



## City of Hamilton

# HAMILTON MUNICIPAL HERITAGE COMMITTEE REVISED

**Meeting #:** 21-001

**Date:** January 29, 2021

**Time:** 9:30 a.m.

**Location:** Due to the COVID-19 and the Closure of City Hall

All electronic meetings can be viewed at:

City's YouTube Channel:

<https://www.youtube.com/user/InsideCityofHamilton>

Loren Kolar, Legislative Coordinator (905) 546-2424 ext. 2604

---

**1. CEREMONIAL ACTIVITIES**

**2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

(Added Items, if applicable, will be noted with \*)

**3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

**4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

4.1. November 30, 2020

**5. COMMUNICATIONS**

5.1. Correspondence from Kevin Finnerty, Assistant Deputy Minister, Heritage, Tourism and Culture Division respecting an Update on Ontario Heritage Act amendments

Recommendation: Be received.

\*5.2. Correspondence from the City of Hamilton, and the City of Burlington respecting a Notice of Study Commencement, Valley Inn Road Bridge, City of Hamilton Municipal Class Environmental Assessment

Recommendation: Be received.

- \*5.3. Correspondence from Doug and Alison Dunford, respecting the inclusion of 259 Filman Rd, Ancaster, on the Pre-Confederation Register.
- Recommendation: Be received and referred to Item 10.1, Ancaster Pre-Confederation Inventory (PED21031) (Ward 12), for consideration.
- \*5.4. Correspondence from Hazel Ryan, respecting the inclusion of 38 Academy Street, Ancaster, on the Pre-Confederation Register.
- Recommendation: Be received and referred to Item 10.1, Ancaster Pre-Confederation Inventory (PED21031) (Ward 12), for consideration.
- \*5.5. Correspondence from Donato Cascioli, respecting the inclusion of 1157 Garner Road, Ancaster, on the Pre-Confederation Register
- Recommendation: Be received and referred to Item 10.1, Ancaster Pre-Confederation Inventory (PED21031) (Ward 12), for consideration.
- \*5.6. Correspondence from Carl Galli, NGE Land Holdings Inc., respecting the inclusion of 34 Lloyminn Avenue, Ancaster, on the Pre-Confederation Register
- Recommendation: Be received and referred to Item 10.1, Ancaster Pre-Confederation Inventory (PED21031) (Ward 12), for consideration.
- \*5.7. Correspondence from Marcel Wigger, respecting the inclusion of 4237 Powerline Road West, Ancaster, on the Pre-Confederation Register.
- Recommendation: Be received and referred to Item 10.1, Ancaster Pre-Confederation Inventory (PED21031) (Ward 12), for consideration.
- \*5.7.a. Correspondence to Councillor L. Ferguson from Marcel Wigger, respecting the inclusion of 4237 Powerline Road West, Ancaster, on the Pre-Confederation Register
- Recommendation: Be received and referred to Item 10.1, Ancaster Pre-Confederation Inventory (PED21031) (Ward 12), for consideration.
- \*5.8. Correspondence from Danyal Sheikj, respecting the inclusion of 105 Filman, Ancaster, on the Pre-Confederation Register.
- Recommendation: Be received and referred to Item 10.1, Ancaster Pre-Confederation Inventory (PED21031) (Ward 12), for consideration.

## **6. DELEGATION REQUESTS**

- \*6.1. Delegation Request from Danyal Sheikh, Owner, respecting the Inclusion of 105 Filman Road, Ancaster, on the Ancaster Pre-Confederation Inventory

- \*6.2. Delegation Request from Tom Murison, Consultant, respecting the Inclusion of 105 Filman Road, Ancaster, on the Ancaster Pre-Confederation Inventory
- \*6.3. Delegation Request from Paul Masotti, respecting the Inclusion of 1719 Powerline Road West, Ancaster, on the Ancaster Pre-Confederation Inventory
- \*6.4. Delegation Request from Donato Cascioli, respecting the Inclusion of 1157 Garner Road East, Ancaster, on the Ancaster Pre-Confederation Inventory
- \*6.5. Delegation Request from Carl Galli, NGE Land Holdings Inc., respecting the Inclusion of 34 Llyoyminn Avenue, Ancaster, on the Ancaster Pre-Confederation Inventory

## **7. CONSENT ITEMS**

- 7.1. Inventory and Research Working Group Meeting Notes - November 23, 2020
- 7.2. Policy and Design Working Group Meeting Notes - November 23, 2020
- 7.3. Heritage Permit Applications - Delegated Approvals
  - 7.3.a. Heritage Permit Application HP2020-033: Proposed alterations to 207-209 King Street West, Dundas (Ward 13) (By-law 3310-81)
  - 7.3.b. Heritage Permit Application HP2020-036: Addition to the west face of the northeast wing to facilitate the installation of an elevator shaft and storage area at 601 Barton Street East, Hamilton (Ward 3) (By-law No. 16-334)
  - 7.3.c. Heritage Permit Application HP2020-037: Enclosure of the second storey balcony, alterations to the lower storey porch and installation of window shutters at 912 Beach Boulevard, Hamilton (HCD) (Ward 5) (By-law No. 00-135)
  - 7.3.d. Heritage Permit Application HP2020-041: Renewal of previously-approved but lapsed Heritage Permit (HP2018-044) Redevelopment of 98 James Street South, Hamilton (former James Street Baptist Church) (Ward 2)
- \*7.4. Policy and Design Working Group Meeting Notes - December 7, 2020
- \*7.5. Heritage Permit Review Sub-Committee Minutes - November 17, 2020

## **8. PUBLIC HEARINGS / DELEGATIONS**

## **9. STAFF PRESENTATIONS**

- 9.1. 2020 Summary of Heritage Activity

## **10. DISCUSSION ITEMS**

\*10.1. Ancaster Pre-Confederation Inventory (PED21031) (Ward 12)

\*10.2. Inventory and Research Working Group Meeting Notes - December 7, 2020

**11. MOTIONS**

**12. NOTICES OF MOTION**

**13. GENERAL INFORMATION / OTHER BUSINESS**

13.1. Buildings and Landscapes

This list is determined by members of the Hamilton Municipal Heritage Committee. Members provide informal updates to the properties on this list, based on their visual assessments of the properties, or information they have gleaned from other sources, such as new articles and updates from other heritage groups.

13.1.a. Endangered Buildings and Landscapes (RED)

(Red = Properties where there is a perceived immediate threat to heritage resources through: demolition; neglect; vacancy; alterations, and/or, redevelopment)

- (i) Tivoli, 108 James Street North, Hamilton (D) – T. Ritchie
- (ii) Andrew Sloss House, 372 Butter Road West, Ancaster (D) – C. Dimitry
- (iii) Century Manor, 100 West 5th Street, Hamilton (D) – G. Carroll
- (iv) 18-22 King Street East, Hamilton (D) – W. Rosart
- (v) 24-28 King Street East, Hamilton (D) – W. Rosart
- (vi) 2 Hatt Street, Dundas (R) – K. Burke
- (vii) James Street Baptist Church, 98 James Street South, Hamilton (D) – J. Brown
- (viii) Long and Bisby Building, 828 Sanatorium Road – G. Carroll
- (ix) 120 Park Street, Hamilton (R) – R. McKee
- (x) 398 Wilson Street East, Ancaster (D) – C. Dimitry
- (xi) Lampman House, 1021 Garner Road East, Ancaster (NOID) – C. Dimitry
- (xii) Cathedral Boys School, 378 Main Street East, Hamilton (R) – T. Ritchie
- (xiii) Firth Brothers Building, 127 Hughson Street North, Hamilton (NOID) – T. Ritchie
- (xiv) Auchmar Gate House, Claremont Lodge 71 Claremont Drive (R) – R. McKee
- (xv) 80 to 92 Barton Street East (Hanrahan Hotel) – T. Ritchie
- xvi) Television City, 163 Jackson Street West – J. Brown

13.1.b. Buildings and Landscapes of Interest (YELLOW)

(Yellow = Properties that are undergoing some type of change, such as a change in ownership or use, but are not perceived as being immediately threatened)

(i) Delta High School, 1284 Main Street East, Hamilton (D) – D. Beland

(ii) 2251 Rymal Road East, Stoney Creek (R) – B. Janssen

(iii) Former Valley City Manufacturing, 64 Hatt Street, Dundas (R) – K. Burke

(iv) St. Joseph's Motherhouse, 574 Northcliffe Avenue, Dundas (ND) – W. Rosart

(v) Copley Building, 104 King Street West; 56 York Blvd., and 63-76 MacNab Street North (NOI) – G. Carroll

(vi) Dunington-Grubb Gardens, 1000 Main Street East (within Gage Park) (R) – D. Beland

(vii) St. Clair Blvd. Conservation District (D) – D. Beland

(viii) 52 Charlton Avenue West, Hamilton (D) – J. Brown

(ix) 292 Dundas Street East, Waterdown (R) – L. Lunsted

(x) Chedoke Estate (Balfour House), 1 Balfour Drive, Hamilton (R) – T. Ritchie

(xi) Binkley property, 50-54 Sanders Blvd., Hamilton (R) - J. Brown

(xii) 62 6th Concession East, Flamborough (I) - L. Lunsted

(xiii) Beach Canal Lighthouse and Cottage (D) – R. McKee

(xiv) Cannon Knitting Mill, 134 Cannon Street East, Hamilton (R) – T. Ritchie

13.1.c. Heritage Properties Update (GREEN)

(Green = Properties whose status is stable)

(i) The Royal Connaught Hotel, 112 King Street East, Hamilton (R) – T. Ritchie

(ii) Auchmar, 88 Fennell Avenue West, Hamilton (D) – R. McKee

(iii) Treble Hall, 4-12 John Street North, Hamilton (R) – T. Ritchie

(iv) 104 King Street West, Dundas (Former Post Office) (R) – K. Burke

(v) 45 Forest Avenue, Hamilton – G. Carroll

(vi) 125 King Street East, Hamilton – T. Ritchie

13.1.d. Heritage Properties Update (BLACK)

No properties

13.2. Staff Workplan Update

13.3. Hamilton Municipal Heritage Committee Heritage Awards Update (no copy)

**14. PRIVATE AND CONFIDENTIAL**

**15. ADJOURNMENT**



# Hamilton

## **HAMILTON MUNICIPAL HERITAGE COMMITTEE**

**MINUTES 20-007**

**9:30 a.m.**

**Monday, November 30, 2020**

**Hamilton City Hall**

**71 Main Street West**

---

**Present:** A. Denham-Robinson (Chair), J. Brown, K. Burke, G. Carroll, C. Dimitry (Vice-Chair), B. Janssen, L. Lunsted, R. McKee, T. Ritchie and W. Rosart

**Absent with  
Regrets:** Councillor M. Pearson and D. Beland

---

### **THE HAMILTON MUNICIPAL HERITAGE COMMITTEE PRESENTS REPORT 20-007 AND RESPECTFULLY RECOMMENDS:**

- 1. Revisions to the Council Approved Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest and Description of Heritage Attributes and Notice of Intention to Designate for the Designation of 85 King Street East and 4 - 12 John Street North, Hamilton under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act (PED17167(a)) (Ward 2) (Item 10.1)**

**(McKee/Burke)**

- (a) That the revised Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest and Description of Heritage Attributes of 85 King Street East and 4 - 12 John Street North, Hamilton, attached as Appendix "A" to Report PED17167(a), be approved; and,
- (b) That the City Clerk be directed to take appropriate action to designate 85 King Street East and 4 - 12 John Street North, Hamilton under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act, in accordance with the revised Notice of Intention to Designate, attached as Appendix "B" to Report PED17167(a).

**CARRIED**

**FOR INFORMATION:**

**(a) CHANGES TO THE AGENDA (Item 2)**

The Clerk advised the Committee of the following changes:

**7. CONSENT ITEMS**

- 7.2.f. Heritage Permit Application HP2020-038: Proposed alterations to 25 Mill Street North, Waterdown (Ward 15), a property located within the Mill Street Heritage Conservation District (Bylaw No. 82-81-H)
- 7.2.g. Heritage Permit Application HP2020-39: Proposed installation of a security camera at 5 Mill Street South, Waterdown (Ward 15), located within the Mill Street Heritage Conservation District (By-law No. 82-81-H)
- 7.2.h. Heritage Permit Application HP2020-040: Proposed tree and shrub removal at 157 Mill Street North, Waterdown (Ward 15), located within the Mill Street Heritage Conservation District (Bylaw No. 82-81-H)
- 7.3. Inventory and Research Working Group Meeting Notes - September 28, 2020 (deferred at the October 30, 2020 meeting)
- 7.4. Inventory and Research Working Group Meeting Notes - October 26, 2020
- 7.5. Inventory and Research Working Group Meeting Notes - November 9, 2020

**(Ritchie/Burke)**

That the Agenda for the November 30, 2020 Hamilton Municipal Heritage Committee be approved, as amended.

**CARRIED**

**(b) DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (Item 3)**

No declarations of interest were made.

**(c) APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING (Item 4)**

**(i) October 30, 2020 (Item 4.1)**

**(Brown/Ritchie)**

That the Minutes of the October 30, 2020 meeting of the Hamilton Municipal Heritage Committee be approved, as presented.

**CARRIED**

**(d) CONSENT ITEMS (Item 7)**

**(Janssen/Carroll)**

That the following items be received:

- (i) Heritage Permit Review Sub-Committee Minutes - September 15, 2020 (Item 7.1)
  
- (ii) Heritage Permit Applications - Delegated Approvals (Item 7.2)
  - (a) Heritage Permit Application HP2020-029: Replacement of the existing exit balcony and stairs at the rear of the building (south elevation) at 35-43 Duke Street, Hamilton (Ward 2) (By-law No. 75-237) (Item 7.2(a))
  
  - (b) Heritage Permit Application HP2020-030: Restoration of the upper southwest corner church sanctuary wall, flashing and shingles at 114-116 MacNab Street South, Hamilton (Ward 2) (By-law No. 90-144) (Item 7.2(b))
  
  - (c) Heritage Permit Application HP2020-031: Construction of a 19 square metre rear yard deck to replace the existing deck at 171 Forest Avenue, Hamilton (Ward 2) (By-law No. 77-287) (Item 7.2(c))
  
  - (d) Heritage Permit Application HP2020-032: Repainting of the front metal facade and restoration of the upper storey windows on the front facade at 68 King Street East, Hamilton (Ward 2) (Bylaw No. 84-259) (Item 7.2(d))
  
  - (e) Heritage Permit Application HP2020-34: Proposed alterations to 157 Mill Street North, Waterdown (Ward 15), a property located within the Mill Street Heritage Conservation District (Bylaw No. 82-81-H) (Item 7.2(e))
  
  - (f) Heritage Permit Application HP2020-038: Proposed alterations to 25 Mill Street North, Waterdown (Ward 15), a property located within the Mill Street Heritage Conservation District (Bylaw No. 82-81-H) (Added Item 7.2(f))

- (g) Heritage Permit Application HP2020-39: Proposed installation of a security camera at 5 Mill Street South, Waterdown (Ward 15), located within the Mill Street Heritage Conservation District (By-law No. 82-81-H) (Added Item 7.2(g))
- (h) Heritage Permit Application HP2020-040: Proposed tree and shrub removal at 157 Mill Street North, Waterdown (Ward 15), located within the Mill Street Heritage Conservation District (Bylaw No. 82-81-H) (Added Item 7.2(h))
- (iii) Inventory and Research Working Group Meeting Notes - September 28, 2020 (deferred from the October 30, 2020 meeting) (Added Item 7.3)
- (iv) Inventory and Research Working Group Meeting Notes - October 26, 2020 (Added Item 7.4)
- (v) Inventory and Research Working Group Meeting Notes - November 9, 2020 (Added Item 7.5)

**CARRIED**

**(g) GENERAL INFORMATION / OTHER BUSINESS (Item 13)**

**(i) Buildings and Landscapes (Item 13.1)**

**(Janssen/Lunsted)**

The following updates were received:

- (a) Endangered Buildings and Landscapes (RED):  
(Red = Properties where there is a perceived immediate threat to heritage resources through: demolition; neglect; vacancy; alterations, and/or, redevelopment)**
  - (i) Tivoli, 108 James Street North, Hamilton (D) – T. Ritchie
  - (ii) Andrew Sloss House, 372 Butter Road West, Ancaster (D) – C. Dimitry
  - (iii) Century Manor, 100 West 5th Street, Hamilton (D) – G. Carroll
  - (iv) 18-22 King Street East, Hamilton (D) – W. Rosart
  - (v) 24-28 King Street East, Hamilton (D) – W. Rosart
  - (vi) 2 Hatt Street, Dundas (R) – K. Burke

- (vii) James Street Baptist Church, 98 James Street South, Hamilton (D) – J. Brown

A partial mural has been put up on the property

- (viii) Long and Bisby Building, 828 Sanatorium Road – G. Carroll
- (ix) 120 Park Street, Hamilton (R) – R. McKee
- (x) 398 Wilson Street East, Ancaster (D) – C. Dimitry
- (xi) Lampman House, 1021 Garner Road East, Ancaster (NOID) – C. Dimitry
- (xii) Cathedral Boys School, 378 Main Street East, Hamilton (R) – T. Ritchie
- (xiii) Firth Brothers Building, 127 Hughson Street North, Hamilton (NOID) – T. Ritchie
- (xiv) Auchmar Gate House, Claremont Lodge 71 Claremont Drive (R) – R. McKee
- (xv) 80 to 92 Barton Street East (Hanrahan Hotel) – T. Ritchie
- (xvi) Television City, 163 Jackson Street West – J. Brown

There appears to be construction happening on the property

There appears to be vegetation growing on the building which may damage the structure.

**(b) Buildings and Landscapes of Interest (YELLOW):  
(Yellow = Properties that are undergoing some type of change, such as a change in ownership or use, but are not perceived as being immediately threatened)**

- (i) Delta High School, 1284 Main Street East, Hamilton (D) – D. Beland
- (ii) 2251 Rymal Road East, Stoney Creek (R) – B. Janssen
- (iii) Former Valley City Manufacturing, 64 Hatt Street, Dundas (R) – K. Burke
- (iv) St. Joseph's Motherhouse, 574 Northcliffe Avenue, Dundas (ND) – W. Rosart

- (v) Copley Building, 104 King Street West; 56 York Blvd., and 63-76 MacNab Street North (NOI) – G. Carroll
- (vi) Dunington-Grubb Gardens, 1000 Main Street East (within Gage Park) (R) – D. Beland
- (vii) St. Clair Blvd. Conservation District (D) – D. Beland
- (viii) 52 Charlton Avenue West, Hamilton (D) – J. Brown
- (ix) 292 Dundas Street East, Waterdown (R) – L. Lunsted
- (x) Chedoke Estate (Balfour House), 1 Balfour Drive, Hamilton (R) – T. Ritchie
- (xi) Binkley property, 50-54 Sanders Blvd., Hamilton (R) - J. Brown
- (xii) 62 6<sup>th</sup> Concession East, Flamborough (I) - L. Lunsted
- (xiii) Beach Canal Lighthouse and Cottage (D) – R. McKee
- (xiv) Cannon Knitting Mill, 134 Cannon Street East, Hamilton (R) – T. Ritchie

**(c) Heritage Properties Update (GREEN):  
(Green = Properties whose status is stable)**

- (i) The Royal Connaught Hotel, 112 King Street East, Hamilton (R) – T. Ritchie
- (ii) Auchmar, 88 Fennell Avenue West, Hamilton (D) – R. McKee
- (iii) Treble Hall, 4-12 John Street North, Hamilton (R) – T. Ritchie
- (iv) 104 King Street West, Dundas (Former Post Office) (R) – K. Burke
- (v) 45 Forest Avenue, Hamilton – G. Carroll
- (vi) 125 King Street East, Hamilton – T. Ritchie

**(d) Heritage Properties Update (black):**

**(Black = Properties that HMHC have no control over and may be demolished)**

No properties.

**CARRIED**

(h) **ADJOURNMENT (Item 15)**

**(Dmitry/Carroll)**

That there being no further business, the Hamilton Municipal Heritage Committee, adjourned at 10:25 a.m.

**CARRIED**

Respectfully submitted,

Alissa Denham-Robinson, Chair  
Hamilton Municipal Heritage Committee

Loren Kolar  
Legislative Coordinator  
Office of the City Clerk

**From:** [Robichaud, Steve](#)  
**To:** [Roth, Jennifer](#); [McKie, Shannon](#); [Fabac, Anita](#); [Kolar, Loren](#)  
**Cc:** [Addington, David](#); [Golden, Alissa](#); [Sheryer, Jennifer](#)  
**Subject:** RE: Update on Ontario Heritage Act amendments  
**Date:** January 12, 2021 3:30:53 PM

---

Loren

Can you please place this on the next mhc agenda as correspondence to be received by the Committee. No action required

Sent from my Bell Samsung device over Canada's largest network.

----- Original message -----

**From:** "Roth, Jennifer" <Jennifer.Roth@hamilton.ca>  
**Date:** 2021-01-12 3:04 PM (GMT-05:00)  
**To:** "McKie, Shannon" <Shannon.McKie@hamilton.ca>, "Fabac, Anita" <Anita.Fabac@hamilton.ca>, "Robichaud, Steve" <Steve.Robichaud@hamilton.ca>  
**Cc:** "Addington, David" <David.Addington@hamilton.ca>, "Golden, Alissa" <Alissa.Golden@hamilton.ca>, "Sheryer, Jennifer" <Jennifer.Sheryer@hamilton.ca>  
**Subject:** Fw: Update on Ontario Heritage Act amendments

FYI.

**Jennifer Roth, MCIP, RPP**

Planner I - Community Planning & GIS  
Planning and Economic Development  
Planning City of Hamilton  
(905) 546-2424 Ext. 2058

---

**From:** Beaudin, Lisa (MHSTCI) <Lisa.Beaudin@ontario.ca> on behalf of Finnerty, Kevin (MHSTCI) <Kevin.Finnerty@ontario.ca>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 12, 2021 3:01 PM  
**To:** Finnerty, Kevin (MHSTCI)  
**Subject:** Update on Ontario Heritage Act amendments

**FROM:** Kevin Finnerty  
Assistant Deputy Minister, Heritage, Tourism and Culture  
Division

**SUBJECT:** Update on Ontario Heritage Act amendments

---

Dear heritage sector stakeholders:

As you know, the Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Culture Industries (MHSTCI) recently consulted on a proposed regulation under the Ontario Heritage Act that was associated with the legislative amendments made through the *More Homes, More Choice Act*, 2019. The proposed regulation and legislative amendments were due to come into force on January 1, 2021. I am writing to let you know that proclamation of the amendments and the regulation have been delayed.

The proposed delay responds to requests from municipalities and heritage organizations to postpone proclamation in order to ensure that municipalities have enough time to prepare for implementing the new processes necessary to comply with the regulatory changes. Municipalities noted that a January 1, 2021 proclamation date would pose significant capacity and operational challenges as they continue to deal with the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic.

The ministry will be posting drafts of the updated Ontario Heritage Tool Kit guide for public consultation at a later date and will communicate further on a proposed proclamation date at that time.

Please reach out to your regular ministry contacts if you have questions. If you do not know who to ask, send an email to [heritage@ontario.ca](mailto:heritage@ontario.ca) and the appropriate staff person will respond.

Thank you for your understanding during these extraordinary circumstances.

*Original signed by*

Kevin Finnerty  
Assistant Deputy Minister  
Heritage, Tourism and Culture Division



## NOTICE OF STUDY COMMENCEMENT


### Valley Inn Road Bridge, City of Hamilton Municipal Class Environmental Assessment

#### THE STUDY

The City of Hamilton and the City of Burlington need to make improvements to the Valley Inn Road Bridge. The Valley Inn Road Bridge carries a pedestrian trail over Carroll's Bay Marsh and is located east of York Boulevard, between Hamilton and Burlington (see study area map).

#### THE PROCESS

The bridge improvements are being planned as a Schedule B Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (EA) project under the Municipal Engineers Association *Municipal Class Environmental Assessment* document (October 2000, as amended in 2007, 2011, and 2015). The EA will confirm the problem and opportunities, develop and assess alternative planning solutions (do nothing, repair or replace the bridge), and document the natural, socio-economic and cultural environments within the area. A preferred alternative solution will be identified following the technical review and input received from the public, stakeholders, Indigenous communities, and agencies.



Additional information about the project is available at [www.hamilton.ca/ValleyInnEA](http://www.hamilton.ca/ValleyInnEA). The website will be updated throughout the study as information becomes available.

This study will complete Phases 1 and 2 of the EA process as documented in the Municipal Engineers Association (MEA) *Municipal Class EA* document (October 2000, as amended in 2007, 2011 and 2015). Upon completion of the study a Project File Report (PFR) will be prepared and made available for a 30-day public review and comment period, with an opportunity for a Part II Order (appeal). Another advertisement will be published at that time, indicating where the report can be viewed.

#### PUBLIC COMMENTS INVITED

If you have any questions or comments, or wish to be added to the study mailing list, please contact one of the project team members:

Dipankar Sharma, P.Eng.  
Project Manager  
City of Hamilton, Public Works Dept.  
Phone: 905-546-2424 ext. 3016  
Email: [Dipankar.Sharma@hamilton.ca](mailto:Dipankar.Sharma@hamilton.ca)

Adam Renaud, P.Eng.  
Project Manager  
Stantec Consulting Ltd.  
Phone: 905-381-5436  
Email: [adam.renaud@stantec.com](mailto:adam.renaud@stantec.com)

If you have any accessibility requirements in order to participate in this study, please contact one of the project team members listed above.

Comments received through the course of this study will be considered in selecting the recommended improvement(s). Information will be collected in accordance with the *Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act*. With the exception of personal information, all comments will become part of the public record. If you would like more information, please contact Dipankar Sharma.

This Notice Issued January 14 and 21, 2021 in the Hamilton Spectator and Burlington Post.

**From:** [Golden, Alissa](#)  
**To:** [Kolar, Loren](#)  
**Cc:** [Summers, John](#)  
**Subject:** HMHC, January 29th: Ancaster Inventory - Owner Opposition to 259 Filman Road  
**Date:** January 21, 2021 3:28:50 PM  
**Attachments:** [image003.png](#)

---

Hi Loren,

Please add the email below outlining the owner opposition to 259 Filman Road, Ancaster to the HMHC agenda next Friday.

Thanks,

**Alissa Golden** *MCIP RPP*  
Heritage Project Specialist  
Planning and Economic Development  
Tourism and Culture, City of Hamilton  
(905) 546-2424 Ext.4654



*The City of Hamilton encourages physical distancing, wearing a mask in an enclosed public space, and increased handwashing. Learn more about the City's response to COVID-19*  
[www.hamilton.ca/coronavirus](http://www.hamilton.ca/coronavirus).

**From:** Doug Dunford [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** January 21, 2021 3:03 PM  
**To:** Golden, Alissa <Alissa.Golden@hamilton.ca>  
**Cc:** Ferguson, Lloyd <Lloyd.Ferguson@hamilton.ca>; Bishop, Kathy <Kathy.Bishop@hamilton.ca>  
**Subject:** Please do not put 259 Filman Rd on the Municipal Heritage Register (submission for the next Hamilton Municipal Heritage Committee Meeting on January 29, 2021)

21 January 2021

Hi Alissa: thank you again for your prompt, knowledgeable and articulate responses to both my phone call and email.... I can see why you are an excellent choice for your position!

RE: placing 259 Filman Rd, Ancaster, ON L9G 3K9 on the Pre-Confederation Registry (Municipal Heritage Register).

259 Filman is definitely a historical site and I understand the Ancaster Pre-Confederation Inventory Project's concerns regarding the possibility of registering it as such on the Municipal Heritage Register.

With respect, I would strongly oppose this.

Being on the inventory itself, however, makes perfect sense.

I grew up in the house at 259 Filman with a father who had a Masters Degree in History from Columbia University and was an executive member of LACHAC, a former local architectural conservatory organization, that has since merged with other similar groups such as the Ancaster Village Heritage Community so I both understand and support the reasoning behind historical preservation.

At the same time, I am now retired and will need to sell my house (hopefully not for several decades) some time in the future to finance whatever my wife and I will need as our next steps in our life. Any challenge to this process would be troubling to us.

259 Filman Rd, Ancaster is already under the restrictions of the Niagara Escarpment Commission. If more restrictions are placed on the property by the Municipal Heritage Register, I would be concerned that this could very well place too many institutional bureaucratic impediments in the way of selling our house, and as a result make 259 Filman an undesirable property.

Please note that the Niagara Escarpment Commission already contains provisions regarding any proposed demolition of the property with a concomitant approval process regarding rebuilding. So another scrutinized process would also, I suspect, be redundant and simultaneously potentially off-putting to any future interested purchaser of 259 Filman.

Finally, my intention has always been, when the time comes to sell the house, to seek a buyer who would appreciate both the house and the garden. Both my parents (who bought 259 Filman in 1953) and my own immediate family who have lived there since the early 1990s have extensively renovated the house as it was at one time in danger of falling in and transforming the garden. My understanding is that there is a growing even if presently a small group of buyers who would be interested in continuing a legacy such as this and not demolish the house and garden upon purchase. A member of that group would be my first choice when it came time for any prospective sale.

Thank you for the opportunity to share my perspective

Yours sincerely,

Doug and Alison Dunford  
259 Filman Rd, RR1 Ancaster, Ontario



**From:** [Golden, Alissa](#)  
**To:** [Kolar, Loren](#)  
**Cc:** [Summers, John](#)  
**Subject:** HMHC - January 29th - Ancaster Inventory - 38 Academy Street Objection Email  
**Date:** January 18, 2021 11:30:27 AM  
**Attachments:** [image005.png](#)  
[image006.png](#)

---

Good morning Loren,

Please see the email below dated **January 18<sup>th</sup>, 2021** from **Hazel Ryan** regarding her property at **38 Academy Street**, Ancaster and her objection to being added to staff's designation work plan.

Can you please assist with including this email correspondence to the HMHC agenda related to the Ancaster Inventory report?

Thank you,

**Alissa Golden** *MCIP RPP*  
Heritage Project Specialist  
Planning and Economic Development  
Tourism and Culture, City of Hamilton  
(905) 546-2424 Ext.4654

---

**From:** Hazel Ryan [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** January 18, 2021 9:41 AM  
**To:** Golden, Alissa <[Alissa.Golden@hamilton.ca](mailto:Alissa.Golden@hamilton.ca)>  
**Subject:** Re: Ancaster Inventory - 38 Academy Street - Follow-up

Hello Alissa

Thanks again for your information regarding our house 38 Academy st in Ancaster.

After much discussion we have decided on the following :

- A. We are perfectly willing to have our property listed on the Municipal Heritage Register as suggested.
- B. We would prefer Not to have the property put forward as a candidate for Heritage Property Designation.

We have lived here for 40 years and love our old house but have some concerns about being involved in many layers of bureaucracy and potential loss of independent control over our property should we agree to designation.

I hope you feel this is adequate or sufficient, Alissa, but please let me know if you have any comments or concerns. I enjoyed talking to you to the other day.

Best wishes,

Hazel.

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Golden, Alissa](#)  
**Cc:** [Ferguson, Lloyd](#); [Whitehead, Terry](#); [Vrooman, Tim](#)  
**Subject:** FW: "1157 Garner Rd. recommended for a listing as a non-designated Heritage  
**Date:** January 25, 2021 9:19:21 PM  
**Attachments:** [Home Cladding.jpg](#)  
[Porch extentsion.jpg](#)  
[replaced\\_patched chimney work.jpg](#)  
[ice and Wood Pecker damage.jpg](#)  
[ice and squirrel damage.jpg](#)  
**Importance:** High

---

Att: Alissa Golden

RE: " 1157 Garner Rd E was identified as an historic property of interest/and is being recommended for listing on the Municipal Heritage Register as a non-designated property..... Listing does not prevent demolition, but does provide a short-term delay(60 days) "

Hello Alissa,

I received your letter by mail, and I object to any change to the current designation and bylaws with the City of Hamilton with regards to 1157 Garner Rd. Ancaster ON.

I am submitting written comment for the virtual meeting of the HMHC, against the purposed non-designated for 1157 Garner Rd. for the following reasons :

- 1)\* it will interfere/complicate with my development rights, which I have been planning for nearly 3 decades.
- 2)\* This house over many years has heavily modified, both internally and externally and has retained no originality.
- 3) \*"Flanked by mature trees"( Most of the trees are severely damaged, dying and are being held together with mechanical aid)
- 4\*)Listing will definitely affect property value
- 5)\*"This property is visually and historically linked to its surrounding" ???

- 1)\*\*\* Interference and complications with my development rights:

I have spent considerable time and money over the past 29 years with attending City Hall meetings, including many emails and with the designing and planning of 1157 Garner Rd.

