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Executive Summary

Located in the heart of Quebec’s Eastern Townships, Bishop’s University was co-founded in 1843 by Bishop Mountain and Lucius Doolittle with intentions to provide training for future Anglican clergymen while delivering a sound and liberal arts education to all students. Due to a variety of internal and external factors, especially social and political events, affected the institution’s history and in turn influenced both the built form and student life; these factors have had a considerable impact upon the Bishop’s campus. Over the past one hundred fifty years, Bishop’s landscape has evolved from just two buildings – the main building and St. Mark’s Chapel – to the existing campus, which consists of 25 buildings spreading across a 550 hectare area; therefore, Bishop’s has faced the considerable challenges of growth, while attempting to maintain its historic built form elements. This report attempts to define Bishop’s heritage significance by identifying elements of the campus’ cultural heritage resources that are significant and should be protected. For the purposes of this study, cultural heritage resources include buildings and structures, cultural landscapes and sites of archaeological potential. Given that University is currently working on a Campus Master Plan, it is hoped that all the information gathered within this study will serve as a guide for future campus planning.

Qualitative methods were chosen to support the research process. First, a literature review was undertaken in order to investigate and understand the different theories behind heritage conservation, paying special attention on cultural landscapes, archaeology, and campus planning. Second, a number of documents were studied as case studies in order to provide a framework for this document. These include the Ontario Heritage Toolkit’s guideline for Heritage Conservation Districts, reports on designation guidelines from U.S. Department of Interior and Heritage Campus Master Plans from academic institutions such as Queen’s University at Kingston and the University of British Columbia, Vancouver. Third, extensive archival research was conducted at the Bishop’s Archives, the Eastern Townships Resource Centre and Buildings and Grounds Department in an attempt to extract supplementary information to complement current campus literature; many of these resources are scattered all over campus throughout various departments at Bishop’s.

The reconstruction of the campus’ history from its establishment to the contemporary era demonstrates the ways in which the campus’ landscape has changed over time. The plot of land upon which the University was built was probably undisturbed or served for agricultural purposes prior to its acquisition by the University. As envisioned by the founder, the first building, Old Arts, was built in the Collegiate Gothic style to mirror established English institutions such as Oxford and Cambridge. However, structures built in later years do not follow that trend, but instead adopt the architectural styles of the period in which they were designed. Results of this study demonstrated that all current built forms share the following
characteristics: all brick façades, and/or their formation reflects the cloistered model with the quadrangle as a gathering place.

Every single landscape and building, whether demolished, modified or still standing, held special meanings for their users through the creation of memories. Even though some of these thoughts and values are neither visible nor tangible, they are important in the study of heritage conservation as they reveal a place’s character, customs, and usage. Therefore, demonstrating the inherent values that were cherished historically helps identify elements that should be recognized and protected for future generations. This approach to evaluating heritage resources assesses both physical/tangible and associative/intangible heritage values.

In terms of the campus’ heritage character, it is clear that Bishop’s campus distinguishes itself by locating at the heart of Eastern Townships. Its extensive history and buildings development in two distinct phases (1843-1909 and 1950-today) create the sense of community and place for all users. Bishop’s Anglican roots may have faded with its secularization, but the institution remains inclusive as it continues to offer a sound and liberal education to all. Its character defining elements include:

- Self-contained
- Contains buildings and landscapes of cultural heritage significance
- Certain buildings designed by historically significant architects (example: John George Howard for Old Arts/McGreer)
- Liberal Arts values manifested in campus layout, encouraging diversity, strong sense of community and associative values
- Landmarks and physical layout that establish a strong place image
- A mix of sacred and secular tradition through traditions and self-sufficiency
- Uniformity of character across campus using bricks and low-density buildings
- Car-oriented campus in newer areas, but pedestrian-oriented in older areas
- Major views scattered across campus due to the campus’ topography
- Important natural features such as Massawippi River and St. Francis River
- Rural setting, encouraging appreciation of nature

After a thorough study of Bishop’s campus’ history, the following are the recommendations made regarding campus planning and heritage conservation:

- Professional archaeologists should be hired as soon as possible to determine the campus’ archaeological potential since not much is known about the site prior to its foundation in 1843.
- An inventory and evaluation of campus cultural heritage resources should be set up based on the research prepared for this report and should inform all future campus planning.
• The heritage character statement and character defining elements identified in this study should be included in the planning principles within the Bishop’s University Campus Master Plan.

• Sensitive incremental development, known as gradual development, should be used instead of large lump development where it is believed that the new building fulfills all future needs. This method offers more flexibility in terms of human and financial resources because it caters to Bishop’s ever-changing needs, and the resultant built forms better complement the existing landscape. Current research notes that this theory did not work as well as expected in the American context; yet, it is possible it may work in the Canadian context when dealing with heritage conservation if funding is made available for small scale projects. Sensitive incremental development should be guided by a comprehensive Campus Master Plan to ensure individual developments fit and contribute to the environment and the overall vision established by the University.

• All old and new members from the Bishop’s community should be encouraged to participate in the planning process by sharing their personal experiences and/or artifacts. Understanding the users’ academic and social needs and travel patterns will ensure that the built form complements the environment rather than focusing on aesthetics or being influenced by the “buzzword” of the period such as walkability. In addition, such information will provide an opportunity to record the site’s history as knowledge for everyone, especially researchers and future generations.

• Recognize the destruction of certain landscapes and buildings that made way for current structures. It is crucial to find ways to retrofit existing buildings while preserving both the indoor and outdoor features of the built forms that have heritage significance. That is because much heritage and features have been lost through renovations and the use of modern materials. In addition, it could be beneficial to commemorate the now demolished buildings and landscapes through memorial plaques as part of a comprehensive campus interpretation plan.

• Emergency preparedness plans should be written and applied for both historical buildings and important artifacts given that much of the University is located on a flood plain and some information was lost in fires over the years. Damages to these structures and historical items could potentially lead to expensive repairs, losses and even destruction, creating gaps in information for future researchers.

• Increased partnership between departments within Bishop’s can ensure the recording and safeguarding of all historical materials for reference and research purposes. For example, immediate needs stemming from art conservation should be addressed with specific expertise by encouraging community members to participate through volunteering, practicums or even coursework.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

This report contains a study that is intended to contribute to the development of the Heritage Campus Master Plan for Bishop’s University. Three questions will be raised and answered through this process:

1) What is the heritage significance of Bishop’s?
2) What are the elements that are considered to be of heritage significance and how should they be protected?
3) How will this information influence the future campus planning at this institution?

Located in the heart of Quebec’s Eastern Townships, Bishop’s University was co-founded in 1843 by Bishop Mountain and Lucius Doolittle with intentions to provide training for future Anglican clergymen while delivering a sound and liberal arts education to all students. Due to a variety of internal and external factors, especially social and political events, affected the institution’s history and in turn influenced both the built form and student life; these factors have had a considerable impact upon the Bishop’s campus. Over the past one hundred fifty years, Bishop’s landscape has evolved from just two buildings – the main building and St. Mark’s Chapel – to the existing campus, which

---

1 See Appendix 1 for a glossary of abbreviations used in this report.
consists of 25 buildings spreading across a 550 hectare area; therefore, Bishop’s has faced the considerable challenges of growth, while attempting to maintain its historic built form elements.

In order to understand the significance of Bishop’s cultural heritage resources, it is important first to understand the stakeholders involved as some of them influence the decision-making or are currently playing a significant role in recording and/or planning the campus’ development. Chapter 1 discusses these individuals and groups. Chapter 2 will examine the qualitative methodologies applied to this report. Chapter 3 will provide an overview of the theories behind heritage conservation, archaeology and campus planning. Chapter 4 will be devoted to the potential format for a heritage campus plan by looking at various documents such as the heritage campus Master Plans from Queen’s University and University of British Columbia, the Ontario Heritage Toolkit and evaluation tools used by U.S. Department of Interior. Chapter 5 will provide the University’s historical timeline to see how historical events affected the campus’ evolution. Instead of focusing on individual buildings, the campus will be studied as a whole to see how its development links to important elements, embodying the themes identified in Chapter 6. The study of both tangible (i.e. buildings, landscapes) and intangible (i.e. usage pattern, ideology) objects will be provided and helps prepare a heritage character statement to guide the future campus development (in Chapter 7). Chapter 8 provides a summary of study findings and recommendations for the future Campus Master Plan that will guide future development and heritage conservation.

1.1 Stakeholder Analysis - Who should care?

This report’s stakeholders consist of:

1) Staff members from Buildings and Grounds (hereby referred to as B&G)
2) Consultants who will be working on the Campus Master Plan
3) Archivists and researchers at the Bishop’s Archives and Eastern Townships Research Centre
4) Recruitment Office
5) Advancement Office
6) Bishop’s administration, faculty, staff and students, possibly Champlain’s students
7) Township residents and the general public

As the University is in the process of creating a Campus Master Plan to support its academic objectives, the staff members from B&G along with members of the selected consulting firm should understand the ways in which the campus’ history affects the dynamic of the academic community and the ways in which individuals use the buildings and landscapes. Although contemporary planning puts considerable emphasis on creating healthy communities (i.e. encouraging walking over car usage)
and making places aesthetically pleasing (i.e. emphasizing architecture and green spaces), the historical and social components are often underplayed. Hence, it is important to recognize and remember that the ultimate goal is to plan for individuals who make use of, and associate themselves with, the campus, whether they are prospective students, staff, faculty, current students, or alumni.

Although there currently exists a historical timeline and fragmentary information on campus development, this report may be of interest to the archivists from Bishop’s University and Eastern Townships Research Centre. This is because documents from the two collections combined will provide more details, allowing a better understanding of the campus’ evolution and its relation to the development of Eastern Townships. In addition, this may help potential researchers, genealogists and visitors appreciate their visit to the University and surrounding areas.

Both the Recruitment Office and Advancement Office would benefit from this research, since the first interacts with prospective students and their families while the latter manages the alumni relations. Having a better knowledge of the campus’ history would enhance tours given by Student Ambassadors from the Recruitment Office and alumni can have an increased appreciation of the Bishop’s community when they return for reunions and Homecoming events.

Bishop’s administration, faculty, staff and current students along with Champlain College’s, a local CEGEP, students have been identified since they are the current users of the campus. At this moment, they are part of the University’s living history and their ability to appreciate the campus’ past may improve their association to the community. Some of this information may be useful to Bishop’s Geography and Environmental Studies department as well if they want to conduct environmental assessments or prepare new reports for B&G.

