayor from 1863 to 1865.

William Leach (1817-1901) was the son of Joshua Leach, after whom Joshua Creek is named. Leach purchased Lot 7 from William F. Romain and maintained ownership of the property very briefly, between 1851 and 1852. Joshua Leach (1776-1862), owned the lot north of the subject property and operated a sawmill there relying on his namesake stream for its operation. In 1844, William took over the operation of the mill from his father.

Reuben Simeon Bacon (1825-1900) owned Lot 7 between 1872 and 1889. Research revealed very little information about Reuben S. Bacon, however his son Samuel Edward Bacon (born c. 1865) is likely the Bacon denoted in the 1906, Carson and Bacon plan of subdivision referred to in Hazel C. Mathews book, Oakville and the Sixteen: The History of an Ontario Port.  

Encompassing part of Lot 11, Concession 4 SDS, and lying west of Gairloch Gardens, the Carson and Bacon subdivision established Park Avenue, which ran between Colborne Street (later Lakeshore Road East) to the north, and the lakefront. With the addition of land to the east, the area became known as Orchard Beach. Orchard Beach was created in response to a demand for summer cottages and was described as “a plan of subdivision that was marketed as an out of town country destination for city residents from both Toronto and Hamilton.”

69 David Ashe and Joyce Burnell, Oakville Street Names & Landmarks. Page 13.
72 Hazel C. Mathews, Oakville and the Sixteen: The History of an Ontario Port (University of Toronto Press Incorporated, 1953), Page 433.
74 Town of Oakville, Engineering and Construction files, “Registered Plan 114”, November 1907.
75 Hazel C. Mathews, Oakville and the Sixteen: The History of an Ontario Port (University of Toronto Press Incorporated, 1953), Page 433.
Historically, Oakville’s location, beautiful scenery and strong economy made it an attractive destination to visit and in which to live. As well as being a source of transportation for both goods and people, Lake Ontario also provided recreation to residents and visitors. Amongst these visitors was a small group of “wealthy businessmen from Toronto and elsewhere [who bought] property along the lakefront”.78 The result “was that large homes, stables… and beautifully landscaped grounds leading down to the lake became the norm. In fact, so many of these businessmen arrived between 1900 and 1930 that the lakefront became known as Millionaires row.”79

5.1.2 The MacKendrick era (1910 – 1960)
Family history indicates that Lt. Col. William Gordon MacKendrick (1864-1959), who made his fortune as a road builder, amassed between 350 and 400 acres of land running from Lake Ontario to Upper Middle Road.80 Land Registry Office records indicate that MacKendrick made two purchases in Lot 7, Concession 4 SDS. The first purchase occurred on 7 June 1910, when MacKendrick and his wife Sarah Corrine King (1866-1913) bought the “westerly half of broken front, Lot number Seven in the Fourth concession South of Dundas Street in the said Township of Trafalgar, containing by admeasurement twenty acres…more or less”, from the Ontario Oddfellows Home Association, for $35,500.81

The second purchase occurred in November 1921, when Col. MacKendrick bought from William Henry Brouse, 11.47 acres of “part of Lot Number Eight in the Broken Front, or Fourth Concession, S.D.S.”, for $15,500.82 It was after this second purchase that Colonel MacKendrick, as he was more commonly
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78 *A History of Oakville: Our Beautiful Town by the Lake, Lifestyle.*
79 Ibid.
81 *Indenture 10038*, being a Bargain & Sale, dated 7 June 1910. Land Registry Office records.
known, built his home. Constructed between 1923 and 1924 and developed as a private, waterfront estate, MacKendrick named the property “Chestnut Point”.

![Figure 9: Chestnut Point, undated](image)

William Gordon MacKendrick was one of eight children born to James MacKendrick and Clara Crane, in Galt (now Cambridge), Ontario. Educated at Galt’s Central School and Collegiate Institute, MacKendrick followed up “this basic education” by learning, through hands-on experience, the trade of road building. Described as a “major road builder and promoter of city parks and gardens”, by 1913, MacKendrick was a man of significant property, owning a house with extensive gardens in Rosedale as well as his summer home on Centre Island and land outside of Oakville (the subject property).

---


84 Image courtesy of Oakville Galleries


86 Ibid.
Sometime after April 1923, after the death of his wife Corrine, (more commonly known as Cora), in 1913; the death of their eldest son Gordon in France in 1916; and, having served in WWI, MacKendrick constructed a rural retreat for he and his family.89 “Chestnut Point” was built “in a grove of chestnut

---

88 Image courtesy of Oakville Galleries.
trees“ and was constructed in a design which “was very similar to [his] Toronto house”. 90, 91 Built in 1911, Lt. Col. MacKendrick’s Rosedale home was constructed in the Tudor Revival style, a style influenced by the Arts and Crafts movement, and was based on a design by Ashton Pentecost which was said to be “inspired by the English homes of British architect Charles F.A. Voysey.”92, 93 This building, located at 55 Roxborough Drive, still stands. At Gairloch, MacKendrick went so far as to replicate the ravine topography of his Rosedale home. Utilizing his professional acumen “designing and building roads”, he “created a rise [of land] using the road building machinery that was typically used to level such geographic features.”94 95

According to MacKendrick’s son Harry, his father chose to settle in Oakville after the war mostly because he wanted a larger garden.96 Lt. Col. MacKendrick is credited with altering “the original sand cliff which separated the grounds form the lake…into a gentle sloping bank.”97 He laid flat lake stones “into the pathways which led to the canopied teahouse and down to the lake [and] landscaped the grounds with [trellises], hedges, trees and shrubs to preserve and enhance his beloved vistas.”98

---

90 David Ashe and Joyce Burnell, Oakville Street Names & Landmarks: Gairloch Gardens. Page 38.
92 Ibid., page 12-6.
96 Ibid.
98 Ibid., page 16.
Further, he “dammed Morrison Creek just south of Lakeshore Road to create two duck ponds. Beyond these ponds he planted rose gardens and extensive vegetable garden. At a similar distance the tennis courts were located.”

Lt. Col. MacKendrick was the President of the Toronto Horticultural Society, and Harry MacKendrick states that at one time the gardens “featured more than 350 different varieties of roses.”

Another theory posits that MacKendrick built Chestnut Point as a personal retreat from the fast pace of city life and the “global political sphere that he had once embraced as city builder and servant of the British Empire.” A popular belief at the time, known as the Park Movement, espoused the view that the “park as a restorative environment” provided beneficial effects “of beauty as it was manifested in nature.” “Crowded housing was thought to undermine a community’s moral standards” and country life was thought to be “imbued with higher moral standards.”

The Park Movement sprang from a desire to improve the health of those who were living in overcrowded, rapidly growing industrial towns. By the end of the Victorian era, public parks had become symbols of civic pride and a means of providing its users with attractive, natural surroundings in which to enjoy their leisure time. Further, the need for public open space was deemed necessary in order to provide the ‘lower levels of society’ with opportunities for betterment. To this end, parks often included attractions such as music, sports, horticultural displays, museums, art galleries and/or libraries.

101 Ibid.
102 Ibid.
103 Ibid.
In an August 1979, newspaper interview, Harry MacKendrick spoke about the “heart, energy and money that Dad [Lt. Col. MacKendrick] poured into this place” as being “stupendous.” He went on to describe life at Chestnut Point as well as the 350-acre farm that lay north of Gairloch.

“It was just heaven to live here... Every Saturday during the summer – rain or shine – we would have a picnic and play tennis on courts which were near the present ‘studio’. When we got hot we went down to the change house (now used to house ducks, swans and pigeons) and swam in the lake, which wasn’t polluted then. We had a big war canoe and my brothers and I used to take it out in storms and we were dumped – frequently.”

He also reminisced about “farming Jersey cattle and later turkeys” on the farm. The subject property also included “a bowling green by the lake” and a “pheasant sanctuary near the entrance of the house.”

Figures 16 and 17: Stone pillars on the driveway between 1310 Lakeshore Road East and 1306 Lakeshore Road East, north of the studio, circa 1950s and 30 August 2018.

Neighbours also offered up recreational distractions in the form of a “polo field [that] was adjacent” to the subject property where “its upper end spectators could watch show-jumping horses.”

As his children matured, Lt. Col. MacKendrick ‘sold’ land along the driveway “for homes to two of his married children.” Land Registry Office records indicate that on 8 April 1926, the first gift of land

---

107 Ibid., page A2.
108 Ibid., page A2.
109 Figure 16 image courtesy Janet Armstrong
went to his son Dane Evan MacKendrick (1900-1952) when he purchased, for “Love and $1” part of Lot 7 and 8, Concession 4 SDS.112 Today this property is known municipally as 1314 Lakeshore Road East.