If you simply google Don, and Donato Cascioli, you will find many records on the internet stating my intent to develop 1157 Garner Rd,( and 1175 Garner as well) including two OMB hearing in 2004( PL040278) and 2018( PL161240.)

Some past communication and comments in regards to developing 1157 Garner RD. with City staff include:

Doug Waddell, Thomas Cameron, Tanya Mckenna, Terry Whitehead, Alvin Chan, Anita Fabac, Melanie Schneider, S Robichard, Mayor Eisenberger, Yvette Rybensky, Carlo Ammendolia, Tim Vrooman and Mr. Lloyd Ferguson. Never once was the issue of non-designated a topic of discussion.

To demonstrate the full development potential of units for 1157 Garner, I along with Dave Elliot ( my Real Estate Lawyer) attended a meeting with Losani homes on April 6, 2017 .( At the time Losani showed interest in the properties, but no actually sale ever took place) At the meeting a representative from Losani home, Cory Giancanti and Losani's legal counsel William Liske presented a sketch that showed a design layout with 16 Town Homes for 1157 Garner Rd. The average price of a condo in Ancaster is in the \$600,000.00 range. If you times that amount by 16 units, the fully developed survey would have a value around 10 Million dollars.

You also mentioned "Listing does not prevent demolition, but does provide a short-term delay(60 days) This interim protection allows staff time to discuss alternative to demolition with the land owner"

Even If I were to relocate the home on a corner of the property, I don't think it would visually fit well with a row of town home. For my experience as a landlord, contractor, register Real Estate agent, and my begins as a developer with 1175 Garner Rd. in a past formal consultation meet with the City on ov.13 ,2019 with about 20 City staff members including Yvette Rybensky. I am certain this would greatly complicate matters with the City Planning committee. Not To mention great costs involved in moving the piecemealed home, building a new foundation and connecting to new water and sewer services. Also this house's foot print would also occupy space for approx. 2 town homes, which does not make economic sense.

2)\*\*\*Heavy Modification/additions and renovation of home.

This past summer I painted the outside of the home, and noticed many changes, and modifications through time.

a) Change in Cladding

A view from the outside of the home shows 5 different outdoor cladding added to the home over the years, poorly fitted (\*\*SEE ABOVE PIC 1 Home Cladding\*\*)

TYPES OF CLADDING CHANGED/ADDED OVER THE YEARS:

- Wooden board and batten
- Metal siding
- concrete parging

-wood siding (used siding in various widths mismatched.)see pic 3

-Pebble dash-There are cracks all over this finish. This form of stucco is common on many homes in the downtown area built in 1940s and 1950s

This finish is a technique used by builders to cut costs to maximize profit. It is a cheap alternative to fine brick and stone masonry work.

b)Porch has also been added and expanded over the years.(SEE ABOVE PIC 2 Porch extension.( porch was not original to house)

- One section is poured concrete ( 40 years old) sitting on modern day concrete block footings covered in pressure treaded lattice, and the other section was added much later built with pressure treat wood that has been painted due to decay.

-all wood railing have also been replaced with pressure treated lumber in the 1990s ( I added a coat of paint this summer, as the wood was beginning to rot once again)

-porch ceiling sheeting is typical plywood

c) Windows

-original window opens have been cut out to accommodate larger windows.

-many windows had to be filled with outdoor puddy because of wrought.

d) Doors (see pic 1)

-all doors, casing, and hardware have been replaced in the 1970s.

e) Chimney

- was replaced and mended many times using different common brick (see pic.3 replaced, patched chimney work)

f) Addition to rear of home ( See pic 1)

-the rear wall of home from one end to the far wall was removed and extended by about 10 feet to make the kitchen and bathroom larger.

- The newer addition sits on modern day concrete block footing.

-windows are typical of the 1980s and 1990s (see 1 and pic 3)

g) Roof

-shingles have been replaced many time over with asphalt, and also re sheeted with plywood.

h) Basement

- at one point in time it was just a crawl space, and was later excavated in the past for a greater depth, then formed with plywood and concrete.(typical of today's construction)

- difference in ceiling high is about 4 feet higher, bring the new height to a little over 6 ft.

- Since all the recent development and change in grading, my tenants inform me the basement leaks.

- I have had many conversations with the City of Hamilton about the grading. I last spoke with Carlo Ammendolia in April 2020. He has made notes of some improper curb heights, and swales that were never added to 1169 Garner Rd. development. To date he has not return any of my

emails.

- one modification was made with the extension of asphalt and addition of a concrete curb surrounding a storm sewer...(This work was done, as I first had to bring it to the City's attention) How did this survey receive a grading certificate? One side of the development is 6 feet higher than 1175 Garner rd.( a Property I also own) and all the grading is sloping on a 45 degree angle towards my back yard.

Also this retaining wall abutting to my property to complete this new 92 town home development is already beginning to form many cracks. From my past 30 years of experience in construction I would strongly recommend sending an engineer to inspect this wall.

- a past tenant of mine at 1175 Garner Rd. reached out to The Spec to voice her frustrations with the grading and basement constantly filled with mud and water.

Google " The sad fate of a special place for dogs" for the fully story( The Spec)

i)Interior

-floors consist of peel and stick floor tile, linoleum, carpet, painted plywood sheets, and mix matched hardwood.

-all interior doors and hardware have been replaced in the 1970s.

-all baseboards were replaced in the 1990s with MDF ( glue resin and wood saw dust composite)

-walls are drywall downstairs, and 1970s style wood paneling upstairs.

-stair case has been replaced within the last 40 years.

-ceilings construction design are typical of the 1970s.

-lighting fixtures are from the 1980s.

#### A SECOND OPINION

I have a very knowledgeable neighbor living down the road from 1157 Garner Rd. for 65 plus years, his name is Mr. Raymond Wilson. Raymond's family I believe has been living in Ancaster since the 1800s. Raymond is a very well respected member of the community, and is VERY VERY well known within the City of Hamilton's planning Dept. He serves on many boards, just to name a few....Scottish Rite, Ancaster Fair Grounds, and ANCASTER TOWNSHIP HISTORICAL SOCIETY. ( I believe Raymond Rd off of Garner was named after him as well) This gentleman is well known for his in-depth knowledge of history in Ancaster. He and his past family have owned many properties on Garner Rd.

I spoke to Ray over this past weekend, and he could not believe 1157 Garner Rd. was identified as a potential property of interest. His Uncle Arthur Epps used to own 1157 Garner rd. Raymond informed me that the house was used as a rental for many years. He said that the house on 1157 Garner Rd. is a piecemealed house. No originality, and has had additions, and changes over the years. His personal opinion is the home has no historical or architectural value.

3)\*\*\*"Flanked with mature trees( Trees are severely damaged, are dying, and being held together by mechanical aid..See pics 3,4,5)

Over the years many trees have been critically damaged by:

-by ice storms resulting in broken branches and split tree trunks

-Wood Pecker, and Squirrel damage

-damaged root system by survey construction(see pic 3)

-old age, center of tree trunks are rotten and trees are at their end of a life cycle.

4)\*\*\* Listing will definitely affect property value

-I am also a licensed Real Estate agent working for Kronas Real Estate. This company has been around for 69 years. A few past projects Kronas has been involved in are COAHP Task with the City of Hamilton, and assembly of the Meadowlands in Ancaster. I have benefited greatly with knowledge by working with this company first as an investor in 1992, and now as an agent.

-I do not plan on selling this property, but if a listing were to be created, the non-designated property status under Section 27 of the Ontario Heritage Act would turn away all investors, and developers once it appears on the Real Estate listing.

-I have been approached in the past to partner with a large developer for 1157 Garner Rd. I can assure you with no doubt in my mind that this designation would end my potential partnership.

5)\*\*\* This property is visually and historically linked to its surrounding" ???

- To the west abutting on my side yard is a square building known as the Ancaster water pump station

-Beside this pump station is a future project that is supposed to contain a 9 story building with 92 units. Terry Whitehead knows many particulars of this future project.

-to the east abutting on to my property is a 92 unit development by Losani.

-in behind my property are more towns, and million dollar homes.

- a few hundred feet down the road are countless new homes built by Marz, Rosehaven, Desantis, Losani, and DiCenzo all built within the last couple of years.

- further down the Garner Rd across Miller is the Silvestri Home built in 1995. It is considered by many to be the Largest single family home in Canada.

My property does not visually or historically link to the surrounding.

I have been planning development of 1157 Garner Rd. for almost 29 years since ownership. Mr. Lloyd Ferguson was present at many meetings in the past. He helped me, and guided me tremendously with my many questions in regards to future development of my land, such as traffic, units per hectare acre, etc. Never once did any City staff member raise any interests for my property as a non-designated property requiring a 60 day delay for demolition. Why now 29 years later? If the property had any value, it would have been already designated long ago.

This house was cheaply constructed, and treated as such by the many owners and landlords with upkeep, cost cutting maintenance and additions. My expert personal opinion from Raymond Wilson reinforces my own statements. 1157 Garner Rd has not retained its original building footprint, nor any of its original visible features both interior or exterior. This is not a stone building, there is no slate roof. This home in any shape or form cannot be compared to either The Shaver Homes, or the Rousseau.

Trees have reached the end of their life cycle due to time, and the elements. To sustain any type of building on this property, Soil levels will have to be eventually raised to match Losani's Grading.

Listing this property with the purposed designation, from my past experiences, and after receiving professional advice over the weekend, there is absolutely no doubt that this will deeply affect my property value. I am also in remission from cancer, and this is causing me unbearable stress.

Today this property sticks out like a sore thumb, and is totally out of character or fit. It is wedged beside a square commercial building, ( Ancaster water pump station) a purposed 9 story building a 92 town house development, and an endless sea of new construction down the road. I encourage you to drive by 1157 Garner Rd. and see for yourself.

1157 Garner is situated in a perfect location for high density. We need more intensification, efficiency and sustainability. ( Place to Grow 2006) It has the potential to serve as homes for 16 families, as there is a great need for more housing. It is close to shopping, and close to the airport. This development would be transit-supportive, as there are several bus routes across the street. It also would generate tax dollars for investments in infrastructure. ( sidewalks along Garner is much needed as I see students crossing the street on the stone shoulders, particularly dangerous in the winter with snow, and ice at Garner and Glanaster road.) This non designation would not benefit the overall community. The house was an inexpensive home to build, and retains no originality, visually or structurally. Is this really worth it? How much tax dollars in the exploration of this non-designation of 1157 Garner Rd. is this costing our tax payers?

Has the Ancaster Village Heritage Community/Hamilton Municipal Heritage Committee taken any of the above in consideration?

I think not.

Donato  
Cascioli












Sonoma Home's  
purposed 9 story  
Building


Görner Rd ↗

Ancaster  
Water  
Pump Station

1157 Görner Rd.

Losani's 92  
Unit Townhouse  
Complex







**From:** [clerk@hamilton.ca](mailto:clerk@hamilton.ca)  
**To:** [Kolar, Loren](#); [Carson, Katie](#)  
**Subject:** Correspondence re 34 Lloyminn - Carl Galli  
**Date:** January 27, 2021 2:39:17 PM  
**Attachments:** [letter to HMHC jan 27, 2021 re 34 Lloyminn ancaster.pdf](#)

---

**Magda Green**

*Administrative Assistant II to the City Clerk*  
**City of Hamilton**  
905 546-2424 ext. 5485  
[magda.green@hamilton.ca](mailto:magda.green@hamilton.ca)

---

**From:** Carl [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** January 27, 2021 2:38 PM  
**To:** [clerk@hamilton.ca](mailto:clerk@hamilton.ca)  
**Cc:** Ferguson, Lloyd <[Lloyd.Ferguson@hamilton.ca](mailto:Lloyd.Ferguson@hamilton.ca)>; Bishop, Kathy <[Kathy.Bishop@hamilton.ca](mailto:Kathy.Bishop@hamilton.ca)>; Golden, Alissa <[Alissa.Golden@hamilton.ca](mailto:Alissa.Golden@hamilton.ca)>  
**Subject:** 34 Lloyminn - Hamilton Municipal Heritage Committee Meeting January 29, 2021

Hello

Attached is our submission regarding our objection to including 34 Lloyminn Ave. in Ancaster on the Municipal Heritage Register

Carl Galli  
NGE Land Holdings Inc.



**NGE LAND HOLDINGS INC.**

950 Fennell Ave. E., Suite 105

Hamilton, Ontario, L8V 1X2

Phone (905) 387-2255, FAX (905) 574-3838

Email: [cgalli@rogers.com](mailto:cgalli@rogers.com)

January 27, 2021

Hamilton Municipal Heritage Committee  
City Of Hamilton

**VIA Email: [clerk@hamilton.ca](mailto:clerk@hamilton.ca)**

**RE: 34 LLOYMINN AVENUE ANCASTER**

As owners of the above noted property, we are objecting to the property being included on the Municipal Heritage Register ("MHR"). We feel that the property exhibits few if any of the attributes to be considered a heritage property, other than the fact that part of the structure was built in or around 1854. We have more fully detailed our reasons below.

***The House – Style***

As noted in the Ancaster Pre-Confederation Inventory Form (the "Form"), the "Architectural Style / Influence - Vernacular". By definition: vernacular is "...architecture concerned with domestic and functional rather than public or monumental buildings". In addition, all signs of the architecture have been covered over and, in some cases, removed completely to a point where little if any of the original structure can be recognized.

***The House – Structure***

The original house has been significantly modified over the years to a point where there is very little left to consider it heritage.

- Approximately 50% of the house as it stands now is not original. The addition on the back (added late 1970's) and the Breezeway and Garage (added in or around 1946).
- There are no architectural significant features to the house. The original home was a cottage and is a large one-story rectangle home with no distinguishing features and a simple hip roof which may not even be the original roof.
- All original exterior windows and doors (and most if not all interior doors) have been replaced and or removed from the home. In the 1980's, some glass panes may have been used on the newer windows, however they appear to no longer be on site. The six over six windows noted in the Form are not original as evidenced by the old storage shed/outhouse which used to be on the property.

- The original outhouse/storage shed in the backyard had a collapsed (roof) and was unsafe (walls were unstable). It was removed in 2016. This structure had the original 12 pane windows, but they were broken from the roof/building collapse.
- Approximately 50% of the original back foundation and back wall was removed and replaced with a common block wall during a renovation (Late 1970's).
- All items of historical significance were either removed by the former owners (fireplace mantel, Chandelier, Iron works from roof etc.) or items were donated to the Fieldcote Museum in Ancaster (ship flagpole that stood in front of the house and other items).
- The exterior bricks, that remains from the original house, were Stucco /plastered over and are no longer visible. As indicated, some of the bricks were removed completely during the renovations.
  - The addition behind the house and breezeway/garage, is clad in white bricks from the 1970's.
- The southeast corner of the house has a foundation problem. It appears a repair was attempted some time ago which did not work, and the corner is deteriorating.
- There is significant leaking in the old basement of the house which cannot be accessed for repair from the exterior due to the location of the Breezeway.
- There is structural problem under the new basement floor in the back addition, near where the new block wall was added.
  - The new basement floor is bulging upwards.
- Almost all original walls have been covered over or removed during past renovations and are not visible.

In summary, the original house has been modified and renovated so many times over the years that very little of the original style or structure is evident in the home. In addition, it appears that all items of historical significance have either been removed, destroyed or donated.

### ***Historical Significance***

As indicated above, all items of historical significance appear to have been removed from the house and or donated to the Fieldcote Museum.

The Form indicates that the property is associated with "Local Military History". To date, we have not found any indication or evidence that this is correct. The only indication of any military association is that the first owner of the home served in the military about 15 years before building the home (in the 1830's) and the last owner of the home, Dr. Famer served as a reservist (after World War II)

before purchasing the home in 1962. There appears to be no record or any military activity on the property at any time in the past.

In addition, the original property was filled with Oak Trees (only one or two remain on the property). The largest oak tree on the property, which was badly rotted, recently fell into a neighbor's yard during a storm. The original 200 acre property was partly cleared of oak trees in the 1860's becoming farmland and later an apple orchard before eventually becoming a subdivision.

### **Conclusion**

Based on the above, we see no reason for the property to be added to the MHR. The history of the house is well documented (1981 report by Janet Wilson) however the drawing attached to the report is very inaccurate. Little if anything of historical significance remains at the property since most has been removed / destroyed and or donated. Also, there appears to be no historical or military significance to the location. Part of the house is a simple cottage built in or around 1854 in an oak forest that was eventually cleared as farmland and is now part of a subdivision (a common story in the area).

Based on the City Brochure, "Heritage Designation Process", the section entitled "What are the criteria for evaluating the heritage value or significance of a property?", 34 Lloyminn does not appear to meet, in any material way, any of the three criteria:

1. The property appears to have no design value or physical value based on the criteria that makes it necessary for preservation.
2. The house has no historical value or associative value based on the criteria.
3. The house has no contextual value based on the criteria.

Therefore, we see no reason to have this property added to the MHR.

Yours very truly,  
**NGE Land Holdings Inc.**



Per: Carl Galli, CA, CBV

Cc Alisa Golden  
Lloyd Ferguson

**From:** [Kolar, Loren](#)  
**To:** [Golden, Alissa](#); [benjamin@barchitecturaldesign.com](mailto:benjamin@barchitecturaldesign.com)  
**Cc:** [Ferguson, Lloyd](#); [Bishop, Kathy](#); [marcel.wigger@liebherr.com](mailto:marcel.wigger@liebherr.com)  
**Subject:** RE: Ancaster Inventory - 4237 Powerline Road West - Opposition to Listing  
**Date:** January 27, 2021 8:28:00 AM  
**Attachments:** [image003.png](#)  
[image004.png](#)

---

Will do.

Mr Wigger, your correspondence will be added to the Addendum of the agenda, and published before the meeting.

Thank you for your participation.

**Loren Kolar**

*Legislative Coordinator*

T | (905) 546-2424 ext. 2604

E | [loren.kolar@hamilton.ca](mailto:loren.kolar@hamilton.ca)

---

**From:** Wigger Marcel (LCA) [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Friday, January 22, 2021 5:26 PM  
**To:** Benjamin McFadgen [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** RE: Ancaster Inventory - 4237 Powerline Road West - Opposition to Listing

Hi Ben

I planning on to build a new house for the last couple years. Last year in August I contact City of Hamilton to find out if my currant house is under heritage or not. Also I was asking if container houses are allowed in the area where I have my property. At that time I get the confirmation from Hamilton that all OK is to build new house (see the emails between City of Hamilton and me). So I started to get mortgage increase to start the project. Shortly after I get the founds from the bank I contacted Ben McFadgen from BM Architectural Design to get started on the drawings for the new House. We working together with Giant Container to finalize the container layout and the engineering drawings. Let me know if you have any questions of concerns.

Property address:

Marcel Wigger

4237 Powerline Rd W

Lynden, ON, LOR 1T0

Regard Marcel

Kind regards / Cordialement / Mit freundlichen Grüßen

Marcel Wigger

**From:** [Golden, Alissa](#)  
**To:** [Ferguson, Lloyd](#); [Kolar, Loren](#)  
**Cc:** [Wigger Marcel \(LCA\)](#)  
**Subject:** RE: Ancaster Inventory - 4237 Powerline Road West - Opposition to Listing  
**Date:** January 28, 2021 10:25:59 AM  
**Attachments:** [image002.png](#)  
[image006.png](#)  
[image009.png](#)

---

Good morning Councillor,

Mr. Wigger's correspondence and opposition to being listed on the Register has been noted and added to the HMHC agenda for tomorrow.

**Loren** – can you please add the additional email to Councillor Ferguson below to the correspondence for this property at 4237 Powerline Road West?

Thank you,

**Alissa Golden** *MCIP RPP*  
Heritage Project Specialist  
Planning and Economic Development  
Tourism and Culture, City of Hamilton  
(905) 546-2424 Ext.4654



*The City of Hamilton encourages physical distancing, wearing a mask in an enclosed public space, and increased handwashing. Learn more about the City's response to COVID-19*  
[www.hamilton.ca/coronavirus](http://www.hamilton.ca/coronavirus).

---

**From:** Wigger Marcel (LCA) [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 27, 2021 6:12 PM  
**To:** Ferguson, Lloyd <[Lloyd.Ferguson@hamilton.ca](mailto:Lloyd.Ferguson@hamilton.ca)>  
**Subject:** RE: Ancaster Inventory - 4237 Powerline Road West - Opposition to Listing

Dear Councilor Ferguson

As you may already was on the email below. I started planning the new house construction on my property last year in August when I first time get in contact with the City of Hamilton to make sure there is no restriction on the property, house for a new build. I get the confirmation from the city that all is ok. So I started to get working with the bank for a mortgage increase. Everything went well so I hired Ben McFadgen from BM Architectural Design to start the first plans for the new house. Shortly after we get in contact with Giant Container from Toronto.

Then before Christmas I get the letter in my mail box from the Ancaster Heritage Committee. I was quite a shock then I just invested a large amount with BM Architectural Design and also Giant Container.

Hoping to get my house of the possible Heritage list would be a big relief.

If you have any questions don't hesitated to contact me any time

Thanks for your understanding and help

Regards Marcel Wigger

Kind regards / Cordialement / Mit freundlichen Grüßen  
**Marcel Wigger**

From: [REDACTED]  
 To: [Ferguson, Lloyd; Golden, Alissa](#)  
 Cc: [Bishop, Kathy](#); [REDACTED]  
 Subject: Cultural Heritage comments for FC-15-081/ for the 105 Filman property  
 Date: January 25, 2021 11:54:57 AM  
 Attachments: [Filman Rd City Contract.pdf](#)  
[Heritage Comments - FC-15-081 \(11\).doc](#)  
[105 Filman Ancaster Heritge Assessment Report.pdf](#)  
 Importance: High

---

Hello Councilor Ferguson, Alissa, and Kathy.

I am the resident at 105 Filman Rd, Ancaster.

On Christmas eve, 2020 we got an abrupt, generic, and rather nonsensical letter from an individual we have never met before named Bob Maton; referencing his crusade to put our residence (and 64 others) on a proposed Heritage watchlist; because of his findings that the City had asked for (and without our consent) !

While I have my opinions and reservations as to the method employed by this group, motives, and more importantly the competence to this "so-called" volunteer group that the City has retained, I'll leave my bias out for now and deal with only facts, and to draw Bobs findings in his generic letter to us - to its logical conclusion.

Please allow me to shed light to this property.

- In 2015-2016, 105 Filman Rd was introduced to the City for part of a redevelopment proposal **(Please see 1st attachment- City Hamilton)**
- An initial City consult was undertaken and paid for and accepted at the City, and various City Departments were consulted for their comments. The City approved 22 townhomes on this property **(please see 1st attachment- City Hamilton- attached contract from the City Hamilton)**
- Cultural Heritage had also passed comments on this subject property and identified this property with no cultural heritage issues of by Chelsey Tyers, Cultural Heritage Planner **(please see 2nd attachment- City Hamilton comments as part of Cultural Heritage comments done in 2015-2016)**
- Based on those comments and City approval and contract for re-development, we purchased this property
- For personal reasons, we delayed the redevelopment of Filman as we have been residents here
- On Dec 23, 2020, we received Bobs letter
- On Dec 25, 2020 we retained the services of a highly accredited Heritage consultant Mr. Tom Murison to dispel Bobs assumptions (that came at a considerable cost to us)
- Mr. Murison's conclusions are outlined explicitly and rebutted "point-on-point" in his extensive and detailed 70 page report attached in this email **(please see attached 70 page report, summary, and conclusions dispelling not one, but all of Bob's presumptions)**

That being said, and drawing from

1. The City's initial comments from Cultural Heritage, City Hamilton Planning, and their Contractual approval for 22 townhomes. and
2. Our accredited Heritage consultant, Mr. Murisons conclusion,

I am requesting that Filman be effectively removed from this process, as I believe this has reached its logical conclusion on multiple fronts and to put this matter to rest.

While I presume this is more than sufficient, could you kindly advise if we still need to attend the meeting on the 29th, 9.30 am - 1 pm virtually ?

I will need to schedule for both myself and Mr. Murison to be attending virtually if you still need further clarification to our Heritage Impact Assessment report.

Thank you and please feel free to reach out should you have any further questions.

—

Regards,

Danyal Sheikh

cc. Dr. Khurram Khan

cc. Larry Levine - QC, Legal Council

# HERITAGE INVESTIGATION & ASSESSMENT

105 FILMAN ROAD, ANCASTER

January 16, 2021



**West Elevation: 105 Filman Road, Ancaster**

**Prepared by: T. Murison Heritage Consultant**

**COPYRIGHT & DISCLAIMER:**

**This Report has been prepared for the sole purpose of assessing the age and historic significance of the house and outbuilding at 105 Filman Road, Ancaster. It may be reviewed and distributed by the Owner to the City of Hamilton, in response specifically to the Ancaster Pre-Confederation Inventory Form. It may not be copied, excerpted, or distributed for any other purpose. The author will attend virtual meetings to review the findings of this Report with City of Hamilton and volunteer historical groups as required.**

**Copyright: J.T. Murison, January 20, 2021**

**INDEX:**

<b>Number:</b>	<b>Description:</b>	<b>Page:</b>
<b>00.00</b>	<b>Introduction:</b>	<b>3.</b>
<b>01.00</b>	<b>Site Visit and Observations</b>	<b>4.</b>
<b>01.01 - 01.91</b>	<b>Observations</b>	<b>4. - 24.</b>
<b>02.01 - 02.29</b>	<b>Site &amp; Outbuilding</b>	<b>25. - 39.</b>
<b>03.01 - 03.29</b>	<b>Analysis</b>	<b>40. - 46.</b>
<b>03.30 - 03.40</b>	<b>House Style and Design</b>	<b>46. - 61.</b>
<b>04.01 - 04.10</b>	<b>Conclusions</b>	<b>61. - 62.</b>
<b>05.01</b>	<b>Consultant and Addenda</b>	<b>63.</b>

## **00.00 INTRODUCTION:**

**00.01** A letter from the **City of Hamilton** Heritage Department indicated that this property is being considered for inclusion in the **Ancaster Pre-Confederation Inventory Form** with 65 other properties. This Investigation will examine the age of the two structures on the site, house and shed which we have determined was a greenhouse. The property has been reviewed previously by the City of Hamilton and found not to be of historic significance, but this Report will provide much more detail about the buildings and their history.

**00.02** The Authors of the Ancaster Pre-Confederation Inventory Form have assumed and stated that these buildings are Pre-Confederation, and are Dutch Colonial in design. They have also assumed that the foundations are stone, and that these buildings are the same ones that appear on the 1875 Wentworth Map. Another assumption is that the Filman Road alignment on the Map has not changed (but it is clearly different from the modern road system). We will use a comparative method to determine whether the assumptions are true or false and summarize the findings. The question of whether the house is a landmark has nothing to do with whether it is a pre-confederation building. This will also be considered and addressed.

**00.03** Construction methods and materials will be examined carefully to determine the age of each component. Framing, doors and windows, interior finishes, hardware, electric lighting and wiring, plumbing and heating will also be reviewed. Certain items can be dated accurately to within a decade or so. Other items which have builders plates or actual date tags will also be reviewed.

**00.04** In terms of the design, the plans and elevations will also be described and analyzed since customs and tastes are quite specific to particular eras. The inclusion of a three car underground garage would not be expected before automobiles became common after WW1.

**00.05** Where there any structures on the site before the 1875 Wentworth map was made? It is important to work out exactly where the houses shown on that map were located, and this will require some simple measurements made from modern sources like Google Earth against features that can be confirmed on both the modern map and the 1875 map.

**00.06** This Report will also examine the historical and associative context of the buildings, to determine where they fit into the urban development of Ancaster. If it is clear that the assumptions and questions used by the Inventory Form do not apply to this property, a recommendation will be made to remove it from the Inventory, permanently.

## Site Visit & Observations

December 27, 2020

**Site Investigation:** 105 Filman Road, Ancaster

**Conditions:** Minus 1 degree C., sunny, calm air

**Location:** Filman road is the first intersection west of the junction of Hwy. 403 & Lincoln Alexander Parkway, in Hamilton. The Rosseau Street exit from the 403 joins Mohawk Road along the west property line. This is the closest residence to, the junction.



View to the east from the south eastern corner of the lot. Note the presence of many trees and elevation difference to the road below. Mohawk Road is an overpass here with Highway 403 below.

**01.00** The private laneway to the house is 100 meters north of Rosseau Street on the east side of Filman.

**01.01** The large three storey residence is 66 meters from the road.



**01.02** A three-car garage (basement level) fronts the driveway. The 3 segmental overhead doors (original) are now operated remotely by electric motors.

**01.03** the façade facing the driveway has windows at four stories in the high gable, with two access doors at the basement and first floor via a small side porch.

**01.04** The roof pitches are 12/12. Overhangs on the roof are minimal at the verge and less than 6 inches at the eaves.

**01.05** Wall siding appears to be aluminum with 11 courses per door height (7-5/8" to weather, per course)

**01.06** Windows in this elevation are modern replacements with faux vinyl muntins.

**01.07** Limestone (random rubble) masonry was used for retaining walls flanking the garage, and for the massive chimney (three flues with stainless steel liners) visible at the cap.

**01.08** The roof is a recent replacement with aggregate coated steel tiles laid with a large lap of approximately 12" per course.

**01.09** An aluminum screen door has been installed to protect the upper and lower wooden entry doors.

**01.10** The asphalt driveway was laid within the past thirty years.

**01.11** Motion detecting exterior lights and several fan vents are visible on this side.



**01.12** South elevation (Rousseau Street) features asymmetrical elements including:

- a). a large gable with projecting triple unit bay window at first floor and double unit window at the second floor
- b). an entry door with a Colonial Revival broken pediment.
- c). a pair of faux coach lamps (electric) on the jambs of the door surround
- d). an entry door with six raised panels below a trio of Italianate arched window panes
- e). side panels to the deeply recessed doorway have three raised panels that do not match those of the door.
- f). a hardware store brass knocker and good quality lever and deadbolt set, and brass kick plate on the door.
- g). a short flagpole over the center of the door head. This feature is much more common on American homes than those in Canada.



- 01.13** Detail of entry with “broken cornice” typified by American “Federal” designs, which are considerably more baroque in detail and ornament than Classical Revival, British designs.
- 01.14** In an authentic 19<sup>th</sup>. century Ontario carpentry arch, this “keystone” would be considered superfluous. American examples were more likely to use the faux embellishment. It’s use in this case, suggests that this entry treatment is twentieth century and more American in nature than British. To be more specific, it is likely to be more “American” if the influence came from an American magazine or pattern book idea. This idea will be considered in the discussion section of this Report.
- 01.15** A pair of dormers that “break through” the 1-1/2 story eaves at the second floor. This is necessary because of the low eaves on the main roof.
- 01.16** A triple gang “Palladian” window at the living room beside the entry door also has a gable dormer centered above.
- 01.17** Both second floor gables are centered on first floor openings.
- 01.18** The roof of a sun porch at the east end of the house is extended from the same slope as the main roof, but it’s eaves are much lower, level of the first floor ceiling.

**01.19** A small lavatory window is placed on the west end of the elevation near the side entry. This room is now part of the kitchen storage area. The eaves here are the same height as the sunroom on the other end of the elevation.

**01.20** A second, tall, stone chimney can be seen above and beyond the sunroom ridge.

**01.21** East elevation features a two story gable with a single bedroom window above the screened and unheated, sun porch.



**01.22** The limestone cladding of the foundation continues around the base of the sunroom, providing the impression of a low plinth.

**01.23** Double posts with trellis were used at the corners of what was probably the original sun porch. The sun porch was extended along the north side of the living room with slightly different (simpler) details used to frame the screened walls.

**01.24** A mechanically operated attic vent is visible beside the gable chimney. This power vent appears to be sensor operated.

**01.25** A small bedroom window is located above the low slope sun porch roof next to the large chimney that serves the living room fireplace.

**01.26** The screen porch wraps around the east elevation from the south side.

**01.27** Aluminum scuppers above the sunroom eaves troughs suggest that the low slope roof has been a maintenance problem, which has required the

redirection of water from the higher roof across the low slope roof by using extensions to the upper down pipes.

**01.28** A build-up of ice and snow also suggests that the roof has insulation problems at the perimeter which cause “ice dams” to form. While the metal roof has reduced wear from sunlight and wind, it cannot be expected to prevent water from backing up above excessive ice buildup. Under some ice conditions large areas of built up snow and ice may also come loose from the steep roof and avalanche down to the sun porch or ground below. The roof does not have snow guards to prevent this happening.

**01.29** Minimal eaves at gable walls, may allow ice dams to divert snow melt over the edge of the roof to form secondary icicles on the gables.