The last identified group consists of the Township residents, especially long-time residents, and members from the general public. Notwithstanding occasional problems arising from the infrequently-contentious town-gown relationship, the University is normally perceived as a hub for people who live in Lennoxville. Facilities such as the Sports Centre, the rink, and the Centennial Theatre are used for athletic and entertainment purposes. Members of the general public can recognize the value of the historic aspects of this campus for pure enjoyment or personal interests; therefore, this report is an attempt to reach out to as many people who are interested in the University’s history and cultural resources.
Chapter 2: Methodology

In order to address the three questions posed at the Introduction, qualitative methods have been selected for the purpose of this project. Although the author lived on campus for her four years of undergraduate studies, she revisited the campus numerous times: during Fall 2008, Fall 2009 and Winter 2011. The purposes of these field trips were to identify visually what modifications had been carried out. During the site visits, photographs of buildings and landscapes were taken and archival research was conducted to see what information is available.²

Preliminary research from Fall 2009 revealed that little has been written about the Bishop’s history although photographs and advertisements in old newspapers along with journals were extensively collected. Interestingly enough, the author’s visit in Winter 2011 to the University’s Archives (which also houses the Eastern Townships Research Centre or ETRC) and Buildings & Grounds department unveiled more information than was previously thought to exist.

It is important to recognize the scarcity of primary sources because some of the records may well have been destroyed by various fires that have broken out over the years. In addition, memorabilia of Bishop’s faculty, staff, current students and alumni may still be in personal collections which are not readily accessible for the purpose of this project; therefore, there may be gaps in information on buildings and landscapes for certain time periods.

As a result, this report relies heavily on the following books as secondary sources: Bishop’s University 1843-1970 by Principal Christopher Nicholls and A Portrait of Bishop’s University/ L’Université Bishop’s: Un retrospective, edited by Anna Grant. Both works were published for the Sesquicentennial Celebrations in 1993-1994. A recent timeline compiled by Anna Grant provides updated information as well. Bishop’s University: the first hundred years, written by D.C. Masters in the 1950s, will not be studied due to presence of inaccurate information, leading to doubts in terms of the author’s research methodology. The unpublished work from the ETRC collection entitled Lennoxville/Ascot 1791-1950 by Dorothy Dutton, a 1920 Bishop’s graduate, has

² Considering that this document is based completely on archival research, it is not required to go through General Research Ethics Board’s ethic clearance since no formal interview was conducted with individuals. The author believes it is appropriate to mention that she has completed the Queen’s Course in Human Research Participant Protection certification and acted appropriately to avoid all ethics violation.
proven to be valuable, considering it is personal work, and its methodology deemed acceptable. It contains an extensive list of references and includes interviews with local residents. It provides more details about history of the region and the University; however, certain findings may contradict the ones found in Principal Nicholl’s book given that both authors were dealing with current history through their own observations or historical documents.

Several recent articles, published within the last 20 years, are useful as well in studying the campus’ physical evolution. The documents consist of Phyllis Lambert’s address upon conferral in 1987 (found in the 1994 booklet on buildings produced by Bishop’s Archives) and Les Couvertures de Photographies Aériennes des Cantons de l’Est: Inventaire et Utilité pour les Études Multidates, et Cas du Campus de l’Université Bishop’s by Jean-Marie Dubois and Léo Provencher. This information complements the historical data gathered from Bishop’s University 1843-1970. Meanwhile, the tour guide prepared by the former Liaison Office in 2005, as well as booklets provided by Bishop’s archivist, Anna Grant, along with the Biographical Dictionary of Architects in Canada 1800-1950, were used to help support historical research to identify elements that this author deems significant and should be protected.

The thorough cross-examination of those books, documents, photographs and maps helps provides insight into the evolution of the campus, the buildings and landscapes including values associated with these places. In addition, tangible objects such as photographs, postcards and old journal articles may reveal information on individuals’ associative values for the campus. Aerial photos of the campus clearly demonstrate how the campus has evolved over time. Again, it is important to note that this is only a preliminary list and new information may surface over time through personal recollections or items donated (i.e. personal diary) by descendants that have historical significance pertaining to the University.

Given that the research methods and personal bias have been thoroughly discussed, it would be appropriate to study the theories behind heritage conservation and campus planning before explaining the structure of the Ontario Heritage Toolkit and best practices for Heritage Campus Master Plans.

Even though historical research is relatively straightforward, it is important to recognize the role that bias plays in this report. First, no writer is completely impartial when recording historical events; therefore, documents will contain bias depending on a person’s stance. Second, the author’s personal bias may be present either due to her perceptions or due to her experiences as a former student and an alumna. The
mitigation of bias is difficult, but all facts shall be presented as objectively as possible through direct citation of data.
Chapter 3: What Are the Ideas behind Heritage Conservation and Campus Planning?

For rural or urban planners, there is a need to understand the extensive history and rationale behind the notions of heritage conservation and campus planning. That is because there is a need to preserve culture for future generations as mentioned in United Nation’s *Our Common Future* (United Nations World Commission on Environment and Development, 1987). Meanwhile, academic institutions exist both in rural and urban settings and require expansion when they reach a certain capacity. Planners should be able to accommodate needs stemming from expansion while balancing growth with heritage conservation.

3.1 Heritage Conservation: Cultural Landscape and Archaeology

Until the 1980s, heritage conservation focused primarily on preserving buildings for their historical association or architectural design, whether it be on a local, national or international level (Tyler, Ligibel, & Tyler, 2009; Denhez, 1997). It was only at the end of the 1980s that people started exploring the legitimacy of treating cultural landscapes, while identifying circumstances surrounding them through legislation and incentives (Murtagh, 1993, pp. 62-77). However, Murtagh questions whether it is possible to keep a site true to the original design intent after the designation process, as people will seek to preserve it within the modern context (Murtagh, 1993, pp. 116-118; 166-171). This is complicated further when dealing with rural areas considering: “rural preservation necessitates attention to individual buildings and villages of cultural significance within a given area, it also encompasses the husbanding and maintenance of the surrounding open space which enhances the significance of those villages and helps to maintain the local economy and social institutions. […] Rural preservation therefore becomes a very sensitive interdisciplinary effort, consisting as it does of agricultural, economic, environmental, social, political, and historical factors.” (Murtagh, 1993, p. 137)

This paragraph suggests the difficulties that one can find during the rural conservation process. Everything said above can certainly apply to Bishop’s University since it is located in a rural setting and has a complex cultural landscape.

3.1.1 Cultural Landscape

It is important to know that the notion of cultural landscape varies depending on the institutions involved. This report will use United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization’s definition from 1992:

“Cultural landscapes represent the combined works of nature and of man. They are illustrative of the evolution of human society and
settlement over time, under the influence of physical constraints and/or opportunities presented by the natural environment and of successive social, economic and cultural forces, both external and internal.” (National Capital Commission, 2007)

From there, it is understood that cultural landscapes reflect the continuous interaction between culture and nature. Nature provides a physical framework within which culture can flourish. This creates opportunities in social, economic and cultural realms.

One should emphasize history and collective memory as part of cultural landscape. As seen in Tadhg O’Keeffe’s *Landscape and Memory: Historiography, Theory, Methodology*, stimulus grasped and memories created by the five senses affect how individuals within a community remember a landscape which in turn influences a place’s management and redevelopment (O’Keeffe, 2007, pp. 3-17). The article *Changing Conceptions of Heritage and Landscape* by Paul Claval shows how it can be recognized that “the contemporary interest in landscapes is often linked to their role as sites of memory.” (Claval, 2007, p. 85) This suggests how people valued places that are used for their historical associations. In addition, numerous aspects in the physical environment can influence ethnic and even national groups’ identity when one looks at them from a historical perspective. Therefore, vernacular landscapes are a factor in cultural landscape planning.

3.1.2 Archaeology

The notion of archaeology should not be ignored in a cultural landscape, as many sites have archaeological potential. Many artifacts may be hidden under the ground, but they are valuable in understanding an area’s character once they are understood through studies or preliminary evaluations with the use of technology, excavations or after going through the process of art conservation. In addition, many of those items may be conserved in archives which give people a better appreciation of what came before them and the customs associated with that place. Thus, archaeological research links back to the study of cultural landscape since it enhances the values associated to that specific place.

As mentioned in Sam Turner’s (2006, p. 385) article, Historic Landscape Characterization (HLC) “is a form of landscape archaeology for understanding and representing landscapes with particular references to their historical development.” This definition suggests that a place’s interpretation depends on its historical, cultural and methodological context.

The good management of artifacts, especially those related to archaeology, may alter people’s perceptions and cultural values. A sense of community can be fostered through media coverage along with increased research and participation. In the example of the Quadrant Site in Sydney, Australia, archaeologists tapped into hidden knowledge as local people came forward with oral tradition, photos and mementos that
related to the place’s history and its associative values (Cressey & Vinton, 2007, p. 18). Therefore, the inclusiveness encourages people to participate fully in the process of heritage conservation. All this new information sheds light while providing a clearer picture of a history that would have been otherwise left unrecorded and lost to the community.

Cultural landscapes and archaeological resources are important components of heritage conservation. They complement people’s understanding and interpretation of physical settings, which is applicable in the process of campus planning.

3.2 Campus Planning

Campus planning is largely influenced by the beliefs and styles of different periods. Literature prior to the 1980s has a tendency to focus solely on the technical aspects (i.e. built form and efficiency) of campus planning (Bullock, 1969). However, more recent books and articles start to explore the ways in which people associate themselves with built form and their environment. Therefore, such sources provide an excellent source of information for the development of Master Plans, as they attempt to understand how people perceive the cultural landscapes over time.

As noted by Alexander Cooper, a planning consultant in New York City, “[m]aster plans typically have their origins in the politics of decision-making.” (Dixon, 2003, p. 41) To elaborate on this aspect, it can be noted that universities use buildings or gateways to “give a favourable first impression of the school’s brand—relaxed, modern, respectful of tradition—but also to frame memorable views of the campus’s impressive chapel and playing fields.” (Dixon, 2003, p. 41) This statement highlights the importance of the first impression provided by the university to parents and prospective students, and how its image/environment can potentially affect a family’s final choice of university.

Re-emphasizing how time and place matters in campus planning, Munitz starts his essay by noting that, “[w]hen looking back on their college days, many people find that their most vivid and lasting memories include a mental image of their alma maters: the buildings, grounds, and other tangible settings of their campus lives. (Munitz, 2004)” This suggests the ways in which campus planning, along with architectural styles, serves to illustrate the campus’ identity and the effects on one’s memory long after the educational experience is over. The author raises an important point: the importance of looking after historic buildings as he says, “[p]reserving our built heritage speaks to the core of the educational mission: to learn about the past while we reach toward the future. It ensures that future generations can experience and appreciate great architectural treasures for years to come.” (Munitz, 2004)

While other works, like Bullock and Dixon, spoke little on the aspect of preservation per se, Munitz notes the role of heritage on campus in his article by stating that, “[t]he visual manifestation of our institutions, however, enriches not only our
personal or communal recollections, but also our shared architectural heritage.” (Munitz, 2004) This demonstrates that a campus has numerous layers that need to be understood while the “preservation of historic sites and buildings can help bind communities, connect people to traditions, revive traditional craft skills, and even reinvigorate cities and towns.” (Munitz, 2004)

Other than campus built form, landscapes and historic values, the social component is vital to campus planning. As noted by Thomas Jefferson, designer of the University of Virginia, a campus should be seen as an “academic village” considering “American higher education has largely adhered to the ‘collegiate’ ideal rooted in the medieval universities, where students and teachers lived and studied together in small, tightly regulated colleges.” (Turner P. V., 1984, p. 3) Therefore, the need to fulfill these requirements forced architects to create a community rather than focusing on the individual buildings.