On 6 November 1934, Lt. Col. MacKendrick gifted land to his son-in-law and daughter, Christopher Armstrong (1906-1955) and Clara Georgina Armstrong (1909-1992). For “Love and $1”, the Armstongs received part of Lot 7 and 8, Concession 4 SDS, which today is known municipally as 1312 Lakeshore Road East.114 This parcel of land lies immediately south of the land gifted to her brother Dane. Lt. Col. MacKendrick’s third gift of land occurred in April 1955, when he ‘sold’ another parcel of land to the Armstongs for $1. This property was identified as “Part Lot 8 & other lands” and lay on the west side of the private laneway, west of 1312 Lakeshore Road East.115 On 10 January 1974, Clara G. Chisholm, (Armstrong’s widow and at the time married to Kenneth T. Chisholm), donated this land to the Town of Oakville.116

---

112 ONLAND, Ontario Land Registry Access. Grant 15711  
https://www.onland.ca/ui/20/books/23278/viewer/416799?page=107 (accessed 1 November 2018). Historical Books, Halton County, Trafalgar Township, Page 107. Used on an as is basis with the permission of Teranet Inc.
113 1314 Lakeshore Road East, image courtesy Janet Armstrong.
114 ONLAND, Ontario Land Registry Access. Grant 18237  
https://www.onland.ca/ui/20/books/23278/viewer/59779082?page=108 (accessed 1 November 2018). Historical Books, Halton County, Trafalgar Township, Page 108. Used on an as is basis with the permission of Teranet Inc.
115 ONLAND, Ontario Land Registry Access. Grant 41401  
https://www.onland.ca/ui/20/books/23278/viewer/59902474?page=147 (accessed 1 November 2018). Historical Books, Halton County, Trafalgar Township, Page 147. Used on an as is basis with the permission of Teranet Inc.
116 ONLAND, Ontario Land Registry Access. Grant 381274, ONLAND  
https://www.onland.ca/ui/20/books/23278/viewer/26216969?page=152 (accessed 1 November 2018). Historical Books, Halton County, Trafalgar Township, Page 152. Used on an as is basis with the permission of Teranet Inc.
According to his son, Harry MacKendrick, Lt. Col. MacKendrick “was active [on the property] up to the day he died at 95 years of age.” After his death on 22 September 1955, his third wife, Annie Edna Spratt (1900-1984), retained ownership of the property until she and co-Executor George Edward Hill, Solicitor, sold the property to Clarence H. Stabler, of Toronto. Stabler owned the property for slightly more than four months, having purchased it on 2 May 1960, until he in turn sold it to James Arthur Gairdner (1893-1971) on 15 September 1960.

5.1.3 The Gairdner era (1960 – 1972)

James Arthur Gairdner, or “Big Jim” as he was known to his grandchildren, was “an athlete, a soldier, a stockbroker, a businessman, a philanthropist and a landscaper painter.” During World War I, Gairdner...
“joined the York-Rangers as a Lieutenant, and served with the 3rd Battalion in France, retiring in 1918 with the rank of major.” He was described as “a significant local and Canadian figure”; a “millionaire financier”; and, a “significant philanthropist whose many legacies include an internationally known foundation” which “recognizes important international discoveries in the field of medical research.” Gairdner was the Honourary Chairman of Gairdner and Co. Ltd.; an Honourary Chairman of Oakville-Trafalgar Memorial Hospital; the President and Founder of the Gairdner Foundation; and, a Past Chairman of the Canadian Arthritis and Rheumatism Society.

According to his son, John S. Gairdner, his father moved to Oakville “soon after World War 1.”

In his early 50s, with the onset of severe arthritis, Gairdner donated half a million dollars to establish the Gairdner Foundation. The Foundation was formed to “recognize major research contributions in the

---

128 Image used with permission from the Cleeve Horne Estate. Not to be used without permission. www.cleevehorne.com
conquest of disease and human suffering.” Awarded since 1959, and as of 2017, of the 320 recipients some 87 have subsequently gone on to win the Nobel Prize for Medicine. The Gairdner Foundation continues to operate today.

Gairdner, who was of Scottish descent, renamed the estate from Chestnut Point to Gairloch, after a small village in Scotland. In Gaelic, gairloch means “short lake.” Records indicate that the subject property was the third of Gairdner’s properties to be named as such. According to a March 1968, Toronto Life magazine article, the first Gairloch was “a 26-acre estate in Oakville.” The second Gairloch was the Toronto Township (later Mississauga) property that he shared with his second wife Kathleen Gairdner.

James Gairdner is responsible for the existence of the artist studio on the subject property. In 1960, upon divorcing his wife Ethel Kathleen nee Harding (1908-1991) of Harding Carpets fame, Gairdner moved his studio westward down Lakeshore Road from the home they shared in what is now Mississauga, to the subject property, where it continued to serve its original purpose until Gairdner’s death in early 1971. According to the January 2012, Heritage Impact Statement report written by City of Mississauga Heritage Planning staff:

“In the late 1940s, Gairdner took up painting, inspired by his stepdaughter Daphne. According to Daphne, it relaxed him and was great stress relief for his demanding career. He enrolled in art classes at the Art Gallery of Toronto. There he befriended York Wilson, Jack Bush and Cleeve Horne. However, they, specifically Bush, according to his biography, written by wife Lela Wilson, felt that Gairdner was a “natural primitive and just wanted to keep him painting in his own way.”

Gairdner built himself a studio west of the main house. Lela Wilson describes how he invited his artist friends for the laying of the cornerstone. Cleeve Horne did the honours and was rewarded with a silver trowel. According to Lela Wilson, the studio, which included a well-stocked bar, kitchen and bedroom, was “perfect, the envy of every artist.”

---

130 William D. Gairdner, grandson of James A. Gairdner. Interview by Planning Services staff, Oakville, Ontario. 20 February 2019
134 Land Registry Office record, Instrument 130104, being a Grant dated 15 September 1960.
William D. Gairdner, James Gairdner’s grandson, articulated the value of the studio to his grandfather:

“The funeral was held as he would have wanted, in his magnificent light-filled painting studio at his Oakville home…festooned with hundreds of the paintings he had so enjoyed creating of all the places dear to his heart.”137

The studio was designed by Oakville Architect William Gould Armstrong, who, with Gairdner’s move to the subject property, also became his neighbour.138 William Armstrong tried to dissuade his client, and new neighbour, to leave the studio behind as it fit the architectural style of Gairdner’s Toronto Township/Mississauga home but not the style of Mackendrick’s.139 Undeterred, Gairdner and his studio both moved west. In the late 1970s the studio was “run as an art shop by a committee of some 60 volunteers.”140

Gairdner’s philanthropy continued with his death. When he passed away in 1971, the property was bequeathed to the Town, with the caveat that his wife be allowed to “use and occupy...my said residence and property for a period not exceeding one year from the date of my death”, an opportunity of which she availed herself, resulting in the property being transferred to the Town in early 1972.141 The gift came with conditions, specifically that “Without imposing any trust or legal obligation upon the Council of the said Town, it is my wish that they use my said residence and the land immediately adjacent thereto as an Art Gallery for the display of works of art by contemporary artists and the remaining land as a public park.”142 It has been used as a public art gallery/art museum and park ever since, and has been identified as being “among Canada’s best-known regional showcases for contemporary art.”143

5.1.4 The Town of Oakville era (1972 to present)

After taking ownership of the subject property, “the Mayor appointed the Gairloch Gardens committee to oversee the estate. Under the committee’s management the main house was opened up as an art gallery/art museum and the grounds “as a ‘walking garden’ in the sense of a botanical garden attraction.”144

138 Janet Armstrong, daughter of William Gould Armstrong, former residents of 1314 Lakeshore Road East, interview by Planning Services staff, Oakville, Ontario. 8 November 2018.
139 Ibid.
142 Ibid., unnumbered page.
In January 1974, when Lt. Col. MacKendrick’s daughter Clara Georgina (Gina) Chisholm ‘sold’ the parcel of land lying along the west side of the driveway to the Town of Oakville for $2, the configuration of the grounds as they exist today was complete.\textsuperscript{145}

That same year, “through the efforts of a group of dedicated volunteers”, Gairloch Gallery opened within MacKendrick’s former residence.\textsuperscript{146} Records conflict, but in 1978 or 1980, Oakville Galleries was incorporated, amalgamating Centennial and Gairloch Galleries. Between 1985 and 1986, the south end of the former residence, where historically the garage had existed, was enlarged to make room for “an education facility and additional art rental space.”\textsuperscript{147}

On 15 September 1986, Gairloch Gardens was designated a Part IV heritage property, (under Section 29 of the Ontario Heritage Act), pursuant to By-law 1986-192.

In 1990, the exhibition galleries on the second floor were converted into the gallery’s administrative offices. At the time the gallery served as an art centre where “works are exhibited, classes taught and paintings rented. The grounds, which are maintained by the Town’s Parks and Open Space department, have been further landscaped and continue to be used as horticultural, walking garden.”\textsuperscript{148} Today, classes are taught, and works are exhibited, however, the gallery’s art rental and sales program was dismantled in the early 2000s.\textsuperscript{149}

Accessory structures on the property include an equipment storage shed and a small pre-cast utility building. The storage shed, which was built in the early 1980s, lies south of the trellis-enclosed, rose garden and is used by the Town’s Parks and Open Space staff. The pre-cast utility building, which houses the water supply for the park, was built in 2005 and sits north of the stairs leading down from the driveway to the table land close to the north-most pond and walking path. Neither have any known heritage value.