**01.30** A dormer with double casement windows on the east elevation has ice buildup and snow cornices at the valleys. A snow guard fitted to the metal roof tiles appears to be holding back snow and ice just above this north wall.



**01.31** a secondary entrance with arched door on the east side is situated opposite the main entrance on the west elevation. This doorway and door seem to be heavily weathered from being located close to an inside corner on the north side of the east elevation.



- 01.32** An arch topped window for the stair landing halfway between floors has been awkwardly flashed to accommodate the new aluminum siding. The segmented flashing demonstrates noticeably how it was made and secured by cutting and bending.
- 01.33** The yellowish white colour of the metal siding is in contrast to the bluish white painted trim surrounding the older windows.
- 01.34** Three windows at the second and third floor window on the large north east gable have noticeable staining running down the siding from the lower corners of the window sills. Why this should happen may be explained possibly by gradual drainage (or weeping) of moisture from behind the siding being directed out to the surface by the side flashings of the window jambs. The drainage is either chronic or sufficiently slow that dirt and grime is able to adhere better to the siding in these streaks.
- 01.35** The locking seams at the underside of each piece of siding also show unusual patches of dirtiness. This may be a result of sealants or mould growing on the substrate. This is difficult to account for unless the metal was painted with a product that oxidizes to produce a viable habitat for mould. This has been observed on examples of mid-1960's aluminum siding that develop a powdery surface after decades of exposure. Patches of noticeably brighter

paint were observed high up on the gable and just under the roof verge where the slightly projecting trim has sheltered the siding below. These irregular areas of white paint contrast sharply with the yellowish and stained pieces that are not protected. Paint on traditional wood siding does not tend to weather like pre-finished metal siding.

- 01.36** A trio of kitchen windows on the first floor of the east gable are flashed with metal that has a distinctly blue tinge. While the siding and windows may have been colour matched originally, oxidation is altering the paint significantly over time.
- 01.37** A large round headed screen door that protects the east door has indications of several previous hardware locations. The door is wooden with visible seams where the arched top is connected and where the toe rail has begun to deteriorate. Doors of this sort are typical post- WW1.
- 01.38** the overall impression of the exterior is that this house is similar to loosely interpreted colonial revival houses in the United States after World War One, especially those from “pattern books” of “catalogue houses” whose plans were advertised in magazines like Ladies Home Journal, and Better Homes and Gardens. These catalogue designs were prepared on speculation by architectural firms hired by the magazines or prefabricated home builders, for sale to the general public. In some cases, like the T. Eatons Catalogue from Toronto, the house plans were used to sell complete house kits. The pre-manufactured house could be ordered and purchased by mail, for delivery as a single shipment via railway boxcar or flatcar.
- 01.39** the entryway vestibule is partly enclosed by a paneled decorative arch. The broad jambs and arch are framed with what is now be considered to be sophisticated raised trim and recessed panels. For a skilled carpenter in the 1920’s this was normal work but used only in better homes.
- 01.40** The pilasters “supporting” the arch are fluted with five precise stopped grooves. A cornice mould is used at the “springing” of the arch, which has a simplified back band and “keystone” element at its highest point.
- 01.41** In order to keep the placement of the arch well below the cornice mould around the hall, (and provide wall space above the arch), the springing is by necessity, low, at shoulder height. This places the springing well below the cornices of the doors to the closet and w.c. on either side of the entry. This compression of vertical space creates an odd conflict between the height of the intermediate rails of the side doors and the arch moulding, which would have been avoided in nineteenth century houses where floor to ceiling dimensions allowed the springing to meet or exceed the door head trim. This architectural compromise, while charming, indicates a clear difference between this space and a less self-conscious nineteenth century example that was working hard to be accurately classical in style.



- 01.42** The built-up mouldings in the cornice around the hall emphasize horizontal layers of moulding but lack the “excitement” of deep shadow lines and reverse curvature that modulates the ceiling light. The effect is bland and difficult to define, but that may have been the intention of the builder.
- 01.43** The rather low ceiling height becomes obvious when one looks at the stairwell. The cornice mould is coped to terminate at the edge of the ceiling just above the foot of the stairs.



**01.45** Principle staircase to second floor, at entry hall.

**01.46** While the stairs are beautifully formed with a “spindle basket” wrapping around a central newel on the lowest tread, the window that illuminates the quarter landing is truncated when seen from the doorway from the entry. The impression is one of insufficient headroom and ominous weight of the floor above.

**01.47** The treads and railing are varnished but the risers and spindles are painted in a very traditional manner. The use of three spindles per tread, closely spaced, suggests a very high quality staircase, and close examination of the rather thin spindles indicates that they are likely dovetailed into the treads as per good practice. The railing is tight and free from wobble. This is a good example of 1920’s stair building as prepared by a joiner.

**01.48** A simplified skirt board with repeating, sawn, decorative fretwork below each tread, is nicely rendered but does not quite match typical nineteenth century patterns. The long cyma reversa curve dies in an indistinct scotia shape that one might expect to meet either the face of the tread above or the shoulder of the next cyma reversa. Instead, the scotia is truncated to allow room for a painted cove mould below the varnished tread bullnose. The effect is just noticeable enough to demonstrate accidental design. A classical

approach to this same feature would have used a square termination to the cyma reversa to enhance the sense of precision at each tread.

**01.49** the spindles were designed with the best practice of having different sizes for each “set” of three spindles on each tread. This method allowed the squared ends at the top of each spindle to follow the slope of the railing, while the squared bottom ends ran parallel to the treads. This more complex joinery, is a much calmer and authentic approach than using spindles which are “one size fits all”. See sketches:

**01.50** A drawback to using three spindles per tread is that each spindle must be made narrower than was typical in nineteenth century staircases to allow for reduced space between the spindles. These spindles were made from blanks that were less than 1-1/4” square, instead of 1-1/2” or even 1-5/8” square stock. This is not noticeable until one examines the peculiarly elaborate “fluted bead” roughly 7” above each tread. These fluted beads catch the light because of their concave faces on eight sides. They dominate the stack of moulded rings below them and emphasize the bulbous nature of this mid-spindle line to the detriment of the lower section which appears weak and arbitrary. The effect is odd and reminiscent of a healed fracture on the shaft of a femur. Yes it catches the light prominently, but no, it does not provide a sense of either solidity or wholeness to each spindle. The spindles seem to be too weak and insubstantial below this elaborate and ill conceived knob.

**01.51** Though the stair builder or architect introduced this elaborate design error into the spindles, the builder was quite skilled as a joiner. He was able to apply his skills to making a perfect increasing sequence of matching spindles around the newel, but did not adjust the last two not keep the volute cap level with the declining spiral. This “error” in the termination of the railing demonstrates a conceptual error rather than an error in joinery skill.

**01.52** While the handrail is carefully crafted, it is narrow by the standards of pre-WW1 or the nineteenth century. The railing would be wider at the top shoulder than at the bottom bead. A railing was typically 3” wide at the bottom and 3-3/4” at the top. This allowed a comfortable groove between the upper roll and the lower bead to allow the fingers to securely grip the railing. This railing has almost no difference in width from top to bottom of the section, and is roughly 3/4” narrower than older examples. Whether this was to save material or better fit a small hand is debatable, but it varies enough from the traditional railing as to be notable.

**01.53** The skirt board on the housed ends of the treads (wall) is a modest height when it becomes a baseboard at the quarter landing. Such a grand stair would normally have at least six inches of skirt board above the treads and landing, but here we see that it is near four inches plus moulding. This may reflect a residual understanding of the proportions of trim to ceiling

height that was “rule of thumb” before the Great War. Architects and builders were so used to the idea of “first class”, “second class” and “third class” houses prior to the war, that they would not specify the dimensions of any trim on typical house drawings other than to state, ie.: “second class house. Trim varnished oak.” This was all the information the builder would require as he would know that this meant 11'-0" floor to floor heights, 10" baseboard, 5" jamb casing, 7'1/2" cornices on doors and windows, etc.. But here we see a ‘miniaturized’ version of the stair skirt, likely caused by the desire to make the baseboard in the hall, and the skirt on the stair, match the new, lower ceiling standard for this house.


- 01.54** The single hung window at the landing is one of the few original to the house. But here we observe another change from traditional proportions. The casing at the jambs has a back band which is substantial, but too wide in comparison with the jamb board itself. Where a typical 1920's house might have a plain painted 4" board without back band trimming the window, this one has a 1-5/8" back band leaving a 2-3/8" trim board. This is not entirely true however because an extra bead mould, (3/8") was applied just inside the corner of the jamb trim. In the nineteenth century this corner would likely have had a ‘bead and quirk’ on both the internal face at the window and at the face to the room, rather than an “applied bead” only on the face to the room. The visual effect suggests that the jamb trim is too narrow relative to the back band.
- 01.55** This departure from traditional joinery is even more pronounced below the window stool where the typical 4" wide board or board plus bead, has been reduced to a 2" board with very slim mouldings that disappear into the plaster below. The stool appears insubstantial and weak. It is definitely twentieth century in execution.
- 01.56** Another obvious departure from nineteenth century stair building is seen where the housed string butts the baseboard at the floor. In 19<sup>th</sup>. century stairs the baseboard height would always exceed the height of the first tread. To make this work, the joiner would use a curved “ramp” to transition the moulding along the top of the string from horizontal to sloped conditions. Here we see that the baseboard and stringer are mitred with no curved transition. While quicker and cheaper it is not historically accurate. One must conclude from these observations that the stairs, though attractive, are not historically accurate reproductions.
- 01.57** One final note pertains to the design of the newel post with the tall “ramp” at the quarter landing. The ramp and railing are handled skillfully, but the newel post is disproportionately stilted at the quarter landing. The newel is square at the landing to allow the strings and risers to be tenoned to it. Above the landing there was no need to retain the square section so it would have become a turning just above the first winder of the upper flight, or just above

the quarter landing. Here it is nearly nine inches above the quarter landing. This creates the impression of a monumental chunk of wood forcing the railing to bend upwards at the inside corner of the rail. One would also expect a squared off block at the top of the newel to match those of all the pickets.

- 01.58** An arched opening to this hall, under the second floor landing, leads to a secondary exterior door on the north-east side of the house. This doorway is trimmed with fluted pilasters and keystone arch, like the main doorway, but the wall here is only 6' thick. A basement stair is tucked under the main stair with a door to isolate the little vestibule from the basement.
  
- 01.59** The arched door to the exterior is glazed, with a similar storm door swinging out from this opening. While this is technically a center hall plan, the misalignment of the east and west doors creates a less obvious, and more theatrical corridor at the middle of the house.
  
- 01.60** A large living room spans the house on the south side of the hallway. It has a set of three French doors on the east wall, a door and window flanking the fireplace on the south side and a large triple window on the west side. The wrap around sun porch or verandah, can be accessed from both the east and south wall of this room, though it appears that the French door has been unused and sealed for many years.
  
- 01.61** The fireplace and surround have been embellished with applied plaster mouldings both as a ceiling cornice, as pilasters flanking the fireplace and as part of the raised panel on the mantelpiece.
  
- 01.62** Window and door trim in this room has been done with the "picture frame" method. There is no distinction between the scale of mouldings used at the sides and the top of the opening.
  
- 01.63** Built in bookshelves on the west wall indicate that the house was custom built even if it used a pre-designed plan.
  
- 01.64** The narrow red oak strip flooring in the living room is typical of houses built between 1925 and 1960. The narrow tongue and groove boards are mostly flat sawn, which is an economy grade. Evidence of cupping suggests that the basement has been relatively damp for some of the history of the house.
  
- 01.65** The house had an oil fired hot water heating system. The oil tank and some piping in the basement provide confirmation.
  
- 01.66** A very large, modern high efficiency furnace was installed, but is reported to have difficulty providing sufficient heat for this large building.

- 01.67** The former dining room on the east side of the house has been converted to a lounge. Built in cabinets flank the large east window. These cabinets are similar to those used in 19<sup>th</sup>. century houses but with much simpler joinery in the doors.
- 01.68** The patterns of doors in this room and the house in general is unusual and inconsistent. Several rooms have glazed doors that use eight glass panes per door. The double French doors from the breakfast room to the former dining room and the opposite doors to the exterior, follows this pattern. The door from the kitchen to this room has three square and equally sized, raised panels, as do the closet and secondary room doors off both entries. The round headed door from the center hall has eight panes of equal vertical height with heavy foot rail. The main entry door has six smaller raised panels below a trio of Italianate panes. The door to the rear porch (north elevation) has six unequal raised panels below a trio of tall panes. Varnished pine and fir doors to the garage and closet in the basement have a single flat panel under a large single glass pane. The variety of inconsistent doors in one house is quite unusual and suggests an ad hoc method of planning. It is very unlikely that this represents the work of an architect who provided plans and construction management of the work. This would seem to confirm that the house plans were purchased or adapted from, a pattern book.
- 01.69** Brass hardware was used on most doors even in the basement. The hardware also demonstrates purchase from a variety of sources, with good solid hardware used on exterior doors and cheaper utility hardware on closets and secondary rooms. The embossed brass plates on some doors in the basement are consistent with a mid-1920's date. Slotted brass screws were observed.
- 01.70** Some doors, (foyer closet & 2 pc.) used brass and glass knobs, and brass escutcheon plates for a keyed lock. More modern deadbolts of various vintages have been added for security. The kitchen door to the former dining room has no knob-sets. It is a bi-swing door with spring loaded pivots for hands free use.
- 01.71** A pair of built in glass china cabinets in the former dining room have ornate multi-pane doors with pendant style brass pulls. The matching pediments on both cabinets have nicely carved broken pediments like the front door, alluding to a faux nineteenth century pedigree. The shelves inside these cabinets are not pine boards but tempered glass, a modern intervention.
- 01.72** A secondary (kitchen) staircase has been fitted into a narrow hallway with two quarter landings. It has treads made with red oak strip flooring, and simple square Douglas fir newels and handrails. The square pickets, risers and stringers are painted. A painted back band was used to cap the housed stringer. The rear flight of stairs to the north porch is of similar construction. This is very typical 1920's work.

- 01.73** Interior brick partitions were observed in the basement. Exterior walls are poured concrete with an exterior limestone veneer (random rubble dressed square) above grade. The use of brick for interior foundations was seen occasionally before WW2.
- 01.74** The former pantry was converted into a second kitchen recently. Both have been fully modernized with new cabinets and appliances. Windows have been replaced with vinyl single hung units. Stone countertops and modern electrical outlets complete the cabinets.



- 01.75** A study or home office is located across the hallway from the former dining room. The room is paneled with elaborate varnished pine cornices, raised panels and built in cabinetry. The working fireplace has an unusual pine mantle with dentils and elaborate botanical carvings of laurels, flowers and fruit. The hearth and fireplace surround were made with a deep green marble with white veins. The pine window and door trim suggests that this work is original to the house. This would indicate that the first owner used this room as his home office or study when the house was built. The absence of closets, change room or adjoining washroom, is good evidence that this comfortable room was not built for a physician. The windows have been replaced with modern vinyl casements, but the side door to the exterior is an original 8 pane fixture.



- 01.76** The second floor main hallway is open to the stairs below. The north slope of the roof is only visible above the ascending stairs. The roof is high enough at the landing to be 100" clear of the landing.
- 01.77** The narrow oak strip flooring is seen on the quarter landings and on the second floor where two dark decorative strips were used as a boundary to the regular flooring.
- 01.78** There are doors to several rooms and to an extended corridor to the west end of the house which has a second staircase from the kitchen end of the house. These "kitchen" stairs were often intended for use by servants, like a maid, cook and nanny, to avoid them using the main staircase when guests were over or at hours when this would be inconvenient.
- 01.79** The kitchen stairs are slightly narrower and have treads and risers that are plain. Simple square newel posts and rectangular pickets seated in a foot board flush with the floor were used here. Due to the narrowness of the floor plan, two quarter landings were used in this stair as well, so the major flight ran parallel with the hallway.

- 01.80** A closet and large bank of storage drawers and upper cabinets for linens were installed on the north side of this secondary corridor. The construction of the drawers is simple, with the drawer fronts nailed to the drawer box. In nineteenth century work, the drawer front would likely be dovetailed in place. The hinges used on the cabinet doors are also plated steel hardware typical of the early twentieth century.
- 01.81** Two bedrooms and a bathroom are located at the end of this corridor. While they may have been intended for servants originally, they are now used as children's rooms. A third bedroom which opened into the main corridor has been combined with the bedroom on the north east corner to make one very large C shaped bedroom, accessed normally from the rear corridor.
- 01.82** Another staircase to the attic has a door above the first flight of the kitchen stair. This attic stair can be completely isolated when this door is closed and locked. As was common at the time, the young servants or maids, often slept in rooms that were above the kitchen wing. These "garret" rooms were sometimes accessibly by a narrow isolated staircase directly off the kitchen so that the family would not interact with the maid(s) when they retired for the night. By the early twentieth century the uniquely isolated maid's stair had disappeared, but kitchen stairs still allowed moderate privacy for both children and maids in their own rooms of the house.
- 01.83** The unusual three panel doors seen at the ground floor were also used in the main bedroom doors of the second floor, and door to the attic. A large bedroom on the south side of the house, and above the study, had interior closets built on either side of the chimney flue from the fireplace below. These two closets used narrow single doors, also three panel but with an unusual detail. The hinge and strike stiles were beaded from top to bottom. Cabinet pulls and ball catches were used instead of knob sets to secure the doors. These doors retained the raised panels and sticking seen in other doors to the rooms.
- 01.84** A master bedroom suite at the east end of the hallway has large windows on both the north and east elevations. An adjoining bathroom and very long closet open from the south side of this suite. The long closet was probably built as a dressing room originally. It has built in storage cabinets and drawers plus a pair of closets with doors flanking a window on the east (gable) wall above the sun porch.
- 01.85** Most of the second floor bedroom doors feature glass knobs instead of solid brass as at the basement and utility rooms. These knobs were made by casting glass in moulds, in the mass production facilities that developed rapidly in the early 20<sup>th</sup>. century. The ferrules that retain the glass were formed of brass castings machined for grub screws and square threaded spindles that assemble the knob sets. The escutcheon plates are also cast

brass machined to fit the shank of the knob set and spindles. These knobs became very popular after WW1 and were manufactured in millions of units. The mortise locks were made with brass face plates and pressed steel boxes that house the mechanisms, spring bars and assembly screws. Many of the bedroom doors have a keyed deadbolt with separate brass escutcheon plates for generic skeleton keys. While these sorts of keys were used for over 80 years, the design of these lock sets are typical of the early 20<sup>th</sup>. century. Units often have makers marks and patent dates embossed in the mechanism to help date the hardware.

- 01.86** The brass plate door hinges do not taper from pin to edge of the plate. In mid-19<sup>th</sup>. century doors the hinges were often cast iron, and were tapered to provide greater strength of the brittle iron, near the pivot point than at the outer edge. Brass hinges were reserved for very expensive doors before WW1 but the massive increase in mining and manufacturing during the war, particularly when the demand for things like brass shell casings grew astronomically, led to much cheaper production costs for solid brass hinges after the war. These hinges are typical of post WW1 not pre-confederation..
- 01.87** Ceramic knobs were seen on the built in cabinetry in the corridors and some bedrooms. The knobs were bolted through the doors with machine bolts and washers on the inside of the cabinet doors. These are of typical 1920 design.
- 01.88** French doors at the living room have an “active” (first operation) and “passive” (second operation) leaf. To retain the passive leaf without using an astragal (post), mortised head and foot bolts were used. The rectangular brass face plate has a “dumb-bell” type recess to allow the operating lever to lie flat below the face of the plate. When the bolt is thrown in the head or foot of the door, the lever is secured below the surface of the face plate to prevent a thief from lifting the lever with a bent rod pushed between the door leaves. This is a manufactured product that became commonly available before WW1. The semi-circular finger pull, is of the Post-WW1 type. Four slotted brass screws retain the mechanism in the door.
- 01.89** A lever activated dead bolt was also used just below the knob set on the active leaf, to hold the middle of the active leaf closed. This small oblate brass grip engages a catch in the meeting rail of the passive leaf, which has been locked by the head and foot bolts.
- 01.90** More 1920’s type hardware was observed in the basement. A very elaborate solid fuel firebox an cleanout was found in a massive block of masonry in the furnace room. The two heavy cast iron doors have large rotary vents to control air flow in the middle of both the upper and lower door which are aligned vertically. A large lever on the left side operates a rod between the upper and lower doors and engages a second rod at the same height above the floor via two quadrant gears that are attached to each rod. When the

lever is pulled down the left rod rotates counter clockwise, and the right rod rotates clockwise. While only the ends of the rods can be seen, this mechanism was likely used to operate a pair of grates below the upper door. Rotating the gates from horizontal to vertical would dump ash from the solid fuels burned in the upper firebox into the lower clean out chamber, avoiding the dirty job of raking out residue from a coal fired chamber. This was a sophisticated solid fuel furnace when installed, but was later replaced by an oil fired furnace. The tank for the oil furnace is found in the small adjacent room. Coal fired furnaces were very common after WW1 but replaced with oil fired units after WW2.



**01.91** The underside of the first floor is exposed in the furnace room. The tongue and groove pine subfloor consists of 4" boards nailed perpendicular to the joists. The boards have small joints indicating that they were air dried before installation. The floor joists are 1-3/4" x 11" pine. Subfloor after WW2 was usually 1" x 6" tongue and groove laid diagonally across joists which were 1-1/2" x 11-1/2". Before WW1 the subfloor would also be perpendicular to the joists but usually wider, 1" x 6" or 1" x 8", and the joists were typically 2" x 12". The evidence indicates that the floor was built between the Wars.



- 01.92** Portions of the exposed (but painted) foundation wall indicate that it was poured concrete. The limestone facing visible on the exterior was applied as a facing on the outside of the floor assembly.
- 01.93** Knob and tube wiring was not observed. Some heavy old wiring with black insulated sheathing was observed. This is typical of pre-WW2 construction. A disused breaker box, painted black has a brass name plate, "Bulldog Safety Switch Cat. No. 52323, Volts 115 - 230-, Amps 100. C.F.S.A. Standard Enclosed Switch. Form 60-100. Approved by Hydro Electric Power Com. Ser. 292" Division of Amalgamated Electric Corporation Limited Toronto. This type of early electrical safety equipment became common after electrification expanded along the new supply grid from Niagara Falls. The low Serial number 202 suggests that this house was built soon after electrical services became available in Hamilton. Electric street lighting was inaugurated in Hamilton in 1914. Westinghouse became a major employer between WW1 & WW2.




- 01.94** Another breaker box is labeled Taylor Electric Mfg. Co. Ltd. London - Canada. The logo and graphics on this name plate are very typical of inter-War equipment, so was probably installed at the same time as the Bull Dog Safety Switch. A note on this breaker indicates that it is still used for a dual power bar outlet on the work bench. All other electrical equipment is modern, except the heavy cast steel block (brass bolts) for original telephone wiring.

## 02.00 Site and "shed".

**02.01** The house is situated on a large irregular lot overlooking a major highway interchange, Highway 403 & Lincoln Alexander Parkway, Hamilton. The property is isolated on the east side by the off ramp from Highway 403, and on the north side by Filman Road and conservation lands. A vacant lot across Rousseau Street (to the south) appears to be dedicated right of way for future expansion of roads. The construction of the Mohawk Road overpass and Highway 403 Expansion in 1969 removed much of the original landscape including the properties of J. Horning and J. Filman at the edge of the escarpment. A building shown on the 1875 Wentworth Map of Ancaster, was located approximately 560 feet east of what is now the intersection of Filman Road and Rousseau Street. This would put the Horning house in the middle of the 403 off ramp. Any trace of that early structure was bulldozed fifty-one years ago. See yellow line on the image below.

**02.02** The lot is teardrop shaped with mature trees around the perimeter. Extensive road works of the past several decades have isolated the property from the rest of the community.



**02.03** What appears to be an old farm shed is located on the south side of the driveway. This building is constructed of limestone and unfinished vertical siding. The boards are probably decades older than the house. The eaves are low and steeply pitched (12/12). Asphalt shingles can be seen at the verge. Two snow covered vents occur on the ridge. A single hollow core door with modern hardware secures the building.



**02.04** The random rubble masonry is of utilitarian quality except for a dressed lintel over the doorway. This lintel has drafted margins and a pecked face. This is the only stone with substantial workmanship, so may be reclaimed from another older building. Larger squared blocks were used as quoins at the lower corners of the structure to tie the walls together. This was good practice, particularly where the backs of the stone blocks are very irregular and undressed. In common work like this, the outer face received the best blocks, the inner face smaller and less perfect pieces and the core of the wall was filled with rubble, chips and mortar. The thickness of blocks may vary from six or eight inches as they appear at corners to less than three inches, as most of the load bearing capacity is on the face of the stones when properly squared and pointed.

**02.05** A single six pane window was used on the north elevation. Close examination of this inoperable sash, suggests that it is a modern (twentieth century) product. The muntins are too wide and shallow to have been made in the early nineteenth century. Adams style sash have muntin bars that are 5/8" wide and 1-1/8" to 1-1/2" deep. The styles and top rail of the upper sash are typically 2-1/4" wide. The meeting rail is typically 1-5/8" to 1-7/8" wide. The rails are mortised and pegged into the styles. This sash does not match any of

those details. The muntins are 1-3/4" wide but less than 1-1/2" deep. The styles and rails do not match the typical early precedent. The most atypical details are that the glass is not retained by putty but wood, and the vertical muntins are interrupted by the horizontal muntin. This was never done in traditional window sash, and may explain why the sash has weathered badly. The presence of a flag pole screwed to the sash is reminiscent of the flag pole screwed over the head of the door on the house. This "romantic" ornament, may represent a mildly obsessive-compulsive desire to over-embellish buildings. The connection between the two flag poles also suggest that this installation was made after the mid-1920's by the first owner.



**02.06** The sash window on the north elevation appears at first to be historic, but has none of the characteristics of a window built between 1790 & 1875. The masonry was not built around a framed box. The sash was cut to fit the masonry opening. The sill is poured concrete not dressed stone, pine nor white oak, as would be expected before WW1. The aggregate in the concrete is fine sharp sand with small pebbles. This is typical of hand mixed concrete before WW2. The binder in 19<sup>th</sup>. century mortars was lime. Here it is Portland Cement. Most workmen did not understand how concrete required a balance between just enough water and thorough mixing. When they opted for an easier to shovel "sloppy" mix, it would result in low strength concrete. The over hydrated Portland reduced the growth of crystals in the matrix which produce the ultimate strength of the concrete. The surface has weathered away here.

- 02.07** The placement of the small window on the north elevation would make some sense if this were a well house or cold room. However, on the south side of the building we observe a chimney with clay flue tile liner of more modern construction. This chimney has been built up against the older wall of the structure, is not “keyed in” with the existing wall. The dense blocks in the chimney appear to be Queenston Limestone. The rest of the structure is soft buff limestone that appears nearby on the escarpment. It is likely that the mason brought most of the stone for the landscape retaining walls, foundation cladding and greenhouse from a convenient outcrop. The stone for the chimney, however, is likely to have been shipped from a quarry closer to Queenston. This type of very hard limestone was preferred by later builders because of its higher strength and very square edges which were produced by shearing rough blocks with machinery. The stones were easier to lay and more regular in dimension.
- 02.08** The window does not match the proportions, method of construction or details of a traditional sash. The top rail is 2-3/4” not 2-1/4” if this were a reclaimed sash. The bottom rail should be 1-1/4 or 1-3/4” but is 2-1/4”. The styles are 4” wide not 2-1/4”. The muntin bars are wide (1-1/2”) and shallow (1-1/4”) and do not have any of the three main profiles of typical 19<sup>th</sup> century muntin bars. The muntins would be 5/8” wide and between 1-3/8” and 1-5/8” if this were an authentic 6 pane sash. Most damning is that the construction has a continuous muntin across the unit with short vertical muntins fitted into it. This was never done because the center bar is longer and weaker (because of two joints instead of one) and more prone to rot because of the horizontal joints. We should also see putty retaining the glass on the exterior and the wood profile at the inside of the unit. In this case there is no putty either on the exterior or the interior. There are no visible peg holes at the corners, and the lower rail should be tenoned into the styles but it is again, done the wrong way. This is a replica window made by someone who was not a window builder. It is also like other poor copies from the twentieth century that have been observed elsewhere.
- 02.09** A small cold room would never have a fireplace, especially when it was such a small structure. The later addition of the fireplace suggests that one of the owners had a romantic notion about using this little shed for some purpose other than covering a well head or storing vegetables.
- 02.10** The low stone wall that forms the rest of this peculiar little shed, is unlike any other construction that the author has observed. While the knee wall appears to be less than 3 feet tall, it supports a very weathered board wall that lacks battens to seal the inevitable joints. The boards extend up to the soffit of this little building. The board siding may have been used as a cosmetic cladding to cover poorly laid walls, but this raises a significant question as to why very weathered reclaimed material would be chosen for

this purpose. How do we know that the boards are reclaimed? Several boards have large numbers of holes from “square” nails. This pattern of nailing indicates that the board had a previous life as roof sheathing, where it was perforated by rows of shingles when they were nailed down. On either side of one of these roof boards we see boards that have very few holes of a similar size and shape. Multiple nails were used when these boards were attached to a large sill or girt. This might be expected if the material was used originally in a heavily framed barn. The sill in this little shed is only a couple of inches thick, so would not have required nailing four or five inches above the lower edge of the cladding. It is apparent that more of the boards came from barn siding than from roof sheathing of an older structure. The fact that the boards are so heavily weathered, and appearing to be far in excess of 100 years old, is because they are much older but reclaimed and unpainted for a very long time. One must conclude that they were chosen to create the impression of a nearly two hundred year old building in one that was constructed after 1924.




- 02.11** If the building were used as a storage shed or other utility building, it would likely have had another single or double door in the eastern end of the structure. The only access is via the narrow west door.
- 02.12** One might consider whether the building was a chicken coop or poultry house. In this case it would likely have had small access doors to allow the birds to come and go to access food and water during the day, and also be shut in at night to isolate them from foxes and raccoons. There are no signs that the wall boards were ever different than we now see them.

- 02.13** We may also consider whether it was used to store vegetables or root crops. If this were the case, one would expect a wide or double door to allow a wagon to drop the vegetables directly inside the building at some convenient spot near the middle of the long wall. There is no evidence of a doorsill on the north, east or south walls. Carrying sacks of potatoes and other root vegetables through a narrow door and the length of the building would be impractical and can be dismissed out of hand.
- 02.14** Was the building used as a stable? Horses and cattle cannot use a narrow door like this, and horses require much higher ceilings for safety. Piggeries were often the size and shape of this building, but had multiple doors on the long walls to allow easy access by the animals. The single man door also makes it unlikely that the building was used as a farrowing shed. This leaves the possibility that the shed was used to store tools. The most likely purpose would be as a small workshop, but if this was the case, there should be multiple windows to illuminate the interior. The building is essentially windowless and dark, unsuitable as a workshop. This leaves the possibility that it was built and used as a utility shed, with no other purpose than to keep gardening equipment like shovels and rakes out of the rain.
- 02.15** The very strange combination of wall types is unique in the author's experience. While the building appears to be very old, there are cases where the builder has made a romantic "folly" that is much more recent than it appears. This may be the case here, if the boards were reclaimed from a barn or old shed to build this new structure. The evidence of chimney, modern door, steeply pitched roof, concrete window sill, replica window, all suggest that this building is not an original or historic structure.
- 02.16** While the shed is picturesque, its siting is also peculiar. There is no apparent reason for it to be located near the driveway but having nothing to do with carriages, wagons, vehicles or storage of same. It has conflicting characteristics that suggest it was heated, unheated, occupied or unoccupied. The addition of a chimney and presumably fireplace, to a garden shed, suggests that one of the owners considered this as a place to prepare plants for potting in the spring. The absence of windows is once again suspicious for this possible use.
- 02.17** There is also no evidence for another habitable structure or house ever being situated on the property. Examination of Rousseau Street, also indicates that this route to Hamilton did not exist until very recently when the overpass was built to cross Hwy. 403. If the house was sited on the lot to take advantage of the grand view to Burlington Bay, rather than address an historic route or trail, we can conclude that a previous house is unlikely to have ever been built for the exact same reason. Settlers almost always sited their first house so that it was sheltered from wind and cold, with the north wall typically a gable. Windows were placed on the east and west elevations

to allow as much sunlight into the house as possible in the era before artificial lighting or inexpensive candles allowed an alternative. The same grand view that justifies the location of the 1920's house, would have been avoided by settlers as unnecessary exposure to wind and cold especially where the welfare of animals was concerned.

**02.18** We may conclude that this building is probably a romantic, improbable fabrication built at the same date as the house and altered after 1924. It should not be considered as historic or as a landmark structure with a specific practical purpose.