Despite following the British model, American campus planning became a field on its own by “placing of colleges in the countryside or even in the wilderness” (Turner P. V., 1984, p. 4) while putting emphasis over “separate buildings set in open green space.” (Turner P. V., 1984, p. 4) This desire to integrate natural settings forces individual campuses to be more self-sustaining compared to those situated in larger cities. Meanwhile, having open spaces moves away from the cloistered model promoted by British universities. All of these alterations serve to distinguish the institutions’ intrinsic values while bearing in mind their historical evolution.

The abovementioned aspects reinforce the idea that campus planning must take heritage conservation and social planning into consideration. As noted by Munitz (2004), “[t]oo much is at stake [without physical heritage]: our collective memories, history, and achievements.” These words serve as a reminder that the past must be studied, so that future generations comprehend why the campus evolved into what is known today.
Chapter 4: What Should a Heritage Campus Master Plan Look Like?

In order to understand how campus heritage conservation works, evaluation criteria for Bishop’s University’s buildings and cultural landscape from the *Ontario Heritage Toolkit* will be used, especially the section on heritage conservation districts which addresses cultural landscapes. Reports from U.S. Department of Interior’s National Park Service will be examined to complement the existing framework. Also, the heritage study prepared for Queen’s University and the history section of the University of British Columbia’s campus plan will be studied and act as case studies for the purpose of this report.

4.1 Ontario Heritage Toolkit – Heritage Conservation District

As this report looks at designating a defined area on campus for heritage conservation, it may be helpful to study an existing set of heritage conservation guidelines. The Province of Ontario provides a Heritage Toolkit which includes a section on the Heritage Conservation District (HCD). According to the *Ontario Heritage Toolkit*, the HCD “may comprise an area with a group or complex of buildings, or a larger area with many buildings and properties […] with a concentration of heritage resources with special character or historical association that distinguishes it from its surroundings.” (Ministry of Culture, 2006, p. 5) Therefore, its purpose “contributes to an understanding and appreciation of the cultural identity (Ministry of Culture, 2006, p. 5)” which is applicable to the Bishop’s community. A similar designation process would be beneficial as well since Quebec still does not have official guidelines and this will become a unique planning framework for the University, enhancing people’s sense of space and, the campus’ cultural vitality, while promoting healthy cultural tourism for families of prospective students and tourists.

The HCD is complex because it “often extends beyond its built heritage structures, streets, landscape and other physical and spatial elements, to include important vistas and views between and towards buildings and spaces within the district” (Ministry of Culture, 2006, p. 5). These features are important as they contribute the most to personal perceptions while interacting physically with that space. The ability to list components allows the identification of major resources that define the ways in which the place evolved historically.
4.2 Reports from U.S. Department of the Interior

The Heritage Conservation movement (and attendant policies) was deeper roots in the United States, so it would be appropriate to study the National Register Bulletins #18 and #30 published by U.S. Department of the Interior’s National Park Services. *How to Evaluate and Nominate Designed Historic Landscapes* and *Guidelines for Evaluating and Documenting Rural Landscapes* are helpful because Bishop’s campus is located in a rural area and possesses a historic landscape.

According to *How to Evaluate and Nominate Designed Historic Landscapes*, former Bulletin #18, the Bishop’s campus would qualify for heritage designation as it is built to a recognized style and used institutionally. As for the evaluation process, there is a need to gather information on the location’s history, as well as identify and analyze its characteristics and significance by creating a narrative description of the historical features that reflects the past and the present. Then, there is a need to evaluate its integrity in order to ensure that significant heritage elements remain intact. (Keller & Keller, n.d.)

For the *Guidelines for Evaluating and Documenting Rural Historic Landscapes*, former Bulletin #30, rural historic landscape are defined as “a geographical area that historically has been used by people, or shaped or modified by human activity, occupancy, or intervention, and that possesses a significant concentration, linkage, or continuity of areas of land use, vegetation, buildings and structures, roads and waterways and natural features.” (U.S. Department of Interior et al., 1999, p. 3) This document may not apply as much for this report considering “rural landscapes usually are not the work of a professional designer and have not been developed according to academic or professional standards, theories, or philosophies of landscape architecture.” (U.S. Department of Interior and al., 1999, p. 2) The campus was developed according to the notion of ‘quadrangle’ in architectural terms. However, it is not necessary to dismiss the report’s usefulness since it may be applicable to other sections of Bishop’s campus.

The eleven processes identified shall be listed for future references: land uses and activities, patterns of spatial organization, response to the natural environment, cultural traditions, circulation networks, boundary demarcations, vegetation related to land use, ‘buildings, structures and objects’, clusters, archaeological sites and small scale elements (U.S. Department of Interior and al., 1999, pp. 4-6). These are the themes to keep in mind when conducting further research for the campus.
4.3 Heritage Campus Master Plans

In order to study how the heritage campus master plan works, examples from the University of British Columbia in Vancouver, British Columbia and Queen’s University at Kingston, Ontario will be studied as case studies. Their structures and contents will be briefly analyzed in order to see what composition might be the most appropriate for the Bishop’s heritage campus master plan.

4.3.1 University of British Columbia

The University of British Columbia has taken the lead in heritage campus planning in Canada. While working on its latest campus plan, it published *UBC Campus Historical Context and Themes* (2009) which discusses the history of the site and associated heritage values after conducting extensive research and consultations. In terms of methodology, UBC’s built environment and landscape were studied to understand their development, and how various historical events (i.e. World Wars, etc) affected campus planning. The use of photographs (particularly aerial photos) and GIS maps helps the readers visualize changes while identifying distinct characteristics that users of the campus would notice. All of these details allow individuals to connect the features to the various themes proposed in the document.

4.3.2 Queen’s University

As part of the Campus Master Plan, Queen’s University has undertaken an extensive heritage study on its properties and cultural landscapes. This document is relatively straight forward as it follows the *Ontario Heritage Toolkit (OHT)*. Separated into categories based on the institutional, residential or cultural use, each element is evaluated according to the OHT’s guidelines of classification, descriptions and character defining elements. The use of photography and maps help identify and illustrate the points mentioned in the text. Sources from the archives have proven valuable as well for the history section of the Queen’s report. The advantage of the Queen’s heritage plan is the meticulous work that has been put into the policy framework for existing and new developments although some may deem it outdated in relation to changes in provincial heritage legislation since the date of the plan’s completion. (Queen's University Campus Planning and Development & Commonwealth Historic Resources Management Ltd., 1998) Therefore, this section may be consulted for the development of heritage policy for Bishop’s University.

4.4 Proposed format for Bishop’s Heritage Master Plan

Based on the analysis of the *Ontario Heritage Toolkit*, reports from the U.S. Department of Interior and the case studies, the suggested format combines relevant
aspects of the OHT along with the UBC and Queen’s plans. The Ontario Heritage Toolkit gives a good framework using Ontario’s heritage guidelines, since Quebec does not have such an extensive designation system and is currently updating its policies on heritage conservation. UBC’s format will be useful for Bishop’s historical timeline to reflect changes in the built form and cultural landscapes. Meanwhile, Queen’s layout will not be used, but serve as a reference because architectural data for building description at Bishop’s is proven to be incomplete and the campus will be analyzed as a whole. However, this method from Queen’s University can be applied to future research projects in order to complete descriptions of historical usage of all buildings and cultural landscapes. As a result, the following chapters will be an attempt to provide a basic overview of the campus’ history and identify what are possibly the character defining elements which inform the heritage designation process.
Chapter 5: Thematic History of Bishop’s University

Unless indicated differently, all information provided in this section comes from Principal Christopher Nicholl’s book Bishop’s University 1843-1970 because it contains the most up-to-date sources for Bishop’s history. Page numbers will be indicated for reference purpose except for Dutton’s unpublished work because it is unnumbered.

5.1 Years before the Official Foundation

This institution would have been located in Trois Rivières, Quebec, if not for a missionary priest’s intervention. Back in 1840, Bishop George Jehoshaphat Mountain, the third Anglican Bishop of Quebec, was looking into converting a rectory into a theological college in Trois Rivières. Bishop Mountain had support from the Society for Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, individual subscriptions and various donations from congregations of the Church of England (Nicholl C., 1994, p. 16). This plan never came to fruition, as Lucius Doolittle – an intelligent entrepreneur, missionary and founder of a grammar school for boys– wanted the establishment of a college with both a theological and arts curriculum in the Sherbrooke - Lennoxville area (Nicholl C., 1994, pp. 17-18). This was one of his main strategies to increase both immigration to and quality of education within the Eastern Townships, while accommodating the needs of the local English and Protestant population (Nicholl C., 1994, p. 20). Through pledges from local residents pledges, Doolittle managed to raise money for the initial building; however, there were great debates within the Sherbrooke-Lennoxville community on the future college’s exact location (Nicholl C., 1994, pp. 20-21).

Although many wanted the academic institution to be located in Sherbrooke due to its development into a commercial and industrial hub, Lennoxville was chosen for its tranquility and beauty; these qualities were deemed more appropriate for education (Nicholl C., 1994, p. 21). Another deciding factor was that Lt-Col. William Morris purchased 40 acres of land at the junction of the St. Francis and Massawippi River near the

---

3 Located in the Mauricie region of Quebec, Trois-Rivières was referred as Three Rivers by the Anglophone community as seen in Nicholl’s book.
4 Not much is known about Lt.-Col. William Morris other than he was an officer in the British army. According to McGill’s archives, his documented arrival in Canada dated from 1835 and owned lands in both Cape Breton and the Eastern Townships. His grandson, William Morris, went on to attend Bishop’s College. (McGill Archives)
town of Lennoxville, which forms the core of the present campus (Nicholl C., 1994, p. 21).

The University took its first step towards becoming a recognized institution when Edward Hale, elected representative for Sherbrooke County, took a bill authorizing its formation to the Legislative Assembly of the now defunct Province of Canada (Nicholl C., 1994, p. 23). As there were intense arguments in Upper Canada over the right to confer degrees at the time, the bishop chose to abstain from this matter until further notice (Nicholl C., 1994, p. 23). Although there was no direct opposition to the bill, there were endless disputes on the college’s name until a special committee resolved it (Nicholl C., 1994, p. 23). It finally received Royal Assent on December 9th, 1843 after everyone on the committee agreed on the proposed name of “Bishop’s College” (Nicholl C., 1994, p. 23).