Other man-made features added to the property after the Town assumed ownership include the third, south-most, man-made pond; a variety of sculptures and commemorative plaques; and, wooden benches. They have no known heritage value.


\textsuperscript{148} Ibid., unnumbered page.

\textsuperscript{149} Matthew Hyland, Director/Curator, Oakville Galleries, interview by Planning Services staff, Oakville, Ontario, 7 February 2019.
### 5.1.5 Summary of post contact property owners

Below is a summary of the property owners of Lots 7 and 8, Concession 4 SDS from the Crown Grant to the present. The rows shaded grey indicate ownership after the estimated construction of the current house.

**Lot 7:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Owner</th>
<th>Period of Ownership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Richard Willcose (Patentee)</td>
<td>April 1812 - July 1812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John C. Harris</td>
<td>1812 – 1832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George McCraney</td>
<td>1832 - 1834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elijah Dexter</td>
<td>1834 – 1835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John C. Griswold</td>
<td>1835 – 1838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anson Griswold</td>
<td>1838 - 1840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diadana Hilliard (or Hilbrand)</td>
<td>1840 - 1849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Francis Romain</td>
<td>1849 – 1851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Leach</td>
<td>1851 - 1852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Spencer</td>
<td>1852 - 1865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Levey</td>
<td>1865 – 1872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reuben Simeon Bacon</td>
<td>1872 – 1889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert W. Dodd &amp; James Boomer</td>
<td>1889 – 1890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Boomer</td>
<td>1890 – 1904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario Oddfellows Association</td>
<td>1904 – 1910</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Lot 8:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Owner</th>
<th>Period of Ownership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Richard Coates Sr. (Patentee)</td>
<td>1839 – 1856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Coates Jr.</td>
<td>1856 – 1861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orpheus Alexander Coates</td>
<td>1861 – 1863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Hallaran</td>
<td>1863 – 1864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry McCardle</td>
<td>1864 – 1874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Scarlett</td>
<td>1874 - 1888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitty E. B. Scarlett</td>
<td>1888 - 1888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Jane Walls</td>
<td>1888 – 1907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Henry Brouse</td>
<td>1907 – 1921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Gordon MacKendrick</td>
<td>1921 – 1960</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Part Lots 7 & 8:**

Ownership of the two parcels (Part Lots 7 and 8) is combined in 1921 with Lt. Col. MacKendrick’s purchase of part of Lot 8, Concession 4 from William H. Brouse.

---

150 According to “Trafalgar, Plan of the Second Township, In the Tract of Land lately Purchased from the Mississauga [sic Indians],” by Samuel L. Wilmot, Surveyor, 28 June 1806, Richard Willcose is residing on Concession 4, Lot 7 before the Crown issues the 14 April 1812 Patent.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Owner</th>
<th>Period of Ownership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>William Gordon MacKendrick</td>
<td>1921 – 1960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clara Georgina Chisholm</td>
<td>1955 – 1974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarence H. Stabler</td>
<td>1960 – 1960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Arthur Gairdner</td>
<td>1960 - 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Corporation of the Town of Oakville</td>
<td>1972 - present</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2 Structure chronology

5.2.1 MacKendrick’s residence and teahouse – c. 1923

Lt. Col. William G. MacKendrick’s home and teahouse were the first buildings to be constructed on site. Their precise dates of construction are unknown, however, based on Land Registry property records and unattributed plans and elevations, the buildings were erected sometime after April 1923.151

Constructed in the era of the Arts and Crafts movement, MacKendrick’s buildings reflect the “wonderfully informal and unpretentious, subtly sophisticated” style of English country houses.152 The Arts and Crafts movement “found supporters in North America, where nostalgia for the past and admiration of things British fostered the transatlantic development of this revival. It was especially popular in certain affluent suburbs of Toronto, Vancouver and Victoria.”153

Strictly speaking, Arts and Crafts wasn’t an architectural style, instead it was “an intellectual approach to many styles.”154 It was “an approach to architectural design [which] sought to create buildings that had the rightness to place and the sense of belonging characteristic of vernacular architecture.”155 Instead of prescribing the use of specific architectural elements and details, Arts and Crafts houses were to be built to reflect “an informal but cultured lifestyle”.156 Physically, this manifested itself in open floor plans; the use of natural (and preferably local) materials such as stone, brick and wood; and, light-filled rooms that “encourage interaction with the outdoors.”157 British architects such as C.F.A. Voysey and Edwin Lutyens “stressed informal, functional plans, fairly spare decoration that suggested hand-craftsmanship, and a harmony with the setting that brought the ideas of the early nineteenth-century

---

153 Ibid., pages 153 & 156.
157 Ibid.
Picturesque movement into the twentieth.\textsuperscript{158} MacKendrick’s buildings reflect the philosophy of both the Arts and Crafts and the Picturesque movements.

Architecturally, the focal point of the property is MacKendrick’s Tudor Revival style house. Located at 1306 Lakeshore Road East, the building sits on the property’s “highest elevation and provides an impressive view of the gardens and waterfront.”\textsuperscript{159} Built from repurposed sandstone which was “taken from the various barns which previously stood on the property”, it served for almost 50 years as the MacKendrick family home.\textsuperscript{160}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figures22_and_23.png}
\caption{Figures 22 and 23: MacKendrick residence west and north elevations, April 1923}
\end{figure}

Tudor Revival architecture drew “inspiration from the rural vernacular architecture of Tudor England” and was popular around the same time as the Arts and Crafts movement. Typical Tudor Revival built heritage elements found on the residence include its “generally picturesque, asymmetrical massing”; steeply pitched and irregular rooflines; prominent gables; and, its leaded glass and bay windows.\textsuperscript{161} The house also includes deeply projecting eaves and a flared, steeply pitched rooftop which, at the time of its construction, constituted the south end of the structure, see figure 22.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figures24_and_25.png}
\caption{Figures 24 and 25: MacKendrick residence east and south elevations, April 1923}
\end{figure}

Lt. Col. MacKendrick also constructed the teahouse “a large open shelter supported on brick piers” which sits south-east of the former MacKendrick family home, overlooking the shore of Lake Ontario. According to his son, Harry MacKendrick, the teahouse was called “The Look-Out”. Constructed of materials similar to those used on the residence, the structure match the porches on the house, and display elements typical of Tudor Revival style architecture, including it’s “low, ground hugging contours”; rustic, natural building materials; and, exposed rafter tails.

Figure 26: Large open shelter, known as the Teahouse, to the south-east of MacKendrick’s residence, c. 1960-1971

Figures 27 and 28: Teahouse details, 1992\textsuperscript{166}

Figure 29: “The Look-Out”, MacKendrick’s teahouse. West façade, December 2018

---

5.2.2  Artist studio - c. late 1940s, relocated to the subject property c. 1960

James Arthur Gairdner’s late 1940s artist studio is the other principal structure on the property. Relocated to the subject property in 1960, the studio sits north of the former MacKendrick family home, on, or near to, the site of the former tennis courts. Gairdner constructed the studio in the late 1940s at his home in the far south-west corner of Mississauga (formerly known as Toronto Township). Architecturally, the studio was built to complement the Modern Classical style house that his wife, Kathleen (nee Harding), and her first husband, Charles Powell Bell (1908-1938), had built in late 1937.

Described by his grandson, William D. Gairdner, as being “light-filled”, the former studio physically embodies the early 20th-century Modern architecture philosophy that form should follow function; ornamentation rejected; and, minimalism embraced.

The studio is a one-and-a-half-storey building which is bracketed by two, one-storey wings: one on the north elevation and the other on the south. The structure is clad in white, horizontal clapboard siding. The three sections are capped by open gable roofs which are minimally ornamented with return eaves. A central interior stone chimney sits at the junction of the one-storey north wing and the larger one-and-a-half storey section of the building.

![Figure 32: The studio, north-west corner, 30 August 2018](image)

The west façade is dominated by a projecting bay, floor-to-almost-ceiling window. Configured in a three-bay layout, the central, twelve-pane section is fixed; and, the two, three-pane side windows are casement and as such have the potential to function as doors.

![Figure 33: The studio, west façade bay window, 3 October 2018](image)

The south façade of the studio includes the principal entryway into the building.
Like the studio’s west façade, the east façade has minimal ornamentation. The one anomaly being the skylight.
Today, the artist studio in known as *The Studio in Gairloch Gardens* and is identified municipally as 1302 Lakeshore Road East.

### 5.2.3 Contemporary outbuildings

Accessory structures on the property include an equipment storage shed which was built in the early 1980s, and a pre-cast utility building which was constructed in 2005. The equipment storage shed is used by the Town’s Parks and Open Space staff; and, the utility building houses the water supply for the park. Neither have any known heritage value.