**02.19** Sketch of the west elevation with single entry door. The chimney was added later. The only dressed stone, the lintel is reclaimed from another structure.

**02.20** A second visit access was made to examine the interior. The floor is concrete. A partition with second door on the axis of the building, was built 6'-4" from the entry wall. This little vestibule has an 8" diameter stove thimble on the south wall where the chimney was added to the original wall. The rafters are 1-3/4" x 4" dressed smooth not rough. Before 1890 most dimensional lumber was a full 2". After WW2 all lumber was dressed 1-1/2" x 3-1/2" with planed surfaces. During the interim period, the sizes were typically 1-3/4" wide by 4" or 3-3/4" deep at 19" on center. The rafter surfaces were planed not

rough. The rafters are seated on a 2" x 8" plate that was leveled on a bed of mortar above the top of the wall. This agrees well with the mid-1920's.

- 02.21** The roof sheathing is a type of thin pine board  $\frac{3}{4}$ " thick by 6" wide with a V-groove along the center axis to make the board appear to be two separate 3" boards. This "double V-match" tongue & groove board was developed in the twentieth century as a more rapid way to panel a room than by using the older style 3" V-match, that was typical before the end of WW1.
- 02.22** The entry door is a modern plywood veneer door. Mahogany is visible where it is unpainted. This door may have been used at the front entry to the house, and because of similar dimensions, was recycled when the shed door was old.



- 02.23** The electrical panel, switch plate & black asphaltic paper wrapped wiring are typical of the 1920's and 1930's and appear to have been installed when the building was constructed. Ceramic blocks for the lightbulbs were fastened to the collar ties and wiring fed from above.
- 02.24** It is possible that the first door to the shed was a batten door, since that would match the interior door and explain the necessity for replacement roughly forty years ago. The second door is a "batten and rail" door which

uses the same double v-match material for the vertical boards (stiles) and 1" x 4" boards for the (rails). Many small 2" machine made nails with circular heads were seen. Up to around 1870 we would expect these small nails to be cut nails. These nails have a circular depression on the head that is seen in nails circa 1910 to 1930. The strap hinges, hanging the interior door, are a modern type with nail holes also stamped from flat steel sheet when the hinges were made.

- 02.25** The stone knee wall cannot be dated by the quality of the stonework, but the mortar is post-nineteenth century. Coarse sand is visible, but the characteristic inclusions of lime (white lumps from slaking the quick lime in a pit) are missing. No bits of coal or coarse chips of stone visible, indicating that this sand was of better quality than that found in most 19<sup>th</sup>. century projects. When sand was shoveled onto a wagon from a source of glacial sand, it would not have the narrow range of aggregate sizes. If the mason were very professional he might have sieved the sand through a fine screen. This was seldom done, and suggests that the sand had been prepared for sale by a company that sold bricks and cement. This is another indication of a post WW1 source for the mortar. The high relative strength of the mortar is also visible at one corner where the stones have broken vertically across mortar beds. This only happens if the mortar contains Portland Cement. The resulting mortar is much stronger and harder than the surrounding stone. Instead of the mortar cracking or "flowing" to allow movement, the stone breaks. If this was recent repointing the smoothness of the joint would be obvious, (unless the mason used a hair brush to artificially age the joint). There is no evidence that the mortar is not original and severely weathered. This implies that the Portland Cement was original to the construction and mixed after WW1.
- 02.26** Why do we see whitewash on the exterior stonework? This was rarely used after the 19<sup>th</sup>. century except to reduce overheating inside greenhouses and barns. The chimney has no trace of whitewash. We may conclude perhaps, that the whitewash was applied before the chimney was added, perhaps a year or two after the greenhouse was built, and the owners had time to assess how well the building was performing. The use of masonry in greenhouses provided thermal mass which would moderate cold at night by slowly releasing daytime heat into the glass house. Even before greenhouses, delicate plants like roses were often planted on the south side of a brick wall to take advantage of the protection from cold that the brick offered.
- 02.27** Examination of the 8" diameter "thimble" through the wall to the chimney, suggests that the a small solid fuel stove was added inside the room after initial construction. The chimney stones were not "keyed" into the wall. It was built against the existing wall, but on its own footing. The thimble was installed by breaking a hole through the stonework and rebuilding it around a steel liner to fit the stove pipe. Why heat such a small room? The obvious

reason was to allow the greenhouse to be used early in the spring before the risk of frost had ended. A series of very severe winters occurred in the 1930's with record low temperatures and heavy snowfall.


- 02.28** The ceiling of the heated room used the same V-match boards as in the partition and interior door. When we examine the rest of the roof and wall structure beyond the first room, we see a steeply pitched roof sheathed with plywood and the walls with OSB, Oriented Strand Board, or "Chip Board". This material has only been used for the past 30 or so years, so means that the roof was covered that recently. The "rafters" are very slender boards, measuring only 2" wide at the underside and 1" at their lower flange. (They are T-shaped and more of them can be seen above this lower flange, indicating that they originally carried something like sheets of glass.) The rafters are 17-1/4" on center. This is a very odd measurement for any kind of wood sheathing. In the heated room the rafters were 1-3/4" by 4" and 19" on center, so why the difference? If one were buying a material like glass, it would be much better to use standard sizes like 16" width, rather than have to cut each pane to a strange measurement like 14-3/4". Using manufactured sizes would be much less work and result in less wastage. So it might seem likely that the inverted T-section rafters were actually intended for panes of glass.
- 02.29** The rafters have a continuous lightweight cleat or "purlin" measuring 2" wide by 1" deep, nailed to each rafter approximately 14-1/2" on either side of the ridge. At every fourth rafter we see a truss like structure built from 2" x 2" wood cleats nailed across the roof from cleat to cleat like a collar tie. Down from these four "collar ties" are a pair of inclined compression braces, also 2" x 2" which bear on the sill plate that supports the walls. These compression braces have a short strut that bears perpendicular to the outer face of the strut, out to the inside corner of the plate that the rafter sits on. This brace and strut on either side effectively turns every fourth set of studs and rafters into a lightweight truss.



**02.30** Truss connection with iron bracket / reinforcing plate. Note rod with crank arm at ridge is retained by the bracket without a bearing or bushing. The original octagon box with ceramic light fixture was fastened to the tie beam directly below the ridge. All connections are nailed and utilitarian, except for the bolted brackets at the underside of the collar tie / compression brace joint. The trusses supported the purlin before the glass bars were installed. These heavy pieces of hardware ensure a strong joint and support a longitudinal steel rod) 7/8" that has a pair of articulated cranks at the approximate center of the roof. The cranks have a hinged "knee" and a hinged "foot" at the end of the second segment. A square headed machine bolt is used to secure the large "knuckle" of the arm to the rotating rod. Looking more carefully at the rafters in this area we see that the rafters are missing above the "purlin" in the vicinity of these two cranks. This indicates that a pair of hinged vents were located on either side of the ridge, and that these vents were made to open via the cranks and rods.



**02.31** When looking back towards the partition, we see that the rods are supported by a complex iron mechanism that acts as a support for each rod and mechanical linkage to the large iron pulley wheel adjacent. A chain over the flanged wheel was used to rotate the wheel, and cause the horizontal rod to drive a differential gear in the bearing to rotate the crank shaft. This manual mechanism can still be seen today in some commercial overhead doors. It is an elaborate method to open two roof vents that could be reached more simply with a broomstick. This mechanism was likely intended for commercial greenhouses instead of small garden glass houses. It would appear that builder of this little garden building had serious intentions of starting lots of flowers and plants in a greenhouse before setting them out in beds.



- 02.32** A Breaker box mounted on the partition beside the window has a Builder's Plate: Canadian Westinghouse Co. Ltd. Hamilton, Canada Max. 50 amps. 125 A.C. 250 Volts. Type WK 50 "NOFUZ BREAKER" Pat. 1926-29-32-33 This equipment is connected to the ceramic screw type light fixtures in the ceiling, indicating that the light system was installed in or after 1933 in the greenhouse.
- 02.33** A pair of wooden "bunks" were built on either side of the center walkway. These ventilated platforms supported potted plants and provided nearly 8" of airspace above the concrete floor. This allowed drainage of water from the pots to prevent root rot, an important consideration when there are many seedlings that need constant watering.



**02.34** A block with a ceramic lightbulb socket is screwed to the center of each collar tie to provide electric light to the space below. The fixtures appear to be contemporary to the early knob and tube type wiring. Note new plywood sheathing on roof to support shingles.


**02.35** Taking all the evidence together it is clear that this building was a glass greenhouse contemporary, or later than, the house which has several dated plates (Patent: 1924). This would mean it was built after 1925 and modified several times. It was merely a utility structure for the gardens. The first modification was the addition of the chimney and stove to provide heat to the building early in the spring when frost was likely. A second modification occurred when the glass was broken or no longer used. Glass was removed and OSB was installed to cover up the lightweight framing of the building. This means that the ancient and weathered boards on the exterior of the shed are not the original cladding but recent additions nailed onto the OSB. Many of the boards have oddly placed rectangular holes that indicate they were originally nailed to a structure with "cut nails". There is a common misconception that all early rectangular nails were hand made. This is false. After the American Revolution and particularly when iron made in England was embargoed by Britain during the War of 1812, there were profound shortages of iron nails and other products in the United States. These shortages prompted the classic "Yankee Ingenuity" to invent nail making machines to automatically "slit" or shear iron stock and then "upset" the heads on each piece. By 1806 a single machine that could slit and upset was developed to make the process more efficient. Millions of nails could now be produced, (primarily near Boston), and then shipped wherever they were needed. Almost all buildings in Upper Canada and then Canada West, used

machine made nails, smuggled or traded across Lake Ontario. While the old sheathing boards have weathered for almost 150 years, they have been reclaimed from siding or the roof sheathing, of old structures. (One board has many small nail holes indicating that it was used for roof sheathing not wall cladding before this recycling.)

- 02.36** Two roof vents are visible under the snow. Asphalt shingles are exposed at the edges of the shed roof. These were installed when the OSB was added to the structure and are probably less than thirty years old.
- 02.37** This leaves one single stone as the only part of the building that might pre-date confederation. The lintel over the door head is a dressed block of limestone. It has just enough width (40") to span the 35" doorway, and provide about 3" bearing on either side. The edges of this block have been tooled with a chisel that looks like a kitchen fork with straight tines. When driven perpendicular to the edges of the stone, narrow parallel grooves were made. The stone cutter would create this "drafted margin" a term that was borrowed, and is still used, in describing typesetting a page of text. The remainder of the stone, the panel or "body" was made flat and then "pecked" with a sharp pointed tool leaving a series of random diamond shaped pits in the surface. This type of work is very typical of 1850 and earlier, but the absence of any other well dressed stones, and use of concrete for sills (where dressed stones would almost always be located) indicates only that this stone was reclaimed from some building, (now lost) at another location.
- 02.38 From all the evidence, the greenhouse was built with or slightly after the house, so probably dates from 1925 to 1928.**
- 03.39** There are no other structures on the site. Three easements for hydro transmission road allowance and other services occur along the eastern boundary of the lot.
- 03.40** Much of the property is lawn, with trees planted primarily at the perimeter. The following species were observed: maple, spruce, red pine, apple, ash, sumac, birch, locust. Raised flower beds were made around the house, with a semi-formal garden on the north side of the verandah.

### 03.00 Analysis:

**03.01** The property is near the crest of the escarpment with a fine view of Dundas and Burlington Bay from the uppermost window on the north elevation. The house is surrounded by Highway 403 (off ramp to Rousseau Street) to the east, Rousseau Street to the south, and Filman Road to the west and north. At ground level the views are limited to nearby housing and mature trees around the periphery of the lot. Several easements on the east side of the property restrict land usage. An earthen berm along Rousseau Street also limits the view of the house from the road. It is possible to catch a glimpse of the house while eastbound, but for westbound drivers it is almost impossible to view the house for more than a second.




**03.02** View of the house from Mohawk Road. Note that this image, from Google Earth, is taken at a lens height of 8' above the road. The house is obscured further by the earthen berm. Most drivers will have a viewpoint of 4' or 5' above grade. They have a fleeting glimpse of the house and can barely see the ground floor. It cannot be considered a landmark when it is so obscured.

**03.03** This may have been an isolated rural lot 95 years ago, but is affected now by its proximity to major traffic routes which diminish it's appeal as a idyllic suburban home with large gardens. It is now just another suburban house on a busy road.


**03.04** Subdivisions to the west and south of the property were built in the early 1960's and later. At least part of one house on Mohawk and another on

Filman were also built between WW1 and WW2. This would mean that suburban development was occurring, albeit slowly, in the vicinity of 105 Filman.


**03.05** Some questions have been raised over the age of the house and whether it is a pre-confederation structure. **The 1875 Wentworth Atlas Map was used to support this assumption.** Two structures were shown in the vicinity of the current house, on the north side of Mohawk Road (formerly Rousseau Street). One was labeled T. Hammill, the other J. Horning. The Horning house appears to have been just east of a road that may be the precursor to Filman Road. The road alignment was quite different with the intersection almost perpendicular. This does not match the extreme loop of current Filman Road which wraps around the north and west side of the house before meeting Rousseau. To establish where 105 Filman would have been on the 1875 Map, a direct measurement was required. We can be quite certain that Wilson Street in Ancaster has changed little since 1875 because many of the heritage buildings that predate confederation were in place on both sides of the road. This would limit changes to width and alignment of the street. Since this road is unchanged since 1875 it can be used to take a measurement from the intersection of Rousseau and Wilson to the intersection of Halson and Wilson (where Wilson alters direction to a more westerly direction). This distance is 2760' +/- 10'. Using this scale on the Google Earth image, the distance from Wilson and Rousseau to the center of the intersection of Filman and Mohawk is 5280' (one mile) +/- 10'.



**03.06** Google Earth Map showing intersection of Rousseau and Wilson top left, and Filman and Mohawk (formerly Rousseau) center right. This distance (yellow line with red squares) is exactly one mile or 5,280 feet.



03.07 This map shows the extrapolated distance along Wilson and from Wilson to Filman as a green line ending at the south west corner of the property .



03.08 This segment of the 1875 Wentworth map shows the modern measurements transferred to the 1875 map (using Wilson Str. as the yardstick.)  
**A.** Intersection of Halson & Wilson. **B.** The intersection of Wilson & Rousseau, and **C.** Is the intersection of Rousseau (now Mohawk) & Filman. **Notice the red bar across the road above C. (the unoccupied lot of T. & S. Hammill), between the houses of T. Hammill and J. Horning.** The Horning house was approximately 130 yards to the east of Filman. This is where the Hwy. 403

offramp is now. **Filman road no longer meets Mohawk Road east of the house.** It has been realigned to wrap around the west side of the property.

**03.08** Measurements also show that the **J. Horning house would have been about 380 feet to the east of the new Filman intersection and the Hammill house was about 475 feet to the west.** The survey of 105 Filman shows several easements along the eastern boundary that are much closer to the alignment of the 1875 road. These easements are almost perpendicular to Mohawk Road. This agrees well with the location of the J. Horning house as being on the east side of the old wagon trail on the eastern boundary of 105 Filman. This trail went down the escarpment on the Wentworth map under what is now Hwy. 403. A similar road another mile to the east is a close match for Rice Avenue, which appears to have previously run down a gully in the escarpment onto what is now Chedoke Golf Course. Traces of this old wagon trail can be seen crossing the Golf Course even now. Rice Avenue is almost exactly two miles from Wilson. This gives credence to locating old Filman trail east of its current route. The distance between the two houses was about 755 feet. Allowing for offset from the property lines of the T. & S. Hammill field, the vacant lot was 660 feet wide, or 1/8 mile. 105 Filman is now located within this parcel. This explains **the misidentification of the J. Horning house on the 1875 map as the T. Hammill house.**

**03.09** The extant 20<sup>th</sup>. century house was not built over a structure built before 1875. The other house to the west, that was owned and built by **T. Hammill, was situated where # 702 Mohawk Road is now.**

**03.10** The lot line between Lot 49 & Lot 50 runs almost due north just steps away from the east end of the house (#105). The **J. Horning house** was located therefore, **on Lot 50 not Lot 49** where the house is now. Over time, and with the many changes to roads and services, confusion has been created between the J. Horning House (pre-1875) and the new house built after 1925. They are not the same structure and do not occupy the same lots. This agrees fully with other evidence that the house and greenhouse are twentieth century buildings.

**03.11** To summarize the characteristics of this house and it's similarity to others built in the decade after World War One, we must include:

- a). Wide clapboard siding (approximately 8" to weather). On dense urban streets it was common to use the more fire proof materials of brick or stucco than clapboard. (Now vinyl 8" siding.)
- b). The asymmetrical plan and elevations are driven by interior room layouts rather than exterior symmetry or impressions.
- c). Numerous gables of several sizes include; the entire west end of the

house 2-1/2 floors, the north and south large gables (both 2 storeys), a 1-1/2 story gable at the east wall, a single story gable at the north porch, and four “eyebrow” gables that break the roof line on the south and north walls. The roof projects less than 3 inches beyond the wall, which emphasizes the wall shape rather than the roof overhangs.

- d). Two large limestone chimneys rise above the roof. The westerly chimney has multiple flues for the original coal furnace and den fireplace. The eastern chimney has a single flue (living room fireplace)
- e). A large screen porch wraps around the east and north side of the house. The first porch was accessed from the living room by a single door. The porch was extended to enclose the terrace on the north side soon after the house was built. A second exterior door from the living room opens into the northern portion of this enlarged porch.
- f). An elaborate Federal Revival entryway with broken cornice over the front door in this house, versus elaborated vernacular cornices.
- g). A second entrance door from the garden terrace, (north elevation) provides access to the the center hall of the house via the arched vestibule opening.
- h). Limestone masonry was used as veneer on concrete foundations
- i). Steel beams were used to support part of the house.
- j). Original windows have been replaced with modern vinyl windows.
- k). the roof is clad with metal tiles not shingles or clay tiles as was typical of the 1920's.
- l). Interior floor finishes are narrow tongue and groove manufactured oak flooring typical of the 1920's and later. Some walnut accent strips were used in principle rooms like the entry, living room and study.
- m). Some rooms use modern ceramic tile, carpet and vinyl tile finishes.
- n). The main staircase was constructed like traditional 19<sup>th</sup> century stairs, but with design errors that include an un-level cap at the lowest newel basket, a handrail that is narrower than traditional examples.
- o). The servants kitchen stair, and rear basement stair were constructed in varnished Douglas Fir as was common between 1920 and 1950.

- p). Door hardware is typical of the post-world war one era, with glass and brass knob sets for many rooms, and solid brass with embossed cover plates and escutcheons in the utility rooms and corridors.
- q). A wide variety of doors were used including varnished douglas fir and pine doors, painted pine panel doors, custom glazed arch head doors, and many three panel doors which are distinctly post WW1.
- r). No evidence of architecture elements older than 1920 were observed.
- s). Electrical equipment in the furnace room is post-WW1 and pre-WW2.
- t). The telephone terminal block is cast steel of the post-WW1 type.
- u). The solid fuel furnace door, cleanout and damper mechanism indicate that coal was the fuel source for heating. The machinery is of an elaborate and expensive design from the 1920's.
- v). **Identifying plates on two of the three overhead garage doors have a patent date of 1924.** The doors were installed no earlier than 1924 and likely in 1925 or 1926, because patent plate were frequently updated in this era.
- w). All of these details are typical of mid to late 1920's suburban houses.



**03.12 Builders Plate: "This Rolltite Door"**  
 Serial No. 11926 Pat. "D" Canada 1924  
 Richards Wilcox Canadian Co. Ltd. Winnipeg Vancouver London Montreal Toronto  
 Two doors have sequential number plates.  
 They were likely installed in 1924, 1925 or 1926.



View of three car garage with steel pipe column and steel beam supporting joists in the floor above. The roll up doors are only 8' wide, with narrow posts supporting the lintel above. The concrete floor is original, and buried the footings for the posts in the manner of contemporary houses. Steel beams were rarely used in residential houses before WW1 and were still uncommon until after WW2. The ceiling is insulated above the unheated garage. The concrete foundation wall has a stucco finish inside the garage.

### **03.13 House Style and Design:**

The style of the house is reminiscent of a “pattern book” house which were common after WW1. Some designs were commissioned by magazines as regular “features” to attract subscribers. Other designs were made by house kit manufacturers to market their products in magazines. The rapid growth in “print” coincided with advances in colour printing that was almost as revolutionary in its time as internet shopping has become today. We should note that Federal Revival Houses and Dutch Colonial Revival Houses were created after WW1 as a way to reintroduce some of the romantic ideals of much earlier house types. Colonial Revival houses were not built before 1875 in Ontario. Greek Revival Architecture was the most popular style before Confederation, as society aspired to recreate the “glorious ideals” of the early nineteenth century from Europe. Suggesting that this house is a pre-1875 Colonial Revival house is inconsistent with also expecting that it is a mid-19<sup>th</sup>. century house type.

**The NEWPORT**  
5 Rooms and Bath

AVERAGE PAYMENTS \$37.50 A Month

Price \$1957

**Delightfully New and So Distinctive**  
**Plaster Arches... Many Gables**  
**Casement Windows... Fireplace**

A MODERN version of the English cottage with its peaked roof, numerous gables, arched doorway, and casement windows. Architecturally, it is one of the recent small houses ever designed. Its floor plan is perfect embodying the modern architect's greatest achievements in scientific room arrangement.

Particularly striking is its entrance. An unusual brick terrace in the threshold for the old English arch door, flanked on one side by the sturdy fireplace chimney and on the other by the tiny box-seat window.

Stepping into the large vestibule, you find on one side a well lighted coat closet, on the other an arched doorway leading into the most delightful living room imaginable. The room is 17 feet long and 13 feet 3 inches wide, with grouped casement windows on three sides, a chobby fireplace and built-in book shelves.

Beyond, through another plastered arch, is the dining room, 13 feet 3 inches by 11 feet. The small, perfectly arranged kitchen has our convenient case "A," and also an extra cupboard built in, with space for the sink beneath a window; the clothes closet is beside the chimney. Cellar stairs go down from the entry, where the architect has found room for a broom closet. Space for the refrigerator is provided beneath one of the cupboards.

The two good sized bedrooms open into a hall in which is a linen closet. Each chamber has two windows and a fine, big closet. Both perfectly arranged for modern plumbing, with a convenient medicine cabinet built in.

**Our Price Includes These Quality Materials**

**Painting Lumber** - No. 1 Quality Yellow Pine  
**Roof Sheathing** - No. 2 Quality Yellow Pine  
**Wall Sheathing** - No. 2 Quality Yellow Pine - Stipes, oak sheathing  
**Sub-Flooring** - No. 2 Quality Yellow Pine (trigard and sheathing and sheathing)  
**Flooring** - No. 1 Quality Yellow Pine in Casement (see option)  
**Wood Shingles** - No. 1 Quality Red Cedar, the highest grade wood shingles manufactured.  
**Shingles** - No. 1 Quality Yellow Pine for near porch and outside.  
**Ceiling** - No. 1 Quality Yellow Pine for near porch and outside.  
**Ceiling Finish** - One Ft. 6 in. Clear Maple in kitchen and bath.  
**Finishing** - No. 1 Quality Yellow Pine in kitchen and bath.  
**Windows** - Four Double Hung White Pine, White Pine sash and extra space section.  
**Kitchen Cabinet** - "Design A" and extra space section.  
**Medicine Cabinet** - "Design B" see Page 89.  
**Living Closet** - see Page 89.  
**Telephone Cabinet** - see Page 89.  
**Cellar** - see Page 89.  
**Medicine Cabinet** - see Page 89.

**Hardware** - Pushpin hinges see Page 85.  
**Paint** - Three coats for trim.  
**Grates** - Three coats for base and decorative trim and base.  
**Wood Filler** - For all oak knots.  
**Stain** - For wood work in trim and dining room.  
**Complete set of Plans and Specifications**  
Extra materials required, see Page 89.  
Light Oak Finish for oak doors and window trim for the wood work in living and dining rooms and vestibule.  
Price does not include cement, wiring, back or plaster.  
For more detailed specifications see Pages 86 to 89.

**OPTIONS**  
See detailed descriptions on Pages 86 and 87.

**Dark Stained and Trim for living and dining** \$100.00  
**Light Stain - Hardwood Asphalt Shins** \$100.00  
**Shingles and Siding** \$100.00  
**Plasterboard and Plaster in place of st.** \$100.00  
**Green Glass and Windows, and 810 A** \$100.00  
**Green Glass and Windows, and 810 B** \$100.00  
Shades for outside doors and windows \$100.00  
For prices of plumbing, heating, electrical wiring and fixtures, see Page 89 to 91.

03.14 "A Modern version of the English Cottage with it's peaked and numerous gables, arched doorway, and casement windows." This was a "Kit House" for \$ 1,957 (U.S. dollars). Published September 1925, in a "Ladies" monthly magazine. These advertisements capitalized on simple new house plans that gave the impression of the so called "Garden Houses" that were being built in the "Garden Cities" (suburbs) around London England. Demand for new housing and the enormous growth of London in the 19<sup>th</sup>. century had created the largest city in the world with a population of nearly 9 million people. London was literally choking with air pollution, poverty, clogged streets and overcrowding in substandard old buildings. Planners determined that London should be surrounded by a ring of parks and agricultural lands to halt the incessant growth and provide fresh air for the already enormous city. The "Garden Cities" were to be built outside of the existing boundaries, but this had only become possible with the expansion of railways in the 19<sup>th</sup> C.. American cities, and

especially New York which was rapidly overtaking London, followed suit.

## The Home of Your Dreams



### The Vernon

**I**T IS impossible to attempt even the briefest survey of The Vernon on this page. The photographs, while they indicate to certain extent the beauty—the perfect poise—the symmetry and graceful charm of this architectural master-plan, fail to do The Vernon justice.



Nor can the supreme convenience of the arrangement be explained in such limited space although the plans may be studied to good advantage in connection with the interiors shown on page 121.

Then, construction is a chapter in itself. The specifications and a multitude of important construction and quality advantages can not be included here.

There is only one way we can reveal, in true light, the many desirabilities of this wondrous Home. You must write.

After you have explored this prospectus fully, please tell us of your interest and also give us all necessary knowledge of conditions as shown on our information blank.

The Vernon is a Home of Dreams—but it has often been made a wonderful reality. Let us show you how easily it can be placed on your lot with a \$1,500 cash saving.



#### Prices and Terms Specifications on Request

Price, \$2,926.00. Cash Discount, \$16.20. Net Price, \$2,779.70. Or \$1,361.00 Down, Balance \$61.01 per Month for Two Years. With plaster add \$78.00. Size, 40x34, 10 Room Home. Oak Floors and Finish throughout living room, dining room, hall, downstairs closets, vestibule, toilet and sun room, \$116.55 net.

*The Sterling Stamp on Your Home Means the Same as on Your Silver*

119

This house has a similar arrangement of foyer, stairs, rear hall, fireplaces and flanking rooms as 105 Filman. However, the kitchen end of 105 Filman was built, where the open pergola is shown here. The sun porch (screened) was built at the east end where the sunroom is shown. This description of "The Vernon" as a ten room plan, is quite similar to #105 except for the full second story walls.

03.15

It is unlikely that the owner/builder of # 105 understood how the concept of the garden house had migrated from England to New

England. It is more likely that they understood how this design gave a suitable orientation to the landscape to take advantage of sunlight and ventilation. The provision of underground parking for three cars was a new idea, and very few families owned more than a single new automobile at this time. Excavating grade to allow the vehicles to drive under the house was a natural response to utilize the sloping site. The “Newport” plan, previous page, shows a house that was now seen as a collection of interconnected rooms without a corridor or central axis of circulation. The bedrooms and bath are accessed through the dining room. The kitchen, pantry and stoop are located behind the dining room and are connected by a series of doorways that diminish useable wall space. Cabinetry is limited, as one might expect in the decades just before appliances proliferated.

- 03.16** If “modernity” meant doing away with corridors and hallways, it was also a way to compress the volume of the house and reduce construction costs. Number 105 is modern in having central heating, a multi-car garage and electrical services when built, but it retained the idea of a central hall and circulation rather than forcing travel through each of a series of rooms. A center hall was used as a way to allow multiple routes through the house, some “publically” through the inhabited rooms or “privately” via the hallways when the dining room, living room or den were occupied. Doors could close off the back corridor to allow children and staff to move around unseen while guests were in the house.
- 03.17** The design was concerned with a multiplicity of “what-if” uses, which may reflect thoughts about having many choices of entry and exit, during a wide variety of social circumstances, via the ten separate means of egress. These concerns were much more complicated than those of the average home. It would appear that the owner was thinking about a variety of social situations, parties, adults living without children constantly under foot, etc.. There is a very telling framed poster in the garage which presents a formulaic collection of “bon mot’s” that we would normally expect to be of a more recent origin.
- 03.18** The house does not have the exposed masonry parapets or baroque parapet details of real Dutch Colonial Houses. It is also lacking the “Mansard” roof type that was featured in a minor subset of so called “Dutch Colonial Houses” also in the late 1920’s. These houses are often symmetrical, two story or more and feature much steeper lower roofs that are essentially shingled walls.
- 03.19** The interior layout is was designed for utility except at the entrance hall. The formal staircase and hall was intended to show a picturesque

first impression of the house, but the ceilings are low and sense of continuity with the exterior is very restricted. The provision of a second stair to the second and third floor in the “kitchen” end of the house is more likely a result of wishing to isolate children and staff from the living areas and other bedrooms. Closing two doors at the first and second floor would accomplish this. This so called “servants” stair was not continuous to the basement however. Yet another staircase was inserted beyond the kitchen and side door at the south west corner of the house. This would have allowed deliveries of food to the pantry by suppliers, but required yet more space to be devoted to access from cellar to the main floor. The result if five staircases, in a house that could probably have made do with three. It is unlikely that an efficient floor plan by an architect would have included this complication.

**03.20** The number of exterior doors also supports this idea. There are two “exterior” doors from the living room to the screen porch, which has another two screen doors to exit to grade. The entry door would normally be the principle entrance to the house, but the center hall has a second door on the north side. The dining room also has double doors opening to the courtyard on the north side. Two more doors to grade are found at the service stairs below the first floor kitchen and at the cellar level underneath. If one also includes the basement door that allows egress via the three car garage, this gives a total of 10 different doors to exit to grade. This is another indication of a homeowner whose expectations for a flexible plan, ran wild. Different doors were required for different functions. If there was a pattern book plan to start with it was heavily modified. This would be difficult to do in a more formal and traditional plan, but was easily accommodated here because the exterior walls were essentially featureless except for window and door openings. As an ad hoc design it developed in a way that is very similar to contemporary speculative houses. The function does not follow the form. The form is an after thought.

**03.21** Designs for these houses were prepared ‘on spec’ by magazine publishers to draw in readers with diverse ‘modern’ plans prepared by architects. In some magazines a series of the ‘latest’ designs were featured in successive issues to keep subscriptions up. Often these popular designs had a continent wide geographic reach. A good example is a 1925 show home that used a type of dark rustic (wire cut) brickwork that was laid in a peculiar way. Random full bricks were laid as “headers” cantilevered out from the wall. On occasion, 19<sup>th</sup>. century town houses were built right up to the property line. In anticipation of another building going up next door, random header brick were left hanging out to allow the new wall to be bonded to the

old one. We may speculate that an architect working for “Lady’s Home Journal” noticed a wall of this sort and decided to use this detail in his next month’s design. This particular feature was very popular that year with examples of this new design being built all over Canada and the U.S.. Examples can be found in Halifax, Montreal, Toronto, Hamilton, Calgary, and Vancouver. But like many “fads” this one seems to have ended the next year (1926). It is quite likely that the inviting staircase of header bricks resulted in an epidemic of broken arms and legs among young children who decided to climb these first “rock walls”, because we have not seen any examples from 1927 or later.