5.2 Campus’ development from 1843 to 1949

While trying to gather more financial support for the institution, Bishop Mountain envisioned the campus’ first building to be built in the Collegiate Gothic architectural style, designed by John George Howard (Biographical Dictionary of Architects in Canada 1800-1950), an architect from Toronto (Nicholl C., 1994, p. 25). There was recognition that recruiting labour or transporting building materials to the Eastern Townships could be difficult; moreover, the commercial depression in 1843 was a further major issue as many supporters could not pay their pledge or went bankrupt (Nicholl C., 1994, p. 26). As a result, the first cornerstone was not laid until September 18th, 1844 in front of an extensive audience (Nicholl C., 1994, p. 26). The first classes were held in a commercial building while early faculty and students resided in the Town of Lennoxville until the building’s completion in 1846. In order to accommodate the new principal and his family, the Old Lodge, located on the west side of the main building, was authorized by Bishop’s Corporation in 1848 (Nicholl C., 1994, p. 42). An extension to the building,

---

5 Even though Nicholl’s source is more recent compared to Dutton’s, there seem to be conflicting claims about the initial 40 acres of land. It is difficult to say where Dutton got her sources; yet, she claims that “Colonel William Morris provided the land where the Massawippi and St. Francis Rivers joined (land acquired through marriage).” Also, in her Settler’s chapter, it is said that land can only be acquired through promises to become a farmer prior to 1803 while land can be purchased after 1804.
designed by Lawford and Nelson, was added in 1860 (Biographical Dictionary of Architects in Canada 1800-1950). However, little else is known about this period in terms of student life; therefore, it is not possible to study people’s interaction with this environment.

Bishop’s College was disadvantaged compared to other degree-granting institutions due to political decisions made in the Act of 1843 that had authorized its creation. However, after many years of advocating, the College finally received its Royal Charter to grant degrees from Queen Victoria on 18th January, 1853 (Nicholl C., 1994, p. 47). At that time, its name was changed to the University of Bishop’s College. (Nicholl C., 1994, p. 47) 1855 was a year of great importance for the University because of its first convocation held in Lennoxville (Nicholl C., 1994, p. 50). Until the completion and consecration of the St. Mark’s Chapel6 in 1857, faculty and students attended church services at St. Georges in the town (Dutton, 1988). Therefore, even in that early period there existed a strong town-gown relationship.

The University once had a strong relationship with a grammar school now known, as Bishop’s College School. Both institutions shared the same campus; after a difficult 1859-1860 fundraising campaign, a building specifically for the junior department was constructed on campus. (Nicholl C., 1994, pp. 59-62) Shared facilities between the two departments included, a drill shed7, about which little is known, although both institutions have long military traditions stemming from the Civil War (Dutton, 1988). In order to achieve the ideal of a liberal arts education, there was much

---

6 The booklet on individual buildings from the Bishop’s Archives indicated the Chapel’s architectural design reflected the Perpendicular Gothic Style.

7 According to The Black Watch - Royal Highland Regiment of Canada, the Volunteer Rifle Company was established in 1861 which is known now as the BCS Cadet Corps #2. Therefore, the data has some correlation and that area was probably used as a drill hall where soldiers and cadets performed and practiced military drills.
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emphasis on extracurricular activities as well. A Fives court was located next to the drill shed, most likely modeled after the British sport Fives. Later, an addition to the Old Lennoxville Golf Club in 1897 which is now recognized as one of the few on campus golf course and “the oldest ‘9 hole’ golf club within the Royal Canadian Golf Association and in the Province of Quebec” (Bishop's University Club de Golf Lennoxville). These two elements are deemed historically significant given that they reflect changes made in Bishop’s cultural landscape.

For a long time, the University struggled with deficits, despite many alumni becoming Anglican clergymen for Upper and Lower Canada. Quebec’s entrance into the Canadian Confederation in 1867. The start of a rift between members of the Anglican church, especially the Montrealers, did little to improve Bishop’s finances (Nicholl C., 1994, p. 73). First, the Province of Quebec moved to establish the Department of Public Instruction to regulate Catholic and Protestant education (Nicholl C., 1994, p. 73). Then, Bishop’s faced attacks from the Diocese of Montreal on financial and religious grounds. It also survived a proposal from Bishop Oxenden to establish a theological college in Montreal, which could have compromised Bishop’s future (Nicholl C., 1994, pp. 74-77).

---

8 This sport is described as “similar to handball” by Ljungkull. (Grant, p. 52)
Although enrollment to the University has increased over time, economic crises and political uncertainties have played crucial roles in its finances. The 1870s proved to be turbulent due to the severe depression in North America and low endowment (Nicholl C., 1994, pp. 79-94). Further misfortunes included a series of fires gutting both institutions’ buildings which destroyed the original building designed by John Howard (Bishop’s University Archives, 2010), and an 1880s-era typhoid fever epidemic on campus (Nicholl C., 1994, p. 95). Originally, the administration suspected that the college’s well, located in the quad, was the culprit (Bishop’s University Archives, 2005); however, research revealed that a bad sanitation system was to blame (Nicholl C., 1994, pp. 95-96). Despite these problems, Bishop’s continued to grow. Between 1874 and 1878, an apse was added while the nave was extended in the Chapel to accommodate a growing student population. Meanwhile, Harrold Lodge was built to house faculty members of the Divinity department, and the main building was completed in 1878 (Nicholl C., 1994, p. 87). Numerous academic events occurred during this period as well. The most important one was the debate on women’s admission into higher education; men believed this would disrupt domestic harmony and women’s suitability for marriage. (Nicholl C., 1994, p. 132) On campus, there were attempts to establish professional schools, such as Faculties of Law and Medicine; however, they proved to be short-lived because of Bishop’s location and the lack of opportunities in the area compared to Montreal. (Nicholl C., 1994, p. 24)

In 1890, Bishop’s Williams Hall was added to the grammar school building; however, it was destroyed by a fire in 1891. The BCS’ Old Boys, which consisted of junior school’s alumni, raised the funds for its reconstruction (Dutton, 1988). Later in 1891, Divinity House and Morris House were completed. Divinity House was designed by the architectural firm Nelson & Clift (Biographical Dictionary of Architects in Canada 1800-1950), and
was built through a grant from the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge in London (Liaison Office, 2005-2006). Divinity would then be used to house divinity students and the Professor of Pastoral Theology. An oratory was added to Divinity House through the generosity of Margaret Stewart McKenzie in 1907 (Bishop's University Archives, 1994). Not much is known about Morris House, except that it served as temporary housing after the 1891 fire and as an infirmary for both academic institutions until dynamics on the campus changed in the 1950s (Nicholl C. , 1994, p. 111; Liaison Office, 2005-2006).

By 1893, the new school building was reconstructed and the arches served to unite the buildings belonging to the two institutions (Bishop's University Archives, 2010). A capital campaign was launched when the University celebrated its Jubilee in 1895 (Nicholl C. , 1994, p. 118). The successful campaign led to Robert Hamilton’s endowment, which allowed renovations like extending the main building’s third floor while enlarging and improving the school’s facilities. Alterations, such as the central tower and a stone staircase, were added to enhance the building’s appearance (Nicholl C. , 1994, p. 120). Bandeen Hall was completed in 1898 to serve as a gymnasium and team sports flourished (Ljungkull, 1994, pp. 52-65).

The early 1900s proved to be another difficult period with lower enrollment for the number of spaces available with the expanded facilities. Eventually, a decision was made to admit women to the Faculty of Arts; however, they were excluded from certain extracurricular activities and lived off-campus in Lennoxville (Nicholl C. , 1994, pp. 133-146; 179-181). The first female graduate was Anna Bryant, who received her B.A. in 1905 (Bishop's University
In 1908, the New Lodge acted as the new Principal’s Residence to free up space for student housing and academic pursuits. A year later, the library wing was added to the Old Arts building, housing the chemistry and physics labs (Bishop’s University Archives, 2010).

The library wing extension, now known as the Old Library, marks the end of Bishop’s pre-1950 building projects. Further expansion was prevented by a number of issues, including internal problems, financial difficulties, and the enlistment of many military-age students and faculty member into Canada’s military during World War I. In terms of social structure, the issues were caused by the lack of maturity by the entering undergraduate class, leadership and low morale that stemmed from war casualties (Nicholl C., 1994, p. 152). However, the War empowered female students as by 1917 they outnumbered men on campus, and were encouraged as a result to participate more fully in campus life through theatre or writing for the Mitre, the University’s magazine (Nicholl C., 1994, pp. 152-183). When the students and alumni returned from war in 1919, there were calls to secularize Bishop’s to ensure that it was in line with other Canadian institutions (Nicholl C., 1994, pp. 156-157). There was also recognition that new academic programs to provide knowledge in the sciences were necessary since McGill was already well established in the field (Nicholl C., 1994, pp. 192-195). The war and unmet needs altered the dynamics of the university, which would be reflected in the future building program.

In 1922, Bishop’s College School severed its ties to the University by moving to Moulton Hill, located across the St. Francis River. From then on, the college building was renamed Old Arts while the former BCS building was renamed New Arts (Nicholl C., 1994, pp. 153-154). That period was marred with more leadership crises and financial difficulties contributing to the deterioration of buildings. The efforts of Principal A.H. McGreer were crucial to Bishop’s survival, as he led successful endowment campaigns.

Figure 12: Bishop’s Johnson building © Bishop’s University Archives

Figure 13: Wooden Bridge connecting Lennoxville and Bishop’s © Eastern Township Research Center, 2011
while promoting the University’s image outside of the Townships to ensure its survival (Nicholl C., 1994, pp. 165-172). In 1937, a storm destroyed the wooden bridge that linked the institution to the town, leading to the construction of a steel bridge with distinguished arches as its replacement. (Bishop's University, 2006) Two years later, the path leading to this bridge9 and other structures, like telephone poles, were removed in order to improve the campus’ aesthetics. (Bishop's University Archives, 2010)

When World War II broke out in 1939, enrollment in Arts and Sciences declined considerably, as many students enlisted for military service.10 Unlike World War I, faculty members were retained as many of them were past military age (Nicholl C., 1994, pp. 199-200). The question over secularization of the Bishop’s Corporation, which consisted mainly of members from Anglican Church, came about again with the resignation of Principal McGreer in 1945 to ensure it can receive financial contributions from outside organizations (Nicholl C., 1994, pp. 205-209). By raising $2.35 million, the 1948’s capital campaign proved to be successful. A portion of that amount, including a $1 million grant from the Quebec Government, was dedicated to new constructions and to University operating costs (Nicholl C., 1994, p. 222). All these events, especially the secularization of the Bishop’s Corporation, seem to have triggered a transition from a sacred to secular landscape. That is because newer constructions from 1950s onwards will move away from the traditional Collegiate Gothic to more modernistic styles.

---

9 The following is a description of the surrounding areas by Dutton (1988): “Between the Old Lodge and the Divinity House was a very large and very old pine tree with a wooden seat encircling it. Another enormous pine was near the road where a path led from the short covered wooden bridge.”