### 4.2.4 Alterations and additions

Records indicate that the first major alterations to the MacKendrick home occurred between 1960 and 1979. In the basement, the boiler/coal room in the south-east corner was converted into “one large space for utilities.” On the first floor changes included the addition of a small staircase along the “north wall in the kitchen” and a new fireplace to the “south wall in the living room”; recessing a dining room wall; and, screening in the “patio on the north west end”. Second floor changes included the addition of a fireplace “against the south wall in the library”; the creation of entranceways in the “south and north walls of the library”; the conversion of the sewing room into a bedroom; the balcony on the “north end [was] converted into a fire escape”; in the north-east section two bedrooms were converted

---

171 Image courtesy of Oakville Galleries
173 Ibid., unnumbered page.
into one bedroom; and, the “remaining bedroom” was converted into a bathroom.\footnote{Oakville Galleries. “An Information Package on the History of The Gairloch Estate, Gardens and Gallery: Plans” (1992). “Alterations to the Main Building at Gairloch (1960-1979)”. Unnumbered page.} And on the third floor “two bedrooms [were] converted into one large room.”\footnote{Ibid., unnumbered page.}

In June 1974, the foyer of Gairdner’s artist studio was altered. On the west side of the structure, the building’s existing washroom was converted into a public (Women’s) washroom. On the east wall of the foyer, a second public (Men’s) washroom was added as well as a new closet. A replica of the existing hexagonal window, in the women’s washroom, was included in the new washroom. The hexagonal window in the women’s washroom is itself a replacement. Photos from the time of the Gairdner’s ownership, (c. 1960-1972), show that a six-over-six wood window existed there originally.

![Figure 42: The Studio in Gairloch Gardens, sometime between 1960 and 1972](image)

Between 1985 and 1986, further alterations were undertaken to the first and second floors of MacKendrick’s former house. Changes on the first floor included enclosing the “front entranceway on the east side of the building”; the addition of a wall between the front hallway and the kitchen and the small stairway against the north wall in the kitchen was “buried within the wall”; the garage was “enlarged and converted into an art education room”; a bathroom was built “north-west of [the] new art education room”; and the “servants room and kitchen [were] amalgamated into one large space” in order to serve “as a kitchen and transit/storage area.”\footnote{Oakville Galleries. The Gairloch Estate (1960-1971) collection, donated by Mrs. Marie Gairdner.} Second floor changes included the amalgamation of two “galleries and bathroom in the south end” into one large space which was to be used as an “art rental room”; and the addition of a kitchen on the “north-east end of the art rental room”, and washrooms “north of the art rental room.”\footnote{Ibid., unnumbered page.}
Figure 43: Site Plan, Addition & Alterations, Gairloch Gallery, 1306 Lakeshore Rd. E., 1985

Figure 44: Gairloch Gallery west façade proposed addition detail, 1985

Figure 45: Gairloch Gallery west façade, 30 August 2018

Figure 46: Gairloch Gallery south façade, proposed addition detail, 1985\textsuperscript{181}

Figure 47: Gairloch Gallery south façade, August 2018

Figure 48: Gairloch Gallery, east façade proposed addition detail, 1985\textsuperscript{182}


Figure 49: Gairloch Gallery east façade, 30 August 2018

Figure 50: Gairloch Gallery north façade proposed addition detail, 1985

---

Figure 51: Gairloch Gallery north-east corner showing north wall of primary entry door
30 August 2018

Figure 52: Gairloch Gallery, north façade. 20 December 2018
5.3  Landscape chronology
Adhering to the goal of the Arts and Crafts movement of harmonizing structures with their surroundings, and knowing that the “landscaped setting of ... buildings is important to the final overall effect of their architectural design”, MacKendrick paid great attention to the subject property’s landscaped setting.\textsuperscript{184}

He is credited with landscaping the grounds “with hedges, trees and rose gardens and [with digging] a winding water path through the land. These original gardens were quite exotic and oriental in style and were complimented by a [sic] open-air teahouse.”

The property’s man-made features were designed to take advantage of the area’s natural landscape features. These include various hardscaping elements such as a “large stone retaining wall [which] runs along the southern part of the property”; “a pathway along the waterfront”; and, a small wooden pedestrian bridge which spans a small meandering stream that feeds the man-made ponds.

---


Figures 59 and 60: Stone and concave concrete retaining wall and pathway along shore of Lake Ontario, circa 1950s and 30 August 2018\(^{187}\)

**Figure 61: Pedestrian bridge and gardens, 30 August 2018**

Historic images show a much more formal garden layout, than that which exists today.

Figures 62 and 63: formal garden allee, undated; and similar aspect 30 August 2018

James Gairdner gets some of the credit for this change. He made “a few minor changes to the house and garden during his residency there”, including to the “grounds themselves [which] became minimal in design with fewer hedges and trees.”\(^{188}\) Gairdner is also credited with paneling in the teahouse,

\(^{187}\) Figure 59 image courtesy of Oakville Galleries

making it “an intimate enclosed space.” Photos show that at one time the teahouse also included multiple eight-pane windows set on the curved, low stone, south façade wall; see Figure 26. Both the panelling and windows have subsequently been removed.

6 Evaluation of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest

Gairloch Gardens has previously been identified as having cultural heritage value and interest. In 1986, it was identified and protected by designation By-law 1986-192. And in 2015, Laurie Smith and Associates wrote:

Gairloch may have design value as a representative example of the lakefront estates established in Oakville in the early 20th century. Although altered, the house is an example of an Arts-and-Crafts-style house from the 1920s. The grounds may retain elements that typify early-20th-century garden design. The grounds and gardens may display a high degree of craftsmanship and artistic merit.

Gairloch has historical associations with the development of estate properties along Oakville’s waterfront in the early 20th century as summer homes for wealthy families from Toronto and Hamilton. The property is associated with Col. W.G. MacKendrick, who first assembled the land and built the house and grounds; and with James Gairdner, who further developed the house and grounds and donated the property to the Town of Oakville. Both were successful entrepreneurs in Toronto; Gairdner also had a significant presence in Oakville. The house may demonstrate the work of Ashton Spencer Pentecost, the Toronto architect who designed a similar house for MacKendrick in Toronto in 1911. Elements of the grounds may reflect the design work or ideas of James Gairdner or of later landscape designers employed by the Town.

Gairloch is important in defining the character of the area along Lakeshore Road East, comprised of large estates or remnant estates from the late 19th and early 20th centuries. It may be visually linked to its surroundings. It is considered a public landmark in the community.

6.1 Criteria for Determining Cultural Heritage Value or Interest

Evaluation of the cultural heritage value of the subject property was guided by the criteria outlined in the Ontario Heritage Act’s, Ontario Regulation 9/06: Criteria for Determining Cultural Heritage Value or Interest. Evaluation of the subject property as a Cultural Heritage Landscape was guided by the criteria outlined in the Town’s Cultural Heritage Landscape Strategy. Evaluation of the subject property considered the components and layout of an early to mid-20th century residential estate.

6.2 Summary of Evaluation Findings

Per UNESCO’s (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization) categories of cultural heritage landscapes, which the Town adopted in its 2014 Cultural Heritage Landscapes Strategy, Gairloch Gardens falls within the Designed Landscape category of cultural heritage landscapes. Further, per the Ontario Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing’s 2014 Provincial Policy Statement, the subject property qualifies as a significant cultural heritage landscape.

6.3 Statement of Cultural Heritage Value and Significance

Description of Property
Gairloch Gardens, a cultural heritage landscape located on the property known municipally as 1288 – 1306 Lakeshore Road East, is situated on the south side of Lakeshore Road East, east of Trafalgar Road and west of Winston Churchill Boulevard. Lower Morrison Creek runs along the west side of the property and Lake Ontario lies to the south. The 4.5-hectare (11.2 acre) property is a significant cultural heritage landscape and currently is the location of Oakville Galleries at Gairloch. The property serves as a neighbourhood park and includes three 20th century buildings, and two late 20th/early 21st century accessory outbuildings; carefully designed gardens; and various hardscaping elements. These include, but are not limited to, walkways; a small wooden pedestrian bridge spanning a small meandering stream which feeds the man-made ponds; stone stairs and retaining walls including a stone and concave concrete retaining wall at the lakeshore, and a metal fence bracketed by stone pillars at the Lakeshore Road East entrance to the property; a variety of art installations; commemorative plaques and benches; wooden garden trellises; and, a large public parking lot.

Lower Morrison Creek defines the west boundary of the property, with the creek forming the low point of the property and the gallery buildings positioned on higher ground. The area includes a variety of mature trees, shrubs and ornamental plants. Noteworthy are unimpeded views and vistas to, from and between the house, the lake and the gardens.

The boundary of the cultural heritage landscape has been defined in a survey dated 18 March 1960, entitled, “Plan Showing Parts of Lots 7 and 8 - Conc. IV – S.D.S., Tp. Of Trafalgar, Co. of Halton”.

Statement of Cultural Heritage Value
Gairloch Gardens is a Designed Landscape cultural heritage landscape. It is a defined geographical area which has been modified by human activity (the MacKendrick and Gairdner families); and, it has been identified as having cultural heritage value or interest (1986 designation). The subject property includes structures, spaces and natural elements that are valued together for their interrelationship, meaning and association. Gairloch Gardens is an elegant example of an early 20th century, rural lakefront estate built by and for a wealthy Toronto family.