- 03.22** Manufacturers also advertised their prebuilt “package” homes when they saw how effective these magazines were at reaching new customers. The kit home builders like T.E. Eatons, Sears Roebuck, Pacific Homebuilders, and others grew rapidly to fill a new demand for modern houses that had indoor plumbing, electricity, labour saving appliances. The idea of house kits was seen as a way to sell a variety of different items that would normally be purchased from many different suppliers as a single sale. The demand for this type of pre-manufactured kit grew from rapid urbanization in some areas and settlement of vast areas of the continent using the extensive railway networks that had made access possible almost everywhere by WW1. Kit houses were often sold as complete packages with all framing materials, floors, windows, doors, cabinetry, shingles, stairs, hardware and even plumbing parts provided in a carefully packaged shipment via boxcar. The recipient would take possession of his new house at the closest railway siding, and transport the entire package to his lot to start the construction of the new house. The components were labeled and coordinated by construction drawings to allow the home builder to undertake the work in a logical and efficient manner. While this method was very economical it did require some rigor and caution to ensure that nothing was damaged or lost before it could be used in the new house. Considerable care was taken in how the home kit was shipped so that the parts could be unloaded in the right sequence to start the work. While this building is probably a speculation design rather than a kit house, because it was so much easier to purchase the latest overhead garage doors, custom cabinets, trim and windows from local suppliers in Hamilton than was possible in a remote community like Oyen, Alberta or Brandon, Manitoba.
- 03.23** Sawn floor joists 1-3/4” x 11”. Note the square edges and generally smooth cut. The subfloor is pine tongue & groove with very tight joints, indicating that it was well dried before installation. The medium size tight knots, (very few edge knots) no wane or check, indicate that this was a number 1 & 2 grade material, flat sawn with slight bevel to the faces of tongue & groove. The subfloor is 4” wide.

Before WW1 this would likely be 6" wide. Likely date of use, after 1910, but before 1960. There are five types of wiring here: 1. Twisted pair telephone cable, 2. Armored cable "BX" 3. Black sheathed cable (common before 1960) 4. Modern 14-2 sheathed cable (white) 5. Modern fiber cable. The first three types were in use between WW1 & WW2.

**03.24** Since these kit builders were widely separated geographically across the country, each manufacturer used somewhat different combinations of materials for their product. In New York for example, white oak and white pine were common for finishes and framing. In California the package was probably framed in fir and finished with redwood. In the southern U.S. the package might be framed in southern yellow pine and trimmed with chestnut or pecan wood. Each region also had preferences for door and window materials. Some "Kit houses" can still be identified by markings on the back of trim or cabinets. There were no identifiable marks in this house that would suggest that it is a kit house, but the general characteristics indicate that the plans at least were likely provided from a prepared source. To understand the architectural pedigree of the house, a number of details must be examined so the lineage can be identified.

**03.25** The roof slopes are generally steep, close to 12/12 pitch, or 45 degree roof slope. Roof slopes changed continuously in the nineteenth century, starting at approximately 5/12 before 1830, moving to 5.5 /12 before 1850. After the Civil War and Confederation, roof pitches increased to 8/12 and 9/12. By 1890 12/12 pitch became very common. Why was this steady increase in roof slope occurring?

**03.26 Historical background:** The earliest settlement houses were often very small and only a single story. Rafters were seated on the top plate which was normally 100" above the sill. The buildings seldom exceeded 18' width, so the roof ridge was no more than 45" above the top plate. This made for an extremely low attic that was only used for storage, or a sleeping place for children. By 1825 most houses were story and a half, measured 20' or more in width, and between 28 and 36 feet long. The top plate was almost always 14' above the sill. The second floor joists also functioned as tie beams, and were again, typically 100" above the first floor. Where the sills were typically 8" high, this placed the top of the second floor at between 42" and 50" below the top of the top plate. This "knee wall" meant that beds and chests of drawers could be placed at the perimeter of the floor under the eaves, but head room was comfortable only in the center half of the second floor. This design was almost universal before 1859 when the tax laws changed. Up to 1859 any house that was 1-1/2 story or 14 feet to the top plate, was classed as a single story. If it were higher

than this the property taxes doubled. This was a strong incentive to keep every house just under this limit. Exceptions were usually those of wealthy people who could afford the increased tax and saw the obvious prestige of having a full two story house as worthwhile. With lower roof pitches the thrust vector of forces pushing against the top plate were higher than if the roof was optimized at 45 degrees. Since hewn and sawn timber from a local mill was green when used, the higher thrust would force an outward bow in the top plate before the cellulose "set" and stiffened. Many early houses have a permanent sag along the ridge because of this lateral movement along the

- 03.27** The felling of vast tracks of forest in southern Ontario had an impact on the micro-climate of farms and villages. People noticed that the summers were becoming hotter and more uncomfortable. Rainfall decreased and many of the creeks and streams that had previously run year round, (while surrounded by dense forest), began to dry up in the summer. The reduced transpiration from trees and evaporation from the land, resulted in fewer rainstorms and hotter nights. Builders began to increase roof height as a way to keep the residual daytime heat higher above the second floor. This reduced thermal radiation from the ceiling after sunset, and allowed a slightly better sleep. With the removal of the tax burden on two story houses, and changing tastes, the typical center gable house of mid-century became more common. Even older 1-1/2 story houses were often modified to add a center gable over the front entry. This was often done by cutting through the large heavy timber plate, 7" x 9" or 8" x 10" which carried the thrust of the roof rafters on the long walls. ( # 442 Wilson Street, Ancaster is a good example). This loss of connection between the gable walls sometimes resulted in a new sag in the roof where the rafters pushed the "broken" top plate away from the other side of the house. The ridge can often be seen as sagging where this was done. In a few uncommon cases, the owner realized this compromise would affect their roof, so they built a much squatter new gable above the top plate. This compromise resulted in an often unpleasant little gable, sometimes with a triangular or faux gothic revival arch in the peak.
- 03.28** Soon after Confederation, a newer style emerged, the 1-3/4 story house where the top plate was now constructed at around 16' above the sill. The second floor knee walls were now almost 6' high, allowing occupants to walk around the entire floor space without ducking at the eaves. This change occurred with the increase in roof slope to 9/12 or more. Collar ties created a wider attic space with more volume above the ceiling. Houses of this type are sometimes seen with gable vents, which was another recognition of the need to move hot summer air out of the attic to allow a comfortable night's sleep. It is no coincidence that the first experiments with balcony sleeping occurred

in the Chicago school, (Prairie Houses) and in California, by the 1890's. The climate was warming and in places like Tennessee, wealthy people who found the summer heat oppressive, would travel all the way to Lake Erie to cruise on steam boats in the more comfortable temperatures of Ontario. A small colony of people from Memphis Tennessee was established in Port Colbourne on Tennessee Avenue, because they much preferred summering with Canadians to rubbing shoulders with Yankees in upstate New York. They brought their African American servants, southern mores and ways of life with them, because air conditioning had not yet been invented.

- 03.29** By 1890 most houses were a full two story, and constructed with high attics and a 12/12 roof pitch. In better houses the sash windows were actual double hung, with the upper sash capable of siding partway down as well as the lower sash sliding upwards. This allowed the hot stratified air near the ceiling to be vented outside more quickly with a night time breeze. Windows here are the common single hung type.
- 03.30** The subject house has a 12/12 roof pitch, and high attic which had access via a regular staircase, suggesting that it was intended for occupancy, though probably by maid and cook rather than the family. The roof pitch and high attic indicate that this house was built after 1890.
- 03.31** Ceilings on the second floor are 101" or 8'-5". This is only slightly more than the modern standard 8'-0" height but well below the 9'-0" standard of most "Second Class" houses before WW1, which it would be equivalent to, in terms of floor area.
- 03.32** The upper hall is quite wide and more than 10 feet from the handrail to the interior wall, yet it seems narrower due to the steeply sloping roof above the stairs. This diminishes the grand effect that one sees from the front door. The functional subdivision of the second floor hall and bedrooms is similar to houses built since 1970, with a promise of grandness, but delivery of utilitarian low rooms with 80" doors.



Second floor hall and sloping roof above the stairwell. The window heads are uncomfortably different and below eye level when standing on the second floor.

- 03.33** Summarizing the electrical & mechanical findings shows that the technology used in this house can be dated after 1924. This includes:
1. Builders plates on the garage overhead doors dated Pat. 1924
  2. Bulldog Electrical service box circa 1925
  3. Ceramic light bulb fixtures (octagonal) circa 1925 (greenhouse)
  4. Solid fuel firebox door, cleanout & mechanical dampers, 1925.
  5. Brass door hardware & hinges (post WW1)
  6. Three panel (4 rails) custom doors circa 1926.
  7. Folding ironing board (built-in) circa 1925.
  8. Narrow red oak strip flooring (post WW1)
  9. Steel 8" pipe posts & double rail beams (no earlier than 1912.)
  10. Chain drive mechanism for greenhouse roof vents circa 1920.
  11. Poured concrete foundations (post WW1)
  12. Installation of three overhead doors for a three car garage (under the house) is not seen before WW1.
  13. Westinghouse panel, Pat. 1933 +/- in Greenhouse
- None of these items can be reliably dated as pre-1920.


- There are no signs of an older house having been incorporated within the existing house.
- The house must have been constructed after 1924.
- The greenhouse is contemporary with the house or was built in the decade after the house (1924 – 1933)
- The green house has been heavily modified with a mixture of new and reclaimed materials from much older structures. These reclaimed materials were added in the past 30 years, on modern OSB sheathing.
- None of the siding materials can be assigned to a particular pre-existing structure or time frame. They are out of context and have no historic value in their own right.

**03.34**

The eccentric layout of the house was derived from the plan. The arrangement of rooms is as follows:

1. Kitchen west side above garage.
2. Stairs from basement & half landing at grade south west.
3. Pantry at top of these stairs at entry to kitchen.
4. Seryery on north side of kitchen
5. Breakfast room on north side of house beyond server.
6. Dining room east of Breakfast Room on north elevation
7. Kitchen hall & kitchen stair to second floor east of server.
8. Center Hall accessible from dining room & kitchen hall.
9. Study east of kitchen and on south side of plan via center hall.
10. Entry vestibule for entry at south side, east of Study.
11. Main stairs and exit to garden (under), north side of center hall,
12. Closet & powder room off entry vestibule.
13. Living room east end of center hall.
14. Screen porch east side of living room with access door.
15. Addition to screen porch, north side of living room, access from living room and older screen porch.
16. Second floor hall above center hall.
17. East master bedroom off hall and above living room.
18. Dressing room west side of M.Br. and above L.Rm.
19. Bathroom off dressing room and hall.
20. Bedroom 2, south side, off hallway.
21. Bedroom 3 & 4 off north side of hallway, west of stairs.
22. Kitchen stairs & built in cabinetry above kitchen hall.
23. Second bathroom above servery.
24. Bedroom 5 above kitchen.
25. Attic bathroom west side of stairs.
26. Attic bedroom 6 north side above Bedrooms 3 & 4
27. Dressing room above second floor hall.
28. Closet off east end of dressing room.
29. Three car parking garage under Kitchen, servery, breakfast room.

- 30. Basement hall from garage, under dining room.
- 32. Closet on north side of basement hall,
- 33. Basement laundry below kitchen via delivery stairs.
- 34. Furnace room under study & kitchen hall.
- 35. Former coal bunker now exercise room, under 2<sup>nd</sup>. basement stairs.
- 36. Basement bedroom under living room.
- 37. Basement bathroom under powder room & vestibule.



A good example of a similar size Pattern Book (Kit) House circa 1925. This one is symmetrical but set in a similar, idealized, garden landscape.

**03.35** The asymmetrical elevations follow the plan. While the entry hall was conceived as a stage set, having front and back doors that do not align and are separated from the hall by vestibules demonstrates a poor consideration of views and the relationship of interior and exterior space. Traditional center-hall plans were present as early as 1790, ( James Gage House , Battlefield Park, Stoney Creek N.H.S.) The functional purpose of the “center-hall” was to allow ventilation through the house on warm days. It created, unintentionally, a sense of public space (outside the door) and semi-private space (inside) particularly when one can see in one door and out the other. The James Gage House is a good example but 134 years older than 105 Filman. It is also aligned East –West with a vista from the “back door” facing north towards the lake. But the doors and sidelights are aligned and offer a beautiful view both ways to the landscape when they are open. The “back” door at 105 Filman is glazed, faces a semi-formal garden on the north side, but is recessed in a short foyer tucked under the stairs. The low headroom and narrow view, diminishes its appeal. Similarly the “front” door on the south side is separated by an arch and foyer making openness very limited. One can never see in one door and out the other in this house,

**03.36** The extra “layer” of space between the center hall and the exterior, diminishes the experience of accessibility and creates three perceptual layers; “public” outside, “semi-public “in the foyer, and “private” inside the hall. The sense of restriction is perhaps what the homeowner found so appealing. It isolated the family more, from the outside world, and is a theme that can be seen in other houses of the 1920’s. Private, glass, sunrooms replaced open “public” verandahs where the family had sat together before the Great War, as the evening cooled. Casual conversations with passersby, was replaced with listening to a radio without interruption. Did families wish to stay indoors and away from casual visits or conversations, or was this incidental to the “trend” perceived by the few designers who . influenced the public taste? This trend after WW1 is somewhat mysterious, but occurred rapidly. One must also ask whether this trend was connected to the general withdrawal from society that many people felt as a result of so much death and tragedy during the War. Were people yearning for peace and quiet, or simply tired of interacting with the tragic realities that so many others and the less fortunate, had experienced? Perhaps that is why these post-War houses tried so hard to be picturesque but failed as communal statements? This house is particularly noticeable as an “object” in a “garden” surrounded by wide lawns and clumps of mature trees. It is idealized without being functionally ideal or connected to the history of the first hundred years of settlement.

- 03.37** The greenhouse shed was constructed when the house was built. The owners to have a place to start plants and flowers for transplanting into what were probably extensive beds and gardens. The theme of having many beds of flowers around a picturesque house in a landscape was promoted in many magazines at the time. These so called “garden homes” were contemporary with the idea of “garden suburbs” or “garden cities” with many of the first examples established around London England. In the U.K. and New England States (Boston, Hartford, Long Island, Chicago etc.) the development of street car rail links allowed suburban life to be accessed on the daily commute to work. This was one of the major factors in the creation of these communities. There was no nearby railway line along Mohawk or Rousseau Street in 1925, but automobiles were another factor that made inexpensive lots farther away from the town, so attractive for development. This property was on the periphery of Ancaster so qualifies as an early “outlier” of the type seen in modern suburbs. The construction of a three car garage under the house is also an indication of prosperity and the new found functionality of the automobile. So the house and gardens were typical examples of what we now consider to be normal suburban growth. The house is, therefore, a modern house with modern functions having also picturesque interior details in an asymmetrical plan. It is not an historic 19<sup>th</sup>. century house, and is less than 100 years old.
- 03.38** Comparing this property to others in Ancaster that are both older and more significant historically, shows that 105 Filman is not and does not contain structures which have similar pre-WW1 attributes. This is a modern house, built after 1925. It was probably a catalogue design but is not a Kit-House. The separate greenhouse structure was built with commercial equipment that was available between the wars. The OSB cladding, asphalt shingles and recycled wood cladding are all very recent modifications. This structure was used to start plants for the extensive flower beds that are now abandoned.
- 03.39** The house is a reasonably well executed modern catalogue design but was not a custom home by an architect. The greenhouse is also modern but modified to look very old. It is not historic. Other buildings in Ancaster that are much older and worthy of preservation are clustered along Wilson Street. 105 Filman was field or forest throughout much of the 19<sup>th</sup>. century. The house is part of the interwar building boom which saw many new structures built in Hamilton, Ancaster and Dundas as the communities grew and modern technology like electricity, became available. The greenhouse was built as an ancillary building to the house but has been made to appear much older. The superficial appearance to older structures is unfortunate and accidental. In the context of historic pre-WW1

Ancaster, these two structures should be excluded from the current list of sixty- six structures which are under review.

- 03.40** The City of Hamilton issued a letter in 2016 indicating that this house and property would not be considered historic for the purpose of designation. The new evidence agrees completely with the previous determination by the City of Hamilton.
- 04.01** **Conclusions:**
- 04.02** **There were no buildings on this property before 1925.** The garage doors of the house can be accurately dated to 1924 at the earliest and may have been built one or two years later. Framing materials, steel beams and posts, door hardware, flooring, electric boxes, methods of construction and specific features are consistent with a date of 1925 to 1930.
- 04.03** **The greenhouse is contemporary with the house, but has been made to appear much older with the use of recycled materials.** This deliberate “rustication” has caused confusion about the age of both buildings. **It is not an historic pre-Confederation structure.**
- 04.04** The house was probably inspired by or derived from a **Pattern Book design**. It includes modern features like overhead garage doors, electric lights and appliances with the initial construction.
- 04.05** **Historic buildings on adjoining properties appeared in the 1875 Wentworth Map, (J. Horning & T. Hammill), were demolished decades ago.** 105 Filman is not Pre-Confederation or even pre-WW1 and does not occur on the same lots as these two much older buildings.. 105 Filman is one mile from historic buildings on Wilson Street and is unrelated to early development of Ancaster. **It is not an outlier but is misidentified.**
- 04.06** **Many exterior features of the house are modern replacements.** Vinyl siding, vinyl windows, and metal roof tiles have been used. The greenhouse has been covered with OSB board, asphalt shingles and reclaimed wood. Original roads have been moved, widened or rerouted around the house. An earthen berm and trees conceal the house.
- 04.07** **The house cannot be seen well enough to be considered a landmark, and was intended to be a modern suburban house, on secluded pastoral grounds, in the 1920's**

- 04.08**      **The plan of the house is modern and asymmetrical. It is not a Dutch Colonial Revival house.** The elevations are a form of English Revival as first drawn in the U.K. but altered by American designers, and then transplanted to Canada. The Federal Revival entrance is far more typical in New England than in Canada, except where Americans have brought their architectural aspirations with them when they moved here. The greenhouse was originally used to supply plantings for the gardens, but these former flower beds have been abandoned for lawns. Limestone used in the greenhouse was partly reclaimed but there is no indication of where from. The house has many (10) exterior doors and many windows. There are five stairs and indications that the “back stairs” and “attic stairs” were used by some servants, possibly a cook and nanny at the least.
- 04.09**      Features like built in cupboards were designed to appear as 19<sup>th</sup>. century fixtures but were built to a lower quality, 20<sup>th</sup>. century standard.
- 04.10**      The foundations are poured concrete.
- 04.11**      The coal furnace which was replaced with a fuel oil furnace.
- 04.12**      Ceilings are generally lower than would be expected in a big house like this if it were built before WW1.
- 04.13**      **This is a modern house built in the second quarter of the twentieth century which has nothing in common with historic houses along Wilson Street, (currently under review as “important pre-Confederation buildings” for designation).**
- 04.14**      **Since it meets none of the criteria for designation, it is recommended that it should be removed from this process.**

- END -

**05.01**

**This Report was prepared by James T. Murison, Heritage Consultant, Oakville. CAPHC.** T. Murison graduated from Fitzwilliam College, Cambridge, (1980) (architecture). His work has included investigations of many early structures (1789 to 1930), Condition Assessments and Heritage Reports. He has prepared measured drawings, working drawings, reconstruction drawings, and building archaeology illustrations for numerous projects. He has also worked as a restoration technologist and general contractor for a wide range of projects. His work includes:

- St. Paul's Presbyterian Church, Hamilton 1860
- Museum of Steam and Technology, Hamilton
- James Gage House, Stoney Creek NHS
- Battlefield Monument, Stoney Creek
- Cenotaph & Bronze Statuary Restoration, Stoney Creek
- Waldies Blacksmith Shop & Milton Public Archives, Milton
- Puterbaugh Log Schoolhouse, Pickering Museum Village
- Swallowtail Lighthouse, 1859. Grand Manan Island, N.B.
- Collins Log House, 8<sup>th</sup>. Concession, Hamilton bc. 1825
- Vertical Plank frame House, Rockton, circa 1815
- Peter Matthews House c. 1822 & Abraham Losie General Store c. 1825, (now Brougham Hotel) Pickering Museum Village.
- Don Station, Cabin D, Tool Shed King Street Crossing Shanty, Toronto Railway Heritage Museum, Bremner Blvd. Toronto
- Boston Presbyterian Church , Milton (entry only)
- James Stewart House, 1818, 1824, 1835 & 1860, Milton
- McCutcheon House, Victoria Street, Milton c 1859
- Simpson House, Milton c. 1825 & 1859
- Midland Public Library (custom house & post office) c. 1912
- Charles Sovereign House, Oakville, circa 1825 & 1834
- Romaine House, Oakville 1845 & 1860
- Addition to Rideau Hall, Ottawa (Timber date investigation)
- A general store, (relocated to Martin Street) Milton
- McClure-McKay log house, temporary saw mill & grist mill, Silver Creek Conservation Area, Georgetown. C. 1868
- John Beattie House 1819, Meadowvale, Ontario
- Benjamin Smith (Carriage builder) house, c. 1819 Palermo, Ont.
- Unassigned (wagon & carriage shop) Bullocks Corners, c. 1810
- John Shaw House, c. 1806, Palermo, Ontario
- 110 Chisholm Street, Oakville, 1916.
- Hatt Building, Dundas. (Voluntary examination.)
- Knox Presbyterian Church, Oakville. Heritage Assessment.
- Tea House Gazebo, 21 Allen Str., Oakville. Heritage Assessment

[murison@gmail.com](mailto:murison@gmail.com)

(905) 334 - 9120

## Response to: Ancaster Pre-Confederation Inventory Form

December 2020

### 105 Filman Road, Ancaster

Information provided by the City of Hamilton to the owner is described with comments added at the appropriate places in the document. These comments are based on investigations and ongoing research into the property, building components, an analysis of the architectural details and comparison with other structures of similar age. The assumptions made in the Inventory Form are addressed by comments in red letters.

Heritage Date: c. 1850      No part of the house, foundations, walls, landscape structures or greenhouse were built before 1925. See Investigative Report prepared by T. Murison – Heritage Consultant. The greenhouse has actually be made to look like a much older structure by using reclaimed materials over modern sheathing.

Architectural Style / Influence:

Vernacular Dutch Colonial: The house does not have exposed gable walls, mansard roofs, symmetrical elements. There are elements which can be described as Federal Colonial Revival, but the house is most similar to Pattern book houses or Kit houses that were published in magazines in the mid-1920's.

Storeys: 2.5      Accurate

Foundation: Stone      The foundation is concrete with a stone veneer above grade only. Steel beams and columns were used to support the first floor. This was never done before WW1.

Construction Material:  
Wood frame      To be accurate, the frame is stud frame, probably with full height studs, (balloon frame). The framing materials are typically 1-3/4" thick which are intermediate between full 2" studs and joists before WW1 and 1-1/2" after WW2.

Roof type: Gable      The variety of gable types reflects a modern floor plan that emphasizes picturesque exterior forms. The roofs are a consistent 12/12 pitch.

Roof Material:      Metal shingles, interlocking.

- Metal (shingle): The modern interlocking metal tiles are less than 30 years old and obviously not historic.
- Notable Building Features: 2.5 story home built into the landscape with garage entrance in stone foundation on one side and 1.5 storey massing on the other, horizontal siding, T-shaped footprint with additions.
- The foundation is not stone but concrete, with stone veneer only above grade. The siding is vinyl 8" exposure to weather. Many of the windows are replacement vinyl units. The three car parking garage is a modern feature not seen before the explosion in automobile ownership of the 1920's. The building has a complex H-shape with a small original porch on the west corner. There are seven entry doors from the exterior, two on the living room, two on the center hall, one from the dining room and two from the west porch as grade and at the foundation level.
- Landscape Features: (not described)
- A Greenhouse with electrical lighting, mechanical ventilation and heater was built after 1925. This is an interwar structure made to look much older by the addition of white wash, and reclaimed barn board quite recently.
- Historical Associations: Pre-Confederation; T. Hammitt. (sic)
- There was no structure on the site before 1925. It is not pre-confederation. The property owner of this empty lot in 1875 was T. Hammill
- Design / Physical Value: The property's style or expression is rare, reflecting Dutch Colonial influence.
- The building is very similar to other speculative Pattern Book Houses, and was probably published in a magazine or woman's journal circa 1925. It has characteristics of Federal Colonial Revival (American). The house does not have exposed parapets, mansards or other details that are typical of Dutch Colonial Revival. It is similar to houses that were still being built in the 1950's.
- Historical/Associative Value: The property is associated with a potentially significant theme (pre-Confederation development). The property may be associated with early Euro-

Canadian settlement. The 1875 Wentworth County Atlas Map shows a farmhouse for "T. Hammitt"(sic) in this location. Further research has the potential to yield information that contributes to understanding of the community of Ancaster.

The 1875 map showed a house either 240 yards west ("T. Hammill") or 115 yards east of the S.W. corner of the subject property, ("J. Horning"). Both houses were demolished before 1970. The off ramp from highway 403 required excavation and removal of the J. Horning house. There are no traces of any pre-confederation buildings, on site.

Contextual Value:

The property helps defines (sic) the character of the area. The property is physically, functionally, visually and historically linked to its surroundings, located in an island surrounded by roads with the ramp to the 403 to the south and Filman Road looping around the property to the north. The property is a local landmark.

This statement is confusing. Since the purpose of this Inventory is to identify "Pre-Confederation" structures with historical connection to the rest of the community, statements about how it is surrounded by an off ramp from the 403 or modern loop of Filman Road do not support its value as an historic property.

It is not a landmark because the high berm makes it difficult to see the house while concentrating on driving, and most traffic is moving too quickly along Mohawk Road to catch more than a glimpse of the structure. There are very few pedestrians here.

The mature trees also block much of the view for passersby. It is also important to note that the other 60+ buildings that have been identified as having heritage value are found in a single area along Wilson Street. This house is a mile away, a real outlier which is chronologically and contextually isolated by subdivisions from the core of buildings in Ancaster that are truly pre-confederation. By the proposed criteria, it should not be included for listing in the Municipal Heritage Register.



Hamilton

Mailing Address:  
71 Main Street West, 5<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Hamilton, Ontario  
Canada L8P 4Y5  
www.hamilton.ca

Planning and Economic Development Department  
Development Planning, Heritage and Design  
71 Main Street West, 5<sup>th</sup> Floor, Hamilton ON L8P 4Y5  
Phone: 905-546-2424 Fax: 905-546-4202

January 8, 2016

File: FC-15-081

Ashenhurst Nouwens & Associates Inc.  
c/o: Harry Kalantzakos  
225 King William Street, Suite 112  
Hamilton, ON  
L8R 1B1

Dear Harry:

**RE: Formal Consultation Meeting – Application by Ashenhurst Nouwens & Associates Inc., on behalf of Khurram Khan for Lands Located at 105 Filman Road (Ancaster) (Ward 12)**

Please find the attached Formal Consultation Document from the Development Review Team Meeting held on **September 23, 2015**, which identifies the required items that must accompany a future **Zoning By-law Amendment (Complex)** application, **Draft Plan of Condominium (type to be determined by applicant)** application, and **Site Plan Control (Major)** application in order to deem the applications complete, in accordance with the *Planning Act*.

Staff note that dependent on the built-form and tenure a Draft Plan of Subdivision and corresponding Part-Lot-Control applications may also be submitted.

As part of the Formal Consultation Process, signatures by the Owner(s) and Agent/Applicant are required. Please return a signed copy of the Formal Consultation Document to the Development Planner. Should you wish to proceed with the submission of a **Zoning By-law Amendment (Complex)** application, **Draft Plan of Condominium (type to be determined by applicant)** application, and **Site Plan Control (Major)** application for this proposal, please enclose a copy of the signed Formal Consultation Document with your application.

If you have any questions or require assistance at any time throughout the development process, please feel free to contact, Alvin Chan at 905.546.2424 ext. 1334 or by e-mail at Alvin.Chan@hamilton.ca or myself at ext. 1258.

Yours truly,


Anita Fabac, MCIP, RPP  
Manager of Development Planning, Heritage and Design  
Planning Division

**Re: Formal Consultation Meeting – Application by  
Ashenhurst Nouwens & Associates Inc., on behalf  
of Khurram Khan for Lands Located at 105 Filman  
Road (Ancaster) (Ward 12)**

**January 8, 2016  
Page 2 of 2**

ac:AF  
Attachment

cc: Khurram Khan  
1274 King College Drive  
Oakville, ON,  
L6M 2T8



Hamilton

Planning and Economic Development Department  
Development Planning, Heritage and Design  
71 Main Street West, 5<sup>th</sup> Floor, Hamilton ON L8P 4Y5  
Phone: 905.546.2424 - Fax: 905.546.4202

**Formal Consultation Document**

Meeting Date: September 23, 2015 File No: FC-15-081

Owner: Khurram Khan

Applicant: Ashenhurst Nouwens & Associates Inc. c/o: Harry Kalantzakos

Agent: Ashenhurst Nouwens & Associates Inc. c/o: Joe Vendetti

**PROPERTY INFORMATION**

Address and/or Legal Description: 105 Filman Road

Lot Frontage (metres): 173 Lot depth (metres): 76.4 Lot Area(m<sup>2</sup>): 6,720

Regional Official Plan Designation: N/A

Rural Hamilton Official Plan Designation: N/A

Urban Hamilton Official Plan Designation: Neighbourhoods – Schedule E-1

Local Official Plan Designation: N/A

Other Plan Designation: N/A

Zoning: Existing Residential “ER” Zone and Agricultural “A” Zone (By-law No. 87-57)

Description of current uses, buildings, structures and natural features on the subject lands: Single Detached Residential

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Brief description of proposal: \_\_\_\_\_

Draft Plan of Condominium for a private roadway with a parking area for 10 spaces  
in association with a 22 unit block townhouse development.

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

## APPLICATIONS REQUIRED

Rural Hamilton Official Plan Amendment	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Urban Hamilton Official Plan Amendment	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Local Official Plan Amendment	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Zoning By-law Amendment (Complex)	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Subdivision (only if for freehold units)	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Condominium (Type: Applicant to determine)	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Site Plan (Type: Major)	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Consent	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Variance(s)	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Other	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Note:** The City of Hamilton is in the process of creating a new comprehensive Zoning By-law for the entire City. The new Zoning By-law is being prepared in phases by Land Use topic. New Industrial, Commercial and Residential zoning may be implemented which could be different than the current zoning. Accordingly, additional applications may be required. If a Building Permit has not been issued by the City prior to the new zoning coming into effect, the approved site plan may be affected, related to zoning compliance, which may require further planning approvals (i.e. Minor Variance, Zoning Amendment, etc.). In addition, the City of Hamilton has prepared a new comprehensive Rural Official Plan and Urban Official Plan. Should the proposed development not proceed prior to the final approval of these Official Plans, further amendments to these plans may be required.

## FEEES REQUIRED

City of Hamilton:	Zoning By-law Amendment	\$21,890.00
	Draft Plan of Condominium	\$TBD by Applicant
	*Joint Application (-25%)	\$TBD by Type of Condominium
	FC Credit	-\$1,045.00
	Site Plan (Major)	\$9,120.00
	TPP Review Fee	\$560.00
	<b>CITY TOTAL</b>	<b>\$30,525.00</b>
Conservation Authority Review Fees:	To be consulted due to Karst Bedrock which will confirm if fees are required	
Other:	Street Tree Fee (\$450+hst/tree)	
TOTAL:	\$30,525.00	

\*If a Draft Plan of Subdivision is also proposed, it would be eligible for the joint application discount along with the Zoning By-law Amendment and Draft Plan of Condominium applications.

**Notes:**

- *Formal Consultation fee may be credited towards a future application*
- *Notwithstanding the fees noted above, all fees are payable based on the rate in the fee schedule by-law in effect on the date the payment is made.*
- *Further fees may be required at a later date as per the fee schedule.*
- *Separate cheques are payable to the City of Hamilton and the applicable Conservation Authority.*
- *A Cost Acknowledgement Agreement for potential costs at the Ontario Municipal Board may also be required.*

**DESIGN REVIEW PANEL**

The Design Review Panel shall provide urban design advice to Planning Division staff on Planning applications with respect to complex Zoning and Site Plan applications in the following Design Priority Areas:

- (a) Downtown Hamilton Secondary Plan Area;
- (b) Areas of Major Change and Corridors of Gradual Change within the West Harbor Secondary Plan Area;
- (c) Primary Corridors as shown on Schedule E – “Urban Structure” of the Urban Hamilton Official Plan;
- (d) Any other large scale projects that may impact the physical environment functionally and/or aesthetically.

The Director of Planning or his or her designate may waive projects from the review of the Design Review Panel, if the project is not deemed to have the potential to significantly impact the physical environment functionally and/or aesthetically.

Design Review Panel review required?       Yes       No

**REQUIRED INFORMATION AND MATERIALS**

All identified reports, studies, and/or plans must be submitted before an application is deemed complete. Unless otherwise noted, 5 copies of each item and an electronic digital file in PDF locked file format must be submitted.