10 According to Nicholls (p. 199): “The battalion of the Royal Rifles sent to defend Hong Kong in 1941 was largely recruited from the Townships. Ten of them, including eight of their officers, were Bishop’s men; and when the Japanese attacked Hong Kong on 18 December, McGreer cabled the BBC to ask that a message of pride and confidence be broadcast to them from the university. The message was broadcast on the Far Eastern service of the BBC on Boxing Day. Unhappily the garrison had been overrun the previous day.”
5.3 Campus Development from 1950 – today

The building campaign in the 1950s reflected administrators’ recognition that older facilities must be revamped, so upgrades were made to the central heating plant and sewage system (Nicholl C., 1994, p. 225). Administrators also recognized the value of Bishop’s residential character. With the mentality change from World War I, many believed that living space should be made available so that female undergraduates could be included as full members of the community. Although the proposal was met with some resistance from board members, a women’s residence was built in addition to a new men’s residence in 1950 (Nicholl C., 1994, p. 225). They were named Pollack and Norton Hall respectively after their benefactors and helped form the third side of the quadrangle. Memorial House, the new sports complex, was built so that the old gym could be converted into a dining hall (Bishop’s University Archives, 1994). To commemorate the accomplishments of Principal A. H. McGreer after his death, Old Arts was renamed McGreer Hall in 1953. The University itself was formally renamed “Bishop’s University” in 1958 (Bishop’s University Archives, 2010).

With increased enrollment, the Bishop’s campus continued to expand in the late 1950s until 1960s. The John Bassett Memorial Library was constructed after the Old Library proved to be inadequate in housing the expanded books and journals collection (Nicholl C., 1994, pp. 231-234). As a result, the fourth side of the quadrangle was created. Mackinnon Hall was added in 1959 to provide additional housing for female students; six houses were soon built around it to accommodate faculty members (Nicholl C., 1994, p. 244). Other residences built during this time included Abbott Hall (1962) and Kuehner Hall (1965). The W. B. Scott Arena was
completed in 1960 to replace the older rink, and to increase students’ involvement in other type of sports (Ljungkull, 1994, p. 60).

Other buildings constructed to support academic, residence life and extracurricular activities during this time included Bishop Mountain House, the Jasper Hume Nicolls Building, the John Hamilton Building, Dewhurst Hall as the new dining hall, Munster Hall, and the Centennial Theatre (Dubois & Provencher, 2003, pp. 38-47). Finally, New Arts was expanded in the 1960s to create the Andrew S. Johnson Science Building which contained new laboratories. The former BCS’ Headmaster’s house, built before 1945, was demolished in this process (Dubois & Provencher, 2003, p. 41).

The introduction of the CEGEP¹¹ system by the Quebec government in 1964 proved to be problematic for Bishop’s, as it created many uncertainties and meant that curriculum changes were required for Quebec students. At first, the education reform committee initially thought that Bishop’s would be better off as a CEGEP rather than a university due to its small size and enrollment (Nicholl C., 1994, pp. 265-267). However, it was spared with the establishment of Champlain College¹² Lennoxville, an English CEGEP which shared most campus facilities with Bishop’s (except for the students’ residences) (Nicholl C., 1994, p. 295). McGreer was converted to Champlain’s use until Bishop’s celebrated its sesquicentennial anniversary (Nadeau-Saumier, 1994, p. 20).

¹¹ CEGEP is the acronym that stands for Collège d’enseignement général et professionnel which roughly translate into College of General and Vocational Education. This pre-university program only exists in Quebec because the schooling curriculum is different: Primary school = Grade 1 to 6. Secondary school = Grade 7 – 11. CEGEP = Grade 12 – first year of university. University = second year – fourth year.

¹² Champlain College is an English CEGEP.
The Faculty of Divinity finally closed in 1970 due to declining enrollment; Divinity House was converted into student housing, and later into offices in 1988 (Bishop's University Archives, 1994). The John H. Price Sports and Recreation Centre served as the new gymnasium while the Marjorie Donald House was constructed in the late 1970s (Bishop's University Archives, 2010). The two most recently constructed buildings are respectively the Molson Fine Arts Building (built in 1990 to house the Fine Arts department), and Paterson Hall (built in the apartment style in 2004 to house students from the “double-cohort” created by the elimination of Grade 13 in the Province of Ontario). A notable landscape created during this time is the Peace Garden, which included a time capsule to celebrate of the University’s 150th anniversary. Then, 2008 marked the construction of the Coulter Field which is a synthetic turf field to host various sport events for Bishop’s and the community (Bishop's University, 2008).

With a renewed emphasis in science programs such as environmental studies, several off-campus locations were either purchased or dedicated for student research purposes. The first is an experimental farm that is often described in older literature “as further down the road” (Dutton, 1988). The second is the Curry Wildlife Refuge, a three-hectare wetland conservation area, which was established in 1991 (Bishop’s University Archives, 2010). The last, the Johnville Bog, was purchased from the City of Sherbrooke as a joint venture between Université de Sherbrooke and Bishop’s University (Bishop's University Archives, 2010).

Land was also made available for other student initiatives. For example, a small plot of land, located behind Paterson Hall, was given to the Department of Classical Studies in 2000. It serves as a mock archaeology field where students apply basic methodologies – survey, excavation and analysis – as they attempt to uncover artifacts.
such as glass and fake pottery from the Munsterite\(^\text{13}\) civilization. Unfortunately, a section of this site was destroyed when construction workers unknowingly dumped soil during the construction of Paterson Hall, by burying it even deeper into the ground.

Piecing together Bishop’s history, one realizes that the University is a community that stands on its own. Having understood this, it gives everyone – especially campus planners – a better perspective in the creation of a thematic framework that is reflective of Bishop’s past, present and future developments.

\(^\text{13}\) Munster Hall was actually the closest building to the site prior to the construction of Paterson Hall in 2004. Therefore, the professor who taught the course named the mystery civilization as the Munsterite. Considering Munster Hall is a 24h quiet residence and the motto given by students is “the campus’ best kept secret”, there is a prominent joke amongst Classicists that they are attempting to uncover Munsterite’s secrets through the analysis of the artifacts. (The author has taken this course in Fall 2006, this is how she knows the details)
5.4 Summary of Building and Landscape Evolution during Major Periods of Campus Development

5.4.1: Foundation to 1950

Figure 22: Bishop's Campus pre-1843
© Hoi Kei Phoebe Chan, 2011
Buildings:
1. Old Arts – 1846, extensions include The Lodge in 1848 and ‘Dining Room’ in 1861. Original interior destroyed in 1875’s fire.
* Reconstruction and renovations for the three buildings were completed in 1878
4. BCS building, extension with Bishop’s William Hall in 1890
5. Divinity House – 1891
6. Morris House – 1891
7. Bandeen Hall – 1898
8. Principal’s New Lodge – 1908
9. Old Library – 1909, damaged by fire in 1917
11. “Headmaster’s House” – remains undated, but built before 1945
12. Faculty housing (constructed between 1900-1950)
13. Cricket field - 1873, converted into football field
14. Golf Course - 1897

Landscapes:
 a) Fives Court (removed before 1945)
 b) Drill shed (removed before 1945)
 c) Fence between McGreer and Old Johnson
 d) Roundabout
 e) Arches connecting School and College Buildings (1893) instead of ‘fence’ from 1865
 f) Tennis court (removed from Old Quad), formation of existing Quad
 g) Wooden bridge connecting to Lennoxville, demolished after 1937’s storm
 h) Removal of telephone and hydro poles in landscape programme – 1939
 i) Parking lot next to New Lodge
5.4.2: 1950-today

Figure 23: Bishop's Campus 1950-onward
© Hoi Kei Phoebe Chan, 2011
Buildings:

15. Memorial House - 1950
17. Pollack Hall - 1950
19. Barn (?) - next to Pollack Hall
20. Garage (?) - behind the trees, near New Lodge
21. Second set of Faculty Residences – around 1959
23. Mackinnon Hall - 1959
24. W.B. Scott Arena – 1960
27. John Hamilton Building – 1963
29. Kuehner Hall – 1965
30. Munster Hall – 1966
31. Andrew S. Johnson, extension in 1966
32. Dewhurst Hall – extension in 1998
34. John H. Price  Sports Centre – 1975
35. Hangar – undated, around 1980s, but partially demolished in 1998
37. Peter C. Curry Wildlife Refuge – 1991
38. Panda Daycare – 1992
39. Champlain Regional College – 1993
40. Paterson Hall – 2004
41. Marjorie Donald House – 1977

Demolished: Headmaster’s House and New Lodge


Landscapes:

j) Tennis court
k) Trees
l) Outdoors skating rink – undated
m) New road behind the new residences connecting to the main road and other areas
n) Parking lots
The information from the two maps indicates the extensive changes to buildings and landscapes during the two major periods of campus development. The stylistic change from Collegiate Gothic to Modernist architecture demonstrates the gradual, but subtle transition from Anglican into a secular institution. As for the natural landscape, its transformation simply reflects the ever-changing needs and interests of the Bishop’s community. These two elements combined help create a better understanding of the campus’ history while identifying characteristics that are distinct to Bishop’s University.
Chapter 6: Thematic Framework to Understand How History and Development Work Together

The thematic history from the previous section allows the exploration of Bishop’s development as seen through the evolving campus landscape. It is important to recognize that all of these details are helpful in the understanding and the description of the campus to reflect how individuals use it, so that it is possible to identify historical themes that will form the thematic framework.

Through the identification of two historical themes through the guidelines set by UBC, it is possible to understand how space and time worked together for the creation of actions, events, functions, people’s involvement and time periods. The development of themes will be a way to understand campus history as a basis for attempts to preserve the integrity of its tangible and intangible heritage attributes, especially those defined by members of the Bishop’s community. Hence, this section will be guided by the second question: what are the elements that are deemed significant, and what should be protected? This will eventually help in the creation of the heritage character statement.

6.1 Cultural Landscape Characteristics

As mentioned previously, the inventory categories from the UBC’s Heritage Campus Master Plan will be used as a framework to help determine Bishop’s campus’ heritage character. (Birmingham & Wood, 2009, p. 26) That is because it ensures ‘generalizability’¹⁴ in terms of methodology. The following are the categories and their descriptions:

1. **Natural Systems and Features** - natural aspects that have influenced the development and physical form of the landscape
2. **Spatial Organization** - 3D organization of physical forms and visual associations
3. **Land Use** - principal activities that form, shape, and organize the landscape as a result of human interaction
4. **Cultural Traditions** - practices that influence the development of the landscape’s use, division, building forms, stylistic preferences, and use of materials
5. **Cluster Arrangement** - the location and pattern of buildings and structures and associated and outdoor spaces
6. **Circulation** - spaces, features, and applied material finishes that constitute the system of movement
7. **Topography** - the 3D configuration characterized by features and orientation
8. **Vegetation** - indigenous or introduced
9. **Buildings and Structures** - sheltering, mechanical, and structural
10. **Views and Vistas** - panoramic prospects (vistas) and controlled more focused sights (views)
11. **Constructed Water Features** - built features that use water for aesthetic or utilitarian functions

¹⁴ Generalizability means whether the methodology is accepted in the field and can be replicated for future projects.
12. **Small-Scale Features** - elements providing detail and diversity for both functional needs and aesthetic concerns
13. **Archaeological Sites** - ruins, traces, or deposited artifacts

6.1.1 Building a Healthy Academic Community through Education, Sports and Patriotism

As seen through Bishop’s historical timeline, the notion of community has been emphasized throughout the campus’ development. The early days were marked by strong town-gown relationship because members of the Bishop’s community attended school and church services in Lennoxville before the completion of the academic buildings and the chapel on campus. Its remoteness encourages characteristics of a liberal arts education to faculty, staff and students. In addition, the institution has no choice but to reinforce the residential character of the University as part of its traditions.