Design and Physical Value:
Gairloch Gardens has design and physical value as a rare and representative example of an early to mid-20th century lakefront estate. Large estates, such as the subject property, were at one time the dominant building and land form on the Lake Ontario shoreline in the vicinity of Oakville. The property includes significant built and natural heritage features which are inter-related and combine to create the property’s cultural heritage value as a cultural heritage landscape.

The property includes structures, spaces and natural elements that are valued together for their interrelationship, meaning and association. Specific features include the property’s topography which informed the siting of the house; the artist studio; the teahouse; the two accessory outbuildings; and, its pathways and plantings. The residence and artist studio were prominently located on an elevated, man-made rise overlooking the shore of Lake Ontario and the banks of Lower Morrison Creek. The teahouse was located close to the residence, overlooking the lake. Adhering to the early 20th century Modern architecture philosophy that form should follow function, the accessory outbuildings were pragmatically positioned close to the gardens and creek. A large stone and concave concrete retaining wall runs along the southern part of the property, at the shore of Lake Ontario, and a pathway runs part-way along the waterfront. Various sculptures, plaques, stone walls and manicured plantings are found throughout the
property. Natural elements include Lower Morrison Creek; MacKendrick’s two man-made ponds fed by a small meandering stream; mature trees; and, the remnants of MacKendrick’s early 20th century, designed garden. Collectively, these heritage attributes and features display a high degree of craftsmanship and artistic merit.

The cultural heritage landscape includes spaces which form significant viewsheds. Views and vistas to, from and between the buildings; Lake Ontario; and, Lower Morrison Creek articulate relationships between the site and buildings. Collectively, the various built and natural attributes evoke the desired effect of a Picturesque landscape being: variety, suspense, surprise, irregular outline and contrast. Their layout displays a high degree of artistic merit.

Architecturally significant structures on the property include the MacKendrick family’s c. 1923, Tudor Revival style residence and teahouse; and, James Gairdner’s relocated, late 1940s artist studio. These structures are representative examples of their respective architectural styles and they display a high degree of craftsmanship and artistic merit.

**Historical/Associative Value:**
Gairloch Gardens has cultural heritage value in its direct association with the theme of early 20th century, rural lakefront estate development activities in Oakville; and, to the late 19th/early 20th century concept known as the Park Movement.

The property has historical and associative value through its direct association with Lt. Col. William Gordon MacKendrick and James Arthur Gairdner, two wealthy Toronto businessmen, and the property owners who physically and fundamentally shaped the subject property into what it is today.

The property has historical and associative value through its direct association with Oakville Galleries in Gairloch Gardens, a not-for-profit contemporary art museum; and, Gairloch Gardens, a public park.

The property yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of early 20th century, rural lakefront estate development activities in Oakville; to the Mississaugas of the Credit First Nation (MCFN) who, as the area’s pre-contact indigenous inhabitants, have an interest in Lower Morrison Creek; and, to the archaeological record of the area.

The property reflects the work of Ashton Spencer Pentecost, “a talented delineator” from Toronto who designed MacKendrick’s Toronto home, of which the property’s c. 1923, Tudor Revival residence is a copy. Further, it demonstrates the work of local architect, William Gould Armstrong, who designed Gairdner’s c. 1948, Modern Classical artist studio. Remnant landscape elements reflect the design and/or work of both Lt. Col. MacKendrick and James Gairdner.

**Contextual Value:**
Gairloch Gardens has contextual value as a publically accessible site which supports the character of the area. The property is physically, visually, and historically linked to its surroundtions, including a number of remnant, historic lakefront estates; Lake Ontario; and, Lower Morrison Creek. The property is a landmark within the Town of Oakville.
Heritage Attributes:
Key heritage attributes which contribute to Gairloch Gardens overall cultural heritage value and significance as a cultural heritage landscape include:

- its defined geographical area which has been modified by human activity (MacKendrick and Gairdner families);
- the relationship between the property’s topography, natural elements and hardscaping features, and its variety of historic buildings; including the former residence, teahouse, and artist studio, all of which result in its unique spatial organization.

Key geographic, natural and hardscaping attributes which contribute to Gairloch Gardens overall cultural heritage value and significance include its:

- varied topography which includes table land, natural embankments, and a man-made embankment which overlooks the gardens, Lake Ontario, and Lower Morrison Creek;
- prominent location and proximity to Lake Ontario and Lower Morrison Creek;
- views and vistas to, from and between Lake Ontario; Lower Morrison Creek; the former MacKendrick residence; the teahouse; and, the artist studio;
- residential setting within the residential neighbourhood known as “millionaire’s row”;
- naturalized area along the western edge of the property;
- placement and variety of mature trees, shrubs and gardens;
- blend of formal and informal gardens, and park grounds; including remnants of MacKendrick’s early 20th century, designed garden; and, the formal rose and perennial garden;
- decorative, wooden fencing surrounding the rose garden;
- manicured, arboretum-like park area;
- stone wall and archway, along the driveway, north of MacKendrick’s house;
- stone stairs and paved and gravelled pedestrian pathways;
- small wooden pedestrian bridge spanning Lower Morrison Creek;
- dam within Lower Morrison Creek, near mature Spruce trees which mark the entrance to the formal rose and perennial garden;
- MacKendrick’s two man-made ponds and water fountains;
- stone sea-wall and steps running along the edge of the waterfront;
- stone and concave concrete retaining wall, running the length of the shoreline;
- stone pillars and metal fence, along Lakeshore Road East, at the north end of the property;
- stone pillars and metal gate on the driveway between 1310 Lakeshore Road East and 1306 Lakeshore Road East, north of the studio.

Key built heritage attributes which contribute overall to Gairloch Gardens’ cultural heritage value and significance include:

- shape, form and massing;
- various foundation, façade and roofing materials;
- original/early doorways, doors and windows including their asymmetrical placement, sizes and shapes;
- various construction materials, including, but not limited to, wood, stone, brick and glass which reflect relevant construction methods, techniques and ornamental details;
- configuration and layout.

Key built heritage attributes specific to the c. 1923, Tudor-Revival style, residence include:

- open, cross gable roof configuration with overhanging eaves and exposed, wooden rafters;
• eyebrow and wood shingle-clad, shed dormers;
• Arts and Crafts inspired, steeply sloped roof section, ending in a subtle upward curve;
• first storey’s local stone structure, and the second storey’s plaster stucco exterior cladding;
• the west façade porch’s post and beam construction; and, exposed wooden rafters, supported by stone piers;
• original/early leaded and stained glass windows;
• interior open plan, cross-hallway configuration;
• original/early fireplaces and chimneys.

Key interior, built heritage attributes specific to the c. 1923, Tudor-Revival style, residence include:
• red tile floors, coved-ceilings, and wood panelling throughout;
• the sunroom’s paneled beams, ornamented with curving wooden brackets;
• collectively, the dining room’s original/early oak panelling, picture rail and carved frieze of grapes and leaves, all of which are attributed to Caleb Keene, a well-known Oakville artist;
• the basement’s rustic, stone-surrounded fireplace;
• original/early wood stairs, moulding and trim;
• original/early wood doors and windows and their associated moulding, trim and hardware;
• original/early bathroom and kitchen fixtures and fittings;
• original/early radiators.

Key built heritage attributes specific to the Tudor-Revival style teahouse include:
• low stone walls, including the curved south wall
• timber-framed, wood roof supported by stone piers, which match those on MacKendrick’s former home;
• red tile floor, stone steps and stone walkway.

Key built heritage attributes specific to the late 1940s artist studio include:
• open gable roof configuration, with return eaves and the original/early four-pane skylight;
• west façade’s 12-pane projecting bay window flanked by two operable, three-pane casement windows/doors.

Key interior, built heritage attributes specific to the late 1940s artist studio include:
• wood floors;
• exposed, timber frame ceiling structure;
• original/early wood panelling throughout;
• original, stone fireplace, hearth and simple wood mantel.
### 6.3.1 Summary of Cultural Heritage Value and Significance

The table below provides a summary of Gairloch Gardens’ cultural heritage value and significance, based on the Ontario Heritage Act’s, Ontario Regulation 9/06, Criteria for Determining Cultural Heritage Value or Interest:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O.Reg. 9/06 Criteria</th>
<th>Criteria Met (Y/N)</th>
<th>Justification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The property has design or physical value, because it:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, expression, material, or construction method,</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Collectively, Gairloch Gardens is a rare and representative example of an early to mid-20th century lakefront estate. The property’s multiple buildings; formal gardens and pathways; man-made landscape features; and, its historic and continuing relationship to Lower Morrison Creek and Lake Ontario are elements of a “clearly defined landscape designed and created intentionally by man” which fits UNESCO’S category of a Designed Landscape cultural heritage landscape. Individually, the structures at Gairloch Gardens are representative examples of their representative architectural style (MacKendrick’s Tudor Revival residence and teahouse; and, Gairdner’s Modern Classical artist studio).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit, or</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Collectively, the relationship between the property’s structures, spaces and natural elements were informed by the property’s topography. The layout of the buildings, pathways and plantings form significant viewsheds, and display a high degree of craftsmanship and artistic merit. Individually, MacKendrick’s Tudor Revival residence and teahouse; and, Gairdner’s Modern Classical artist studio displays a high degree of craftsmanship and artistic merit.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
iii. demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement.  | N  