Reports, Studies, Plans	Required	Staff Responsible for providing guidelines or terms of reference
<b>Background Information</b>		
Survey Plan	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Zoning Stage: - Dev. Planning (A. Chan – Ext 1334)

Concept Plan	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Zoning Stage: - Dev. Planning (A. Chan – Ext 1334)
<b>Planning</b>		
Affordable Housing Report/Rental Conversion Assessment	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Draft OPA, and By-laws	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Zoning Stage: - Dev. Planning (A. Chan – Ext. 1334)
Land Use/Market Needs Assessment	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Planning Justification Report	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Zoning Stage: - Dev. Planning (A. Chan – Ext. 1334)
Site Plan and Building Elevations	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Site Plan Stage: - Dev. Planning (A. Chan – Ext. 1334) - MTO (H. Thai – 416-235-4387)
Urban Design Report	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Zoning Stage: - Dev. Planning (J. Chludzinska – Ext. 1393)
<b>Cultural</b>		
Archaeological Assessment	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Zoning Stage: - Dev. Planning (C. Tyers – Ext. 1202)
Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment *(See Comments provided and dated Sept. 18, 2015 for criteria)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Zoning Stage: - Dev. Planning (C. Tyers – Ext. 1202)
<b>Environmental</b>		
Aggregate Resource Assessment	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Aggregate/Mineral Resource Analysis	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Air Quality Study	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Channel Design and Geofluvial Assessment	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Chloride Impact Study	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Cut and Fill Analysis	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Demarcation of top of bank, limit of wetland, limit of natural hazard, limit of Environmentally Significant Area (ESA), or limit of Conservation Authority regulated area	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Erosion Hazard Assessment	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Fish Habitat Assessment	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Floodline Delineation Study/Hydraulic Analysis	<input type="checkbox"/>	
General Vegetation Inventory (GVI)	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Impact Assessment for new Private Waste Disposal Sites	<input type="checkbox"/>	

Karst Assessment/Karst Contingency Plan	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Landscape Plan	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Site Plan Stage: - Dev. Planning (A. Chan – Ext. 1334) (J. Chludzinska – Ext. 1393 - Urban Forestry (S. Brush – Ext.7375)
Linkage Assessment	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Meander Belt Assessment	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Nutrient Management Study	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Odour, Dust and Light Assessment	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Restoration Plan	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Shoreline Assessment Study/Coastal Engineers Study	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Slope Stability Study and Report	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Species Habitat Assessment	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Tree Management Plan/Study	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Zoning Stage: - Urban Forestry (S. Brush – Ext.7375)
Tree Protection Plan (TPP)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Zoning Stage: - Dev. Planning (M. Kiddie – Ext. 1290)
<b>Environmental/Servicing and Infrastructure</b>		
Contaminant Management Plan	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Record of Site Condition (RSC)	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Erosion and Sediment Control Plan	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Site Plan Stage: - Dev. Engineering (M. Trink – Ext. 2657) - MTO (H. Thai – 416-235-4387)
Hydrogeological Study	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Grading Plan	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Site Plan Stage: - Dev. Engineering (M. Trink – Ext. 2657) - MTO (H. Thai – 416-235-4387)
Master Drainage Plan	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Stormwater Management Report/Plan and/or update to an existing Stormwater Management Plan	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Site Plan Stage: - Dev. Engineering (M. Trink – Ext. 2657) - MTO (H. Thai – 416-235-4387)
Soils/Geotechnical Study	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sub-watershed Plan and/or update to an existing Sub-watershed Plan	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Financial</b>		
Financial Impact Analysis	<input type="checkbox"/>	

Market Impact Study	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Servicing and Infrastructure</b>		
Recreation Feasibility Study	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Recreation Needs Assessment	<input type="checkbox"/>	
School Accommodation Issues Assessment	<input type="checkbox"/>	
School and City Recreation Facility and Outdoor Recreation/Parks Issues Assessment	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Functional Servicing Report	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Servicing Options Report	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Water and Wastewater Servicing Study	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Land Use Compatibility</b>		
Agricultural Impact Assessment	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Dust Impact Analysis	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Zoning and Site Plan Stage: - Hamilton Public Health (R. Finkenbrink – Ext. 5820)
Land Use Compatibility Study	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Landfill Impact Study	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Minimum Distance Separation Calculation	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Noise Impact Study	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Zoning Stage: - Dev. Planning (A. Chan – Ext. 1334)
Odour Impact Assessment	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sun/Shadow Study	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Vibration Study	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Wind Study	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Transportation</b>		
Cycling Route Analysis	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Transportation Impact Study	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Zoning Stage: - MTO (H. Thai – 416-235-4387)
Parking Analysis/Study	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Pedestrian Route and Sidewalk Analysis	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Roadway/Development Safety Audit	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Modern Roundabout and Neighbourhood Roundabout Analysis	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Neighbourhood Traffic Calming Options Report	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Transit Assessment	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Transportation Demand Management Options Report	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Zoning Stage - Public Works, Transportation Planning (A. Kirkpatrick – Ext. 4173)
<b>Cost Recoveries</b>		
Cost Acknowledgement Agreement	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Zoning Stage:

		- Dev. Planning (A. Chan – Ext. 1334)
<b>DRP Submission Requirements</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Other:</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<u>Zoning Stage:</u> 1. Detailed Parking Plan - HMPS (T. Mendoza – Ext 5441)  <u>Site Plan Stage:</u> 1. Driveway Sightline Study Min. 30m from Highvalley Road - Corridor Management (T. Detmar – Ext. 5675)  2. Street Tree Fee (\$450+HST/per tree) - Urban Forestry (S. Brush – Ext.7375)  3. Mohawk Road Road Widening and Daylight Triangles - Dev. Engineering (M. Trink – Ext. 2657) - Public Works, Transportation Planning (A. Kirkpatrick – Ext. 4173)  4. Wastewater Generation Assessment - Dev. Engineering (M. Trink – Ext. 2657)  5. Storm Drainage Area Plan (see comments for details) - Dev. Engineering (M. Trink – Ext. 2657)  6. P. Eng Reports for Domestic Water Demands and Required Fire Flows - Dev. Engineering (M. Trink – Ext. 2657)  7. Ministry of Transportation Permits - MTO (H. Thai – 416-235-4387)

	8. One Foot Reserve - Growth Planning (P. Toffoletti – Ext 4348)
--	--

**ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**

Additional Agencies to be contacted: Hamilton Conservation Authority Re: Karst

Comments: Back-lotting is discouraged – see UHOP policies

No individual driveways permitted on Mohawk Road or Filman Road

3m x 3m visibility triangles at driveway/access locations

Waste Collection Eligible – Design Standards Provided

Ancaster Tree Cutting By-law requires permit for removals of trees of 45 cm D.B.H.

All vehicular maneuvering shall occur on-site

If De-watering is proposed a local water well survey within 500m is required

Limited Storm and Sanitary services – See Dev. Engineering comments

Cash-in-lieu of sidewalks will be taken due to existing site conditions (no sidewalks)

MTO 14m setback shall be included in all plans and design

Filman Road shall be used, not Filman Mountain Road

Private road to be shown as a block on Subdivision Plan, if applied for.

Confirm ownership of parking area

**PLEASE BE ADVISED OF THE FOLLOWING:**

1. *The purpose of this document is to identify the information required to commence processing a complete application as set out in the Planning Act. Formal Consultation does not imply or suggest any decision whatsoever on behalf of City staff or the City of Hamilton to either support or refuse the application.*
2. *This document expires 1 year from the date of signing or at the discretion of the Director of Planning.*
3. *In the event this Formal Consultation Document expires prior to the application being accepted by the City, another document may be required.*
4. *If an application is submitted without the information and materials identified in this Formal Consultation Document the City may deem such an application incomplete and refuse to accept the application.*

5. In accordance with the Planning Act, it is the policy of the City of Hamilton to provide public access to all Planning Act applications and supporting documentation submitted to the City. Therefore, the information contained in an application and any documentation, including reports, studies and drawings, provided in support of an application, by the owner, or the owner's agents, consultants and solicitors, constitutes public information and will become part of the public record. With the filing of an application, the applicant consents to the City of Hamilton making the application and its supporting documentation available to the general public, including copying and disclosing the application and its supporting documentation to any third party upon their request.
6. It may be determined during the review of the application that additional studies or information will be required as a result of issues arising during the processing of the application.
7. The above requirements for deeming an application complete are separate and independent of any review under the Ontario Building Code (OBC) as part of the Building Permit review process. In the event that a building permit application does not comply with the OBC, a letter outlining the deficiencies or areas of non-compliance will be issued to the owner and/or agent. Formal consultation and building permit review are separate and independent processes.

**SIGNATURES**

Alvin Chan  
 Planning Staff

[Signature]  
 Planning Staff Signature

1/8/2016  
 Date

Anita Fabac  
 Planning Staff

[Signature]  
 Planning Staff Signature

Jan 8/16  
 Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Engineering Staff

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Engineering Staff Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Owner

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Owner Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Applicant (I have the authority

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Applicant Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Date

to bind the Owner)

\_\_\_\_\_  
Agent (I have the authority  
to bind the Owner)

\_\_\_\_\_  
Agent Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Other Staff or Agency

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Other Staff or Agency

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Other Staff or Agency

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date



Hamilton

Planning and Economic  
Development Department

## Memorandum

**To:** Heather Travis, Senior Project Manager

**From:** Chelsey Tyers, Cultural Heritage Planner

**Date:** September 18, 2015 **File:** FC-15-081

**Subject:** Cultural Heritage Comments Regarding Formal Consultation Application by Ashenhurst Nouwens & Associates Inc. on Behalf of Peter Banting for Lands Located at 105 Filman Road, Ancaster

---

### Archaeology:

The subject property meets four (4) of the ten criteria used by the City of Hamilton and Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport for determining archaeological potential:

- 1) Within 300 metres of a primary watercourse or permanent waterbody, 200 metres of a secondary watercourse or seasonal waterbody, or 300 metres of a prehistoric watercourse or permanent waterbody;
- 2) Local knowledge associates areas with historic events/activities/occupations;
- 3) In an area of sandy soil in areas of clay or stone; and,
- 4) Along historic transportation routes.

These criteria define the property as having archaeological potential. Accordingly, Section 2 (d) of the *Planning Act* and Section 2.6.2 of the Provincial Policy Statement apply and Staff require that an Archaeological Assessment be completed and submitted with any future application.

(ES 2015 09 18)

### Built Heritage:

The subject property comprises a historic farmhouse seen on the 1875 Ancaster Wentworth County Atlas historically owned by Thomas Hammill (see excerpt below).

**Subject:** Cultural Heritage Comments Regarding Formal Consultation Application by Ashenhurst Nouwens & Associates Inc. on Behalf of Peter Banting for Lands Located at 105 Filman Road, Ancaster

**September 18, 2015**  
**Page 2 of 4**



(1875 Ancaster Wentworth County Atlas, Concession 2 Lot 49)

The City recognizes there may be cultural heritage properties that are not yet identified or included in the Register of Property of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest nor designated under the *Ontario Heritage Act*, but still may be of cultural heritage interest. These may be properties that have yet to be surveyed, or otherwise identified, or their significance and cultural heritage value has not been comprehensively evaluated but are still worthy of conservation.

Accordingly, the following sections of the Urban Hamilton Official Plan, Volume 1, apply:

- B3.4.1.3 “Ensure that all new *development, site alterations*, building alterations, and additions are contextually appropriate and maintain the integrity of all on-site or *adjacent cultural heritage resources*,” and,
- 3.4.2.1g “Ensure the conservation and protection of *cultural heritage resources* in planning and development matters subject to the

**Subject:** Cultural Heritage Comments Regarding Formal Consultation Application by Ashenhurst Nouwens & Associates Inc. on Behalf of Peter Banting for Lands Located at 105 Filman Road, Ancaster

**September 18, 2015**

**Page 3 of 4**

Planning Act either through appropriate planning and design measures or as conditions of development approvals.”

- 3.4.2.1h “Conserve the character of areas of cultural heritage significance, including designated heritage conservation districts and *cultural heritage landscapes*, by encouraging those land uses, *development* and *site alteration* activities that protect, maintain and enhance these areas within the City.”

The proponent proposes to redevelop the subject lands to develop 30 freehold townhomes on a private condominium road. A Zoning By-law Amendment, Draft Plan of Condominium, Draft Plan of Subdivision and Site Plan Control applications will be required to implement the proposal.

Accordingly, Section B3.4.2.14 of the Urban Hamilton Official Plan, Volume 1, states that *“Where cultural heritage resources are to be affected, the City may impose conditions of approval on any planning application to ensure their continued protection. In the event that rehabilitation and reuse of the resource is not viable and this has been demonstrated by the proponent, the City may require that affected resources be thoroughly documented for archival purposes at the expense of the applicant prior to demolition.”*

If this application is approved, Staff require the following condition:

- 1) That the applicant submit detailed documentation of the building on the subject property, to the satisfaction and approval of the Manager of Development Planning, Heritage and Design, prior to any demolition taking place; and,
- 2) That any historic fabric to be removed, including windows and doors, be salvaged for re-use, where feasible. Documentation regarding the salvage of these features shall be submitted to the satisfaction and approval of the Manager of Development Planning, Heritage and Design, prior to any demolition taking place.

(ES 2015 09 18)

**Subject:** Cultural Heritage Comments Regarding Formal Consultation Application by Ashenhurst Nouwens & Associates Inc. on Behalf of Peter Banting for Lands Located at 105 Filman Road, Ancaster

**September 18, 2015**  
**Page 4 of 4**

Request to Speak to Committee of Council Form

Submitted on Tuesday, January 26, 2021, 7:04 p.m.

==Committee Requested==

Committee: Hamilton Municipal Heritage Committee

==Requestor Information==

Name of Individual: Danyal Sheikh

Name of Organization: Resident

Contact Number: [REDACTED]

Email Address: [REDACTED]

Mailing Address:

105 Filman Rd

Ancaster ON

Reason(s) for delegation request: Municipal Heritage consultation

Will you be requesting funds from the City? No

Will you be submitting a formal presentation? Yes

**Request to Speak to Committee of Council**

Submitted on Wednesday, January 27, 2021 - 11:11 am

==Committee Requested==

**Committee:** Hamilton Municipal Heritage Committee

==Requestor Information==

**Name of Individual:** Tom Murison

**Name of Organization:** Heritage Consultant

**Contact Number:** [REDACTED]

**Email Address:** [REDACTED]

**Mailing Address:**

[REDACTED]

**Reason(s) for delegation request:** Review 105 Filman Road

**Will you be requesting funds from the City?** No

**Will you be submitting a formal presentation?** Yes

**Request to Speak to Committee of Council**

Submitted on Wednesday, January 27, 2021 - 9:32 am

==Committee Requested==

**Committee:** Hamilton Municipal Heritage Committee

==Requestor Information==

**Name of Individual:** Paul Masotti

**Name of Organization:**

**Contact Number:** [REDACTED]

**Email Address:** [REDACTED]

**Mailing Address:** 1719 Powerline Rd. West

**Reason(s) for delegation request:** To be able to ask questions/give feedback during the HMHC meeting on Jan 29th from 9:30 am to 1:00 pm.

**Will you be requesting funds from the City?** No

**Will you be submitting a formal presentation?** No

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Golden, Alissa](#)  
**Cc:** [Ferguson, Lloyd](#); [Whitehead, Terry](#); [Vrooman, Tim](#)  
**Subject:** FW: "1157 Garner Rd. recommended for a listing as a non-designated Heritage  
**Date:** January 25, 2021 9:19:21 PM  
**Attachments:** [Home Cladding.jpg](#)  
[Porch extentsion.jpg](#)  
[replaced\\_patched chimney work.jpg](#)  
[ice and Wood Pecker damage.jpg](#)  
[ice and squirrel damage.jpg](#)  
**Importance:** High

---

Att: Alissa Golden

RE: " 1157 Garner Rd E was identified as an historic property of interest/and is being recommended for listing on the Municipal Heritage Register as a non-designated property..... Listing does not prevent demolition, but does provide a short-term delay(60 days) "

Hello Alissa,

I received your letter by mail, and I object to any change to the current designation and bylaws with the City of Hamilton with regards to 1157 Garner Rd. Ancaster ON.

I am submitting written comment for the virtual meeting of the HMHC, against the purposed non-designated for 1157 Garner Rd. for the following reasons :

- 1)\* it will interfere/complicate with my development rights, which I have been planning for nearly 3 decades.
- 2)\* This house over many years has heavily modified, both internally and externally and has retained no originality.
- 3) \*"Flanked by mature trees"( Most of the trees are severely damaged, dying and are being held together with mechanical aid)
- 4\*)Listing will definitely affect property value
- 5)\*"This property is visually and historically linked to its surrounding" ???

- 1)\*\*\* Interference and complications with my development rights:

I have spent considerable time and money over the past 29 years with attending City Hall meetings, including many emails and with the designing and planning of 1157 Garner Rd.

If you simply google Don, and Donato Cascioli, you will find many records on the internet stating my intent to develop 1157 Garner Rd,( and 1175 Garner as well) including two OMB hearing in 2004( PL040278) and 2018( PL161240.)

Some past communication and comments in regards to developing 1157 Garner RD. with City staff include:

Doug Waddell, Thomas Cameron, Tanya Mckenna, Terry Whitehead, Alvin Chan, Anita Fabac, Melanie Schneider, S Robichard, Mayor Eisenberger, Yvette Rybensky, Carlo Ammendolia, Tim Vrooman and Mr. Lloyd Ferguson. Never once was the issue of non-designated a topic of discussion.

To demonstrate the full development potential of units for 1157 Garner, I along with Dave Elliot ( my Real Estate Lawyer) attended a meeting with Losani homes on April 6, 2017 .( At the time Losani showed interest in the properties, but no actually sale ever took place) At the meeting a representative from Losani home, Cory Giancanti and Losani's legal counsel William Liske presented a sketch that showed a design layout with 16 Town Homes for 1157 Garner Rd. The average price of a condo in Ancaster is in the \$600,000.00 range. If you times that amount by 16 units, the fully developed survey would have a value around 10 Million dollars.

You also mentioned "Listing does not prevent demolition, but does provide a short-term delay(60 days) This interim protection allows staff time to discuss alternative to demolition with the land owner"

Even If I were to relocate the home on a corner of the property, I don't think it would visually fit well with a row of town home. For my experience as a landlord, contractor, register Real Estate agent, and my begins as a developer with 1175 Garner Rd. in a past formal consultation meet with the City on ov.13 ,2019 with about 20 City staff members including Yvette Rybensky. I am certain this would greatly complicate matters with the City Planning committee. Not To mention great costs involved in moving the piecemealed home, building a new foundation and connecting to new water and sewer services. Also this house's foot print would also occupy space for approx. 2 town homes, which does not make economic sense.

2)\*\*\*Heavy Modification/additions and renovation of home.

This past summer I painted the outside of the home, and noticed many changes, and modifications through time.

a) Change in Cladding

A view from the outside of the home shows 5 different outdoor cladding added to the home over the years, poorly fitted (\*\*SEE ABOVE PIC 1 Home Cladding\*\*)

TYPES OF CLADDING CHANGED/ADDED OVER THE YEARS:

- Wooden board and batten
- Metal siding
- concrete parging

-wood siding (used siding in various widths mismatched.)see pic 3

-Pebble dash-There are cracks all over this finish. This form of stucco is common on many homes in the downtown area built in 1940s and 1950s

This finish is a technique used by builders to cut costs to maximize profit. It is a cheap alternative to fine brick and stone masonry work.

b)Porch has also been added and expanded over the years.(SEE ABOVE PIC 2 Porch extension.( porch was not original to house)

- One section is poured concrete ( 40 years old) sitting on modern day concrete block footings covered in pressure treaded lattice, and the other section was added much later built with pressure treat wood that has been painted due to decay.

-all wood railing have also been replaced with pressure treated lumber in the 1990s ( I added a coat of paint this summer, as the wood was beginning to rot once again)

-porch ceiling sheeting is typical plywood

c) Windows

-original window opens have been cut out to accommodate larger windows.

-many windows had to be filled with outdoor puddy because of wrought.

d) Doors (see pic 1)

-all doors, casing, and hardware have been replaced in the 1970s.

e) Chimney

- was replaced and mended many times using different common brick (see pic.3 replaced, patched chimney work)

f) Addition to rear of home ( See pic 1)

-the rear wall of home from one end to the far wall was removed and extended by about 10 feet to make the kitchen and bathroom larger.

- The newer addition sits on modern day concrete block footing.

-windows are typical of the 1980s and 1990s (see 1 and pic 3)

g) Roof

-shingles have been replaced many time over with asphalt, and also re sheeted with plywood.

h) Basement

- at one point in time it was just a crawl space, and was later excavated in the past for a greater depth, then formed with plywood and concrete.(typical of today's construction)

- difference in ceiling high is about 4 feet higher, bring the new height to a little over 6 ft.

- Since all the recent development and change in grading, my tenants inform me the basement leaks.

- I have had many conversations with the City of Hamilton about the grading. I last spoke with Carlo Ammendolia in April 2020. He has made notes of some improper curb heights, and swales that were never added to 1169 Garner Rd. development. To date he has not return any of my

emails.

- one modification was made with the extension of asphalt and addition of a concrete curb surrounding a storm sewer...(This work was done, as I first had to bring it to the City's attention) How did this survey receive a grading certificate? One side of the development is 6 feet higher than 1175 Garner rd.( a Property I also own) and all the grading is sloping on a 45 degree angle towards my back yard.

Also this retaining wall abutting to my property to complete this new 92 town home development is already beginning to form many cracks. From my past 30 years of experience in construction I would strongly recommend sending an engineer to inspect this wall.

- a past tenant of mine at 1175 Garner Rd. reached out to The Spec to voice her frustrations with the grading and basement constantly filled with mud and water.

Google " The sad fate of a special place for dogs" for the fully story( The Spec)

i)Interior

-floors consist of peel and stick floor tile, linoleum, carpet, painted plywood sheets, and mix matched hardwood.

-all interior doors and hardware have been replaced in the 1970s.

-all baseboards were replaced in the 1990s with MDF ( glue resin and wood saw dust composite)

-walls are drywall downstairs, and 1970s style wood paneling upstairs.

-stair case has been replaced within the last 40 years.

-ceilings construction design are typical of the 1970s.

-lighting fixtures are from the 1980s.

#### A SECOND OPINION

I have a very knowledgeable neighbor living down the road from 1157 Garner Rd. for 65 plus years, his name is Mr. Raymond Wilson. Raymond's family I believe has been living in Ancaster since the 1800s. Raymond is a very well respected member of the community, and is VERY VERY well known within the City of Hamilton's planning Dept. He serves on many boards, just to name a few....Scottish Rite, Ancaster Fair Grounds, and ANCASTER TOWNSHIP HISTORICAL SOCIETY. ( I believe Raymond Rd off of Garner was named after him as well) This gentleman is well known for his in-depth knowledge of history in Ancaster. He and his past family have owned many properties on Garner Rd.

I spoke to Ray over this past weekend, and he could not believe 1157 Garner Rd. was identified as a potential property of interest. His Uncle Arthur Epps used to own 1157 Garner rd. Raymond informed me that the house was used as a rental for many years. He said that the house on 1157 Garner Rd. is a piecemealed house. No originality, and has had additions, and changes over the years. His personal opinion is the home has no historical or architectural value.

3)\*\*\*"Flanked with mature trees( Trees are severely damaged, are dying, and being held together by mechanical aid..See pics 3,4,5)

Over the years many trees have been critically damaged by:

-by ice storms resulting in broken branches and split tree trunks

-Wood Pecker, and Squirrel damage

-damaged root system by survey construction(see pic 3)

-old age, center of tree trunks are rotten and trees are at their end of a life cycle.

4)\*\*\* Listing will definitely affect property value

-I am also a licensed Real Estate agent working for Kronas Real Estate. This company has been around for 69 years. A few past projects Kronas has been involved in are COAHP Task with the City of Hamilton, and assembly of the Meadowlands in Ancaster. I have benefited greatly with knowledge by working with this company first as an investor in 1992, and now as an agent.

-I do not plan on selling this property, but if a listing were to be created, the non-designated property status under Section 27 of the Ontario Heritage Act would turn away all investors, and developers once it appears on the Real Estate listing.

-I have been approached in the past to partner with a large developer for 1157 Garner Rd. I can assure you with no doubt in my mind that this designation would end my potential partnership.

5)\*\*\* This property is visually and historically linked to its surrounding" ???

- To the west abutting on my side yard is a square building known as the Ancaster water pump station

-Beside this pump station is a future project that is supposed to contain a 9 story building with 92 units. Terry Whitehead knows many particulars of this future project.

-to the east abutting on to my property is a 92 unit development by Losani.

-in behind my property are more towns, and million dollar homes.

- a few hundred feet down the road are countless new homes built by Marz, Rosehaven, Desantis, Losani, and DiCenzo all built within the last couple of years.

- further down the Garner Rd across Miller is the Silvestri Home built in 1995. It is considered by many to be the Largest single family home in Canada.

My property does not visually or historically link to the surrounding.

I have been planning development of 1157 Garner Rd. for almost 29 years since ownership. Mr. Lloyd Ferguson was present at many meetings in the past. He helped me, and guided me tremendously with my many questions in regards to future development of my land, such as traffic, units per hectare acre, etc. Never once did any City staff member raise any interests for my property as a non-designated property requiring a 60 day delay for demolition. Why now 29 years later? If the property had any value, it would have been already designated long ago.

This house was cheaply constructed, and treated as such by the many owners and landlords with upkeep, cost cutting maintenance and additions. My expert personal opinion from Raymond Wilson reinforces my own statements. 1157 Garner Rd has not retained its original building footprint, nor any of its original visible features both interior or exterior. This is not a stone building, there is no slate roof. This home in any shape or form cannot be compared to either The Shaver Homes, or the Rousseau.

Trees have reached the end of their life cycle due to time, and the elements. To sustain any type of building on this property, Soil levels will have to be eventually raised to match Losani's Grading.

Listing this property with the purposed designation, from my past experiences, and after receiving professional advice over the weekend, there is absolutely no doubt that this will deeply affect my property value. I am also in remission from cancer, and this is causing me unbearable stress.

Today this property sticks out like a sore thumb, and is totally out of character or fit. It is wedged beside a square commercial building, ( Ancaster water pump station) a purposed 9 story building a 92 town house development, and an endless sea of new construction down the road. I encourage you to drive by 1157 Garner Rd. and see for yourself.

1157 Garner is situated in a perfect location for high density. We need more intensification, efficiency and sustainability. ( Place to Grow 2006) It has the potential to serve as homes for 16 families, as there is a great need for more housing. It is close to shopping, and close to the airport. This development would be transit-supportive, as there are several bus routes across the street. It also would generate tax dollars for investments in infrastructure. ( sidewalks along Garner is much needed as I see students crossing the street on the stone shoulders, particularly dangerous in the winter with snow, and ice at Garner and Glanaster road.) This non designation would not benefit the overall community. The house was an inexpensive home to build, and retains no originality, visually or structurally. Is this really worth it? How much tax dollars in the exploration of this non-designation of 1157 Garner Rd. is this costing our tax payers?

Has the Ancaster Village Heritage Community/Hamilton Municipal Heritage Committee taken any of the above in consideration?

I think not.

Donato  
Cascioli












Sonoma Home's  
purposed 9 story  
Building


Görner Rd ↗

Ancaster  
Water  
Pump Station

1157 Görner Rd.

Losani's 92  
Unit Townhouse  
Complex







**Request to Speak to Committee of Council**

Submitted on Wednesday, January 27, 2021 - 2:27 pm

==Committee Requested==

**Committee:** Hamilton Municipal Heritage Committee

==Requestor Information==

**Name of Individual:** Carl Galli

**Name of Organization:** NGE Land Holdings Inc.

**Contact Number:** [REDACTED]

**Email Address:** [REDACTED]

**Mailing Address:**  
[REDACTED]

**Reason(s) for delegation request:** 34 Lloyminn Ave  
Ancaster - property owned by our company being considered  
for the Municipal Heritage Register.

**Will you be requesting funds from the City?** No

**Will you be submitting a formal presentation?** No

## Inventory & Research Working Group

### Meeting

Monday, November 23, 2020 (6:00 pm)

City of Hamilton Webex Virtual Meeting

Present: Janice Brown (Chair); Ann Gillespie, Secretary; Alissa Denham-Robinson; Graham Carroll; Lyn Lunsted; Rammy Saini; Jim Charlton

Regrets: Joachim Brower; Brian Kowalesicz; Chuck Dimitry

Also present: Miranda Brunton (City of Hamilton, Cultural Heritage Planners)  
Alissa Golden (Heritage Project Specialist)

#### 1. Chair's Remarks

Janice welcomed all present.

#### 2. Declarations of Interest

None

#### 3. Review & Approval of Meeting Notes October 26, and November 9, 2020

Approved with one minor revision to the October 26 notes.

#### 4. Places of Education Update

There were no updates from members assigned to the various wards, with research on hold until archival facilities open up again to the general public.

#### 5. Former Mount Hamilton Hospital (Juravinski Complex), 711 Concession Street

Graham had hoped to find the name of the builder but was unable to do so. He agreed to wrap up his research to complete the Preliminary Evaluation for presentation to the Working Group at its next regular meeting in January 2021.

#### 6. 62 Concession Road 6, East Flamborough – Preliminary Evaluation for House and Barn

NOTE: For background see August 24, 2020 meeting notes.

Lyn advised that the barn had already been demolished (with or without a demolition permit). The 60-acre property, including a large pond, and a late 19<sup>th</sup> century farmhouse has, otherwise been well-maintained. For the purpose of

listing the property on the Heritage Register, Lyn agreed to do some more research and complete a Preliminary Evaluation for the next regular meeting in January 2021.

## **7. Places of Worship Review, Dundas Listings**

Ann presented two more places of worship in Dundas: St. Mark's United Church at 1 Lynndale Drive and the former New Apostolic Church. After Ann's presentation and some discussion, a consensus was reached on the following classifications and future recommendations for each building.

St. Mark's United Church: a *character-defining resource*; add to the Heritage Register (non-designated).

Former New Apostolic Church: an *inventory property*; no action required.

The rationale for these classifications and recommendations is provided by the Inventory Form, Documentation and Preliminary Evaluation for each building. (See City Share Link <https://cityshare.hamilton.ca/s/rLsGt4f8fpW9GMz>) Ann will continue with this review process for four more places of worship, thereby, completing all of the pre-1967 non-designated properties.

## **8. Other Business – a) Resignation of Ann Gillespie as Secretary b) Update of Tracking Table for POW**

- a) Ann announced that she would be resigning as Secretary following our December Meeting. Rammy Saini offered to assume this role for 1 year. Ann was thanked for her outstanding efforts on behalf of the I&R WG. She will be missed both as Secretary and as an extremely competent researcher for I&R WG.
- b) Alissa will update the POW Tracking Table to determine the next Ward to be evaluated and what wards are incomplete.

## **9. Meeting Adjournment and Next Meeting Date**

The meeting was adjourned around 7:45.  
Next special inventory meeting: December 7, 2020.

**MEETING NOTES**  
**POLICY AND DESIGN WORKING GROUP**

Monday November 19, 2020

9:30 am

City of Hamilton Web Ex Virtual Meeting

---

Attendees: A. Denham- Robinson, C. Dimitry, B. Janssen, L. Lunsted, R. McKee, W. Rosart, C. Priamo

Regrets: K.Stacey,

Also Present: M. Brunton

---

**THE POLICY AND DESIGN WORKING GROUP NOTES FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE HAMILTON MUNICIPAL HERITAGE COMMITTEE WITH RESPECT TO:**

**(a) CHANGES TO THE AGENDA**

None

**(b) DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

- C. Dimity indicated that, as a member of the Permit Review Sub-Committee he was aware of various permits which had been applied for and he may have pre-conceived ideas regarding the property.
- C. Priamo indicated that she was also aware of previous history of the property

**(c) REVIEW OF PAST MEETING NOTES**

- Clarifications: R. McKee noted that in section e) Plaquing Policy, the blue plaques were for buildings on the inventory, not the register, and that this correction should be made to the meeting notes.
- C. Priamo asked for clarification regarding the buildings at 202 Cannon St.W. and 79-81 Cathcart St.: are they all coming down, and are we requesting additional information from the developer? M. Brunton advised that yes, all buildings were due to be demolished, and that the group was ok with the recommendations.

**October 19, 2020:**

Notes as corrected , approved.

**(d) C.H.I.A. – 1 property**

**Farmer's Rest Hotel – 207 King Street West, Dundas, Ontario**

An overview of the proposed changes was given by Miranda Brunton (City of Hamilton). Although the subject property is a designated property, the heritage permit was applied for, to go ahead with several changes to the building.