Due to financial and political uncertainties, the campus expanded slowly in order to accommodate many unmet social and academic needs. The emphasis on low density student residences and buildings along with parking lots create a sprawling effect on campus. Yet, any on-campus trip between buildings requires a short and enjoyable stroll, given that the site is walkable and people are surrounded by the natural environment.

Trouble may arise for persons with disabilities since the current built environment is still not completely accessible for them due to the site’s topography. Until recent construction work on the main library and Johnson, only McGeer, Nicholls, SUB, Bandeen, Mackinnon and Patterson were accessible to those in wheelchairs. Therefore, there is a need to increase accessibility so that barriers are removed while allowing the community to be inclusive and learn from one another instead of promoting segregation.

Over the years, Bishop’s shared public space with other schools: Bishop’s College School (from founding until 1922) and Champlain College Lennoxville (from 1971 to the present). These collaborations changed the dynamics of the University as students from both schools interacted with one another in both academic and or extracurricular settings. As the campus expands, visitors, special guests and members from the general public have visited the campus and accessed to entertainment facilities such as the sports complex and Centennial Theatre. Therefore, community building at Bishop’s can be described as a complex, but rewarding experience where everyone comes together to enjoy the Bishop’s experience.

It is not surprising the institution has strong military connections, given that Bishop’s University is located near the United States’ borders and was founded during a period where the U.S. seriously considered expansion into the present day Canadian
When World War I and II broke out in Europe, many faculty members and undergraduate students of military age enlisted to fight and protect what they believed in. Many fell on the battlefield, but their bravery is commemorated through plaques and memorial services on Memorial Day at the St. Mark’s Chapel. Some returned to complete their studies after their military service. However, it was due to this patriotism that promoted the University’s secularization, as the veterans were exposed and strongly influenced by ideologies from other cultures in time of warfare.

During peacetime, faculty and students are encouraged to participate in physical activities for training or leisure. The focus of a “Sound and Liberal Arts Education” includes a physical health component as well as emotional and spiritual well-being; therefore, team sports in the form of varsity and club sports along with intramurals were (and continue to be) strongly encouraged by various principals and administrators. It is interesting to note that a number of Bishop’s alumni ended up as professional athletes, especially those who played Football. As seen in aerial photos or older maps, green open spaces were converted into the court of fives, cricket fields and tennis courts. Nowadays, a number of them have become football, soccer fields or even multi-use fields to accommodate the community’s needs.

The following list contains a summary of potential heritage resources found on campus as identified by the author. Knowledge from this inventory and its analysis will inform the heritage character statement later in Chapter 7.

1. **Natural Systems and Features**
   a. Vast amount of undeveloped land
   b. Vast fields and greenery
   c. Massawippi River
   d. St. Francis River

2. **Spatial Organization**
   a. Open space
   b. Natural slopes
   c. Plains
   d. Quadrangles

3. **Land Use**
   a. Institutional buildings set in rural landscape
   b. Football field (formerly a cricket field)
   c. Soccer field
   d. Tennis courts
   e. Artificial football field
   f. On-campus golf course
   g. Quadrangles

4. **Cultural Traditions**
   a. Recreational and services for students, staff, faculty and people from the community.
   b. Activities for students and people in the greater community
   c. Military drills
d. Emphasis on Football and Homecoming  
e. Gaiters sport teams  
f. St. Mark’s Chapel, former association with Anglican Church  
g. Educating Anglican clergy at Divinity House  

h. Sense of community, especially through the use of quadrangles  
i. Sound and Liberal Arts education  

5. **Cluster Arrangement**  
a. Proximity of residences to open spaces  
b. Proximity of entertainment and food services  
c. Proximity of academic buildings to residences  
d. Proximity of support services to academic buildings  
e. Bandeen Hall (former gym) and the Quad  
f. Cloutier Football Field, John H. Price Sports and Recreation Centre and tennis courts  

6. **Circulation**  
a. Parking lots around the arena, SUB, Divinity House, arena, student residences, John H. Price Sports and Recreation Centre  
b. Roads and pathways scattered across campus  

7. **Topography**  
a. Slopes  
b. Variation in water table, prone to flooding  
c. Flatness in certain parts of the campus  
d. Flood plains  

8. **Vegetation**  
a. Tamed grassland  
b. Undisturbed forests on the undeveloped sections of the campus  

9. **Buildings and Structures**  
   **Academic/ Student Life**  
a. McGrer  
b. Johnson  
c. Nicholls  
d. Hamilton  
e. Bandeen (as former gym)  
f. SUB/ Memorial Hall (former gym)  
g. John H. Price Sports and Recreation Centre  
h. Scott Arena  
i. St. Mark’s Chapel  
j. Dewhurst  
k. Divinity House  
l. Morris House  
m. Molson  

   **Residences**  
n. Norton  
o. Pollack  
p. Mackinnon  
q. Abbott  
r. Kuehner
10. **Views and Vistas**
   a. View from the Old Quad
   b. View from the New Quad
   c. View from Peace Garden to New Side and soccer field
   d. View from Nicholls to football field belonging to Champlain College

11. **Constructed Water Features**
   a. Outdoor pool

12. **Small-Scale Features**
   a. Benches and potted plants in Open Area
   b. Public Art
   c. Maze
   d. Gazebo

13. **Archaeological Sites**
   a. Aboriginal village where Nicholls is located (Dutton)
   b. Foundation of the now demolished wooden bridge that leads into Lennoxville
   c. Drill shed
   d. Wood arena
   e. Principal’s Lodge (demolished in 1961)
   f. Headmaster’s House (demolished during Johnson’s extension)

All identified themes provided a good insight on how Bishop’s built form and landscapes interact with their users over the years. From here, both the analysis of Bishop’s historical timeline and themes gathered can provide enough information to begin assessing which of these components have heritage significance.

Based on the list, all the items classified in the categories contributed directly to the campus’ development. Intangible elements, especially the strong cultural traditions, affected Bishop’s growth; thus allowing the creation of physical and associative heritage values by all users. Both tangible and intangible cultural values need to be considered in developing the heritage character statement in Chapter 7.

The campus’ natural systems and features are enhanced by its proximity to the St. Francis River and the Massawippi...
River. With the rivers creating limited access to neighbouring areas in its early days, Bishop’s had to develop its self-contained character which can be seen in the built form’s organization. Over the years, Land ownership gives the university greater control over its development; its diversified layouts allow presence of fields, greenery and retention of undeveloped land which form part of the current landscape.

Spatial organization at Bishop’s can be observed through the natural slopes, plains, open spaces and quadrangles. These features influence how the built form and landscape are designed and organized. Plains are used as open space for activities while buildings such as SUB and Mackinnon complement the slopes and the surrounding areas. The presence of quadrangles reflect the institution’s history while creating a physical and visual identity similar to British universities such as Oxford and Cambridge.

Within the land use component, the founders’ idea in fostering a ‘sound and liberal arts education’ and a ‘sense of community’ to all students within the once-Anglican institution is emphasized through its location in rural setting; the land is dedicated to various sports (i.e. football, tennis) and the use of quadrangles where everyone can come together for social activities. The continuous evolution of the open spaces reflects the ever-changing interests when it comes to sports and other physical activities. One of the best examples is the conversion of the cricket field into the football field with the decline of interest in cricket and emphasis on the football team.

Out of all the themes, cultural traditions serve to explain the rationale behind the campus’ development. Former ties with the Anglican Church are still reflected through the presence of St. Mark’s Chapel and Divinity House. The commitment in building an inclusive community for all can be seen through the evolution of Bishop’s built form and landscape such as the use of quadrangles. In addition, the continuous promotion of various activities (i.e. military drills, sports teams, Homecoming) and services (i.e. entertainment) offered to the Bishop’s and greater community over the years serve as another reminder of the institution’s long history and inherent values.

The cluster arrangements identified demonstrate how the built form should complement the different uses and their users accordingly. For example, having support services close to academic buildings or residences close to open space increases students’ access to amenities, thus, increasing social interactions. The Cloutier Football Field, plex and the tennis courts cluster allows everyone, especially athletes, to have direct access to sport facilities, making it more convenient for training and exercising.

In term of circulation, the roads and pathways scattered across the campus allow vehicles and people to travel from one location to another. Before the 1950s, pathways were used instead of roads since all buildings and amenities were accessible at a walking distance. But as the sprawl created by the campus’ expansion occurred at later years, the demand for better road network and parking spaces increased as users are more reliant on cars for quicker access throughout the campus.
Figure 25: Bishop's Brochure #1
© Bishop’s University Archives
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Figure 26: Bishop's Brochure #2
© Bishop’s University Archives
The campus’ topography may look simple with the presence of slopes and flatness in certain areas. However, it is important to take note of the floodplains and variations in water table since Bishop’s is located next to the Massawippi River and St. Francis River. As for vegetation found within the landscape, tamed grassland is seen through the open fields while undisturbed forests remained on the undeveloped section of the campus.

Highly influenced by the institution’s needs, the buildings and structures all hold significant physical and associative values. The architecture of buildings and extensions built prior to 1909 reflects Anglican influences and traditional values while constructions from 1950 onwards illustrate modernization under secular influences. One of most memorable views of the quadrangle, often depicted in photographs and brochures, is created where the arches between McGreer and Johnson building meet (Old Quad). In addition, associative values for the buildings change as people use space according to their own needs. One of the best examples is Divinity House that was once dedicated to house and train students for ministry until its conversion into faculty offices after the Faculty of Divinity’s closure.

Notable views and vistas on campus are found in the Old Quad, New Quad and Peace Garden to the New Side. The view from Peace Garden (located on the south side of SUB) serves as a divide between the older and newer developments. Also, view from Nicholls to Champlain College denotes Bishop’s actual boundaries despite shared facilities. Meanwhile, view from Dewhurst to the Plex reflects the institution’s commitment to sports and recreation.

The outdoor pool, used for recreational purposes, is the only one known constructed water feature at Bishop’s. Constructed during the second phase of campus’ development, the pool serves as a safer alternative than swimming in the Massawippi River. Meanwhile, small-scale features, consisting of benches, potted plants, public art and a maze, are scattered across the campus. Some features are functional in nature, as they improve one’s experiences at the institution and the landscape’s aesthetics.

