Statement of Significance

40 BRIDGE STREET WEST



Summary of Significance

☑Design/Physical Value

⋈ Historical Value

図 Contextual Value

☒ Social Value

□ Economic Value

☐ Environmental Value

Municipal Address: 40 Bridge Street West

Legal Description: German Company Tract Part Lot 59

Year Built: 1933

Architectural Style: Gothic

Original Owner: Emmanuel Evangelical Church

Original Use: Church Condition: Good

Description of Cultural Heritage Resource

40 Bridge Street West is an early-20th century brick church built in the Gothic architectural style. The building is situated on a 0.72 acre parcel of land located on the corner of Bridge Street West and Woolwich Street in the Bridgeport West Planning Community of the City of Kitchener within the Region of Waterloo. The principal resource that contributes to the heritage value is the institutional building, known as the Bridgeport United Church.

Heritage Value

40 Bridge Street West is recognized for its design/physical, historic/associative, and contextual values.

Design/Physical Value

The design and physical value of 40 Bridge Street West resides in its Gothic-architecture, being a representative example of the Gothic style laid out in a rectangular shape with a side gable roof and offset front projecting gable entrance. The building is constructed of multi-coloured red-brown brick with brick buttresses with concrete details, and ogee shaped stained glass windows featured in groups of three per bay with brick voussoirs and concrete sills. There are 1/1 windows at the basement level. The foundation is concrete but appears to have been re-finished at some point as chipping reveals another material at the eastern corner of the church. There is a brick chimney on the rear façade of the church.

The front entrance of the church features a decorative stone door surround with a pointed arch opening, original wood doors that have been re-painted, with original metal hardware and decorative strap hinges. There is a stone above the front entrance that reads "Emmanuel Evangelical Church" and a stone cross at the top of the front projecting gable. Flanking the main entrance are two former window openings with concrete sills, now infilled with brick of a similar red-brown brick colour. At the eastern-most corner of the front façade, a date stone just above the foundation reads "1933". In the front yard to the left of the main entrance, a newer stone sign reads "Bridgeport United Church". In addition, three large mature trees are located in the front and exterior side yard.

The western-most section of the building is comprised of an addition built in 1958, creating an education wing that expanded the capacity of the Sunday School. It is one storey in height with a flat roof and has a rectangular floor plan that matches the width of the existing church. The addition features vertical pillars clad in similar brick to match the church. The pillars flank a concrete base and large windows composed of multiple framed vertical panes topped with geometric diamond shaped tracery. A metal fascia runs horizontally along the top edge of the roof. There is a cement walkway connecting a side entrance on the front façade to the street, and there is another entrance on the rear façade with steps leading down to the lower parking lot.

Historical/Associative Value

The historic and associative values of 40 Bridge Street West relate to the use as a place of worship along with the buildings architect and contractor. The Emmanuel Evangelical Church congregation in Bridgeport (now Kitchener) dates back to as early as 1876 (Bridgeport United, 2014). The congregation bought the property in 1878 to hold Sunday school. A white brick church was built in 1889 and the current church was built in 1933. The congregation changed their name to Bridgeport United in 1987 to stop the confusion with Emmanuel United in Waterloo (Bridgeport United, 2014).

The church was designed by W.H.E. Schmalz (Kolarisch & Horne, 1984-85). W.H.E. Schmalz was a native of Berlin (now Kitchener) and son of former Mayor W.H. Schmalz (Waterloo Region Generations, 2014). W.H.E. Schmalz graduated from the University of Toronto and was known as the Twin Cities' dean of architects (Waterloo Region Generations, 2014). He, along with B.A. Jones, designed the 1922 Kitchener City Hall (Hill, 2009). The firm of Schmalz & Jones maintained an office until 1926 (Hill, 2009). W.H.E. served with the Royal Canadian Horse Artillery in 1916; served with distinction on the Waterloo Historical Society, the Ontario Historical Society, the Ontario Pioneer Community Foundation and the Waterloo County Hall of Fame; and, held office in, or was a long-time member of, the Chamber of Commerce, the Kitchener Parks Board, the K-W Hospital Board, the Kiwanis Club, the Kitchener Musical Society, the Kitchener Young Men's Club, the Kitchener Racing Canoe Club and the Lutheran Church (Waterloo Region Generations, 2014).