- Proposed development:
  - o Interior renovations to allow for 4 residential units
  - o New roofline dormers and free standing balconies
  - o A new surface on the existing parking lot
  - o New soft landscaping
  - o New storm water management

Working Group Members noted the following regarding the CHIA in general:

- o L. Lunsted would like a history of the changes/alterations which have already been made to the building.
- o C. Priamo noted that the Permit Review committee had not seen the proposed roofline changes.
- o C. Dimitry would like to see more details on the proposed landscaping – is the whole property going to be redone and what are the cultural heritage impacts of this.
- Review of the proposed changes:
  - o In general, the working group liked the rear additions and the new windows. The open design allows the original brickwork to show through
  - o They agreed that getting rid of the front dormer window was a good thing
  - o The group was unanimous in their dislike of the proposed front façade
    - C. Priamo felt the proposed changes would destroy the Georgian roofline which is one of the protected attributes.
    - C. Dimitry also wondered if the roof changes were set back further, would that make a difference? He also felt that for storm water management having something more sympathetic to the 1890s such as scuppers would be better.
    - B. Janssen felt that the addition completely changed the look of the building. He wanted to know what kind of permits were being applied for. M. Brunton indicated that the more recent additions (such as the dormer and roof) on the building were excluded as heritage attributes in the by-law and, as such, Heritage Permits were not required for alteration to these elements.
    - R. McKee requested more information as to the water management design at the rear of the building. He also would like more details as to what is happening on the interior. M. Brunton advised that the water management design has not yet been approved.
    - W. Rosart felt the proposed new structure on the roofline adversely affects the character of the neighbourhood.

**Recommendations regarding the CHIA for 207 King Street West, Dundas**

- That the applicant provide alternative designs more in keeping with the heritage design of the building.

**Other Comments:**

- Perhaps the proposed new addition could be clad in brick to tie it to the existing building, rather than making so different.
- Has there been any discussion regarding interpretive plaques, which may attract people to the retail portion of the building?
- Is there going to be barrier-free access? It is not obvious in the drawings but the engineering permit may address this.
- How are signs for the retail stores going to be handled? Will there be any kind of stipulation keeping them in line with the heritage character of the building?

**(e) OTHER BUSINESS**

- R. McKee had been contacted by the owner of the parsonage at 1073 West 5<sup>th</sup> as he was concerned about development around him. M. Brunton advised that the information had been passed onto the appropriate department and they would contact the property owner.
- W. Rosart advised that the Historic Hamilton Architecture Facebook page had wonderful photos taken by Jim Charlton of the Copley Noyes building and he wondered what the status of the building was. R. McKee said that there were issues when the NOID was done in the 1980s. The by-law was not passed but M. Brunton indicated that the building is considered a designated building. Under the updates to the Ontario Heritage Act projected to come into effect in January 2021, there is a one year grace period to clean up all outstanding NOIDs. These comments will be passed on to D. Addington, the Cultural Heritage Planner for the Urban area.

**(f) ADJOURNMENT**

The Policy & Design Working Group Meeting adjourned at 10:45 am.

**Next meeting date:** To be determined



Hamilton

Mailing Address:  
71 Main Street West  
Hamilton, Ontario  
Canada L8P 4Y5  
www.hamilton.ca

Planning and Economic Development Department  
Planning Division  
71 Main Street West, 5th Floor, Hamilton, Ontario, L8P 4Y5  
Phone: 905-546-2424, Ext. 4281  
Fax: 905-540-5611

FILE: HP2020-33

November 13, 2020

Applicant – Daniel Cheatley  
751 Lansdown Ave  
Toronto, On  
M6H 3Y9

**Re: Heritage Permit Application HP2020-033:  
Proposed alterations to 207-209 King Street West, Dundas (Ward 13)  
(By-law 3310-81)**

---

Please be advised that pursuant to By-law No. 05-364, as amended by By-law No. 07-322, which delegates the power to consent to alterations to designated property under the *Ontario Heritage Act* to the Director of Planning and Chief Planner, Heritage Permit Application HP2020-033 is approved for the designated property at 207-209 King Street West, Dundas, in accordance with the submitted Heritage Permit Application for the following alterations:

- Repointing of all the masonry elements, including the brick and limestone elements, on the south and west street facing elevations;
- Repointing and repair of masonry parapets;
- Installation of wooden panels below the large commercial windows on the south elevation; and,
- Installation of new storm water management downspout leaders on the south, street facing elevation.

Subject to the following conditions:

- a) That the applicant shall not proceed with the installation of the stormwater management downspout leaders until finalization of the engineering review by the City's Growth Management Division as part of Minor Site Plan application MDA-20-052;
- b) Any minor changes to the plans and elevations following approval shall be submitted, to the satisfaction and approval of the Director of Planning and Chief Planner, prior to submission as part of any application for a Building Permit and / or the commencement of any alterations; and,

Re: Heritage Permit Application HP2020-033:  
Proposed alterations to 207-209 King Street West,  
Dundas (Ward 13) (By-law 3310-81)

November 13, 2020  
Page 2 of 2


- c) Installation of the alterations, in accordance with this approval, shall be completed no later than November 30, 2022. If the alterations are not completed by November 30, 2022, then this approval expires as of that date and no alterations shall be undertaken without a new approval issued by the City of Hamilton.

Please note that this property is designated under Part IV of the *Ontario Heritage Act*, and that this permit is only for the above-noted alterations. Any departure from the approved plans and specifications is prohibited, and could result in penalties, as provided for by the *Ontario Heritage Act*. The terms and conditions of this approval may be appealed to the Conservation Review Board within 30 days of your receipt of this permit.

The issuance of this permit under the *Ontario Heritage Act* is not a waiver of any of the provisions of any By-law of the City of Hamilton, the requirements of the *Building Code Act*, the *Planning Act*, or any other applicable legislation.

We wish you success with your project, and if you have any further questions please feel free to contact Miranda Brunton, Cultural Heritage Planner, at 905-546-2424 ext. 1202 or via email at [Miranda.brunton@hamilton.ca](mailto:Miranda.brunton@hamilton.ca).

Yours truly,



Steve Robichaud, MCIP RPP  
Director of Planning and Chief Planner

cc: Miranda Brunton, Cultural Heritage Planner  
Chantal Costa, Plan Examination Secretary  
John Lane, Manager, Building Inspections  
Loren Kolar, Legislative Coordinator  
Christine Vernem, Legislative Secretary  
Tamara Reid, Supervisor-Operations and Enforcement MLE  
Councillor Arlene VanderBeek, Ward 13



Mailing Address:  
71 Main Street West  
Hamilton, Ontario  
Canada L8P 4Y5  
www.hamilton.ca

Planning and Economic Development Department  
Planning Division  
71 Main Street West, 5th Floor, Hamilton, Ontario, L8P 4Y5  
Phone: 905-546-2424, Ext. 1214  
Fax: 905-540-5611

FILE: HP2020-036

December 8, 2020

Harry Stinson  
134 Mary Street  
Hamilton, ON  
L8R 1K5

**Re: Heritage Permit Application HP2020-036:  
Addition to the west face of the northeast wing to facilitate the installation  
of an elevator shaft and storage area at 601 Barton Street East, Hamilton  
(Ward 3) (By-law No. 16-334)**

---

Please be advised that pursuant to By-law No. 05-364, as amended by By-law No. 07-322, which delegates the power to consent to alterations to designated property under the *Ontario Heritage Act* to the Director of Planning and Chief Planner, Heritage Permit Application HP2020-036 is approved for the designated property at 601 Barton Street East, Hamilton, in accordance with the submitted Heritage Permit application for the following alterations:

- Addition to the west face of the northeast wing to facilitate the installation of an elevator shaft and storage area.

Subject to the following conditions:

- a) Any minor changes to the plans and elevations following approval shall be submitted, to the satisfaction and approval of the Director of Planning and Chief Planner, prior to submission as part of any application for a Building Permit and / or the commencement of any alterations;
- b) Implementation of the alterations, in accordance with this approval, shall be completed no later than December 31, 2022. If the alterations are not completed by December 31, 2022, then this approval expires as of that date and no alterations shall be undertaken without a new approval issued by the City of Hamilton;

**Re: Heritage Permit Application HP2020-036:  
Addition to the west face of the northeast wing to  
facilitate the installation of an elevator shaft and  
storage area at 601 Barton Street East, Hamilton  
(Ward 3) (By-law No. 16-334)**

**December 8, 2020**

**Page 2 of 2**


- c) That the final cladding materials for the proposed addition shall be submitted prior to any alterations, to the satisfaction and approval of the Director of Planning and Chief Planner; and,
- d) That the proposed alterations are not commenced until the applicant receives final approval of Site Plan Control application DA-15-185 to the satisfaction of the Manager of Development Planning, Heritage and Design.

Please note that this property is designated under Part IV of the *Ontario Heritage Act*, and that this permit is only for the above-noted alterations. Any departure from the approved plans and specifications is prohibited, and could result in penalties, as provided for by the *Ontario Heritage Act*. The terms and conditions of this approval may be appealed to the Conservation Review Board within 30 days of your receipt of this permit.

The issuance of this permit under the *Ontario Heritage Act* is not a waiver of any of the provisions of any By-law of the City of Hamilton, the requirements of the *Building Code Act*, the *Planning Act*, or any other applicable legislation.

We wish you success with your project, and if you have any further questions please feel free to contact David Addington, Cultural Heritage Planner, at 905-546-2424 ext.1214, or via email at [David.Addington@hamilton.ca](mailto:David.Addington@hamilton.ca).

Yours truly,



Steve Robichaud, MCIP RPP  
Director of Planning and Chief Planner

cc: David Addington, Cultural Heritage Planner  
Chantal Costa, Plan Examination Secretary  
John Lane, Manager, Building Inspections  
Tamara Reid, Supervisor-Operations and Enforcement MLE  
Loren Kolar, Legislative Coordinator  
Christine Vernem, Legislative Secretary  
Councillor Nrinder Nann, Ward 3



Hamilton

Mailing Address:  
71 Main Street West  
Hamilton, Ontario  
Canada L8P 4Y5  
www.hamilton.ca

Planning and Economic Development Department  
Planning Division  
71 Main Street West, 5th Floor, Hamilton, Ontario, L8P 4Y5  
Phone: 905-546-2424, Ext. 1214  
Fax: 905-540-5611

FILE: HP2020-037

December 8, 2020

Victoria Schutte  
912 Beach Boulevard  
Hamilton, ON  
L8H 6Z4

**Re: Heritage Permit Application HP2020-037:  
Enclosure of the second storey balcony, alterations to the lower storey porch and installation of window shutters at 912 Beach Boulevard, Hamilton (HCD) (Ward 5) (By-law No. 00-135)**

---

Please be advised that pursuant to By-law No. 05-364, as amended by By-law No. 07-322, which delegates the power to consent to alterations to designated property under the *Ontario Heritage Act* to the Director of Planning and Chief Planner, Heritage Permit Application HP2020-037 is approved for the designated property at 912 Beach Boulevard, Hamilton, in accordance with the submitted Heritage Permit Application for the following alterations:

- Enclosure of the second storey balcony, alterations to the lower storey porch and installation of window shutters, including:
  - Second storey balcony enclosure: a single window centered in the middle of the porch surrounding with white wood siding and gable clad with wooden shakes; and,
  - Lower storey porch: white wood columns will be square with carved panel relief and metal black railing and balusters.

Subject to the following conditions:

- a) Any minor changes to the plans and elevations following approval shall be submitted, to the satisfaction and approval of the Director of Planning and Chief Planner, prior to submission as part of any application for a Building Permit and / or the commencement of any alterations; and,

**Re: Heritage Permit Application HP2020-037:  
Enclosure of the second storey balcony, alterations to  
the lower storey porch and installation of window  
shutters at 912 Beach Boulevard, Hamilton (HCD)  
(Ward 5) (By-law No. 77-287)**

**December 8, 2020  
Page 2 of 2**


- b) Implementation of the alterations, in accordance with this approval, shall be completed no later than December 31, 2022. If the alterations are not completed by December 31, 2022, then this approval expires as of that date and no alterations shall be undertaken without a new approval issued by the City of Hamilton.

Please note that this property is designated under Part V of the *Ontario Heritage Act*, and that this permit is only for the above-noted alterations. Any departure from the approved plans and specifications is prohibited, and could result in penalties, as provided for by the *Ontario Heritage Act*. The terms and conditions of this approval may be appealed to the Conservation Review Board within 30 days of your receipt of this permit.

The issuance of this permit under the *Ontario Heritage Act* is not a waiver of any of the provisions of any By-law of the City of Hamilton, the requirements of the *Building Code Act*, the *Planning Act*, or any other applicable legislation.

We wish you success with your project, and if you have any further questions please feel free to contact David Addington, Cultural Heritage Planner, at 905-546-2424 ext.1214, or via email at David.Addington@hamilton.ca.

Yours truly,



Steve Robichaud, MCIP RPP  
Director of Planning and Chief Planner

cc: David Addington, Cultural Heritage Planner  
Chantal Costa, Plan Examination Secretary  
John Lane, Manager, Building Inspections  
Tamara Reid, Supervisor-Operations and Enforcement MLE  
Loren Kolar, Legislative Coordinator  
Christine Vernem, Legislative Secretary  
Councillor Chad Collins, Ward 5



Hamilton

Mailing Address:  
71 Main Street West  
Hamilton, Ontario  
Canada L8P 4Y5  
www.hamilton.ca

Planning and Economic Development Department  
Planning Division  
71 Main Street West, 5th Floor, Hamilton, Ontario, L8P 4Y5  
Phone: 905-546-2424, Ext. 4281  
Fax: 905-540-5611

**FILE: HP2020-041**

December 16, 2020

McCallum Sather Architects  
c/o Christina Karney ([Christinak@mccalumsather.com](mailto:Christinak@mccalumsather.com))  
c/o Cecilia Nin Hernandez ([cecilian@mccallumsather.com](mailto:cecilian@mccallumsather.com))  
286 Sanford Ave North,  
Hamilton, ON  
L8L 6A1

Hue Developments & Investments Canada Inc.  
c/o Luke and Michael Wywrot ([Lukas@lch.to](mailto:Lukas@lch.to))  
5 Allan Avenue  
Toronto, ON  
M4M 1T5

**Re: Heritage Permit Application HP2020-041:  
Renewal of previously-approved but lapsed Heritage Permit (HP2018-044)  
Redevelopment of 98 James Street South, Hamilton (former James Street  
Baptist Church) (Ward 2)**

---

**Note: This Heritage Permit application is the same as HP2018-044, which was approved on December 7, 2018 with condition (b) expiring December 30, 2020. It is being re-issued as HP2020-041 to extend the date for the completion of alterations as the proposed work will not be completed by December 30, 2020.**

Please be advised that pursuant to By-law No. 05-364, as amended by By-law No. 07-322, which delegates the power to consent to alterations to designated property under the *Ontario Heritage Act* to the Director of Planning and Chief Planner, Heritage Permit Application HP2018-044 is approved for the property located at 98 James Street South, Hamilton, in accordance with the submitted Heritage Permit Application for the following alterations:

- To renew previously-approved (but lapsed) Heritage Permit (HP2018-044), notably the following:
  - Retention of the existing front (east) façade and corner towers on James Street South in situ, including all existing windows, doors and other features (the “retained portions”);

**Re: Heritage Permit Application HP2020-041:  
Renewal of previously-approved but lapsed Heritage  
Permit (HP2018-044) Redevelopment of 98 James  
Street South, Hamilton (former James Street Baptist  
Church) (Ward 2)**

**December 16, 2020  
Page 2 of 4**

- Salvage and reuse of features and materials from the removed portions of the building (the “salvaged portions”); and,
- Construction of a new building and / or addition on the remainder of the site and attached to the retained portions (the “new building”).

Subject to the following conditions:

- a) That any minor changes to the plans and elevations following approval shall be submitted, to the satisfaction and approval of the Director of Planning and Chief Planner, prior to submission as part of any application for a Building Permit and / or the commencement of any alterations;
- b) That implementation of the alterations, in accordance with this approval, shall be completed no later than December 31, 2022. If the alterations are not completed by December 31, 2022, then this approval expires as of that date and no alterations shall be undertaken without a new approval issued by the City of Hamilton;
- c) That the applicant submit, on a monthly basis, ongoing monitoring reports assessing and outlining the condition of the retained portions to City staff;
- d) That the applicant provide a written update to City staff on the current condition of the site and existing salvaged features which remain;
- e) That, once the alterations are complete, the owner shall agree to appropriate amendments to the Heritage Conservation Easement agreement to reflect the altered building; and,
- f) That a Conservation Plan consisting of the following items shall be submitted to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning and Chief Planner prior to the commencement of any alterations:
  - I. Documentation of the existing building and its architectural features and finishes in situ.
  - II. Specifications and methodology for the protection, stabilization, and restoration of the retained portions.
  - III. Inventory of the existing architectural features and building materials and a methodology for salvaging these features and materials from the removed portions.

**Re: Heritage Permit Application HP2020-041:  
Renewal of previously-approved but lapsed Heritage  
Permit (HP2018-044) Redevelopment of 98 James  
Street South, Hamilton (former James Street Baptist  
Church) (Ward 2)**

**December 16, 2020  
Page 3 of 4**

- IV. A plan for the storage and protection of retained and salvaged heritage elements, including the on or off site storage location(s), environmental conditions and security, a schedule of regular inspections and monitoring, and any other protection measures as appropriate. In addition:
- i. If the storage location is to be changed, the new location and address shall be submitted to the satisfaction and approval of staff, prior to the removal of the heritage elements to a new storage facility.
  - ii. Any unsatisfactory environmental conditions or failures in the security measures shall be reported to Planning staff as soon as they are discovered and appropriate remedies shall be developed and approved by Planning staff prior to implementation, except in emergency situations.
  - iii. City staff shall be allowed reasonable access to inspect the heritage elements in storage, at any time.

Please note that this property is designated under Part V of the *Ontario Heritage Act* and subject to a Heritage Conservation Easement held by the City of Hamilton, and that this permit is only for the above-noted alterations. Any departure from the approved plans and specifications is prohibited, and could result in penalties, as provided for by the *Ontario Heritage Act* and the terms of the Heritage Conservation Easement Agreement. The terms and conditions of this approval may be appealed to the Conservation Review Board within 30 days of your receipt of this permit.

The issuance of this permit under the *Ontario Heritage Act* is not a waiver of any of the provisions of any By-law of the City of Hamilton, the requirements of the *Building Code Act*, the *Planning Act*, or any other applicable legislation.

We wish you success with your project, and if you have any further questions please feel free to contact David Addington, Cultural Heritage Planner, Cultural Heritage, at 905-546-2424 ext.1214, or via email at david.addington@hamilton.ca.

Yours truly,

**Anita**  
**Fabac**

Digitally signed  
by Anita Fabac  
Date: 2020.12.16  
14:05:11 -05'00'

Steve Robichaud, MCIP RPP  
Director of Planning and Chief Planner

**Re: Heritage Permit Application HP2020-041:  
Renewal of previously-approved but lapsed Heritage  
Permit (HP2018-044) Redevelopment of 98 James  
Street South, Hamilton (former James Street Baptist  
Church) (Ward 2)**

**December 16, 2020  
Page 4 of 4**

cc: Councillor Jason Farr, Ward 2  
Chantal Costa, Plan Examination Secretary  
John Lane, Manager, Building Inspections  
Christine Vernem, Legislative Secretary  
Loren Kolar, Legislative Coordinator  
Tamara Reid, Municipal Law Enforcement

# MEETING NOTES

## POLICY AND DESIGN WORKING GROUP

Monday December 7, 2020

9:00 am

City of Hamilton Web Ex Virtual Meeting

---

Attendees: C. Dimitry, B. Janssen, L. Lunsted, R. McKee, W. Rosart,

Regrets: C. Priamo , K.Stacey, A. Denham- Robinson

Also Present: D. Addington

---

### THE POLICY AND DESIGN WORKING GROUP NOTES FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE HAMILTON MUNICIPAL HERITAGE COMMITTEE WITH RESPECT TO:

**(a) CHANGES TO THE AGENDA**

None

**(b) DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

None

**(c) REVIEW OF PAST MEETING NOTES**

**Notes of November 19, 2020:**

Notes approved.

**(d) C.H.I.A. – 1 property: 101 King Street East, Hamilton**

An overview of the proposed changes was given by David Addington, (City of Hamilton). The subject property is listed on the Municipal Heritage Register and is located within the Gore Park Cultural Landscape.

- Proposed development:

- Adding 3 storeys to the existing 3 storey building. This building is structurally sound.
- Remove an existing 1-storey addition at the rear to allow for a 7 storey addition
- Integrate the existing interior to the new addition
- Remove existing cladding and repair existing brick exterior using original brick where possible
- Remove existing windows which are not original

Working Group Members noted the following regarding the CHIA in general:

- In general, the working group liked the concept and was happy to see that existing brick would be used. The integration of the existing building into the design is very well done.
- Review of the proposed changes:
  - The group was unanimous in their dislike of the proposed cube structures on the front of the 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> storey. Although the CHIA indicates that the cubes are intentionally designed to contrast with the heritage aspects of the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> storeys, the group felt they were too drastic a contrast.
    - C. Dimitry suggested that perhaps the cantilever on the 5<sup>th</sup> storey could be set back. He also wondered if there were any plans to leave some of the interior joists exposed as they are the only interior heritage feature left.
    - B. Janssen liked the proposed use of the brick and the work on the heritage features
    - L. Lunsted wondered if they could frame the cube in brick, similar to the building at 185 King St. E., to soften the look of the cube.
    - The group also suggested that the window glazing could be simplified
    - The cube shape is evident in several surrounding buildings but the impact of those is not as jarring. Some are set back so they are not as visible from the street.

**Recommendations regarding the CHIA for 101 King Street East, Hamilton**

- That the applicant provide alternative designs more in keeping with the heritage design of the building.

**(e) OTHER BUSINESS**

- R. McKee asked what the status was concerning the designation of Gore Park. D. Addington replied that it is still being worked on. There is also no change to the status of the Auchmar Gate House.
- 

**(f) ADJOURNMENT**

The Policy & Design Working Group Meeting adjourned at 9:45 am.

**Next meeting date:** To be determined

**MINUTES OF THE HAMILTON HERITAGE PERMIT REVIEW SUB-COMMITTEE**

**Tuesday, November 17, 2020**

**Present:** Melissa Alexander, Diane Dent, Charles Dimitry (Chair), Andy MacLaren, Carol Priamo, Tim Ritchie (Vice Chair), John Scime, Stefan Spolnik,

**Attending Staff:** David Addington, Miranda Brunton, June Christy, Shannon McKie

**Absent with Regrets:** Steve Wiegand

Meeting was called to order by the Chairman, Charles Dimitry, at 4:00pm

**1) Approval of Minutes from Previous Meetings: October 20, 2020**

Motion on overall minutes moved by – Carol Priamo

Seconded – Tim Ritchie

Carried by unanimous vote, no objections

## 2) Heritage Permit Applications

- a. HP2020-035: 52 Charlton Avenue West, Hamilton
- Scope of work - alterations to the exterior and interior of the building to facilitate its adaptive reuse including:
    - Interior:
      - reconfiguring of the internal partition walls on each floor to change the use of each room
      - removal of the kitchen, laundry and pantry on the ground floor and construction of new kitchen, bathroom and rooms on the upper floors
      - removal and salvage of existing central staircase and reconstruction of staircase in the rear portion of the building
      - relocation of three existing fireplaces
      - removal of built in cabinet in former dining room
      - removal of a portion of the plaster moulding on north partition wall of former living room and replication of the moulding along length of new main hall wall
      - removal of one existing hallway arch on the second storey and replication of the arch in three areas of the second storey
      - removal of window surrounds on three second storey windows on east elevation
      - replacement of existing wood and sash windows with aluminium replications\*
    - Exterior:
      - reinstatement of the original entry on the front façade and re-bricking of existing entry
      - removal of existing two storey front porch and deck and reconstruction of a smaller porch similar to the building's original front porch
      - construction of second storey porch and deck off the east elevation including creating door openings from three existing second storey windows
      - removal of the single storey pergared room on the rear elevation and alterations to the rear wall to building a new two storey, rear addition and basement garage
      - extension of the rear roof with a gable profile and reconstruction of the wood bracketed eaves along the rear roof elevation

- enlargement of the length of the west elevation roof dormer

Sheldon Salada, the property owner and James Neilson of ASI, spoke to the sub committee at the permit review.

The Sub-committee considered the application and together with input from the applicant and advice from staff, passed the following motions:

That the Heritage Permit Review Sub-committee advises that Heritage Permit application HP2020-035 be consented to, subject to the following conditions:

- a) That any minor changes to the plans and elevations following approval shall be submitted, to the satisfaction and approval of the Director of Planning and Chief Planner, prior to submission as part of any application for a Building Permit and / or the commencement of any alterations; and,
- b) Installation of the alterations, in accordance with this approval, shall be completed no later than November 30, 2023. If the alteration(s) are not completed by November 30, 2023, then this approval expires as of that date and no alterations shall be undertaken without a new approval issued by the City of Hamilton.
- c) That a Conservation Plan consisting of the following items shall be submitted to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning and Chief Planner prior to the commencement of any alterations:
  - i. Documentation of the existing building and its architectural features and finishes in situ;
  - ii. Specifications and methodology for the protection, stabilization, and restoration of the retained portions and details of the new construction;
  - iii. Inventory of the existing architectural features and building materials and a methodology for salvaging these features and materials from the altered areas of the building;
  - iv. A plan for the off site salvage of any heritage elements where it is demonstrated that the on site conservation, rehabilitation and reuse of cultural heritage resources is not viable; and,

d) That the Owner prepare amended Appendices “B” and “C” to the Heritage Conservation Easement showing the changes made to the heritage attributes within 90 days of the substantial completion of the work, to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning and Chief Planner.

Motion for permit conditions a) b) c) and d) moved by – Tim Ritchie  
Seconded – Andy MacLaren

Carried by a 5-3 sub committee vote

- John, Andy, Tim, Chuck, Carol FOR
- Diane, Melissa, and Stefan AGAINST

- b. HP2020-036: 601 Barton Street East, Hamilton
- Scope of work - addition to the west face of the northeast wing to allow the installation of an elevator shaft and storage area.
  - Reason for work – to facilitate the adaptive reuse of the former school property to residential use. Placing the elevator system adjacent to the existing building rather than internally allows for the preservation of the grand scale and materials of the internal hallway while providing accessibility for all users of the without having to remove or change the interior of the structure. The location chosen is a façade that is distant from the street and has already been altered with the addition of the projecting stairwell (1960) and windows have been bricked in and enlarged

Harry Stinson, the developer and property owner, spoke to the sub committee at the review.

The Sub-committee considered the application and together with advice from staff, passed the following motion:

That the Heritage Permit Review Sub-committee advises that Heritage Permit application HP2020-036 be consented to, subject to the following conditions:

- a) That any minor changes to the plans and elevations following approval shall be submitted, to the satisfaction and approval of the Director of Planning and Chief Planner, prior to submission as part of any application for a Building Permit and / or the commencement of any alterations;
- b) Installation of the alterations, in accordance with this approval, shall be completed no later than November 30, 2022. If the alteration(s) are not completed by November 30, 2022, then this approval expires as of that date and no alterations shall be undertaken without a new approval issued by the City of Hamilton; and,
- c) That the final cladding materials for the proposed addition shall be submitted prior to any alterations, to the satisfaction and approval of the Director of Planning and Chief Planner.

Motion for permit conditions a) and b) and c) moved by – Melissa Alexander

Seconded – Tim Ritchie

Carried by unanimous vote, no objections

- c. HP2020-037: 912 Beach Boulevard, Hamilton
- Scope of work - enclosure of the second storey balcony, alterations to the lower storey porch and installation of shutters to the windows on the front façade, including:
    - Second storey balcony enclosure: a single window centered in the middle of the porch surrounding with white wood siding and gable clad with wooden shakes; and,
    - Lower storey porch: white wood columns will be square with carved panel relief and metal black railing and balusters.
  - Reason for work – to increase usability of porch due to concerns related to dirt accumulating on porch and to improve the appearance of lower porch and the front façade of the dwelling.

Victoria Schutte, the property owner, spoke to the sub committee at the review.

The Sub-committee considered the application and together with input from the applicant and advice from staff, passed the following motions:

That the Heritage Permit Review Sub-committee advises that Heritage Permit application HP2020-037 be consented to, subject to the following conditions:

- a) That any minor changes to the plans and elevations following approval shall be submitted, to the satisfaction and approval of the Director of Planning and Chief Planner, prior to submission as part of any application for a Building Permit and / or the commencement of any alterations; and,
- b) Installation of the alterations, in accordance with this approval, shall be completed no later than November 30, 2022. If the alteration(s) are not completed by November 30, 2022, then this approval expires as of that date and no alterations shall be undertaken without a new approval issued by the City of Hamilton.

Motion for permit conditions a) and b) moved by – Diane Dent  
Seconded – Tim Ritchie  
Carried by unanimous vote, no objections

- d. HP2020-038: 25 Mill Street North, Waterdown
- Scope of work - repairs to the cupola, including:
    - replacement of deteriorated cedar slats
    - wire netting will be installed inside the cupola
    - repainting of the entire cupola, to match existing colour with Allback linseed oil paint
    - repair of the weather vane
  - Reason for work – the cupola is in need of general repairs and repainting and netting is to be installed inside the cupola is for rodent control. Squirrels are getting into the attic space through the cupola. glazing

Melissa C. represented the owners at the review.

The Sub-committee considered the application and together with input from the applicant and advice from staff, passed the following motions:

That the Heritage Permit Review Sub-committee advises that Heritage Permit application HP2020-038 be consented to, subject to the following conditions:

- a) That any minor changes to the plans and elevations following approval shall be submitted, to the satisfaction and approval of the Director of Planning and Chief Planner, prior to submission as part of any application for a Building Permit and / or the commencement of any alterations; and,
- b) Installation of the alterations, in accordance with this approval, shall be completed no later than November 30, 2022. If the alteration(s) are not completed by November 30, 2022, then this approval expires as of that date and no alterations shall be undertaken without a new approval issued by the City of Hamilton.

Motion for permit conditions a) and b) moved by – Diane Dent  
Seconded – Andy MacLaren  
Carried by unanimous vote, no objections

- e. HP2020-039: 5 Mill Street North, Waterdown
- Scope of work – installation of security camera
  - Reason for work – required for operation of business tenant completed

Kendra McCalla, the store manager, represented the owners of the property at the review.

The Sub-committee considered the application and together with input from the applicant and advice from staff, passed the following motions:

That the Heritage Permit Review Sub-committee advises that Heritage Permit application HP2020-039 be consented to, subject to the following conditions:

- a) That any minor changes to the plans and elevations following approval shall be submitted, to the satisfaction and approval of the Director of Planning and Chief Planner, prior to submission as part of any application for a Building Permit and / or the commencement of any alterations; and,
- b) Installation of the alterations, in accordance with this approval, shall be completed no later than November 30, 2022. If the alteration(s) are not completed by November 30, 2022, then this approval expires as of that date and no alterations shall be undertaken without a new approval issued by the City of Hamilton.

Motion for permit conditions a) and b) moved by – Andy MacLaren  
Seconded – Melissa Alexander

Carried by unanimous vote, no objections

- f. HP2020-040: 157 Mill Street North, Waterdown
- Scope of work – removal of walnut trees along fence

Sue-Ann Ward represented the church at the review.

The Sub-committee considered the application and together with input from the applicant and advice from staff, passed the following motions:

That the Heritage Permit Review Sub-committee advises that Heritage Permit application HP2020-040 be consented to, subject to the following conditions:

- a) That any minor changes to the plans and elevations following approval shall be submitted, to the satisfaction and approval of the Director of Planning and Chief Planner, prior to submission as part of any application for a Building Permit and / or the commencement of any alterations; and,
- b) Installation of the alterations, in accordance with this approval, shall be completed no later than November 30, 2022. If the alteration(s) are not completed by November 30, 2022, then this approval expires as of that date and no alterations shall be undertaken without a new approval issued by the City of Hamilton.