2. The property has historical 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, | Y  
| The property has direct associations with the theme of early 20th century, rural lakefront estate development activities in Oakville; and, to the late 19th/early 20th century concept known as the Park Movement. It has direct association with Lt. Col. William Gordon MacKendrick and James Arthur Gairdner. It has direct association with *Oakville Galleries in Gairloch Gardens*; and, with *Gairloch Gardens*. |

| ii. yields, or has the potential to yield information that contributes to an understanding of a community or culture, or | Y  
| The property yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of early 20th century, rural lakefront estate development activities in Oakville; to the Mississaugas of the Credit First Nation (MCFN); and, to the archaeological record of the area. |

| iii. demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer or theorist who is significant to a community. | Y  
| The c. 1923, Tudor Revival residence and teahouse, as a copy of MacKendrick’s (Rosedale) Toronto home, reflects the work of Ashton Spencer Pentecost, “a talented delineator” from Toronto. The c. 1948, Modern Classical artist studio demonstrates the work of local architect, William Gould Armstrong. Remnant landscape elements reflect the design and/or work of both Lt. Col. MacKendrick and James Gairdner. |
3. The property has contextual value because it:

| i. | is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an area, | Y | Gairloch Gardens has contextual value as a publically accessible site which supports the character of the area. |
| ii. | is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings, or | Y | The property is physically, visually, and historically linked to its surroundings, including a number of remnant, historic lakefront estates; Lake Ontario; and, Lower Morrison Creek. |
| iii. | is a landmark. | Y | The property is a landmark within the Town of Oakville. |

6.4 Evaluation of Provincial and/or National Historic Significance

A cultural heritage landscape may have values that are significant, to one or multiple communities, at a local, provincial and/or national level. In these instances, it may be necessary to apply a range of interpretive and interdisciplinary tools and approaches to understand a property. Should it be determined that the subject property be evaluated for its Provincial or National significance, a third party will be engaged to undertake this assessment.

7 Conclusion

Council directed that certain areas with town should be identified and evaluated to determine if they qualify as cultural heritage landscapes, which, as cultural heritage resources, require protection or enhanced protection. These areas provide a wider understanding of the context of how built resources, natural heritage and land uses function together as a whole. Based on Council’s direction, the Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report – Gairloch Gardens was undertaken to determine the property’s potential as a cultural heritage landscape.

The evaluation of the property’s potential cultural heritage value and significance was based upon criteria outlined by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO); Ontario Regulation 9/06 (Ontario Heritage Act); Ontario Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing’s 2014 Provincial Policy Statement; and, the aforementioned Town of Oakville Cultural Heritage Landscape Strategy. Specifically, the assessment considered the layered, nested, and overlapping aspects of cultural heritage landscapes.

Based on this approach, it has been determined that Gairloch Gardens has cultural heritage value as a Designed Landscape cultural heritage landscape.
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Appendices

9.1 Appendix A: Photos

Figure 64: Gairloch Gardens, west entrance gates and fence, 30 August 2018

Figure 65: Gairloch Gardens, west entrance gate and fence, 30 August 2018
Figure 66: Gairloch Gardens, east entrance, public parking lot, 30 August 2018

Figure 67: Pathway from parking lot (looking south) from public parking lot.
Figure 68: Rose garden and wooden trellis, 30 August 2018

Figure 69: North pond, 30 August 2018
Figure 70: MacKendrick’s south pond, 30 August 2018

Figure 71: Stone and concave concrete retaining wall at Lake Ontario, looking east, 30 August 2018
Figure 72: Lake stone pathway between Lake Ontario and residence, looking north, 30 August 2018

Figure 73: Lake stone pathway between Lake Ontario and residence, looking east, 30 August 2018
Figure 74: west façade, stone archway along the driveway, north of MacKendrick’s house, 30 August 2018

Figure 75: east façade, stone wall and archway along the driveway, north of MacKendrick’s house, 30 August 2018
Figure 76: Stone pathway, stairs and gardens, north of MacKendrick’s house, 30 August 2018

Figure 77: Stone pathway, gardens and seating area, north of MacKendrick’s house, 30 August 2018
By-law 1986-192 - A by-law to designate certain property as property of historic and architectural value and interest (Gairloch Gardens – 1306 Lakeshore Road East)

THE CORPORATION OF THE TOWN OF OAKVILLE

BY-LAW NUMBER 1986-192

A by-law to designate certain property as property of historic and architectural value and interest (Gairloch Gardens – 1306 Lakeshore Road East)

THE COUNCIL ENACTS AS Follows:

1. The property known municipally and referred to as Gairloch Gardens (1306 Lakeshore Road East) is hereby designated as a property of historic and architectural value and interest pursuant to the Ontario Heritage Act, for the reason set out in Schedule "A" to this by-law.

2. The property designated by this by-law is the property described in Schedule "B" to this by-law.

PASSED by the Council this 15th day of September, 1986.

[Signatures]

MAYOR

CLERK.
SCHEDULE "A" TO BY-LAW 1986-192

REASON FOR DESIGNATION:
The entire property provides an excellent example of a Lake Estate which remains intact and yet integrates a residential area to the East within its overall "umbrella". It has many unique attributes, such as a meandering stream, a pond and formal areas such as the rose garden.

The main house, which employs indigenous stone, was built in 1923-24 by Colonel W. G. MacKendrick. In 1960, the property was bought by Mr. James Gairdner and in 1972 he bequeathed the Estate to the Town of Oakville.
SCHEDULE "B" TO BY-LAW 1986-192

DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY:
The following is the description of the property as described in Instrument Numbers 381274 and 330179 registered in the Registry Office for the Registry Division of Halton.

Instrument Number 381274:
ALL AND SINGULAR that certain parcel or tract of land and premises situate lying and being in the Town of Oakville, in the Regional Municipality of Halton, and being composed of part of Lot Number Eight (8) in the Fourth Concession, South of Dundas Street, in the said Town of Oakville, which said parcel may be more particularly described as follows:

BEGINNING at a cement monument planted at the intersection of the division line between Lots 7 and 8 in the Fourth Concession, South of Dundas Street, in the Town of Oakville with the southeasterly limit of the King's Highway Number 2;

THENCE north thirty-eight degrees seventeen minutes thirty seconds east (N.38°17'30"E) along the last mentioned line fifty feet, seven and three-quarter inches (50'7 3/4");

THENCE south forty-four degrees twenty-six minutes, thirty seconds east (S.44°26'30"E) along a fence four hundred and sixty-eight feet six inches (468'6") to an iron pipe planted;

THENCE south forty degrees thirty-six minutes west (S.40°36'W) one hundred and forty-five feet, one and one-half inches (145'1 1/2") to an iron pipe planted;
THENCE south fifty degrees forty-one minutes west (S.50°41'W) forty-seven feet nine inches (47'9") to an iron pipe planted in the southwesterly limit of a right-of-way, being the point of commencement;

THENCE south thirty-nine degrees, fifty-five minutes west (S.39°55'W) two hundred and eight feet, one and one-quarter inches (208'1 1/4") to an iron pipe planted;

THENCE north fifty-two degrees six minutes west (N.52°6'W) eighty-seven feet nine and one-quarter inches (87'9 1/4") to an iron pipe planted;

THENCE north thirty-eight degrees fifty-four minutes east (N.38°54'E) one hundred and eighty-seven feet, eight inches (187'8") to an iron pipe planted;

THENCE north sixty-one degrees, fifty-four minutes east (N.61°54'E) ten feet (10'0") to an iron pipe planted;

THENCE south fifty-nine degrees, forty-one minutes east (S.59°41'E) eighty-eight feet, six and one-half inches (88'6 1/2") to the point of commencement.

Instrument Number 330179:

ALL AND SINGULAR that certain parcel or tract of land and premises situate, lying and being in the Township of Trafalgar, in the County of Halton and Province of Ontario, being composed of parts of Lots 7 and 8 in Concession IV South of Dundas Street of the said Township, the boundaries of the said parcel of land being described as follows:
PREMISING that the north-westerly limit of the said Lot 8 has a course of north thirty-eight degrees seventeen minutes thirty seconds east (N.38°17'30"E) and relating all bearings herein thereto;

COMMENCING at a point in the said north-westerly limit of Lot 8 distant one hundred and sixty-nine feet eight and one-quarter inches (169'8 1/4") measured south-westerly thereon from the most northerly angle of the said Lot 8;

THENCE south forty-eight degrees nineteen minutes thirty seconds east (S.48°19'30"E) one hundred and fifty feet three and one-half inches (150'3 1/2") to an iron bar planted;

THENCE north thirty-eight degrees seventeen minutes thirty seconds east (N.38°17'30"E) ten feet (10'0") to an iron bar planted;

THENCE south forty-eight degrees nineteen minutes thirty seconds east (S.48°19'30"E) one hundred and eighteen feet nine inches (118'9") to an iron bar planted;

THENCE south-easterly on a curve to the left having a radius of three hundred and twenty-two feet eight inches (322'8") and to which the last described course is tangent, a distance of thirty-one feet five and one-half inches (31'5 1/2") to an iron bar planted;