The church was built by Oscar Wiles (Bridgeport United, 2014; Kolarisch & Horne, 1984-85). Oscar Wiles founded Oscar Wiles General Contractor in 1927, which later became Oscar Wiles and Sons Ltd. (KW Record, 1982). The company's first job was the former KW Record building at Duke Street and Queen Street (KW Record, 1982). Oscar's five sons: Arthur, Donald, Peter, Bill and Richard assisted with the family business, which built houses, churches, schools and factories.

Contextual Value

The contextual value of 40 Bridge Street West relates to its historical, physical, functional and visual importance to the surrounding area. The church is located in-situ and retains its original use. It has operated as a longstanding place of worship and community gathering. The Bridgeport West Community history dates back to the early nineteenth century and is now an established, stable neighbourhood characterized by older dwellings, new subdivisions, and low-rise infill development. Additionally, across the street from the church to the southwest is Bridgeport Public School, further enhancing the stability of the area.

The church may also be classified as a local landmark. Situated near the top of a hill sloping up from the Grand River, the Bridgeport United Church has a strong visual presence on Bridge Street West and Woolwich Street. The church also has views of Bridgeport Bridge that spans the Grand River and connects to Bridgeport East.

Other Values

Social Values

The Bridgeport United Church has significant social value as a place of worship and education. This building has been providing these services since its construction in 1933, and the congregation dates back even further to 1876. It remains a prominent place of importance within the Bridgeport West community. Places of worship often provide intangible community value, serving as places where people gather and socialize in addition to providing comfort or support to those who need it and creating community connections. Schools also contribute social value for a community, acting as a source of socialization and learning for children.

Heritage Attributes

The heritage value of 40 Bridge Street West resides in the following heritage attributes:

- All elements related to the Gothic architectural style of the church, including:
 - o rectangular plan;

- side gable roof with offset front projecting gable entrance;
- o multi-coloured brick;
- brick buttressing with concrete details;
- o ogee shaped stained glass windows in groups of three per bay with brick voussoirs and concrete sills;
- 1/1 windows in basement;
- o front entrance decorative door surround;
- o front doors with metal hardware and decorative strap hinges;
- o sign above front entrance that reads "Emmanuel Evangelical Church";
- o cross in gable end;
- o date stone that reads "1933"; and
- o chimney;
- All elements related to the contextual value, including:
 - Location of the church and contribution that it makes to the character of the neighbourhood.

References

Bridgeport United. (2014). *History: A short history of Bridgeport United*. Retrieved from http://www.bridgeportunited.org/history on November 26, 2014.

Kolarisch, D. & M. Horne. (1984-85). *Historic Property Report: Bridgeport Emmanuel United Church.*

https://lf.kitchener.ca/WebLinkExt/DocView.aspx?id=1211043&dbid=0&repo=CityofKitchener

Photos



40 Bridge Street West



40 Bridge Street West



40 Bridge Street West



40 Bridge Street West



40 Bridge Street West

CULTURAL HERITAGE EVALUATION FORM

	Address:		Recorder:	
	Institutional Description:		—— Date:	
	Photographs Attached: ☑Front Facade ☐ Left Fa	ıçade ⊠ Right Façade ⊠ Rear Facade	e ⊠ Details □ Setting	
Designation Criteria Recorder – Heritage Kitchener Committee		Heritage Planning Staff		
	1. This property has design value or physical value because it is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, expression, material or construction method.	N/A ⊠ Unknown □ No □ Yes □	N/A □ Unknown □ No □ Yes ⊠	
	2. The property has design value or physical value because it displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit.	N/A ⊠ Unknown □ No □ Yes □	N/A □ Unknown □ No ⊠ Yes □	
	3. The property has design value or physical value because it demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement.	N/A ⊠ Unknown □ No □ Yes □	N/A □ Unknown □ No ⊠ Yes □	