The archaeological sites identified reflect a legacy that is now forgotten due to a lack of knowledge of the campus’ archaeological potential (i.e. the aboriginal village). The loss of the drill shed, the headmaster’s house, the wooden bridge to Lennoxville and the principal’s lodge serve as a reminder that part of the collective memory is gone forever as they cannot be replaced. Although remains of the wooden bridge are still visible, the drill shed’s location can no longer be identified. However, the headmaster’s house and principal’s lodge are being replaced by Johnson’s extension and a parking lot respectively. Though modern built form might be more beneficial and pleasing to current users, memories of these locations become obscure due to a lack of reference to these earlier structures. Without these indicators, it is difficult to raise interest and awareness within the Bishop’s community about the institution’s history and the older traditions which once founded this campus.
The notion of ‘cultural tradition’ used on all the maps refers to a site used for past, ongoing or present traditions/activities at the institution.
Figure 28: Bishop's potential heritage resources after 1950
© Hoi Kei Phoebe Chan, 2011
Figure 29: Bishop's overall potential heritage resources
© Hoi Kei Phoebe Chan, 2011
Chapter 7: Bishop’s University as a Heritage Conservation District

As described in Section 4.1 on the Ontario Heritage Toolkit (OHT), a Heritage Conservation District (HCD) is a preferred model for conserving heritage resources because of its holistic emphasis on context and on a collection of heritage resources than on individual properties. Meanwhile, Section 4.3.2 on Queen’s University Heritage Campus Master Plan demonstrates how the OHT can be applied on campuses, like Bishop’s, to manage and guide future development through policies and establishment of guidelines to conserve, protect and enhance the institution’s special character. With the themes and potential heritage values identified from Chapter 6, it is now possible to determine Bishop’s University’s heritage district boundaries along with its heritage character.

7.1 Bishop’s Heritage District Boundaries

The proposed Bishop’s University Heritage Conservation District extends from Divinity House and Old Quad to the North, the railway tracks and natural boundaries of the Massawippi River to the West, the rear of the hangar and Paterson Hall to the south with the area behind the sports complex, tennis courts and Coulter Field to the East. This selected area reflects the institution’s overall identity from its foundation to the present time; thus emphasizing on its extensive history that should be cherished by current students and alumni while creating a link for future generations.

Since there is no official campus plan available for this study, references to “Bishop’s campus” in this Statement reflect only the boundaries which are set by the author without taking the Golf Course or any of the conservation areas in consideration. Her decision is based on the concentration of heritage resources available with the recognition that lack of published documents and historical records for other areas would require more research in order to be included in current district.
7.2 Common Characteristics of Heritage Districts and their Types

Based on the *OHT*, the followings are the most common characteristics found in heritage districts even though each has its own in character:

- **A concentration** of heritage buildings, sites, structures; designed landscapes, natural landscapes that are linked by aesthetic, historical and socio-cultural contexts or use.
- **A framework of structured elements** including major natural features such as topography, land form, landscapes, water courses and built form such as pathways and street patterns, landmarks, nodes or intersections, approaches and edges.
- **A sense of visual coherence** through the use of such elements as building scale, mass, height, material, proportion, colour, etc. that convey a distinct sense of time or place.
- **A distinctiveness** which enables districts to be recognized and distinguishable from their surroundings or from neighbouring areas.

In addition, three main types of heritage districts defined as having “designed”, “evolved” or “associated cultural value”. (Ministry of Culture, 2006, p. 9-11)

Bishop’s Campus District fulfills all the characteristics by providing a sense of place with the mix of low-density historical buildings and modern red bricks buildings. Major natural features, such as the Massawippi and the St. Francis River, help distinguish the campus from the town of Lennoxville and BCS campus at Moulton Hill. With this mixture of the past and ongoing development, Bishop’s can be defined as actually an evolved district to meet the needs of present and future community.

Again, these general elements, derived from the potential heritage resources in Chapter 6, can assist the development of Bishop’s campus master plan through the Conservation and Development map which is found at the end of this chapter.

7.3 Character Defining Elements and Heritage Character Statement

The historical research from themes and potential heritage resources found in Chapter 5 and Chapter 6 has revealed many of the campus’ characteristics. Although much importance is placed on religious and secular architecture and landscapes in this research, social, economic and political aspects emerged as guiding principles to campus planning. Many of these help create Bishop’s collective identity – sense of place and character – suggesting the Study Area’s designation as a Heritage Conservation District.

In this section, Heritage Character Statements for each of the two sub-areas identified as key features, will be made before formulating a summary Statement and Character Defining Elements for Bishop’s Campus District.
7.3.1 Heritage Character Statement: Old Quadrangle and Environs

The Old Quadrangle, formed by McGeer (including Old Library and Chapel), Johnson, Norton, Bandeen, Pollack and John Bassett Memorial Library, is a major open space where academic and social life comes together. It is also the first contact point as people walk and drive in from the Town of Lennoxville. Located nearby, Morris House and Divinity House are grouped into this building cluster since they were completed during the first phase of Bishop’s development. Character defining elements include:

- Buildings and landscape of cultural heritage significance, especially the sacred architecture completed before 1950.
- Mixed use of buildings: academic, administrative and residential
- McGeer Hall and St. Mark’s Chapel as major landmarks
- Views to the Massawippi River and St. Francis River
- Pedestrian-oriented design

7.3.2 Heritage Character Statement: New Quadrangle and Environs

The New Quadrangle is another open space where social and residence life come together. Formed by the dining hall (Dewhurst) and four student residences (Abbott, Kuehner, Munster and Paterson), this quad, the gym and the playing fields in the area allow students to gather for social and sports events. Character defining elements include:

- Buildings and landscape group reflecting the campus development after 1950s.
- Buildings of different heights in secular and modern architectural design
Out of all of the Anglophone universities in Quebec, it is clear that Bishop’s campus distinguishes itself by locating at the heart of Eastern Townships. Its extensive history and buildings development in two distinct phases (1843-1909 and 1950-today) create the sense of community and place for all users. Bishop’s Anglican roots may have faded with its secularization, but the institution retains elements of its sacred character by continuing to offer a sound and liberal education to all.

Character defining elements include:

- Self-contained urban form
- Buildings and landscapes of cultural heritage significance
- Certain buildings designed by historically significant architects (example: John George Howard for Old Arts/McGreer)
- Liberal Arts values manifested in campus layout, encouraging diversity, strong sense of community and associative values
- Landmarks and physical layout that establish a strong place image
- A mix of sacred and secular tradition through traditions and self-sufficiency
- Uniformity of character across campus using bricks and low-density buildings
- Car-oriented campus in newer areas, but pedestrian-oriented in older areas
- Major views scattered across campus due to the campus’ topography
- Important natural features such as Massawippi River and St. Francis River
- Rural setting, encouraging appreciation of nature
The examination of the multiple and varied features of Bishop’s heritage shows how the interaction of natural and built form combines to define heritage character in different eras of development. The analysis of both the heritage character statement and character defining elements has shown how specific features of heritage character evolve with historic, social and economic dynamics. Materials found in both chapters 6 and 7, especially the overall Bishop’s district and character defining elements, help identify zones for conservation, development and redevelopment (as seen in Figure 34). In addition, all this information will inform conservation principles for the Bishop’s district which will be included in Chapter 8’s recommendations.
Figure 34: Conservation and Development Map for Bishop's
© Hoi Kei Phoebe Chan, 2011
Chapter 8: Recommendations and Conclusion

The last question posed in the introduction will be addressed in this section: how the collected data and its analysis will contribute to future campus planning, especially when it comes to heritage conservation. Broad comments will cover the first section to conceptualize the overall picture for campus planning at Bishop’s. Then, specific comments will be made in the second section to address heritage conservation issues on campus.

8.1 First section: Campus Planning

A campus can be compared to a small city because its planning encompasses land use, environmental and social elements. Its self-sustaining nature creates an interesting dynamic through the formation of long-term partnerships with neighbouring towns or other academic institutions in the area.

8.1.1 On Participation and Growth

At this point, increased participation from Bishop’s, greater Lennoxville and professional community is vital to a campus plan’s success although people come and go after completing their degrees, contracts or even visits. One of the best success stories is the Oregon Experiment, originated from the University of Oregon, whose “process [includes] users, neighbors, designers, and planners in the planning/design process is key. In order to [increase effectiveness], those involved work together to solve design issues that arise” (University of Oregon Planning Office, 2005). This inclusive approach enables both feedback and involvement from users instead of wasting ingenious ideas and/or resources available. Therefore, users’ knowledge of and values for the campus should be addressed during the creation of the Campus Master Plan.

For the purpose of the future Master Plan, sensitive incremental development, based on the concept of piecemeal growth, is seen as a more desirable choice. As defined by authors of the Oregon Experiment, piecemeal growth “goes forward in small steps, where each project spreads out and adapts itself to the twists and turns of function and site [...] each project is attuned to the nature of the terrain, the trees, the greens, the character of the surrounding buildings.” (Alexander, Silverstein, Angel, Ishikawa, & Abrams, 1975, p. 67) This serves to balance the campus’ ever-changing needs rather than create “large lump development [where] the environment grows in massive chunks” (Alexander, Silverstein, Angel, Ishikawa, & Abrams, 1975, p. 71) Heritage conservation may be best served by sensitive incremental development since “it maintains and repairs the places which are working, and which over the years, have come to have some human character” (Alexander, Silverstein, Angel, Ishikawa, & Abrams, 1975, p. 73). Current large lump developments, on the other hand, “[destroy] these places and replaces them with monolith” (Alexander, Silverstein, Angel, Ishikawa, & Abrams, 1975, pp. 73-76).
Financially speaking, sensitive incremental development offers more flexibility and may be cheaper than large lump developments. The example given by the University of Oregon demonstrates that “the large lump project ties up several million dollars in a single act of construction, $2.3 million alone for the School of Education; while the piecemeal scheme spends the money more prudently, in a series of projects, totaling $1.4 million.” (Alexander, Silverstein, Angel, Ishikawa, & Abrams, 1975, p. 76) This statement suggests it would be more beneficial to adapt to the changing needs gradually through smaller projects given that minor repairs can be done inexpensively (Alexander, Silverstein, Angel, Ishikawa, & Abrams, 1975, p. 78). As for bigger developments, potential mistakes and repairs could necessitate and drain more human and financial resources in the future (Alexander, Silverstein, Angel, Ishikawa, & Abrams, 1975, pp. 78-79).

However, recent research by University of Oregon and various institutions demonstrated that sensitive incremental development required more financial resources than anticipated. That is because different levels of governments often provide one lump sum for new constructions or building upgrades (i.e. LEED standards) rather than grants for smaller repairs and renovations. So, a trend is created where there is a preference to demolish instead of readapting or renovating older buildings. In some cases, it is possible for an academic institution to fund smaller repairs through alumni donors and naming rights appeals (i.e. Centennial Theatre). Yet, this approach may require more coordinated strategy using more time, resources and energy from various departments within the University. Sensitive incremental development may be an ideal solution for the campus to preserve its heritage character but it should be carefully considered and adapted to circumstances if it is ever considered for future heritage campus planning at Bishop’s. These individual developments should be guided by a comprehensive Campus Master Plan so that they fit and contribute positively into the setting and overall vision established for the institution.