THENCE continuing south-easterly on the said curve to the left, fifty-two feet (52'0") chord measurement to an iron bar planted at the end of the said curve;
THENCE south sixty-three degrees nine minutes thirty seconds east (S.63°09'30"E) seventy-three feet and one-half an inch (73'0 1/2") to an iron bar planted;

THENCE south-easterly on a curve to the right having a radius of one hundred and thirty-one feet eight inches (131'8") and to which the last described course is tangent, twenty-six feet eleven inches (26'11") to an iron bar planted;

THENCE south forty-two degrees fourteen minutes east (S.42°14'E) eight feet six inches (8'6") to an iron pipe planted at a point hereinafter called Point "A";

THENCE north forty degrees thirty-two minutes east (N.40°32'E) one foot one inch (1'1") more or less to the point of intersection with the said curve to the right having a radius of one hundred and thirty-one feet eight inches (131'8")

THENCE south-easterly along the said curve to the right, twenty-one feet six inches (21'6") to an iron bar planted;

THENCE south thirty-eight degrees nineteen minutes thirty seconds east (S.38°19'30"E) seventy-one feet two inches (71'2") to an iron bar planted;

THENCE south-easterly and easterly on a curve to the left having a radius of seventy-two feet seven inches (72'7") an arc distance of ninety-four feet two inches (94'2") to an iron bar planted at a point hereinafter called Point "B", the chord of the said arc having a bearing of south seventy-five degrees twenty-nine minutes thirty seconds east (S.75°29'30"E) and a length of eighty-seven feet eight and one-half inches (87'8 1/2");
THENCE north forty-five degrees twenty-eight minutes east (N.45°28'E) one hundred and six feet nine and one-half inches (106'9 1/2") to the south-westerly limit of the lands included a plan filed in the Registry Office for the Registry Division of the County of Halton as Number 397;

THENCE south forty-four degrees thirty-two minutes east (S.44°32'E) along the last mentioned limit, one hundred and thirteen feet eleven inches (113'11") to an angle in the said limit;

THENCE south seventy-eight degrees thirteen minutes east (S.78°13'E) still along the said limit, one hundred and seventy-nine feet one and one-quarter inches (179'1 1/4") to another angle in the said limit;

THENCE south forty-four degrees fourteen minutes east (S.44°14'E) still along the said limit of Registered Plan Number 397, four hundred and seven feet (407'0") more or less to the water's edge of Lake Ontario;

THENCE westerly along the said water's edge of Lake Ontario to the north-easterly limit of Lot 10 according to a plan filed in the said Registry Office as Number 343, produced south-easterly if necessary;

THENCE north forty-two degrees thirty-five minutes west (N.42°35'W) to and along the said north-easterly limit of Lot 10 three hundred and forty feet (340'0") more or less to an iron tube planted at the most northerly angle of the said Lot 10;
THENCE still north forty-two degrees thirty-five minutes west, (N.42°35'W) along the north-easterly limit of Lot 11 according to the said Plan Number 343, fifty-five feet seven inches (55'7") to an iron tube planted;

THENCE north forty-two degrees thirty-four minutes west (N.42°34'W) still along the north-easterly limit of Lot 11, one hundred and thirty-four feet four and three-quarter inches (134'4 3/4") to an iron tube planted;

THENCE north fifty-six degrees thirty-nine minutes west (N.56°39'W) along the north-easterly limit of the lands included in the said Plan Number 343, forty-five feet (45'0") to an iron tube planted;

THENCE north fifty-nine degrees thirty-seven minutes west (N.59°37'W) still along the last mentioned limit, one hundred and eleven feet eight inches (111'8") to an iron tube planted;

THENCE north sixty-four degrees twenty-three minutes west (N.64°23'W) still along the last mentioned limit, three hundred and sixty feet eight and one-half inches (360'8 1/2") to the said north-westerly limit of Lot 8;

THENCE north thirty-eight degrees seventeen minutes thirty seconds east (N.38°17'30"E) along the said north-easterly limit of Lot 8 being along the south-easterly limit of Lakeshore Road, three hundred and ninety-eight feet three inches (398'3") more or less to the point of commencement;
SAVING AND EXCEPTIONING thereout and therefrom, the following described part of the said Lot 8;

COMMENCING at an iron bar planted at a point distant forty-seven feet nine inches (47'9") measured on a course south fifty degrees thirty-seven minutes west (S.50°37'W) from the said Point "A";

THENCE south thirty-nine degrees fifty-three minutes west (S.39°53'W) two hundred and eight feet one and one-quarter inches (208'1 1/4") to an iron pipe planted;

THENCE north fifty-two degrees eight minutes west (N.52°08'W) eighty-seven feet nine and one-quarter inches (87'9 1/4") to an iron pipe planted;

THENCE north thirty-eight degrees fifty-two minutes east (N.38°52'E) one hundred and eighty-seven feet one and one-half inches (187'1 1/2") to an iron tube planted;

THENCE north sixty-one degrees fifty-two minutes east (N.61°52'E) ten feet (10'0") to a spike driven in a paved driveway;

THENCE south fifty-nine degrees forty-three minutes east (S.59°43'E) eighty-eight feet six and one-half inches (88'6 1/2") more or less to the said point of commencement;

THE SAID lands excepted from the lands hereby granted being subject to a right-of-way appurtenant to the immediately adjoining parts of the lands hereby granted, over a strip of land six feet (6'0") in width described as follows;
BEGINNING at a point in the south-easterly limit of
the said lands hereby excepted, distant one hundred
and seventy-three feet one and one-quarter inches
(173'1 1/4") measured south-westerly thereon from the
most easterly angle of the said lands so excepted;
THENCE north fifty-two degrees eight minutes west
(N.52°08'W) eighty-eight feet three and one-quarter
inches (88'3 1/4");
THENCE south thirty-eight degrees fifty-two minutes
west (S.38°52'W) six feet (6'0");
THENCE south fifty-two degrees eight minutes east
(S.52°08'E) eighty-eight feet three and one-quarter
inches (88'3 1/4");
THENCE north thirty-nine degrees fifty-five minutes
east (N.39°55'E) six feet (6'0") to the said place of
beginning;
THE SAID lands hereby excepted and the said
right-of-way being or intended to be the lands and
right-of-way secondly described in Instrument Number
41401 for the Township of Trafalgar;
THE SAID lands hereby conveyed being subject to a
right-of-way for all those entitled thereto over,
along and upon the following described part of Lot 8;
BEGINNING at a point in the north-westerly limit of
the said Lot 8 distant one hundred and sixty-nine
feet eight and one-quarter inches (169'8 1/4")
measured south-westerly thereon from the most
northerly angle of the said lot;
THENCE south forty-eight degrees nineteen minutes thirty seconds east (S.48°19'30"E) one hundred and fifty feet three and one-half inches (150'3 1/2") to an iron bar planted;

THENCE north thirty-eight degrees seventeen minutes thirty seconds east (N.38°17'30"E) ten feet (10'0")

THENCE south forty-eight degrees nineteen minutes thirty seconds east (S.48°19'30"E) one hundred and eighteen feet nine inches (118'9") to an iron bar planted;

THENCE south-easterly on a curve to the left having a radius of three hundred and twenty-two feet eight inches (322'8") and to which the last described course is tangent thirty-one feet five and one-half inches (31'5 1/2") to an iron bar planted;

THENCE south thirty-eight degrees seventeen minutes thirty seconds west (S.38°17'30"W) twenty feet (20'0") more or less to the point of intersection with a curved line having a radius of three hundred and forty-two feet eight inches (342'8") concentric with the said curve having a radius of three hundred and twenty-two feet eight inches (322'8")

THENCE northerly along the said curve having a radius of three hundred and forty-two feet eight inches (342'8") and continuing along a line tangent to the said curve having a bearing of north forty-eight degrees nineteen minutes thirty seconds west (N.48°19'30"W) in all a distance of three hundred feet (300'0") more or less to the said north-westerly limit of Lot 8;
THENCE north thirty-eight degrees seventeen minutes thirty seconds east (N.38°17'30"E) along the said limit of Lot B, ten feet (10'0") more or less to the point of commencement.
Appendix C: Plan showing Parts of Lots 7 and 8, Con. IV, S.D.S. March 18, 1960:
Appendix D: Written description of the interior of Lt.-Col. MacKendrick’s Residence, circa 1922


Chestnut Point, named after the chestnut grove in which it stood, was situated on four hundred acres of farmland on the lakeshore just east of the town. It was set back from the main road at the end of a quiet lane which ensured its seclusion and tranquility; its most notable qualities. It was designed as a two storey house with a gable roof and a large steep gable turned to the west face. This sloped dramatically down, ending in a subtle upward curve.

Characteristically the construction materials used, as at Edgemere, reflect the environment in which it was set. The ground floor was made of sandstone taken from the various barns which previously stood on the property. The upper levels were made of a light coloured [sic] stucco. The front porch, spanning roughly half the west face was covered by an open canopy made of wooden rafters supported on rectangular sandstone piers. The roof rafters were extended out to the wide eaves and created a visual link with the porch. The same rafters were seen in the back porch, the garage roof and the distant tea house roof, a common motif throughout the estate.