Motion for permit conditions a) and b) moved by – Stefan Spolnik  
Seconded – Melissa Alexander  
Carried by unanimous vote, no objections

- 3) **Adjournment:** Meeting was adjourned at 7:05 pm  
Motion moved by – Tim Ritchie  
Seconded – Diane Dent  
Carried by unanimous vote, no objections

- 4) **Next Meeting:** Tuesday, November 17, 2020 from 4:30 – 8:30pm



Hamilton

# Summary of Heritage Activity 2014-2020

Hamilton Municipal Heritage Committee  
January 29, 2021

# 2020 - Register Additions

**100** properties added to the Register:

- Individual listings: **9**
- Batch Ancaster listings moved by the Ward Councillor : **32**
- Batch Beasley listings submitted by the Beasley Neighbourhood Association: **59**

# 2020 - Heritage Permits

- **41** Heritage Permit applications received and processed:



171 Forest Ave, Hamilton



50 Mill St North, Waterdown

# 2020 - Designations

3 properties designated

Designated:

- 24 Main Street West, Hamilton (Centenary United Church)
- 127 Hughson Street North, Hamilton (Firth Brothers)
- 1021 Garner Road East, Ancaster (Lampman House)



24 Main St W, Hamilton



127 Hughson St N, Hamilton



1021 Garner Rd E, Ancaster


# 2020 - NOID's Issued

## 4 NOID's Issued:

- 110-122 King Street East, Hamilton (Royal Connaught)
- 85 King Street East & 4-12 John Street North (Pagoda and Treble Hall)
- 828 Sanatorium Road, Hamilton (Long & Bisby Building)
- 1389 Progreston Road, Flamborough



110-122 King St E, Hamilton



4- 12 John St N, Hamilton



828 Sanatorium Rd, Hamilton

# Summary of Heritage Activity – 2014 - 2020

	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	Total
<b>Heritage Permits Processed</b>	56	45	47	71	47	41	41	348
<i>Delegated Approval</i>	51	37	33	66	38	40	41	306
<i>Undelegated (Staff Report to Council)</i>	5	8	11	2	*1			27
<i>Incomplete / Withdrawn</i>			3	3	8	1		15
<b>Register Listings</b>	746	12	4	737	14	15	100	1628
<i>Individual Listings</i>	10	12	4	4	14	15	9	68
<i>Batch Listings</i>	736			733			91	1560
<b>Designations Processed</b>	1	5	3	6	6	1	7	29
<i>NOIDs Only</i>			1				**4	5
<i>By-laws Passed</i>	1	5	2	6	6	1	3	24

\*This HP application was submitted in 2018 however Report PED19035 went to HMHC/PC in February 2019

\*\*This category includes the NOID for 1387 Progreston Rd - while the appeal period ended in 2020, the by-law is intended to be passed in 2021

# Inventory & Research Working Group

## Meeting Notes

Monday, December 7, 2020 (1:30 to 4 pm)

City of Hamilton Webex Virtual Meeting

Present: Janice Brown (Chair); Ann Gillespie, Secretary; Alissa Denham-Robinson; Graham Carroll; Lyn Lunsted; Chuck Dimitry; Rammy Saini

Regrets: Joachim Brower; Brian Kowalesicz; Jim Charlton

Also present: Alissa Golden (Heritage Project Specialist)  
Carol Priamo (Beasley Heritage Project and ACO Hamilton Region Branch Board)  
Shannon Kyles (ACO Hamilton Region Branch President)  
Bob Maton, President of the Ancaster Village Heritage Committee

### RECOMMENDATION:

#### **THE INVENTORY & RESEARCH WORKING GROUP RECOMMENDS THE FOLLOWING TO THE HAMILTON MUNICIPAL HERITAGE COMMITTEE:**

The Inventory & Research Working Group recommends that the 1932 Maternity Wing of the **Former Mount Hamilton Hospital, 711 Concession Street, Hamilton** be added to the Municipal Register of Properties of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest and to the staff work plan for heritage designation under the Ontario Heritage Act as a high priority (see Appendix A).

#### **1. Chair's Remarks**

Janice welcomed all present.

#### **2. Declarations of Interest**

None

#### **3. Review & Approval of Meeting Notes, November 23, 2020**

Approved by general consensus.

#### **4. Ancaster Village Heritage Committee (AVHC) – Inventory of pre-Confederation Buildings**

Janice introduced Bob Maton and congratulated him and his assistants/ advisors, Shannon Kyles, Carol Priamo and Laurie Brady, on their excellent inventory work completed with the assistance of about 20 volunteers and the professional guidance of Alissa Golden. A total of 109 properties were inventoried; 63 were identified as character-defining or character-supporting and recommended for addition to the Heritage Register. 12 were also identified as potential candidates for OHA designation,

to be added to the Designation Work Plan. The AVHC volunteers also plan on conducting additional research to support the future designation of these properties. The I&R WG supported the AVHC's recommendations for both additions to the Heritage Register and the Designation Work Plan.

While it will not be difficult to make a case for the pre-Confederation buildings in Ancaster, there is a huge backlog of properties on this work plan and a property can only be given a high priority status if it is under a perceived threat (e.g. demolition for a proposed development or by neglect). The short-term priorities for the Ancaster inventory work are properties located within the village core and Jerseyville. Bob indicated that with 20 volunteers divided into teams of two, each team was able to cover 10 to 11 buildings and he hopes that these volunteers will continue on with the post-Confederation buildings.

## 5. Places of Worship in Dundas Review

Ann completed her presentation of pre-1967 Places of Worship in Dundas for the last four properties to be reviewed. Following discussion, members agreed on the following classifications and recommendations:

NAME	ADDRESS	CLASSIFICATION	RECOMMENDATION
Former Dundas Baptist Church	108 Park Street West	character-defining	add to Register; potential candidate for OHA designation
Former Bluestone Church	280 King Street West	character-supporting	add to Register
Life Community Church	165 King Street West	character-supporting	add to Register
Christian Science Society	245 Mill Street	inventory	no action required

Given that the building complex of the former Dundas Baptist Church also includes a well-preserved private residence at 104 Park Street built in 1867 as the rectory, it was agreed that this property should also be recommended for inclusion on the Register.

Ann will update the reviewed Preliminary Evaluation forms. For the four post-1967 places of worship in Dundas, she will finish the photography work started in 2018 and for each of these properties complete an inventory form, documentation report and preliminary evaluation (as completed for the pre-1967 properties) for review at a regular or special meeting in 2021.

## 6. Places of Worship: Screening Process Summary and Next Steps

NOTE: The ward numbers are based on the pre-2018 ward boundaries.

Janice has lined up a student volunteer to work with her on completing inventory and evaluation forms for the places of worship in Ward 3. Alissa Denham-Robinson will provide an update for Ward 2 at the next I&R WG meeting. Alissa Golden will undertake the following:

- a) Update the Places of Worship Screening Process Summary to determine the next Ward to be evaluated and what wards are incomplete.
- b) Find a volunteer to complete the work started by Brian for Ward 5 or take this on herself.
- c) Do the same for Ward 1 as for Ward 5.
- d) Prepare a summary of draft recommendations for Stoney Creek for I&R WG's consideration, based on research undertaken and forms submitted by former member Kathy Wakeman but not yet reviewed by staff.
- e) Contact Lyn to confirm what work is outstanding for Flamborough (previously undertaken by Wilf Arndt and Sylvia Wray).
- f) Prepare the summary documents for Ancaster, Glanbrook and Hamilton Mountain (Wards 6, 7, 8).

#### **7. Former Mount Hamilton Hospital (1932 Maternity Wing), 711 Concession Street, Hamilton**

The I&R WG supported Graham's request to add this property to the Heritage Register and that it be tagged as a high priority for designation due to its endangered status. It is not under any immediate threat but is slated for demolition, to be replaced by a new \$1 billion Hamilton Health Sciences facility adjacent to the Juravinski Hospital. Graham will update his inventory and evaluation forms and send them to Alissa Golden, David Addington and Ann, to include with her notes for this meeting.

#### **8. Meeting Adjournment and Next Meeting Date**

The meeting was adjourned at 3:45 p.m.  
Next special inventory meeting: to be scheduled in 2021.

## APPENDIX A

Below you will find the following supporting documents for the 1932 Maternity Wing of the Former Mount Hamilton Hospital, 711 Concession Street, Hamilton:

1. Built Heritage Inventory Form with accompanying Write-Up and Images
2. Article: Mark McNeil (Dec. 7, 2020), "Tens of thousands of babies were born in historic Mountain Hospital now facing demolition," *The Hamilton Spectator*



# BUILT HERITAGE INVENTORY FORM

Address 711 Concession Street Community Hamilton  
 Also known as Juravinski Hospital Legal Description \_\_\_\_\_  
 P.I.N. \_\_\_\_\_ Roll No. \_\_\_\_\_ Ward 7 Neighbourhood East Hamilton

**Heritage Status:**  Inventory  Registered  Designated (Part IV / Part V)  Easement (City / OHT)  NHS  
 HCD (if applicable): \_\_\_\_\_ Cultural Heritage Landscape (if applicable): \_\_\_\_\_

**Property Status (Observed):**  Occupied Building  Vacant Building  Vacant Lot  Parking Lot

**Integrity:**  Preserved / Intact  Modified  Compromised  Demolished (date) \_\_\_\_\_

**Construction Period:**  Pre 1867  1868-1900  1901-1939  1940-1955  1956-1970  Post 1970  
 Year (if known) 1932 Architect / Builder / Craftsperson (if known) William Palmer Witton

**Massing:**  Single-detached  Semi-detached, related  Semi-detached, unrelated  Row, related  Row, unrelated  Other Hospital

**Storeys:**  1  1 ½  2  2 ½  3  3 ½  4 or more  Irregular  Other \_\_\_\_\_

**Foundation Construction Material:**  Stone  Brick  Concrete  Wood  Other \_\_\_\_\_ Finish: \_\_\_\_\_

**Building Construction Material:**  Brick  Frame (wood)  Stone  Log  Other Steel Frame Finish: \_\_\_\_\_

**Building Cladding:**  Wood  Stone  Brick  Stucco  Synthetic  Other \_\_\_\_\_ Finish: \_\_\_\_\_

**Roof Type:**  Hip  Flat  Gambrel  Mansard  Gable  Other \_\_\_\_\_ Type: \_\_\_\_\_

**Roof Materials:**  Asphalt Shingle  Wood Shingle  Slate  Tile/Terra Cotta  Tar/Gravel  Metal  Other \_\_\_\_\_

### Architectural Style / Influence:

- |   |   |   |  |  |
|---|---|---|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Art Deco / Moderne<br>(1920s-1950s) | <input type="checkbox"/> Craftsman / Prairie<br>(1900s-1930s) | <input type="checkbox"/> International<br>(1930-1965) | <input type="checkbox"/> Ontario Cottage<br>(1840-1900)    | <input type="checkbox"/> Romanesque Revival<br>(1850-1910) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Beaux-Arts Classicism<br>(1900-1945)           | <input type="checkbox"/> Colonial Revival<br>(1900-Present)   | <input type="checkbox"/> Italian Villa<br>(1830-1900) | <input type="checkbox"/> Period Revivals<br>(1900-Present) | <input type="checkbox"/> Second Empire<br>(1860-1900)      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Bungalow<br>(1900-1945)                        | <input type="checkbox"/> Edwardian<br>(1900-1930)             | <input type="checkbox"/> Italianate<br>(1850-1900)    | <input type="checkbox"/> Post-Modern<br>(1970-Present)     | <input type="checkbox"/> Vernacular                        |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Classical Revival<br>(1830-1860)               | <input type="checkbox"/> Georgian / Loyalist<br>(1784-1860)   | <input type="checkbox"/> Neo-Classical<br>(1800-1860) | <input type="checkbox"/> Queen Anne<br>(1880-1910)         | <input type="checkbox"/> Victory Housing<br>(1940-1950)    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Chateau<br>(1880-1940)                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Gothic Revival<br>(1830-1900)        | <input type="checkbox"/> Neo-Gothic<br>(1900-1945)    | <input type="checkbox"/> Regency<br>(1830-1860)            | <input type="checkbox"/> 1950s Contemporary<br>(1945-1965) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other  |   |   |  |  |

**Notable Building Features:**

- Porch: \_\_\_\_\_  Sill(s): \_\_\_\_\_  Tower/Spire  Bargeboard  Eaves: \_\_\_\_\_
- Verandah: \_\_\_\_\_  Lintel(s): \_\_\_\_\_  Dome  Transom  Verges: \_\_\_\_\_
- Balcony: \_\_\_\_\_  Shutters: \_\_\_\_\_  Finial  Side light  Dormer: \_\_\_\_\_
- Door(s) : \_\_\_\_\_  Quoins: \_\_\_\_\_  Pilaster  Pediment  Chimney: \_\_\_\_\_
- Stairs: \_\_\_\_\_  Voussoirs: \_\_\_\_\_  Capital  Woodwork  Parapet: \_\_\_\_\_
- Fire wall: \_\_\_\_\_  Cornice: \_\_\_\_\_  Panel  Date stone  Bay: \_\_\_\_\_
- Windows: \_\_\_\_\_  Column  Cresting  Other Oversize arches on balcony

Notes:

**Context:**

- Historic Context Statement:  Yes  No Name of HCS Area: \_\_\_\_\_
- Streetscape (Residential / Commercial)  Terrace / Row  Complex / Grouping  Landmark
- Multi-address parcel (list addresses): \_\_\_\_\_  Other \_\_\_\_\_
- Related buildings: \_\_\_\_\_

**Plan:**  Square  Rectangular  L  U  T  H  Cross  Irregular  Other \_\_\_\_\_

**Wings:** South side **Setback:**  Shallow  Deep  At ROW  Other \_\_\_\_\_  Corner Lot

**Accessory Features and Structures:**

- Features (e.g. stone wall, fountain): \_\_\_\_\_  Structures (e.g. shed, outbuilding): \_\_\_\_\_

**Additional Notes:**

This building with is massing and prominent location at the edge of the escarpme

**Related Files:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Fire Insurance Mapping:**

**Additional Documentation and Research Attached (if applicable):**

<b>Surveyed by:</b> Graham Carroll	<b>Date:</b> October 24th 2020	<b>Survey Area:</b>
<b>Staff Reviewer:</b>	<b>Date:</b>	

# PRELIMINARY EVALUATION

<b>Physical / Design Value:</b>	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The property's style, type or expression is: <input type="checkbox"/> rare <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> unique <input type="checkbox"/> representative <input type="checkbox"/> early
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The property displays a high degree of: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> craftsmanship <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> artistic merit
<input type="checkbox"/>	The property demonstrates a high degree of: <input type="checkbox"/> technical achievement <input type="checkbox"/> scientific achievement
<b>Historical / Associative Value:</b>	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The property has direct associations with a potentially significant: <input type="checkbox"/> theme <input type="checkbox"/> event <input type="checkbox"/> belief <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> person <input type="checkbox"/> activity <input type="checkbox"/> organization <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> institution
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The property yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of a community or culture
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The property demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of a potentially significant: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> architect <input type="checkbox"/> artist <input type="checkbox"/> builder <input type="checkbox"/> designer <input type="checkbox"/> theorist
<b>Contextual Value:</b>	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The property is important in: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> defining <input type="checkbox"/> maintaining <input type="checkbox"/> supporting the character of the area
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The property is linked to its surroundings: <input type="checkbox"/> physically <input type="checkbox"/> functionally <input type="checkbox"/> visually <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> historically
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The property is a landmark

**Classification:**

- Significant Built Resource (SBR)
- Character-Defining Resource (CDR)
- Character-Supporting Resource (CSR)
- Inventory Property (IP)
- Remove from Inventory (RFI)
- None

**Recommendation:**

- Add to Designation Work Plan
- Include in Register (Non-designated)
- Remove from Register (Non-designated)
- Add to Inventory – Periodic Review
- Inventory – No Further Review (Non-extant)
- No Action Required

<b>Evaluated by:</b> Graham Carroll	<b>Date:</b> October 24th 2020
<b>HMHC Advice:</b>	<b>Date</b>
<b>Planning Committee Advice:</b>	<b>Date:</b>
<b>Council Decision:</b>	<b>Date:</b>
<b>Database/GIS Update:</b>	<b>AMANDA Update:</b>

## The Mount Hamilton Hospital Maternity Wing

This building designed by prominent Hamilton architect William Palmer Witton is a unique remaining structure in all of Hamilton.

Witton and his various firms also designed other prominent structures in the city and beyond. Some of these other structures have already obtained Designation and protection under the Ontario Heritage Act. 198 St. Clair Boulevard, 255 West Avenue, addition to the former West Avenue School and the Chancel addition to Christ's Church Cathedral. Other notable buildings on the registry include the South Drill Hall of the John Weir Foote Armoury, the Playhouse Theatre on Sherman avenue north and the nurses residence (Patterson Building) at 672 Sanatorium road.

The maternity wing started construction in 1931 and was completed in 1932 by the City of Hamilton using local tax dollars as a much needed expansion of capacity for the care of city's citizens. Due to budget constraints the building was not equipped or opened until 1938. Since that time the building has seen to the healthcare needs of many new mothers and children and later after the maternity section was closed as a general purpose hospital and lately as a rehabilitation ward.

With its Art Moderne stone lines on the lower two floors and upper four floors of brick cladding there are none like it in Hamilton. The lines do remind one of the facade of the Pigott but the pilasters are more ornate on the maternity wing. The only building with a larger balcony is in McMaster Innovation Park, the former Camco Office building. But it is much plainer and lacks the vaulted plaster ceilings.

With the large massing near the edge of the escarpment it can be seen from nearly the entire lower part of Hamilton. The remaining open balcony of the sixth floor is a feature not present in any other buildings I recall remaining in the city. With oversized stone arches, vaulted plaster ceilings, stone sills and rear brick arches the beauty is unmatched. The view from this balcony is quite stunning and was for the health benefit of the patients and babies of the wing.

This building requires protection and if the Hospital is to expand it should be incorporated into the design plan so all Hamiltonians can continue to enjoy its beauty and history.

Graham Carroll.



Image courtesy of Hamilton Public Library




Image courtesy of Vintage Hamilton




Image courtesy Old Hamilton Photos





This classical stone portico is dedicated to the memory of the nurses who cared for patients at this site.

The Mount Hamilton Hospital (opened 1917) and  
The Nora Frances Henderson Hospital (opened 1954).

The portico was designed by architect W.P. Witton for the 1931 addition to the Nurses' Residence that stood on Poplar Avenue from 1917 to 2010.

Today, the nurses of Hamilton Health Sciences continue the tradition of caring and commitment to excellence that their predecessors established so long ago.





Own Pictures.

# Tens of thousands of babies were born in historic Mountain Hospital now facing demolition

By [Mark McNeil](#) Contributing Columnist  
Mon., Dec. 7, 2020 timer4 min. read



Yet another historic hospital building on the Mountain brow is being threatened by the wrecker's ball.

And this one seems to be the most doomed of them all.

The former Mount Hamilton Hospital, that was built in 1931 and 1932 on Mountain Park Avenue, is in the way of a massive \$1 billion, multi-year expansion of Juravinski Hospital. And Hamilton Health Sciences officials say they plan to demolish it.

The news comes after major heritage preservation battles over the Long and Bisby building, that is the last remaining structure from the city's famed Sanatorium, and the

Century Manor building, that is the last standing from the former Hamilton Asylum for the Insane.

The vacant, 1920-built, Long and Bisby on Sanatorium Road — after many months of vandalism, a \$50,000 arson fire and a plan to demolish it — has been given a last-minute reprieve. Owner Valery Group announced in October it had decided to save the structure and renovate the building into its head office.

But the fate of the provincially-owned, 1884-built Century Manor on Juravinski Drive is uncertain. There was a deal to renovate the boarded up building into a Mohawk College residence. But the Ford Government reneged on the agreement in favour of a more wide ranging residential development plan for the area that could eventually see the structure torn down.

Now the stage is set for the latest heritage clash on the Mountain. The six-storey Mount Hamilton building, that does not have heritage protection, served as the city's main maternity ward for decades. Indeed, in the 1940s, it was the hospital where the infamous Evelyn Dick had three of her out-of-wedlock children — one that lived, one she later murdered and a third that was stillborn.

In the 1950s, the building was merged with a convalescent care facility on the site and became part of the Henderson General Hospital, named after Norah Frances Henderson, the first woman elected to Hamilton City Council.

But the Henderson name was controversially scrubbed from the hospital nameplate in 2010 when the upgraded hospital was renamed the Juravinski Hospital and Cancer Centre after Hamilton philanthropists Charles and Margaret Juravinski.

Now another controversy is brewing as word spreads about collateral effects of the Juravinski Hospital's plans for further expansion.

“There simply is no remaining structure in Hamilton that matches this building nor do many have its history. It is important that we work to save this amazing building,” says Graham Carroll, of the Hamilton Municipal Heritage Committee.

The committee will discuss the issue in January to decide whether to recommend protection from demolition.

“The building is stunning. Stone with intricate designs was used on the lower two floors,” he says.

As well, he says, there are delightful arched balconies on the sixth floor and a series of iconic stone spouts for water drainage. On the west side, stone work from a previously demolished nurses' residence has been incorporated into the building along with a memorial plaque for nurses who worked at the hospital.

The art moderne building was designed by the renowned architect William Palmer Witton (1871-1947) whose local resume includes work on the James Street Armouries, the old Spectator building on King Street East, the chapel for the Christ Church Anglican Cathedral on James, the Playhouse Cinema on Sherman Avenue and the Herkimer Apartments on Herkimer Street.

Also interesting about the Mount Hamilton Hospital is its stature as a skyline landmark above the escarpment for people who live in the south central part of the lower city.

The building was connected by tunnel to a heating plant built into the side of the Sherman Cut. That concrete landmark is no longer used by the hospital but remains as an inexplicable concrete bunker passed by thousands of motorists each day on the Mountain Access who have no idea what it is.

Yet, the hospital building and heating plant only hint at the elaborate initial design by Witton. The hospital building he imagined was more than twice the size of the completed structure. His design was truly two-tiered, with a much larger lower level heating plant that also served as an entrance and delivery area from the Sherman Access.

Mark Osbaldeston, author of the book “Unbuilt Hamilton,” says, “It was a grand vision of a hospital arising from the escarpment.”

Rob Hamilton, an archivist with expertise in local architecture, says “they had big plans but the money ran out. It took them years to finally find the funds to open the hospital after it was constructed.”

But Carroll says the completed building is still a sight to behold. He feels it could be preserved as part of the Juravinski upgrade. “There is no reason they can’t build a tower behind the building.

“It’s part of the history of Hamilton. Tens of thousands of babies were born in that place. People have a lot of connections to that building,” he says.

# Staff Designation Work Plan

Revised January 2021

*\*Initial target date if different from current date.*

Year			Common Name	Address		Former Municipality	Heritage Status	Buildings & Landscapes List	New Information
Added	Initial*	Target							
2009	2017	2021	Desjardins Canal		Cootes Dr	Dundas	Register	-	
2013	2015	2021	Jimmy Thompson Pool	1099	King St E	Hamilton	Register	-	
2017	2018	2021	Former Blacksmith Shop	2	Hatt St	Dundas	Register	Yes (Red)	
2011	2018	2021	Residence	7	Ravenscliffe Ave	Hamilton	Register	-	
2009	2013	2021	Dundas Post Office	104	King St W	Dundas	Register	Yes (Green)	
2009	2013	2021	Auchmar Gatehouse	71	Claremont Dr	Hamilton	Register	Yes (Black)	
2008	2011	2021	Gore Park	1	Hughson St S	Hamilton	Register	-	
2009	2016	2021	Barton Reservoir	111	Kenilworth Access	Hamilton	Register	-	
2009	2015	2021	Former Grace Anglican Church	1395-1401	King St E	Hamilton	Register	-	
2011	2017	2021	Hambly House	170	Longwood Rd N	Hamilton	Register	-	
2006	2011	2021	Gage Park	1000	Main St E	Hamilton	Register	Yes (Yellow)	
2013	2016	2021	Former Cathedral Boys School	378	Main St E	Hamilton	Register	-	Temporary Shelter proposed (no development application)

2011	2018	2021	San House (Medical Superintendent's Residence/Residence 37)/Patterson Building	540-672 (650-672)	Sanatorium Rd	Hamilton	Register	-	
2012	2018	2021	Regency Cottage	39	Lakeview Dr	Stoney Creek	Register	-	
2014	2020	2021	W.H. Ballard School	801	Dunsmure Rd	Hamilton	Register	-	
2014	2020	2021	Memorial School	1175	Main St E	Hamilton	Register	-	
2013	2020	2021	Residence	105	Erie Ave	Hamilton	Register	-	
2014	2020	2021	Kenilworth Library	103	Kenilworth Ave N	Hamilton	Register	-	
2013	2020	2021	Former Union School	634	Rymal Rd W	Hamilton	Register	-	
2019	2020	2021	Royal Coachman	1	Main Street	Waterdown	Register	-	
2019	2020	2021	-	9	Main Street	Waterdown	Register	-	
2019	2020	2021	Maple Lawn	292	Dundas Street East	Waterdown	Register	Yes (Yellow)	
2018	2020	2021	-	828	Sanatorium Road	Hamilton	Register	Yes (Red)	
2014	2020	2021	Cannon Knitting Mill	134	Cannon St E	Hamilton	Register	-	
2014	2020	2021	Bell Building	17	Jackson St W	Hamilton	Register	-	
2014	2020	2021	Oak Hall	10	James St N	Hamilton	Register	-	
2014	2020	2021	Former Bank of Nova Scotia	54	King St E	Hamilton	Register	-	
2012	2020	2021	Former Elfrida United Church	2251	Rymal Rd E	Stoney Creek	Register	Yes (Yellow)	

2020	2020	2021	-	490	Old Dundas Rd	Ancaster	Register	-	
2020	2020	2021	-	454	Wilson Street E	Ancaster	Register	-	
2020	2020	2021	-	450	Wilson Street E	Ancaster	Register	-	
2020	2020	2021	-	449	Wilson Street E	Ancaster	Register	-	
2020	2020	2021	Village Gate Montessori School	442	Wilson Street E	Ancaster	Register	-	
2020	2020	2021	Mount Mary-Wynnstay Estate	437	Wilson Street E	Ancaster	Register	-	
2020	2020	2021	-	430	Wilson Street E	Ancaster	Register	-	
2020	2020	2021	-	426	Wilson Street E	Ancaster	Register	-	
2020	2020	2021	-	425	Wilson Street E	Ancaster	Register	-	
2020	2020	2021	Needle Emporium	420	Wilson Street E	Ancaster	Register	-	
2020	2020	2021	Masonic Lodge	419	Wilson Street E	Ancaster	Register	-	
2020	2020	2021	-	413	Wilson Street E	Ancaster	Register	-	
2020	2020	2021	Old Ancaster Hotel	380	Wilson Street E	Ancaster	Register	-	
2020	2020	2021	-	363	Wilson Street E	Ancaster	Register	-	

2020	2020	2021	Ancaster Memorial School	357	Wilson Street E	Ancaster	Register	-	
2020	2020	2021	-	347	Wilson Street E	Ancaster	Register	-	
2020	2020	2021	Postans House	346	Wilson Street E	Ancaster	Register	-	
2020	2020	2021	Purple Pony	340	Wilson Street E	Ancaster	Register	-	
2020	2020	2021	-	327	Wilson Street E	Ancaster	Register	-	
2020	2020	2021	-	311	Wilson Street E	Ancaster	Register	-	
2020	2020	2021	-	303	Wilson Street E	Ancaster	Register	-	
2020	2020	2021	-	297	Wilson Street E	Ancaster	Register	-	
2020	2020	2021	-	289	Wilson Street E	Ancaster	Register	-	
2020	2020	2021	-	287	Wilson Street E	Ancaster	Register	-	
2020	2020	2021	-	286	Wilson Street E	Ancaster	Register	-	
2020	2020	2021	-	283	Wilson Street E	Ancaster	Register	-	
2020	2020	2021	Former General Store	280	Wilson Street E	Ancaster	Register	-	
2020	2020	2021	-	277	Wilson Street E	Ancaster	Register	-	

2020	2020	2021	Ryerson United Church	265	Wilson Street E	Ancaster	Register	-	
2020	2020	2021	Fraser House	176	Wilson Street E	Ancaster	Register	-	
2020	2020	2021	Former Carriage Factory	241	Wilson Street E	Ancaster	Register	-	
2020	2020	2021	-	558	Wilson Street E	Ancaster	Register	-	
2014	-	2021	Former Hamilton Distillery Company Building	16	Jarvis St	Hamilton	Register	-	
2014	-	2021	Former County Courthouse	50	Main St E	Hamilton	Register	-	
2019	-	2021	Lennard House	7	Rolph Street	Dundas	Register	-	
2014	-	2022	Charlton-Hughson-Forest-John Block	39-49; 40, 50; 189	Charlton Ave E; Forest Ave; Hughson St S	Hamilton	Register	-	
2014	-	2022	Copp Block	165-205 (Except 193)	King St E	Hamilton	Register	-	
2014	-	2023	Hughson House	103	Catharine St N	Hamilton	Register	-	
2014	-	2023	Hamilton Hydro	55	John St N	Hamilton	Register	-	
2014	-	2023	First Pilgrim United Church	200	Main St E	Hamilton	Register	-	
2014	-	2023	St. John's Evangelical Lutheran Church	37	Wilson St	Hamilton	Register	-	

2014	-	2024	Stelco Tower	100	King St W	Hamilton	Register	-	
2014	-	2024	Landmark Place/Century 21 Building	100	Main St E	Hamilton	Register	-	
2014	-	2024	Hamilton Club	6	Main St E	Hamilton	Register	-	
2014	-	2024	Commercial Building	189	Rebecca St	Hamilton	Register	-	
2014	-	2025	George Armstrong School	460	Concession St	Hamilton	Register	-	
2017	-	2025	Gartshore Building	64	Hatt St	Dundas	Register	Yes (Yellow)	
2017	-	2025	Undercliffe	64	Aberdeen Ave	Hamilton	Register	-	
2017	-	2025	Gateside	131-135	Aberdeen Ave	Hamilton	Register	-	
2017	-	2025	Hereford House/Royal Alexdandra	13-15; 19-21	Bold St; Bold St	Hamilton	Register	-	
2020		2025	Eastcourt Carriage House	24	Blake St	Hamilton	Register		
2017	-	2026	Residence	192	Bold St	Hamilton	Register	-	
2017	-	2026	Henson Court	170	Caroline St S	Hamilton	Register	-	
2017	-	2026	Central Presbyterian Church	252	Caroline St S	Hamilton	Register	-	
2017	-	2026	Eggshell Terrace	14-24	Charlton Ave W	Hamilton	Register	-	
2020	-	2026	Binkley Drive House	50	Sanders Blvd	Hamilton	Register	Yes (Yellow)	
2020	-	2026	Lakelet Vale	54	Sanders Blvd	Hamilton	Register	Yes (Yellow)	
2017	-	2027	Residence	99	Duke St	Hamilton	Register	-	
2017	-	2027	Residence	191	Bay St S	Hamilton	Register	-	

2017	-	2028	Residence	173	Bay St S	Hamilton	Register	-	
2017	-	2028	Maple Lawn	254	Bay St S	Hamilton	Register	-	
2017	-	2028	Widderly	274	Bay St S	Hamilton	Register	-	
2017	-	2028	Bright Side/Sunny Side	280	Bay St S	Hamilton	Register	-	
2017	-	2028	Balfour House	282	Bay St S	Hamilton	Register	-	
2017	-	2028	Residence	41	Charlton Ave W	Hamilton	Register	-	
2017	-	2029	Residence	72	Charlton Ave W	Hamilton	Register	-	
2017	-	2029	Stone Houses	14	Duke St	Hamilton	Register	-	
2017	-	2029	Residence	98	Duke St	Hamilton	Register	-	
2017	-	2030	Herkimer Terrace	11-17	Herkimer St	Hamilton	Register	-	
2017	-	2030	Semi-detached Residence	44-46	Herkimer St	Hamilton	Register	-	
2017	-	2030	Residence	370	Hess St S	Hamilton	Register	-	
2017	-	2030	Residence	378	Hess St S	Hamilton	Register	-	
2017	-	2030	Residence	384	Hess St S	Hamilton	Register	-	
2017	-	2030	HREA Residence	203	MacNab St S	Hamilton	Register	-	
2017	-	2031	Moodie Residence	37	Aberdeen Ave	Hamilton	Register	-	
2017	-	2031	Residence	125	Aberdeen Ave	Hamilton	Register	-	
2017	-	2031	Gibson Residence	311	Bay St S	Hamilton	Register	-	
2017	-	2031	Residence	312	Bay St S	Hamilton	Register	-	
2017	-	2032	Cartwright Residence	321	Bay St S	Hamilton	Register	-	
2017	-	2032	Whitton Residence	351-353	Bay St S	Hamilton	Register	-	
2017	-	2032	Pigott Residence	358	Bay St S	Hamilton	Register	-	

2017	-	2032	Semi-detached Residence	64	Charlton Ave W	Hamilton	Register	-	
2017	-	2033	First Hamilton Christian Reformed Church	181	Charlton Ave W	Hamilton	Register	-	
2017	-	2033	Herkimer Apartments	86	Herkimer St	Hamilton	Register	-	
2017	-	2034	Residence	347	Queen St S	Hamilton	Register	-	
2017	-	2034	Residence	403	Queen St S	Hamilton	Register	-	
2017	-	2034	The Castle/Amisfield	1	Duke St	Hamilton	Register	-	
2019	-	2035	Goldblatt House	45	Amelia Street	Hamilton	Register	-	