		* E.g constructed with a unique material combination or use, incorporates challenging geometric designs etc.				
-	4.	The property has historical value or associative value because it has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization or institution that is significant to a community. * Additional archival work may be required.	N/A ⊠ Yes □	Unknown □ No □	N/A □ Yes ⊠	Unknown □ No □
	5.	The property has historical or associative value because it yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of a community or culture. * E.g - A commercial building may provide an understanding of how the economic development of the City occured. Additional archival work may be required.	N/A ⊠ Yes □	Unknown No	N/A □ Yes ⊠	Unknown No
	6.	The property has historical value or associative value because it demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer or theorist	N/A ⊠ Yes □	Unknown □ No □	N/A □ Yes ⊠	Unknown □ No □

	who is significant to a community. * Additional archival work may be required.				
7.	The property has contextual value because it is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an area. * E.g It helps to define an entrance point to a neighbourhood or helps establish the (historic) rural character of an area.	N/A ⊠ Yes □	Unknown 🗆 No 🗆	N/A □ Yes ⊠	Unknown No
8.	The property has contextual value because it is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings. * Additional archival work may be required.	N/A ⊠ Yes □	Unknown □ No □	N/A □ Yes ⊠	Unknown □ No □
9.	The property has contextual value because it is a landmark. *within the region, city or neighborhood.	N/A ⊠ Yes □	Unknown □ No □	N/A □ Yes ⊠	Unknown □ No □
Note.	S				

Additional Criteria	Recorder	Heritage Kitchener Committee	
Interior: Is the interior arrangement, finish, craftsmanship and/or detail noteworthy?	N/A ⊠ Unknown □ No □ Yes □	N/A □ Unknown ⊠ No □ Yes □	
Completeness: Does this structure have other original outbuildings, notable landscaping or external features that complete the site?	N/A □ Unknown □ No ☑ Yes □	N/A □ Unknown ⊠ No □ Yes □	
Site Integrity: Does the structure occupy its original site? * If relocated, is it relocated on its original site, moved from another site, etc.	N/A ⊠ Unknown □ No □ Yes □	N/A □ Unknown □ No □ Yes ⊠	
Alterations: Does this building retain most of its original materials and design features? Please refer to the list of heritage attributes within the Statement of Significance and indicate which elements are still existing and which ones have been removed.	N/A ⊠ Unknown □ No □ Yes □	N/A □ Unknown □ No □ Yes ⊠	
Alterations: Are there additional elements or features that should be added to the heritage attribute list?	N/A ⊠ Unknown □ No □ Yes □	N/A □ Unknown □ No ⊠ Yes □	
Condition: Is the building in good condition? *E.g Could be a good candidate for adaptive re-use if possible and contribute towards equity-building and climate change action.	N/A ⊠ Unknown □ No □ Yes □	N/A □ Unknown □ No □ Yes ⊠	

N/A ⊠ Unknown □ No □ Yes □	N/A □ Unknown □ No □ Y es □		
☐ Additional Research Required	□ Additional Research Required		
N/A ⊠ Unknown □ No □ Yes □ □ Additional Research	N/A □ Unknown □ No □ Y es □ ☑ Additional Research		
Required	Required		
Unknown ☐ Residential ☐ Commercial ☐	Unknown ☐ Residential ☐ Commercial ☐ Office ☐ Other ☒ -		
Office □ Other □ - Church	Industrial		
N/A □ Unknown ☒ No □ Yes □ □ Additional Research Required	N/A □ Unknown □ No ☑ Y es □ □ Additional Research Required		
N/A □ Unknown ☒ No □ Yes □ □ Additional Research	N/A □ Unknown □ No ☒ Y es □ □ Additional Research		
Required	Required		
	Yes		

Notes about Additional Criteria Examined					
<u>Recommendation</u>					
Does this property meet the definition of a significant built heritage resource, and should it be designated under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act? (Does it meet two or more of the designation criteria?)					
N/A □ Unknown □ No □ Yes ⊠					
If not, please select the appropriate action for follow-up					
☐ Keep on the Municipal Heritage Register					
□ Remove from the Municipal Heritage Register					
☐ Additional Research Required					
Other:					
General / Additional Notes					
TO BE FILLED BY HERITAGE PLANNING STAFF:					
Date of Property Owner Notification:					