The west front was the primary facade where the roofline moved in steps from the garage on the south, to a small gabled pavilion, to the main gable and then to the turned gable. The roof thereby created a progressive rhythm, concentrated on the southern half of the house. This was balanced on the other half by the strong horizontals of roofline, eave, canopy and ground. Large bay windows on this side opened onto each room; those on the ground floor being larger than the ones on the second level. The window in the master bedroom -- under the large gable -- was topped by a shed roof, which marked both its importance and added visual interest. All were originally leaded, casement windows. These - in combination with the materials, low horizontal lines and varied roof level -- recall the work of the late nineteenth-century British architect C.F.A. Voysey (1857-1941). Voysey’s design for a house in Surrey of 1896 possesses an overall similarity to Chestnut Point with its linear simplicity and use of tall broad chimneys, but omits his favoured rectangular bay windows.

The east face of Chestnut Point was also composed of horizontal lines of diminishing intervals, from the line of the first storey, to the eaves, to the low dormer window. The various size, shape and spacing of the windows created an irregular rhythm. The main entrance was situated on this face, protected by a small canopy supported on short stone piers.

A leaded glass door with sidelights opened into a spacious, square entrance hall panelled [sic] in oak. It had a cove ceiling and red, quarry tile floor. A cloakroom and washroom were situated on the right, the kitchen and stairs to the left and the main cross hall directly ahead. The latter provided the main north-south axis to the house and gave access to the three principle rooms on the ground level through wide entrances creating an open, flowing space. This type of open plan was first seen in the work of Baillie Scott (1865-1945) and Frank Lloyd Wright (1867-1959) and was probably making a debut here (at Chestnut Point) in Oakville.

Turning right from this hall one entered the music room, a spacious, rectangular room with a bay window on the west wall presenting a full view of the lake. A leaded glass door at one end of the north wall led to the garden and a window at the opposite end overlooked the distant tennis courts. An Italian black marble fireplace with carved wooden mantle provided a warm focus to this refined room. The ceiling here and throughout the house was coved.
Further along the hall was the entrance to the sunroom, which had a red tile floor, oak panelling [sic] and a granite fireplace. It was lit by a floor-to-ceiling window which formed a deeply projecting bay. A large panelled [sic] beam, running the width of the room divided the room from the bay. Another beam, running at right angles to the first was exposed on the porch canopy revealing the heavy post and beam construction. A plain, curving, wooden bracket in each corner of the room linked the covered ceiling beams with the wall panelling [sic] in a direct and simple way. These brackets accentuated the rustic note of this informal setting.

Proceeding south along the hall one entered the dining room which again, overlooked the lake through a large bay window. It was panelled [sic] in oak to the picture rail and was originally stained a very deep green with faint touches of red and blue. A carved frieze of grapes and leaves appeared above this, which had initially been surmounted by a Greek key pattern painted in gold leaf. The decoration of this room is attributed to Caleb Keene, a well-known Oakville artist. Cupboards built into the panelling [sic] on the east wall opened into the kitchen thereby eliminating the need for a serving pantry. The richness of the room would have provided a subtle contrast to the bright simplicity of the other principal rooms. A door in the south dining room wall opened onto a stone walled breakfast room with two large windows and a tiled floor. The informality of this room again contrasted with the dining room atmosphere and is said to have provided an excellent retreat for children during dinner parties.

To the east of the dining room lay the service area. The bright kitchen overlooked the back garden while a small sitting room with a back entrance provided the necessary separation between the kitchen and the dining room. A narrow and steep service stair situated between the kitchen and entrance hall climbed to the servants' bedrooms directly above and on up to the attic.

The main stair on the south wall of the entrance hall had a plain rail with straight sided balusters ending with the popular newel cage. Simple convex-concave moulding decorated the stairs' risers. Leaded glass windows pierced the wall at the lower landing dividing the entrance hall from the cross hall and a stained glass window on the east wall at the second landing (now replaced) provided warm sunlight. The layout of the ground floor was repeated upstairs. The north-south axis gave access to four bedrooms and a study. Again, all the rooms possessed both a fireplace and bay window, providing a similarly airy spaciousness and broad vista of the bay. Above the entrance hall a pleasant sewing room looked over the garden. Bathrooms were located in the master bedroom to the south and on the north wall at the end of the hall.

The sole access to the attic was provided by the back, servants' stair. Here, four small rooms were located at either end of the cross hall. A storage area was located in the space between the slope of the roof and the hall, lit and ventilated by an eyebrow window. Downstairs a full basement -- six and a half feet high -- was divided into several rooms each fitted with heavy, panelled [sic] wooden doors. A furnace provided hot water for steam radiators as the primary means of heat. The fireplaces therefore, were largely decorative.

Outside, the original sand cliff which separated the grounds from the lake was landscaped into a gentle sloping bank. Flat lakestones [sic] were set into the pathways which led to the canopied teahouse and down to the lake. MacKendric [sic] landscaped the grounds with treillages, hedges, trees and shrubs to preserve and enhance his beloved vistas. As further decorative touches, he dammed Morrison Creek just south of Lakeshore Road to create two duck ponds. Beyond these ponds he planted rose gardens and an extensive vegetable garden. At a similar distance the tennis courts were located.

Colonel MacKendric [sic] died in 1957 and the house was bought by J. Gairloch in 1960. He made but a few alterations. Most notably Gairdner refinshed the wall panelling [sic] in a grey-beige. He subsequently renamed the house Gairloch eventually donating it to the town in 1972. It now forms part of the Oakville Galleries.

The tranquility which pervades Chestnut Point is combined with a taste for formality evident in the fine panelling, [sic] carved and painted ornament, fittings and furniture. As at Edgemere, the facade
suggests the different functions of the living space. The use of wood, stone and stucco displays natural colours, simple construction and an affinity for the environment in keeping with the Arts and Crafts ideals. It is these qualities which underline the difference of Erchless and the Victorian taste. Erchless does not reveal the different functions of the house through its massing; simply that different parts were built at different times. At times the building materials were disguised rather than expressed openly as illustrated by the wooden lintels passing for stone. And Erchless did not reflect the natural colours of the environment. The feeling of affluence and grandeur expressed by its ornamental detail, lofty proportions and formal parlours was not appreciated by the following generation. Indeed its picturesque simulation of historic styles was anathema to adherents of the Arts and Craft movement, and was replaced by a simpler, more direct style in the later houses. Therefore, despite the similarities of country setting, clear construction and simple design, Erchless does illustrate ideals and traditions in architecture different to those of Edgemere and Chestnut Point.
9.5 Appendix E: Ontario Regulation 9/06:

Ontario Heritage Act

ONTARIO REGULATION 9/06
CRITERIA FOR DETERMINING CULTURAL HERITAGE VALUE OR INTEREST

Consolidation Period: From January 25, 2006 to the e-Laws currency date.

No amendments.

This is the English version of a bilingual regulation.

Criteria
1. (1) The criteria set out in subsection (2) are prescribed for the purposes of clause 29 (1) (a) of the Act. O. Reg. 9/06, s. 1 (1).

(2) 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. O. Reg. 9/06, s. 1 (2).

Transition
2. This Regulation does not apply in respect of a property if notice of intention to designate it was given under subsection 29 (1.1) of the Act on or before January 24, 2006. O. Reg. 9/06, s. 2.

Français

Back to top
9.6 Appendix F: Definitions of cultural heritage landscapes

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) definition:
Cultural landscapes are cultural properties and represent the "combined works of nature and of man". They continue, advising that these areas are "illustrative of the evolution of human society and settlement over time, under the influence of the physical constraints and/or opportunities presented by their natural environment and of successive social, economic and cultural forces, both external and internal.192

Ontario Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing’s 2014 Provincial Policy Statement, Cultural Heritage Landscape Definition:
Cultural heritage landscape: means a defined geographical area that may have been modified by human activity and is identified as having cultural heritage value or interest by a community, including an Aboriginal community. The area may involve features such as structures, spaces, archaeological sites or natural elements that are valued together for their interrelationship, meaning or association. Examples may include, but are not limited to, heritage conservation districts designated under the Ontario Heritage Act; villages, parks, gardens, battlefields, mainstreets and neighbourhoods, cemeteries, railways, viewsheds, natural areas and industrial complexes of heritage significance; and areas recognized by federal or international designation authorities (e.g. a National Historic Site or District designation, or a UNESCO World Heritage Site).193

Town of Oakville’s Cultural Heritage Landscapes Strategy definition:
A cultural landscape is the recognizable imprint of human settlement and activities on land over time. But while any landscape that has been deliberately modified by humans is a cultural landscape, only those cultural landscapes that have a deep connection with the history of the community and are valued by the community can be identified as ‘cultural heritage landscapes’. Cultural heritage landscapes can include any combination of built structures (i.e. houses, barns, shops, and bridges), natural heritage (i.e. trees, hedges, and lawns), transportation routes (i.e. roads, pathways, trails) and viewscapes or vistas, providing that these features demonstrate the required significance and value.194

---

192 Ibid. Page 95.