8.1.2 Natural disasters

As mentioned in earlier chapters, Bishop’s University is prone to floods given that it is located next to the Massawippi and St. Francis Rivers. As seen in recent years, (notably 2005, 2010 and 2011), floods have created many inconveniences, while some required school closures; therefore, having a good emergency preparedness plan for both buildings and their irreplaceable collection of artifacts could mitigate damages considering much of the University is located on a flood plain. A prime example is Centennial Theatre, which stood at the lowest point on campus and was thus significantly damaged during the 2010 flood. (O’Beirne, 2010) If it was a much older building and used to store delicate objects of historical value, it would have been disastrous. These experiences suggest Bishop’s should reconsider how it manages its financial, material and human resources when it comes to campus and historical planning.
8.2. Second Section: Heritage Conservation

By understanding the overall history of individual buildings forming the Bishop’s heritage district, it is now possible to develop a concrete plan to address conservation and upcoming development issues. The preliminary analysis of heritage resources (refer to Chapter 6) and the district’s characteristics (refer to Chapter 7) on campus sheds light on elements worth studying and recognizing as potential resources. The compilation of these sections demonstrates the struggle to understand and piece information together to create an in-depth inventory for all the buildings and landscapes to identify contents (i.e. building’s original architect(s), style and intent) found in the 1998 Queen’s Heritage Master Plan. Again, despite all the information is scattered or lost; regrouping and retrieving them can allow more specific guidelines to be established for evaluations which determine the location’s heritage significance to the Bishop’s community. The heritage character statements, character defining elements and district boundaries are the primary planning tools resulting from this process.

Further research online, at various departments (i.e. Bishop’s Archives or B&G) or outside organizations (i.e. historical societies and archives in the area or other parts of the country) will build a more detailed inventory and evaluation for application to the conservation process. In turn, this will enhance the research conducted for this study and foster the creation of a stronger policy framework in the management of heritage resources. The recognition of the campus’ characteristics would help campus planners and consultants address and plan future development objectively while respecting the institution’s history, traditions, other intangible elements, its physical environment and budget.

Heritage conservation is often overlooked due to monetary constraints especially when older buildings are in dire need of repair, or when there is a necessity to comply with evolving regulations such as building codes and disability laws. In fact, many of the new buildings are now constructed according to universal design guidelines, allowing people of all ages and capacity to access the facilities. Retrofitting buildings to comply with updated disability laws will present a challenge, as planners tend to prioritize on accessibility issues and create add-ons without considering the edifice’s character or history. In addition, adaptive reuse is frequently dismissed in order to ‘reduce’ costs for renovations as mentioned in the section 8.1.1, and existing structures are simply demolished to make way for new buildings. As a result, a landscape’s history is potentially lost at the expense of progress.

With all these factors involved, a campus planning goal should be to integrate heritage campus planning as part of the future Campus Master Plan to put Bishop’s in line with other Canadian Universities such as UBC and Queen’s. That is because they reflect the best practices in the field along, with complying with Canadian and provincial standards for heritage conservation. Also, the development of policies surrounding the management and preservation of existing built form and landscapes,
identifying sites of archaeological potential through evaluations and addressing possible accessibility issues that may arise in the long run will facilitate growth management along with future campus development.

8.2.1. Campus Heritage Planning Objectives

8.2.1.1 Designation

Again, it would be highly advisable to integrate a Heritage Campus Master Plan by designating the Study Area as a Heritage Conservation District. This designation could allow the recognition of the institution’s heritage character while ensuring that its defining elements are retained in future development.

Bishop’s University retains the right to modify the buildings and landscape according to its needs with the exception of St. Mark’s Chapel, as that building falls under conservation guidelines from the Province of Quebec. However, as much of the remaining building’s original characteristics have been destroyed through renovation programs which were carried out for the 1930s to the present time, (examples include the removal of McGreer Hall’s veranda and replacement of window borders with PVC or other modern materials), all future changes to building fabric should reflect and respect their character defining elements so that its distinctive qualities can be retained for heritage purposes.

8.2.1.2 Conservation Principles for the District

According to potential heritage resources and the character statement, the following characteristics should be preserved when considering future developments:

- Low density buildings
- Maximum height: 4 floors (+ basement) or not taller than McGreer’s iconic tower
- Preserve existing views (i.e. McGreer, St. Mark’s, Old Quadrangle) that are highly valued by users and visitors
- Instead of allowing car-oriented development and sprawl, there is a need to reinforce the pedestrian-oriented character
- Rather than demolishing and replacing older buildings, adaptive reuse should be used when dealing with buildings of heritage significance to ensure continuity
- Consistent use of building material across campus such as red brick

Based on information gathered from chapter 6 and 7 along with the Conservation and Development Map, buildings built prior to the 1950s and those creating Old Quad should be conserved as they are of historical value. Conservation guidelines from 8.2.1.3 should be followed in order to protect and preserve the area’s physical appearance, character and potential heritage resources. Instead of new development, Mackinnon should be kept as it is or used through adaptive reuse for its historical value in being one of the first female residences on campus.
The New Quad with the residences built after 1950 has its distinct architectural character while serving as a contrast to the Old Quad. Except for the flood plains and areas with high water table, the remaining areas can either be developed or redeveloped according to future needs. However, the new buildings must be in red brick and should follow the conservation principles prescribed earlier to ensure consistency for the campus’ overall appearance.

8.2.1.3 Conservation Guidelines for the District

- **Archaeological resources**: Hire professional archaeologists to study the areas of archaeological potential on campus, especially in areas close to water. This assessment will help to identify sensitive zones, and ensure that all current uses and future developments will not disturb or destroy any identified and significant pre-or-post-contact archaeological resources in those zones. Having such research will enhance the historical understanding of the site prior to the University’s foundation in 1843.

- **Documenting campus evolution**: Acknowledge that a part of Bishop’s history is now lost due to demolition or alterations in the built form and physical landscape by documenting former elements of the campus setting, especially if archaeological resources and future research reveal information pertaining to the institution.

- **Conservation standards**: Attempt to preserve the original built forms’ characteristics, both interior and exterior, while retrofitting for accessibility or compliance to Quebec’s building code. Use the Parks Canada *Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada* (2010) as the basis for all interventions in heritage settings.

Although this report focuses on the cultural heritage resources of campus physical setting, the author’s visits to the archives and B&G have raised issues that should be addressed right away lest much of the knowledge, (especially documented history) will be lost to future generations. Here are other recommendations to consider when dealing with heritage resources as part of planning for Bishop’s campus:

- **Oral history**: The University should encourage current alumni, former staff and faculty members and their descendants to share stories and artifacts (i.e. photos,
articles) that are related to the Bishop’s experience. This process can encourage further research that can lead to greater understanding of existing documentation found at the Bishop’s Archives.

- **Archival Records**: Collaboration between Bishop’s Archives and Buildings and Grounds department would be beneficial in preserving items such as building blueprints for future reference and research purposes. This is because paper and other organic materials kept under normal conditions become brittle in time; therefore, they should be conserved by following accepted curatorial standards for artifact conservation including:
  
  - Store items in temperature-controlled room to decelerate their deterioration.
  - If this conservation process is not available, discourage the circulation of those plans unless required for consultation. This is to ensure they are not damaged further when handled.
  - If funding is available, hire an intern to take photographs of the older blueprints in order to digitize the plans for reference.
  - If time and resources allow, properly document and repair the blueprints with archival tape and put them behind Mylar film to facilitate handling.

In conclusion, the campus history and assessment of its heritage character revealed numerous issues that should be addressed in the process of creating the Campus Master Plan. The general proposals regarding campus planning reflect current problems while ‘best practices’ from other universities can also be easily applied to Bishop’s. Meanwhile, the specific recommendations on heritage conservation (and art conservation) are reflections of current practices, legislations and some personal observations over the years and during the research process. It is hoped that some of these recommendations will be applied to ensure the success of campus planning and preserve historical elements for current and future generations.
Appendix 1: Timeline and Naming Convention Used in this Report

Due to the author’s familiarity with the Bishop’s campus, there may be instances where the names of the buildings and landscapes that are used by most faculty, staff and students are shortened. For example, Bishop’s University may be referred as the University; therefore, the following terminologies will be used extensively since they will be mentioned in the Thematic History and various sections in this report. In addition, this chronology is provided by Bishop’s University’s Archives (2010).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Building’s Original Name</th>
<th>Name Used by the Author</th>
<th>“Nicknames” or Other Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1846</td>
<td>Old Arts/ McGreer Hall</td>
<td>McGreer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1853</td>
<td>St. Mark’s Chapel</td>
<td>St. Mark’s</td>
<td>Chapel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861 / 1966</td>
<td>Old Johnson/ Andrew S. Johnson Science Building</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891</td>
<td>Morris House</td>
<td>Morris</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891</td>
<td>Divinity House</td>
<td>Divinity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1892</td>
<td>Bishop William Hall</td>
<td>BWH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1898</td>
<td>Bandeen Hall</td>
<td>Bandeen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1909</td>
<td>Old Library, located in McGreer Hall</td>
<td>Old Library</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>Memorial House</td>
<td>Student Union Building (SUB)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>Norton Hall</td>
<td>Norton</td>
<td>No-Po</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>Pollack Hall</td>
<td>Pollack</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>John Bassett Memorial Library</td>
<td>Library</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>Mackinnon Hall</td>
<td>Mack</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>W.B. Scott Arena</td>
<td>Arena or rink</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Buildings</td>
<td>Authors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>Abbott Hall</td>
<td>Abbott</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Bishop Mountain House</td>
<td>Student Union Building (SUB)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Jasper Hume Nicolls Building</td>
<td>Nicolls</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>John Hamilton Building</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Kuehner Hall</td>
<td>Kuehner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>Dewhurst Hall</td>
<td>Dewhurst Dewies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>Munster Hall</td>
<td>Munster</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>Centennial Theatre</td>
<td>Centennial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>John H. Price Sports and Recreation Centre</td>
<td>Sports Centre, Gym or Plex</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Marjorie Donald House</td>
<td>Student Union Building (SUB)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Molson Fine Arts Building</td>
<td>Molson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Paterson Hall</td>
<td>Paterson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bishop’s University</td>
<td>Bishop’s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bishop’s College School or B.C.S.</td>
<td>BCS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Old Quad</td>
<td>McGreer, Johnson, Norton, Bandeen, Pollack, Library</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Quad</td>
<td>Dewhurst, Abbott, Munster and Kuehner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Champlain College</td>
<td>Champlain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student Union Building (SUB)</td>
<td>University Centre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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